



**MAUT Council Meeting**  
Thursday, November 23, 2023 at 12:00 pm  
*In-person meeting with hybrid option*

---

**Revised & Approved Agenda**

1. **Approval of Agenda**
2. **Approval of Council Minutes of 2023-10-25**
3. **Motion President be Censured [R. Sieber]**
4. **Budget Presentation [Guest: C. Manfredi and C. Buddle] 1 pm to 1:45 pm**  
[McGill Budget & Resource Allocation](#)
5. **Other Business**
6. **Adjournment**



**MAUT Council Meeting**  
Thursday, November 23, 2023 at 12:00 pm  
*In-person meeting with hybrid option*

---

<b>Attendees:</b>	<b><u>Executive Officers</u></b> Peter Grutter, President Nate Quitoriano, President-Elect Renee Sieber, Past-President Jelena Ristic, VP Internal Victor Muniz-Fraticelli, VP External (virtual) Steve Jordan, VP Communications	<b><u>Council Members</u></b> Ben Forest Caroline Riches Catherine Lu Lisa Munter Michael Hendricks Yves Winter Jill Boruff (virtual) Ipek Tureli Sandra Hyde Mary Hague-Yearl, MAUT-LS (virtual) Frank Ferrie, MAUT-RAC
<b>Guests:</b>	Chris Manfredi, Provost & Vice-Principal Academic Chris Buddle, Associate Provost (Teaching and Academic Programs) Richard Martin, Executive Director, Analysis, Planning, and Budget David Theodore, Associate Professor, School of Architecture	
<b>MAUT Office:</b>	Jo-Anne Watier, AO and Joseph Varga, PLO	
<b>Regrets:</b>	Executive: Kirk Bevan, VP Finance   Council: Richard Gold	

---

### Approved Minutes

P. Grutter called the meeting to order at 12:06 pm.

#### 1. Approval of Agenda

B. Forest moved to approve the agenda, seconded by J. Ristic. R. Sieber asked to amend the agenda to add her item before item 3. Business Arising and to discuss the joint statement sent on behalf of P. Grutter and C. Manfredi. Council discussed whether to present it first, third or last on the agenda. Everyone agreed to add it before Business Arising. Council approved.

#### 2. Approval of Council Minutes of 2023-10-25

J. Ristic moved to approve the minutes, seconded by R. Sieber. Council approved.

#### 3. [Motion President be Censured](#) [R. Sieber]

R. Sieber presented a motion to Council that MAUT President, Peter Grutter be censured for failing to consult with MAUT Council and Executive on a [joint statement](#) with Provost Chris Manfredi that was sent out to McGill faculty and other academic staff on November 18, 2023. Some members of Council expressed their dissatisfaction in the lack of transparency in presenting the motion without their knowledge (un-collegial) or having had the opportunity to read the motion in advance. R. Sieber responded that she was unable to send the motion to Council by email earlier due to technical issues (internet was down). R. Sieber also then suggested that N. Quitoriano replace P. Grutter as the Chair of this meeting, indicating that she had discussed this with N. Quitoriano before the meeting, and N. Quitoriano said that he agreed to serve as Chair. VP Internal J. Ristic questioned this change, and asked whether it would be more appropriate for a current VP to take over the role of Chair instead. The issue of whether someone other than P. Grutter should chair the meeting was not resolved while the meeting continued. Several Council members argued that

although there is nothing in the Constitution to provision the President from making a statement on his own without consultation from Council and Executive, perhaps creating a policy in the future would provide guidance. A review of past MAUT Council meeting minutes by J. Varga indicates that past presidents have made joint statements without consultation with Council or Exec, and have not met with disapproval from Executive and Council; J. Varga also confirmed that presidents can act on their own accord in making joint statements, without violating the Constitution. Some argued that the joint statement should have been approved by Exec and/or Council, and this should lead to changes moving forward.

P. Grutter read his statement to Council. With tensions rising in the Middle East, some colleagues and students felt threatened and were afraid to come to campus. Some found the joint statement to be outrageous while others said it did not go far enough. The University has a legal obligation to maintain a safe environment. If the joint statement had gone out without MAUT's leadership, MAUT would have been perceived to be uninvolved. In the opinion of P. Grutter, the content of the message was no different and reaffirms what was discussed electronically and in person at the last Council meeting, where Exec./Council adopted the [CAUT Academic Freedom statement](#). Council decided not to make a political statement, but reinforce the right to speak up for our members (Academic Freedom), while pointing out that one needs to watch out for red lines one might not want to get too close to (due to possible misinterpretation by colleagues, staff and students) or even cross (hate speech is not protected by Academic Freedom). With freedom comes responsibilities. One positive consequence of the joint statement is that there is now a strong confirmation on Academic Freedom from the Provost in writing. P. Grutter continued to read his statement and apologized to anyone who he might have upset as it was not his intention. He added that 'The purpose of the MAUT, as defined in its Constitution a.II - ...' is to promote collegial governance and academic freedom through policies, procedures and working conditions that are conducive to the teaching, research and other pursuits of the academic staff of McGill University.' As President, I have prime responsibility for the affairs and operation of the Association (aIV(1)). With the rapid escalation of tension on campus, P. Grutter said he felt it urgent to make a decision when the Provost approached him to be part of a joint statement because it reinforced the principles discussed before and during last Council and that many colleagues needed to hear that Academic Freedom is protected but also reminding them that we should think of how peers, staff and students are affected by the statements that are made. As per J. Varga, there are no rules that he could find that pertain to the President making statements in MAUT's name or joint statements. This was backed up by Past Presidents K. Hastings, A. Kirk, J. Mauzeroll and P. Rohrbach who sent email responses regarding this question. There are processes that could be implemented to allow for wider consultation, starting with collecting Council member's cell numbers. Some Council members felt the joint statement was more about lack of procedure than it was about topic. Others felt the joint statement could have waited before being sent for feedback from Exec and/or Council members.

B. Forest moved to have the motion presented in writing at the next Council meeting, seconded by N. Quitariano. Council discussed, a member asked if the motion could be withdrawn. R. Sieber made a friendly amendment to change the wording of the motion stating that P. Grutter acted on his accord and not as President of MAUT, seconded by I. Tureli. Council discussed - C. Lu asked to amend the motion that would explain that MAUT has no clear procedure and that a policy for communications be discussed. She suggested to withdraw the original motion and have new motion saying that we don't have a clear policy. S. Jordan asked to withdraw the motion for censure and instead have a statement stating that P. Grutter did not represent the association. R. Sieber withdrew the motion but requested that a statement go in the newsletter and MAUTforum. C. Lu left the meeting at this point to teach.

R. Sieber asked if the majority of Council was in agreement to direct S. Jordan to write a letter for the newsletter and MAUTforum and to circulate the draft by email for approval before the next Council meeting. Two opposed, two abstained. S. Jordan will prepare the letter and circulate to Council.

S. Hyde joined the meeting at 1 pm.

**4. Budget Presentation [Guest: C. Manfredi and C. Buddle] 1 pm to 1:45 pm**

**McGill Budget & Resource Allocation**

C. Manfredi thanked P. Grutter and Council for being invited to present the budget. He began by acknowledging the government announcement of October 13th regarding tuition fees and that the government has not yet made a formal decision (waiting for the budget of Nov. 1st which has passed). He then introduced C. Buddle, R. Martin and D. Theodore.

- C. Manfredi began his presentation by stating McGill's fiscal period runs from May 1st to April 30th. Financial Statements consist of 4 basic funds:

- Unrestricted
- Restricted
- Endowment
- Plant

The financial responsibility of the Provost as Chief Budget Officer falls under the Operating Budget (unrestricted fund). Most of these funds finance the operations (tuition, government grants, sales of goods/services, etc.), money flows from here to pay most of the salaries (some through the endowment fund), research oriented staff/research assistants/research associates are paid from grants funds (individual PI grant funds - part of the restricted funds).

- C. Manfredi went on to explain each person's role and responsibility in the Operating (unrestricted fund) Budget:
  - PVPA, Chief Budget Officer
  - VPAF, Chief Financial Officer
  - Finance and Infrastructure Committee (new - combination of finance, buildings, properties)
  - Board of Governors (financial authority over the university)
  - Senate
  - Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur, MES
- Summary of the Budget Cycle
- Operating (unrestricted fund) Results and FY2023-2024 Budget
  - Budget from the last four years
- Operating Revenues (over 80% is driven by student enrollment)
  - 43% Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur (operating grants)  
Research support funding received from the federal government that comes as a grant attached to Tri-Council funding (around \$3M), is partially spent on activities that support research, activities, research, office, etc.
  - 12% Sales of Goods/Services
  - 39% Tuition Fees
  - 6% Other revenue sources (federal grants, gifts, etc.)
- Operating Revenue:
  - Quebec Grants  
\$523M operating (permanent) grant (becomes \$465M because \$82 million is recovered from the ministry to cover a forfaitaire on CNRQ students (Canadian non resident Quebec) and Quebec student fund. The government gives the university funding and then they claw back. This occurs with specific temporary grants that are important to government where

- McGill is asked to increase teaching/classes in certain areas (such as engineering, science, nursing, etc.).
- About Tuition Rates  
Students belong to one of three Ministry defined categories (three tuition rates):
    1. Regulated (Quebec/Canadian Residents)
    2. Deregulated (International – exempting France and Belgium)
    3. Self-Funded (Non-Credit Courses)
  - Tuition & Fees
  - Sales of Goods/Services
  - Operating Expenses
  - Operating Expenses:
    - Salaries and Benefits
    - Non-Salary
  - MES (Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur) Funding Model
    - What is an FTE? 30 credits
    - What is a weighted FTE (WFTE)? CAFF Code
    - Regulated students: Tuition and grand revenue
  - Government of Quebec – October 13, 2023 Announcements – Proposed Funding Model (FY2025+)
    - FY2025 Quebec Government Announcements
    - FY2025 Changes to the Fall 2019 Deregulation Policy
      1. Partial reregulation of international undergraduate and non research students – they'll set a prix plancher of \$20,000 (\$3,000 base tuition and \$17,000 forfaitaire). Universities can charge what they want above \$20,000, and will retain everything on top of that (but will now start getting grants for those students). The average grant for those students is around \$12,000. The government is going to be collecting \$5,000 per international student. Currently a student pays \$45,000/year in tuition, is a deregulated international student and McGill keeps the \$45,000. Under the new system starting in September 2024, they'll pay \$45,000 to McGill and the Government will take \$17,000, leaving the university with \$28,000. We will then get \$12,000 back bringing the amount up to \$40,000 (a loss of \$5,000 per international student x 5,000 international students).
      2. CNRQ Students pay \$3,000 on Quebec tuition and \$6,000 forfaitaire (\$9,000), government is effectively changing the forfaitaire from \$6,000 to \$14,000 (increasing tuition from \$9,000 to \$17,000). The university will be only collecting \$3,000 plus the grant. Revenue from these students will not change but enrollment will decrease reducing revenue and the ability to fill those vacancies in other categories of students. Current students are grandfathered.
    - FY2025 Quebec Government Announcements: Impacts (if Implemented)
    - FY2025 Quebec Government Announcements: Mitigation Measures  
Recruitment efforts will be stepped up in recruiting students, in particular Quebec students from a pool of other universities (the best students).
  - Provostial Model for Resource Allocation
    - Provostial Budget Allocation Model
    - Provostial Model: Additional Considerations

Discussion: Questions/Comments:

S. Hyde: 1. Why not raise international student rates? 2. Will they really go through with the tuition hike?

C. Manfredi: 1. McGill benchmarks itself against the public's tuition, the AU includes the Harvard's, Princeton's and Stanford's but also includes University of Michigan, etc. The average out of state tuition at a

public university is around \$45,000 US. International student tuition in the Faculty of Management is now approaching \$67,000, so there is room to manoeuvre. Faculty of Arts is getting high. McGill has the highest American student enrollment in Canada. 2. The Quebec government is quite adamant on going through with the tuition hike. There hasn't been any ministerial decree at this time. But some radical adjustments to curb spending will be necessary.

Y. Winter: 1. Rather than trying to increase tuition, would it be possible to replace the CNRQ students that we're losing with international students? 2. A lot of our colleagues and MAUT members are worried about salary and merit for this academic year, can you reassure them that merit is going through as planned?

C. Manfredi: We have a three-year agreement with MAUT. The only time was at the beginning of the pandemic, we did reach an agreement by six months. It was exceptional collegiality and a cooperative way of working with MAUT. We made a commitment at that time that we saw that things are better, we would reinstate merit, which we did. But I don't think I want to do that again. So not saying it can't possibly happen, but it's going to be a last resort. 2. We can replace some of the students that we think will lose with Quebec students with international exams, with international non-exempt. We don't think we can replace them all.

F. Ferrie: Is there any effort over time, reducing our dependency on Quebec funding?

C. Manfredi: It's a strategy we'll have to look at. As I said, 40% of our funding comes from the Quebec government, relative to other Canadian universities, that's fine. Toronto is now probably at 20-22%. But relative to Quebec universities, it's really low. The other Quebec universities are 70 to 80% of their funding coming. We're already less dependent than other Quebec universities. It's a \$475M plus capital. We get \$140M from the government of Quebec, let's say \$600 million and that's a big endowment.

V. Muniz-Fraticelli: Can we model US universities where not all students actually pay the sticker price because there's a whole process of internal redistribution through financial aid. You have more flexibility to subsidize students by need. So wherever students may be from, they may be in a worse financial situation than a very well off Quebec student. Perhaps starting with some programs, like the programs that still have a competitive advantage, even within Canada, can be presented because it implies a political cost. Even if financially it makes sense, it implies a political cost for McGill because this was forced upon. But I think it can be presented plausibly and honestly as a progressive measure for reconfiguring our finances to meet the needs of our students. McGill's position in the history of Canada, our Canadian students, not only Quebec students, but also Canadian students. I think we ought to seriously consider how we frame it.

C. Manfredi: We will try to identify the people who have the capacity to pay the full price, and then use some of that to sort of subsidize the students who can't pay the full price (we're doing a little bit of that already). \$56M a year out of our operating grant goes to student aid. There's also money that we have put into our endowment by donors to support students. The challenge for us right now is that the increase is so large, so quickly, going from \$9,000 to \$17,000 (\$8,000 x 6000 students = \$48M). There may be philanthropists who want to help McGill maintain its identity.

N. Quitoriano: There was less high level administrative staff in the past and have you consider looking into that?

C. Manfredi: We're going to look at all kinds of measures. There's the overhead of running University. The actual direct mission of the university, which is teaching and research - we look at all of that. On the reporting administration, a lot of that has been imposed on us by government. The cost of reporting on the extra money, is almost not worth the extra money. We have to track every activity that each student does. When an engineering student takes an English Literature course, they will be generating less money for that course, than they would if they were sitting in an engineering mechanics course.

J. Ristic: 1. In terms of generating revenue, did you also think (potentially), there's financial gain on the buildings that we have that serve as residences to render them to, like condo rentals, or those kinds of operations? I know UBC has profited immensely. 2. If we are to increase our enrollment substantially to generate revenues would it also make sense financially to start taking over have a teaching stream appointments, so we could accommodate a larger influx of undergraduates as well as potentially larger influx of graduate students?

C. Manfredi: We do have a master plan that does include some measures around identifying buildings that are no longer academically suitable and have been identified as possible disposals. Many of our old mansions were given to us, once used but they're no longer meet 21st century academic purposes. There's an interesting question about whether we can somehow monetize our residents activity in a way that would make sense. There's all sorts of issues around that other universities have done. Resident's life also has a pastoral aspect to it. Do you just want to run these things as a business? Or do you want them to have a pastoral element attached to it? That is the ongoing debate. 2. We haven't been looking at how but we had some faculties who had already kind of done that. I talked about these targeted envelopes for like increasing engineers or computer scientists. We realized that it was actually more efficient to use that money to hire faculty, lecturers, (of course, job security and reasonable salaries). They mostly do teaching, if the purpose is to teach as many students as you can, as quickly as you can. And they don't require the research infrastructure that tenure track professor does and we have already had difficulties dealing with.

C. Manfred: It is a bit of a wake up call to tell us that, what we thought was stability in Quebec government University funding policy was just that, a short term thing. So we have to be prepared and this a different fiscal year budget. As we start to look at different options for turning some of the knobs, we are going to probably have at least a couple of general town halls with community to talk about what we're thinking, what we're looking at, get feedback, and try to see what we can collectively come up with to address some of these issues.

**5. Other Business**

No other business.

**6. Adjournment**

P. Grutter moved to adjourn the meeting. C. Riches moved, seconded by B. Forest. Meeting adjourned at 2:07 pm.

---

Respectfully submitted and recorded by: JA Watier