



NEWSLETTER

McGill Association of University Teachers

Association des Professeur(e)s et Bibliothécaires de McGill

www.maut.mcgill.ca/

Volume 30, No. 1 Summer Été 2004

IN THIS ISSUE

INCOMING PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE	2
FALL GENERAL MEETING	3
FQPPU'S FUTURE	5
PRESIDENT'S REPORT	6
REPORTS FROM MAUT COUNCIL MEETINGS	7
SCHOLARSHIP	11
UNIVERSITY FUNDING AND TUITION FEES	12
NEWS FROM THE FACULTY CLUB	13
CAUT BENEFITS	14
MAUT FORUM ON MCGILL'S STRATEGIC PLANNING	15
MAUT FORUM ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE: THE PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING OF THE MCGILL BOARD OF GOVERNORS	20
NEW EXECUTIVE AND COUNCIL MEMBERS 2004 - 2005	27

Incoming President's Message

Frank Mucciardi

On April 14, 2004 I became the President of MAUT. During the last year I served as President-Elect under the stewardship of Prof. Bernard Robaire. What an experience that was. Bernard is a truly remarkable person – he is a wealth of knowledge. He is a true intellectual. He will continue to serve MAUT by Chairing the MAUT delegation of the Academic Salary Policy Sub-Committee (ASPSC). It is this parity group, which is chaired by the Provost, that decides what the current and future salary policies are. So if we get a 'good' raise, you can thank this group.

Continued on page 2

Parking on McGill's downtown campus

Nick Acheson

In July 2003, Ancillary Services announced a new rate structure for parking for McGill employees at downtown campus sites. A differential rate structure was set up. This entailed increases in monthly rates from 5% to 72%, depending on the permit. The highest jump was for "C" permits, which allow parking at all campus sites. This was apparently intended to discourage people from keeping their "C" permits, allowing better planning of parking space availability in the different sites. However, rates for other parking locations rose by 41% (Bronfman and Burnside garages), 25% (Engineering Courtyard and Main campus), or 5% (most other locations).

Continued on page 11

Incoming President's Message

Frank Mucciardi

Continued from page 1

As an association, MAUT plays an important role because it has an influence on many aspects of your life at McGill. Let me take this opportunity to tell you, from a general perspective, some of the things it does. I have chosen to divide MAUT's role into 4 streams: 1) Interaction with Administration, 2) Membership Services, 3) Service to Members, and 4) External Affairs.

Before discussing the functions of MAUT, you should understand that the MAUT Executive and Council members are all volunteers. Your fees are not used to pay these individuals. MAUT only has two fulltime employees. They are Ms. Honore Kerwin-Borrelli, the administrative officer and Mr. Joseph Varga our lawyer and our resource person for finding, synthesizing, analyzing and presenting data and information to MAUT.

The first role of MAUT is to interact with the Administration for the purpose of discussing and formulating policies that affect academics at McGill. Some items that were discussed this past year included salaries, tenure, auxiliary services like parking and food services, health and safety, salary adjustments relating to gender anomalies, adoption leave, professional development allowances, bonus for rank promotion, rank of emeritus professor and so on. Changes don't just happen, champions are required to make them happen.

Another role of MAUT is to provide the members with information by organizing forums that deal with topics of relevance to the membership. In the next section, Bernard Robaire presents an excellent summary of what was done last year. In addition to forums, MAUT publishes a hard copy newsletter and an electronic newsletter. It maintains a web site and it hosts 2 semi-annual meetings. These meetings along with some of the forums include lunch.

The third function I listed relates to the service MAUT renders to individual members. Most of the membership does not use (or need) this service. However, for some it is very important. For example, if you are denied tenure, or if you have a dispute with the administration, or if you believe you are being treated unfairly, or if you simply need legal advice related to your academic position, you can ask MAUT for help. There is a group of experienced individuals who will help you to resolve (or at least deal with) your issues.

The final role I identified as a significant MAUT activity is that of 'external affairs'. The academic staff cannot live in a vacuum. It is important for us to know what is happening around us in the other Quebec universities, and across Canada. To this end, we have a Vice-President, External who co-ordinates our activities with CAUT and FQPPU. We pay membership fees to these groups (almost half of your fees). They lobby the governments, gather statistics etc. on behalf of member groups like MAUT.

I will discuss some specific issues in the next newsletter. In the meantime, if you have ideas and suggestions you would like to share with me, let me know. I will be happy to discuss them with you. ❖

FALL GENERAL MEETING

Wednesday, November 26, 2003

1. TRIBUTE TO DR. GERALD PRICE

B. Robaire introduced Dr. Maria Zannis-Hadjopoulos who delivered a brief tribute to the late Dr. Gerald Price and acknowledged his many contributions to MAUT.

2. SALARY POLICY

B. Robaire

B. Robaire briefed the members on the accomplishments of the MAUT caucus of the ASPSC (see President's Report). Effective December 1st, there would be an across the board increase of 1.9% and a merit increase within a range of \$0 to \$3800 in increments of \$950. The Chairs will discuss the merit exercise with their staff and B. Robaire asked members for feedback. Continuing with the salary policy, there will be an additional catch up amount of \$1000 for each eligible academic which will be paid on June 1st, 2004, but is retroactive to December 1st. He continued with a brief recap of the Gender Anomaly Exercise which began three years ago. G. Tannenbaum chaired this ASPSC sub committee. There was \$1 million dollars set aside for gender anomaly corrections. The first year, \$350K was allocated, the second, \$200K and in the third and final year, \$400K. Last August, MAUT contacted every female academic to inform them of the results of this exercise and that they would receive a letter from Provost Vinet to indicate any corrections and rationale.

At the MAUT Retreat held last June 2003, two issues were earmarked for discussion with the Administration: a professional development allowance, similar to what other members of the G-10 have, and a step increase for promotion from Associate to Full Professor (Faculties presently pay for the step increase from Assistant to Associate Professor). The MAUT caucus will continue to push for inclusion of these items in this year's policy discussions.

3. PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

B. Robaire

B. Robaire discussed two major processes that the university is implementing: the Strategic Planning Process and the Proposed Restructuring of the Board of Governors. He noted that the current proposed restructuring of the Board of Governors would involve a significant reduction of Board

members from 45 to 18, a reduction in academic representation from 6 to 2, with the elimination of Senate representation. This issue was discussed at Executive, Council and Pre-Senate meetings. Council suggested holding Open Forums in late January and February to inform members, provide an opportunity for input and / or devise alternate proposals. (see Forums)

4. HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES AT McGill

B. Robaire

B. Robaire noted that WESA (Alberta) had been hired to conduct a health and safety audit at McGill. Its mandate was to identify and solve problems rather than conduct audits of specific buildings. V-P M. Yalovsky is expected to present the preliminary report to Senate in December, with the full report in January 2004. MAUT is continuing to monitor whether the University is meeting its objectives in assessing and correcting health and safety issues at McGill.

5. DEMUTUALIZATION of SUN LIFE, HEALTH INSURANCE and OTHER ISSUES

N. White - V-P Internal

MAUT Executive and Council have recommended the Pension Committee look into including a "Socially Responsible Investment Option" with the Pension Investments, as long as there is no increase in administration costs. N. White discussed parking fees (see Parking on McGill's downtown campus by Nick Acheson).

N. White noted that under the current adoption leave policy, academics have 5 days, whereas other McGill employees have 10 weeks time off for adoption leave. MAUT is working to change the current situation for academics.

Concerning the health and drug insurance and life insurance premiums, N. White explained that the increase begins after age 64. The current McGill plan is self-financed, insures all McGill employees (MAUT, MUNASA and 3 Unions) and is administered by Maritime Life. Up to age 64, both employees and the university pay an equal amount. After age 64, the same coverage by McGill is more expensive and most employees opt for drug coverage under the RAMQ plan. N. White

presented several schedules and scenarios whereby employees over 64 could still be covered by the McGill plan. These included a raise in premiums for all McGill employees under 65 and a raise in premiums for employees with a possible matching amount by the university. N. White will present his proposals to the SBAC, MUNASA and the McGill unions for further discussion. He noted that any increase in McGill's contribution would be part of a compensation package.

Concerning the demutualization of Sun Life, N. White commented that the University, MAUT, MUNASA and the McGill unions have reached an agreement and each eligible McGill employee will receive either a health premium holiday or a cheque.

6 AUDITOR'S REPORT AND BUDGET

Estelle Hopmeyer - Secretary-Treasurer

E. Hopmeyer presented the Auditor's Report for 2003 and Budget for 2004. She noted the increase in photo-copying, printing and office expenses were due to intensified recruiting practices. There was a donation to the CAUT Academic Freedom Fund. E. Hopmeyer moved that the Assembly receive the 2003 Auditor's Report and approve the Actual for 2003 and Proposed Budget for 2004. Seconded by C. Cumming Speirs. Approved.

7. MOTION TO CREATE A FINANCE COMMITTEE

E. Hopmeyer - Secretary-Treasurer

E. Hopmeyer gave formal notice to the Assembly that on November 12th, 2003, MAUT Council had approved the establishment of a Finance Committee to review the Budget and oversee finances. The Committee's recommendations included a reduction in the mil rate for full members, a reduction in dues for retired members, the provision that funds would be set aside to increase services to members, a yearly review of finances, the provision that investments would be placed in conservative and moderate risk portfolios, and a ladder withdrawal of funds to cover any deficit incurred. This formal notice is reported in the MAUT Constitution.

8. CAUT and FQPPU UPDATES

Marie-Claude Prémont - V-P External

M.-C. Prémont reported on the CAUT Conference (November 21-23) and the upcoming FQPPU Conference (November 27-28).

The CAUT Workshops addressed general pension issues, female academics and their specific pensions, national policies

that affect university teachers, national identity cards, and colleagues who had experienced difficulty traveling to the United States for research purposes. She asked the membership for feedback on these issues. There were also discussions about systemic discrimination in the CRC program as only 17% of the 1035 Chairs were awarded to women. CAUT will investigate this issue. CAUT has also sponsored public awareness campaigns on funding for higher education. Two other CAUT discussions were on accommodation for academic staff with disabilities and academic freedom issues. She asked members to forward their comments to her. E. Gisel asked if CAUT is looking into provisions for pension adjustments for female academics. M-C Prémont will bring this issue to CAUT.

M-C. Prémont commented on two discussion issues at the upcoming FQPPU Conference. The first would be the future of SORT, a service offered by FQPPU for labor relations and negotiations. She noted that MAUT is not involved with this service. The second issue will be a debate on university financing and tuition fees and each association has been asked to present a position. MAUT's motion, adopted by Council (November 12th) will be presented to FQPPU and included support for the principle of accessibility for students founded on reasonable tuition fees, support for indexed increase in tuition fees, support for the principle that any increase in tuition fees should be matched by an equivalent amount of public funding, and opposition to all increases in tuition fees that would bring about a modulation according to programs.

9. TENURE MENTORING COMMITTEE

Kohur GowriSankaran – Past-President

K. GowriSankaran reported on the issues discussed at the Tenure Mentoring Forum (organized by Alenoush Saroyan last May 2003) that benefited new and recently-hired academics and experienced professors who could be enlisted as mentors. The next Forum will be held in May 2004.

10 MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Nicholas Acheson - Chair

N. Acheson commented that though MAUT has increased its membership, it must constantly recruit and asked the Assembly for their support. At the Orientation for New Faculty (Fall 2003), each new hire received a recruitment package. This semester MAUT is holding a series of recruitment luncheons to meet newly hired academics and explain MAUT's services. In the second semester, MAUT will

invite recently-hired academics. He asked members to forward their recruitment suggestions to him.

11. CHANGES IN LIBRARIANS' STATUS AND TASK FORCE TO REVIEW LIBRARIANS' SALARIES

Joan Hobbins – Chair, Librarians' Section

The report was presented by Daniel Boyer. In 1998, the regulations were changed in the Grey Book to resemble those governing academic faculty. However, the result has been that the substance of the regulations has, in the opinion of the Administration, changed the level of the promotion and tenure requirements for librarians. No entry-level tenure track librarian has been hired since that time. In addition, 25% of librarians on staff are hired outside of tenure track and are performing core duties. The Proposed Framework governing Librarians' Status was presented to Deputy Provost A. Masi in November. There has been an agreement in principle and it is expected that the Framework will be recast in the Regulations. These will enable librarians to keep their special status in the academic community at McGill. D. Boyer reported that the ASPSC has mandated an AON-like survey to address the problem of librarians' salaries. The main difficulty is the gathering of reliable salary data. The Librarians are awaiting the results.

12. PRINCIPAL'S TASK FORCE ON NON-TENURE TRACK ACADEMICS

Malcolm Baines

M. Baines, a representative of the academic staff on the Task Force, said the report was submitted in September 2003 and is subject to revision and approval by the University. He anticipates the final report will appear in January 2004 and would be solution-oriented. The overall goals of the Task Force were to recognize the importance of the non-tenure staff and propose fair policies and procedures to recruit, retain and reward these academics. One recommendation adopted by the University was that the minimum salary for contract academic staff would be \$5000 per course.

13. FACULTY CLUB

Edith Zorychta – President, Faculty Club

E. Zorychta reported that the Faculty Club is doing well financially due to good management and creativity in bringing in new sources of revenue. There is on-going work at the Faculty Club to restore the rooms to their original beauty. Two

examples were the carvings in the Heritage and the English tiles in the Old McGill Rooms. E. Zorychta publicized the annual Christmas luncheon and the collaboration with the Faculty of Music for Gala Dinners in the Ballroom. She mentioned the joint MAUT and Faculty Club reception and recruitment event that will take place in the second semester for the new academic staff.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

G. Robinson asked for an update on the Emeritus Professor issue that MAUT had discussed previously. B. Robaire said the issue was spearheaded by R. Harris, then V-P Communications, and though discussions with the Administration had ceased, they would be resumed later this year with Principal Munroe-Blum. The problem was not with the concept but with giving the name "Emeritus" to all retirees. The members of the MAUT sub committee are discussing these issues with the Administration and they welcome your input. ❖

FQPPU'S FUTURE

Marie-Claude Prémont VP External

The future of the Federation of Québec University Professors is to be debated during the special Congress to be held on 15-16th April in Magog. Following the decision made in 2003 by the Union of Université de Montréal (SGPUM- Syndicat général des professeurs et professeures de l'Université de Montréal) to leave the Optional Labour Relations Service (SORT), the Federation's financial status became critical and is forcing all unions and associations of the Federation (including MAUT) to revisit the very mission and organization of the Federation. Immediate changes to the statutes of the Federation are to be decided in order to meet transitory financial consequences of the situation. But most importantly, all members are invited to participate in broad discussions in working seminars about the future role of the FQPPU and the best way the Federation can fulfill the needs of a concerted action of the Québec University professors and their unions and associations. Following the result of the intensive consultation and orientation congress, proposals of new services and the future structure of the Federation will be made and presented for approval during the 2005 Congress. ❖

President's Report

Bernard Robaire (*Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics*)

Dear Colleagues,

The last few months have been a very active period for MAUT. We have reviewed our financial situation and adjusted the mil rate, and planned and are in the process of running several forums. We are having ongoing discussions with the administration regarding compensation and the revision of tenure guidelines, and continue to press the administration for an improved health and safety environment at the University. Some of the highlights are described below.

MAUT Finances and the Mil Rate

Under the leadership of our Secretary-Treasurer, we created a Finance Committee with the mandate to review annually our financial situation and to advise on investments. The news is good. We are in a sound financial state. Based on the low rate of spending and our revenues, Council voted unanimously to reduce the mil rate, that is the rate you are charged for membership, from 0.55% (already among the lowest in the country) to 0.50%. This reduction was put into effect as of January 1, 2004.

Open Forums

A major component of MAUT's mission is to promote communication regarding major issues that affect the academic community. Council decided to hold four forums this term. Three of these forums have already been held and the fourth, on mentorship chaired by K. GowriSankaran, will take place on May 4, 2004. All three forums we have held thus far have been very well attended with participation ranging from 60-140 academic staff. In this newsletter, you will find a detailed summary of the proceeding of the first two forums (University's Strategic Planning Initiative and Governance and Collegiality). The topic of the third forum was Choices: Planning for Retirement. Estelle Hopmeyer did an outstanding job of planning and chairing this forum; a summary of its proceeding should be available soon.

Council has decided to continue the formula of open forums in the fall. Some of the topics under active consideration include: MUHC/Glen Yards project: effects on the University; Learning and Teaching; Pros and Cons of early

retirement. Please let us know about topics that you would like to see discussed in the forums by contacting the MAUT office at ext 3942 or at maut@mcgill.ca.

Academic Salary Policy

In addition to the increases that you all received last December 1 (seen on your paycheck as of December 15), you will each receive a \$1,000 across the board increase on June 1, 2004, retroactive to December 1, 2003. This will appear on the June 15 paycheck. With this amount, we anticipate that the University's commitment to raise our salaries to that of the mean of the G-10 universities will have been met. However, for us to confirm that this has actually taken place we must await the full set of data for 2003 that will be available in winter 2005.

Discussions for compensation for the coming year are ongoing. The basic principles being pursued for these discussions are making sure that we do not fall below the mean of the G-10 and also that we make a significant step toward attaining the mean salary of the three leading universities in Canada. We anticipate that, in the next newsletter, we will be able to communicate the results of these discussions.

As was the case last year, we have requested that the mean salaries by faculty, rank, and percentile be made available by the administration to the entire academic community. We have also asked that data be presented with respect to years since highest degree, as opposed to mean age.

The three-year gender anomaly exercise has come to a close. The commitment made by the administration to allocate nearly a million dollars (up to \$950,000) in order to correct inequities in the compensation received by female academic colleagues has been met. To determine whether these anomalies have in fact been fully corrected and to make sure that they do not recur in the future, a plan has been established whereby systematic, regular review of compensation by gender will be analyzed and appropriate corrections will be introduced, as necessary.

Revisions to Tenure Guidelines

A multi-year process of reviewing guidelines is likely to come to a conclusion in the near future. The pressure of large cohorts of newly appointed Assistant Professors combined with the desire to have written guidelines reflect current practice to have reasonable consistency across the university in the way Department Tenure Committees function have provided the incentive for undertaking the review. A joint committee of MAUT (Sam Noumoff and Marie-Claude Prémont) and administration (Stuart Price and Nicholas de Takacsy) representatives have worked long hours to develop a text that will optimize the process. We hope that a draft will be presented to Senate in the near future.

Health and Safety

With the creation of a Joint Health and Safety Committee (with MAUT representation), chaired by VP Yalovsky, a new spirit of ensuring that McGill meets its commitment to provide an environment that meets and exceeds health and safety standards has been created. We all have the responsibility of making sure that any hazardous activity or physical or structural defect in our environment is reported to our departmental health and safety committee, that accident reports are filled out, and that the Health and Safety Office (Wayne Wood) is notified if no action is taken. The first phase of the health and safety audit mandated by Senate has been completed. A long list of action items has ensued from this report. Some have been implemented; many are yet to be done. We are looking forward to seeing the comprehensive health and safety audit of the 175 buildings on both of our campuses! ❖

REPORTS FROM MAUT COUNCIL MEETINGS

(Minutes by Honore Kerwin-Borrelli, MAUT Administrative Officer)

September 10, 2003

1. Services Fair for New Faculty held on September 2, 2003, approximately 90 new hires received recruitment packages from the MAUT table. The Executive and Council have approved a strategy to meet the new faculty by inviting small groups throughout the fall to recruitment meetings at which senior MAUT members would discuss issues and provide an update on MAUT services.
2. B. Robaire reported to Council on the meeting with Principal H. Munroe-Blum concerning the position of the Provost. There would also be a review of the person holding the position of Provost and MAUT did not object to including the existing Provost as a candidate.
3. Council was updated on the salary data released by the administration in July 2003 on the request of MAUT. The reaction from members indicated that the age category was not the most appropriate and that the number of years since highest degree was a better indicator. MAUT will lobby for an

updated list next year and to make the release of salary data by faculty a yearly practice.

4. Concerning the demutualization issue, B. Robaire reported that MAUT sent a memorandum of understanding and another document specifying an understanding and clarification to HR in August. As a result, HR circulated a final document on demutualization in September 2003.
5. Last winter B. Robaire presented a motion at Senate to have a health and safety audit of the university buildings, to find out what and where the issues were, to set priorities, and to make corrections. The University is using the motion as a basis for a substantial plan to review the buildings, group them according to different priorities, and decide what has to be done.
6. Now that we have achieved the goal of having our salaries at the mean of that of the G-10, the goals for compensation over the next time window consist of two main pillars: to have the university administration agree to the commitments not to fall below the mean of the G-10 and to “hopscotch” between the mean of the G-3. B. Robaire suggested that MAUT come up with a written position paper to present to the Administration.
7. F. Mucciardi reported on the MAUT Retreat. There were three themes discussed: compensation and bringing McGill salaries to the mean of the G-3; the quality of professional life

and the additional work downloaded to academics; and long-range planning, which included recruiting and teaching.

8. M-C Prémont reported on the FQPPU, which has a new president and executive. Jean Roy replaced A. Hamalian as president. In the next FQPPU Conseil, October 2-3, the Agenda will deal with salary negotiations, SORT issues, parliamentary commissions, and tuition fees.

9. The Executive has decided to use MAUT funds to provide services for members and increase MAUT's visibility. Some of the recommendations were to review and update the investment strategy annually, examine the current fee structure for retired members, and create a Finance Committee.

10. J. Varga reported that he would get copies of the affiliation agreements between McGill and its affiliated hospitals. There are approximately 720 GFT-H's at McGill who are eligible for membership and MAUT competes with the medical associations for their membership.

November 12, 2003

1. N. Acheson (Chair, Membership Committee) updated Council on the first Recruitment Lunch held on October 31st, during which MAUT members made brief presentations to the new hires and answered questions. Two new members were recruited as a result of this luncheon. A. Paré said that if academics are concerned about the direction the university is heading, they should join the Association, participate actively on committees, and present alternative perspectives through MAUT.

2. B. Robaire met with Principal Munroe-Blum on October 31st. and discussed salaries, the commitment not to fall below the mean of the G-10, and to move toward the mean of the G-3. K. GowriSankaran commented this was an important gain for academic staff, had created much good will, and is a useful tool for recruitment purposes. During the same meeting B. Robaire brought up the general teaching environment, inadequate classroom space, the atmosphere in classrooms, inadequate audio-visual equipment, and uneven cleanliness and maintenance on campus.

B. Robaire also met with the Principal, R. Geller and M. Mendelson to discuss the proposed restructuring of the Board of Governors and identified key flaws. B. Robaire suggested holding an open membership meeting in winter 2004 to

discuss the governance issue. K. GowriSankaran reported on the Board of Governors' Retreat on November 8th and 9th. He agreed that under the present structure, the Board of Governors meetings do not function well and compared them to Senate meetings that function well with a larger membership of 105. K. GowriSankaran also discussed the proposal to separate administration from governance whereby an HR administrative committee would handle issues of promotion, tenure, and salaries. He commented that it was unacceptable that an administrative body should handle academic issues and violate collegiality. He noted that the Principal was surprised at the negative reaction from R. Prichard, M. Mendelson, S. Noumoff, and himself.

3. B. Robaire briefed the Council on the ASPSC meeting on October 27th. He noted some progress in the step increases for rank and professional development allowance. Currently the increase is 1.9% and merit. In June 2004, there will be an extra \$1000 retroactive to December 2003.

4. F. Mucciardi discussed the Planning Cycle document presented by V-P Vinet at Senate on November 5th. He indicated a tight time line and a great emphasis on performance indicators. A. Paré referred to performance indicators that will be imposed and others generated by units, and comparisons between individual units within and outside the university. The Strategic Plan is tied to budgets and enrolment in the university, and it stipulates early deadlines such as November 15th.

5. The MAUT motion to FQPPU on freezing tuition was discussed. M-C. Prémont reported there would be a parliamentary commission to discuss general issues concerning university finances and that FQPPU was preparing a position paper on freezing tuition fees in Québec. Council discussed many scenarios and finally approved a revised motion. (see below)

6. J. Hobbins reported briefly on the CAUT Librarians' Conference that dealt with possible changes to the Librarians' Regulations and these documents were forwarded to the Librarians' Committee that is meeting with Deputy Provost Masi.

7. E. Hopmeyer presented a motion to create a Finance Committee, which after some discussion and a friendly amendment was approved. Any decisions taken by the Finance Committee will be brought to Council for ratification. The composition of the Finance Committee includes: Chair, E. Hopmeyer (Secretary-Treasurer), B. Robaire (President), F.

Mucciardi (President-elect), G. Grantham (Economics), F. Grimard (Economics) and A. Deutsch (Economics).

December 10, 2003

1. D. Guitton updated Council on his concerns about the MUHC/Glen Yards project. He also circulated a document with information that compared the surface area of the proposed super hospital with existing facilities, the current and projected number of beds, the budget projections, and the proposed re-location of Neuro-Science research to three sites. He said a report would be sent to the provincial government by December 15th and scrutinized by the Johnson-Mulroney Commission. N. White remarked the lack of collegiality and consultation since the Board of the MUHC was not attentive to the researchers' and doctors' concerns. He noted the impact of the funds required by the university and suggested that MAUT encourage these discussions on campus.

2. N. Acheson had previously circulated three documents: his comments on undergraduate education at McGill, courses with enrollments larger than 100, and excerpts from the minutes of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning. He said that in order for introductory classes with huge enrollments to operate in the best possible conditions, there should be well-trained TA's, feedback from written exam questions, and functional and comfortable classrooms. B. Robaire will meet with L.Vinet to explore the possibility of creating a 4th Associate V-P for issues of undergraduate teaching.

3. N. Acheson (Chair, Membership Committee) updated Council on the series of Recruitment Lunches held during October and November. As of December 10th, there were 35 new members and of these 18 were new hires.

4. B. Robaire referred to the timeline document on the Revisions to the Tenure Regulations. MAUT has raised concerns about these proposed revisions. B. Robaire contacted V-P S. Price and proposed a sub-committee of MAUT representatives and university administrators to review these changes. Council suggested M-C. Prémont (Law), S. Noumoff (Political Science), and J. Hobbins (Libraries) as the alternate.

5. B. Robaire briefed Council on developments with the ASPSC. L. Vinet will advise academics as to who will or will not receive a gender anomaly adjustment. K. GowriSankaran noted that L. Vinet had accepted the Deans' recommendations for anomaly adjustments.

6. N. White reported that the rates for Health and Dental Coverage would be the same next year. The rates for Optional Life Insurance and Basic life Insurance are slightly lower.

7. M-C. Prémont briefed Council on the SORT issue and said a specific congrès will be held in March 2004 to revisit the mission of FQPPU. MAUT presented its motion on tuition fees and all motions were presented to the Executive of the FQPPU for information.

8. At the meeting of the Finance Committee on Nov 18th, G. Grantham provided the historical background to the current mil rate that had been raised to pay court costs but had never been reduced. The Finance Committee recommended and the Council approved reducing the mil rate from .55% to .50%, effective January 1, 2004. E. Hopmeyer moved that MAUT improve its services to members by making \$40K available per year over a five-year period for services to members and which would also cover any deficit incurred by reducing the mil rate. The motion was approved by the Council.

9. B. Robaire noted that the Retirement Workshop will be planned for March – April 2004 and the Tenure Mentoring Workshop for May 2004.

10. A. Kirk proposed a motion that the university should pay attention to its teaching mission and the Centre for University Teaching and Learning should report to a member of the administration who has a clearly defined responsibility for teaching and learning. The motion was approved by the Council.

January 14, 2004

1. N. Acheson (Chair, Membership Committee) reported that recruitment campaign including lunches, advertisement in the Reporter, and contacting the new hires produced positive results and that MAUT membership had increased by 48 when compared to last year's numbers.

2. B. Robaire reported that MUNACA thanked MAUT for its expression of solidarity.

3. B. Robaire reported that the Québec government is proposing to cut all ministerial budgets by 30-35%, with the exception of Health and Education. He remarked that the Research Councils, that fall presently under the Ministry for Regional and Economic Development, are threatened to be cut by 6-7%.

4. M-C Prémont updated Council on the proposed modifications to the Tenure Regulations Amendments, Draft # 20. She noted there were major changes in the process and that a joint Administration (S. Price & N. de Takacsy) and MAUT (M-C. Prémont & S. Noumoff) Committee had been struck to review these changes and make recommendations.
5. B. Robaire updated the Council on the meetings with H. Munroe-Blum, L. Vinet, and the ASPSC. Concerning the Emeritus Professor issue, L. Vinet had no opposition to the idea but objected to the title “Emeritus” for every retiring professor. The discussion will continue, as retiring professors wish to retain their connection with the university and its privileges.
6. Concerning a minimum salary for assistant professors special category, there is no specific agreement as contracts vary. B. Robaire remarked that the administration has used this category for academics who have not yet completed their doctorates. Administration is committed to review the status and salaries of the approximately 400 ranked part time or special category professors individually.
7. F. Mucciardi reported on the MAUT motion he presented concerning the Centre for University Teaching and Learning (CUTL) and the selection of a Director. This motion requested a stable funding source for the CUTL and proposed a reorganization of the reporting structure so that the CUTL would report to a specific academic with a defined responsibility for teaching and learning rather than only technology related issues. This motion was presented to L. Vinet along with the suggestion to create a V-P position for Teaching and Learning.
8. J. Hobbins informed Council that the framework for a draft statement of principles on the status and working conditions of librarians at McGill was posted on the website. This has been approved by the Librarians and sent to the lawyers for their comments. There will be changes to the current terminology in the Grey Book and these could revert back to previous technical terms.

9. E. Hopmeyer reported that the mil rate was reduced from .55% to .50% effective January 1, 2004. E. Hopmeyer reported that the Executive has discussed reducing the \$50.00 membership fee charged to Retired Members to \$25.00 and this would include the MAUT, CAUT and FQPPU Newsletters and also the services that CAUT offers to Retired Members. E. Hopmeyer moved that the membership fees be reduced to \$25.00.

February 18, 2004

1. M-C. Prémont reported on the meeting with Associate V-Ps Price and de Takacsy concerning the revisions to the Tenure Regulations Amendments. The MAUT members of the ad hoc committee had sent Draft #21 to the administration and will meet again.
2. B. Robaire noted that with the exception of Health and Education, there is a proposed 30% budget cut in the funding for other Ministries. The text of McGill's brief presented to the Commission parlementaire sur la qualité, l'accessibilité et le financement des universités is on the McGill website.
3. B. Robaire mentioned a suggestion by R. Prichard to have an additional forum to discuss the Glen Yards Project and its positive and negative implications for the University. B. Robaire commented on the positive response to the joint MAUT / Faculty Club event held on February 5th. The suggestion is to hold these recruitment events for new hires in the fall and spring.
4. F. Mucciardi reported on the colloque held on February 12th and the presentation on future recruitment needs. He quoted statistics from a survey on the hiring needs for 2003-2008 and noted that 37% of the academic staff would have to be replaced within the next 5 years. There would be 1046 new positions in the next 5 years and among the newly hired, 80% would have PhD's. ❖

Parking on McGill's downtown campus

Nick Acheson

Continued from page 1

Furthermore, Ancillary Services began to collect parking fees at the lower campus on Sundays. Previously, the lower campus was open to anyone to park for free on Sundays. There is now an automated gate that requires non-permit holders to pay for parking 24 hours per day, seven days per week.

These changes were instituted with no apparent consultation with users of McGill parking or their representative associations.

MAUT has begun consultations with Ancillary Services to try to deal with some issues brought to its attention by members of the academic staff who drive to work. We are concerned that parking rates can be raised without consultation. We have learned that designated alternative parking areas are available in case of overcrowding in a given area, and that visits of 20 minutes or less (to pick up or drop off goods or passengers) are without charge in areas controlled by automated gates. We encouraged Ancillary Services to communicate this information to parking permit holders. We suggest that after-hours and weekend parking might be offered at lower rates to McGill employees; space is available and academic staff who come to work after hours or on weekends should be able to park near their place of work.

Overall, the University administration seems to consider campus parking a low priority. It has allowed numerous surface parking spaces to disappear as new buildings are erected, and does not seem to be planning for parking spaces in relation to future building projects.

Any MAUT members who may have issues with parking at the downtown campus are encouraged to communicate with Norman White (former VP Internal) or Nick Acheson (current VP Internal). ❖

Scholarship

The tragedy at Ecole Polytechnique in December 1989 touched us all. In 1990, the MAUT Council felt that the profound implications of the 14 murders warranted a very tangible and lasting memorial. To that end, the MAUT Council had voted unanimously to establish an MAUT Scholarship, to be granted every year, to a female student in Engineering at McGill. This action, typical of MAUT, demonstrates once again that our concerns are not merely our narrow self-interest, but the quality of the academic life as a whole.

This year the scholarship was granted to Ms Ilana Leppert, in Electrical Engineering. Congratulations! ❖



From left to right: Nick De Takacsy, Associate Vice-Principal (Academic), Ilana Leppert, Jamshid Beheshti, Director, Graduate School of Library & Information Studies (MAUT VP Communications)

University funding and tuition fees

McGill's position on university funding in Quebec is presented in a report:

Brief presented by McGill University to the Commission parlementaire sur la qualité, l'accessibilité et le financement des universités

FRENCH:

<http://upload.mcgill.ca/public-relations/memoire-2004-02-17.pdf>

ENGLISH

<http://upload.mcgill.ca/public-relations/mcgill-brief-2004-02-17.pdf>

and

Responses to the 19 questions asked in the Consultation Paper issued by the MEQ and the Government of Quebec for the Parliamentary Committee on Education for the Quality, Accessibility, and Funding of Universities

February 2004

<http://upload.mcgill.ca/public-relations/appendix-19-questions.pdf>

MAUT's position on tuition fee increases presented in a motion and unanimously adopted by the Council on November 12th 2003, states:

WHEREAS university education is a public service to which citizens must have access, without regard to their socio-economic status;

WHEREAS tuition fees required from students constitute a central element in a policy of accessibility to university studies;

WHEREAS the public financing of university and a reasonable level of tuition fees required from students represent the best guarantees so that the principle criteria for the selection of students be founded on their intellectual capacity and not on their financial capacity;

WHEREAS the pressure to augment tuition fees is principally felt at professional faculties like medicine, law, and dentistry. The model that is observed in Ontario where, for example, the tuition fees of the Faculty of Law at the University of Toronto are in the order of \$16,000 for the 2003-2004 academic year, is contrary to the support of the principle of accessibility, even in the presence of a student financial aid program based on need.

WHEREAS the position presented to the Quebec Minister of Education by the administration of McGill University in the September 1999 document entitled: Tradition and Innovation: An International University in a City of Knowledge, where she had pleaded for the establishment of the right for tuition modulation according to programmes, like that we find in Ontario, is not acceptable;

WHEREAS to permit the augmentation of tuition fees that vary according to programmes will result in the significant augmentation of the tuition fees in contingent programmes.

WHEREAS to maintain the tuition fees at a reasonable level, does not prevent an annual indexation.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT MAUT:

SUPPORTS the principle of accessibility for university students, founded on reasonable tuition fees;

OPPOSES all increases in tuition fees that would bring about a modulation according to programmes;

SUPPORTS the indexed increase in tuition fees;

SUPPORTS the principle that any increase in tuition should be at least matched by an equivalent amount of public funding. ❖

NEWS FROM THE FACULTY CLUB

Edith Zorychta

Chair, MAUT Faculty Club Committee

President, McGill Faculty Club

Our McGill Faculty Club has recently enjoyed a series of successful years, and 2003/04 is continuing the trend. Use of the Club has increased steadily since 1999, with most activities (85%) being internal to the university, and the remainder predominantly involving alumni or organizations that are linked to McGill through donations, research collaborations or scholarly activities. Excellent financial management has allowed for a series of renovations and restorations that have markedly enhanced the facilities and consequently increased the frequency with which the Club is chosen for various events – a very positive cycle.

Those of you who are regular participants at the Faculty Club will have noticed many of the restorations in recent years, a few examples being the tapestry in the dining room, various pieces of heritage furniture, the antique brass in the Ballroom and the beautiful oak and tiled fireplace on the third floor, previously camouflaged by 20 coats of paint. You will also be enjoying the comfort of central air conditioning on hot days in June, or lunch on the elegant terrace with brickwork and plants instead of asphalt. The dozens of visible changes to this beautiful heritage site have been accompanied by a series of less obvious, but vital, improvements to the structure and safety in the building - relined fireplaces, a completely new fire detection system, and new exhaust ventilation in the kitchen, to name a few. The Faculty Club has made great progress in reversing a long period of earlier neglect, and it is hoped that the remainder of the needed upgrades can be accomplished in the near future, including such things as major rewiring, better heating and insulation, and restoration of many of the windows.

The Faculty Club is governed by an Executive and Council, which contains representatives from a wide range of university departments, including academic and non-academic members.

Council monitors the budget, approves major expenditures, and together with the General Manager, formulates the primary short and long-term goals. Success in reaching these goals is fundamentally determined by the capabilities of the management team. In this regard, most of our accomplishments in the past six years can be credited to the competence and dedication of the General Manager, Mr. Nicholas Bourboulakis, and the team he has assembled to direct the operations of the Club. He came to McGill with a wealth of management experience in the hospitality industry, ranging from large hotels on several continents to the Montreal Convention Center, and his talents include speaking seven languages, being versed in diplomatic protocol, and being able to graciously cope with just about anything. The new menu and excellent food are due to Pierre Majois, our Executive Chef (yes, he is from France), and special events are handled by Octavio Vieira, who can smoothly arrange anything from a five-course banquet for 150 conference participants in the ballroom to a confidential luncheon for 3 in a private room.

During the next academic year you can expect to see a few more changes as the gradual restoration continues to take place, to hear more live music in the ballroom, and to smell and taste some wonderful food ...watch for the special events in particular. The collaboration between the Faculty Club and MAUT will continue to be strengthened, and this year's joint reception for new faculty promises to be a regular event from now on.

In summary, the Faculty Club is thriving, and we hope that all of you will take advantage of the unique opportunity it provides to get to know your colleagues from other areas within McGill. If you have been attending academic functions upstairs but haven't had time for lunch at the Club this year, bring a friend and try the buffet at Ole's bistro between 11:30 and 2. Ole's has been completely renovated, and the walls now showcase an elegant series of campus scenes created by Joan Edwards. As soon as the weather warms up, you can dine on the terrace, and sample some new selections on the menu. The good food in pleasant surroundings will be enjoyable even if you only have a few minutes, and the congenial atmosphere among colleagues is irreplaceable. ❖

CAUT Benefits

Ralph Harris

Dear Fellow MAUT Members:

I seldom bother reading mail solicitations carefully, but after I received my home insurance renewal notice with a second 30 % increase in two years and as I had been told by my insurance broker that ING Insurance was the ONLY company that would insure my home because of its age of construction, 98+ years, I decided to follow up on the mail we all received from CAUT a few months ago mentioning the Johnson Home-Auto Insurance Plan.

First, I found that I was not connected to Johnson when I called the number given by CAUT, but rather to La Capitale Insurance, the company, not a broker. Once this confusion was resolved, the story becomes interesting, but to cut to the chase, here's a summary of what transpired:

Home insurance renewal with present broker:	\$1,371.22 (tax included)
Home Insurance with La Capitale:	\$756.46 (tax included)
Difference in coverage:	---NIL---
Savings:	\$614.76
First Car insurance with present broker:	\$752.85 (tax included)
First car insurance with La Capitale:	\$352.80 (tax included)
Difference in coverage:	---NIL---
Savings:	\$400.05
Second car insurance with present broker:	\$207.60 (tax included)
Second car insurance with La Capitale:	\$207.60 (tax included)
Difference in coverage:	---NIL---
Savings:	\$00.00
Discount for insuring home and second car:	10%
Savings:	\$133.93
TOTAL SAVINGS:	\$1148.74
Percentage savings:	49% !!!

Need I say more?

The person that I dealt with at La Capitale was Marie Cournoyer (514) 906-2033 who does NOT get commission, but must meet quota. Alternatively, you can call the number given by CAUT:

1-800-563-0677 and get the person at La Capitale whom the computer refers you to.

Cheers

Ralph Harris, Professor

PS - I also do NOT receive commissions! ❖

MAUT FORUM ON McGill's STRATEGIC PLANNING

Monday, January 19, 2004

12:00 p.m. to 2:00 pm
McGill University – Faculty Club

MINUTES

Chair: Bernard Robaire, President MAUT – Introduction

Panelists: Dr. Luc Vinet, Provost
Dr. Lydia White, Faculty of Arts
Dr. Diane Mather, Faculty of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences
Dr. Anthony Paré, Faculty of Education
Dr. Raphael Fischler, Faculty of Engineering
Dr. Kohur GowriSankaran, Faculty of Science

Introduction

The meeting began at 12:15 pm. B. Robaire welcomed MAUT members and guests to the Open Forum. He introduced Luc Vinet, Provost, who spoke about the New Planning Cycle Document (2004/5 – 2007/8) that was presented on November 5, 2003 to Senate.

Luc Vinet congratulated MAUT for organizing the Forum and providing another opportunity to discuss the Strategic Planning exercise with the university community. He paraphrased his presentation to Senate and noted it was posted on the Web. This planning process builds on previous actions and results from a renewal process and the expectation of having 100 new hires per year for the next 10 years.

L. Vinet reviewed the reasons for the Strategic Plan. Among them were the new leadership both at McGill University and at the provincial government level, McGill's tradition and innovation, the end of the MEQ performance contract and associated funding, and the need to develop a plan that would focus on academic renewal for the next 20 years. The university is also planning an impressive capital fund raising campaign. L. Vinet stated that the Strategic Planning exercise would provide a framework for collegial leadership and decision-making. This framework would include multi-year plans for teaching, research, space development and budgeting.

L. Vinet spoke about the collegial nature of university leadership. The collegial structure intensely involves the Faculties, and the objective is to improve the quality of the university with respect to its mission.

In terms of research, L. Vinet spoke about the organization involved, the structural support needed and space allocation. These needs must be integrated within the strategic priorities and budget and resource allocation. The resource allocations will be determined through a planning analysis. The Deputy Provost and the University Planning Office are developing "Faculty Profiles". There have been two rounds of meetings to bring convergence to the development of the Strategic Plan. There was also a Deans' Retreat, and group and individual meetings with Deans. Each unit has been asked to develop a "compact" or agreement with the university that will describe its goals and objectives, which will be part of the faculty profile. The first draft submitted by the Faculties included their strategic priorities and integrated expressions. There was feedback to this draft. In February, there will be two more rounds of meetings to finalize the compacts with the faculties. In March or April, the resource recommendations from the Provost will be tabled with the compacts. He emphasized that the underlying philosophy of "prune and grow" would allow us to attain our objectives.

B. Robaire thanked L. Vinet and introduced Lydia White – Faculty of Arts.

L. White said that Dean J. Hall, who was appointed last year, is becoming familiarized with the Faculty. There are currently about 20 academic units involved in the planning process. In the Faculty of Arts, there have been discussions in the Planning Committee concerning university priorities and the crucial and strategic areas that need to be developed. The

Chairs have had three different meetings to discuss issues relating to the strategic plan for the Faculty. A three-page planning document from the Dean is to be discussed at the January meeting of the Faculty of Arts. L. White commented that the purpose of the strategic plan is not entirely clear. The timeline outlined in the Strategic Planning document has deadlines that L. White described as unrealistic. She reiterated the need to have enough time for the information to be disseminated, as the first phase of the planning exercise will be over in March 2004 and Arts is a large faculty.

B. Robaire thanked L. White and introduced Diane Mather – Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

D. Mather stated that as the FAES is smaller than the Faculty of Arts, and that as Dean D. Buszard has had more experience, the preparatory documents for the Strategic Planning Process have been in the works for some time. The FAES has identified and agreed on academic priority areas as well as a leader for each interdisciplinary area. She noted that formulating an initial strategic plan that would lead to a compact was a more difficult developmental process, as it would eventually be part of a compact for the whole FAES.

There have been meeting and consultations among theme leaders, unit meetings and reports to faculty. D. Mather referred to her handout, which outlined ideas on developing a strategic plan for a department or discipline. She noted that each plan must begin with a definition of a unit, include where it fits into the faculty, and how it compares to other universities, which would give its position in the market. The handout also suggests bulleted listings of a unit's strengths and weaknesses. There should also be an explanation of the unit's major new directions, the initiatives needed to achieve them and what obstacles would be foreseen on the road to achieving these goals. D. Mather also said that goals should be numbered and / or ranked in importance and logically sequenced. A strategic plan should also include an outline of a 5-to-10 year plan to achieve these goals, list the benefits to teaching and research, and include an outline of the research and human resources needed to achieve these goals. D. Mather also suggested including an appendix to justify the goals or to explain the complexities of the report.

B. Robaire thanked D. Mather and introduced Anthony Paré, - Faculty of Education.

A. Paré commented that the Faculty of Education has been struggling with the Strategic Planning Process, as it has been between Deans. The new Dean, R. Slee, is scheduled to begin very shortly. He mentioned problems concerning deadlines and performance indicators. In the Faculty of Education, there are 3 departments and 1 graduate school and each has a planning committee. An administration group composed of the Dean, the Chairs, and Associate Deans are doing the planning for the Faculty, and there are on-going discussions. He commented that as the Faculty needed a clear definition of the problems, a charter document or statement of goals and objectives as well as a previous version of a planning document would be very helpful. He said the Faculty needs something more than what is currently available and commented on the change that future budgets would be dependent on performance indicators and not just student enrollment. The Faculty is working on a draft compact and he commented that Education is both in a competitive market and is facing diminished resources. He asked if the "pruning exercise" meant losing already established resources. In order to prune properly, the Faculty must first decide what it wants to keep, establish objectives, and then participate in a planning process.

The planning process in the Faculty only started in September 2003, and there have been drafts of individual "compacts" for each unit. There is an on-going attempt to merge the separate "compacts" and this has not been successful to date.

There are several problems with the planning process. A. Paré listed the uncertainty about the objectives / goals / and purposes. He noted the lack of charter documents that would outline the new McGill philosophy and commented that the existing texts in PowerPoint were too sparse and vague. He said that the deadlines were too tight, and that the steps in the planning process were unclear. The result of this exercise to date was to create a competitive environment in the university that would work against collaboration. He also commented that the "pruning" metaphor was unsettling.

B. Robaire thanked A. Paré and introduced Raphael Fischler - Faculty of Engineering.

R. Fischler reported on the progress on the strategic planning process, the "compacts" and the 3-year budget. One purpose of the strategic planning process was to identify priorities for new funding in the Faculty of Engineering. Representatives from each unit met in a faculty-wide planning committee to identify priority areas and multi-disciplinary themes, and improve the cross-disciplinary nature of selected projects.

The committee identified problems in teaching and learning, research facilities, space allocation, support staff, etc. and their possible solutions at the unit, faculty and university level. Once the committee had identified priority areas, this information would be transferred to the budget compact. The committee would also recommend specific actions for the university to implement in order to resolve the problem areas in the faculties.

R. Fischler began with the 1st series of questions: Who plans? / How does one plan? / About what does one plan? R. Fischler referred to a solution-oriented planning process. He asked if it would be a good move for the university to fund units based on their performance indicators. He also asked how the university would go about establishing these performance indicators.

The 2nd series of questions: Who has the funds? The university has indicated it wishes to promote growth but the faculties are faced with a 2% budget cut. What was the rationale for this? What is the plan for reallocating funds within the university? R. Fischler expressed the need for more clarity on these issues.

B. Robaire thanked R. Fischler and presented a one-page outline of initiatives and priorities that had been submitted by the Faculty of Medicine.

B. Robaire introduced Kohur GowriSankaran - Faculty of Science.

K. GowriSankaran said that the present format of Strategic Planning in the Faculty of Science was essentially an extension of what the Dean's Council has been doing for the past several years. Each fall, the Dean asked each Chair/Director to produce the top one, two, or three hiring priorities for each Department for the forthcoming academic year. Such a document took into account, besides the Staff Hiring Plan of the Department, the importance of teaching at undergraduate and graduate levels, interdisciplinary themes, and priorities of the Faculty, etc... The members of the Dean's Council ranked these hiring priorities thus providing the Dean with ideas for the hiring priorities for the Faculty for each academic year.

During the present Strategic Planning process, the Dean's Council met several times in October to brainstorm and prepare documents in each of the core and theme areas of interest to the Faculty. These would be discussed by Council and would aid the Dean in preparing a 'compact' re: the Strategic Planning Document.

The following four committees addressed fundamental and core areas of the Faculty of Science: Mathematical and Computational Sciences, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. There were also five committees formed to review Interdisciplinary themes: Material Sciences, Life Sciences, Information Technology (including Bioinformatics), Environment Sciences, and Earth System Sciences. Associate Dean Mendelson prepared a report on undergraduate education.

The process has also been addressed from the ground up. An example was the process followed by the Mathematical and Computational Sciences Committee which met to generate a proposed document that would take into account teaching, research, administration, space, etc. It was agreed that there would be four documents produced to address four areas of the core Mathematical and Computational Sciences. These documents would go to the Chair's Advisory Committee of his department, and other departments that were involved in producing similar documents. K. GowriSankaran and the committee produced a first version of an Executive Summary, which was available to all members of the Dean's Council by mid-December. Following input from the Dean's Council, K. GowriSankaran presented the current version of the Executive Summary early in the New Year.

K. GowriSankaran said the Dean's Council has met regularly on a bi-weekly basis to monitor and discuss the progress made by the committees, and that they prepared a first draft and subsequent revised versions. The Executive summary of these reports has been placed on the Website of the Faculty of Science, but at this time is available only to members of Dean's Council. Shortly it will be made available to members of the Faculty of Science and later to the entire University community for their input. He noted that the Faculty of Science interacts with many other faculties in research and teaching. The Dean wished to involve all Faculty members and in December 2003, and has outlined the important themes and the possible directions for the Faculty to proceed in the coming years.

B. Robaire thanked K. GowriSankaran and opened the floor to questions.

Question Period:

Shree Mulay – (MCRTW) addressed her comments to L. Vinet to consider the future of the MCTRW and include the Centre in the planning process. She explained that in university processes, the MCTRW has a tendency to fall between faculties. She noted that the strategic planning process is already advanced and the MCTRW wishes to provide input and be part of the process. She said that the process should receive input from all components of the university.

Erika Gisel – School of Physical & Occupational Therapy said that the School had produced a Strategic Planning document, which had been submitted to the Faculty of Medicine, and there had been no reaction to this document. L. Vinet commented that he would ask for the documents from the Schools in the Faculty of Medicine.

Raphael Fischler asked L. Vinet to elaborate on the relationship between planning and the budgetary process.

Luc Vinet said the university must deal with academic initiatives and fiscal realities and that plans must be prioritized. Changes are being proposed. Previously faculty allocations were dependent on enrollment and while enrollment still plays an important role, quantitative and qualitative performance indicators will also be considered. L. Vinet discussed partnerships, the cost of research, and the need to find ways that the university can save money. The intent of the consultative process is to find ways to fund initiatives with the highest priorities.

Anthony Masi spoke from the audience and said that planning would also be useful if there were to be cuts in budgets. They could then be strategic rather than across the board. The intent however, is to focus on resource generation to help make up for shortfalls from the Provincial operating and capital grants.

Anthony Paré said that many people have expressed concerns that federal funding to the university is unevenly distributed. The strategic planning process should incorporate the values of the university community. He has heard people express anxiety wondering what the university priorities are. Their concern is that priorities would be based on what activities bring in more revenue.

Raphael Fischler asked: Does the university intend to give more to units that already have more thanks to research grants and thereby create larger differences between “rich” and “poor” units?

Jacques Derome asked about the “prune and grow” process and the budget planning process. He asked who would make these decisions.

Luc Vinet said the process would be as collegial as possible and make use of the tools available from the government and the university. He said the outcome of this process would be a healthy state and positive growth. The essence of the planning process would be to decide where the university is going and to improve the quality of core activities. He commented that though the time-lines may appear to some to be unrealistic, the process will continue. The process must be iterated, referenced, and fall within a framework. He reiterated the need for clarity and collegiality.

Bernard Robaire asked about the partial redistribution of funds in a “pruning and growth” approach and its reference to a major fundraising campaign.

Luc Vinet commented that the sources of funds included government allocations and tuition and funding from the federal government.

Don Kramer – (Biology) commented on the time allotted for the planning process and the details involving criteria and subdivisions. The process requires the involvement of the faculties and their realization of the costs and benefits of this process. The work involved in the strategic planning process is an extra load; he commented that the faculties need more clarity about the process. Where will the work demanded by the planning process end up? He noted that the faculties would like to see some appreciation / recognition from the university.

Luc Vinet commented that the planning exercise is a useful process that would lead to a more focused and organized university. It is not a make-work project. The data will be useful in planning.

Malcolm Baines (Microbiology & Immunology) commented on how the internal faculty strategic planning process works: it is an iterative process within the faculty. He commented that for something to grow within the faculty, something else must shrink. A multi-year planning process would lead to inter-faculty competitions for funds.

Luc Vinet commented that the university is examining all revenue-generating sources and that the planning exercise would identify what has made and will make the university move forward.

Kate Rhodes (Student and President of SSMU) asked what capability would students have for input into the planning process.

Raphael Fischler commented that students in Engineering have been asked to present their input.

K. GowriSankaran said that students present their input but do not sit on the Council.

Anthony Paré commented that the faculties would want to hear back from the administration once the document has been submitted.

Luc Vinet said that the administration would look at the performance indicators and report back to the faculties.

Anthony Paré asked about a collegial process that would review annual reports, especially concerning the performance indicators.

Luc Vinet said the Planning Office support has been expanded and will be able to provide an enlightened picture of what areas will be looked at. There will be academic consultation and collegial decisions. The offices of the V-P Finance, the Provost and the Deputy Provost will provide data analysis, program reviews, financial oversight and compact implementation and monitoring.

Raphael Fischler noted that checking how people use funds is different from planning itself, from establishing priorities. He said this process of reporting could be useful but that initial information about it had been disquieting.

Anthony Masi commented that the motivation for engaging in a new planning process is to facilitate the performance of successful research and teaching progress and not to cut budgets. He said that the university is operating in a competitive environment and it is difficult to attract and retain quality people based only on low tuition fees and inadequate government funds. Therefore, planning should identify areas that could be targeted for private funding in order to diversify and expand the revenue stream. He said that qualitative discussions with academics have taken place to encourage and facilitate the highest quality of education.

Luc Vinet commented on the need for continuous dialogue with the university community and that the administration is keeping in touch.

Suzanne Lajoie (Educational & Counselling Psychology) commented that the Strategic Plan should define who we are. She said that there should be a refinement of the “bulleted” document to provide more information so that each unit could have a general outline of the data required to compare itself to its other units in the faculty and to place itself within the faculty.

Luc Vinet commented that a unit would be viewed as growing in value through the advancement of knowledge. The bulleted list would provide an outline of strategic areas and not a definitive list of priorities to jump-start a Strategic Planning process. The list would provide material for reflection.

Diane Mather commented that she had worked on the bulleted document and had used it to supplement a framework of priorities.

Bernard Robaire commented that this was the 1st MAUT Open Forum and it provided a perspective of what people in the university think. He thanked the panelists for their input and the audience for their comments and questions.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm. ❖

MAUT FORUM ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE: THE PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING OF THE MCGILL BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Monday, February 09, 2004
12:00 p.m. to 2:00 pm
McGill University – Faculty Club

MINUTES

Chair: Bernard Robaire, President MAUT – Context for Reviewing University Governance

Panelists: Robin Geller, Secretary-Treasurer
Contextual Background and Proposed Changes to University Governance
Patrick Farrell - Perspective on Governance and Collegiality
Roger Prichard - Perspective from the Board and its Executive
Morton Mendelson - Perspective from a Senate Representative to the Board

Introduction

The meeting began at 12:15 pm. B. Robaire welcomed MAUT members and guests to the Open Forum and spoke briefly about the objectives of this Forum. He introduced Robin Geller, the Secretary-General, who described the contextual background and the proposed changes to the current structure of the Board of Governors.

R. Geller began by listing the impetuses for the review of governance: the new Principal, the input from members of the Board of Governors, and the changing environment of governance worldwide. The Principal had consulted with members of the McGill community on their perceptions of the Board and asked for their feedback and suggestions. The input from the Board included comments on the lack of engagement of the Board members, the inability of Board members to make meaningful contributions to meetings, too few opportunities for meaningful discussions, the need for increased accountability, and difficulties in attracting new Board members.

R. Geller discussed the changes in the governance environment in a post-Enron era and the need for increased accountability and transparency in functioning, changes taking place in the public and private sectors worldwide. The Chair of the Board, the Principal and the Secretary-General began a review to improve the functioning of the Board and focused on short and long-term improvements.

The changes that have already been implemented include: a new seating arrangement, nameplates, Board agendas that are structured to include “consent” and “for information” sections, more substantive agendas, a full-day retreat on governance issues, and half-day orientation sessions for all new Board members. Board meetings have increased from 2 to 3 hours, which allows for more substantial discussions and Board committee meetings and meetings of the Board are now held on the same day to facilitate attendance. There are semi-annual meetings with the governors *emeriti*, and regular breakfast meetings between the Principal and Board members.

As part of the long-term strategy, the “Board Renewal “ document was circulated to the Board of Governors and Senate in the fall of 2003 and addressed the size, composition, role, selection and terms of Board members and governors *emeriti* and other recommendations to improve the functioning of Board meetings. There was consultation with the governors *emeriti*, regular Board members, Senate, B. Robaire, President of MAUT and M. Mendelson, the Senate representative to the Board, and with the Presidents of the student associations and the President of the Alumni Association.

The “Governance Structures” document, a companion to the “Board Renewal” document, was circulated to the Board of Governors and Senate in November 2003 and addressed committee structures, membership, and the composition and terms of reference of the Board Committees.

A revised, final set of recommendations was circulated on January 26th at a meeting of the Board of Governors. An ad hoc committee of Senate will be struck to review these recommendations and the Board vote will be delayed in order to allow time for the ad hoc committee to review the recommendations, and report back to Senate at the meeting on April 21st. These recommendations from Senate will be reported to the Board by April 30th and voted on at a Board meeting on May 25th.

The major recommendations related to “Board Renewal” were: a reduction in the membership of the Board from 45 to 23 members, normally two terms for outside members, members should normally be under 65 years of age at the beginning of their term, a new status for governors *emeriti*, which would mean neither voice nor vote, and a new rank of Honorary Governor for life.

R. Geller presented a chart that compared the current, first proposed and latest recommended composition of the McGill Board of Governors. A second chart gave the number of members of the Board at different universities. A third chart showed recent changes in reducing the sizes of various Boards: University Health Network, Bank of Montreal and Mount Allison University.

R. Geller outlined the next steps in the governance review: a vote on the *first* stage of recommendations on May 25th; the recommendations relating to committee structures, terms of reference, composition and signing authority will be tabled after May 25th; the vote on the *second* stage of recommendations will be taken at the first meeting of the Board in September 2004; and the target date for the new Board is January 1, 2005.

B. Robaire thanked R. Geller and commented that as the McGill community is the middle of the process, there is an opportunity to have the maximum impact on this review process.

B. Robaire introduced Patrick Farrell who gave an overview of governance and collegiality.

P. Farrell discussed a definition of collegiality, which implied that employees play a role in the administration of the university and that there should be interplay and exchange between the two groups. He said that the University Board of Governors is not analogous to a board in industry and that the size of the University Board was not necessarily the problem. He talked about the Anglo-Saxon concept of an informal board on which there was a great deal of freedom, which included service on committees, which expected the administration to be benign and honest, and where both administration and employees were mutually accountable.

He referred to two levels of administration: the Board and the university administration. The current Board structure dates back to 1968. The university administration has undergone many changes and the number of administrators has substantially swelled. He referred to the documents on governance renewal and stated they must provide evidence that the university’s governing body has adapted to its role in the 21st century. He mentioned that the documents identify the failure of the current Board with respect to its efficiency. The fact that the Board does not function well is not necessarily a problem of the size of the Board. The purpose of the Board and the administration is to assist in improving the academic quality of the university. He also remarked that not all universities have governing boards and that the presence of a Board of Governors was not necessarily indicative of a university’s educational qualities. He referred to the Faculty of Medicine whose reputation was not due to the Board or the administration.

P. Farrell discussed the idea of collegiality and its importance in the university as it depends on the participation of people for its good functioning. He listed some issues that collegiality would assist in addressing.

1. Before deciding how big the Board should be, it would be better to ask the community at large, decide first on the numbers and then on the roles of the members. Only a small number was consulted and he asked whether all members of the Board had been asked to contribute.
2. The role of the Board is to maintain McGill's international stature and Board members must be aware of where the faculties are heading.
3. The current Board members propose and elect their successors. There should be another method to propose new members.
4. He asked if there would be any advantage if 50% of the Board members have a McGill degree.
5. He proposed a greater degree of openness on the part of the Board and the upper administration to create an atmosphere of mutual respect between the Board and the constituencies it serves. He felt that the Board is perceived to be increasingly remote and is forcing people to take sides.
6. He expressed a great need for collegiality and that it was a two-way street.

B. Robaire thanked P. Farrell and introduced Roger Prichard who presented the perspective from the Board and its Executive.

R. Prichard outlined the responsibilities of the Board of Governors, Senate and the Executive of the Board. The members of the Board of Governors are the trustees of all university property, are responsible for maintenance and administration of all real property, have jurisdiction and final authority over the conduct of affairs of the university, and make all contracts and appointments, including retirements and dismissals.

The Board of Governors makes all rules and regulations relevant to its areas of responsibilities and determines all salaries and emoluments.

The Executive of the Board can exercise all powers of the Board between regular meetings of the Board except to amend University Statutes; appoint the Principal or Chancellor; or to dismiss teaching or senior administration staff. The Executive currently consists of 9 members: the Chair of the Board, the Principal, 2 of the Senate representatives on the Board, and 5 other governors (usually including the Chancellor). He emphasized the importance of the Senate / Board of Governors interface.

R. Prichard outlined the responsibilities and duties of the Senate. It is subject to the authority and powers of the Board of Governors and has the following specific powers:

It has general control and supervision over academic activities of the university; it grants all degrees; it oversees the establishment and discontinuation of faculties, schools and departments, including research centers; it recommends to the Board all aspects of academic policy and it recommends academic affiliations.

R. Prichard stated that Senate may make recommendations to the Board, through the Principal, on any claims and needs of the university. Senate may hear and determine appeals from any teaching staff concerning academic matters and, subject to Board ratification, its decision is final.

Senate is delegated by the Board with special responsibilities over academic matters, and has a special responsibility to advise the Board concerning the academic work and needs of the university.

The composition of Senate includes: the Administration-Principal and Vice-Principals, the Deans of all Faculties and non-Faculty Deans; academic staff from all Faculties, students from all societies, and the administrative and support staff. From the Board of Governors, it includes: the Chancellor, the Deputy Chair of the Board, and two other governors. R. Prichard commented that the academic staff members are in a majority. Senate is composed of all communities charged with executing the University's mission.

He stated that the *raison d'être* and mission of McGill University is teaching and learning and the advancement of knowledge. It is its academic mission, which the Board has delegated to be the chief responsibility of Senate. He said that it is vital that Senate, as the senior academic forum of the University, not only be represented in its own right, but that its representation on the Board needs to be substantial.

R. Prichard made the following recommendations concerning the composition of the Board:

The Board should have a majority of trustees who are not employees or students of the university, i.e. members at large and alumni. The administration, represented by the Principal, needs to be on the Board. He stated it is vital to have adequate representation from Senate. There should also be student representatives, academic staff representation and administrative and support staff representation.

He stated that the proposed one Senate representative in a restructured Board would not be adequate to represent the diversity of Senate and to reflect its importance in the University.

B. Robaire thanked R. Prichard and introduced Morton Mendelson who presented the perspective from a Senate Representative to the Board.

M. Mendelson discussed the need for academic representation on the Board of Governors. He referred to the numbers in his handout, which listed several governing boards in universities in Canada and the distribution of the various consistencies on these Boards – in numbers and percentages. He noted that McGill was on the higher side with respect to total number of members.

He commented that his first impression at a Board meeting was that nothing happened at the Board level except to rubberstamp decisions taken by the Executive. He noted that the changes described by R. Geller were worthwhile because the functioning of the Board must be improved. In comparison to Senate, the Board does not operate under Robert's rules of order. He commented that he sometimes had to read the minutes to find out what happened. He referred to the handout and the Proposed Revision of 28 members as his understanding of the number of members people wanted when this issue was discussed at the Board of Governors' retreat. He commented that size was not the most important issue but rather the need to ensure that diversity of voices in the university was represented. He suggested that the members at large should be drawn from diverse sectors, such as business, the Arts, Sciences and NGO's.

M. Mendelson stressed the importance of Senate representation on the Board and reinforced R. Prichard's statements. His impression from Board meetings was that Board members were disconnected from the academic side of the University and were not familiar with what was happening academically. Therefore, he stressed the need for academic representation on the Board. He commented that previously academics could rely on the administration to represent the academic voice, but this was not the case now due to the appointment of non-academic Vice-Principals. Previously Vice-Principals came from the academic ranks and were typically professors, whereas now the Vice-Principals are drawn from outside and are not necessarily professors. Thus academics cannot rely on the senior administration to represent academic interests. He reiterated that the joint meetings of Senate and Board of Governors are an important link and are specified in the Statutes.

M. Mendelson continued by addressing the issue of collegiality. He commented that academics sacrifice salary to work at McGill, but two of the main reasons for working here are the collegial form of governance and the motivation that comes from participation in an institution in which one has some say. He commented that to cut off the academic input from the Board, which has the ultimate decision-making power, would undermine collegiality. He concluded by reiterating the importance of Senate representation, of guaranteeing the diversity of voices and maintaining collegiality as part of governance.

B. Robaire thanked M. Mendelson. He referred to the microphone and recorder that would help keep notes of the meeting

Question and Discussion Period:

Daniel Guitton, a staff representative to the Board commented on the poor functioning of the Board but stated that reduction in the number of members was not the solution. He reiterated the importance of a diversified identity and representation from various sectors to keep Board members aware of the issues facing the University. He used the example of the Glen Yards / MUHC project and commented that many academics were not aware of the issues involved.

The original 2 billion dollar project was reduced to \$800M that the government would provide but McGill would be required to raise \$500M through fundraising. The medical community has been opposed to this revised project, but there has been no opposition to it presented to the Board of Governors. He commented that a proper restructuring of the Board could be in order but that size was not the issue. He suggested instead finding ways to implicate Board members in decisions that have been identified by the Executive. He referred to the issue of collegiality whereby 85% of medical officers and researchers in McGill hospitals voted against the Glen Yards Project and yet this dissent was not discussed at the Board. He strongly suggested that the Board be restructured so that major issues could be discussed and open to debate.

Barbara Haskell asked if the membership on the Board were reduced, was there any specification for the size of the Executive and if Senate or staff would be part of the Executive. The second question was how often have Senate representatives to Board been faculty members and how often were these representatives of the administration or from other elements.

R. Geller commented that members of Senate represent Senate on the Board. Currently there are 9 members on the Executive of the Board with 2 Senate representatives. The numbers for the new Executive will be decided after the vote on the size of the Board on May 25th. R. Prichard said that Senate representatives usually are academic staff, who are involved in and well aware of the academic life of the university.

Anthony Paré commented that the best knowledge in the university is produced in open community conversation and public debate. He stated that concerns could not be expressed by streamlining, which can effectively leave academics without a voice. He acknowledged that many academics expressed discomfort with the perception that decision-making is centralized in smaller consolidated administrative groups. If academics perceive a lack of collegiality, it is difficult to get people to join committees and participate in academic community life if they feel that decisions are made at a higher level. He also asked if there was any upcoming intention to downsize Senate similar to the proposed restructuring of the Board. R. Geller commented that this was not the Principal's intention and that, to her knowledge, there are no plans in that regard.

Lawrence Mysak commented on the necessity of promoting collegiality and having diversity on the Board and the connection with Senate. He stressed the importance of collegiality and its role in the functioning of the university and did not want to see it decrease. He asked who the members at large were and expressed the need to see sciences represented. R. Geller commented on the mix of members from the business community and on the efforts to broaden representation to include members from the arts, sciences, NGO's and from the not-for-profit sector. Because of restructuring, there have been no additions made lately to the members-at-large. R. Prichard commented that the McGill shareholders of the Board come from the McGill community and imposing the model of a reduced business board is not necessarily appropriate for a university.

M. Mendelson criticized the idea expressed by some Board members that the faculty were the employees and students were the clients.

Richard Janda commented on the general tendency to restructure Boards in a Post-Enron environment; the relationship between business ethics and a collegial climate at a university; and the necessity of accountability.

He stated that in a Post-Enron environment the tendency is to grow boards not diminish them, to increase independent oversight, heighten scrutiny and accountability, and to find more people from outside to look inside rather than trying to shrink boards and close the circle.

He noted that while the current structure may be inadequate and need changes, he asked about the Enron style of debate, the role of independent committees, and the efforts to ensure transparency of documentation and transparency of proceedings in the new structure. He commented that the renewal documents only provided numbers.

His second comment was on the relationship between business ethics and an ethic of collegiality. He compared the current strategic planning environment to the collegial environment previously described by P. Farrell where decisions were made concerning promotion and tenure. The current planning environment, which he compared to a business setting, has used a

top down approach to identify the right issues and see how the needs map up with these projects. He commented that it is possible to have collegial strategic planning and that a streamlined efficient board is better able to manage a strategic planning process. The Board becomes the place where you vet whether the strategic planning process is a move in the right direction. As a member involved in a selection process, he was informed that the academics had to learn to be more business like. He commented that he saw a different model reflected in the current restructuring process. He asked how the Principal, Chancellor, and Chair of Board would convince the McGill community that this new board structure would enhance collegiality rather than substitute something else for it.

David Harpp commented that academics had been left out in the proposed restructuring and that he found out today about the medical community and their concerns about the Glen Yards Project. He commented that the people who know most about academic life in the university should be well represented. His suggestion was to transfer 5 or 6 general Board members to a different status that would represent academics and this would improve collegiality and accountability. He noted the number of student representatives as compared to the number of academics.

Omaini Mansi noted the mission of the university and commented that the percentage of Senate members on the Board is proportionately small to represent the McGill community. Her second comment concerned fund-raising and the need to have business members with corporate vision and background on the Board to help with fund raising. She remarked that if the Board is considered to be less functional or effective that we would like it to be and if size is not necessarily a key factor, then she asked for a clear definition of the role of board members, the specific functions of the members, and their accountability.

Guy Mehuys commented about the Macdonald campus constituency and that it has always had a representative on the Board of Governors. The campus is participating in the strategic planning process. The last meeting of the Macdonald FAES expressed the need for defined representation in the proposed reduced Board of Governors. R. Prichard spoke about current specific representation, with a Macdonald student on the Board. Formerly, there had been a Vice-Principal (Macdonald) who attended Board meetings. He echoed G. Mehuys' concern that out of sight could easily become out of mind.

Nick Acheson commented on the need to talk about functions of the Board, not only representations. The Board has been composed of board members many of whom were business people who were trustees and ran fund raising campaigns. He asked if fund raising and trusteeship were compatible. If not, should McGill have another body such as a "Friends of McGill" which would help business people to understand the goals of the university?

The second comment concerned the reorganization and structure of the Executive Committee, which should only be proposed to Senate after the decision on the size of the Board. The university should know how the Executive committee would operate before the numbers are reduced. R. Geller commented that the McGill Fund Council, composed of Board members and others, currently exists and that its structure and composition are being reviewed.

Peter McNally commented on the somewhat dismissive attitude displayed concerning the Board of Governors and that it has played a very powerful role in governance. It is the authority in the university and he mentioned several active Board committees. Under Principal Johnson, the number of meetings was reduced by half. He stated that Senate representation on the Executive committee is important and wondered whether, in the Board renewal process, there would be a reduction in the number of Board representatives on Senate. R. Geller commented that all issues are open for discussion.

M. Mendelson mentioned the difference between having authority and exercising authority. The Board has the authority and the right to vote on university affairs, but he asked who makes the actual decisions about what is brought to the Board and what "value-added" information is raised in Board discussions that could influence the decisions.

Maria Zannis-Hadjopoulos commented on the vital role of academics from Senate on the Board. The Board may have problems, but it is not a business. It is the best place to voice particular problems and the best people to voice these opinions are academics. M. Zannis-Hadjopoulos stated that although the Statutes require joint Senate-Board meetings, they are neither effective nor interactive. Therefore she said there is a need to structure the meetings and provide opportunities to academics in Senate to voice their opinions. She asked if a "Steering Committee" could decide the Agenda before a

Board of Governors meeting to improve the current structure. R. Geller said there is no equivalent to the “Steering Committee” for the Board with respect to the setting of agendas.

Dan Guitton commented on the analysis of the structure of Board of Governors and commented that the Glen Yards Project is an opportunity to test how the structure operates. The project will have a major impact on McGill’s future in the next decade. He asked if a reduction in the members of the Board of Governors would aid the discussion of the Glen Yards project. He asked what reorganization of the Board could have aided the discussion of these issues? R. Geller said there were presentations by the Dean in September 2003 and January 2004 to the Board of Governors. The Executive Committee approved the McGill proposal with respect to the MUHC project in December 2003 and it was signed off on by the Board. In the Governance Structures document, there is reference to a Nominating and Governance Committee that would regularly review governance structures, could institute an evaluation process, and play a role similar to the Senate Steering Committee with respect to setting agendas at Board meetings. Reduction in the size of the Board could increase the sense of commitment for members.

Kendal Wallis commented on an exercise to downsize a mess could lead to ending up with a smaller mess. He would not like to see the Board become invisible. He suggested bringing in Robert’s Rules for the Board and setting up a mechanism similar to the Senate Steering Committee. R. Geller said there could be a move to increased formality.

Vivian Choy (SSMU) agreed with the suggestions from S. Noumoff and P. Farrell that McGill should fix what is in existence before changing the structure of the Board. She questioned why McGill should follow a business model and decrease the size of the Board. She asked why should McGill not continue to be unique and keep a large Board. R. Geller commented that many Board members expressed the view that size reduction would have a positive impact in the functioning of the Board. R. Geller indicated that a widespread view was that the size of the Board impedes its functioning.

B. Robaire asked for the rationale for stipulating that five of the twelve members-at-large of the Board members should be graduates of McGill University and the age restriction of less than 65 years at the commencement of a Board member’s term of office.

R. Geller said the new proposal reduced the number of members of the Alumni Association significantly, and it was felt that Board members-at-large with a McGill degree would have knowledge of and connection to the community, which would be advantageous in planning for the future of the university.

P. Farrell asked about the issue of age. R. Geller commented this was an issue of renewal. The average age of members of the Board has increased and in the new proposal a member close to age 65 would not be appointed to another term. P. Farrell commented that it was illegal to restrict an appointment with respect to age, found the clause inappropriate, and commented that the Board could be taken to court.

Brendan Gillon thanked MAUT for organizing the Forum. He commented on the need for information and clarification, to know the purpose of the Board, its mission and functions and the need to focus on managerial issues. He also commented that a university does not operate in a business mode and works in many time frames.

P. Farrell commented that it was not necessarily true that Board membership was local and that having a McGill degree did not necessarily mean Board members were interested in ensuring future and direction of McGill. The students are not local but diversified. Recently there have been many Board members from the Sciences. He objected to the age factor included in the proposal and which could become part of the statutes. He mentioned the representation from Macdonald College. He asked for clarification for the student observers/representatives (MACES and Macdonald College) who would be able to attend Board meetings though they would have neither voice nor vote. He objected that post-graduate or post-docs students are disenfranchised and cannot be members of the Board.

B. Robaire noted that the Principal, Provost and Secretary-General are not McGill graduates. He thanked the panelists and speakers.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm ❖

New Executive and Council members 2004 -2005

We are here to serve you. Please contact us with your questions and comments.

MAUT Executive

Position	Name (Dept)	Phone	Fax	Email
President	Frank Mucciardi (Mining, Metals, and Materials Engineering)	1329	4492	frank.mucciardi@mcgill.ca
President-Elect	Michael Smith (Sociology)	6849	3403	michael.smith@mcgill.ca
Past President	Bernard Robaire (Pharmacology/Therapeutics)	3630	7120	brobaire@pharma.mcgill.ca
V.P. Internal	Nick Acheson (Microbiology & Immunology)	3921	7052	nicholas.acheson@mcgill.ca
V.P. External	Jacques Derome (Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences)	5350	6115	jacques.derome@mcgill.ca
V.P. Communications	Jamshid Beheshti (GSLIS)	3366	7193	jamshid.beheshti@mcgill.ca
Secretary-Treasurer	Estelle Hopmeyer (Social Work)	7067	4760	estelle.hopmeyer@mcgill.ca

MAUT Council

The MAUT-APBM Council consists of the seven elected executive officers, plus the following elected Council members.

Name	Dept	Phone	Fax	Email
Brendan Gillon	Lingusitics	4868	7088	brendan.gillon@mcgill.ca
Joan Hobbins (to May 31, 2004)	Library Technical Services	4796	8919	joan.hobbins@mcgill.ca
Daniel Boyer (as of June 1, 2004)	Wainwright Librarian	00156	3585	daniel.boyer@mcgill.ca
Andrew Kirk	Electrical & Computer Engineering	1542	3127	andrew.kirk@mcgill.ca
Humberto Monardes	Animal Science (Macdonald)	7809	7964	humberto.monardes@mcgill.ca
Lawrence Mysak	Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences	3768	6115	lawrence.mysak@mcgill.ca
Patrick Neilson	English	6594	8146	partick.neilson@mcgill.ca
Michael Ngadi	Bioresource Engineering	7779	8387	michael.ngadi@mcgill.ca
Premysl Ponka	Physiology & Medicine	340-8260	340-7502	prem.ponka@mcgill.ca
Alenoush Saroyan	Education / Centre for U T & L	6648	6968	alenoush.saroyan@mcgill.ca
Hanadi Sleiman	Chemistry	2633	3797	hanadi.sleiman@mcgill.ca
Gloria Tannenbaum	Pediatrics	412-4400-22753	412-4661	gloria.tannenbaum@mcgill.ca



MAUT – APBM has a new web site.

Visit us at:

<http://www.maut.mcgill.ca/>
for the latest news and events.

The MAUT- APBM Newsletter is published during the academic year, by the McGill Association of University Teachers, to keep all members informed of concerns and activities.

Editor Jamshid Beheshti (GSLIS)

Administrative Officer Honore Kerwin-Borrelli

Layout Alexander Jerabek (Libraries)

Postal Address

McGill Association of University Teachers
3459 Peel Street, room 202
McGill University
Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 1W7
Tel (514) 398-3942
Fax (514) 398-6937
Email: mautadm@mcgill.ca

Affix address label