



Minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Council held on June 1, 2016 at 4:30 p.m. in the Martin Amphitheatre, (Room 504, McIntyre Medical Building)

PRESENT

Aalamian, Armand	Eidelman, David	Mutter, Christine
Abrahamowicz, Michal	Fabian, Marc	Noel, Geoffroy
Allard, Robert	Funnell, Robert	Nordstrom, Scott
Baumgartner, Jill	Gagnon, Robert	Robaire, Bernard
Bergman, Howard	Girard, Francis	Rochford, Joseph
Boillat, Miriam	Hosatte-Ducassy, Caroline	Sagan, Selena
Brown, Karen	Kafantaris, Demetra	Saunders, Sara Elizabeth
Chartrand, Daniel	Karanofsky, Mark Chad	Schlich, Thomas
Chen, John C.	Kornisch, Myriam	Schurr, Erwin
Cohen, Robin	Larose, Michele	Tampieri, Donatella
Cucca, Elize	Levental, Mark	Tremblay, Michel
Cummings, Beth-Ann	Liben, Stephen	Tsimicalis, Argerie
Daniel, Sam	Liu, Xin Mei	Yordanova, Ivona
Dhaliwal, Kiesha	Martignetti, Lisa	
Distasio, Nicholas	Massie, Rami	

REGRETS: Gillian Bartlett, Mary Belzile, Maxime Bouchard, Fadi Brimo, Evelyn Constantin, Sean Cory, Françoise Filion, Suzanne Fortier, Alyson Fournier, Robert Gagnon, Lucy Gilbert, Laura Gonnerman, Anmar Khadra, Craig Mandato, Christopher Manfredi, René Michel, Carlos Morales, Shawn Robbins, Ernest Seidman, April Shamy, Behrang Sharif, Ewa Sidorowicz, Gustavo Turecki, Sophie Vaillancourt, Francine Wein

SECTION I

1. Welcoming Remarks from the Chair, Dean Eidelman

The Chair welcomed Faculty Council members and guests (non-members) to the second meeting of the Faculty Council. The Chair indicated that the agenda for this meeting was developed by the Steering Committee, which held its first meeting on April 6, 2016.

The meeting began with an “In Memoriam,” whereby a moment of silence was observed to remember some important members of the McGill community who have passed since the last Faculty Council meeting on February 16, 2016, namely: **Dr. John Blundell**, Associate Professor, Department of Surgery and Neurology & Neurosurgery; **Dr. Cheolho Cheong**, Adjunct Professor, Department of Medicine and Microbiology & Immunology; **Dr. Richard J. Hamilton**, Professor Emeritus and former Chair, Department of Pediatrics; **Dr. Michael F. Lalli**, Associate Professor,

Department of Anatomy & Cell Biology; **Dr. John Corbett McDonald**, Emeritus Professor and founding Chair, Department of Epidemiology & Health, now Epidemiology, Biostatistics & Occupational Health; **Sheila O’Neill**, Faculty Lecturer, Ingram School of Nursing; **Dr. Terry Tannenbaum**, Associate Professor, Department of Family Medicine.

2. Approval of the previous Minutes (Feb. 16)

No corrections were proposed for the minutes. The minutes were unanimously adopted following a motion by Dr. Sam Daniel, seconded by Dr. Beth Cummings.

The Chair proceeded to introduce new Faculty Council members, including the new Medical Residents (ARM) representative, Dr. Caroline Hosatte-Ducassy, replacing Dr. Philippe Melanson; Ivona Yordanova from the School of Physical & Occupational Therapy, replacing Mathilde Carignan; Nursing Graduate Kiesha Dhaliwal, replacing Laura Merdsoy; and Medical Student Society President Xin Mei Liu, replacing Doulia Hamad. **Dr. René St-Arnaud then raised his hand to indicate that both he and Dr. Patricia Tonin were volunteering to represent the Human Genetics Department on the Faculty Council.**

3. Report from the Faculty Council Steering Committee

1) Steering Committee membership

The Chair introduced the newly created Steering Committee of the Faculty Council, which is constituted by **Bernard Robaire**, McGill Departments of Pharmacology & Therapeutics, Obstetrics & Gynecology; **Caroline Hosatte-Ducassy**, medical resident representative; **David Eidelman** as Chair and VP (Health Affairs) and Dean of Medicine; **Demetra Kafantaris**, Senior Advisor to the VP/Dean; **Diana Colby**, Associate Director of Communications; **Doulia Hamad**, 2nd year medical student, outgoing MSS President; **Françoise Filion**, Ingram School of Nursing; **Karen Brown**, Paediatrics Anesthesiologist, MUHC; **Lucy Gilbert**, Oncologist, Obstetrics & Gynecology, MUHC; **Xin Mei Liu**, 1st year medical student and incoming MSS President; and **Myriam Kornisch**, 1st year postdoc, MNI. The Chair then highlighted the need for a graduate student representative. **A graduate student, Alex Magdzinski, from the Ingram School of Nursing raised his hand to volunteer***. The Chair then thanked all Steering Committee members for their assistance on behalf of the Faculty as well as the Faculty Council.

The Chair continued to speak to the importance of Steering Committee meetings (as a Standing Committee of the Faculty Council) to help develop the agenda for each Faculty Council meeting, in order to ensure a thorough and inclusive process for determining topics that are of interest to all members. He noted that the first Steering Committee meeting went quite well, stating that two major items emerged: the first, from the Dean, is the need for a Committee on Committees.

2) Committee on Committees

The Chair explained a Committee on Committees was essentially a Nominating Committee. The rationale for this is to improve (transparent, efficient, inclusive and legitimate) the way in which Faculty members are notified of committee participation needs and the process then by which they are selected. The Committee on Committees would provide a mechanism to identify members of committees who are not appointed by the Dean or members of the administration.

An additional role of the Committee on Committees would be to track participation in committees with the goal of widening participation, so as to ensure that individuals who would not normally have a voice in the Faculty are encouraged and allowed to do so. The Chair then opened the floor to Faculty Council members to ask for their approval for the creation of such a Committee on Committees, as proposed by the Steering Committee.

Dr. Bernard Robaire was asked to say a few words about this Committee on Committees. Dr. Robaire reiterated the importance of broad and varied Faculty Council participation, either through the creation of a Nominating Committee or a Committee on Committees.

The Chair further noted the desire to have students, administrators, etc. included on this committee in order to ensure broad participation from the Faculty at large.

In answer to a question from Dr. Michele Larose, the Chair responded that before defining the exact role of the Committee on Committees, he would first like an *ad hoc* committee to look at how the University Nominating Committee functions and how we can adapt that structure to the needs of our Faculty Council. Based on a motion by **Dr. Miriam Boillat, seconded by Dr. Daniel Chartrand, the Council unanimously approved the formation of an ad hoc committee of 3 people to meet once, to determine how to go about starting a nomination committee process. Anyone interested is asked to contact Demetra Kafantaris.**

3) Ad hoc Committees

(B. Robaire/K. Brown)

a. Communication and Consultation

The second item to emerge from the first Steering Committee meeting was highlighted by both Drs. Karen Brown and Bernard Robaire: the Faculty of Medicine is not very good at communicating. The Chair explained that while email and newsletter communication is done rather well across the Faculty overall, there are still some gaps for which additional ad hoc committees or processes should be created.

Dr. Robaire indicated that the idea is to find a way to have communication not be limited to a top-down approach but to encourage bottom-up flow as well. For instance, students, professors and technicians at the departmental level should be able to raise issues and concerns, identify them and bring them to the floor for discussion at Faculty Council. The idea would be to create a Basic Science sub-committee and a Clinical Science sub-committee initially, and to have them work closely together. At this stage, he indicated a need to simply define what the mandate of these committees should be and how this would work. He further mentioned that this is a means to start the process and not deal with communication directly, noting that given that we all work in isolated areas, it would be a good forum to understand how other places function.

Dr. Brown seconded that she would be interested in setting up such a structure that would allow for dialogue from the Faculty to the Dean's Office. She explained that as a "newbie" to McGill administration, one of the processes she was involved in is the development of standards for medical devices, which is a process by consensus between manufacturers, users and regulators of medical devices, indicating that through this structure, we have a dialogue and arrive at a consensus. She is hoping that similarly, this could work in the Faculty Council's process on improving communication. She further noted that it does not need to be as formal as the process she described.

Dr. Donatella Tampieri confirmed her interest in participating on such a committee that aims to clarify the line of communication in both directions for clinicians, like her, who have little to do with McGill's daily administration as a means to understand how the Faculty works and how to become involved. She restated that she would be happy to volunteer, if needed.

Based on a motion by Dr. D. Tampieri, seconded by Dr. Robert Gagnon, the Faculty Council unanimously approved the creation of an ad hoc committee to address the issue related to Communications and Consultation.

b. Policy Infrastructure

The Chair explained that each of our Faculty's programs have specific policies, for instance, School of Nursing and training programs. He stated the need for policies that cut across multiple schools or programs, (i.e., a policy on code of conduct or policies on how research infrastructure is managed within the Faculty). At present there is no overarching mechanism to review such policies.

The Chair spoke to the need for a policy infrastructure, not so much as a policy approval mechanism, but as a place to keep track of policies (equivalent to a policy book), to include a list complete with table of contents, dates of when each policy was approved, when they are up for renewal and some way of "policing," ensuring they are being respected and easy to find for consultation. He further noted that some policy approvals are given by the Deanery Executive Committee, but some Faculty-wide policies should obtain approval by a more representative group in terms of non-leadership within the Faculty.

The Chair stated that this is in early stages of reflection, which is why he is looking for volunteers from the Faculty Council to help set up this ad hoc Policy Infrastructure Committee. Dr. John Chen asked for more clarification and whether this committee develops policies or if it will be asked to identify methods with which to develop new policies, and then once adopted and approved, how they evolve, get communicated, stored and tracked, to which the Chair responded, yes, on all counts except for developing new policies. He stated there are already bodies in place for each program and school to develop policies, but there is no mechanism to review or track them regularly.

J. Chen then commented that this seems to be a very administrative type of task and is not sure how interest would be stirred up from Faculty members. The Chair responded this was a legitimate question but reiterated the need for a process to review policies periodically. The Chair further stated that if the Faculty Council is fine with the Deanery Executive Committee approving policies, he will continue with that process, reiterating that an ad hoc committee would ensure a more representative group and allow for more transparency.

Dr. Michel Tremblay commented that the examples given by the Chair were at the University level, and was wondering about Faculty-level policies. The Chair responded with the example of a local "Code of Conduct," because we have health professional education, which requires us to have separate policies (e.g., interaction with drug companies). While there may not be many Faculty-level policies, there is currently no specific group to turn to, to address specific policy issues. He explained that Undergraduate Medical Education and Postgraduate Medical

Education each have their own Program Committees to review policies, but there is some crossover between them. Who then would review and approve these broader policies, while ensuring a more representative group that will allow for differing opinions and perspectives?

B. Robaire further commented that on the University's website under "Policies," there are no dates of when policies were adopted or re-approved, but mentioned that in Senate, dates are indicated. He stipulated that having this Faculty Council approve policies that are Faculty-wide would be appropriate, and having a committee help guide that process would be useful. He noted it is very hard to find policies on Medicine's website, but if you look hard enough, you can find them. **The Chair then asked someone to put forward the motion to vote on the creation of an ad hoc Policy Infrastructure Committee, done so by B. Robaire and seconded by B. Cummings. The motion was passed after a majority vote.**

4. New Business

The Chair introduced Dr. Gilles Paradis to provide a brief overview of the School of Population and Global Health proposal. G. Paradis began by highlighting the work of a committee that met for over a year with representatives from over 22 departments across the University. He explained that they looked at the feasibility and desirability of creating such a school. Dr. Paradis explained that the proposed school structure was developed by bringing together, in partnership, six existing units within the Faculty of Medicine, and with input from many other faculties and departments across the University. G. Paradis explained that we currently have the most productive and active group of population and global health researchers in Canada. Based on comparison of McGill to other universities within North America, we are already among the best in this field. He believes that we can achieve growth and greater capacity for enhanced research by bringing together the various expertise that exists within a School of Population and Global Health, to act as an interdisciplinary school within the Faculty of Medicine. The school would also link with other local and international public health organizations as a means to engage communities and translate research results into meaningful interventions for populations.

He further outlined that the school would reflect these six units/divisions: Epidemiology, Biostatistics, Occupational & Environmental Health, Global Health, Social Studies, Ethics & Health Policy, and Public Health Practice & Health Services; which collectively are comprised of over 250 students, staff & tenure-track faculty members. He further articulated opportunities to expand on existing programs and develop new ones. This new school should enhance the capacity to create novel research enterprises, e.g., a Centre for Innovation in Digital Health Data, among others.

The Chair stated this proposal arose from our Strategic Research Plan and is also well-aligned with our educational and social accountability priorities. During the ensuing discussion, Dr. Robin Cohen confirmed that she is in agreement with this proposal. Dr. Richard Cruess expressed doubt as to whether Social Studies of Medicine (SSoM) could successfully participate. G. Paradis affirmed his belief that both the SSoM and Biomedical Ethics units can thrive and expand their research context within a School of Population and Global Health, highlighting his belief that being part of the school would prevent SSoM, a small unit, from being isolated and unknown. R. Cohen asked how others could interact within such a structure. G. Paradis answered that the school is well placed to foster interdisciplinary research. The Chair then indicated that such a school would collaborate with the Faculty of Arts, School of Public Policy, with whom the Institute for Health and Social Policy is

already a partner. The goal is to avoid setting up barriers and to provide better support to expand on current activities.

Dr. Maurice McGregor asked whether this new creation would involve the removal of budget from any other areas within the Faculty. G. Paradis explained the plan is to use a consolidated budget for this new school and spoke to the potential for such a school to increase revenues from enrolment in various education programs. Dr. Tremblay asked about the list of faculty on the presentation, whether it is an assembly of older faculty or whether they had thought about how this would be regenerated in the Faculty. G. Paradis responded that 50 faculty members were tenured/tenure-track, so there have been many new recruits. Dr. Tremblay then asked what particular positions will be in this school, to which the Chair responded that this remains to be determined.

The Chair stated that he is asking the Faculty Council for support to go forward with this proposal so that he can bring it back to Principal Fortier and Provost Manfredi, with whom he has been speaking to on this subject for a while. Dr. Paradis indicated that there is general acceptance throughout the University for this new school and highlighted that we can now move into a more formal phase of implementation. He went on to say that his idea for an action plan would be to get it approved, and then to sit down and work out the mechanics. He referenced Dr. McGregor's concern about the goal being not to take away resources but to find a mechanism to increase them. He further noted that if space permitted, many of these programs could accept more students as there are many more applicants than can be accepted due to limited space, which is causing us to lose out on revenues and on the potential impact. He further highlighted that an online or partially online program could also help alleviate the space issue, stating it is part of a combination of reorganization, strategic planning and branding exercise. With regards to smaller groups like SSoM, he indicated that we are not proposing they lose their leadership, but rather want to ensure that these small groups, that are resource fragile and that want to have their own graduate program, would have a greater chance to do so as part of a larger effort to create an interdisciplinary program. In summary, the Chair stated that the main goal for the establishment of such a school is to create an enabling platform for important areas in research and teaching that currently does not exist.

Based on a motion by Dr. Rochford and seconded by Dr. Aalamian, the proposal to establish a School of Population and Global Health was passed unanimously. The Chair indicated he would now inform the Provost of Faculty Council's approval, after which it will then have to go through the University's other committees for further approval.

SECTION II

5. Research: CIHR, junior faculty and career-building

Dr. Philippe Gros presented an update on the many changes at CIHR (Canadian Institutes of Health Research), which have created much chaos within the research community. He explained how Dean Eidelman had organized a meeting with Principal Fortier and key Faculty of Medicine researchers in March, as they felt any advocacy or lobbying should be done through the University Principal, who is a member of the U15 and is the former President of NSERC. He commented that the meeting went quite well and the Principal was sensitized to the major issues. A document was created from this meeting in question and answer format, representing a consensus of the discussion involving roughly 20 people and may be viewed at the following link:

<http://www.mcgill.ca/medicine/about/faculty-council/meetings-minutes>. The meeting touched on a variety of topics including: level of funding and tri-council, the concept of strategic versus open science as streams for spending research dollars, the constant creation/cancellation of new CIHR programs that renders it difficult for people to access, issues with peer review reforms, and an overall discussion of the performance of CIHR leadership.

Dr. Marc Fabian (Oncology) mentioned a need for more people to get involved, noting that he was asked by CIHR for his expertise in grant review, and he accepted, but they later reversed their initial request; there seems to be a disconnect between the need for reviewers and their actions. Dr. Gros responded that CIHR has indicated in writing that it is difficult for them to obtain reviewers. The Chair confirmed that Dr. Baum has recounted similar stories and believes this has to do with a keyword system used to select reviewers. He mentioned that an issue that is complicating this matter is the recent flood of grant applications, noting an average of 850 applications for Project Live and an overall submission rate of roughly 4,000 applications, which has led to this enormous need for reviewers. Despite the difficulties, Dr. Gros urged Faculty Council members to continue accepting to act as reviewers, if they are approached.

P. Gros went on to indicate that the news they had initially received regarding the Foundation Scheme had gotten slightly worse in the past week. This is a program that deals with long-term support of established and new investigators, and they have delayed decisions and will in fact NOT be making any decisions in early May as hoped. He noted that no decisions will be forthcoming until the end of stage 3, upcoming on July 15, which represents the last stage of the application, and with a deadline to re-apply being the end of July.

P. Gros offered some good news in that the government recently invested \$30M into the new CIHR budget, which will be fully invested in the Project competition. He commented on the poor external review results of the CIHR and mentioned that documents were available through the Research Office; the Chair confirmed that a link to these documents is available on the CIHR website. On a final note, P. Gros informed the Faculty Council that the CIHR has created a College of Reviewers for which they have identified 15 Presidents who will be overseeing the peer-review process, reaffirming the importance of becoming involved as a reviewer.

B. Robaire then asked about output and what further action we might see taken by the University regarding CIHR. P. Gros responded that the motivation behind creating this forum was to have a common approach as opposed to having individuals writing editorials in the newspaper. He indicated it will be more effective for Principal Fortier to share the feedback provided with her colleagues across Canada when she meets with them. With regards to output, P. Gros stated the goal is not to give the document to CIHR but to the government, i.e., to those who choose the CIHR leadership. B. Robaire in follow-up wondered whether there will be a U15 position paper coming out. The Chair replied that the U15 had sent a letter to CIHR with their concerns, stating our Principal along with Principals of the 5 of the largest health research universities in Canada have met with the Deputy Minister. There may be a change in CIHR leadership soon.

In response to a question regarding funding rate, P. Gros indicated that this additional funding is the bare minimum to probably keep the funding rate at just under 10%. He mentioned that those who have applied to the Foundation Scheme could this year also apply to the Project Scheme, so there will be some attrition in that pool that will increase the success rate, but it will remain low.

The Chair stated that the Faculty and Research Institutes are trying to create bridge funding.

R. Cohen asked whether McGill has plans now for what happens on July 15 for young investigators and students who may not have money to fund their projects. The Chair responded by saying that we do have some contingency plans, noting a hope for the outcome to be better than expected and further indicating that this bridge-funding program would focus on protecting graduate student programs to ensure they are completed as a first priority. He then noted that we do not have the resources to bridge everyone so the situation will be monitored closely. In the last competition, the Chair indicated McGill did relatively well compared to other schools and we can hope to do well again. He stated we have no choice now but to wait and see how things work out and once we know the results, we will try our best to bridge people. There will be an attempt by the hospital research centres to do the same.

Argerie Tsimicalis, Associate Professor in the Ingram School of Nursing and Nurse Scientist at Shriners's Hospital noted that while on maternity leave this year, she participated in a survey distributed by the Canadian Association of Early Career Health Researchers. She shared their report with the Faculty Council. While not currently a member of the Association, she showcased the names of McGill members who spearheaded this Association and led the survey. She provided a brief overview, mentioning that this survey was done in March 2016, gathering personal accounts from early career investigators about their experience in the current funding environment. She noted that the final report received 143 responses (across Canada) in just one week, with a majority of male responders. A copy of the results is posted on the Faculty Council web site. Other highlights include: 84% of respondents report having delayed starting potential impactful research; respondents currently employ 204 staff and supervise 909 trainees, but many report firing staff and being unable to fund trainees or accept new ones; 46% indicate that because of the current funding environment, they are considering leaving research, academia or Canada. In terms of next steps, A. Tsimicalis indicated that the report was shared with HealthCareCAN, where members discussed its results with CIHR representatives and members of the Minister of Science of Canada. A letter was drafted to CIHR, led by Michael Hendricks (McGill), suggesting how to allocate the additional \$30M provided in the recent federal budget. The content of the letter and further activities (including non-advocacy related issues such as sharing tips for new PIs) are being discussed in a private Slack group. She ended her presentation by stating that anyone interested in getting involved could contact Michael Hendricks, Kristin Connor or Holly Whiteman.

Selena Sagan, a new investigator in the Microbiology & Immunology Department mentioned she had been involved in similar discussions with other new investigators, along with Dr. Terry Hebert, President of MAUT, mentioning some things McGill could do now within the Faculty of Medicine to help new investigators and mid-career investigators alike. She noted one thing that came up was salary awards for which a lot of time is spent applying with the only advantage being a line on their CVs. Consequently, many universities give money to the investigator that receives the salary award and this would benefit both new and mid-career investigators. She offered the example of the CIHR New Investigator Award, which is retained fully by McGill with no funds going to the investigator. Start-up funds were also discussed, which expire after a certain date at McGill and cannot be carried over. A final topic discussed was prioritizing Early Career Investigators (ECIs) in bridge-funding competitions, as they are currently at a disadvantage within CIHR.

Doulia Hamad asked as part of this process whether A. Tsimicalis had spoken to anyone who has left research or academia to determine why they made this decision. Dr. Tsimicalis replied that this

is something for the Association to discuss as a potential follow-up. The Chair commented that this presentation showed a clear issue exists for young investigators and will take into consideration Dr. Sagan's comments regarding flexibility with start-up funds.

6. Towards a Future Health Sciences Campus

The Chair briefly reviewed the process for submitting proposals for future uses of the RVH space. He indicated that based on recent feedback from Principal Fortier, the Faculty of Medicine will likely NOT get the RVH site, further commenting that the idea of having a central location for a medical and health sciences campus is still a legitimate one, with its location to be determined. He outlined the multiple health professional schools that comprise the Faculty of Medicine's future health science campus, including: Medicine (undergraduate and postgraduate), the Ingram School of Nursing, the School of Physical & Occupational Therapy, the School of Communication Sciences and Disorders, and the School of Population and Global Health, in addition to an interdisciplinary science group, which would include the Institute of Computational Medicine. He further noted that the School of Population and Global Health is both an education and a research enterprise as G. Paradis explained in his presentation. The idea is to build around cross-cutting units that are core facilities for education, such as the Simulation Centre and Faculty Development for health science education, and to allow for more inter-professional interaction. Students have also advocated for an inter-professional student space. The Faculty of Medicine RVH proposal can be viewed at the following link: <http://www.mcgill.ca/medicine/about/faculty-council/meetings-minutes>.

B. Robaire mentioned that in previous university plans, there had been proposals for additional buildings going up – one between the two houses for SPOT, another behind the Epigenetics building across from McTavish and Peel, noting there had been plans to have this under a sort of umbrella structure for people to be able to meet between the Bellini and McIntyre buildings. B. Robaire asked what sort of pressure exists for the development of these buildings so we can actually achieve the type of campus described. The Chair responded that he had met with Robert Couvrette earlier that day and noted that at this stage, Principal Fortier must first make a decision about the RVH; the university cannot ignore Medicine. The Chair indicated that our ideal scenario would be to build a Health Science Campus around existing Faculty of Medicine buildings to ensure proximity as much as possible. This plan would be the Faculty's "Plan A," and the RVH re-use would be our Plan B. Either way, the Chair indicated this project would be an exciting one.

D. Tampieri asked what type of factor would influence a decision for adding (or not) to the RVH, further asking when a selection would be made. The Chair responded that mid-June this year is when the Principal has called a meeting for this purpose. He further stated that the money necessary for this project is in the range of \$800M and we will definitely need outside funding (i.e., federal and provincial government, private or public organizations, etc.). He mentioned that he, along with Robert Couvrette, believe that the RVH is one part of a Master Plan for the whole campus, posing the question that if Science and Engineering get the old Royal Vic site, what would Health Sciences get, or vice versa, depending who the Vic site is allocated to.

The Chair went on to the topic of Strategic Planning, noting that we do a lot of it and posed the question, "What do we want to be when we grow up as a Faculty?" He then invited Demetra Kafantaris to say a few words about Project Renaissance. She proceeded to provide an update, mentioning that we ultimately need to use the vision developed for the RVH space to determine the

answers to the question of who we want to be in the next ten years. She outlined that the Dean had launched an exercise last year within the Deanery Executive to identify priority questions, and through an iterative process with the Deanery Executive and then with the Faculty Leadership Commons, a series of refined strategic priority questions were defined, which will help shape the discussion of our overarching image and vision for a Health Sciences Campus.

D. Kafantaris then indicated that she would like to see the formation of a Planning Committee that would look at the overarching image and vision, and further indicated she would like to ask for one or two volunteers from the Faculty Council to join this Planning Committee for Project Renaissance. It would be comprised of 12-15 people who would work together for the remainder of this year with the goal of producing a recommendation for creating a vision and plan for the next ten years.

Demetra also mentioned that Dean Eidelman has asked Dr. Annette Majnemer, Vice-Dean Education, to lead the development of an Education Strategic Plan in parallel. These elements come together in tandem with our Strategic Research Plan that was carried out a couple of years ago. She stated that with these three components coming together, it should make for a transformative exercise. **She then repeated her request for volunteers for the Planning Committee. The process would be designed efficiently and would ensure broad consultation, leading to an implementation plan. Dr. Rochford & Dr. Larose volunteered.**

SECTION III

7. Open Session/Town Hall

Alex Magdzinski voiced concern over a lack of enthusiasm he felt on behalf of the Chair for the old RVH site. The Chair indicated that one of the concerns with the RVH site includes the length of time needed for this project, noting we have urgent needs and he worries rebuilding the RVH would take 25-30 years, whereas re-purposing one of the closer buildings such as the Powell or Stewart would likely only take around ten years. The MUHC-Glen project is a good a reference as it took 20 years to complete. The second concern the Chair expressed is the use of the RVH site would split the Faculty into two main areas. A third concern is uncertainty over what will happen to the MNI/MNH as there is a proposal by the Ministry of Health to move it to the Glen site, a move that would eliminate one of the advantages to taking over the RVH. With the right investment, the Chair concluded that the RVH project would be a great one, albeit he feels that a Health Sciences Campus around existing buildings would be more favourable.

Doulia Hamad (outgoing MSS President) asked what the role of students would be in terms of strategic planning. D. Kafantaris replied that the Planning Committee, once constituted, will include students and will help determine the scope of consultation needed. Some consultation may be done through focus groups. She explained that the Committee would advise on how best to reach our appropriate stakeholders, reiterating that there will definitely be student involvement.

The Chair then introduced new faculty appointments: Lesley Fellows, Assistant Dean, Academic Affairs; Evelyn Constantin, Assistant Dean, Postgraduate Medical Education; Albert Berghuis, Chair, Department of Biochemistry; and Batchimeg Zuend, Senior Financial Officer, Financial Affairs; he congratulated them all on their appointments. He went on to mention outgoing Faculty leaders, namely: Steven Backman, Chair, Department of Anesthesia; Robert Primavesi, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education; Ivan Rohan, Associate Dean, Continuing Professional

Development; and H  l  ne Ezer (in August), Associate Dean & Director, Ingram School of Nursing. He thanked them all for their hard work and congratulated them on their accomplishments.

The Chair then provided an update on the MDCM Program accreditation status and timeline, noting that we will be conducting an External Review (scheduled for tomorrow). He will be meeting with a special team of external experts recruited to review the UGME MDCM accreditation and help us identify any outstanding issues still to be addressed. He further indicated that we must submit the new Data Collection Instrument (DCI) in November, an official summary document evidencing our progress and action. The accreditors will come for a limited site visit in February 2017, assessing our status based on this document. He noted that the UGME MDCM program has also planned two mock site visits in the fall in anticipation of the real site visit to ensure we are well prepared. He further stated there is an excellent team now in our Accreditation Office who have worked hard with UGME and are trying to address all of the issues identified. The External Review will help us be even better prepared for the DCI submission in November.

The Chair continued to the Kudos portion of the meeting, highlighting two recipients of McGill medals (McGill University Medal for Exceptional Academic Achievement), **John Bergeron** and **Phil Branton**. He noted that **Jean-Pierre Farmer** and **Nada Jabado** were named “*Personnalit  s de la semaine*” in La Presse. **Dr. Farmer** also received the *Prix d’excellence 2016, Coll  ge des m  decins du Qu  bec*. He mentioned that **Doulia Hamad**, **Neil Verma** and **Carl White Ulysse** received Scarlet Key Awards for Leadership. He acknowledged **Christine McCusker** in the Top 10 Discoveries of the Year, Qu  bec Science magazine, and **Louise Pilote** for the 2016 Woman of Distinction, Health category, Women’s Y Foundation. Others of note: **Dr. Primavesi** received (yesterday) the Osler Award for Excellence in Teaching; **Linda Snell** received the 2016 Ian Hart Award and **Mark Wainberg** was inducted into the Canadian Medical Hall of Fame just before winning the Lifetime Achievement Award for the Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases Canada. He apologized to those persons whose names on the list he did not mention as there were many.

He then spoke to the previous day’s Convocation event, which was a proud day for the Faculty. There was a fantastic group of graduates and an amazing honorary degree speech delivered.

The Chair invited questions or comments from the Faculty Council. There being none, the Chair reminded members to hand in their name cards and thanked everyone who helped organize the meeting. **Lastly he mentioned that anyone wishing to submit topics for future meetings could send them either to him, Demetra Kafantaris or to any member of the Steering Committee.**

There being no other business to address, on a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

END

**ADDENDUM: Alex Magdzinski approached Demetra to indicate that as he was not a Faculty Council member, he could not volunteer for the Steering Committee. Keisha Dhaliwal volunteered in his stead.*

All documents, including PowerPoint presentations at Faculty Council, are kept as part of the official minutes.