



## Minutes

Wednesday, May 15, 2013 12-13:09

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on May 15, 2013 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

### **PRESENT**

Algieri, Stefano  
 Beheshti, Jamshid  
 Bernard, Daniel  
 Bouchard, Adam  
 Boyer, Daniel  
 Boudreau, Andrew  
 Cowan, Brian  
 Di Grappa, Michael  
 Di Paola, Antonia  
 Dinel, Haley  
 Dudek, Gregory  
 Ferrie, Frank  
 Gale, Charles  
 Grant, Martin  
 Goldstein, Rose  
 Grütter, Peter  
 Harman, Christopher  
 Harpp, David  
 Hebert, Terence  
 Hurtubise, Jacques

Ismail, Ashraf  
 Jonsson, Wilbur  
 Jutras, Daniel  
 Kalil, Alex  
 Kirk, Andrew  
 Kreiswirth, Martin  
 Kucij, Maya  
 Kuzaitis, Ruth  
 Laverdiere, Eric  
 Lowther, David  
 Lu, Catherine  
 Madramootoo, Chandra  
 Manfredi, Christopher  
 Marcil, Olivier  
 Masi, Anthony  
 Mendelson, Morton  
 Michaud, Mark  
 Mooney, Jonathan  
 Munroe-Blum, Heather  
 (*Chair*)  
 Nasr, Mo

Ngadi, Michael  
 Nystrom, Derek  
 Pekeles, Gary  
 Potter, Judith  
 Price, Cynthia  
 Redel, Josh  
 Richard, Marc  
 Riches, Caroline  
 Roulet, Nigel  
 Shaughnessy, Honora  
 Snider, Laurie  
 Thordardottir, Elin  
 Todd, Peter  
 Weinstein, Marc  
 White, Lydia  
 Xu, Boran  
 Zhang, Ji  
 Zorychta, Edith  
 Stropole, Stephen  
 (*Secretary*)

**REGRETS:** Ellen Aitken, Paul Allison, George Azmy, Stephanie Bachelet, Laurence Belanger, Graham Bell, Leslie Breitner, Serge Carriere, Renzo Cecere, Stuart Cobbett, Colleen Cook, Andre Costopoulos, David Covo, Claudio Cuello, Helge Dedek, Elaine Doucette, David Eidelman, Rodrigo Espinosa, Sean Ferguson, John Galaty, Daniel Gagnier, Kalle Gehring, Brendan Gillon, Martin Grant, Jimmy Gutman, Nancy Heath, Evan Henry, Allan Hepburn, Shannon Herrick, Andrew Hynes, Torrance Kirby, David Lametti, Gillian Lane-Mercier, Mark Lefsrud, Bruce Lennox, Mary Jo McCulloch, Arun Misra, Che O'May, Hélène Perrault, Kathryn Peterson, Avi Rush, Melvin Schloss, Ada Sinacore, Nikhil Srinidhi, Arnold Steinberg, Martina Stromvik, Isabel Vivas, Christina Wolfson, Morty Yalovsky, Max Zidel.

The Chair began by thanking all outgoing Senators for their service and contributions. The Chair also thanked Andrew Biteen, Senate governance officer, for his dedication and professionalism in supporting the work of Senate. She mentioned that he will be assuming the position of program manager with McGill's MasterCard Foundation Scholars Program effective June 1, 2013. She then introduced Kevin Chan, incoming Deputy Secretary-General and Shaun Cavaliere, who will be taking over Andrew's duties on an interim basis pending the appointment of Andrew's successor.

The Chair gave a special thank you to Professor Morton Mendelson, Deputy Provost, for his invaluable leadership and service in all aspects of the student experience over the previous seven years. The Provost added his own thanks to Professor Mendelson, underlining his integrity, honesty and sound judgment. Senate applauded.

## **SECTION I**

### **1. Resolution on the death of Charlotte Legare**

The Chair rose and read the following death resolution, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

It is with considerable regret that I inform Senate of the death, on April 29, 2013, of Ms. Charlotte Légaré, at the age of 63. Charlotte Légaré was Director of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for over 20 years.

Born and raised in Shawinigan, Québec, Charlotte started her career at McGill in 1972 after completing a Bachelor of Science degree with honours in Biochemistry from the Université de Montréal in 1970, and a Master of Science in Cell Biology from the Université de Sherbrooke in 1972. While working full time at McGill, Charlotte took evening courses, leading to the completion of a McGill Masters in Business Administration in 1989.

After working in the research group of Professor Stuart Millward in the McGill Department of Biochemistry, Charlotte made the bold move to become the department's Student Affairs Coordinator and found her true calling in the service of students. In 1983, she became a Student Aid Counsellor, where she honed her talent in applying policies with compassion for the individual needs of students. Perfectly bilingual, she also started representing the University on external committees and dealing with the Quebec government.

But it is in 1992 that Charlotte took on an immense challenge, namely the role of Director of Graduate Studies (later Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies). In this role, she touched the lives of graduate students and Postdocs, Graduate Program Directors and Coordinators, and colleagues in every area of the University, in over 85 programs across both campuses. From program conception to delivery, from admission to graduation, Charlotte's imprint is present. The depth and breadth of her knowledge, combined with empathy, common sense and humour, impressed all who sought her advice. Her expertise was invaluable on several subcommittees of Senate, including Courses and Programs, Student Records, Admissions, Scholarships and Student Aid and GDEU. Charlotte also represented the University in formal and informal discussions with the government and other universities.

Charlotte Légaré truly exemplified the University's mission of excellence, and she was recognized in 1995 with the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research Award for Excellence in Service.

We mourn the loss of a friend and colleague, who was the heart and soul of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies at McGill. Senate expresses its condolences to her spouse of over 30 years, Pierre Dansereau, and to her mother, Laurette Dupont-Légaré. Senate also expresses its sympathy to the Graduate and Postdoctoral family at McGill.

**2. Report of the Steering Committee** (12-13:09)

The Report of the Steering Committee (12-13:09) was received.

*Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate.* On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the April 17, 2013 meeting.

*Item 2. Speaking rights.* On motion duly proposed and seconded, speaking rights were granted for Ms. Kathleen Massey, University Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services, for Item IIB10 (Calendar of Academic Dates 2015-2016 and 2016-2017).

*Item 3. Senate Discussion Item.* The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee would explore ways to expand the Question Regarding Limits on Freedom of Expression into a Senate open discussion topic. Pending that discussion, the Steering Committee recommended that related questions be deferred.

**3. Adoption of the Agenda**

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was adopted.

**4. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair began her remarks by discussing government relations. She assured Senate that McGill's advocacy efforts would continue following the end of her mandate as Principal. She said that McGill was preparing its submissions to the post-Summit Work Groups looking at University governance and financing, with the message that academic and institutional autonomy are vital. The Chair also spoke of the future of CREPUQ, following the resignation of half its membership. She suggested that it should continue its data-collection roles.

The Chair also highlighted the recent launch of the Quartier de l'Innovation, the MasterCard Foundation Scholars Program and the Trottier Institute for Sustainability in Engineering. She gave a special mention to the new Rossy Cancer Network, which would bring together research at McGill and its teaching hospitals.

The Chair thanked everyone who had participated in McGill's first Bring a Child to Work Day, which she called a powerful way of engaging young people in the joys of university. The Chair also encouraged Senators to participate in the upcoming Spring Convocation ceremony.

The Chair ended her remarks by reviewing her tenure as Principal of McGill and Chair of Senate. She recalled her first Senate meeting in January 2003. She expressed her appreciation to Senate for its leadership, dedication and collegiality in supporting the University in its mission of academic excellence. She said that McGill had indeed changed her in many exciting and meaningful ways. The Chair told Senate that she would be spending time with her family before spending a sabbatical at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University. She intended to return to Montreal following the sabbatical. She concluded by wishing Dr. Suzanne Fortier well in the role of her successor.

Following the Chair's comments, Senator Grant was recognized and made the following remarks:

Senators, I wish to reflect upon the academic legacy of Principal Heather Munroe-Blum as she presides over Senate for the last time. I appreciate deeply the Principal's contributions to McGill, which have changed us for the better. How has the academic leadership of the Principal been expressed? It is both more subtle and more pervasive than one might think.

Of course the academic impact of our institution is expressed prosaically in our classrooms, our laboratories, our seminar rooms. We do not expect senior academic administrators or Senators to ring up staff and say, for example, "Vicky, I was just thinking you might want to minimize the Fourier ringing by isolating the pulsar's rotation", or, "Rod, I was just thinking about transactional law and Hegel, and I had a few ideas I would like to kick around when you've got a minute." No academic administrator does this. Or at least, none does it twice. Administrators work behind the curtains, as does Senate, driven by our institution's fundamental academic values and goals.

This afternoon, I would like to briefly talk about the Principal's work behind the scenes: why she does it, why all of us do it, what her values and goals are, how they are congruent with McGill's, and where we are going thanks to the Principal. This is complementary to Dean Ellen Atikin's speech last week at a private occasion commemorating the Principal's legacy *in* the spotlight.

There are different theories about how and why people work behind these curtains, I will tell you what I have observed. In a conversation with the Principal, after I had dealt with a difficult issue, she asked me how I felt about my job. I said, to be honest, and I don't understand it, but I don't feel comfortable without some weight on my shoulders. She looked a little startled and said, yeah, me too. I have empirically determined that other academic administrators feel the same way. Indeed at the other event last week I mentioned, I heard the Principal say she is most comfortable with some weight to carry.

Let me get to values and goals. In the Spring of 2002 it was announced that Heather would be our next Principal – but in January of 2003. This interim provided an opportunity for long-distance scrutiny. For example, I read briefs the Principal had written while a VP at Toronto, to get a sense of our Principal-designate. Curiously, in these documents there were no lazy arguments of entitlement, or *laissez-faire*. Instead, there was the simple one-two punch of hard rational arguments, advanced by a person standing on her own two legs, supported by

sound academic principles. And I thought, and think, that looks familiar, this is the sort of person who will fit in well and whom we need at McGill.

We are now all familiar with Heather's qualities and methods. Identify strengths empirically. Identify aspirations, consonant with those strengths. Then, differentially flow resources to enhance our strengths and advance our aspirations. This is the simple path of those who cannot or will not advance the argument of entitlement. Such an approach advances McGill's fundamental identity, the exceptionalism of a modern meritocracy. These arguments have served us well for a very long time, and they are the arguments we shall continue to make.

Indeed, our origin and early success as a modern University can be traced to the leadership of another singular Principal, William Dawson, a naturalist, paleontologist, and geologist who led McGill from 1855 to 1893. The turn of the century brought about the culmination of his effort: McGill became one of the world's great Universities due to Dawson's work.

There is a resonance over the years as we reflect upon *our* Principal's academic legacy. A century after Dawson's time, McGill retains our long-standing strengths, embodied for example by our exceptional students, but we have been enormously changed and strengthened by an unprecedented academic renewal of high quality faculty in targeted areas of strength and aspiration. We are now at a place we have not been at for over a century through many people's work, but particularly through Heather's leadership.

Heather has brought us here through her courageous commitment, her youth and charisma, her consistent and disciplined faith in rational arguments, her overarching belief in the necessity of excellence, of achievement being deeply recognized and rewarded, and finally and fundamentally, the necessity of ambition in the service of our institution. In sum, her leadership, her vision, her relentless drive for excellence has positioned McGill as a University in and of Montreal that makes a difference in Quebec, in Canada and in the world, on the basis of meritocracy and exceptionalism.

Now, notwithstanding current challenges, we have every reason to believe we are on track to enter a new golden age of our institution, parallel to that of a century ago. If we prepare for less, we will surely achieve that. If we prepare for success, and we are steadfast, we will achieve that instead, despite these difficult times. Yes, we have some distance yet to travel, and yes we have some weight to carry on our backs. But the legacy of Principal Heather Munroe-Blum is clear, and her values, goals and achievements serve to illuminate the path ahead. For we are renewed, we are strong, we will succeed.

Senators, let us recognize our Principal.

Thank you.

Senate applauded.

Senator Dinel then said the following:

Thank you Madam Chair. I would just like to say a brief few words about our Chair's time here at McGill. I have not been here as long as many of the colleagues around the room, but I will endeavour to do my best.

Over the last decade, Principal Munroe-Blum has steered our ship through both troubled and calm waters. I can't imagine that the task of being Principal is easy, but she has done so with a love of McGill and a dedication to ensuring that we remain at the top of the proverbial heap. With regard to students and student life, her most notable contribution has been the commissioning of an institutionalization of the two task forces already mentioned today: one on community diversity, engagement and excellence, as well as one on student life and learning which has led to the creation of the position of Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning); and the outcomes of these task forces are still prevalent and relevant today and will remain so in the future of McGill.

It is also worthy to note, as we are here at Senate, her role as Chair. She has led through some difficult and stressful, frustrating conversations as well as sometimes the ones that were happy and forward thinking as well as sometimes funny. Working with her on Steering this year, I have seen firsthand her ability to bring in all sorts of opinions to figure out what is best for us. Through her term as Chair we have seen some amazing things come through Senate.

So, Madam Chair, congratulations on a decade of your service to McGill and congratulations to your contributions here at McGill and at Senate. Thank you.

Senate applauded.

The Provost said the following:

Principal Munroe-Blum, I take this opportunity to thank you for your extraordinary leadership and management of this great University which were so eloquently expressed by our Dean of Science and Senator Dinel a few moments ago.

I have had the privilege of serving in your administration for your entire mandate. I have benefitted personally and enormously from your leadership and mentorship. There is no way in the short time available this afternoon to do justice to your exploits on behalf of McGill, or even to some of your adventures, or mis-adventures, in chairing Senate.

It really is too bad that we have not been video recording and archiving these meetings all along! Many Fellows of Senate would, I am sure, be viewing them and pushing the rewind button to see if you really did that or said that!

More seriously, most of us in this august body have had the chance to see firsthand your extraordinary work ethic. It is truly the stuff of legend. If you did not invent multi-tasking then you certainly have added supplementary definitions to it! Given the volume of e-mails and text messages that you will normally send, in the James Building there is an office pool going, betting on whether or not the keypad on your BlackBerry will actually last another 45 days!

I would like to focus for a moment on some specific things you have done as Chair of Senate, some of which you may not wish to have acknowledged! As chair of Senate:

- o you have always tried to balance the formal and the informal
- o you have provided insightful remarks that are always relevant, and interesting
- o you never fail but to end with an upbeat recognition of the accomplishments of members of the McGill community
- o you have challenged this governing body to step up to its responsibilities to discuss topics that affect the academic and research mission of this great University
- o you have revitalized the Joint Senate-Board meeting agendas so that they always reflect a teaching moment that is bi-directional
- o you have engaged in numerous committee of the whole discussions, many while still in the Chair and a committee of the whole not having actually been convened
- o you have insisted on the importance of courtesy and respect in all interactions
- o you have been willing to experiment with new ways of doing the business of the Senate
- o yet, you have cherished, protected, and enhanced time-honored traditions
- o you have demonstrated to all of us the importance of setting high expectations, stretch goals, and the absolute need to measure ourselves against our peers
- o you have trusted the collective wisdom of this body even when it was not your initial instinct
- o and finally, you have interrupted, cut short, or found the need to correct nearly every report that I have made to Senate, for which I thank you!

I am sure that Senate has come to understand that while you are a tough task master, you have never forgotten what it means to be compassionate in moments of personal need.

Heather, in a private event, I saluted you in a way that I wish to do in the company of the Fellows of Senate:

Principal Munroe-Blum, Madam Chair of Senate,

- o Thank you for all you have done.
- o Thank you for who you are.
- o McGill will never be the same because of you.
- o McGill will never be the same without you.
- o Good luck in all your future endeavours.
- o Thanks for the memories!

Senate rose in applause.

## **SECTION II**

### **Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members**

#### **1. Question Regarding Sustainability in Research**

Senator Dinel asked the following question:

Our community understands that McGill should be a leader in sustainability, that the University should endeavour to advance these principles in Quebec, Canada, and the world by integrating justice and sustainability into all of our activities.

What efforts will the Office of Sponsored Research take to integrate sustainability into its activities?

From a sustainability perspective, how can we as a University better integrate student research into achieving our academic and non-academic priorities?

How are we as a community at this University ensuring that the core principles of McGill are being upheld during research processes?

Senator Goldstein, Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations), answered as follows:

I will take each question separately.

#### **What efforts will the Office of Sponsored Research take to integrate sustainability into its activities?**

Research and International Relations (RIR) at McGill is responsible for leading collaborative efforts across the University to develop and implement policy frameworks and guidelines for research activities. The Strategic Research Plan is a key example of such a framework.

RIR is also contributing to development of overarching policies and plans which are led by other sectors. The Academic Plan, ASAP, (2012) and Vision 2020 (2013) are key examples.

RIR has incorporated sustainability into our work on guiding and policy for research activities. Sustainability is identified as one of 5 core commitments in the Strategic Research Plan. The four other Core Commitments are closely related to Sustainability – Ideas, Innovation, Collaboration and Partnership, and Social Engagement.

Sustainability in research activities is framed in terms of:

1. What researchers study (thematic areas, for example: green chemistry, diversity and inequality studies, ecology and biodiversity, health management);



2. How researchers study questions (approaches);
3. How the university ensures the long-term viability of its research enterprise through operating, maintaining and renewing its infrastructure and core facilities.

These values work together to produce a vision for research that is collaborative and outward-looking, whether we're talking about research which is basic or applied, because solutions to complex challenges increasingly require interaction between different individuals and groups with different kinds of expertise.

In addition to leading institutional-wide policy development, the RIR sector is also implementing sustainability in its own day-to-day operations. Use of electronic signatures on grant applications and development of e-forms for our administrative procedures are just a few examples of these efforts. All our work is based on electronic and web-based applications, not paper.

**From a sustainability perspective, how can we as a University better integrate student research into achieving our academic and non-academic priorities?**

Your question recognizes that students have been in the forefront of McGill's sustainability initiatives. More generally, student research and education are integral parts of McGill's research activities. This is reflected in our SRP, which cites the nexus between research and education as a critical driver of McGill's research enterprise.

Improving student research opportunities is a key way to enhance the university's overall research enterprise, improve research experience for students at all levels, and increase opportunities for all researchers (faculty and students), if they are interested, to contribute to improving the university's ecosystem and to improving the outside world. My portfolio is committed to encouraging this interest.

We have two excellent examples of integration of undergraduate students in strategic priority initiatives led by a Faculty:

- One example is the very successful undergraduate research activities in the Faculty of Arts. The Arts Research Internship Award provides an ideal opportunity for students to translate their classroom experience into real-world situations and gain valuable experience related to their field of study.
- The second example is the undergraduate sustainability research projects in Engineering. In each of the last two years the Trottier Institute for Sustainability in Engineering and Design (TISED) has sponsored 10 summer undergraduate research projects for Engineering students on sustainability topics, and has also awarded prizes for the best three posters on sustainability topics at the annual Summer Undergraduate Research in Engineering (SURE) poster session. The student funding represents \$25,000 from TISED.

Quartier de l'Innovation (QI) is another initiative that will enable students to pursue both pure and applied research questions within the context of an innovation system that encourages entrepreneurship and community partnerships. The RIR sector is working to establish a formal

McGill QI Student Working Group to identify student priorities and projects for QI. Sustainable development is a prominent theme which is emerging in the QI context.

Students are integral to the QI – both in terms of designing projects and to participate in activities. The urban planning aspects have involved students from the early days of QI and continue to do so under the “Volet urbain”. For example, the development of metrics to track the impact of the QI in the district was done with help of a student and the sustainability aspect is noticeable among the indicators. I will describe the projects being developed by McGill’s leader on Urban Planning in the QI, Professor Raphael Fishler, in my presentation on QI, all of which are focused on urban sustainability.

**How are we as a community at this University ensuring that the core principles of McGill are being upheld during research processes?**

Upholding of core commitments and principles outlined in the SRP is a joint responsibility of all students, faculty, and staff at McGill. The buy-in and participation by the McGill community at large is essential to uphold and further develop the principles of sustainability. Going forward, we will benchmark our policies and procedures against the core commitments we have accepted.

The success of the SRP will be measured by its long-term impact and effects. The SRP Implementation Strategy lays out mechanisms for realizing enhanced success for McGill’s research sector in general. Some of these mechanisms are led primarily by V-P(RIR), while others occur in partnership with other sectors of the university.

The role of the RIR is primarily to bring sectors together and catalyze debate and networking which will lead to research projects. A concrete example of activities led by RIR is the establishment of intersectoral working groups such as research on the north, aging, and convergence between science, engineering, and health eg Green Chemistry. All of these three thematic areas have significant focus on sustainability.

Senator Kirk added that in the Faculty of Engineering, the Trottier Institute would aim to weave a thread of sustainability throughout the undergraduate program. Senator Harpp said that the Tomlinson Project would be working alongside the Faculty of Engineering.

**2. Question Regarding Limits on Freedom of Expression**

Senator Mooney asked the following question:

A letter was recently published in the McGill Daily regarding an event titled “Blackface, Ethnic Comedy, and the Tension Between Free Expression and Racism”

The letter states,

[Julius] Grey’s presentation centered on an argument in favour of the right to “free speech” and emphatically against collective rights for minority

groups. He went on to argue that racialized/ ethnocultural groups should assimilate rather than organize and assert themselves collectively.

Grey's entire presentation was underscored by the fact that in delivering it, he asserted his own individual right to "free speech" over the collective rights of those present to be protected from his psychological violence.

How does McGill view its commitment to freedom of expression vis-a-vis its commitment to providing an equitable environment founded upon the fundamental dignity and worth of all of its members?

The Provost answered as follows:

Thank you for your important question.

I will answer it by paraphrasing an open letter that I wrote regarding a controversial invited speaker who came to campus about 18 months ago, that is available off of the Provost's website [http://www.mcgill.ca/provost/sites/mcgill.ca/provost/files/doc\\_provosts\\_letter\\_about\\_controversial\\_speakers\\_on\\_campus\\_201111.pdf](http://www.mcgill.ca/provost/sites/mcgill.ca/provost/files/doc_provosts_letter_about_controversial_speakers_on_campus_201111.pdf).

McGill University is dedicated to intellectual inquiry. That commitment must withstand strong pressures to yield to partisan posturing or political correctness. Our community is diverse in origin and in ideas. Testing facts, opinions, and perspectives requires a level of tolerance that rarely characterise other institutions in our democracy.

As an institution we must be committed to allowing the free exchange of ideas, even those ideas to which we take exception. We would undermine our basic educational mission if we did not do so. Our obligation as a community is to ensure that the University provides a safe space in which controversies can be addressed in a manner that respects our fundamental values.

As members of the McGill community, we should all work to allow discourse to proceed and give space for a discussion of topical, relevant issues. It is difficult to imagine a more appropriate place for confronting controversies than on a university campus such as McGill. No endorsement is given, nor should one be implied because of the mere presence on campus of a flashpoint speaker for a contentious issue.

The price of free speech is rarely too high to pay no matter how repulsive the message or the messenger. We want our students and others in our community to confront controversial topics in an environment that will help them to think critically.

In general while rhetoric is a highly valued competence, knowledge is advanced by the presentation of credible, reliable, and valid evidence. Those who are hateful, dismissive, and intolerant cannot truly add to the intellectual life of the campus, but they provide an opportunity for our community to unmask them for what they are.

We should use controversial speakers as pedagogical opportunities to confront controversial ideas with sharp, but civil and respectful, questions, facts, and opposite points of view.

The enduring sense of public purpose that characterises McGill actually requires of us that we not sugar coat the controversies that confront citizens every day. Sometimes coming to understand the complex world in which we live means listening to uncomfortable positions and engaging in difficult debates.

### **3. Question Regarding the Harassment Policy**

Senator Dinel asked the following question:

Policies on harassment, sexual harassment, and discrimination prohibited by law at all institutional levels tend to operate via complaint reporting procedures. These policies are ex post facto and therefore deal only retroactively with these issues.

Due to the nature of these concerns, it can often be difficult to institutionalize preventative measures to protect communities. The most important issue in this case is the education and protection of our population at McGill. No true change can take place if people are not informed enough and not guarded by rules and procedures in place.

Given recent events surrounding harassment, it is important that our policy should be addressed. McGill students are particularly concerned about their well-being.

Since the McGill Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law is currently under review:

Could the University update the Senate as to its progress on the revisions to the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment, and Discrimination Prohibited by Law?

What mechanisms are in place to protect students and staff from harassment and discrimination?

Are there any institutional processes in place to actively prevent harassment and discrimination prohibited by law?

Senator White, Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity), answered as follows:

Response to question by Senator Dinel on Harassment Policy and related measures  
McGill's Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law was originally approved by Senate and the Board in 2005, and amended in 2009. Section 8.1 of the Policy indicates that a further review of the Policy should be undertaken after 3 years, with a working group set up to conduct this review.

Membership of this working group was established in the fall of 2012 (in accordance with Section 8.1); the group has met 3 times so far in the winter of 2013. We envisage at least a couple more meetings and hope to bring some proposals to Senate in the Fall.

The Policy has as its objectives (i) the promotion of awareness of equity issues, including issues relating to harassment and discrimination, and the fostering of an environment free of harassment, sexual harassment and discrimination prohibited by law; (ii) ensuring that procedures are in place to address complaints. The working group is looking at both types of objectives. Senator Dinel's question is largely concerned with the first of these, i.e. preventative measures.

Existing mechanisms for protecting students and staff after the fact, so to speak, include the Harassment Policy itself, via the work of the assessors, as well as the Charter of Student Rights, the office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, the Ombudsperson, McGill's Dispute Resolution Policy (for MUNASA staff), and the various collective agreements of unionized employees at McGill. It is also possible to bring complaints to Deans and Chairs, as appropriate.

It will never be possible to guarantee an environment totally free from harassment and discrimination. We believe that education and awareness are key in reducing both harassment and discrimination. The University is taking a number of significant measures in this regard.

For example, the promotion of awareness is part of the mandate of the Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office, which is committed to fostering a fair and inclusive environment that respects the dignity of each member of the McGill Community. SEDE engages in a number of activities that relate to the objectives of the Policy. These include training and workshops on topics in diversity and discrimination, public events, special consultations, etc., aimed at students, staff and faculty. In addition, we are including relevant information sessions and training as part of the Academic Leadership Forum (ALF) for academic administrators, as well as in orientation sessions for new faculty members. In addition, as a follow-up to McGill's 2009 diversity survey, we have just conducted a survey that measures students' experiences of discrimination on the part of other students, faculty, teaching assistants, and other employees at McGill. We are now analyzing the results and a report will be available by the end of the summer. By learning more about the incidence and severity of discrimination, we will be better positioned to address problems and to measure the impact of interventions.

## **Part "B" – Motions and Reports from Organs of University Government**

### **Open Session**

#### **1. Amendments to the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Tenure Track and Tenured Academic Staff (D12-65)**

Senator White, Associate Provost (Policies, Procedure and Equity), presented this report for

Senate's approval. The amendment would reinsert the UTC and Principal within s. 7.15.1 of the *Regulations* that were approved in May, 2012.

*On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Tenure Track and Tenured Academic Staff as amended and so recommended to the Board of Governors.*

**2. Revisions to the Code of Student Grievance Procedures (D12-66)**

Senator Costopoulos, Dean of Students, presented this item for Senate's approval. He explained that the Appeal Committee on Student Discipline and Student Grievances is described in both the Code of Student Grievance Procedures and the Code of Student Conduct. Senator Costopoulos told Senate that its amendment of the latter in April left a discrepancy and this motion seeks to ensure consistency between the Codes.

*On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the Code of Student Grievance Procedures as revised.*

**3. Progress Report on the Quartier de l'Innovation (D12-63)**

Senator Goldstein, Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations), presented this report for Senate's information. She told Senate that whereas last year the Quartier de l'Innovation (QI) was a vision, it is now a reality, having been officially launched. QI is a collaboration between McGill and École de Technologie Supérieure, and will be part of the redevelopment of the Griffintown neighbourhood in ways that seek synergy between McGill and the local area.

Senator Goldstein said that the QI vision is to create a hub of mobilization for academic, industrial, social and cultural actors, and a model of sustainable development. It would be university led and based on four pillars that were found to be strengths in similar projects around the world. Senator Goldstein highlighted Centech, a technological incubator located in the QI, as well as the Social Economy Initiative, which is working with QI to engage and strengthen social economy organizations in the areas surrounding QI.

Senator Goldstein finished by telling Senate about the QI launch, which featured many prominent Montrealers and politicians.

Senator Redel asked about consultation with members of the local community. Senator Goldstein answered that there were individual interviews and focus groups conducted by a working group overseen by Professor Will Straw. She added that the working group's report is available for consultation. She also told Senate that these discussions involved community members, shopkeepers, schools and school boards, and religious institutions in the area. Senator Dinell asked about the parameters of McGill's relationships with outside partners in the QI. Senator Goldstein responded that engagements would have to follow the rules and policies of both McGill and outside partners.

Senator Galaty asked what attention had been given to potential impacts on the local community, in particular those who would be impacted by potential real estate appreciation. Senator

Goldstein responded that there was a working group discussing these matters. The working group included real estate developers, artists and community members, as well as university people.

Senator Bouchard asked whether the QI aimed to be financially self-sustaining without outside grants. Senator Goldstein responded that the initial plan required support, especially to sustain its artistic and cultural projects. She added that the innovation and technological aspects could eventually aim for financial self-reliance.

Senator Michaud asked whether the 25-year agreement with ETS was exclusive, or whether other universities might be welcome to join the initiative. Senator Goldstein answered that it was not exclusive, and other institutions were already involved. She added that the QI would eventually be overseen by an independent not-for-profit that would oversee all partnerships.

**4. 447<sup>th</sup> Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D12-67)**

The Provost presented this Report for Senate's approval.

*On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposal for the creation of the Microbiome and Disease Tolerance Centre (MDTC)/Centre microbiome et tolérance aux maladies (CMTM) and so recommend it to the Board of Governors.*

*On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed modification to the degree title "Master of Library and Information Studies" (abbreviated to "M.L.I.S.") to "Master of Information Studies" (abbreviated to "M.I.St.") and that Article 13.1 of the University Statutes (List of degrees granted in course) be amended accordingly, and so recommended to the Board of Governors.*

The Provost provided Senate a notice of a motion to amend the Statutes. The motion to be presented at the September Senate meeting would replace article 13.1 with language allowing Senate to approve and amend the list of degrees to be granted, without requiring a subsequent amendment to the Statutes.

**5. Principal's Prize for Outstanding Emerging Researchers (D12-68)**

Senator Goldstein, Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations), presented this item for approval. She told Senate that, upon Senator Richard's suggestion, she added language to include Librarians and the University Libraries alongside professors and the faculties. She added that age was not a factor, only experience.

Senator Roulet asked about the contradiction between the prize's intended goals of celebrating McGill's most outstanding young researchers and of giving priority to those who have not been granted external prizes or awards. Senator Goldstein said that exceptions could be made, but the award aimed to help researchers' profiles for external awards, so this criterion would help frame the selection.

*On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the creation of the Principal's Prize for Outstanding Emerging Researchers.*

**6. Report of the Nominating Committee (D12-69)**

The Provost presented this item for approval. The Chair explained that section 2.3.1 referred to the Advisory Committee for the Selection of the Dean of Education as Dean H elene Perreault would be assuming the role of Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences at University of Ottawa. Senate congratulated Senator Perreault.

*On motions duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee.*

**7. Regulations on the Retirement of Academic Staff (D12-70)**

Senator White, Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity) presented this item for Senate’s approval. She explained that these regulations consolidated existing regulations and brought them up to date.

Senator White proposed two changes from the version that was circulated, based on consultation with MAUT:

- Section 4.6.2 was removed, with other sections renumbered accordingly;
- Section 4.6.13 was modified to “no longer than ~~two~~ three years”

*On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the Regulations on the Retirement of Academic Staff and so recommended to the Board of Governors.*

**8. Report on Employment Equity (D12-71)**

Senator White presented this item for information. She pointed out the slight increase in the proportion of females in the professoria as a matter of concern. She also told Senate that the new survey data would allow staff to select more than one minority status, and would ensure that the data is handled confidentially, to increase participation in the survey. The Provost asked Senators to encourage their colleagues to participate in the survey, with a view to keeping McGill in conformity with external requirements. Senator Roulet said that certain people would rather not respond and should be allowed to so indicate. Senator White said that such people are counted as “white, able-bodied males,” and the new version would seek to allow responders to answer only certain sections.

Senator Zorychta asked whether the University might benefit from examining successful strategies at other institutions, suggesting a subcommittee of the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity (JBSCE). Senator White promised to raise the issue with the JBSCE in the fall.

**9. Report on Academic Salary Differentials by Gender (D12-72)**

Senator White presented this item for information. She summarized the collected data and the factors affecting academic salary. Among measures taken, Senator White said that the University was encouraging CRC nominations of female staff and had increased mentorship and monitoring for female assistant and associate professors. The Provost added that the University had



established a special budget envelope to rectify anomalies, but this had not been used in two years. He said that the University would continue to look at underlying factors. Senator Zorychta said that most faculty members would not know that their salary was anomalous and suggested that the University seek out individual cases. The Provost said that he would conduct such an analysis.

Senator Grutter asked whether the calculations of years of service before promotion took into account maternity leave. Senator White said she would examine the data and find out.

**10. Academic Calendar of Dates 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 (D12-73)**

Ms. Massey, University Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services, presented this item for Senate's approval. She told Senate that the main priority was academic, with a special regard for allowing students to travel home between the fall and winter terms. Senators pointed out the early start in January, 2017, suggesting that students might not return in time. Ms. Massey said that this was necessary because of the timing of Easter. Questions were also raised about the discrepancy between McGill's winter reading week and those of Montreal area schools, which place a burden on parents. Ms. Massey said that the University sought to align breaks, but needed to place the reading week at the appropriate time in the semester. Senator Grutter asked about the proposed start of a semester on a Friday before Labour Day.

*On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the Academic Calendar of Dates 2015-2016 and 2016-2017.*

**11. Report from the Board of Governors to Senate (D12-74)**

Senator Zorychta presented this item for Senate's information. She told Senate that minutes for the open sessions would be available online.

**12. Annual Report on Safe Disclosure (D12-75)**

The Secretary-General presented this item for Senate's information. He told Senate that steps would be taken to simplify access the Policy on Safe Disclosure on the web.

**13. 2013-2014 Senate Meeting Dates (D12-76)**

The Chair informed Senate that the 2013-2014 Senate Meeting Dates had been circulated. Senator Dinel pointed out that the Joint Board-Senate Meeting, which is scheduled for November 14, 2013, will take place Tuesday, not Thursday.

**Other Business**

There being no other business to deal with, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

END

The complete documents, including presentations at Senate, are kept as part of the official minutes.