

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, October 11, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232), Leacock Building.

PRESENT:

Angus, Adrian	Jobin, Pierre-Gabriel	Richard, Marc
Barralet, Jake	Jonsson, Wilbur	Robaire, Bernard
Bartlett, Kim	Kasirer, Nicholas	Roulet, Nigel
Bennett, Hamilton	Kirk, Andrew	Ryan, Dominic H.
Bhatt, Vikram	Kurien, John	Saroyan, Alenoush
Bouchard, Carl-Eric	Levin, Richard I.	Scott, Marilyn
Bouchentouf, Myriam	Levy, Barry	Sedgwick, Donald
Bracewell, Robert	Lewis, Brian	Serero, Didier
Burns, David	Lin, Charles	Shaughnessy, Honora
Cartwright, Glenn	Lund, James	Skaf, Dora Maria
Chapedelaine, Annick	Maheu, Robert	Smith, Michael
Chase, Ronald	Manfredi, Christophher	Spithill, Terence
Chiang, Albert	Maric, Milan	Steinhauer, Karsten
Cox, Amy	Masi, Anthony	Tallant, Beverlea
Dear, Judy	McGruthers, Lauren	Thérien, Denis
Donny-Clark, Aaron	McLean, Donald	Todd, Peter
Dowsley, Martha	McSweeney, Kerry	Upham, Finn
Duffy, Ciaran	Mendelson, Morton	Wade, Kevin
Etamad, Hamid	Munroe-Blum, Heather (<i>Chair</i>)	Waugh, Sean
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Frances	Nemes, James	Whitesides, Sue
Glaser, Alison	Newlove, Chris	Wild, Gary
GowriSankaran, Kohur	Oxhorn, Philip	Wolfson Christina
Grant, Martin	Paré, Anthony	Yalovsky, Morty
Harpp, David	Pekeles, Gary	Zannis-Hadjopoulos, Maria
Henderson, Ian	Pelletier, Johanne (<i>Secretary</i>)	
Henderson, Jim	Peterson, Kathryn	
Hobbins, John	Pierre, Christophe	
Itzkowicz, Jake	Quaroni, Enrica	
Jacobs-Starkey, Linda	Rhéaume, Alexandra	

REGRETS: Michael Hoechsmann, Frederick Kingdom, Chandra Madramootoo, Sally McDougall, Richard Pound, Robert Rabinovitch, Janine Schmidt, Roger C. Slee, Sarah Stroud.

The Principal welcomed Ms. Myriam Bouchentouf, Management student Senator, to her first meeting of Senate.

1. RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF EMERITUS PROFESSOR ELTON R. POUNDER

The following resolution on the death of Emeritus Professor Elton R. Ponder was presented by Dean Martin Grant and adopted unanimously by Senate.

It is with regret that I inform you of the death of Emeritus Professor of Physics Elton R. Ponder, F.R.S.C., on Tuesday May 30, 2006, in Montreal, QC. Elton obtained his PhD from McGill in 1937 – at the ripe old age of twenty-one – working with J. S. Foster on the Stark effect. He participated in the design, the construction, and in the early operation of the McGill Cyclotron. During the war years, Elton Ponder served as a navigator in the Royal Canadian Air Force, where he rose to the rank of Wing Commander, and was awarded the Air Force Cross. He returned to McGill as an Assistant Professor in

1945, was promoted to Associate Professor in 1948, and was made Full Professor in 1959. He was appointed Macdonald Professor of Physics in 1976. After his retirement, Elton Pounder was made Emeritus Professor of Physics in 1982.

Elton has played a key role in the development of sea ice research in Canada. In 1955 he formed the Ice Research Project at McGill and directed that group up to his retirement. He spearheaded research on the physical properties of sea ice in the country. He has pioneered studies of the movement of floating ice covers in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and in Arctic waters. In doing so, he became a much sought-after authority and has served on many national and international committees, such as the Canadian Committee on Oceanography, and its working group on Ice in Navigable Waters, the Snow and Ice Subcommittee of the National Research Council Associate Committee on Geotechnical Research, and the Committee of Snow and Ice of the International Association of Scientific Hydrology. He has published widely in the scientific literature. His monograph on the “Physics of Ice”, published in 1965, found immediate acceptance, appearing in print at the beginning of an era of rapid northern development and hydrocarbon exploration. The considerable increase of winter shipping to inland ports through the ice-infested waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the late sixties was aided by increased knowledge of the behaviour of the ice pack, to which he contributed.

Professor Elton Pounder was a remarkable instructor, deeply committed to the teaching of physics, at all levels. Upon his return to McGill as an Assistant Professor, he appropriately was assigned the difficult task of teaching introductory physics to the large group of war veterans who were resuming their formal education. During his distinguished career as a Professor, Elton taught almost every course offered by the Department of Physics, ranging from introductory astrophysics to advanced quantum mechanics. His dedication to Physics Education manifested itself early, and led to his co-writing of an introductory physics textbook: “Physics”, with J. S. Marshall, published in 1957.

In his quiet and unassuming way, Professor Pounder has been totally devoted to McGill University. His long service to the community has included active membership on innumerable committees at the departmental, faculty, and university level. He served as the chair of the Matriculation Board, on the Athletics Board, the University Library Committee, the University Scholarship Committee, and the Senate. He served as president of the McGill Association of University Teachers. When the CEGEP system was being developed, he acted as McGill representative on Ministry of Education committees.

The Senate extends its condolences to Professor Elton Pounder’s son David, daughter Norval, step-daughter Gerry Jansen, to his grandchildren, and to his friends. Professor Pounder was predeceased in 1976 by his wife Marion. We have lost a colleague who greatly enriched the life of this university.

2. REPORT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

The report of the Steering Committee (06-07:02) was received.

Item 1, Approval of Minutes of Senate, on motion by Mr. Hobbins, seconded by Professor Thérien, the minutes of the meeting of September 20, 2006 were approved. Dean Shore requested that the minutes be amended as follows:

Item 2, Committee of the Whole, on motion by Professor Zannis-Hadjopoulos, seconded by Professor Robaire, Senate agreed to move into Committee of the Whole for 30 minutes with Dean Kasirer in the chair to discuss Report of the Task Force for Student Life and Learning (D06-13).

3. AGENDA

On motion by Professor McLean, seconded by Ms. Ezzy-Jorgensen, the Agenda was approved.

4. CHAIR'S REMARKS

The Principal opened her remarks with a report on recent rankings, beginning with the announcement that the 2006 Times Higher Education supplement listed McGill as 21st, the only Canadian University in the top 25, ahead of our ranking last year in 24th (adding that in North America, McGill ranked 12th, ahead of Johns Hopkins, UCLA and NYU). Further noted was a report by the Milken Institute ranking McGill 14th worldwide in translating its biotech research into patents, ahead of all other Canadian universities, as well as Yale and UCLA. Reporting on the November 2nd release of the *Macleans* annual university rankings, the Principal noted that many of McGill's peer research intensive universities had chosen not to participate this year – McGill has chosen however to remain in the process. Finally she noted that the *Globe and Mail* is expected to publish its own university rankings for the first time. The Principal remarked that these rankings were a powerful reflection of McGill's superior student body, alumni and professoriate as well as our international reputation.

Reporting on government relations issues arising, the Principal referred to her participation along with Quebec university leaders in discussion with the Ministry of Education on funding issues. On the federal relations front, the Principal reported on meetings between AUCC executive heads with federal government ministers Flaherty (Finance) and Bernier (Industry), as well as Privy Council Clerk Kevin Lynch.

The Principal announced that the G10, a group of the most research intensive universities in Canada, has expanded to 13 universities to include the Universities of Dalhousie, Ottawa and Calgary. The G13 will be meeting in Ottawa in October and McGill will be hosting an event in spring or fall 2007. The Principal reported she will be co-hosting a meeting in Washington in October, bringing people from Ottawa and the Canadian Embassy, as well as Washington think tank members together to develop an agenda for possible collaboration on key policy issues.

Reporting on recent University achievements, the Principal noted the launch of a commemorative stamp celebrating the 100th anniversary of Macdonald College (by the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences); the gift of a golden violin and a new student prize, le Violon d'Or, to the Schulich School of Music by Mr. Schulich in honour of the first anniversary of the naming of the Schulich School of Music. The prize was presented to a fourth-year music student and violinist, Emmanuel Vukovich. The Principal added that renowned violinist Mr. Andrew Dawes was named the first Catherine Thornhill Steele Chair in Music, donated by Mr. Schulich in memory of his close friend Catherine Thornhill. Finally, the Principal noted that the Faculty of Music had recently hosted the Sixth Annual Future of Music Policy Summit, an extraordinary event held outside the U.S. for the first time.

Closing on achievements and good news, the Principal reported that McGill students had won awards in five of twelve categories in the 8th annual Forces Avenir gala. Two McGill students (Samuel Vaillancourt and Lina Kalfayan) and three McGill projects (Community Helath Action Partnership, Re-Cycle project and Ashraya Initiative for Children), were selected for these awards, recognizing young people whose work contributes to knowledge and responsible citizenry.

Ms. Upham, in referring to the Forces Avenir event, expressed a hope that such events would in future have a greater representation from McGill's senior administration. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) thanked Ms. Upham for the comment and indicated that the former Dean of Students, Professor Bruce Shore, had attended the event this year.

5. QUESTION RE CONSULTATION PROCESS ON SPACE ALLOCATION

Professor Lewis asked the following question:

In July, the Centre for Developing Area Studies (CDAS) was informed that it has to vacate its home at 3715 Peel because the building has been reallocated to the Faculty of Education. This is in spite of the fact that renovations were about to begin with CFI funds to accommodate a recent senior Canada Research Chair hire in the History Department—a project that had been carefully planned over the previous two years. Planned renovations to provide study space for undergraduate and graduate students at CDAS were also put on hold. There was no consultation with the Director of CDAS, with the professor in question, or with any of the other CDAS stakeholders.

In early September, the History Department, the Quebec Studies Program, the Montreal History Group and a number of other research programmes learned that they have to move out of their space in New Chancellor Day Hall so that this can be reallocated to the Faculty of Law. Again, there was no consultation with any of the parties concerned. Again, there was only a vague promise of compensatory space elsewhere, as yet unspecified.

We recognize that the university faces a space crisis and that difficult and often unwelcome decisions need to be made. Our point is the complete lack of consultation in both of these instances.

- 1. Does the Provost agree with us that a spirit of collegiality and harmony can best be achieved at McGill by a process of full consultation with professors, departments, research units and other concerned parties before important decisions affecting large numbers of people are reached and announced?*
- 2. Can he reassure us that in both the above examples there was a regrettable lapse in the decision-making process that will not be repeated?*
- 3. If not, can he explain to us why he believes that a top-down, consultation-free approach to decision-making at McGill is preferable to the approach that we thought we operated under?*

The Principal called on the Provost to respond.

Professor Masi thanked Professors Oxhorn and Lewis for what he called “interestingly worded questions”, noting that the verbal summary of the questions offered to Senate was different than the written version from which he worked to produce answers. He provided the following reply:

“The assignment of the spaces in which we conduct educational, research, and support activities on campuses is generally regarded by academic administrators as one of the most delicate and controversial issues that a departmental chair, dean, vice-principal, or provost must face. Indeed, I would rather discuss the elimination of Summer Fridays or the allocation of parking spaces than answer a question on space in Senate.

But, duty calls, and I will address the general issues raised by Senators Oxhorn and Lewis, avoiding where possible the vitriolic, sardonic, and generally ill-tempered tone that they have adopted in their questions, although I have, on rare occasions, been known to give in to the temptation to respond in a vitriolic, sardonic, and generally ill-tempered manner!

It is very clear to this administration, as it has been to several that preceded it, that the Faculty of Arts needs more and better designed space in order to conduct its activities in a manner consonant with its mission. Plans for a new Arts Building have been around since the 1980s, locations have been proposed, preliminary design studies have been conducted, models have been built, and multimedia presentations

have been aired. But financing such an undertaking has not been forthcoming: the government of Quebec will not entertain it as a priority, private donors have not come forward to support the requests, and taking out loans to be paid back from the operating budget would not be fiscally responsible. In such a context, we still must find suitable space for Arts, and other Faculties that occupy our downtown campus.

One way to expand is to purchase or lease space as we have done at 688 Sherbrooke Street West, La Cité, and most recently at 3450 Durocher. The last acquisition stimulated the chain of moves about which Professors Lewis and Oxhorn launched their lament. On the basis of that purchase, we took the decision to re-locate certain back-office functions (mail room and printing from the Libraries, some ancillary services from 688, and the Accounting Department from Ferrier). This decision reflects a desire to utilise precious space on the downtown campus for core research and educational purposes, while still providing appropriate and convenient quarters for support services. The space in Ferrier, while far from ideal, is directly attached to the Arts Building, and so it seemed natural to assign that space to the Faculty of Arts.

This should have been a “win-win”, and I am truly sorry that my colleagues, Lewis and Oxhorn, have not yet seen it that way.

However, Arts is not the only Faculty that suffers from a lack of space or from spaces that are poorly equipped to handle its needs. Science certainly needs more space, but so do Law and Education. Insofar as the currently available spaces are not well suited for, and can not be easily adapted to, wet lab functions, Arts, Education, Law, and the Libraries are the units most directly affected by this recent purchase.

Discussions relative to the assignment of space in New Chancellor Day Hall (NCDH), the Purvis Hall Carriage House, and the mansions on the east side of Peel have been going on for over a decade. So, the statement by Oxhorn and Lewis that there was “a complete lack of consultation” is totally inaccurate.

NCDH has a special renovation fund assigned to the Faculty of Law that can be tapped only when alternative, equivalent space could be found into which to move the Arts units that are temporarily housed there. Arts has a “claim” on the lower mansion currently occupied by several groups from Medicine, and Education is in line for the upper mansion once Law gets NCDH. These are not new plans; the only thing new is that the acquisition of the Durocher property now makes them possible, but involves the inevitable domino effect of cascading moves.

No dean would want the job, if resource allocations to units in his or her Faculty were assigned by the Provost, Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance), or by any other administrator in the James Building. We limit ourselves to the allocation of square-metres based on available space and documented requirements, and then leave it to the Deans, Chairs, and individual professors to sort out which units and individuals go into which areas. The Deans inform me of space requirements, and working with our facilities planners and developers, we try to find surface and volume areas that suit these requirements. Deans, working with Chairs and other faculty members, decide who goes where, why, how and when.

There were considerable changes in the administrative structure of the Faculty of Arts over the last several years while discussions about finding appropriate space for various activities were on-going, so something may have fallen through the cracks. However, there were no lapses in the decision-making processes as I just described them. But I will gladly take the advice of my colleagues to ensure that communications are handled better than by having someone from another Faculty with a tape-measure in hand, informing occupants that they will be moving!

Finally, I am not now, nor have I ever been a subscriber to a “top-down, consultation-free approach” to governance, administration, or management nor have I ever been a card-carrying member of any organisation dedicated to that proposition. Nothing in the record indicates that the events, as described in

the questions my colleagues have asked, unfolded in that way. Indeed, consultation and collegiality should be respected and should operate as a two-way street.”

Ms. Glaser referred to the Law building which will no longer house the many student club bases for publications including the McGill Law journal and asked about the process of informing, accommodating and consulting with students on space allocation.

Professor Masi replied that space assignments are allocated to deans and they in turn make decisions about space allocation to professors, units or other activities within their faculties. The New Chancellor Day Hall has been entirely slated for the Faculty of Law, which meant an increase in square meters for activities to take place. He invited Professor Kasirer, Dean of the Faculty of Law, to comment on this.

Professor Kasirer stated that all stakeholders affected by this relocation, including students, were identified. Last spring a series of open meetings were held involving students, professors and specifically the McGill Law journal who were asked to make recommendations as to where they would like this publication to be relocated.

Mr. Itzkowitz referred to the amount of over \$10,000 allocated to The Centre for Developing-Area Studies (CDAS) by the Arts Undergraduate Improvement Fund Committee in winter of 2006 and asked about the allocation and consultation processes regarding space changes.

Professor Masi replied that whenever a significant change in space occurs, the general objective is to find an alternative space which is equivalent or even better than the space occupied. As to the amount of money allocated, Professor Masi, suggested that this amount may be incorporated for design of the next space. The Principal added that such decisions would be made at the Faculty level.

Professor Oxhorn added that there were consultations as to the funds given and that in order to use the funds more efficiently; it was decided to delay any decision until the space was allocated.

6. QUESTION RE MUSIC PRIVATE LESSON FEES

Mr. Waugh asked the following question:

At the April 19, 2006 meeting of Senate, (former) Senator David Matthews asked a question regarding the suggested implementation of a music lesson fee, and the university's plans to accompany said fee with "adequate need-based financial aid". The response received from Dean Don McLean affirmed that "private instruction on the principal instrument is essential to a higher education in music", despite the fee being referred to as "ancillary", and that the matters of implementation and financial aid were still in discussion.

On June 5th, 2006, a memo from the Dean of the Schulich School of Music was sent to Student Accounts and Financial Services advising the implementation of an "incidental" fee for all students in the Schulich School of Music "taking private lessons on their principal instrument". This fee, currently \$333.00CAD, or \$166.50 per semester, would increase by "approximately the same amount over the next two years to a total of approximately \$1,000CAD in 2008-2009" (pending final analysis).

1. As private lesson instruction is an "essential" part of a music degree, how can the university call the "Music Lesson Fee" an "ancillary fee" when it is clearly related to the cost of instruction, i.e. tuition?

2. With the lesson fee's implementation and its expected yearly increase, what consultation does the University intend to seek out in order to recognize the specific financial difficulties of music students?

3. Further to the response received at Senate on April 19, 2006, what plans has the university developed to accompany the lesson fee with need-based financial aid, and how will said aid be directed specifically towards music students who currently pay the fees?

The Principal invited the Provost to respond. The Provost called on Dean McLean to deal with the first part of the response. Dean McLean replied:

“As I indicated in my response to Senator Matthews at the Senate meeting of April 19, 2006, the fee is considered ancillary because the University has no choice according to current restrictions imposed by the Quebec government on tuition levels. It would be disingenuous for any of us, the University administration included, to fail to acknowledge that a myriad of service or ancillary fees charged to students, though directed to specific needs, are the result of insufficient government funding through tuitions and grants to carry out those services as well as to provide the core academic programs that define us as an institution. We have in this instance simply been more transparent in discussions with our students and with Senate about the cause of the shortfall in the particular case of Music with its individualized private instruction. The current government allocation to music programs (tuition and grants) does not offset the cost of running those programs, including in particular the cost of private lessons – particularly at the level of excellence at which these take place at the Schulich School of Music – and with respect to these lessons we reaffirm they are an essential part of a music degree.

The Schulich School of Music, as action subsequent to a two and half hour open session on this issue with the students as well as with our regular consultation process with our two student societies, has promised to work with the students individually and through their student organizations at the undergraduate and graduate levels to monitor their financial situations and to help them in coordinating their need-based requests to the appropriate faculty-based and university centralized offices for assistance.”

Professor Masi further explained:

“Private lesson instruction is “essential” to the way in which the Schulich School of Music defines the music degree, but combination of the low tuition fees that are paid to attend McGill and the grant from MELS (which is less than comparable funds given by the Ministry of Culture to Conservatory students) are not sufficient to cover the costs associated with the quality programs that our Faculty of Music offers. Not even the considerable internal subsidisation that the Schulich School receives from the operating grant of the University, nor the very generous support of benefactors, can make up the gap. As a consequence, we had to decide whether or not to redefine the program or to have students make a contribution for private lesson instruction. The latter is the road we chose.

Financial aid is determined as a balance between a student’s available resources and actual costs/expenditures. The additional costs associated with private lesson plans will be a factor, but not the only factor, in determining need in the allocation of aid to students. It should be pointed out that there are other programs of study at McGill that require additional fees in order to guarantee the quality of the programs.

There will be no specifically directed financial aid to music students, except in the context noted in my previous answer, but we have been developing a financial aid module that will facilitate the assessment of need for all McGill students. It is a major objective of McGill University to bind as tightly as possible accessibility and quality, and that principle has guided both the implementation of the fee for private instruction lessons for music and the development of a financial aid module in our student information system to ensure that we benefit the greatest number of worthy, but needy, students, regardless of the programs of study in which they are enrolled.”

Ms. Upham thanked the Provost for his reply and asked for a presentation on financial aid to be made to Senate at a future meeting.

Ms. Rhéaume asked whether entrance scholarships to music students would be different from other students at McGill University due to a higher total tuition bill.

Professor Masi replied that this would be a factor to be considered and that there should be a balance between individual student resources and the cost incurred for their programs of study.

Professor Jonsson asked about the position of the university and the Faculty towards staff members accepting fees for private lessons from students.

Dean McLean replied:

“There is a very long tradition, depending on what people’s specialization is, of getting additional professional help. Sometimes it’s from people in the studios with respect to preparing for competitions and things that are outside the norm of our programs. Sometimes it’s for accompanists, sometimes it’s for coaching. The vocal area is particularly hard hit with this, and it was a great concern of our voice students to have this additional fee put on them when they have so many other ancillary costs. But we monitor very carefully the conflict of interest that is possible in these situations between teachers acting on behalf of the University and also effectively consulting outside, whether through the McGill Conservatory program or through other professional training.”

In reply to a question from Mr. Donny-Clark regarding charging higher fees than what the government allows in some instances, Dean McLean noted that this subject warrants a broad discussion of how fees are determined in different programs. He noted that McGill University is deeply committed to a model of a publicly funded university system. However, this requires private fees to supplement various parts of programs. He added that there is the issue of differential fee between non-Quebec students and international students that warrants a much broader consultation within the University.

Professor Masi explained that Quebec makes a distinction in terms of the amount it provides per student in conservatories and the amount it makes available to performance students in universities. He noted that there is a public policy issue – to consider the situation fairly, we must look not only at McGill’s decisions, but the context in which the decisions are made.

7. 383RD REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

The 383rd Report of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (D06-11) was received and noted.

8. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Provost presented the Report of the Nominating Committee (D06-14).

I. For Approval by Senate

Item 1. Statutory Selection Committee, was approved.

Item 2. University Tenure Committee, Professor Jacques Hurtubise, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, was appointed as a representative of Senate on the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Arts, for a term commencing immediately and ending August 31, 2008, replacing Professor Niky Kamran.

SENATE – October 11, 2006

Item 3. University Bookstore Committee, Professor Mathieu Brochu, Department of Mining, Metals and Materials Engineering, was appointed to the University Bookstore Committee for a term commencing immediately and ending August 31, 2008.

Item 4. Committee on Libraries, Professor David Ronis, Department of Chemistry, was appointed to the Committee on Libraries as one of the three faculty members appointed by Senate for a term commencing immediately and ending August 31, 2009. Ms. Mary Lourenco, Nahum Gelber Law Library, was also appointed to the Committee on Libraries as the representative from the non-academic library staff for a term commencing immediately and ending August 31, 2009.

Item 5. Committee on the Rights of Senate, the following were appointed to the Committee on the Rights of Senate with end dates as shown below:

Professor Jane Glenn (Faculty of Law) – 2007
Professor Vikram Bhatt (School of Architecture) – 2008
Professor Kevin Wade (Department of Animal Science) – 2008
Mr. Marc Richard (Cataloguing Librarian) – 2009
Mr. Adrian Angus (Student) – 2007

Item 6. Committee on Student Affairs, the terms of reference of the Committee on Student Affairs were amended to replace “the Dean of the Centre for Continuing Education” with the “The Dean of the Centre for Continuing Education or delegate”.

Item 7. Committee on Student Grievances, Mr. Adrian Angus, SSMU, was appointed as an undergraduate student representative on the Committee on Student Grievances to replace Mr. Max Reed for a term commencing immediately and ending August 31, 2007.

Item 8. Advisory Committee on the Selection of a Dean of Students, Senate approved that the following individuals be appointed to serve on the Advisory Committee on the Selection of a Dean of Students:

Professor Jane Everett, Department of French Language French and Literature
Professor Arun Misra, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor Enrica Quaroni, Associate Dean of Arts, Student Affairs
Professor Henry Leighton, Associate Dean of Science, Student Affairs

Item 9. Representatives on Senate Committees from the McGill Alumni Association, Senate approved that the seats on the following Senate committees which are attributed to the Women’s Alumnae Association, be changed, and that they be attributed to the McGill Alumni Association as the parent association for all alumni and alumnae of McGill. The Nominating Committee of the McGill Alumni Association will ensure fair and equitable representation on these committees from amongst its membership:

Senate Committee on Scholarships and Student Aid
Senate Committee on Physical Development
Senate Committee on Continuing Education.

II. For Information

Item 1. Senate Nominating Committee Use of Banner Data, was noted.

9. 2005-2006 FINANCIAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Vice-Principal Yalovsky presented the 2005-2006 Financial Report to the Board of Governors (D06-12) and replied to questions and comments.

In reply to a question from Ms. Upham regarding the definition of a publicly funded university, Dr. Yalovsky indicated that all universities in Quebec are publicly funded universities. He explained that both federal and provincial governments provide a substantial amount of funding.

Professor Jonsson referred to page 16, item 9, about the employee future benefits. He asked about the connection between the annual contribution of \$2.75 million as at December 2005 and the total current contribution of \$21.9 million.

Professor Yalovsky replied that the \$21.9 million is the total contribution to the pension fund.

As a supplemental question, Professor Jonsson asked whether the annual contributions to cover the actuarial deficit in the solvency would be clawed back once the annuity fund becomes profitable.

Professor Yalovsky explained the definition of solvency and the differences between the going concern evaluation and the solvency evaluation. He added that as of December 31, 2006, the government enacted a new legislation that does not require universities to estimate their pension funds on the solvency basis. We are therefore anticipating a reduction in pension payments to the supplemental fund.

Mr. Itzkowicz asked whether the change in legislation would allow us to spend the supplemental funds. Professor Yalovsky explained that the supplemental fund will remain and would be used in case of other deficiencies.

Dean Lund asked whether we are constrained in our investment as he has seen reports from American universities with greater returns. Professor Yalovsky replied that we are constrained in our investment and do not have the flexibility other universities possess as we adhere to a 5% payout rate, which has served us well.

In reply to a question from Ms. Cox regarding international student fees, Professor Yalovsky explained that McGill University favours the idea of retaining international student fees, however, it is subject to providing appropriate funding for student aid. This is a part of the discussion that is going on with the government.

Professor Chase referred to the Principal's remarks noting that McGill is one of the top publicly funded universities in the world. He asked whether a universal definition of a publicly funded university exists.

The Principal explained that the term publicly funded suggests that universities submit themselves to the equivalent of provincial or state legislations with respect to the way students are funded on per capita basis vis à vis an operating grant from the state. There is a contractual relation between the state and the university which varies according to the province or state.

10. REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON STUDENT LIFE AND LEARNING

The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) presented the Report of the Task Force on Student Life and Learning (D06-13).

As agreed earlier in the Agenda, Senate then moved into Committee of the Whole, Dean Kasirer in the Chair, for 30 minutes, for discussion of the Report. The notes from this Committee of the Whole are attached to these minutes as Appendix "A".

Following the 30-minute period, Senate rose from the Committee of the Whole and the Principal returned to the chair.

11. 2005-2006 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE COORDINATION OF STUDENT SERVICES (INCLUDING PLAND AND PRIORITIES FOR 06-07)

The 2005-2006 Annual Report of the Committee on the Coordination of Student Services (including plans and priorities for 06-07) (D06-05) were received.

12. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The Report to Senate from the Board of Governors (D06-10) was received.

The meeting ended at 5:10 pm

Committee of the Whole
Report of the Task Force on Student Life and Learning

The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) responded to questions.

Mr. Itzkowicz thanked Professor Mendelson and the Committee for their efforts in bringing these recommendations forward. He commented on the distinction between student learning and student life, asking that there be a more explicit support for and interest in student life outside the classroom.

Professor Roulet referred to pages 11 and 12 of the Report (referring to the section on *Academic Advising and Mentoring*) noting that the combination of advising and mentoring suggests the two are equal and or similar. He suggested that a greater distinction be made better defining advising and mentoring as separate functions. Professor Mendelson agreed that more clarification was required.

Ms. Upham expressed her appreciation for the efforts of the Principal’s Task Force, including the inclusion of the term “student centered university” without the qualifier of research intensive. She hoped that the University would continue its endeavours in this direction to reach a balance between the student and research priorities.

Professor Robaire commented on the role of students in a research intensive university. He noted that an important part of the students’ experience is their involvement in and exposure to research, which is not mentioned in this document.

Referring to the definition of a student centred university on page 7 and the sentence “As members of a research-intensive university, students learn about, and are encouraged to participate in, research and scholarship in their field,” Professor Mendelson said the research aspect of the student university experience is clearly on the minds of Task Force members, even if it is not addressed in detail in the draft Task Force report. He pointed out that the Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning is currently considering how to enhance undergraduate involvement in research, which is further affirmation that the issue is an important one at McGill and is being looked at.

Professor Paré asked about the implementation of the Report and whether there is an intention to continue receiving recommendations. He also asked whether these recommendations have a direct link to the budget.

Professor Mendelson explained that the Report would be finalized by the end of this year. The goal is to have an administrative response in two phases (with the first in the 2007 winter term, followed by a more detailed response in the 2007 fall term). On the budget issue, he noted that there are some recommendations that do not have specific financial implications, but that certainly the administrative responses would reflect on the financial issues, including addressing the aspects of the recommendations in the context of the faculty compacts.

The Principal added that she welcomed the input received as it represents the kind of fine-tuning that is desired at this point. Regarding financial implications, she noted that some issues will be considered and reflected at the faculty level, while others have a broader institutional focus. She added that there will be a development need in some cases, while other recommendations may require a reallocation of resources. All such matters would be considered in more detail in the final administrative report.

Dean Lund suggested mentioning the extremely low fees paid by Quebec students in the report. He explained that this would help to clarify the difficulties we face and the reasons for lack of resources to resolve some of the problems outlined in the Report.

Mr. Angus expressed appreciation for the emphasis on academic advising in the Report, adding he hoped that the Principal’s Task Force would recommend a better ratio of advisors to students (for instance in the Faculty of Arts where this has been an issue).

Ms. Cox said she would like to see a specific recommendation in the Report regarding work and study space for graduate students.

Ms. Dowsely referred to page 15, section 2.6 that refers to graduate student responsibility to apply for external funding. She suggested that the University take on responsibility to support students in the application process instead, and noted that the Fellowships Office needs to be better organized and communications should be improved between the Office, faculties and departments.

Mr. Donny-Clark expressed his appreciation for this process and to Deputy Provost Mendelson for his support. He said he was very pleased to see students' problems being discussed and dealt with at a senior level, which had created a very positive experience for the students and their societies.

Professor Pেকেles commended the consultation process, which led to the production of this Report. He stated that the main challenge now is to implement these recommendations and to be able to evaluate in terms of acting on and succeeding with the goals. He cautioned not to lose sight of the big goal, that is to change the culture and philosophy within the University as a whole.

Ms. Skaff said she was pleased to see funding issues discussed in this Report. She asked for an elaboration on the criteria involved in determining the allocation and funding priorities. She further requested a clarification on the statement referring to earning potential and how would this affect the funding for graduate students.

Professor Mendelson reminded Senators that this Report is a broad outline and that detailed recommendations are beyond the mandate of the Principal's Task Force. He added that these issues need to be discussed by individuals who have the expertise and the background. Many of these requests would be addressed in the administrative response and others at the faculty level. The Principal further explained the extraordinarily challenges that faced the Task Force in trying to avoid looking at details that would have delayed the process. She noted that there is a mutual accountability to make the University renowned for being both student centred and research intensive.

Professor Spithill commended the Deputy Provost and the Principal's Task Force on their work, and commented on the insufficient fellowship funds in the School of Parasitology and the lack and quality of work space for graduate students. He noted that student offices now exist in old buildings, which are inadequately ventilated. He hoped to see recommendations to improving the office space which will have a direct impact on the students' morale as well.

Mr. Bouchard noted that in his time at McGill he has seen an improvement in students' perception of their ability express their concerns and be heard. He also expressed a hope that there would be more opportunities for undergraduate students to be involved in research.

Professor Kirk complemented the Deputy Provost and the Principal's Task Force on the Report, noting that the advancement of learning is an important part of the mission of the Deputy Provost. He hoped that more emphasis on the advancement of learning would be reflected in the description of the role of the Deputy Provost.

Professor Mendelson explained his role and his various tasks. He noted that he is still responsible for the Teaching and Learning Services, is coordinator of academic quality control in the Provost office, and is the chair of the subcommittee on courses and academic programs. Thus the academic and learning aspects remain closely tied with elements of the portfolio that directly shape other aspects of student life.

Senate rose from Committee of the Whole.