

McGILL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, February 10, 2010 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT	Grütter, Peter	Mendelson, Morton
Aitken, Ellen	Gulamhussein, Faizel	Moore, Timothy
Allison, Paul	Halavrezos, Alexandros	Munroe-Blum, Heather
Assayag, Deborah	Harpp, David	Neilson, Ivan
Barney, Darin	Hashimoto, Kyoko	Ngadi, Michael
Blachford, Gregg	Hebert, Johanne	Potter, Judith
Blackett, Adelle	Hendren, Laurie	Richard, Marc
Boulet, Benoit	Hobbins, Joan	Robaire, Bernard
Bray, Dorothy	Ismail, Ashraf	Roy, François
Butler, Ian	Janda, Richard	Schmidt, Janine
Caplan, Eric	Johnson, Juliet	Sieber, Renee
Ciobanu, George	Jutras, Daniel	Simeone, Daniel
Cuello, Claudio	Kirby, Torrance	Snider, Laurie
Dooley, Rebecca	Koen, Diane	Thérien, Denis
Doucette, Elaine	Kreiswirth, Martin	Todd, Peter
Drouillard, Jérémie	Kurien, John	Van Eyk, Helen
El Shafie, Dahlia	Leask, Richard	Wade, Kevin
Etemad, Hamid	Levin, Richard	Weinstein, Marc
Everett, Jane	Ling, Andrew	White, Lydia
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Fran	Lipsitz, David	Wolfson, Christina
Farid, Doaa	Low, Bronwen	Woolf, Sarah
Flanders, Kappy	Lowther, David	Zorychta, Edith
Franklin, Keith	Manfredi, Christopher	Strople, Stephen
Gonnerman, Laura	Marshall, David	(Secretary)
GowriSankaran, Kohur	Masi, Anthony	
Grant, Martin	McLean, Don	

REGRETS: Mostafa Altalibi, Gillian Bartlett-Esquillant, Valentin Boss, James Brophy, Renzo Cecere, Roshi Chadha, Stuart Cobbett, Covo, David Alexander DeGuise, Catherine Desbarats, Brian Driscoll, Jan Ericsson, Gerald Fried, Engelbert Gayagoy, Allan Hepburn, Steven Jordan, Alexandra Kindlat, Paul Lasko, Chandra Madramootoo, Manosij Majumdar, James G. Martin, Mitran Mehta, Gary Pekeles, Hélène Perrault, Kathryn Peterson, Andrew Piper, Christophe Pierre, Alenoush Saroyan, Honora Shaughnessy, Arnold Steinberg, Joel Wapnick, Ji Zhang.

The Chair opened Senate by informing senators that *The McGill Daily* requested permission to send text reports from within the Senate meeting room during meetings for the remainder of the term. Since the request was submitted after the Senate Steering Committee had met, it has been referred to the next meeting of the Senate Steering Committee as would be the normal process.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Professor James P. Lund

Dr James P. Lund (Jim) died peacefully in his sleep on December 8, 2009. He was the beloved husband of Dr Jocelyne Feine, cherished father to Michelle and Katherine, devoted grandfather to Laura and Mihai, and adored brother of Paddy and Jo. He was also a dear friend and respected colleague to many around the world.

Jim was born in Lancashire England in 1942 and moved with his family to Southern Australia in 1957. He earned his Bachelor of Dental Science in 1966 from the University of Adelaide and after a brief private dental practice in Mt. Gambier, South Australia, came to the University of Western Ontario. It was there that he received a PhD in Physiology in 1971 and began his life of research. He went on to the Université de Montréal where he enjoyed a distinguished 24-year career culminating in an eight-year appointment as the Associate Dean for Research in their Faculty of Dentistry. During this time Dr. Lund established a laboratory within the Groupe IRSC de recherche en Sciences neurologiques at Université de Montréal that is recognised as the world's leading centre for fundamental studies of orofacial motor function. He was the first to prove that simple rhythmical movements in vertebrates other than respiration could be generated by Central Pattern Generators (CPG) within the central nervous system without sensory feedback. He and his collaborators subsequently provided much of our current knowledge of the CPG that controls mastication. They described how sensory inputs interact with the CPG to adapt mastication to the properties of food. He and his collaborators also found evidence that muscle stretch receptors play a role in chronic pain. They showed that injections of pain-producing chemicals into muscles change the electrical properties of the stretch receptors, causing them to fire in ways that may alter pain-producing circuits.

Discoveries from his basic research and his interest in chronic pain syndromes led to the development of the Pain-Adaptation Model, which shows how pain itself can cause motor and sensory symptoms. This Model has been validated by several clinical research groups throughout the world, and is prompting changes in clinical practice.

In 1995, Jim was appointed Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry at McGill University, a position that he held until June 2008. It was a challenging time for the Faculty but under Jim's leadership, the DMD program at McGill was completely restructured. A champion of interdisciplinary research, Jim played a leading role in the establishment of several multidisciplinary centres at McGill, including the Centre for Bone and Periodontal Research, the Centre for Biorecognition and Biosensors and the Alan Edwards Centre for Research on Pain. Jim's leadership has helped McGill University build its reputation as a world leader in pain research. He led the recruitment of a dozen leading pain scientists from Europe, the USA and Canada, and obtained major

funding from the private sector for the expansion of the Alan Edwards Centre for Research on Pain. Most recently, it was he who led the preparation of the successful “letter of intent” for the Pain CERC application that has now gone to the full application stage and is currently under evaluation. He was also one of the founding members of the Réseau de recherche en santé buccodentaire, a network of approximately 60 researchers working in Quebec universities and research institutes, that has made an enormous contribution to supporting oral health research in Quebec and indeed has partnerships with the Fondation de l’ODQ and the Quebec Dental Surgeons Association.

But probably his most satisfying accomplishment was the establishment of a flourishing Outreach Program that provides free dental care to vulnerable patients within community centres. In recognition of his work in establishing the Outreach Program, he was awarded a Medal by the Carrefour des Communautés du Québec. In addition, the Outreach Program was awarded a Prix Qualité par L’Association des CLSC et CHSLD du Québec in 2003, and a Silver Medal of Excellence by the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education in 2005.

Beyond his role as an excellent researcher and academic leader, Jim was an outstanding mentor to people at all levels of career development from undergraduate and postgraduate students to junior academic staff and peers in administrative positions. Through his nearly 40 years in academic life he has helped bring the best out of an incredible number of people who sought his advice and used him as an example of energy, enthusiasm and leadership.

Throughout his career, Jim made major contributions to professional and scientific societies. He was President of the Neurosciences Group of the International Association of Dental Research and of the Canadian Physiological Society, and served on many committees of the MRC and CIHR. He was part of a working group that drafted the proposal to form the CIHR Institute of Musculoskeletal Health and Arthritis (IMHA), and completed two terms on the IMHA Advisory Board. He was a member of the CIHR Working Group on Clinical Research and has served the National Institutes of Health and other funding agencies in many capacities. His work for the dental profession includes membership on the Comité sur les effectifs en médecin dentaire, and organizing workshops for the Canadian Dental Association. Dr. Lund is also a member of the coalition « Les Dents en Santé» that is pressing for the fluoridation of Montreal’s water supply. He was recently elected to the Canadian Academy of Health Sciences (CAHS) – an outstanding accolade for a health scientist, equivalent to being elected to the Royal Society of Canada – and quickly convinced this organisation to sponsor an enquiry into access to dental care for underprivileged Canadians. He worked tirelessly to raise the money necessary to do this work and to put together a major international committee to perform the review and write a report on the issue.

Jim gave hundreds of seminars on his research and participated in the organization of major international symposia in his field. He published about 190 articles and book chapters, and edited four volumes, including a textbook on Orofacial Pain. He was the co-author of a report to the US Congress on Temporomandibular Disorders and appeared as an expert witness before an FDA panel studying diagnostic devices. He wrote the section on Mastication for the new Encyclopaedic Reference of Neuroscience. He held many research grants and salary awards from

the Medical Research Council and later the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and was granted an honorary doctorate by Umeå University in 1995.

Jim provided outstanding service to academic dentistry and to the health of the population over an excellent career. He made a major contribution to advancing the training of dentists in the province and established Quebec as the leading oral health-related research province in Canada. In addition, throughout this work, he pushed for improved oral health and improved access to oral health care among Quebec's under-privileged groups.

The untimely passing of Jim will leave an enormous hole in the personal and professional lives of many of us.

2. Report of the Senate steering Committee

The report of the Steering Committee (09-10:07) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, the minutes of the January 20, 2010 meeting were approved.

Item 2. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate granted speaking rights to Professor William Foster and Dr. Rima Rozen for item IIB1.1 (Policy on the Conduct of Research); Mr. Jacek Slaboszewicz and Me. Line Thibault for item IIB1.3 (Responsible Use of McGill Information Technology Resources); Professor William Foster for item 11B2.2 (Report of the Senate Nominating Committee); and Ms. Jana Luker for item IIB3.2 (Student Services Strategic Plan).

3. Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair proposed that item IIB1.1, the Policy on the Conduct of Research, be moved from an approval to an information item due to a procedural oversight that would be explained when the item was presented.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was approved with the change to item IIB1.1.

4. Selection of Alternate Chair

The Chair informed Senate that she must leave the meeting at 4:00 p.m. Therefore, the Chair proposed that Dean Ellen Aitken take over the Chair at that time.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, Dean Ellen Aitken was approved as alternate Chair.

5. Chair's Remarks

The Chair opened her remarks by speaking about her involvement in the recent Quebec Mission to India. She noted that the Mission was initiated by Premier Jean Charest, who was accompanied by Mr. Pierre Arcand, Minister of International Relations and Trade, Mr. Clément Gignac, Minister of Economic Development, Innovation, and Export Trade, and Mme H  l  ne David, Associate Deputy Minister of Education. The Chair further noted that trips such as this are not only valuable as international relations, but they also presented an opportunity to foster relationships within the domestic context.

In addition to the Chair, the McGill delegation included Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) Denis Th  rien and Professor Christopher Ragan of the Department of Economics, who serves as an advisor to the federal Finance Minister. In addition to the McGill delegation, the Ministry of Economic Development, Innovation and Export invited Professor Jefferey Bergthorson from the Department of Engineering, Professor Gail Chmura from the Department of Geography, and Professor Fabrice Labeau from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. The delegation included 130 representatives from the education sector, government, industry, and the provincial granting council.

The Mission demonstrated Quebec's integrated and strategic orientation to international relations, and also McGill's close ties to India. The University has over 30 professors from India and many students at the undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral levels. Therefore, the Mission presented an opportunity to advance research and graduate student collaborations, to forge links with potential candidates to our programs, and to reinforce ties with alumni.

The McGill delegation had the opportunity to meet with *The Times of India* to talk about McGill, the Internalization of Post-secondary education, and Quebec. Furthermore, in her role with the Federal Science, Technology and Innovation Council, the Chair presented the State of the Nation report to the Principal Science Advisor to India and the Indian Science Council. McGill signed four memorandums of Understanding while in India, with the National Centre for Biological Sciences, the University of Agricultural Sciences in Bangalore, the University of Agricultural Sciences in Dharward, and the Energy and Resources Institute in Teri.

As a final note regarding the Mission, the Chair said that McGill was well recognized as an institution throughout India. She noted that the High Commissioner to India, Joseph Caron, was very supportive of the Quebec delegation as a whole, but also of McGill. Also, she remarked that Premier Charest represented Quebec and its ambitions at the highest level.

The Chair then spoke about the self-funded MBA program that had been approved by the Board of Governors the previous summer. She noted the disproportionate amount of positive press regarding the new funding model, which she attributed to a changing zeitgeist in Quebec regarding this issue. She noted that McGill was in discussions with the Government of Quebec regarding the new MBA funding model.

She stated that the changes to the MBA funding model were brought about to address serious funding, quality, accessibility, and equity concerns. Currently, there is a gap between the University's revenue stream of \$12,000 a year per student, and the costs of running the program, which are about \$22,000 a year per student. That gap of \$10,000 is taken out of the general revenues of the undergraduate program to subsidize the graduate program.

The Chair explained that MBA students are generally older than most students, entering the program at an average age of 28, and having worked for an average of five years. Graduates of the program have a substantially increased earning power within a few years of graduating, allowing them to absorb the costs of their education. Current students will not be subject to the increase in fees and 30 cents of every dollar brought in by the program will go to student aid which would be equal to an average \$4,000 grant to each student in the program.

The new model requires that all students pay the same tuition of \$29,500 a year, forgoing the government grant associated with the program. McGill cannot maintain the quality of its MBA program under the current funding model and the evidence does not support the conclusion that increased MBA tuition will reduce accessibility or lead to a "tsunami" of tuition increases across all other programs.

The move to the self-funded model has opened up a broader discussion regarding Quebec's university funding model, which is not sustainable. There is about a \$500M gap between funding to Quebec universities and those in the rest of Canada. The Chair noted that when she arrived at McGill seven years earlier, Quebec was the number one investor in students on a per capita basis. Currently, Quebec is number four and slipping to number five. Thus, the University encourages a debate that leads to a review of public policy on post-secondary education.

The Chair closed her remarks by offering her congratulations to Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) Denis Thérien and his team for their successful hosting of *Bravo!*, the annual celebration of outstanding research. The event brought together investigators across disciplines, from music and law to physics and medicine, and our partners in government and in the philanthropic community.

The Chair encouraged Senators to cheer for the 14 McGillians from across the community, who are participating in the Winter Olympic Games in Vancouver. These include the Chancellor Emeritus, Richard Pound; Peter Smith, the current Head Coach of the Martlets, and Assistant Coach to the Canadian Women's Hockey Team; and, two current students, Jennifer Heil and Charlene Labonté.

Senator Richard asked if there was any substance to the reports that the Minister of Education was displeased with the self-funded MBA program and if the Minister was in contact with the University. The Chair answered that she is in ongoing talks with the Minister.

Senator Drouillard asked what the Government's position was in regard to self-funded MBAs. The Chair answered that the discussions were ongoing and therefore she could not comment definitively at this time.

Senator Gulamhussein asked if other faculties were considering changing their funding models. The Chair said no.

Senator Janda informed Senate that the Chair had recently been made an Officer of the Order of Quebec. The Chair replied that Professors Brenda Milner and Mostafa Elhilali had also received that honour.

SECTION II

PART A – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Questions Regarding Public Affairs Reporting

On invitation of the Chair, Senator Dooley asked the question regarding public affairs reporting:

1. Would the Executive Head of Public Affairs agree to submit an annual presentation on our government relations, in coordination with the Provost and the Vice President Research and International Relations, so as to better inform Senate in its decision-making?
2. Will the Executive Head of Public Affairs take this opportunity to elaborate on McGill's relationship with the Provincial Government and any plans and strategies that are currently in place within the Office of Public Affairs to address the issue of investment in post-secondary education?

The Chair answered that there are several members of the Executive, in addition to herself and the Executive Head of Public Affairs, who play a role in government relations at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels. They include the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations), the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance), the Executive Director of Planning and Institutional Analysis, and the Senior Advisor Policy Development. She said that it was her practice to include major developments in this area in her remarks. In addition, whenever the University presents a formal position on policy matters, they are always posted online, and their practice will continue.

She stated that the University takes a multi-pronged approach to government relations, which includes students, staff and faculty taking their own approach in interacting with government. This makes the creation of a comprehensive report to Senate impractical, if not impossible. The Chair explained that the University contributes to policy discourse with the various levels of government in relation to higher education, research, scholarship, internationalization, and innovation. However, the University works to benefit the system and only rarely interacts with government to forward individual goals such as the MBA program.

The Chair was pleased that Senate was interested in the issue of government relations, but the way in which they are carried out does not lend them to the format of an annual report. She mentioned that within the Quebec context the University presented a triennial report to the National Assembly, which is available online. However, the University will do its best to keep the community informed and urged senators that if an issue has not been addressed or discussed to bring it forward to Senate in the form of a question.

Senator Dooley asked if this proposal could be forwarded to the Steering Committee for discussion of potential ways to address this issue. She stated that there was still some merit to allotting a specific time period where Senators could ask more general questions to foster more sensitivity to the University's positions or to foster a community understanding around common issues such as investment. The Chair asked Senator Dooley to bring that suggestion forward as a separate question, which could then be considered by the Senate Steering Committee.

Senator Nielson added that how this is brought to Senate is open to discussion, but that it is important that the discussion happens. The Chair agreed.

PART B – Motions and Reports from Organs of the University Government

1. Policy Matters

1.1 Policy on the Conduct of Research (D09-40)

On invitation of the Chair, the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) presented the Policy on the Conduct of Research for Information.

The Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) presented the report, explaining that the reason it was before Senate for information rather than approval was because the procedures for such a policy require that it come to Senate through the Academic Policy Committee. He said that this was an unfortunate oversight by the Administration. He added that every month that this Policy is not in place undermines the University's competitiveness. He stated that if not for the procedural requirement, he would be comfortable with the Policy on the Conduct of Research being before Senate for approval.

Senator Drouillard asked for a definition of a regulatory framework and if there are any corollary effects of the regulatory framework on the existing Intellectual Property Policy. The Associate Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) answered that the University chose to use the term regulatory framework to encompass all the existing policies so that any changes in the names of those policies would not require amendment of the Policy on the Conduct of Research. Senator Drouillard asked if the Intellectual Property Policy, approved in 2001, was still in effect. The Associate Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) confirmed that the Policy was still in effect.

Senator Dooley stated that while the preamble addresses many of the concerns that students had regarding unethical research, the new Policy did not have clear processes for recourse if the

preamble is violated. She asked what steps would be taken if harmful research was conducted. The Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) replied that the research would be stopped if it violated the principles of the Policy. The Associate Provost (Policies and Procedures) added that if the conduct amounts to research misconduct, the appropriate mechanisms would be set in motion and, if necessary, the University's disciplinary procedures would come into operation.

Senator Ling asked if there should be a specific mention of what is included in a regulatory framework. The Associate Provost (Policies and Procedures) replied that regulatory framework is defined at the beginning of the document.

Senator Sieber said that placing the burden of proof for plagiarism on the researcher in section 5.1.1 raises concerns because it seems to conflict with section 15.2, which states that nothing in the regulations is intended to impugn a researcher for honest errors. Furthermore, the diffuseness of the regulatory framework confuses the issue because even though a student may be a researcher, the burden of proof is not placed on him or her. The Associate Provost (Policies and Procedures) answered that a researcher needs only to establish that they made an honest error. Students are protected by the current definition of plagiarism in the Student Code of Conduct, the approach reflected in the Policy for all other researchers is the same approach that already exists. The Director of Legal Services added that on matters of plagiarism it is common to assume that it exists unless the opposite is demonstrated.

Senator Robaire suggested the addition of an appendix of documents associated with a regulatory framework, which has the advantage of being updated without returning to Senate, and gives people the ability to know what policies inform the document. The Senator then asked if the University Archivist has tried to create a policy to handle the storage of data that is required by the Policy. The Chair answered that the Administration would take these as suggestions for further reflection about the challenges related to data storage.

Senator Janda said that the wording of section 5 is problematic because if it is established that there was no knowledge of plagiarism then it does not exist. He added that in principle a finding of plagiarism can happen, no matter what the state of knowledge, and should be clarified. In addition, he said that it is not a straightforward matter to state that the University owns data, as stated in section 4.8.1, and that there is United States case law on the difficulties of asserting ownership of data. The Senator went on to say that he is less convinced of the enforceability of the preamble with respect to research misconduct.

Senator Woolf expressed concern about the lack of clear guidance in regard to proper standards of ethical research. The Policy defers to a Research Ethics Board, but to the best of the Senator's knowledge, this board is concerned with the immediate welfare of human and animal subjects, rather than the potential societal and ethical outcomes of the research. She stated that despite the extensive articulation of ethics, the revised version of the Policy does not actually provide guidance as to what this ethical standard might be.

Senator Wolfson asked if there was another part of the regulatory framework that provides guidance on the use of University publications to recruit subjects into University related research. She thought that there should be some sort of oversight in relation to this type of recruitment.

1.2 Responsible Use of McGill Information Technology Resources (D09-42)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost, presented the Policy on the Responsible Use of McGill Information Technology Resources for approval.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the Provost asked that the policy be considered for information rather than approval due to last minute suggestions from the representatives of the Faculty of Science. Senate approved the motion.

The Chair asked that in future if Senators had comments or proposed changes that they come forward in a timely manner, reflecting the need for Senate to proceed effectively and efficiently in its consideration of important substantive matters.

The Provost explained that these suggestions were useful, but necessitated that this item be reconsidered. These included the addition of a definition of an IT guideline, the rewording of what it means to be anonymous, concerns about the ability of academics to legitimately forward their email outside the University, the clarification of what it means to use web services at McGill or to have a McGill branding look and feel, a standard exception to be added to section 8.4 as outlined in the IT guidelines that would not require approval, and section 8.5 to make reference to the defined IT guidelines. Unfortunately, these friendly amendments were not conducive to adoption on the floor of Senate because they require significant rewording of the affected sections.

Senator Ciobanu proposed that “or confidentiality” be struck from section 10.1 to protect students and staff while using McGill email for non-McGill activities.

Senator Richard Asked that section 7 include a definition of “McGill sponsored public websites.”

Senator Sieber suggested that the University identify outlier departments and researchers to test the limits of this type of policy in the future. The Provost said that the use of focus groups is an integral part of implementation going forward.

Senator Janda asked if the monitoring in the course of routine maintenance, outlined in section 4.4, is referring to monitoring the levels of resources, and if so, there could be an amendment to specify that the monitoring would be restricted to that narrow use. The Provost answered that the intent was to monitor for the purposes of ensuring that services are not threatened by use. The Director of Legal Services added that the intent of the monitoring was to protect use, but that IT staff did have access to individual accounts. She assured Senate that IT staff do not look into personal files, but that it is necessary that they have that level of access in order to properly carry out their functions.

Senator Lipsitz asked if section 4.4 gives permission to monitor people who are not in direct breach of McGill's policies. The Director of Information Security Office said that user information may accidentally be accessed while investigating such things as external hacker attacks.

Senator Aitken suggested that the confusion in section 4.4 may be a question of the wording, but not necessarily the intent of the Policy.

Senator Butler asked if section 6.3, part 2 implied that people could opt out of email notifications. The Provost answered that the ability to opt out depended on the nature of the list. Individuals can opt out of lists they join voluntarily.

2. Committee Reports

2.1 417th Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D09-43)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost, Anthony C. Masi, presented the 417th Report of the Academic Policy for Approval.

1. For Approval

A. New Teaching Programs Requiring Senate Approval

Proposal to approve a Master of Arts in Teaching and Learning (MATL) in the Faculty of Education.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the Master of Arts in Teaching and Learning (MATL) was approved by Senate.

B. Academic Performance Issues/Policies/Governance/Awards

Responsible Use of McGill IT Resources.

This Policy was brought forward to Senate in document (D09-42).

2.2 Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D09-44)

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the Statutory Selection Committee for a Professor in the Department of Department of Linguistics was approved.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the Statutory Selection Committee for a Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering was approved.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the Statutory Selection Committee for a Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering was approved.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the Statutory Selection Committee for a Professor in the Department of Pediatrics was approved.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the Statutory Selection Committee for a Professor in the Department of Psychology was approved.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the Statutory Selection Committee for a Professor in the Faculty of Dentistry was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the Chair for the Committee on Student Grievances for a six month term was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Arts was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Dentistry was approved.

The University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Education was referred back to the Senate Nominating Committee for reconsideration of the diversity of its composition. Senator Caplan asked that the Committee include more representatives from the humanities since its proposed composition is heavily weighted towards the sciences. The Provost answered that the University conducts two levels of tenure review. One tenure review is carried out at the departmental level, which includes experts from the applicant's field, and the other is a University Tenure Committee. The University Tenure Committee is purposefully composed without representatives from the same disciplinary background or faculty of the candidate. The Provost did concede that the Faculty of Education presented a special case since it derived representatives across disciplines and agreed to return the Committee to the Senate Nominating Committee for reconsideration.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Engineering was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Law was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Desautels Faculty of Management was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Medicine was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Schulich School of Music was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Religious Studies was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Faculty of Science was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the University Libraries, including a chair, alternate chair, and a senate representative was approved.

The Chair invited Dean Ellen Aitken to take over the Chair.

3. Administrative Reports

3.1 Student Services Strategic Plan (D09-46)

On invitation of the Chair, Ms. Jana Luker, Executive Director of Services for Students presented the Student Services Strategic Plan for information.

Senator Gulamhussein suggested that Students Services adopt a faculty-specific approach to providing services to students since students have unique challenges depending on the faculty in which they study. He also asked, with the exception of financing, what internal changes the Executive Director of Services for Students would make to her organization. The Executive Director of Services for Students answered that she would like more space and has been working within the larger McGill vision to make that happen. Regarding the faculty-specific approach, the Executive Director of Services for Students said Students Services considers the specific needs of students to be of primary importance.

Senator Drouillard asked who the new Officer and Manager of Assessment will report to and when the office will be operational. The Executive Director of Services for Students answered that the position is an eighteen month developmental assignment, scheduled to commence in September, that will be reporting within Student Life and Learning.

Senator Butler suggested that McGill adopt a system of student services similar to Queensland University in Australia. The Executive Director of Services for Students thanked the Senator and stated that Student Services has been seeking best practices from around the world as part of a U21 initiative.

Senator Low asked if there had been any progress in regard to access in the last year. The Executive Director of Services for Students answered that there has been progress and some tangible initiatives that will be tied to the Principal's Task Force on Student Life and Learning.

3.2 Report Card on Student Life and Learning (D09-47)

On invitation of the Chair, the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) presented the report for information.

Senator Barney asked if there was any available data about the impact of online opt-outs to independent student group funding. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) said he would be happy to bring a report forward concerning this issue, and suggested their request be forwarded as a question to senate.

Senator Janda asked if student surveys were showing if the University was improving on their outcomes. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) said that a number of surveys are ongoing that monitor reactions at the University level, but globally they tend to resist change. Thus, the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) endorsed the type local monitoring conducted by the Faculty of Arts, which tends to capture the particular needs of students within the somewhat unique circumstances at the faculty level.

Senator Drouillard asked where the results of local monitoring are made available. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) answered that Arts students can access the results at their faculty office and students from other faculties can ask their respective administrations for similar initiatives to take place. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), conducted in 2008, gave a global indication of student sentiment, but the results are outdated and the University will have to wait until 2011 to see if any improvements have been made.

Senator Robaire asked if there are any numbers available about the number of professional full-time advisors that have been hired since the implementation of the plan or how many are slated to be hired. The Senator also asked if the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) and the Dean of Students have input with the Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) in the development of student spaces for learning that were clearly identified by the Principal's Task Force and needed across campus. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) answered that he did not have the information at hand regarding the increase in personnel, but there is a mention in the report about an increase in spending on student advising issues. In regard to the space issue the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that progress has been made, but this is a difficult problem in general for the University.

Senator Blachford asked if there was any resistance or reconsideration concerning the movement to a professional student advising model at the faculty level. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) answered that the response to the changes in student advising are particular to the interpretation of the faculties and departments. However, the changes have been positive.

Senator Lipsitz asked how this report was being promoted to the general student body. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) answered that the report is available online and has been presented to Senate, which has student representation.

Senator Dooley asked if the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) would be able to hold a forum to increase the visibility of the report. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) said he is always available to hold a Town Hall for students.

4. Adjournment

There being no other business to deal with at the meeting, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.