

McGILL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, March 24, 2010 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT	Gulamhussein, Faizel	Neilson, Ivan
Aitken, Ellen	Halavrezos, Alexandros	Pekeles, Gary
Allison, Paul	Harpp, David	Perrault, H�el�ene
Barney, Darin	Hashimoto, Kyoko	Peterson, Kathryn
Blachford, Gregg	Hebert, Johanne	Pierre, Christophe
Blackett, Adelle	Hendren, Laurie	Potter, Judith
Boss, Valentin	Hobbins, Joan	Richard, Marc
Boulet, Benoit	Janda, Richard	Robaire, Bernard
Bray, Dorothy	Johnson, Juliet	Rozen, Rima
Butler, Ian	Jutras, Daniel	Saroyan, Alenoush
Caplan, Eric	Koen, Diane	Shaughnessy, Honora
Ciobanu, George	Kreiswirth, Martin	Sieber, Renee
Covo, David	Kurien, John	Simeone, Daniel
DeGuise, Alexander	Leask, Richard	Snider, Laurie
Dooley, Rebecca	Levin, Richard	Van Eyk, Helen
Doucette, Elaine	Ling, Andrew	Wade, Kevin
Driscoll, Brian	Lipsitz, David	Weinstein, Marc
Drouillard, J�er�mie	Low, Bronwen	White, Lydia
Everett, Jane	Lowther, David	Wolfson, Christina
Farid, Doaa	Marshall, David	Woolf, Sarah
Flanders, Kappy	Martin, James G.	Zhang, Ji
Franklin, Keith	Masi, Anthony	Zorychta, Edith
Gonnerman, Laura	McLean, Don	Strople, Stephen
GowriSankaran, Kohur	Moore, Timothy	(Secretary)
Grant, Martin	Munroe-Blum, Heather	

REGRETS: Mostafa Altalibi, Deborah Assayag, Gillian Bartlett-Esquillant, James Brophy, Renzo Cecere, Roshi Chadha, Stuart Cobbett, Claudio Cuello, Catherine Desbarats, Dahlia El Shafie, Jan Ericsson, Hamid Etemad, Fran Ezzy-Jorgensen, Gerald Fried, Engelbert Gayagoy, Peter Gr utter, Allan Hepburn, Ashraf Ismail, Steven Jordan, Alexandra Kindlat, Torrance Kirby, Paul Lasko, Chandra Madramootoo, Manosij Majumdar, Christopher Manfredi, Mitran Mehta, Morton Mendelson, Michael Ngadi, Andrew Piper, Arnold Steinberg, Peter Todd, Joel Wapnick.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Professor Roger Knowles

Dr. Roger Knowles passed away Friday November 27th 2009. His wife, Ruth, was by his side throughout to provide the best quality of life possible during a difficult time. Roger also leaves behind his son Michael, daughter Cindy, and grandchildren Nicholas, Brendan, Adrianna, Andrew, Heather and Hunter. Roger was devoted to his family, friends, and colleagues. He was a world renowned environmental microbiologist and a humanist beloved and respected by all who crossed his path.

Roger Knowles was born in 1929 in Halifax, Yorkshire, England and served with the Royal Navy before pursuing a B.Sc. at Birmingham University. He obtained a Ph.D. at London University, University College in 1957, specializing in Microbiology. Roger immigrated to Canada in 1957, and joined the staff of Macdonald College, McGill University as a lecturer in the Microbiology Department. He served as Assistant Warden of the men's residence, Britain Hall in 1958 and the following year he was made Warden. In 1963, he married Ruth Runnells, a long-standing member of the Macdonald Community.

Dr. Knowles moved rapidly through the academic ranks at Macdonald College, becoming Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor of microbiology. His teaching and research was mostly in the areas of terrestrial and aquatic microbiology. He led an outstanding research program with strong external funding throughout his career, indeed, Roger published over 160 peer-reviewed manuscripts and book chapters and is credited with 70 invited presentations.

Roger's early research experience was an examination of humus in the boreal forest, and this established the foundation for the highly significant contributions he made in nitrogen, (nitrogen fixation, denitrification, nitrification) and methane cycling. His interest in microbial physiology and the kinetics of microbial activity in the environment inspired the research activities of countless undergraduate, over 50 graduate and 25 post-doctoral students, many technicians and summer students and several visiting scientists in his laboratory. Students fondly remember him as inspirational in the classroom, especially on the subject of microbial ecology, and through his guidance, a large number of his students have gone on to become professors. Indeed, many of Canada's current microbial ecologists at one time or another received training directly from Roger or were mentored by Professors who cut their teeth in Roger's lab.

Roger was not only an exceptional teacher and researcher; he was also an admired and respected university administrator. Roger served two terms as Chairman of the Department of Microbiology: from 1970 to 1974, and from 1979 to 1987, periods of introduction of the new undergraduate program and of consolidation in the new Macdonald Stewart building, respectively.

Dr. Knowles was a member of the editorial board of several prestigious microbiology and soil science journals; he served twice on grants selection committees for National Sciences and

Engineering Research Council and was a member of national and international committees examining microbial impacts on stratospheric air and water pollution.

Dr. Knowles was an enthusiastic and major contributor to the Canadian Society of Microbiologists. In 1964 he was the representative for the Agricultural Microbiology section, he received the CSM Award for outstanding scientific contributions in 1982, and went on to hold several positions including CSM president in 1987. Roger continued to serve the society as CSM representative for the International Union of Microbiology Societies until 2003. Roger's tremendous impact in the Canadian context will be acknowledged at the CSM Annual Meetings in Hamilton in 2010, where a eulogy will be given, and in 2011 in St. John's Newfoundland, where a Special Symposium in his honour will take place.

Dr. Knowles also contributed to the American Society for Microbiology. He was elected chairman for several sections of the ASM during the 1970's and 80's. Dr. Knowles was a member of Association des Microbiologistes du Quebec. He was the AMQ president in 1976-77 and selected as a Membre émérite of the AMQ in 1986.

Dr. Knowles was the recipient of numerous prestigious awards and honoraria. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1987. As a further testimony to his brilliant scientific career, Roger was honoured by receiving the DSc from his alma mater, University College London in 1986.

On his retirement in 1994, Prof. Knowles was made an Emeritus Professor of McGill University, and continued to maintain an active research laboratory with graduate students and post-doctoral fellows for several years after his retirement. Roger was a cherished mentor and friend to his departmental colleagues and was admired by many people for his lifetime of contributions to the field of microbiology worldwide.

Roger had a great love for worldly travels, sailing and the outdoors, and a passion for music, successively singing in the Montréal Bach Choir and the Tudor Singers of Montréal, and later playing viola in the Lakeshore Chamber Orchestra and the Contabile Orchestra. He was also a founding member and later President of the Lakeshore Chamber Music Society, formed in 1958, and still active more than forty years later.

In Roger's memory, his family has created the Roger Knowles Scholarship Fund at Macdonald College of McGill University.

2. Resolution on the death of Professor Jeanne M. Wolfe

Emeritus Professor Jeanne M. Wolfe passed away peacefully on December 20th 2009. Born in 1934, she was educated at the University of London (a Bachelor's degree in Geography– 1956), the University of Western Ontario (a Master's degree in Geography–1959) and McGill (a second Master's degree in Geography/Urban Planning–1961). Her 46-year career included work as a professional planner with the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the City of Montréal

and the Québec Ministry of Municipal Affairs, and approximately 36 years of teaching, research and community outreach.

Respected nationally and internationally, Jeanne Wolfe's honours include the Ordre des urbanistes du Québec's 2004 *Prix Jean-Claude La Haye*, the Canadian Institute of Planners' 2007 *President's Award* and the Order of Canada. The latter was presented to her in 2009 for "her contributions as a leading scholar and mentor in the field of urban planning, in Canada and abroad".

Jeanne Wolfe joined McGill's newly formed School of Urban Planning in 1973, later assuming responsibility for the School's cornerstone course in the History and Theory of Planning and for inter-disciplinary studio courses that focus on working with the community to solve planning problems. Her tenure as Director, from 1988 to 1999, coincided with a period of tremendous growth in teaching, research and community outreach activities.

Jeanne Wolfe was passionately committed to the promotion of affordable housing, to environmental quality, to historic preservation and to effective urban governance, and she never hesitated to make her views known in public debates on these subjects. She was especially interested in how public decisions affect the lives of ordinary people for better or worse. Her extensive interests are expressed in her prolific work as a researcher and writer. Jeanne co-edited four books and authored or co-authored a large number of articles, book chapters and reports. Several of her works are considered classic, authoritative contributions to her field.

Professor Wolfe complemented her research and teaching activities with direct involvement in municipal affairs, participating in many local, national and international organizations, projects and commissions, including the 1986 Parizeau Commission on the Future of Municipalities in Québec. Her work abroad was instrumental in establishing graduate-level planning programs in six developing nations and improving local planning and governance structures in Caribbean and Central American countries, China and India.

As a teacher, Jeanne Wolfe is remembered for her encyclopaedic knowledge, her attention to details and overall goals, rigor, passion for the field of planning, sharp insights, as well as succinct, forthright utterances that crystallized debate and moved people to simply "get on with it". Her strong conviction that knowledge must be used to actively promote positive change in communities inspired generations of graduates.

On behalf of the School of Urban Planning, the Faculty of Engineering and all of those at McGill who knew and admired Jeanne, we send our condolences to her son, Dr. Alexander P. Wolfe, to her daughter, Dr. Elizabeth A. Edwards, and to all the other members of her family.

3. Report of the Steering Committee

The report of the Steering Committee (09-10:08) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, the minutes of the February 10, 2010 meeting were approved.

Item 2. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate granted speaking rights to Professor William Foster and Me. Line Thibault for item IIB2 (Policy on the Conduct of Research) and item IIB3 (Responsible Use of McGill Information Technology Resources).

Item 3. Confidential Session. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into Confidential Session for consideration of item IIB1 (Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee, D09-50).

Item 4. Information Item. The Steering Committee provided a written report to Senate from the Secretary-General on the annual tenure meetings.

Item 5. Information Item. The Chair informed Senate that the joint meeting of the Senate Steering Committee and Board of Governors Executive met to discuss the proposed topic for the Fall 2010 joint meeting of the Board of Governors and Senate. At the meeting, the Executive and Steering committee agreed to discuss the topic of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies within the larger context of the White Paper and academic planning at the fall meeting.

Item 6. Information Item. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering report included a response denying the request of the McGill Daily to post the deliberations of Senate while they are taking place at the March 24, April 28, and May 19 meetings.

Senator Dooley asked if the Senate Steering Committee could allow the *McGill Daily* to “tweet” during the next Senate meeting so that students who are busy with exams can remain engaged with Senate. The Secretary-General said that he would communicate the decision of the Senate Steering Committee to the *McGill Daily*. Any further requests would need to be considered by the Senate Steering Committee.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was approved

5. Chair’s Remarks

The Chair opened her remarks by providing context around the monitoring of government budgets, both at the Federal level and in Québec. Members of the senior administration and deans devote a good deal of time ensuring that McGill has sufficient resources to support the pursuit of its academic mission. As outlined in the Annual Report to Senate, one of our goals is to diversify the University’s sources of revenue. The Chair compared the financial situation of McGill to the University of California. While McGill’s resources have grown and the overall quality of its programs has increased, the University of California, which has greater resources per student, may be required to make dramatic cuts to budgets that would affect education and support positions as well as stalling infrastructure programs.

The Chair clarified that despite the focus on financial resources, they are but a means to an end. They are necessary, but inadequate conditions for ensuring quality in the fulfillment of the University's mission; that being teaching, research, scholarship, and service to the community.

The Federal government is a key source of research funding to McGill through the granting councils, the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), Genome Canada, and many other programs including the Canada Research Chairs program, and graduate student and fellowship support. Quebec, in addition supporting McGill's direct operating grant, also supports research through its own councils. The Quebec Research and Innovation Strategy sets out the goals of these councils; an important goal being to attract and retain talent and research funding to priority programs in Quebec. McGill works closely with the G-13 and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) at the federal level, and with the Conférence des recteurs et des principaux des universités du Québec (CREPUQ), other research intensive universities in Quebec, and affiliated teaching hospitals to advance McGill's interests consistent with supporting research and scholarship at a higher level.

Full compensation for the indirect costs of carrying out federal research remains one of the biggest goals and challenges regarding the Federal government. While the funding of indirect costs of research is appreciated, it is underfunded; the current rate of 23 cents (On average) out of every federal dollar is not enough to support the actual indirect costs. A formula for these costs from the United States research funding agencies indicates that for every dollar of research conducted at McGill, 59 cents more should be provided to support the indirect costs of that research.

Turning to the 2010-2011 Federal Budget, the Chair said a new postdoctoral fellowship program that allocates \$45 million over five years has been established. A grant of \$70,000 will be received by 70 postdoctoral fellows in the first year then 140 fellows each year afterward. The budget also provided for modest two percent increases to the annual budgets of research granting councils and additional funding to the indirect costs program that merely maintains the current position of research-intensive universities. Genome Canada received an additional \$75 million for genomics research and additional funding for the International Science and Technology Partnerships Program (ISTPP).

The Chair indicated that in light of the current financial situation in Canada, the Federal budget was positive. However, the new tax regime for postdoctoral fellows is cause for some concern. The budget announced that this would be the first year in which postdoctoral fellows' income would be taxed, which puts an additional hardship on this group because there has not been time to plan for the impact. Quebec represents a unique milieu within the Canadian context because it requires that postdoctoral fellows register their status. Currently, the Conseil Supérieur is creating a report to be made public in May on the topic of postdoctoral fellows and graduate studies and the President of the Conseil will report directly to the Minister in the near future. The provincial government has indicated cuts will be forthcoming, but the Chair was optimistic because the government also indicated that it was placing its priorities on health and education.

In closing, the Chair congratulated Professor Victoria Kaspi for being awarded a Killam Research Fellowship this year for her work in astrophysics. In addition, she congratulated the 14 members from the McGill community who participated in the Winter Olympic Games; roughly half of whom returned with medals.

Senator Simeone asked if the Principal, as the President of CREPUQ, would support the creation of a CREPUQ position on the funding of postdoctoral fellows at adequate income levels. He also asked if the Principal would lobby the Tri-council granting agencies to increase the level of funding to research grants to ensure continued funding of postdoctoral fellows at adequate income levels. Furthermore, if government is unwilling to fix these problems, will McGill offer the added level of support to postdoctoral fellows necessary to maintain adequate net income levels. The Chair said that she could not respond affirmatively to each of Senator Simeone's questions, but did express great concern over the new tax regime and called on the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to comment. The Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies said that he would be presenting a report later in the meeting that would address these issues.

SECTION II

PART A – Questions and Motions by Members

None

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

Confidential Session

1. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D09-50)

Senate moved into confidential session to discuss the Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D09-50) (this minute is not published or circulated but is attached to the permanent minutes of Senate as Appendix "A").

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the following statement by the Provost in confidential session was included in the open session minutes.

The Provost reminded Senators that the process for conferring the status of professor emeritus had changed to make the designation more generally available to retired full professors/librarians. In brief, designation of professor emeritus no longer involves evaluation by committee, recommendation to the Honorary Degrees Committee, approval by Senate and the Board of Governors, and conferral at convocation. Instead, full professors/librarians will be nominated by their dean for approval by the Provost. Thus, the new McGill Medal does not replace emeritus status because retiring full professors are still eligible for the emeritus title as an honorific signifying the excellence of their scholarly contributions which typifies our expectations for all McGill full professors.

The University has established the McGill University Medal for Exceptional Academic Achievement to recognize those retired members of the academic staff who have made extraordinary contributions to their discipline, to McGill or to scholarship, generally over a significant period of time. The McGill Medal will be awarded to a small number of retiring professors, whose academic achievement merit special consideration and recognition.

It should be clear that all Medal nominees would have received emeritus status under the old system. The process for determining medal winners, however, is much more selective than the former emeritus system. The McGill Medal is conferred on those professors who are recommended by their deans with supporting documentation, then reviewed by an advisory committee chaired by the Provost, whose positive recommendations are sent to the full Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee for recommendation for approval by Senate. The selection criteria and rigorous approval process mean that in any given year few or no medals will be awarded, and it should not be an expectation that a Medal recipient will be honoured at every Convocation ceremony. The Provost made it clear that the nominees for the McGill Medal who do not receive the award should not be embarrassed, just being nominated should be considered an honour.

Open Session

Senate returned to open session.

2. 418th Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D09-51)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost presented the Report of the Academic Policy Committee.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, item 1A, the Certificate in General Practice Residency was approved.

3. Policy on the Conduct of Research (D09-57)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost presented the Policy on the Conduct of Research. The Provost stated that this is the third time the Policy has been before Senate and invited the Interim Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) (VPRIR) to speak about the policy. The Interim VPRIR said that the various changes to the policy suggested by Senate have been incorporated and approved by the Academic Policy Committee.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate discussed the Policy on the Conduct of Research.

Senator Drouillard asked if the appendix of the regulatory framework had been taken into consideration. The Interim VPRIR said that there would be appended regulatory frameworks that are relevant for this policy.

Senator Janda introduced an amendment to section 5.1 to change the text from “A Researcher shall not engage in Plagiarism” to “A Researcher shall not knowingly engage in Plagiarism.” The Provost accepted the change as a friendly amendment.

Senator Janda introduced the following amendments to section 11:

1. Change the heading from “Hazardous Research” to “Hazardous Research and Harmful Applications.”
2. Change the text of section 11.2 from “A Researcher engaged in a Research activity which poses a significant recognizable inherent risk of physical injury to persons or property who has reasonable cause to believe that injury to person or property has occurred or is imminent shall.” to “A Researcher engaged in a Research activity which poses a significant recognizable inherent risk of physical injury to persons or property who has reasonable cause to believe that injury to person or property has occurred or is imminent, or a Researcher who upon receipt of a research grant or contract has reason to believe that the application of the Research activity may be directly harmful, shall.”
3. Change section 11.2 (ii) from “report the incident or potential threat to the Researcher’s chair,” to “report the incident or potential harm to the Researcher’s chair or Dean as relevant. These reports shall be forwarded to the Vice-Principal (Research).”
4. Add a section 11.3 reading, “There shall be bi-annual Report to Senate by the Vice-Principal (Research) summarizing reports made pursuant to section 11.2.”

Senator Janda explained the amendment, stating it was an attempt to implement the solemn undertaking made in the preamble to the Policy that “[s]pecial responsibility rests with Researchers to remain aware of the consequences of their Research and to balance the potential benefits against the possibility of harmful applications.” This amendment had been proposed to APC but was not retained. The goal of the amendment was to make such an assessment transparent and to generate information for the university community as a whole. It would not create an academic offence of conducting research with harmful applications. As a leading research institution, McGill should try to anticipate the direct effects of its research. Reporting on direct harmful effects has become a common practice of socially responsible corporations and universities should do at least as well.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, senate discussed the proposed amendments.

The Interim VPRIR said section 11 is intended to address immediate harm such as dangerous experiments being conducted alone, not secret, military, or possible harmful research. Thus putting these two concepts in the same section makes it difficult to understand the goal of the section. Furthermore, as discussed, the agency that funds research is not necessarily an indication of potential harm. Defining harmful research is highly problematic since it is particular to individual perceptions. One can find harmful applications for most forms of research regardless of their benefits. Consequently, it would be difficult to monitor and anticipate the long-term harmful effects of research in light of this broad interpretation. No other university has defined military or harmful research in their policies precisely because of the difficulty in knowing what

is meant by the word harmful. The accountability of research is preserved through the fact that all funding is public information found at the grants office, to which everyone has access. This includes the source of funding, title of the research, the investigator, and the dollars received by that investigator at McGill.

Senator Grant objected to the amendment for the same reasons as the Interim VPRIR, but added that the amendment was not subjected to the necessary consideration and scrutiny based on its last minute nature.

Senator Neilson said that the amendment does not mention military research, but instead restricts itself to harmful applications. He agreed that what constitutes harmful research is subjective and that is why the responsibility is placed on the researcher.

Senator Marshall asked if the proposed amendment was simply creating a reporting mechanism for the obligation that currently exists in the policy to consider harmful applications of research. Senator Janda agreed.

Senator Gulamhussein agreed with the proposed amendment because it attempted to put the preamble into practice. He asked if the amendment is not adopted, how will the preamble be enforced? The Interim VPRIR answered that the section on research misconduct addresses deviations from ethical practices. Furthermore, any application for funding goes through multiple levels of scrutiny before being submitted by the University.

Senator Zorychta noted that the amendment was to a proposed University Regulation. She expressed concern that researchers who mistakenly did not predict harmful effects might be subject to discipline.

Senator Aitken said the amendment would produce meaningless information because every human endeavour causes potential harm. Thus, every research activity in the University would have to be registered in this proposed process.

Senator Wolfson said the amendment confused immediate harm and harmful effects, rendering it ineffective.

Senator Barney said the reason this amendment was before Senate was because the section on research funded by military agencies was removed, which had been useful in previous years. The previous section on research funded by military sources did not assume that all research from those sources was harmful, but instead was based on the premise that research funded by military sources was more likely to have harmful applications than other granting agencies. He stated that it would be reasonable to include a stipulation regarding further scrutiny of research funded by military sources.

Senator Dooley said that the reporting stipulated in the amendment provides a moment of reflection for Senate on the research that is being conducted at McGill. Furthermore, social responsibility should be of equal importance to academic priorities.

Senator Dooley said that the reporting stipulated in the amendment provides a moment of reflection for Senate on the research that is being conducted at McGill. Furthermore, social responsibility should be of equal importance to academic priorities.

Senator Jutras stated that the amendment was incomprehensible as proposed and did not offer the moment of reflection just mentioned. The text of the amendment does not allow the researchers to know when they should be reporting and is thus unimplementable.

Senator Janda responded to the notion that this regulation would produce meaningless information, stating that if researchers are already required to make a declaration of direct harm caused in the conduct of research, an additional declaration concerning directly harmful applications would be equally feasible. Furthermore, if anticipating harmful applications of research is a meaningless endeavour, then all language setting out a solemn obligation on all researchers to do so should be removed from the preamble. As regards the idea that harmful research and harmful applications are separate issues, he responded that the proposal linked the two for drafting efficiency. Under the proposal, reporting on potential directly harmful application would only take place upon receipt of a research grant or contract. This would make such reporting a normal part of the research workflow at a single specified moment. Finally, in response to the question that this regulation may result in disciplinary proceedings against a researcher, Senator Janda noted that the Interim VPRIR had suggested that the existing language of the preamble could already result in disciplinary proceedings. The proposed amendment only narrowed the scope of the preamble by focusing solely on the researcher's obligation to report on directly harmful applications upon receipt of research monies.

The Provost reminded Senate that this policy has been before Senate three times and has been considered at length at the appropriate committees. Furthermore, delaying this policy undermines the University's position in regard to securing funding as it is required by to the tripartite granting agencies.

The proposed amendment by Senator Janda was defeated by majority vote.

Senator Wolff proposed that the following text be inserted into the policy:

Applicants for contracts or grants whose source is a government military agency shall indicate on the checklist/approval form of the Office of Technology Transfer or the Research Grants Office whether this research has direct harmful consequences. Where the University so requires, the applicants shall furnish a written statement setting out the possibilities of direct harmful applications and potential benefits of the research.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate discussed the proposed addition.

Senator Perrault said that the policy was a framework and does not dictate the implementation of research. These types of questions are addressed at the various levels of approval and ethics review that are very strict and well thought out.

The proposed amendment by Senator Wolff was defeated by majority vote.

Senator Franklin said that article 3.9 should be amended to read “publically acknowledged” rather than “associated with” the work so that people giving informal advice are not held accountable for another person’s academic output. The Provost answered that the proposed amendment did not substantively change the meaning of section 3.9. Senator Franklin withdrew the amendment.

Senator Franklin said the articles 4.6 and 4.7 place an unreasonable burden on the departments for the storage of research data. He asked that the passage of this policy be accompanied by a proper archival policy. The Provost answered that a policy and accompanying procedures is being developed by the McGill University Archives in conjunction with the Libraries.

Senator Sieber proposed a friendly amendment to 3.8.1 that states, “section 3.8 shall not override the rights of human subjects of the research,” to add “or other rights as stipulated by agreements negotiated by the University.” The Chair did not view this as a friendly amendment, and furthermore this would be covered by the Memorandum of Understanding. While she understood that intelligent people are able to identify gaps in any policy document, words cannot replace the good will and due diligence of the community in its implementation. The Chair called a vote on the Policy on the Conduct of Research.

The Policy on the Conduct of Research was approved by a majority vote.

4. Responsible Use of McGill Information Technology Resources (D09-58)

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

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate discussed the Policy on the Responsible Use of McGill Information Technology Resources.

Senator Wade asked if section 5.2 III should read “required by law” instead of “permitted by law.” The Provost did not consider the amendment friendly because it is permitted by law due to the clause referring to the administrator, not required by law because some other party is forcing the University. If required replaces permitted, systems administrators may not be able to perform maintenance. Senator Wade withdrew the amendment.

Senator Wade proposed an amendment to section 9.3 to read “in the performance of their duties, and subject to sections 2.3 and 5.2” because section 9.3 gives unfettered access without that stipulation. The Director of Legal Services answered that the amendment defeats the purpose of section 9 because administrators need to have access for maintenance, which would also give access to personal data. Access in this way is not to read personal data, but to perform maintenance. Senator Wade withdrew the amendment.

Senator Wade said that there is little information on the malware referred to in section 8.5 on the IT website. The Provost agreed to have more information available.

Senator Ciobanu said that 99% of the time administrators only need to have access to aggregate data, not individual documents. The Provost replied that in practice administrators would only look at aggregate data, but in that 1% of the time that administrators need access, the policy grants them that ability.

The Policy on Responsible Use of McGill Information Technology Resources was approved by a majority vote.

5. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D09-52/D09-49)

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

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

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Academic Policy Committee was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Committee on Libraries was approved.

The Committee on the Rights of Senate was referred back to the Senate Nominating Committee for reconsideration since the proposed membership included more members than called for in the terms of reference.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Committee on Physical Development was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Advisory Committee for the Selection of a Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance) was approved. The Chair informed Senate that she will include Professor Bernard Robaire as a special advisor to the Advisory Committee.

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

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Advisory Council on the Charter of Students' Rights was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Appeal Committee for Student Discipline and Grievances was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Committee on Student Discipline was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Committee on Student Grievances was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded the Resolution on the Formation of Statutory Selection Committees (D09-49) was approved with friendly amendments, as follows:

Section (ii) of paragraph one of the section concerning the proposed selection process for Senate nominees to read, "For review, revision, and approval of the pool by the Senate Nominating Committee ~~on behalf of Senate.~~"

The third sentence of paragraph two of the section concerning the proposed selection process for Senate nominees to read, "[o]nce approved by the Nominating Committee, the list of those constituting the pool would be forwarded to Senate for ~~information~~ approval."

Paragraph one of the section headed "reporting" to read, "Once approved by the Nominating Committee, a list of those full professors who constitute the pool of Senate representatives on SCCs for that year will be provided to Senate for ~~information~~ approval."

9. Report on Postdoctoral Studies (D09-48)

On invitation of the Chair, The Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (GPS) presented the Report of Postdoctoral Studies. As part of his presentation the Dean spoke about the new tax regime regarding postdoctoral fellows. Previously, postdoctoral fellows were not taxed on their grants and were issued a T2202A to receive student status for tax deductions. Presently, postdoctoral fellows will be taxed on their income, regardless of the source. This change will affect about 23% of all postdoctoral fellows across Canada, who are paid and receive benefits depending on the provincial context and school. At McGill there is a drive now to review the postdoctoral fellowship employment status and it seems likely that they will become employees. There may be other implications because the lack of consultation with the universities that extends to within the government, which, for example, has rules regarding immigration that contradict the taxation of foreign postdoctoral fellows.

Senator Martin commented on the restrictiveness in the definition of a postdoctoral fellow in Medicine which has made it problematic to offer invitations to foreign medical graduates. He noted that this problem was particular to Quebec and did not exist in other provinces. The Dean of GPS answered that Quebec has a different attitude towards clinicians who want to do research as a postdoctoral fellow compared with postdoctoral fellows in clinical settings. At the moment though, the regulations are not clear regarding this issue. The goal at this point is to make it possible for the University to hire the best researchers.

Senator Grant asked if people who completed their clinical postdoctoral training and are now considered research fellows, but not enrolled in a PhD program are included in these postdoctoral fellows from the Faculty of Medicine. The Dean of GPS answered that they are inconsistently included because Quebec law requires one to have completed a postdoctoral fellowship or a medical equivalency. What complicates the issue is that in other provinces, medical residents who complete a research requirement may be considered a postdoctoral fellow at that time, the same as a non-medical resident postdoctoral fellow. In Quebec, the rules around clinical practice complicate postdoctoral activities, requiring other forms of classification.

Senator Sieber asked if there were classes or seminars that faculty members supervising postdoctoral fellows could attend to improve their supervisory skills. The Dean of GPS answered that although there are presently no workshops, this suggestion has been raised by others and the University would like to offer this form of support.

6. Assessment of the 2006 White Paper (D09-54)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost presented the Assessment of the 2006 White Paper. The Provost reminded Senate that the University had moved to a multi-year budget in 2006, which was coming to renewal in the coming year. As such, this was a good time to review the goals set out in 2006 and compare them with what was actually delivered.

Senator Boulet noted that the research centres mentioned in objective four have suffered a 30% reduction in funding. He asked if these moneys will return. The Provost responded that there is a study concerning the productivity of the large amount of research centres and suggested that money was not well spent. The Interim VPRIR said that the 30% reduction in funding can be attributed to the proliferation of centres while the overall funding remained static.

Senator Ling asked about the status of the creation of the School of Public Policy, which had been mentioned in the White Paper. The Provost replied that while the idea has been explored, it has not been as successful as those initiatives in Environment, Neurosciences, and the Humanities and Social Sciences with the creation of IPlay. At this time, public policy initiatives are being explored within the Faculty of Law, but it must be implemented in a way that reaches across all faculties. He mused that it could be created as a graduate level institute rather than a full school.

Senator Robaire urged the Provost to bring the new priorities for the upcoming White Paper to Senate early so that Senate could have greater input. The Provost told Senate that he was getting

ideas about the priorities before the summer so that they can be brought back to Senate early in the fall for input before they are finalized. He also mentioned that the deans were asked to consult more broadly with faculty members.

Senator Dooley asked if the Provost could comment about any improvements that could be implemented to the process of program review and what lessons have been learned from the previous process. The Provost responded that McGill will redesign the process to provide for cyclical reviews from the deans of academic units that link program offerings from undergraduate to graduate programs with the professors offering the program and the courses. The first set of new reviews will be complete in the winter of next year.

7. Preliminary 2010-2011 Budget Report

On invitation of the Chair, The Provost gave a verbal update of the Preliminary 2010-2011 Budget Report. The Provost noted that the development of the University budget has been complicated by the new reporting year, which shortens the current fiscal year by one month. In addition, the move from the Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (MELS) accounting to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) has resulted in a major shift in the accounting practices of the University. As such, the financial situation of the University can be misinterpreted due to the changes in reporting mechanisms from one year to another. He informed Senate that the economic downturn was not over for universities, which traditionally experience funding cuts during recovery. Although McGill's position is relatively strong at present, other universities are experiencing significant financial pain, including hiring freezes and furloughs during holiday breaks. In the coming year, the University must make operational changes and sacrifices while maintaining quality, access, and competitiveness.

Senator Janda thanked the Provost and his team for their good stewardship of the University's finances. He stated a preference in favour of having the next budget remain transitional, which among other things would allow the University flexibility to engage in some hiring at a time when other universities are vulnerable to losing talent. He recognized that a negative provincial budget could force the University to take more drastic financial measures.

Senator Marshall asked if the Provost could speak about revenue generating activities in line with the Universities strategic priorities. The Provost responded the University is well positioned to provide consulting activities and courses in other jurisdictions that do not compromise the institutional identity of McGill or the quality of the programs offered. He expanded that summer and Continuing Education programs have not been maximized and should be explored. The Chair added that leveraging funds on international relationships can help raise funds as well so long as they are viewed through the lens of the academic mission.

Senator Covo asked if self-funding programs were a potential solution to funding problems. The Provost answered that self-funding programs do not have the type of revenue generating capacity to drive a major research university. Leveraging international collaborations on science, technology, and infrastructure could play a larger role for University financing. In the future

there will likely be more self-funded programs, but they would require the University to think about its relationship to its mission.

8. Report of the Board of Governors to Senate (D09-56)

The Chair asked Senate if they have any questions regarding the Report of the Board of Governors to Senate.

Senator Wolff asked why some deans were reappointed for a period longer than five years. The Chair responded that there was a double objective in giving longer terms to those who were starting their first term as Dean. First, giving a longer term served to stagger the timing of the advisory period for possible reappointment. Second, a five year term is not long enough for deans to advance a mandate. The practice at many research universities is to offer a longer first terms and shorter second terms while staying within the ten year limit.

Adjournment

There being no other business to deal with at the meeting, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.