

Minutes of meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, April 28, 2010 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT	Hashimoto, Kyoko	Neilson, Ivan
Aitken, Ellen	Hebert, Johanne	Perrault, Hélène
Barney, Darin	Hendren, Laurie	Peterson, Kathryn
Blachford, Gregg	Hepburn, Allan	Pierre, Christophe
Blackett, Adelle	Hobbins, Joan	Potter, Judith
Boss, Valentin	Janda, Richard	Richard, Marc
Boulet, Benoit	Johnson, Juliet	Richards, Mike
Bray, Dorothy	Jordan, Steven	Robaire, Bernard
Covo, David	Jutras, Daniel	Saroyan, Alenoush
Dooley, Rebecca	Kreiswirth, Martin	Shaughnessy, Honora
Doucette, Elaine	Kurien, John	Sieber, Renee
El Shafie, Dahlia	Leask, Richard	Simeone, Daniel
Etemad, Hamid	Levin, Richard	Snider, Laurie
Everett, Jane	Ling, Andrew	Todd, Peter
Farid, Doaa	Low, Bronwen	Van Eyk, Helen
Franklin, Keith	Lowther, David	Wade, Kevin
Fried, Gerald	Madramootoo, Chandra	Wapnick, Joel
Gonnerman, Laura	Manfredi, Christopher	Weinstein, Marc
GowriSankaran, Kohur	Marshall, David	Woolf, Sarah
Grant, Martin	Masi, Anthony	Zhang, Ji
Grütter, Peter	Mendelson, Morton	Zorychta, Edith
Gulamhussein, Faizel	Moore, Timothy	Strople, Stephen
Harpp, David	Munroe-Blum, Heather	(Secretary)

REGRETS: Paul Allison, Mostafa Altalibi, Deborah Assayag, Gillian Bartlett-Esquillant, James Brophy, Ian Butler, Eric Caplan, George Ciobanu, Alexander DeGuise, Brian Driscoll, Jérémie Drouillard, Renzo Cecere, Roshni Chadha, Stuart Cobbett, Claudio Cuello, Catherine Desbarats, Jan Ericsson, Fran Ezzy-Jorgensen, Kappy Flanders, Engelbert Gayagoy, Alexandros Halavrezos, Ashraf Ismail, Alexandra Kindlat, Torrance Kirby, Diane Koen, Paul Lasko, David Lipsitz, Manosij Majumdar, James G. Martin, Don McLean, Mitran Mehta, Michael Ngadi, Gary Pekeles, Andrew Piper, Rima Rozen, Arnold Steinberg, Lydia White, Christina Wolfson.

SECTION I

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

Item 3. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate granted speaking rights to Professor Jim Nicell for item IIB 1 (Sustainability Policy); Professors Andrew Kirk, Stephen Yue, Subhasis Ghoshal, John Zucchi, and Hans Beck for item IIB2 (Report of the Academic Policy Committee); and Dr. Maureen Simmonds for item IIB3 (Notice of Amendment to the Statutes of McGill University).

2. Adoption of the Agenda

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was approved

3. Chair's Remarks

The Chair opened her remarks on the topic of the McGill self-funded MBA. She said that the media exchange on McGill's move to a self-funded MBA has heated up again, precipitated by an article in the April 20th edition of *Le Devoir* headlined "Québec veut punir McGill." In the article, Minister Courchesne, through a spokesperson, said that MELS would withhold \$28,000 from McGill's grant for every full-time equivalent student in the program paying the new tuition. McGill's Board of Governors decided last July to move to a self-funding model for the program in support of accessibility, equity, and quality. A self-funding model means that the University would seek no government financial support for the program and that the program would be financed solely on tuition revenue.

Currently, McGill receives about \$12,000 in grants and tuition for the program while the program costs \$22,000 per student per year to deliver. The Chair clarified that those costs reflect the current program, which is not at the level of quality that McGill would like to offer. The gap of \$10,000 is derived from the undergraduate programs, thus resulting in undergraduate students subsidizing the current MBA. Undergraduate students do not generally have much work experience and are younger, in their late teens and just out of CEGEP or high school. Conversely, students in the MBA program generally have five or more years of work experience, enter the program making on average \$50,000 per year, and will make, on average, \$104,000 per year within three years of graduation. The University did not think it was fair for the MBA program to be funded on the backs of undergraduate students. The model McGill is implementing ensures that the students who benefit from the program pay the costs. The

program also commits 30 cents of every dollar it takes in towards financial aid so that every student that is accepted into the program will be able to come. This amounts to an average of \$4,000 in financial aid for each student in the program.

The Chair said that Dean Todd and she, over the course of the last week, had spoken to a number of journalists and editorialists, as well as key leaders in the community, to set the record straight. A small group of the University's at-large Board members have been closely working with the Principal and Board Chair to analyse the events and develop McGill's approaches. The Dean of the Desautels Faculty of Management has been in the lead on the Faculty side; Vaughn Dowie and Doug Sweet in Public Affairs, Pierre Moreau in Planning and Institutional Analysis, as well as many others in the University are helping to advance the case for the self-funded MBA.

Senator Janda reminded Senate that the self-funded program was supposed to alleviate financial burdens on the University. He calculated that if the University attracted 60 students, the government could claw back \$1.5 million from McGill's government grant. He asked if the government did not reverse its plan, was there a contingency plan and would there be a moratorium on these types of initiatives until the relationship between the University and the Ministry is clarified. The Chair replied that the University has no intention of turning back from the direction it has taken, and while the University has a number of contingency plans it would be imprudent to discuss these while in discussion with the government.

Senator GowriSankaran indicated that there have been articles in the newspaper in support of McGill. The Chair agreed that there have been a number of editorials in support of the self-funded MBA and she promised to have them forwarded to Senators.

Senator Robaire asked to be briefed on the positions of McGill's sister universities and if the Minister is speaking directly to McGill. The Chair indicated that she would like to reserve any comments about the interactions between the University and the Minister during discussion with the government. She asked Dean Todd to speak about the positions of other Quebec universities. Dean Todd replied that while he cannot speak for other institutions, he has been in contact with HEC and Concordia and they feel that they face the same kinds of financial constraints in relation to funding the MBA program, from government money and tuition. He indicated that he was unaware of the direction these universities were planning, but he did know that McGill's self-funded model was viewed as a viable way of moving forward.

The Chair returned to her remarks, asking Dean Levin to speak about the new McGill University Health Centre (MUHC). Dean Levin said that after a campaign of nearly 20 years, the first ceremonial shovel was turned near the site of the new Glen Yards super-hospital. This \$1.3 billion dollar project, funded by the city and province will give Quebec a state of the art, modern facility. This initiative would not have been realized without the constant efforts of a group of people that came together in 1992 at McGill who wanted to create a new hospital had medical school on a single contiguous site. The project will move the Children's Hospital, the Royal Victoria Hospital, and the research institute of the MUHC from where they currently are to the Glen site. The Montreal General Hospital will remain where it is in a reconfigured and polished state and will be referred to as the Mountain Campus. In addition the Neuro is expected to

remain in its current location for a very long time. The concept for the new super hospital was conceived with support and creativity from the Faculty of Medicine, with thousands of hours of volunteer service, for the coming era of personalized medicine. The Centre for Innovative Medicine, for which the CFI was sufficiently impressed to give the federal portion of McGill a \$250 million construction grant to construct the research institute component, is central and the hospital will be constructed around it by SNC Lavalin. Overall there will be fewer beds in the MUHC system - 154 single bedded rooms for children and 346 for adults - creating more interest in providing a unified academic health network among our affiliated institutions: McGill, MUHC, the Jewish General Hospital, St. Mary's, and the Douglas. The financial closing is anticipated in the next six weeks and actual construction should commence in three weeks.

The Chair closed her remarks by informing Senate that she will be in Quebec City during the next Senate meeting to discuss the omnibus budget bill and concerns that universities have about restrictions the government is proposing in relation to university operations.

SECTION II

PART A – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question regarding optional student fees

On invitation of the Chair, Senator Barney asked the question regarding optional student fees.

Senator Barney asked his question as follows:

In 2007, the University implemented an online system (via MINERVA) enabling students to withhold optional fees paid to a variety of student organizations on campus. The organizations and services affected by this system include Radio CKUT 90.3 FM (a highly-acclaimed campus-community radio station that broadcasts from the McGill campus), the McGill chapter of the Quebec Public Interest Research Group (a student-led organization that houses a variety of social and environmental justice groups on campus), Midnight Kitchen (a student-operated service providing low-cost vegan meals to McGill students), Queer McGill (a student-run support service for lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender students), and Nightline (a peer telephone-counselling service). Each of these groups makes a unique and important contribution to meeting the goals of the *Principal's Task Force on Student Life and Learning*, and enriches the life of the campus more generally.

Student fees to support these organizations are optional and are authorized by periodic referenda conducted according to the rules of Elections McGill. The online system enabling students to exercise the option to withhold fees on an individual basis was implemented in 2007 without adequate consultation with the affected groups and services, and persists against their continued objections. The intention of the online opt-out system was to make withholding these fees more convenient for individual students. However, the system has also produced unintended consequences. For example, it has unwittingly facilitated organized campaigns encouraging students to withhold their fees *en masse*, (see: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A63r7J6SSyA>)

and <http://qpirgoptout.com>), campaigns which the targeted organizations are now compelled to contest, expending scarce resources which could otherwise be devoted to delivering their core services. These campaigns are conducted outside the scrutiny of Elections McGill and its regulations ensuring equity and fairness, and undermine McGill students' collective democratic decisions to support these groups, as expressed repeatedly in rule-bound referenda.

Most seriously, the online opt-out system has undermined the ability of the affected groups to deliver their programs and services to McGill students, due to the negative impact of increased opt-outs on the revenues of these organizations. For example, in 2009-10, the rate of online opt-outs for the organizations and services highlighted here typically exceeded 10%. In the case of both Radio CKUT and QPIRG McGill, this amounts to over \$20,000 removed from the annual budgets of each of these organizations. As QPIRG reports: "The on-line opt-out system and resultant massive cuts to our income are beginning to severely impede QPIRG's ability to function and continue to bring events, research opportunities and resources to McGill students...Should these on-line opt-outs continue at this rate or even at a higher rate, QPIRG may no longer be able to fund our diverse working groups, research opportunities, orientation programs for new students, resource centre, and event series."

1. Will the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) agree to conduct a thorough investigation of the impact of the MINERVA opt-out system upon the ability of affected organizations to deliver their services effectively to McGill students, and to report the results of this investigation to Senate?
2. Will the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) agree to meet with representatives of the affected organizations to explore the feasibility of an alternative system for allowing students to withhold optional fees, and to report the outcome of this meeting to Senate?

The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) answered as follows:

I will first provide Senate some background information. Students have adopted some fees for themselves with the proviso that individuals may opt not to pay. Before 2007, the opt-out procedures were handled by student groups and were unnecessarily time-consuming. The University, however, implemented a Minerva-based opt-out system, whereby students can now exercise their right to opt out of fees at a single web site linked to their fee account. Efforts were taken to provide information to students about the fees they might choose not to pay. Before opting out, students are provided the fee description, which can include a link to the group's web site for additional information, such as the benefits of the service. Upon implementation of the on-line system, opt-outs increased from a range of about .5 to 2% to a range of about 1 to 8%. This increase indicated the degree to which the previous bureaucratic system had inhibited students from exercising their right to opt out. Since then, overall opt-out levels have increased to a range of about 6 to 15%, probably in part because students have become more aware of the on-line procedure.

In fall 2009, 15% of McGill undergraduates opted out of at least one fee, but students were selective: Only about half opting out, chose to opt out of everything. At the University level,

students were most likely to opt out of the fees for QPIRG and CKUT, but least likely to opt out of the environment fee. Students were even less likely to opt out of fees that benefited initiatives directly relevant to their own faculty, such as the Arts Improvement Fund and Engineers without borders. Moreover, students in different faculties opted out at different levels, with only 4% of students in Arts opting out of everything, compared to 10% in other faculties. Thus, McGill students have benefited from the simplified opt-out system, and students are exercising the right associated with certain fees to choose what initiatives they will, and will not, support.

The Minerva opt-out system affords important benefits to students and the University:

- The system is transparent and non-bureaucratic.
- It maintains students' privacy, because student groups do not receive the names or IDs of students who have opted out.
- It enables students to exercise their right to opt freely, without inconvenience, pressure, or possible embarrassment.
- It ensures that students immediately see the impact of opting-out on their Student Account and do not have to deal with small credit balances that they might otherwise have to collect in person.
- It adjusts the fees and opt-out amounts automatically as course registrations change during add/drop period.
- It ensures that the administration is fulfilling its fiduciary responsibility and is accountable to students for the funds that it collects from them on behalf of student groups.
- Finally, it has reduced administrative overhead associated with a number of tasks:
 - reminding student groups to submit data regarding opt outs;
 - validating the data;
 - manipulating data files, to load the opt-out information into Banner;
 - returning small credit balances.

Senator Barney has raised what he sees as unintended consequences of the on-line opt-out system, including political campaigns advocating that students opt out of fees. Such campaigns are probably more a byproduct of Facebook and YouTube than of Minerva. Of course, a bureaucratic, opaque opt-out system would presumably diminish the impact of such campaigns, but that does not justify making it more difficult for students to exercise their right to opt out of fees.

A second consequence is that student groups, as well as the University – for example, in the case of the Library fund – receive less funding when students can conveniently exercise their right to opt out. However, I am convinced that the primary benefits of the on-line opt-out system, which are related to matters of principle and service to students, outweigh the monetary costs, which could be recovered, at least in part, by better communication and possibly by slightly increasing some of the fees.

Now I would like to turn specifically to Senator Barney's questions.

1. Given opt-out fees, students have the right to vote with their wallets every semester for some services, activities and initiatives. As a result, the budgets for these may be reduced. Therefore, choices must be made about what can be done within available budgets or how the budgets might be augmented. It is up to student groups and activities that are independent of the University to make those choices for themselves and to communicate with students directly, not via a report to Senate from the Deputy Provost.
2. Over the past few years, I have had several meetings with students and have exchanged written communications with them regarding the opt-out system. We are certainly open to suggestions to improve communication about the fees within the system, as indicated by the improvements we have implemented at the behest of student groups.

However, we are not willing to abandon the approach we have adopted, because it affords the benefits I mentioned above. We also do not have the resources to overhaul the current system, nor are we willing to hand over the University's responsibilities for fee collection to student groups. I, therefore, must respectfully say that I consider the case of the opt-out system closed.

Senator Barney replied that the appeal to principle is unsatisfying because the appeal to choice is inconsistently applied in regard to student fees. Students are forced to pay fees for services they do not use despite the fact that those required fees have never been democratically authorized. If democracy is the principle that the Deputy Provost appealing to, why is it inconsistently applied at the University. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that the basis for the University to collect certain fees is the referendum passed by student groups. If the referendum provides that students can opt-out of a student fee, the University must ensure that students can in fact opt-out of those fees. There are certain fees that the University charges students in order to provide services.

Senator Dooley asked if the data used in the Deputy Provost's answer could be made available to Senators. She also asked that the issue of student fees not be considered closed as there is always room for improvement in the opt-out system. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) stated that the issue of online opt-outs is closed, but the system of communicating the benefits of certain student groups can be improved and will continually be improved. He also took under advisement to release the data to Senate.

2. Question regarding deferred exams

On invitation of the Chair, Senator Dooley asked the question regarding deferred exams for Senator Lipsitz, who could not attend Senate.

Senator Dooley asked the question as follows:

Why does the University not schedule the deferred exam period at a time closer to that of the regular exam period of the same semester (eg. in January for fall exams or in May for winter exams)?

Why does University policy not allow a student who has recovered before the end of the regular exam period to write the deferred exam during that same regular exam period, especially if professors may be able to provide alternate exams in a timely manner, and will need to do so anyways for the deferred exam period?

The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) answered as follows:

I'd first like to point out that accommodations for illness are somewhat different from those for other reasons. Religious holy days are known beforehand, so that the accommodations can be planned. In contrast, illness and family tragedies typically arise unexpectedly. It is also important to note that Student Affairs Offices do grant requests for special accommodation under exceptional circumstances. Therefore, I will limit my remarks to the typical case of deferred examinations to accommodate illness or other legitimate reasons for unexpectedly missing an examination.

The CSA Subcommittee on Student Affairs Policies discussed the matter in fall 2007, seeking to achieve common policies and procedures, transparency of information to students, common dates, and such. As a result, the Desautels Faculty of Management brought its practices into line with those of other faculties. Engineering, however, retained the practice of offering deferred examinations the next time the course is offered, a decision that was supported by the Faculty Council and by students in Engineering.

In reply to the Senator's first question, I agree that there would be apparent advantages to allowing students to write a deferred examination shortly after the missed exam:

- Students would quickly resolve the issue.
- They would benefit from learning retained from the term.
- It would reduce their workload for the examination period at the end of the winter term, which otherwise can be particularly problematic for students who miss several exams in the fall and who have to carry a full load in the winter.

However, further reflection reveals a number of disadvantages to changing the current practice, particularly because many students are not able to write a deferred exam soon after the originally scheduled final:

- The underlying reason for the deferral may not be resolved so quickly.
- Students from far away may have already made travel plans for the day immediately after their last scheduled final exam.
- Students may have made employment or other commitments that require them to be available immediately after their last scheduled exam.
- There is no time between the end of the fall final exam period and the beginning of the winter semester during which deferred exams could reasonably be held.
- It sometimes takes some time for students to provide the documentation needed to justify an accommodation and for Student Affairs Offices to verify the documentation.

- There are logistical challenges in arranging deferred exam – e.g., scheduling the exams without conflicts, finding the space, collecting exams, arranging invigilators, and so on – and there are many students who write deferred exams. In 2009, the Exam Office supervised 1,002 deferred exams in May and 1,169 in August. The sheer volume of work dictates that the exams be scheduled systematically, but the number of other pressing demands during the regular exam schedule preclude that happening at the same time or even shortly afterward.

Moreover, the current deferred exam periods provide students with the time they need to recover from whatever circumstances led to the deferral and to make the necessary alterations to their travel, work and other plans. It also provides the time they need to explore their options with a departmental or faculty advisor.

In answer to the second question, the key issue is equity for students:

All students writing a deferred exam should have the same opportunity to prepare for it, but not all students who recover from their illness will have had time to study for a deferred examination in the same exam period. Unless the deferred exams in a single course are all scheduled at the same time, instructors would have to prepare many exam papers for the same course for the same exam period.

Students suffering from severe illnesses or hardship would not be prepared to write the deferred exam during the ongoing exam period, so, to provide them with sufficient time to recover, another deferred exam period would have to be scheduled at a much later date.

It would be administratively and logistically problematic to hold more than one deferred exam period after the regular final exam period, as a time would have to be negotiated with the instructor and each student, a new paper submitted, a room booked, and invigilation arranged.

Finally, all students in the course should write an exam that is reasonably similar in scope and challenge to the original final exam, but different enough so that they do not benefit from discussions with students who have written the original. It becomes increasingly difficult to accomplish these goals with increasing numbers of exams.

Senator Dooley asked if the University would work to help students understand or even improve the policy. Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) said that he would bring the suggestion to the Enrolment and Student Affairs Advisory Committee for discussion.

Senator Seiber asked if there are any metrics available to determine if students who defer exams are disadvantaged. She said that that it would be useful to know if a student's grade dramatically dropped after taking a deferred exam. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that the type of comparison suggested would be extremely complicated and not easily done. He suggested that the best information the University could provide in this respect was a comparison between the final grades of those that took the deferred exam and those that did not. He could not promise that this type of information could be available quickly.

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

1. Sustainability Policy (D09-41)

On invitation of the Chair, the Assistant Vice-Principal (University Service) presented the Sustainability Policy. He said that the policy is the culmination of a two-year process with consultations and feedback from over a thousand people in the University community. He said that the policy and process of creating the policy have been positively received and there was much goodwill towards sustainability at McGill. Once passed, this policy will launch McGill University into a much longer era of sustainability.

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

Senator Janda said that this policy must be seen as part of a larger framework of regulations including Quebec's Sustainable Development Act, which has reporting requirements to the broader community. He noted that the Sustainability Policy as framed has only reporting requirements to the McGill community and hoped that there would be merger of the internal and external reporting requirements. The Chair stated that Senate should assume that when McGill has obligations to report to external agencies and government that the University fulfills those requirements.

The Sustainability Policy was approved.

2. 419th 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, Senate discussed item IA, the Certificate in Finance, Diploma in Finance, and Diploma in Supply Chain and Operations Management.

Senator Saroyan asked if these certificate and diploma programs are recognized for credit if a student decides after their completion to enter into a degree program in the Desautels Faculty of Management. Dean Todd replied that the practice has been to assess courses from Continuing Education and other institutions on a case-by-case basis.

Senator Robaire said that the trend in Quebec has been the attainment of a Bachelor's Degree through an accumulation of Certificates and Diplomas. Although this has not happened at McGill, he asked if this program could be seen as a first step in that direction. The Provost replied that Continuing Education has not offered degrees and these certificate programs are seen as refinements of what is currently offered, service to the community, or additional training for graduates. Currently it is not possible to obtain a degree through the Centre for Continuing Education by means of an accumulation of certificates.

Senator Janda asked what the relationship between Continuing Education and other faculties. Specifically, he asked what kinds of programs would be offered in each. The Provost answered

that the Faculty of Management has a long history with Continuing Education, but they serve different populations. People who study at Continuing Education are capable and motivated, but they are not subject to the same admission requirements to access degree programs. In addition, programs in Continuing Education are created in consultation with the faculties.

Dean Todd added that in addition to consultation, members of the Desautels Faculty of Management participate in the creation of these diploma and certificate courses.

Senator Saroyan said that Continuing Education could be seen as a stepping stone into a degree program, expanding access to the University for a large group of people. If these people were assured that the courses they took in Continuing Education would be considered credit courses, McGill would be doing the community a larger service. The Provost said the University undertook a review of Continuing Education and is exploring those types of options.

Dean Potter said that although these options have not been fully explored, they are all on the table for discussion.

The Certificate in Finance, Diploma in Finance, and Diploma in Supply Chain and Operations Management were approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate discussed item IC.1a, the McGill Institute for Aerospace Engineering (MIAE).

Senator Saroyan asked how the mandate of the MIAE differs from other aerospace institutes in Montreal. In addition, she asked where the contact was for the health monitoring aspect of the Institute. Dean Pierre replied that the health monitoring is structural in nature and has nothing to do with health as it is commonly known. Professor Yue said the Institute would put in place a system for allowing students to access internships in the aerospace sector that are not available currently by virtue of McGill not having an aerospace institute. In order for students to access these internships, the Institute must be similar to other aerospace institutes, but McGill will be different due a concentration on research, not merely filling jobs in the aerospace sector.

The McGill Institute for Aerospace Engineering (MIAE) was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate discussed item IC.1b, the Institute for Sustainability in Engineering and Design (ISEAD).

Senator Janda asked if the potential for interdisciplinary work in the institute was going to be realized. Professor Kirk answered that the instruction at the undergraduate level will involve people from outside the Faculty of Engineering where people can be found that can give a lecture that is relevant to the subject material. This will be done by each department's curriculum committee in consultation with the Institute.

Senator Saroyan asked if the terms of membership could be amended to include individuals from outside the Faculty of Engineering. Professor Kirk replied that members need to have an

awareness of engineering and design, but the terms do not say that they have to be an engineer. Dean Pierre said that the Institute, as defined, concentrates on finding technological solutions to sustainability. Clearly the problem is broader than this, but this is a reasonable first step and in a few years the University may enlarge the definition, composition, and membership of the institute. The membership is open to other faculties and provides a unifying theme between Engineering and the two schools of Architecture and Urban Planning.

The Institute for Sustainability in Engineering and Design (ISEAD) was approved.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, item IC.2, the name change for the Department of History to “Department of History and Classical Studies” was approved.

3. Notice of Motion to Amend the Statutes (D09-65)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost gave notice of the motion to be presented at the next Senate meeting. An amendment is required in order to implement the APCs approval of changes in degree names. A more sweeping amendment to remove specific degree names from the statutes will be tabled in the fall.

No questions were asked.

4. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D09-60)

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

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the terms of reference for the Committee on the Rights of Senate was approved.

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

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

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the Advisory Committee for the Selection of a Dean for the Schulich School of Music was approved.

On a series of motions duly proposed and seconded, the membership of the University Tenure Committee for Recruitment from each Faculty was approved.

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

5. Academic Calendar of Dates 2011-2012 (D09-53)

On invitation of the Chair, the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) presented the Academic Calendar of Dates 2011-2012.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate discussed the Academic Calendar of Dates 2011-2012.

Senator Dooley asked if the Deputy Provost could comment on revising the Academic Calendar for 2012-2013. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that at the time this calendar was created, there were discussions about making the semester shorter, but it was thought that if the University were to implement that change, other changes should be considered to the structure of the calendar of dates. A work group will be struck to investigate the various issues that are relevant to changing the calendar of dates.

Senator Marshall asked if any consideration had been given to conflicts with student orientation in light of classes commencing on a Thursday. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that this was not the first time classes had started on a Thursday and it presented no problems in the past.

Senator Gulamhussein asked if there had been any consideration towards adding a break in the first semester, similar to the reading week in the second semester. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that this is an issue that is to be discussed in the restructuring.

Senator Gulamhussein asked if there would be some sort of guarantee that these issues would be discussed before the 2012-2013 calendar was brought before Senate. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that the plan is to have fulsome discussion before that calendar is brought so that the University can make a report.

The Academic Calendar of Dates 2011-2012 was approved.

6. Report on Graduate Studies (D09-61)

On invitation of the Chair, The Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies presented the Report on Graduate Studies, referencing document D09-61. He made note of a significant increase in research enrolment and an increase in funding for graduate students of 29 percent over the previous four years. He indicated that the University was trying to make data available on graduate funding so that the report on graduate studies, to be delivered in the fall, will be more complete. The Dean also announced that the recruitment and retention group of the Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies team won a prestigious award: the 2009-2010 Northeast Association of Graduate Schools and Educational Testing Service Award for Innovation and Graduate Student Recruitment and Retention.

Senator Robaire asked when and if the funding policy that transfers money to departments for Masters and PhD levels would be continued. There was an explicit indication that this funding would be for three years, making it hard for long-term planning. He also asked how many more PhD students the University can sustain and if there will be a plateau in the ratio of PhD students to professors. The Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies replied that there has been a working group on graduate student funding that is considering how to make funding more stable, flexible, and timely. One of the problems noted in the past was that a significant contribution from the unit was unsustainable. In regard to the ratio of PhDs and supervisors, the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies said that there will likely be some plateau in numbers, but that should be determined by each unit rather than on a University-wide basis. The Chair said that part of this discussion is the University's efforts to reinforce its areas of distinctiveness and quality. McGill has been first-ranked in regards to the proportion of doctoral students compared to undergraduate students within the Canadian context.

Senator Saroyan indicated that this year there have been a number of declined acceptances in the Faculty of Education due to better funding opportunities outside McGill. The Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies answered that Senator Saroyan's department is unique relative to the experience across the University. As stated, the University has increased graduate funding by 29 percent, but there will always be instances where other universities will offer a higher package than McGill. The Dean hoped that the funding shortfall would be compensated by the superior quality of McGill's programming. He noted data shows that funding alone does not add to the success of candidates beyond a certain point.

Senator Janda asked if the push by other universities to increase their graduate funding will lead to McGill falling further behind despite increasing its funding by 29 percent. He suggested that funding could be targeted from donors to graduate students. The Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies agreed that McGill could fall behind other Universities, but he reiterated that the quality of the programming should attract top students.

7. Annual Report on the Committee on Libraries (D09-37)

On invitation of the Chair, Professor Timothy Moore presented the Annual Report on the Committee on Libraries. Professor Moore noted an improvement in satisfaction with the Libraries at McGill, which has been shown through ongoing surveys. Libraries have seen increased use by students physically and by professors virtually, which has been facilitated by an increase in electronic journal subscriptions. The Library encourages its users to subscribe to the eScholarship program as a way of gaining a larger audience for their publications. In addition to the many electronic initiatives, Professor Moore noted a number of renovations across McGill's libraries.

Senator Hebert noted that the report was for 2008-2009 and that Senate has not received a report for 2009-2010.

8. DAR Report on Campaign McGill (D09-62)

On invitation of the Chair, the Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations) presented the DAR Report on Campaign McGill.

The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) noted that the key to making these campaigns successful was developing relationships with students throughout their time at McGill, including before they start their studies. In order to have an engaged alumni, the University has to engage students with the types of services and advising that students need and want.

Senator Woolf asked if the University anticipated hitting the \$750 million mark by the close of 2012-2013 considering the University is currently at \$542 million. The Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations) replied that the University is at 73 percent of its goal after 68 percent of the campaign, and should meet its stated goal with the anticipated uptake in the economy.

Senator Janda asked how the dip in contributions over the previous year compares to other universities in Canada and also if some perspective could be given as to why this year as opposed to last year has been harder for the campaign. The Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations) replied that what is reported in 2009 is predicated on what happened in 2008, the year before the financial crisis. What is reported in 2010 is what happened in 2009, the year of the financial crisis. He said that Canada has been relatively untouched by the financial crisis, as compared to the United States.

Senator Dooley asked to what extent donors are engaged with the underfunding of universities by the Province. The Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations) said that this is one of primary considerations impressed upon donors.

9. The Use of Text Matching Software at McGill: A Review (D09-64)

On invitation of the Chair, the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) presented the Use of Text Matching Software at McGill: A Review. He noted that although the software had been approved by Senate in 2004, it had not been implemented until 2007, and thus he was bringing the results of the required two-year review to Senate at this time.

Senator Zorychta asked if this software could be used as a tool to prevent plagiarism. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) said that Professor Starkey and the Academic Integrity Subcommittee are examining the possibility of using this as an educational tool and not just for monitoring.

Senator Marshall asked if there would be some sort of study about what contributes to students using and not using the “Turnitin” process. The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) replied that it is up to individual professors if they want to use the software and there are not enough students opting out to merit a proper study.

10. Senate Dates for 2010-2011 (D09-64)

The Chair asked if there were any questions regarding the Senate dates for 2010-2011.

No questions were asked.

Adjournment

There being no other business to deal with at the meeting, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.