

SENATE
McGILL UNIVERSITY

08-09:10

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on Wednesday April 29, 2009 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232), Leacock Building.

PRESENT:	Ling, Andrew
Aitken, Ellen	Luther, Ryan
Allison, Paul	Madramootoo, Chandra
Arnaert, Antonia	Manfredi, Christopher
Barralet, Jake	Martin, James G.
Bishop, Alexandra	Masi, Anthony C.
Blackett, Adelle	McLean, Donald
Boss, Valentin	Mendelson, Morton J.
Boulet, Benoit	Moore, Timothy
Bray, Dorothy	Munroe-Blum, Heather (<i>Chair</i>)
Burgoyne, John Ashley	Neilson, Ivan
Caplan, Eric	Oxhorn, Philip
Chadha, Roshi	Pekeles, Gary
Covo, David	Perrault, H�el�ene
DeGuise, Alexander	Perumal, Nandita
Dourley, Barbara	Peterson, Kathryn
Ericsson, Jan	Potter, Judith
Etemad, Hamid	Quaroni, Enrica
Everett, Jane	Richard, Marc
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Frances	Roy, Fran�ois R.
Franklin, Keith	Saroyan, Alenoush
Gehr, Ronald	Schmidt, Janine
GowriSankaran, Kohur	Sieber, Renee
Grant, Martin	Smith, Michael
Gr�utter, Peter	Snider, Laurie
Harpp, David	Steinhauer, Karsten
Hebert, Johanne	Th�erien, Denis
Hendren, Laurie	Todd, Peter
Hobbins, John	Turner, Kathleen
Jonsson, Wilbur	Wade, Kevin
Jordan, Steve	Weinstein, Marc
Kasirer, Nicholas	Wilkinson, Nadya
Kreiswirth, Martin	Wolfson, Christina
Kurien, John	Zannis-Hadjopoulos, Maria
Labban, Margaret	Zorychta, Edith
Lasko, Paul	
Levin, Richard I.	Pelletier, Johanne (<i>Secretary</i>)

REGRETS: Stefano Algieri, Gillian Bartlett-Esquillant, Gregg Blachford, David Brackett, Ian Butler, Gerald Fried, Faizel Gulamhussein, David Lowther, Christophe Pierre, Richard Pound, Robert Rabinovitch, Bernard Robaire, Honora Shaughnessy, Hana Thomas, Helen Van Eyk, Manon Vennat, Ann Vroom.

The Principal welcomed all to Senate.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Professor Emeritus Samuel Solomon

The following resolution on the death of Professor Emeritus Samuel Solomon was read by Dean Richard I. Levin, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, and adopted unanimously by Senate.

On December 13, 2008, the Faculty of Medicine was greatly saddened by the passing of Dr. Samuel Solomon, Professor Emeritus and a leading Canadian medical researcher who advanced the study of steroids and peptides in fetal development and endocrinology.

Born in Brest-Litovsk, Poland, Dr. Solomon immigrated to Canada in the 1930s with his family. He earned both undergraduate and doctoral degrees from McGill University, and then joined Columbia University to conduct research and to begin what evolved into a stellar career. Dr. Solomon returned to McGill in 1960 and was named a Professor in the Departments of Medicine, Obstetrics and Gynecology, and Biochemistry in 1970 and Professor Emeritus in 1995.

At McGill, where he headed the Division of Experimental Medicine for close to 20 years, Dr. Solomon and others defined the fetal-placental unit, a key concept in understanding the molecular signals that guide early development. His knowledge of steroid biochemistry, combined with his passion as a researcher and teacher, led to major innovations in the then new field of molecular endocrinology and development.

In addition to many international awards and honors in the fields of biochemistry and endocrinology, Dr. Solomon was a member of the Royal Society of Canada, which awarded him the McLaughlin Medal. He was inducted as an Officer of the Order of Canada in 1997. As the abuse of steroids in sport became an international issue, Dr. Solomon shared his expertise in the field as a member of the Dubin Commission in 1989.

Dr. Solomon's pivotal contributions to his field and to the Faculty today form part of our proud legacy.

2. Resolution on the death of Professor John Dick Maclean

The following resolution on the death of Professor John Dick Maclean was read by Dean Richard I. Levin, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, and adopted unanimously by Senate.

The Faculty of Medicine deeply mourns the passing of Dr. J. Dick MacLean, Professor of Medicine and Director of the McGill Centre for Tropical Diseases, which since has been renamed the J.D. MacLean Centre for Tropical Diseases in his honour. Dr. MacLean died on January 22, 2009.

Born in Flin Flon, Manitoba in 1940, Dr. MacLean earned his Doctor of Medicine degree in 1966 from Queens University in Kingston, Ontario. He completed post-graduate training at McGill, and then went on to study tropical medicine at the University of London. He returned to our University as a faculty member in the mid 1970s.

Dr. MacLean's boundless enthusiasm and dedication to tropical medicine spanned more than 40 years and numerous countries, from Zambia, Kenya, Malaysia, Indonesia, Japan and Ethiopia through to the Caribbean. He helped create the National Reference Centre for Parasitology, co-founded the Canadian University Consortium for Health in Development, contributed important research breakthroughs in malaria and other epidemic diseases, and invented the McGill Centre for Tropical Medicine. His tireless efforts put McGill on the map as one of the foremost tropical disease units in North America, and, for that, we are very grateful. His expertise was formally recognized in 2006 when he was asked to serve as the President of the Clinical Group of the American Society of Tropical Medicine & Hygiene.

Dr. MacLean's influence will be felt for decades to come through the many colleagues he inspired, not only to be better physicians but also to be citizens of the world.

3. Resolution on the death of Professor George Karpati

The following resolution on the death of Professor George Karpati was read by Dean Richard I. Levin, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, and adopted unanimously by Senate.

It is with much sorrow that the Faculty of Medicine marked the passing of Dr. George Karpati, Professor of Neurology and Neurosurgery, on February 6, 2009.

Born in Debrecen, Hungary, Dr. Karpati was a survivor of the Holocaust, who immigrated to Canada in 1957, where he earned his Doctor of Medicine degree from Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia. A highly esteemed physician and scientist, and holder of the I.W. Killam Chair, Dr. Karpati distinguished himself throughout a career of more than four decades with the Montreal Neurological Institute, where his sensitive and insightful clinical acumen was appreciated by patients, students and colleagues, alike. He made highly influential and original contributions to research in neuromuscular disease, garnering international respect from his peers.

Dr. Karpati was an Officer of the Order of Canada and Chevalier de l'Ordre nationale du Quebec, as well as a recipient of the Prix Wilder Penfield (Prix du Quebec). He was also a member of the Royal Society of Canada and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and received honorary doctorates from both the University of Debrecen in Hungary and the University of Marseilles in France.

Dr. Karpati's high spirit and intelligence will be sadly missed by all.

4. Report of the Steering Committee

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

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of April 15, 2009 were approved.

Item 2. Confidential Minutes. It was reported that the Steering Committee has scrutinized and approved the confidential minutes of the meeting of April 15, 2009 on behalf of Senate. These minutes are not published or circulated but are available for perusal by senators in the office of the Secretary of Senate.

Item 3. Committee of the Whole. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into Committee of the Whole for 30 minutes, for discussion of item IIB2.2 (Senate Review Report, D08-60).

Item 4. Chair of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Dean Madramootoo was approved as Chair for item IIB3, the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement.

Item 5. Information Items

- 5.1 *Joint Board-Senate meeting (October 26, 2009).* The topic was noted for information, and the Provost requested, with the approval of the Chair, that the following text be included in the minutes.

Our mission statement speaks to McGill University's research-intensive, student-centred, and publicly-purposed identity. Our aspirations, as expressed in our strategic planning and communications, are for our University to be among the best institutions of higher learning in the world in all three of these categories. In everything that we do, we continually strive for incremental improvements as we position McGill for transformative changes.

McGill's strategic academic and research plans, the responses to the Principal's Task Force on Student Life and Learning, the cases for support that form part of Campaign McGill, our Master Plan for the physical development of our campuses, and the Principal's Report on Priorities and action plan for her second term as presented to Board and Senate, all provide guidance regarding the actions we should take to ensure our success in achieving our goals and objectives. While clearly useful in times of growth, these guideposts are even more important now in this period of economic uncertainty and turmoil.

These administrative strategies, priorities, goals, and objectives, however, need to be discussed and tested by our governance bodies, especially as we look long, deep, and hard at how to improve, refine, or reconceptualise McGill's processes and practices to achieve them. In that context it is appropriate to ask: Are we who we think we are? What would be an appropriate set of indicators, both quantitative and qualitative, to measure where we are in relation to what we claim to be? How do we compare to benchmark institutions? How do we actually measure up on these indicators in terms of the image of ourselves as reflected in our statements about ourselves? If wanting, how do we get on track to convert aspirations into realities?

For the Joint Board-Senate meeting in the fall 2009, we will consider those questions in relation to McGill's identity in terms of research, student life and learning, and projection into the community. The focus will be on where we are, how that positions us, and what we can do to improve.

In the coming weeks the Office of the Provost will form a working group consisting of members selected from both governing bodies. This working group will be asked to constitute three sub-groups to assess McGill's research intensity, its student-centredness, and various aspects of our service to society. The larger working group will then develop the work of the sub-groups into a series of challenges that the Joint Board-Senate meeting will tackle.

The Provost will bring forth information on the progress of these working groups, along with more details on what we will be exploring, early in the fall session of Senate, prior to the Joint meeting.

- 5.2 *Aboriginal enrolment to MDCM program.* Steering Committee requested that Dean Richard I. Levin speak to follow up the question posed at Senate on March 25 regarding the status of Aboriginal enrolment to the MDCM program. Dean Levin provided the following response:

At the request of the four faculties of medicine in Quebec, as of the class entering in fall 2008, the Ministry of Health (MSSS) approved a special Aboriginal quota. This quota is four students per year, for all the Quebec schools. These positions cannot be taken by non-Aboriginals – if four students are not accepted, the spots stay empty.

By agreement among all four medical schools, the admissions process is coordinated by Laval University. The candidates must be approved by the Association des premiers nations du Quebec et Labrador. The grades required for consideration are lower than for non-Aboriginal candidates. Once judged suitable by Laval, the students may apply to any of the four schools.

In the class entering in 2008, we had one Aboriginal student at McGill selected through this process (Laval and Université de Montréal each had one also). Obviously Aboriginal students may also apply through the usual mechanisms. Since self-identification as an Aboriginal student is optional, we don't know for certain whether or not there have been other Aboriginal students but to the best of our knowledge, the student admitted in 2008 is the first Aboriginal student for McGill undergraduate medicine.

The program includes funding for a mentor for the student (an Aboriginal physician who is a faculty member at McGill) and for other support as needed.

In addition, the following steps are being taken to encourage more applicants to the program:

- *the Faculty has hosted McGill days for Kahnawake high school students;*
- *two Mini-Meds tickets are offered to students from Kahnawake and Kanosatake;*
- *we have a kiosk and meet high school students from various aboriginal groups on the McGill Powwow day in the Fall;*

- *we organize a Medicine Sunday event at the Simulation Centre during the McGill May Hi Performance Camp for aboriginal students.*

Since the inception of the new program, all our recruitment presentations include information on the program and the audiences are asked to pass on the message to people they know who might be eligible for that path.

Senator Pেকেles noted that the Association des premiers nations du Québec et Labrador did not represent Inuits and wondered whether Inuit applicants would need to be pre-screened by that body. Dean Levin indicated he did not have certainty on this point.

- 5.3 *Update on the Report on Non-Tenure Track Academic Staff.* The Provost reported that additional work on titles, promotion and access to benefits would continue over the summer and the final report would be presented to Senate in the fall.

Item 6. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate granted speaking rights to Professor Jim Nicell, Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) in relation to the item IIB2.2, the Senate Review Report (D08-60).

5. Adoption of the Agenda

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

6. Chair's Remarks

At the request of Professor Saroyan, the Principal opened her remarks by calling on Dean Levin to provide an update on the MUHC press reports, as mentioned in her remarks at the last Senate meeting. Dean Levin noted that there was an agreement that enquiries about the superhospitals building project would be handled by the MUHC unless an enquiry related to matters demanding a joint response. Although it was reported on one occasion that the Faculty of Medicine had no comment on a story, they had in fact merely informed the reporter to seek the answer from the MUHC directly, which was handling the enquiries. Regarding the FMSQ union being quoted as describing distinct differences in how medicine was practiced in anglophone and francophone communities, there had been communication with the FMSQ that this comment was nonsensical and unacceptable. In terms of the development of the project, there are regular updates from the MUHC leadership – the project is on time and there are no impediments to progress.

The Principal recognized the tragic loss of student Adriano Tassone, who died recently in a car accident. She noted that his death had struck the community not only because he was an outstanding management student, multisport athlete and Redmen football player, but because he was passionate about his interests and cared deeply for his classmates. The Principal also took the opportunity to recognize other students that have been lost throughout the year and in years past.

Following up on the security situation addressed at the previous meeting, the Principal reported that McGill Security had been continuing to work with the Montreal police and it was believed that there was no imminent danger. The Principal thanked those overseeing the examinations

for their efficient handling of the situation, and commented on the very good relationship the University enjoyed with the Montreal police.

Turning to the outbreak of the “swine flu”, the Principal noted that 13 mild cases had been reported in Canada so far, and the University was monitoring the situation and would take appropriate steps if the position changed. She reported that the Canadian government had issued a level 3 security warning for travel to Mexico, and the University would not be supporting student travel to Mexico for University-related activities for the time being. She reported that the Deputy Provost’s Office was working to communicate with and support students who were already in Mexico to facilitate their return home.

The Principal noted the Canada Excellence Research Chairs program, designed to find up to 20 people in fields of top importance to be recruited into Canadian universities. Each proposal will receive up to \$10 million in associated funding. McGill is doing well, having been advanced in four proposals, in the subjects of pain, green chemistry, broadband communications, and Alzheimer’s. The Principal noted the phenomenal level of competition in the program.

Commenting on the winter federal budget that brought no increase in the federal granting council budgets, the Principal noted that she will continue, along with the other G13 universities (who together account for 80% of the funding), to work with the government to try to obtain relief for the granting councils. The Principal added that on May 5, the Science Technology and Innovation Council will be releasing its State of the Nation report that will talk about the need for the granting councils to have effective levels of support.

The Principal noted that the Quebec university governance legislation had still not been tabled but was expected to be later this year. Noting that the Minister had expressed interest in managing compensation frameworks for Quebec’s universities, and having full disclosure on compensation policies, the Principal, speaking both as President of CREPUQ and Principal of McGill, had told the Minister that this would be unacceptable. She remarked that there is education to be done on how to maintain a top-ranking competitive university in an underfunded system.

Referring to the two Canadian winners of the Kyoto Prize, known as the Japanese Nobel, Tony Parson of the University of Toronto and Charles Taylor of McGill, the Principal announced that both winners will be recognized at McGill in an event with the leadership of the Inamori Foundation, at 4pm on May 5 in Moyses Hall.

Turning to the announcement of NSERC discovery grants, The Principal announced that McGill has received \$4.5 million in funding, to support 118 projects, in a peer-reviewed process that has moved from a seniority-based funding system to a seniority-blind peer review with commitment to fewer projects funded but to a higher level of support. While noting some disappointment for senior colleagues, the Principal also wanted to recognize the many successes.

The Principal also noted that the communications team had won a range of awards, including the Gold Medal, in the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education’s awards celebrating excellence in communication in the post-secondary education arena. The Principal extended congratulations to Vaughan Dowie and his team for their achievements.

The Principal concluded her remarks by noting that convocation was approaching, and she invited senators to join the convocation platform parties.

SECTION II

PART “A” – QUESTIONS AND MOTIONS BY MEMBERS

PART “B” – MOTIONS AND REPORTS FROM ORGANS OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

1. 411th Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D08-59)

The Provost presented the Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D08-59).

II. Presented to Senate for Discussion

1) Final Program Review Summary Sheets

Faculty Program Review for the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

The Dean of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences provided a summary of the review process, noting that a committee chaired by the Associate Dean (Graduate Education) had been created to put a plan in place to address the issues raised.

Faculty Program Review for the Desautels Faculty of Management

The Dean of the Desautels Faculty of Management summarized outcomes of the review process, whereby the Faculty had reduced the size of the core of the BCom program, created a series of minors for non-management students, developed new international program streams, and reduced the MBA core to make the program more flexible. There had also been investment in stronger academic and career advising for students.

In response to a question from Mr DeGuise regarding why the PhD program was not included in the review, Dean Todd replied that the PhD was offered jointly with the three other universities in Montreal and was being reviewed on a different timescale.

Faculty Program Review for the Faculty of Religious Studies

The Dean of Religious Studies summarized the recommendations of the program review for the Faculty of Religious Studies.

In response to a question from Mr Burgoyne regarding the cause of lengthy completion time for the PhD program, Dean Aitken replied that this was true and caused by most fields of study requiring the acquisition of four languages, including two or three ancient languages, the basic knowledge of which was not being provided by most universities at the undergraduate level. She added that the Faculty conducted annual progress reviews and goal-setting with PhD students, and that times of completion were not out of step with peer universities in Europe and across North America.

In response to a question from Professor Harpp concerning the audience for the certificate program, Dean Aitken replied that there was general interest from people with curiosity in the subject, as well as from members of NGOs and those working in conflict

resolution who required an understanding of the role played by religion in issues of civil society and public policy.

III. Approved in the Name of Senate

Presented for information.

IV. For the Information of Senate

Presented for information.

2. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D08-60)

2.1 Report on Appointments

The Provost introduced the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D08-60). Mr Hobbins noted that nominations in the report for some committees differed from names presented in a previous report on March 25, approved by Senate, and asked the Provost to address the reasons for those changes before presenting the report. The Provost replied that there had been a discussion at the Senate Nominating Committee (“Nominating”) regarding the selection of librarians to serve on University Tenure Committees for the Faculties (“UTCs”) and on some of the committees relating to student discipline, where it had been decided to replace librarian members on those committees and to work with the Secretary-General to clarify the roles where librarians could best serve the University.

Mr Hobbins cited section 5.28.2 of the Regulations, which stipulates the appointment to UTCs of “nine tenured members of the academic staff” who do not hold appointment in the same faculty. Noting that librarians were tenured members of the academic staff, he observed that librarians have served on UTCs in the past, as well as on UTCs for Recruitment, the University Appeals Committee, Committee on Staff Grievances and Disciplinary Procedures, and two decanal selection committees. Mr Hobbins noted that in the Nominating Report being presented, librarians had been replaced on four committees (the UTCs for AES, Education and Engineering, and on the Appeal Committee for Student Discipline and Grievances), with the decision having been made that they were ineligible to serve. Mr Hobbins noted that there was no basis for this decision, and moved a motion that the nominations for those four committees be removed from the report and the original nominations stand. The motion was duly seconded and the Principal invited discussion of the motion.

Professor Zorychta observed that this was an important issue, and that librarians are academic staff members. Mr Richard reported that at Nominating he had suggested that if librarians were to be excluded, this should not be a practice of Nominating and should be done by changing the committee terms of reference and the Regulations, which would come forward for debate and decision at Senate. In response to a question from Professor Smith regarding why the committees were returning to Senate after having been approved there before, the Provost replied that Nominating was part of Senate, there had been a discussion at Nominating that librarians were not suitable to serve on some committees, and it would be clarified which committees librarians are eligible to serve on.

Ms Hebert asked whether, if librarians were inappropriate to serve on UTCs for the faculties, it was also inappropriate for faculty members to serve on the UTC for the Libraries. The Provost replied that Nominating decided that it was appropriate for faculty to be on the UTC for Libraries, and not the reverse, because librarians do not have PhDs, their tenure criteria are different, and they do not provide course instruction.

Professor Smith commented that these kinds of decisions should not be delegated to Nominating, which was going beyond its terms of reference. Professor Saroyan noted that Nominating was not announcing the changes as a *fait accompli*, but was presenting them to Senate for approval, at which time there would also be discussion about them. The Provost added that Nominating has been delegated the responsibility for making recommendations about committee membership.

Mr Hobbins noted that Nominating had not made recommendations contrary to the Regulations, but had instead decided that librarians should not serve and the Regulations should be rewritten, which is going way beyond the mandate of Nominating. He therefore urged support for the motion.

Dean Grant expressed the view that UTCs were the most important committees in the University, with decisions made affecting scholarship and teaching for the next 40 years – those decisions should be made by true peers, and the expertise on the UTCs was crucial to the running of the University.

Professor GowriSankaran noted that there was no mention of librarians in the Tenure Regulations, and added that if fundamental changes were to be made, that was the prerogative of Senate and not one particular committee.

In response to the Principal's proposal that the four disputed committees be referred back to Nominating, Mr Hobbins noted that Nominating might bring them back to Senate with the same changes and so urged that the original committees be allowed to stand. The Provost noted that Nominating had revisited the original committees because it felt the Regulations had not been followed in those cases. It decided that "academic staff" in the context of the Regulations meant "professorial staff" and had brought the committees back with that reinterpretation applied, fully understanding its mission and oversight function.

Dean Todd commented that if the eligibility of librarians was a grey area, then bearing in mind the possibility that decisions made by those committees could end up in appeals, the safer course was to appoint professors now, and then examine the issue afterwards.

The Principal called for a vote on the motion, which was not carried, with 28 votes in favour and 35 opposed.

The Principal asked if there were comments or questions surrounding the other committees in the Report that had not been disputed. There being none, the Principal called for a vote on the Report as a whole, which was carried.

I. For Approval by Senate

Item 1, Appointments to Senate Standing Committees as circulated in D08-60 were approved. (New appointments underlined below; asterisk indicates reappointment.)

Academic Policy Committee Membership (3-year renewable terms)

The Provost, Chair [Professor Anthony C. Masi]
The Deputy Provost [Professor Morton Mendelson]
The Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) or delegate [Professor Rima Rozen]
The Trenholme Director of Libraries [Ms. Janine Schmidt]
The Associate Provost (Graduate Education) and Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies [Professor Martin Kreiswirth]
The Director, Teaching and Learning Services [Professor Cynthia Weston]
The Sub-Committee Chairs

Professor William Hendershot (Agricultural and Environmental Sciences) – 2012*

Professor Wendy Thomson (Arts) – 2012

Professor Vihang Errunza (Management) – 2010

Professor Paul Holland (Medicine) – 2010

Professor Douglas Farrow (Religious Studies) - 2010

Professor William Caplin (Music) – 2010

Professor Gregory Brown (Science) – 2011

Professor Dennis Klinck (Law) - 2011

Professor Moshe Szyf (Medicine) – 2011

Professor Mari Kaartinen (Dentistry) – 2011

Professor Julie Cote (Education) – 2011

Professor Jorge Angeles (Engineering) – 2011

Ms. Sally McDougall (Board of Governors) – 2010

Five student members: TBA (three undergraduate, one graduate, one from Macdonald Campus)

Ms. Helen Richard, secretary

Committee on Student Discipline Membership (3-year renewable terms)

Professor Richard Leask (Engineering) – 2012* (Chair)*

Professor Rhonda Amsel (Science) – 2012* (Vice-Chair)

The Dean of Students [Professor Jane Everett]

The Associate Dean of Students [Professor Linda Jacobs Starkey]

Six other members of the academic staff:

Professor Jeffrey Derevensky (Education) – 2012

Ms. Cynthia Leive (Libraries) – 2012*

Professor Jim Brawer (Medicine) – 2012

Professor Don Kramer (Science) – 2010

Professor Antonia Arnaert (Nursing) – 2010

Professor Christopher Buddle (Agricultural and Environmental Sciences) – 2011

Two assessors, selected from the teaching staff of the Faculty of Law:
Professor Vrinda Narain – Assessor – 2012
Professor Richard Janda – Assessor – 2010

Eight student members: TBA (four undergraduate, two graduate, one from Macdonald Campus, one from Continuing Education)

Secretary: Edith Breiner

Committee on Student Grievances
Membership (3-year renewable terms)

Professor Spencer Boudreau (Education), Chair – 2011
Professor Nathan Friedman (Science) – 2012*
Professor Elizabeth Elbourne (Arts) – 2010
Professor Richard Chromik – 2012 (Engineering)
Professor Bruce Minorgan (Music) – 2011

Two assessors, selected from the teaching staff of the Faculty of Law:
Professor Wendy Adams (Law) – Assessor – 2010* (one-year term)
Professor Alana Klein (Law) – Assessor – 2012

Four student members: TBA (two undergraduate, two graduate)

Ms. Patricia Wood, secretary

Appeal Committee for Student Discipline and Grievances
Membership (3-year renewable terms)

Professor Grazyna Wilczek (Science) – 2011 (Chair)
Professor Jim Fyles (FAES) – 2012 – consent pending
Professor Alfred Jaeger (Management) – 2012
Professor Mihriban Pekguleryuz (Engineering) – 2010
Professor Heather Goad (Arts) - 2010

Four student members: TBA (two undergraduate, two graduate)

Ms. Patricia Wood, secretary

Advisory Council on the Charter of Students' Rights
Membership (2-year renewable terms)

Professor Frank Mucciardi (Engineering), Chair – 2010
Professor Robert Brandenberger (Science) – 2011
Professor Adrienne Hurley (Arts) – 2011
Mr. Joseph Hafner (Libraries) – 2010

Two student members: TBA (one undergraduate, one graduate)

**University Appeals Committee
(three-year terms ending March 31)**

Professor David G. Cooper (Engineering) – 2012*

Professor Kathleen Cullen (Medicine) – 2012

Professor Daniel Jutras (Law) – 2010

Professor Katrine Stewart (Agricultural & Environmental Sciences) - 2010

Professor Oliver T. Coomes (Science) - 2011

Professor John Zucchi (Arts) - 2011

**Committee on Staff Grievances and Disciplinary Procedures
(three-year terms ending August 31)**

Professor Henrietta Galiana (Medicine) – 2012* (Chair)*

Me. Daniel Boyer (Libraries) – 2012

Professor Christopher Green (Arts) – 2010

Professor Niky Kamran (Science) – 2010 (Vice-Chair)

Professor Robyn Tamblyn (Medicine) – 2010

Professor Lynn Butler-Kisber (Education) – 2011

Professor Richard Munz (Engineering) - 2011

Professor Kenneth Ragan (Science) – 2011

Item 2, Appointments to Committees Arising from University Regulations as circulated in D08-60 were approved. (New appointments underlined below; asterisk indicates reappointment.)

Statutory Selection Committees

a) For a Professor in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Professor Frank Ferrie (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

Professor David Plant (Electrical and Computer Engineering) **[alternate]**

Professor Alan Evans (Neurology and Neurosurgery)

Professor Bruce Pike (Neurology and Neurosurgery) **[alternate]**

b) For a Professor in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Professor David Lowther (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

Professor Peter Caines (Electrical and Computer Engineering) **[alternate]**

Professor Russell Davidson (Economics)

Professor Christopher Green (Economics) **[alternate]**

**University Tenure Committees for the Faculties
Senate lists 2009-2010
(2-year renewable terms)**

Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

Chair

Dean Chandra Madramootoo

Professor Vijaya Raghavan (Alternate Chair)

Senate

Professor Barbara Hales (Medicine/Pharmacology and Therapeutics) – 2010

Professor Emine Sarigollu (Management) – 2010

Professor John Galaty (Arts/Anthropology) – 2010

Professor David Harpp (Science/Chemistry) – 2011

Professor Richard J. Munz (Engineering/Chemical Engineering) – 2011

Professor Cynthia Weston (Education/Educational and Counselling Psychology) – 2011

Professor Ridha Joober (Medicine/Psychiatry) – 2011

Professor Maurice Boutin (Religious Studies) – 2011

Professor Michel Lapointe (Science/Geography) – 2011 – consent pending

Faculty of Education

Chair

Dean Helene Perrault

Professor Gregory Reid (Alternate Chair)

Professor Kevin McDonough (Alternate Chair)

Senate

Professor Laurent Mydlarski (Engineering/Mechanical Engineering) – 2010

Professor Linda Wykes (FAES/Dietetics and Human Nutrition) – 2010

Professor Suzanne Morton (Arts/History) – 2010

Professor Shanling Li (Management) – 2010

Professor James Coulton (Medicine/Microbiology and Immunology) – 2010

Professor Bruce Pike (Medicine/Neurology and Neurosurgery) – 2011

Professor Vincent Chu (Engineering/Civil Engineering and Applied Mechanics) – 2011 – consent pending

Professor Kaleem Siddiqi (Science/Computer Science) – 2011

Professor Don Francis (Science/Earth and Planetary Sciences) – 2010 (one-year term)

Faculty of Engineering

Chair

Dean Christophe Pierre

Professor Rosaire Mongrain (Alternate Chair)

Professor Francisco Galiana (Alternate Chair)

Senate

Professor Jorge Vinals (Science/Physics) – 2010

Professor Steven Jordan (Education/Integrated Studies in Education) – 2010

Professor Robyn Tamblyn (Medicine/Medicine) – 2010

Professor Peter Brown (Science/Geography) – 2011

Professor Jenny Hunt (Arts/Economics) – 2011

Professor Sabah Hussain (Medicine/RVH) – 2011

Professor Suha Jabaji (FAES/Plant Science) – 2011

Professor Hans Beck (Arts/History) – 2011

Professor Suzelle Barrington (FAES/Bioresource Engineering) – 2011

Faculty of Medicine

Chair

Dean Richard I. Levin

Professor Jeffrey Barkun (Alternate Chair)

Senate

Professor Caroline Palmer (Science/Psychology) – 2010

Professor Siegfried Hekimi (Science/Biology) – 2010

Professor James Fyles (FAES/Natural Resource Sciences) – 2010

Professor Stephen Yue (Engineering/Mining, Metals, and Materials Engineering) – 2011

Professor David Brackett (Music/Music Research) – 2011

Professor Lawrence Chen (Engineering/Electrical and Computer Engineering) – 2011

Professor Laila Parsons (Arts/History) – 2011

Professor Catherine Walsh (Law) – 2011

Professor Morty Yalovsky (Management) – 2011

University Tenure Committee for Recruitment

Membership (3-year terms commencing September 1)

Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

Professor Hosahalli Ramaswamy (Food Science and Agricultural Chemistry) – 2010

Professor Timothy Geary (Parasitology) **[alternate]** – 2010

Faculty of Arts

Professor Elizabeth Gidengil (Political Science) – 2011

Professor Robin Yates (East Asian Studies) **[alternate]** – 2011

Faculty of Dentistry

Professor Gary Bennett - 2011

Professor Ferdando Cevero **[alternate]** – 2011

Faculty of Education

Professor Theodore Milner (Kinesiology and Physical Education) - 2011

Professor Andrew Large (Library and Information Studies) **[alternate]** - 2011

Faculty of Engineering

Professor Richard Munz (Chemical Engineering) - 2011

Professor Jorge Angeles (Mechanical Engineering) **[alternate]** - 2011

Faculty of Law

Professor François Crepeau - 2011

Professor Margaret Somerville **[alternate]** - 2010

Desautels Faculty of Management

Professor Samer Faraj - 2011

Professor Paola Perez-Aleman **[alternate]** – 2012

Faculty of Medicine

Professor David Goltzman (Medicine) - 2011

Professor James G. Martin (Medicine) **[alternate]** - 2011

Schulich School of Music

Professor Julie Cumming (Music Research) – 2010 (one-year term)

Professor Wieslaw Woszczyk (Music Research) **[alternate]** - 2011

Faculty of Religious Studies

Professor Katherine Young - 2010

Professor Maurice Boutin **[alternate]** - 2010

Faculty of Science

Professor David Ronis (Chemistry) - 2010

Professor Nancy Ross (Geography) **[alternate]** – 2012

University Libraries

Ms. Daniel Boyer (Nahum Gelber Law Library) - 2010

Mr. Louis Houle (Schulich Library of Science and Engineering) **[alternate]** – 2010

Ms. Anne-Marie Bruneau, secretary

2.2 Senate Review Report

As agreed, Senate moved into Committee of the Whole for discussion of the Senate Review Report (D08-60, 2.2). Notes for the Committee of the Whole are attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

3. Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement (D08-61)

Dean Chandra Madramootoo moved into the Chair while the Principal presented on the subject of the Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement (D08-61). The Principal explained that the Task Force was being proposed in the spirit of striving for continual improvement, that she would appoint the membership, and that there would be many opportunities for members of the McGill community to make representations to the Task Force.

In response to a question from Mr Richard regarding whether McGill had received the impression from the Quebec government that it was not performing in the area of cultural diversity, the Principal replied that this was not the case.

Professor Sieber asked whether community engagement and excellence could be interpreted as moving areas traditionally thought of as service into research, to which the Principal replied that the Task Force could consider such ideas.

Professor Grutter asked what was meant by diversity, how would this be measured without more information from students and staff that might not be available, and what the logic was for targeting diversity when the University is already very diverse. The Principal replied that the University could ask the community questions it thinks are important and give people the opportunity of whether to respond or not, and that diversity (broadly interpreted) was being looked at because although the University has much to celebrate in this area, it could do more.

Professor Wade noted this would be an opportunity to examine the issues campus-wide, including Macdonald, make it an island-wide engagement. The Principal agreed, and remarked

that the Task Force could also examine how studying at McGill could be a Quebec experience for international students.

In response to Professor Zorychta noting that some US universities had created a Vice-Principal for Equity and Diversity, the Principal replied that a recommendation like that could potentially emerge from the Task Force.

Mr Burgoyne expressed satisfaction with the prominence given to graduate supervision in working group 3. He suggested that working groups 3a and 3b were less focused than the others, and recommended merging the first and last points, and second and fourth points, of working group 3a. For working group 3b, he recommended removing the seventh point and incorporating its content into the other points, and moving the last point to working group 1a.

In response to a question from Professor Pেকেles regarding the possible cost of combining diversity and community engagement being that specifics might be lost in one or the other, the Principal acknowledged that this was a risk, but hoped that one could play into the other in each direction, creating new momentum and synergies. She also expressed concern that if both areas were not considered, one might be overlooked and not receive the attention it deserved.

The Principal then returned to the Chair.

4. Report on Research Performance (D08-62)

The Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) presented the Report on Research Performance (D08-62). Vice-Principal Thérien stressed four key messages for the University arising from the Report: we can take pride in the successes while acknowledging there are difficulties that need to be faced; competitive funding is fundamental; if we do not compete we cannot win; and researchers have a role to play in the prosperity agenda for the country for the next generation.

Professor Sieber suggested that the number of CFI applications would increase if people were employed specifically to look after the budgets attached to those awards, and recommended the creation of McGill Awards for Team Leadership to recognise achievements in that area.

Professor Gehr asked whether support would be provided by RGO or GPSO to those whose NSERC grants had been lost or substantially reduced in the last round so that they could challenge the results, and whether Vice-Principal Thérien would be taking up the issue with NSERC. Vice-Principal Thérien replied that the new process implemented by NSERC was considered by most to be a step towards increased competitiveness and excellence, even if this resulted in a reduced success rate nationally and at McGill. He supported the notion of peer review, while noting that NSERC was sending a signal that researchers should not be complacent about continual renewal of their grants and should be looking to diversify the income sources to fund their research. However, Vice-Principal Thérien also noted that he was working with GPSO to identify where help could be given to graduate students whose funding was affected by the situation. He also noted there was no right of appeal to the NSERC decisions unless a clear procedural flaw could be demonstrated, and suggested a meeting with those professors adversely affected by the changes to discuss the details and look at support needs arising.

Professor Caplan asked whether a report could be developed that linked research performance with student-teacher interaction and student life and learning issues to provide a more organic

picture for faculty members and to see whether increased activity in one area produces a corresponding decrease in another. The Principal replied that she would undertake with the Provost, Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) and Deputy Provost to consider how best to address the issue in the fall.

5. Student Services Fee Schedule 2009-2010 (D08-63)

6. Athletics Fee 2009-2010 (D08-64)

The Deputy Provost presented the Student Services Fee Schedule 2009-2010 (D08-63) and the Athletics Fee 2009-2010 (D08-64), for the information of Senate. Deputy Provost Mendelson explained that because the fee increases were not approved in the Winter 2009 PGSS referendum, graduate fees would remain at the 2008-2009 level, but there would be diminution of some services and/or charges for some services for graduate students. In response to a question from Ms Labban regarding the changes that might occur in the Fall for graduate students, the Deputy Provost replied that this would be discussed at a meeting with the PGSS next week.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Committee of the Whole
Senate Review Report

Chair: Principal Heather Munroe-Blum

The Secretary-General introduced the Senate Review Report (D08-60, 2.2), thanking colleagues on the various committees and members of the Senate Review Working Group (“Review Group”) for their work.

Professor GowriSankaran suggested that the phrasing of the draft committee regulations, section 7.4 (committee terms shall be for two-year terms, renewable) be reviewed with reference to the Senate Steering Committee (“Steering”) and Senate Nominating Committee (“Nominating”), and section 7.6 be amended to remove reference to election of ex officio members to Steering. Regarding point 2 on p.25, he noted that Nominating does not recommend the Steering members to Senate. Professor GowriSankaran also commented that the elected members of Senate should form the majority of members of Nominating.

In response to Mr Hobbins questioning the reduction of elected staff members in Nominating from ten to six and their relative proportion to administrators (also commented upon by Professor Moore), the Secretary-General replied that this had been discussed the previous day at a special meeting of Nominating, where it had been agreed to propose the revised number of eight elected staff members. She added that the motivation behind the reduction was to signify that other committees should look at their size and consider reductions in order to improve efficiency. Professor Saroyan noted that a reduction in the number of deans to four was also discussed at the Nominating meeting.

Professor Hendren expressed the view of the Science senators that parity was important for all committees, and suggested including a table for each committee showing the number of academics, students and administrators before and after the proposed changes, with percentage changes in each category, to provide a picture of the overall committee proportions. The Secretary-General expressed concern with this approach, noting that the Review Group had not favoured a one-size-fits-all perspective to the Review – instead, the Review Group had looked at the unique purpose of each committee.

Professor Wade noted that a student from the Macdonald campus had been removed from the Committee on Physical Development (“CPD”), and suggested one be included in the Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs (“CESA”).

Professor Quaroni expressed concerns regarding the decanal composition of CESA if the deans of the largest faculties were not included.

Professor Moore noted that the Research Policy Committee (“RPC”) was also referred to as a subcommittee and this terminology should be made consistent in the document. He also expressed concern as to where technology transfer issues would be dealt with if the Committee on Technology Transfer (“CTT”) was dissolved and thought the role of RPC should be clarified. The Secretary-General replied that RPC was currently an advisory body to the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) that had no reporting relationship to APC and the intention was to restore this relationship via the Research Policy Subcommittee.

Professor Harpp commented that RPC was too important a body to be a subcommittee of APC, to which the Provost replied that it was not the role of a Senate committee to be tied down with administrative advisory functions – the role of the RPC subcommittee would be to bring policy matters forward to Senate.

Professor Saroyan asked for clarification of the roles of the Review Group and Nominating regarding making recommendations for dissolution of committees and amending their mandates, and the role of the Committee on the Rights of Senate (“CRS”) relating to Nominating. The Provost replied that the purview of the Review Group was to make recommendations that would be discussed at Senate, revised based on feedback received and then brought back to be considered for approval.

The Secretary-General commented that Senate has a history of creating ad hoc committees to study a specific matter, which is how Senate came to have 21 committees in 2007, many of which were not meeting. The right of senators to propose the creation of new committees, either in writing or on the floor of Senate, has been retained in the document, with Nominating as the vehicle to consider those proposals, but the final decision on those proposals rests with Senate.

In response to a question from Professor Zorychta as to whether the CRS had a role to play in looking at what impact the changes would have on the kinds of matters that would be brought to Senate in the future, the Secretary-General noted that CRS had been created out of specific historical moments in the 1970s and 1980s relating to concerns about unruly student behaviour and breaches of confidentiality. The CRS has been engaged in reviewing their own terms of reference and will be involved in the work on Senate regulations.

Mr Ling suggested that the powers of SCPD were being reduced and proposed that a Senate committee on the environment be created that would report directly to Senate and reflect the importance of environmental concerns. Associate Vice-Principal Nicell expressed surprise that the revised mandate of SCPD could be viewed as a loss of power. Noting that the terms originated in the 1970s and did not reflect the actual discussions of SCPD, the new mandate and composition would strengthen its powers and focus the conversations on the Master Plan and thematic priorities of the University. He added that the environment and sustainability permeates SCPD matters, and support would continue for the existing Subcommittee on the Environment. Dean McLean stated that the changes would reinvigorate SCPD and agreed that the environment was already a central concern. Ms Wilkinson noted that the principles of sustainability go beyond the matters considered by SCPD and encouraged Senate to think more widely about how sustainability issues can be applied.

Mr Richard noted that CRS will continue to reflect on its role over the summer and requested feedback from Senate at the next meeting on its new draft terms of reference to help CRS define its role and direction.

Mr Luther noted that if the CTT was dissolved, undergraduate student representation on those issues would be lost, and suggested the addition of an undergraduate student representative to the RPC.

In response to a question from Professor Wade regarding whether an individual “or delegate” representative to a committee meant an ad hoc delegate or a delegate for a complete term, the Secretary-General replied that this would be looked at and clarified in the draft regulations.

Dean Kasirer noted that Senate cannot simply create a committee that considers matters not within Senate's authority under the *Statutes* and for this reason spoke in favour of the dissolution of the Committee on Ancillary Services ("CAS"). He also wondered whether it was appropriate or necessary for the Faculty of Law to have an ex officio representative on the CRS, to which Professor Harpp replied that CRS needs legal assistance and hoped it would be maintained.

Mr Neilson recognised that it made sense to combine the University Admissions Committee and the Scholarships and Student Aid Committee, but expressed concern (echoed by Professor GowriSankaran) that by also including the Committee on Student Affairs, the workload of the new CESA would be too great and could lead it to become more reactive rather than proactive.

Ms Dourley expressed concern about the dissolution of the CAS and wondered what forum would exist for students to provide input on subjects such as food services and provision of course packs. Deputy Provost Mendelson replied that CAS was originally created to address food issues, which will soon be handled by Dining Services, which has a new director who is canvassing student opinion and reports to the Deputy Provost. He added that the Committee on Student Services, Athletics Council, Residents Council, and IT Advisory were all in place to ensure student representation in other areas.

Professor GowriSankaran noted that Steering was sometimes called upon to make sensitive, confidential decisions and remarked that the document does not make provision for that.

Professor Blackett noted that CRS considered whether it should become an ad hoc committee and decided that it should be regarded as a kind of insurance policy, to exist as a location for difficult questions to be discussed and then brought back to Senate.

Professor Covo noted that the new terms of SCPD gave the committee an opportunity to redefine itself and become realigned with the priorities of Senate.

The Principal thanked senators for their contributions to the discussion.