

McGILL UNIVERSITY

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

PRESENT	Harpp, David	Pekeles, Gary
Allison, Paul	Hashimoto, Kyoko	Perrault, Hélène
Barney, Darin	Hebert, Johanne	Peterson, Kathryn
Blachford, Gregg	Hendren, Laurie	Pierre, Christophe
Boss, Valentin	Hobbins, Joan	Piper, Andrew
Bray, Dorothy	Hepburn, Allan	Potter, Judith
Brophy, James	Janda, Richard	Richard, Marc
Caplan, Eric	Johnson, Juliet	Robaire, Bernard
Ciobanu, George	Jordan, Steven	Roy, François
Covo, David	Jutras, Daniel	Saroyan, Alenoush
Dooley, Rebecca	Kirby, Torrance	Schmidt, Janine
Doucette, Elaine	Kreiswirth, Martin	Shaughnessy, Honora
Drouillard, Jérémie	Kurien, John	Sieber, Renee
Etemad, Hamid	Lasko, Paul	Simeone, Daniel
Everett, Jane	Low, Bronwen	Todd, Peter
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Fran	Lowther, David	Van Eyk, Helen
Farid, Doaa	Madramootoo, Chandra	Wade, Kevin
Flanders, Kappy	Manfredi, Christopher	Weinstein, Marc
Fried, Gerald	Marshall, David	Lydia White
Gonnerman, Laura	Masi, Anthony	Wolf, Nick
GowriSankaran, Kohur	McLean, Don	Zhang, Ji
Grant, Martin	Mendelson, Morton	Zorychta, Edith
Grütter, Peter	Munroe-Blum, Heather	Strople, Stephen
Gulamhussein, Faizel	Neilson, Ivan	(<i>Secretary</i>)
Halavrezos, Alexandros	Ngadi, Michael	

REGRETS: Ellen Aitken, Mostafa Altalibi, Gillian Bartlett-Esquillant, Adelle Blackett, Benoit Boulet, Ian Butler, Renzo Cecere, Roshi Chadha, Claudio Cuello, Alexander DeGuise, Brian Driscoll, Dahlia El Shafie, Jan Ericsson, Keith Franklin, Engelbert Gayagoy, Ashraf Ismail, Alexandra Kindlat, Richard Leask, Richard Levin, Andrew Ling, James G. Martin, Manosij Majumdar, Mitran Mehta, Timothy Moore, Robert Rabinovitch, Laurie Snider, Arnold Steinberg, Denis Thérien, Hana Thomas, Ann Vroom, Joel Wapnick, Christina Wolfson, Sarah Woolf.

The Chair opened the meeting by reminding all present that proceedings of Senate shall not be recorded. It had come to her attention that the discussion regarding the proposed Policy on the Conduct of Research had been recorded and posted on the internet by Demilitarize McGill. Following discussions at Senate Steering, the Secretary-General was to take steps to have the posting taken down. The Chair asked that if there were any people present that represent Demilitarize McGill, they would be serving their cause best by taking the posting down themselves. She explained that the posting is especially disturbing because recording Senate proceedings hampers the ability of Senators to engage in open and free debate. She asked that everyone respect the rules of Senate, which facilitate the free functioning of this important academic governance body.

SECTION I

1. Report of the Steering Committee

The report of the Steering Committee (09-10:5) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 4, 2009 were approved.

Item 2. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate granted speaking rights to Professor William Foster for item IIB2.1 (Review/Revision of the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment, and Discrimination Prohibited by Law) and item IIB2.4 (Amendment to Regulations Regarding Sabbatical Salaries), to Ms. Sylvia Franke for item IIB2.2 (Responsible Use of IT Resources Policy), and to Professor Jim Nicell for item IA1 (Question re: University Security) and IIB1.1 (Master Plan Report).

Item 3. Confidential Session. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into Confidential Session for consideration of item IIB1.1 (Master Plan Report, D09-29) and item IIB1.2 (Presentation on Budget Considerations, D09-28).

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair noted that item IIA3, the question regarding Graduate Students had been withdrawn and item IIB3.4 should be titled *Amendment to Regulations Regarding Sabbatical Leave*.

Senator Harpp asked that item IIB3.4 be moved ahead of item IIB3.1 to ensure that it was discussed fully.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was approved with the amendment proposed by Senator Harpp.

5. Chair's Remarks

The Chair opened her remarks, confirming that the Fall Convocation was a success. Over 800 students graduated during two ceremonies held at Place des Arts, which also included the installation of McGill's 18th Chancellor Arnold Steinberg, and the conferral of honorary degrees upon former Chancellor, Richard Pound and CBC's Eleanor Wachtel.

The Chair moved on to speak about the *McLean's Magazine* ranking of Canadian universities. McGill ranked first in the country for the fifth year in a row among medical and graduate student intensive universities. McGill has students with the highest average entrance grade point averages and the highest proportion of students that graduate. Furthermore, McGill was first in student awards for the 11th consecutive year and the top performer for the number and average size of social sciences and humanities grants per full-time faculty. In addition, McGill was not far behind in grants per full-time faculty in the other two disciplinary categories. She asserted that the frequency of McGill's top ranking and methodology, which uses only publically available data, affords the study some credibility. She thanked McGill's academic community for its important contributions to the University's top ranking.

The Chair said that four Canada Excellence Research Chairs (CERC) applications have been submitted in the areas of Alzheimer's, green chemistry, broadband communications, and pain. In addition, Minister Gignac, the Ministre du développement économique, de l'innovation et de l'exportation of Quebec committed \$10,000,000 in matching funding for infrastructure improvements related to the successful CERCs.

The Chair reminded Senate of the December 4, 2009 deadline for submissions to decanal advisories. She thanked those that made submissions to the advisories for the Provost and Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations).

The Chair stated that the Principal's Task Force on Excellence, Diversity, and Community engagement is well underway. Each of the working groups has met at least once and a call for submissions, urging members of the community to submit suggestions for fostering excellence, diversity and community engagement, has been sent. The deadline for submissions is January 8, 2010 and further information can be found on the Task Force website via the Principal's website.

The Chair told Senate that the Royal Society of Canada inducted Dr. Allan Sniderman of the Department of Cardiology, Professor Brian Reed of the School of Computer Science, and Professor Vincent Giguère of the Goodman Cancer Centre as fellows at its annual gala on November 24, 2009. In addition, Professor Brian Alters, the Director of the Tomlinson Project in University Level Science Education, won the 2009 McNeil Medal for the Public Awareness of Science. Furthermore, Professor Rod MacDonald, F.R. Scott Chair in Constitutional Law and Former Dean of Law, was inducted as President of the Royal Society of Canada, and Professor Graham Bell is the Chair of Academy III of the Academy of Sciences.

The Chair noted past tensions around the Canadian Council of the Academies (CCA), which was promoted as a body that would bring coherence, profile and impact to the work of the academies. She said that at recent meetings there was progress towards cooperation and synergy between the

academies and the CCA in developing a coherent approach for promoting scholarship in Canadian science and engineering, nationally and internationally.

On invitation of the Chair, the Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) spoke about Coursepacks. He noted that only 32% of coursepacks had been submitted by the November 11th deadline. At December 2nd only 2/3 of the anticipated coursepack have been submitted, and he requested that professors submit their coursepacks as soon as possible to be processed over the coming weeks. He noted that University Services is trying to minimize the possibility of running 24 hour shifts through the Christmas period in order to deliver the coursepacks on time to students.

The Chair turned to the upcoming Federal budget, stating that the G13 and Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada are working to promote a reinvestment in the granting councils and post-graduate studies. Also, the G13, the presidents of the granting councils, and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada are working to secure the full research costs, often termed indirect costs, from the federal government.

Provincially, the Governance Bill is expected to go to second reading in late February with a clause by clause consideration in March. The Conférence des recteurs et des principaux des universités du Québec (CREPUQ) is working to ensure that the legislation is produced in a final form that all universities can live with it.

The chair spoke about Bill 53, which is concerned with accreditation of professional foreign workers trained outside of Canada. She explained that the tension in regard to the Bill is not the accreditation of foreign workers, but the attempt to legislate criteria for who are accepted as students for accreditation. There is a small group of the vice-rectors, vice-principals, and the Provost who are negotiating on behalf of CREPUQ with the Ministry of Justice to ensure the legislation does not challenge academic freedom.

Minister Gignac has a council underway to advance through policies and programs the innovation strategy for Quebec. Both McGill and CREPUQ have made representation to that council.

The Chair mentioned the success of the Remembrance Day event, making special note of Julie Timmons contribution to the organization of the event. Also, the Sustainability Projects Fund passed with 79% of student voters on the downtown campus voting. Five thousand three hundred students voted, the second-highest total in the Students' Society of McGill University's history.

The Chair congratulated Dr. Nahum Sonenberg, James McGill Professor in Biochemistry, on being named researcher of the year for biomedical and clinical research by the Canadian Institute of Health Research; Professor Hans Larson who discovered, along with Paul Sereno and his team, the fossils of five ancient crocodiles; and PhD student Karron James on being named the Liz Paterson International student of the Year by the Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Senator Janda expressed concern over the growth of targeted research within the granting councils, which is a move away from the straight peer reviewed model. In particular, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada announced its new strategy on partnerships in innovation that includes a special grant to build industry ties for company specific projects. At the same time the Canadian Institute for Health Research added a Vice-President of Pfizer to its council. Senator Janda asked that we maintain the efforts to improve funding by granting councils with the focus on peer review. In addition, he asked if Senate should discuss the future of granting councils.

The Chair agreed that the issue should be brought forward in the New Year. She said that this issue raises questions about how the proportion of funding directed through the councils has changed from the late nineties to the last decade. In addition, the Chair stated that work could be done to look at the practices of countries with which we compete and collaborate in science and scholarship. On a positive note, the state of the nation report that came out of the Science, Technology and Innovation Council affirmed that universities were ensuring the quality of scholarship and research, and ensuring that there would be societal benefits of that work, but that there has been a lack of receptor capacity in Canada. She stated that this may be a good Joint Board-Senate theme for next year.

Senator Pেকেles asked the Chair about the processes for measuring progress for strategic priorities over the coming year. The Chair replied that McGill has previously not had an annual report on performance according to priorities. While there are many ways to measure performance, there are a set of indicators that will report on many different areas from the quality and progress of students and professors. The University is using a framework at the level of the senior administration that is tied to the six over-arching priorities to create key performance indicators. A preview of the key performance indicators has been presented to the Board of Governors and will be presented to Senate once it has been discussed by the deans, the Provost, the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations), and the Principal. Those performance indicators will then constitute a portion of the Principal's Annual Report. It will become the University Accountability Report to the Board of Governors and act as a requirement for the Bill on governance.

Senator Pেকেles said that the process is very important because often what the University focuses on can be influenced by what is measured. He said that the performance indicators are not merely a scorecard, but have substantive import that needs to be discussed at Senate. The Chair agreed that discussion should take place.

Senator Saroyan asked that when the indicators are presented, she say something about the process for arriving at the set of indicators. The Principal agreed to do so.

SECTION II

PART A – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question Regarding Nomenclature

On invitation of the Chair, Senator Dooley asked the following relating to nomenclature:

In a meeting of Senate on January 21st, 2009, the issue of ambiguity in terms used to label documents produced by the University was raised, with specific concern for the terms “regulation,” “policy,” “procedure” and “guideline”.

In that same meeting of Senate, The Associate Provost (Policies and Procedures) and the Secretary-General committed to “undertake a review of existing policies, procedures, regulations, guidelines and similar documents with the objective of proposing definitions for a McGill “nomenclature” of terms, and try to “clean-up” this terminology.”

A clear methodology to the naming of our documents is essential to Senate’s ability to carry out its responsibilities.

1. What progress has been made on developing this “nomenclature” of terms?
2. Once developed will these definitions and the subsequent name changes that will result in documents previously approved by Senate come to Senate for approval?

The Chair invited the Secretary-General to answer.

The Secretary-General indicated that he has only recently become aware of this file and that he would be trying to ascertain what previous steps had been made to date. He would then take the appropriate steps to complete the study and present a report to Senate by May 2010.

2. Question Regarding University Security

On invitation of the Chair, Senator GowriSankaran asked the following relating to University Security:

At the last meeting of Senate the Principal made a brief mention of an ‘incident’ on the campus and hailed the cooperation between the City Police and our Security regarding this incident. Later, I saw in campus papers mention of this incident taking place in the building (Burnside Hall) which houses in particular my Department. However, it was not until very recently that I came across one of the victims of the incident who happens to be a full professor in my Department and had the opportunity to learn from him more complete details of the incident: Two hooded men walked into the basement of BH and demanded and took laptops from several present there apparently threatening them with a gun. Until now, I understand very few in the building including key personnel know much about this incident. As a matter of fact there seems to be a general blackout on information regarding this incident. While I understand the importance of not creating panic among the students and the occupants of the building, I believe that it is extremely important to address some of the security issues arising from this incident.

First of all let me bring to the attention of all Senators that the basement of Burnside Hall is found to be an attractive place by a large number of students and virtually most of the time the place is full of students and also some staff members. Science and Arts & Science students have access to the space even during silent hours. The basement also houses the offices of the Science Undergraduate Society (SUS) and Society of Undergraduate Mathematics Students (SUMS). It appears prudent that the Administration should brief some of the key personnel which could include senior members or Chairs/Directors of departments housed in the building and the Presidents of SUS and SUMS of the incident and give them some practical training to deal with any such emergency. With this in mind my questions to Senate are the following.

1. Will the University look at the possibility of briefing key users of the building of the incident and give them some training on how to deal with such situations?
2. Will the University look into the possibility of installing panic buttons connected to the University Security at key locations of the building?
3. Will the University consider installing security cameras at key locations in the Burnside basement and ground floor to further the safety of the large number of students who use the building and staff who work there?

The Chair invited the Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) to answer.

The Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) answered as follows:

“It is our normal practice to publicize information about incidents that we feel the whole community should know about and to issue safety warnings, as appropriate.

In response to this incident in Burnside Hall, a security announcement was posted on the McGill’s homepage on November 3 (http://www.mcgill.ca/channels/announcements/item/?item_id=111875), within 24 hours of the event. This was not an event for which we would normally send out a mass email.

1. Will the University look at the possibility of briefing key users of the building of the incident and give them some training on how to deal with such situations?

We have various resources, including training, available to the McGill community to prepare them for incidents of this nature.

Although this particular incident in Burnside Hall was in no way a Hostile Intruder situation, the Emergency Guide and Hostile Intruder Protocol, which are available online (<http://www.mcgill.ca/safety/emergencymanagement/>) and in printed brochures, clearly outline the steps that individuals should take in case they are involved in a hostile intruder situation or other situations.

We also have a comprehensive Hostile Intruder presentation that illustrates various scenarios of such an incident, and teaches the audience how to react. We would be happy to facilitate this presentation upon request.

We would welcome the opportunity to prepare an information session for the individuals affected by this incident and any others from Burnside Hall wishing to learn more about it. Training would also include preventive measures (e.g. STOP laptop prevention program), individuals' options in incidents of this nature, and McGill Security's procedures.

To inform building occupants of this information session, we will send an email to the building director outlining the content of the presentation (including links to the various resources we offer online) and a link to the HR Staff Development website where interested individuals will be able to register.

2. Will the University look into the possibility of installing panic buttons connected to the University Security at key locations of the building?

When activated, panic buttons send a silent signal to campus emergency personnel. Once alerted, emergency staff will go to the area from where the emergency signal was sent. Panic buttons are reserved for special conditions that warrant them and will be installed in selected locations with the guidance of Security Services personnel.

Please note that panic buttons are a poor substitute for a telephone call to 911 or McGill Security (3000 downtown or 7777 on the Macdonald Campus), because telephone conversations can be used to provide details about the event to help us respond appropriately, whereas panic buttons are limited to sending unspecified alert notices.

3. Will the University consider installing security cameras at key locations in the Burnside basement and ground floor to further the safety of the large number of students who use the building and staff who work there?

At present, we have 775 cameras operating across campus. These cameras have a somewhat limited preventative function and are not used to respond to events as they occur since they cannot each be constantly monitored by staff. They are mostly used after an incident to support an investigation.

In the case of Burnside Hall, this facility is already equipped with cameras, and the recordings relevant to the incident have been handed over to police. The Security Services team will use this incident in Burnside Hall as an opportunity to arrange for an audit of the building by one of our security professionals. The audit will include an evaluation of the necessity for increasing the numbers of cameras in the building, if major surveillance gaps are identified.

If you have questions or concerns about any incident whatsoever, please don't hesitate to call Security Services, University Safety or me. The safety of our community members is our number one priority.

Senator GowriSankaran asked if the Chairs, the Directors, the Science Undergraduate Society (SUS), and the Society of Undergraduate Mathematics Students (SUMS) could be informed of the available training.

The Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) answered that steps have been taken to inform the community of the training, including management and building directors, but he would do it again.

Senator Marshall asked under what circumstances the McGill Alert System would be used. The Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) answered that the system would be used under very limited conditions. This situation was not appropriate because it did not require a mass mobilization of the University community. In this case, the police and security services were on site within three minutes and it was felt that that was the appropriate response because the situation was localized. The Alert System is used only when the entire community needs to be notified of such things as hostile intruders.

Senator Marshall asked if the intruders had been caught or if they still pose a risk to students and staff. The Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) answered that they did not have any information other than the video of the incident is in police hands.

Finally, the Chair asked the Provost to speak concerning the departure of Mrs. Janine Schmidt (Trenholme Director of Libraries). The Provost informed Senate that Mrs. Janine Schmidt would be leaving McGill and thanked her for her excellent service, which included the modernization of the libraries, increasing their holdings, working on internal and external communications, and enhancing the focus on clients and users. From the beginning she has worked to strengthen the importance of the Library as a strategic player in the University, in contrast to its perceived identity as merely a cost centre. She has created new spaces and services and fixed services that were previously broken. Janine Schmidt has shown leadership and vision through improving relationships between Information Technology, Learning Services, and the Library. It is with great regret that McGill is losing such a good and valuable colleague.

Senator Gulamhussein expressed student appreciation for the work that Mrs. Schmidt has done, especially the distribution of online coursepacks.

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

1. Confidential Session

Senate moved into confidential session to discuss the Master Plan Report (D09-29) and the Presentation on Budget Considerations (D09-28) (this minute is not published or circulated but is attached to the permanent minutes of Senate as Appendix “A”).

2. Motions

Senate returned to open session.

2.1 Motion to Amend the Standing Rules of Procedure, Governing the Proceedings of the Senate of McGill University (D09-22)

On invitation of the Chair, the Secretary-General presented the Motion to Amend the Standing Rules of Procedure, Governing the Proceedings of the Senate of McGill University for information.

The Secretary-General presented the motion and asked Senate to provide feedback so that it can be refined and brought back for approval at the next meeting.

Senator White pointed out that changing the wording of the regulation to include only electronic cameras invites people to come to Senate with non-electronic cameras.

The Secretary-General answered that the proposed regulation prohibits recording of sound and images by whatever means, but goes further to include the use of electronic devices for the purposes of transmission of Senate deliberations during meetings.

Senator White disputed the wording of the proposed regulation.

Senator Ciobanu stated that laptops are sold with cameras installed, which may preclude them from Senate as stated in the proposed regulation. He also stated that there are other methods for communicating information about Senate discussions to outside parties, but that Senators should be trusted not to do so without additional regulations.

Senator Saroyan stated that there was no rationale included for disallowing electronic recording devices at Senate.

Senator Marshall was concerned about the prohibition on communicating the proceedings of Senate by live blogging or email. If the justification for the regulation is to prevent people having their exact words recorded, the restriction on writing and sending updates of Senate proceedings as they happen should not be included. He added that communicating the proceedings of Senate in this way does not pose a risk to Senate. The Secretary-General disagreed, stating that those types of transmissions constrain some Senators in enjoying an open and free discussion.

Senator Covo clarified that the regulation was to prevent communication during the meeting, not after. The Secretary-General agreed.

The Chair added that there had been a breach of regulations at the last Senate meeting due to the posting of recording of confidential session on the internet after Senate ended.

The Secretary-General added that the regulation was attempting to do two things. It is intended to provide an absolute ban on recording sound or images, and to prevent transmission of Senate deliberations while Senate meetings are in progress.

3. Policy Matters

3.4 Amendment to Regulations Regarding Sabbatical Leave (D09-31)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost presented the proposed amendment.

The Provost said that the Amendment to Regulations Regarding Sabbatical Leave was designed to get rid of a provision in the regulations that impinges on the University's ability to prepare its operating budget while still recognizing the importance of remaining internationally competitive.

Senator Richard expressed concerns over the vagueness of the wording, which seems to indicate that the salaries for those going on sabbatical leave would be determined on a case by case basis. It is also not clear how often the reassessment of sabbatical salary levels is to be conducted. The Provost answered that this would be a general policy for everyone going on sabbatical leave and it would be an annual reassessment.

Senator Hendren said that sabbatical leaves are not a benefit as much as an academic duty, which helps to redirect one's research. As such it is an academic policy that should stay within the purview of Senate. Any discussions of the level of sabbatical salaries should be conducted at Senate.

The Provost replied that the reason for Senate's oversight is with respect to the academic regulation. Putting a 100% salary level in the regulation conflates the academic purpose for sabbatical with the ability of the University to determine reasonably and in a financially responsible way the financial commitments of the University. He reminded Senate that the University moved from 90% to 100% salary levels when the Canadian dollar was at 62 cents American. Placing sabbatical salaries in the regulations is a constraint on the ability of the University to collegially discuss on an annual basis what the appropriate level of funding should be.

Senator Hendren stated that when sabbatical salaries were at 90%, the other 10% could be added on a discretionary basis. In addition, these levels were in the Grey Book, showing that these funding levels have been changed in the past by Senate. The Provost answered that without this change to the regulation this matter would have to come back to Senate every year.

Senator Hendren stated that any committee can discuss this matter and then present it to Senate as a recommendation. Furthermore, revisiting sabbatical salaries every year will only cause confusion and make it a challenge to recruit people because the University will not be able to promise them anything on the long-term. She felt that there was no reason that something so important to the academics and the academic mission of the University should be removed.

Senator Piper felt that Senate was being asked to make a budgetary decision without knowing the full context of the budget. The Provost reminded Senators that there was a recommendation from the Task Force that was presented as part of the budget presentation to Senate in May 2009. Senator Piper replied that this feels like a budget decision, while past presentations have been preliminary discussions. The Provost said that this was incorporated as part of the 2009-2010 budget, but could not be implemented without this change in the regulation.

Senator Piper stated the wording of the amendment references international levels, but the actual numbers provided are completely national. He asked if the University is trying to remain internationally competitive, what the international benchmark is. The Provost responded that the Association of American Universities' benchmark is very similar to Canadian levels in terms of the percentage of salary paid to sabbaticants. There are differences in how sabbatical salaries are implemented such as requirements on the number of years of service and graduated percentages based on those years. The University decided to use the G13 as its budget comparison while still trying to remain internationally competitive. Senator Piper mentioned that the University's international research competitiveness was in part due to its sabbatical policies.

Senator Barney spoke against the motion, stating that even if one was to accept an extraordinary and temporary reduction in sabbatical salaries as appropriate in the current economic climate, the grant of flexibility and discretion that is entailed in the proposed amendment to section 8.1 is disproportionate or exceeds what is required to accomplish that purpose on an exceptional and temporary basis. Also, even if, as is suggested in the background material, there is an intention to reinstate its policy of full salary for sabbaticants at an appropriate time in future, the language in the proposed revision of section 1.1 is insufficient security for that intention.

Senator Neilson said that this should stay within the realm of Senate because it is tied to the research of the professors. He reiterated that higher sabbatical salaries are important because McGill cannot offer the same levels of base salaries as other universities.

The Provost stated that the University is trying to develop multi-year financial planning frameworks for the budget. The University has had an historic precedent when it removed from the regulations a formula that proposed early retirement benefits. He argued at the time that the formula was inappropriate because it was calculated as an entitlement rather than a discretionary decision; budgetary items similar to this one have already been removed at least once. The intent of the change is not to reduce sabbatical salaries below what is proposed, but rather to not have to revisit the issue on a yearly basis.

Senator Sieber said that sabbatical leaves can actually cost more than what professors are paid because individuals still have to maintain households in Montreal while engaged in travel related to sabbatical research. This is of special concern for people with families due to increased costs. Even a 10% reduction may mean that people who have to stay current in their fields will not be able to take sabbatical leave.

The Provost said that he has heard many assertions that are not based on empirical evidence. He said that our competitor universities pay 82% of regular salary on average, but still attract

qualified faculty. He reiterated that the University moved to 100% when the Canadian dollar was at 62 cents compared to the American dollar on international exchange rates. These Conditions no longer exist and McGill is forcing budget deficits. He also stated that sabbatical leave is not an entitlement; professors must apply for sabbatical approval and is subject to the merit of the sabbatical plan.

Senator Sieber asked that the Provost provide the empirical evidence. The Provost replied that evidence was included in the proposal.

Senator Robaire spoke against the motion, stating that the reason sabbatical salaries went from 90 to 100% was not because the Canadian dollar was at 62 cents. At the time, everyone that applied for sabbatical leave received the 100%, making it the de facto standard. The change in the regulation was made to save the administration time involved in adjusting each request individually. He went on to say that current sabbatical salaries have been a strong point in recruiting professors, which he has been used in the past with success. This amendment represents an attack on the autonomy of Senate and if Senate needs to revisit the issue every five or six years, so be it.

Senator Todd expressed support for the amendment because there is too much implementation detail in the Senate policies that constrains the operations of the University. These issues should be dealt with collegially in salary policy committees that can make decisions in response to conditions as they arise. The University needs to be able to make changes in reasonable amounts of time without coming back to Senate about fine points of detail. He stated that Senators are speaking about two issues; one being the percentage of salaries and the other being who should control those levels. He stated that the manner in which the University must operate demands flexibility. Without that flexibility, the administration will have to make other decisions in respect to staffing levels and benefits.

Senator Jutras stated that the conversation in Senate so far has been about outcomes, when the debates should be whether or not sabbatical salaries should be discussed in a formal setting like Senate or in a flexible committee. He also stated that the issue could come back to Senate if the outcome is deemed to be inappropriate in the long run.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, a vote was called and the amendment was defeated.

3.1 Review/Revision of the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment, and Discrimination Prohibited by Law (D09-23)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost presented the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment, and Discrimination Prohibited by Law. Senator Richard sought clarification about the amount of time the Provost is given on page 4, section 1.4.8 of Appendix "A." He wanted to know if the time was indefinite or only ten days. The Provost answered that it is ten days with the right to consult. He added that cases can be quite complicated and that assessors can come to different conclusions to their reports after the benefit of consultation.

Senator Marshall expressed concern that the document states in the section 5.4.5 that parties will waive any further internal or external recourse. This section makes it sound as though once the internal mechanisms have been used, victims cannot turn to authorities for further help. The Provost considered this an over interpretation. If a person is not satisfied with the internal mechanism, they have recourse to external mechanisms.

Senator Sieber sought clarification on whether consensual sex between a supervisor and a student is allowed under this policy and whether a third party complainant would have standing in such a case. The Provost answered that sexual relationships between supervisors and students represent a conflict of interest and are covered by a different set of rules.

Senator Dooley expressed concern about section 5.5.5. The wording should read “shall” instead of “may” in her opinion. The Provost accepted the change as a friendly amendment.

In reference to section 4.6, Senator Halavrezos asked what kind of training the assessors receive. There seems to be no structured training available to assessors. He asked why the recommendation to provide training was not included in the policy. The Provost answered that the policy is intended to provide accountability for proper implementation, not line-by-line instruction as to how that implementation is to take place.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the policy was approved as amended.

3.2 Responsible Use of IT Resources Policy (D09-24)

On invitation of the Chair, Ms. Sylvia Franke presented the Responsible Use of IT Resources Policy for information.

Ms. Sylvia Franke presented the report, which she explained is informed current practices of other universities and is intended to bring the University into conformity with practices.

Senator Marshall requested that appreciation be recorded in the official minutes for Ms. Franke’s work as CIO.

Senator Richard asked if there was potential for collateral damage in relation to monitoring people as outlined in section 4.3. Ms. Franke stated that the policy was written with the intent to ensure that there was no collateral damage in that regard.

Senator Neilson recommended that the policy be published to students so that there can be awareness of the policy.

Senator Ciobanu asked if administrators that wanted to monitor accounts, as outlined in 5.3, would need to go through multiple levels of approval. Ms. Franke stated that there are a variety of steps that need to be taken in order to access information depending on the department and type of information required. She agreed that those practices need to be clear, but Information

Services is continually trying to improve these practices including the creation of an information security group.

Senator Barney asked what is meant by a public website in section 7.1. Ms. Franke replied that the section is referring to a public website that is part of the McGill IT resources. Senator Barney asked if this included postings on websites external to the University. Ms. Franke replied that any website that represents itself as an official McGill website should conform to the policy. Senator Barney asked that a more explicit definition should be provided.

3.3 Use of Student Response System for Quizzes and Examinations (D09-25)

On invitation of the Chair the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) presented the policy.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the policy was approved.

4. Committee Reports

4.1 Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D09-26)

On invitation of the Chair the Provost presented the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee.

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

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

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

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

5. Annual Reports

5.1 Annual Report of the Policy on Safe Disclosure (D09-27)

Due to the loss of quorum, the Annual Report of the Policy on Safe Disclosure was moved to the next meeting of Senate.

5.2 Annual Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D09-30)

On invitation of the Chair, the Provost presented the report for information.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.