



Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, December 7, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT	Gold, Richard	Marcil, Olivier
Acker, Tom	Goldstein, Rose	Masi, Anthony
Aitken, Ellen	Gonnerman, Laura	McCulloch, Mary Jo
Allison, Paul	Grant, Martin	McDonough, Kevin
Almasri, Mahmoud	Gyakum, John	Mendelson, Morton
Barney, Darin	Han, Lily	Michaud, Mark
Beheshti, Jamshid	Harpp, David	Misra, Arun
Bernard, Daniel	Hashimoto, Kyoko	Munroe-Blum, Heather (<i>Chair</i>)
Bin Shahid, Usman	Hepburn, Allan	Nassim, Roland
Blachford, Gregg	Hobbins, Joan	Paterson, Kady
Bouchard, Adam	Hurtubise, Jacques	Pekeles, Gary
Boyer, Daniel	Hynes, Andrew	Perreault, H��l��ne
Brophy, James	Ismail, Ashraf	Peterson, Kathryn
Chadha, Roshi	Johnson, Juliet	Potter, Judith
Clare, Emily Yee	Jonsson, Wilbur	Pritz, Alex
Clarke, Ian	Jutras, Daniel	Richard, Marc
Cobbett, Stuart	Kirk, Andrew	Roulet, Nigel
Cook, Colleen	Knight, Maggie	Schloss, Melvin
Covo, David	Kreiswirth, Martin	Sinacore, Ada
Crawford, Matthew	Kurien, John	Todd, Peter
Di Grappa, Michael	Kuzaitis, Ruth	Wapnick, Joel
Dinel, Haley	Leask, Richard	Weinstein, Marc
Doucette, Elaine	Lennox, Bruce	White, Lydia
Dudek, Gregory	Leung, Jason	Wolfson, Christina
El-Khatib, Ziad	Lowther, David	Zorychta, Edith
Etemad, Hamid	Luke, Max	Strople, Stephen (<i>Secretary</i>)
Everett, Jane	Ma, Annie	
Ferguson, Sean	Mandramootoo, Chandra	
Galaty, John	Manfredi, Christopher	

REGRETS: Sam Benaroya, Leslie Breitner, Emil Briones, Serge Carrier, Renzo Cecere, Claudio Cuello, Brian Driscoll, Charles Gale, Kalle Gehring, Brendan Gillon, Peter Gr  tter, Terence Hebert, Jacques Hurtubise, Richard Janda, Torrance Kirby, Mark Lefsrud, Michael Ngadi, Andrew Piper, Michael Richards, Amir Raz, Caroline Riches, Honora Shaughnessy, Arnold Steinberg, Ji Zhang.

The Chair greeted everyone and welcomed Senators El-Khatib and Pritz as the newest members of Senate. She also gave a special thanks to Senator Richards for his service to Senate as a Board of Governors representative.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Ms Catherine Kollar

Dean Cook rose and read the following death resolution, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

It is with deep regret that I inform you of the death of Catherine Kollar, in Montreal, on October 18, 2011 after a long illness. Catherine began her work in July 1961 as a Reference Librarian at the Redpath Library, having completed a BA in 1960 and a Bachelors of Library Science in 1961. Catherine went onto complete an M.L.S. in 1966, earning all her degrees from McGill University.

From September 1961 to September 1966, Catherine served as a Reserves Librarian at the Redpath Library. In October 1966, Catherine was promoted to the Head Librarian of the Government Documents Department of the Humanities and Social Sciences Library. This was a department she created and would lead until her retirement in May of 2002.

Over the course of her career, Catherine participated in various library committees and represented the McGill Library in numerous capacities with other universities and government agencies. In 1979, she led an analysis of Royal Commission holdings in relation to the Canadian Studies Program. At this time, she was instrumental in acquiring important research materials including British Parliamentary papers by subject and implementing new check-in procedures for U.N. documents thus speeding up claims.

The digital revolution in the mid-nineties saw Catherine and her team lead the way among Library departments in making government resources publicly available on the internet. In this same year, she completed a *Library Guide to the European Union* and edited L. Rider's *Library Guide to International Agencies*. In the 90's, Catherine was also responsible for drafting the collection policy for Government Documents, weeding the collection and identifying old and fragile volumes in the federal and provincial parliamentary publications for housing in closed stacks. Her additional duties as Bibliographer for the Graduate Program in Communications solidified her tremendous rapport with faculty and students.

Catherine's vision of how government information should be organized and accessed was a model for librarians from all over North America. The reputation of the collection she oversaw was such that government officials, including cabinet ministers and party leaders, would come to the Humanities and Social Sciences Library to consult its holdings.

In recommending her for the promotion to Senior Librarian in 1984, one of her supervisors commented, “Miss Kollar is respected by faculty, students and colleagues for her quiet efficiency, her willingness to share her knowledge and expertise and her success in providing access to specialized material.” She continued to exemplify this assessment throughout her professional career at McGill.

Catherine Kollar’s dignity, erudition, and her depth of knowledge regarding government information and librarianship made her an esteemed colleague to all who had the privilege of working with her. Her unique contributions greatly enriched the McGill Library. With Catherine Kollar’s death we have lost an exemplary member of the McGill Library family.

2. Report of the Steering Committee

The report of the Steering Committee (11-12:04) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the November 16, 2011 meeting.

Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee reviewed the confidential minutes of the meeting of November 16, 2011 and approved them on behalf of Senate.

Item 3. Academic Issues for Discussion at a Future Meeting. The Chair reminded Senate that time will be allotted at a future meeting for a discussion of issues of academic import at McGill that are not part of the regular business of Senate. She noted that the Steering Committee looked at the following issues: variations in student assessment practices across faculties; achieving and assessing teaching excellence at the disciplinary and interdisciplinary levels; and mentorship across the university.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

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

4. Chair’s Remarks

Chair’s Remarks

The Chair began her remarks with an update on the MUNACA strike and settlement, which had been ratified on Monday December 5. The Chair thanked and congratulated the members of the bargaining teams for their hard work in achieving the agreement. She noted how we were all happy to welcome back our MUNACA colleagues to their positions and to begin the process of reintegration and reconciliation. She added that if anyone had any comments or suggestions on the reintegration process, they should send them to the office of the Vice-Principal

(Administration and Finance). The Chair also noted how proud she was of all members of the McGill community for their patience and dedication as well as the important work they do in fulfilling the University's academic and research missions.

The Chair updated Senate on the recent community consultations she held and will be holding in the near future. She thanked all the participants in the consultations. The consultations were with varied groups in a range of fora and served as a means to engage in dialogue and to obtain clarification and feedback from many community members on the events of the fall, including the strike and the events of November 10. The Chair noted that through these and other measures, the administration will provide opportunities for all members of the university community to express their ideas, feeling and recommendations and to assist as we work to regain balance and strengthen engagement as a university community.

The Chair then gave a comment on the Jutras Report, which is ongoing. She reminded Senate that the Report and its recommendations will be submitted to her by December 15, at which point she will release it to the community. She will bring the Report to the Board and Senate for discussion at their first meetings of the new year. The Chair noted that she looks forward to working with Senate to strengthen community engagement. She underlined the exceptional strengths of McGill's people and of the institution and expressed her hope that we engage with, support and recognize all members of our community as we move forward.

The Chair moved on to discuss the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) Statement of Academic Freedom. The Chair informed Senate that she did not participate in the development of the statement, nor did she attend the meeting where it was approved by the AUCC membership. The Chair expressed her great respect for the statement's authors and the AUCC's rationale in undertaking the initiative in the context of new faith-based institutions seeking entry into the AUCC. However, the Chair noted that she does not view the AUCC, or any other external body of universities, as having authority over McGill's policies and practices, and that she did not sign the statement. She noted that McGill is a self-governing body and has been for 190 years. She added that while McGill does not have a formal written policy or statement of academic freedom as such, academic freedom is mentioned throughout our policies and regulations and is a cornerstone of McGill's values and principles. Lastly, the Chair remarked that while McGill had operated for 190 years without a significant discussion in Senate on the topic, it may well be suitable for future consideration, either at the committee level or in the form of a committee of the whole.

The Chair updated Senate on recent leadership changes within the McGill Academic Health Network (MAHN), which is a new structure that facilitates collaboration between our four teaching hospitals and University faculties. She expressed her delight that Dr. David Eidelman would be assuming the post of Dean of Medicine and Vice-Principal (Health Affairs) on January 1 and she thanked Dr. Sam Benaroya for his contributions as Interim Vice-Principal and Dean. The Chair noted that Ms Lynne McVey – associate professor at the School of Nursing – had been appointed the new Executive Director of the Douglas Mental Health University Institute. The Chair also informed Senate that Dr. Arthur Porter had stepped down as Director General and CEO of the MUHC and that Mr. Normand Rinfret had been named his interim replacement. The

Chair described these changes of leadership as elements of a network in transition, opening up opportunities to strengthen synergistic relationships between the partners of the MAHN.

The Chair ended her remarks by telling Senate that in the new year, she would be providing it with an overview of government and public policy issues on which McGill has been working.

Senators thanked the Chair for clarifying the AUCC statement. Senator Galaty added that MAUT would be looking into the statement and looks forward to working with the Chair and all of Senate on determining the role of such a policy at McGill.

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question on Expanding Accessibility of Senate Meetings

Senator Galaty asked the following question:

Recent discourse emerging out of the 10 November events emphasizes a sense of distance between the administration and the university community, and the feeling that the usual processes of consultation are not always effective. Senate processes, for instance, seem distant and irrelevant to many, although Senate sessions often discuss and debate issues of general relevance to the community. Although there is room for a certain number of guests, which demonstrates that the proceedings are in principle open to the university public, this does not appear to meet the interest many have in following Senate procedures.

Given the enthusiasm and interest that welcomed the provision of electronic transmission of the Senate Meeting of November 16th, albeit under extraordinary circumstances and the constraints of space, would the Administration – under the precedent provided by Parliamentary proceedings – consider making Senate meetings more accessible through reconfiguration of the room or through some method of media transmission for those potential observers who cannot now access the Senate meeting room due to space limitations?

The Chair answered as follows:

I thank Senator Galaty for his question which reflects several of the ideas coming out of the last Senate meeting and comments in various fora.

The question asks about two ways of making Senate meetings more accessible to visitors: first, a reconfiguration of the room and second, some method of media transmission. I will deal with these separately.

In terms of the first option, the creation of additional room capacity, the capacity of room 232 historically has been 125 persons, per its original design. That doesn't meet our needs or adhere to the Senate Standing Rules and Procedures. However, in recognition of the recent demand for more capacity in this room for Senate, Emergency Measures & Fire Protection personnel have undertaken a process to re-evaluate the capacity of the Senate chambers. Thanks to their quick efforts and the collaboration of city officials, we are pleased to report that this has produced a positive result. I would like to recognize the leadership of Professor Jim Nicell in expediting this re-evaluation process.

The normal room capacity for Leacock 232 remains at 125 persons for classroom or other purposes with the exception of Senate. For Senate meetings we have received special permission that would allow us to increase the capacity of the entire space to 165 persons. Emergency Measures & Fire Prevention personnel verified in collaboration with city officials the articles of the National Fire Code and the Quebec Construction Code and have agreed that the capacity of the room, for the purposes of Senate meetings, would be 165 people provided that aisles and exits are kept free of obstructions and are not occupied during the meeting except by staff necessary to support the meeting. This total includes reception and security personnel who are in place also to assist in case of evacuation.

This permission means that, for most Senate meetings, the room capacity would be sufficient to meet the provisions on spectator access in the Senate Standing Rules of Procedure.

To address the second option, it is certainly worth discussing and examining whether there are effective methods of media transmission to make Senate proceedings more open and accessible to non-Senators. Live streaming is one method which we utilized for the "committee of the whole" portion of the November meeting.

In considering methods of media transmission, we should understand the pluses and minuses, if any, of moving in this direction. I suggest we create the opportunity to hear the views of Senators on this topic. For example, how do we maintain an environment at Senate meetings which maintains the focus on Senate for Senators, free of any constraint on free and open expression and exchange? We have a longstanding Senate-created rule prohibiting the recording and transmission of images during Senate. This had a purpose – that is, to protect a safe and open context for communication. Does this aim not still pertain? How do we best promote an atmosphere in which Senate and Senators are

protected from undue constraints in conducting the business of Senate? Senate's current Standing Rules of Procedure aim to establish the format and setting of Senate to promote the optimal conduct of Senate business.

While respecting the benefits of making Senate meetings accessible, we all aim to have a Senate that is conducive to open and free debate and discussion, in which all Senators feel comfortable and safe, and where the business of Senate is the main event, not the periphery.

I would welcome an early discussion on the question of media transmission and suggest that we return to this subject in committee of the whole today, once we have made our way through the regular business on today's agenda. I would like to propose framing the discussion around a recommendation that is, understanding that we will be expanding the capacity for observers at Senate, that we reserve live streaming for truly exceptional circumstances, such as the November 10th discussion, and the upcoming discussion of the Jutras Report at our January meeting, and that we retain otherwise the Senate's Rules of Procedure, (in anticipation of widespread interest in Senate's discussion of the Jutras report at its January meeting).

I would ask for a mover and a seconder to discuss this recommendation, in a "committee of the whole" later in the meeting with Dean Aitken assuming the chair.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into a committee of the whole at the conclusion of the regular business of the agenda.

2. Question Regarding the Renaming of James Square

Senator Bin Shahid asked the following question:

On November 14th, over 1000 members of the McGill Community gathered in James Square in response to the events of November 10th and the presence of riot police on campus. The description for the "We Are All McGill" event read:

"We all have a right to a campus free from attacks because of political views. Free from attacks because of political assembly, and free from attacks when simply walking home from campus."

The assembly voted to rename the James Square in commemoration of November 10th to "Community Square".

Is the McGill Administration willing to consult with members of the McGill community to rename James Square in commemoration of the events of November 10th?

The Secretary-General answered as follows:

I thank Senator Bin Shahid for this question which provides an opportunity to describe the naming process for the new green space that has taken place and which commemorates deep historical ties and traditions.

The creation of an open terraced sculpture garden just inside the Milton Gates has transformed this area into an important entry point to the campus and an outdoor space in which McGill community members and visitors to the University can gather to contemplate, discuss, and enjoy the visually striking sculptures and landscape features.

Since its founding by Royal Charter, McGill University has had a special connection to the Governor General of Canada who is McGill's official Visitor. While the McGill Visitor retains responsibility with respect to the University Statutes, the Visitor also represents the founder and the public interest in the University.

The sculpture garden was seen as an exciting opportunity to recognize and celebrate this important and long-standing relationship and tradition by naming it the McGill Visitor's Garden, both to recognize Governors General from the past and those who will come in the future.

The intention of this name is to mark in perpetual commemoration McGill's foundational relationship with the Governor General as its Visitor, and to pay homage to the significant historic ties with that office and the role it has played in shaping McGill's institutional identity and autonomy. The relationship is unique among Canadian universities and conveys autonomy from provincial legislation.

In addition this name connotes openness to all visitors to the University, which is appropriate given that McGill's campus serves as a central public, historic, and green space in the heart of a world-class city.

A naming proposal was considered in the summer of 2011 in accordance with the Policy Relating to the Naming of University Assets. It was enthusiastically embraced and recommended. The Board of Governors approved the naming of the McGill Visitor's Garden at its September meeting, as provided for in the policy.

The name's approval afforded an occasion to acknowledge our close relationship with the current Visitor, David Johnston, Principal and Vice-Chancellor Emeritus and former Professor of Law, by inviting him to a naming ceremony in October. Once the Governor General postponed his October visit to Montreal, the ceremony was rescheduled to 2012, which coincides with our 190th anniversary and presents an ideal opportunity to celebrate our traditions.

If there is an interest by some in proposing an alternate name, there is a process for doing so as described in the University policy. The Policy is available on the Secretariat page of the McGill website. I will be happy to sit down with anyone to review the process or answer questions.

Senator Bin Shahid asked which persons had been consulted and how the McGill community would be involved. The Secretary-General referred Senate to sections 7 and 8 of the Policy Relating to the Naming of University Assets, pointing out that an advisory committee had been constituted as those sections mandate. He added that while the Board of Governors is solely responsible for ratification of names, any member of the McGill community may initiate a proposal. The Chair clarified that Senate does not have purview over the naming of tangible assets.

Senator White commented that as “James Square” was an unofficial title, we may now unofficially refer to the space as “Community Square.”

3. Question Regarding a Re-evaluation of the McGill Governance Structure

Senator Clare asked the following question:

The University has worked to implement several of the recommendations from the Student Consultation and Communication Work Group including the appointment of the Student Life Coordinator, looking into student co-chairs for University level committees, and having a Consultation Fair. Presently, the Student Society of McGill University (SSMU) is actively working to reform its By-Laws and Policies to ensure that student representation is responsible and accountable. To quote the Student Consultation & Communication Work Group:

“More consistent training of new representatives including information on the time commitment and their responsibilities in the position and mechanisms for satisfying those responsibilities (i.e. ideas on how to consult constituents, when to report to student body or governing body, how to solicit feedback).”

However, improving the quality of student representation is insufficient in addressing structural barriers to students. Student representatives should not merely look to provide feedback and to serve as a liaison with the student body; students ought to be actively involved with decision-making processes. Indeed, such participation is part of their education in becoming responsible citizens. There is a difference between the number of people representing a constituency and the power that these representatives have to effect change within the McGill University structure.

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

I wish to thank Senator Clare for raising this issue. The question is limited to Senate and committees, a limitation I will respect in spirit, but I will address broader academic and student-life concerns.

To answer the second question first, there are indeed some steps that can be taken immediately to improve the effectiveness of engagement in the governance process. Senator Clare’s preamble identified some possibilities, some of which were from the Workgroup on Student Consultation & Communication. In addition, we are constructing a user-friendly web

site to inform students and others not only about the mandates and membership of committees, advisories and other bodies at McGill, but also about how to provide input to them.

A challenge we face is that, because student representatives typically have 1-year terms, new student members have to be identified each fall and often join what are essentially ongoing conversations, without having the background to those conversations. By working with the student associations at the end of each governance year, we will strive to ensure a full student complement from the outset of the subsequent year. Moreover, we can better orient new student representatives to the procedures and issues.

Regardless, the question of expanding opportunities is quite open-ended and invites sharing of ideas. Perhaps Steering Committee would consider this as a topic for a discussion at a future meeting of Senate.

I will now turn to Senator Clare's first question. McGill has a long tradition of significant student involvement in governance and advisory committees. Indeed, it is our understanding that, among our peer institutions, McGill is at the very inclusive end of the range of student participation and representation on governance and administrative bodies. I will provide a brief overview here.

Through Senate membership, 20 students and 6 administrative and support staff participate directly in academic governance and account for respectively 19% and 6% of Senate's 107 members. By way of comparison, students also account for 19% of senators at UBC, but they account for only 13% of U of T's Academic Board and only 9% of U of A's senate. As two examples from the AAU, UNC Chapel Hill and University of Michigan have no students or staff on their equivalents to senate.

In addition, students hold 36 reserved positions on Senate's nine standing committees and 23 reserved positions on six other joint governance committees and committees arising from University regulations.

Staff members hold positions on Senate's standing committees either through designation in the terms of reference (e.g., in the Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs) or through recommendation by Senate Nominating Committee (e.g., in the Committee on Physical Development).

Decanal advisory committees, depending on the size of the faculty, have three students out of 13 representatives or two out of seven. Advisory committees for the appointment of the Provost, Deputy Provost, and Vice-Principals have two student members of 10. Staff can be appointed to these committees as representatives of the Board of Governors and of Senate.

Ad hoc committees are occasionally struck and typically reflect membership from across the McGill community. For example, the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement had 25 members, of whom six were students and six administrative and support staff, while the Principal's Task Force on Student Life and Learning had 25 members, of whom 10 were students and four were administrative and support staff.

Staff and students also sit on various bodies, committees and councils at the level of departments, schools and faculties. Moreover, students have substantial representation on advisory committees in the areas of Student Life and Learning – e.g., related to the various Student Services, Food and Dining Services, Athletics and Recreation, and Residences and Student Housing.

Finally, students can, but do not always use the opportunity to, contribute importantly to academic assessments by completing teaching evaluations, which influence decisions about tenure, merit and promotion.

Senator Clare explained that her question arose out of issues brought forth by many students, who often felt their only possible engagement is reactive. She pointed out that she while understood that students could not be involved in every decision at the University, she regretted that students were left out of decision-making processes on issues that impact them. Senator Clare added that, regardless of the decisions made, students would react more positively if they were engaged with in the spirit of dialogue. Senators asked about the power dynamics at play in students' engagement with governance bodies, as well as the administration's willingness to engage the "average student" who might not have the time to be a representative.

Senator Clarke remarked that at the University of Alberta, the highest academic body is actually the General Faculties Council, which has 55 student members out of 130.

The Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning) answered that he, the Principal and the Provost were always willing to answer invitations to speak with students. He added that he hoped that SSMU and the PGSS would continue with their efforts to encourage the broadest participation in governance. He also called on students to engage at the local level, namely their faculties and departments, since that is where most of their academic experience is happening.

Part "B" – Motions and Reports from Organs of University Government

1. Annual Report on the Financial State of the University (D11-24)

The Vice-Principal (Administration & Finance) presented this item for the information of Senate. He explained that the presentation sought to offer Senate more insight into the university's financial well-being than previous presentations.

The Vice-Principal explained that the financial year ending April 30, 2011 was in fact an 11-month year, due to new directives from the Minister of Education, Leisure and Sport (MELS). He added that this year's balance sheet reflected Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) liabilities, whereas MELS directives had previously excluded certain liabilities. The university's balance sheet weighed \$3.2985 billion of assets against the same amount of liabilities and fund balances. The Vice-Principal informed Senate that over the financial year in question, the University had \$1.07 billion in public and private sources of funding, of which

\$630.5 million were unrestricted sources of operating revenue. The majority of this money came from government and tuition fees. Expenditures for the financial year were \$988 million, with the largest portion going to salaries and 12% going to student aid and support. The Vice-Principal remarked that expenditures and revenues would continue to mount, so talk of “cuts” actually refers to lower increases.

The Vice-Principal elaborated upon the University’s shortfall relating to deferred maintenance. He explained that while the University had been able to address life and safety issues, it maintains a large annual shortfall with needs approaching \$1 billion. He also remarked that McGill receives the second-lowest amount of operating income per full-time student and that the projected higher tuition rates will not adequately solve this issue.

The Vice-Principal noted the University’s significant challenges with regard to controlled spending, pensions, maintenance and other liabilities. He added that governments are facing similar challenges and will look to the University to adopt austerity measures, lest they force such measures upon us. The Vice-Principal told Senate he believed that McGill had been fiscally responsible, which should serve it well going forward.

Senators asked about the costs related to deferred maintenance. The Vice-Principal explained that a typical Facility-Condition Index would place maintenance needs at 5-10% of replacement costs, while McGill’s are at 70%. He added that the work being undertaken is related to life, safety and the integrity of buildings, and that the University had so far been able to remain on top of it. The Chair added that should unforeseen emergency needs arise, this money would have to be made available. The Vice-Principal pointed out that McGill had many old buildings, which often lack a detailed record of their construction history. He also informed Senate that the University will be looking for additional government money that could be used towards deferred maintenance.

Senator Zorychta asked about the \$10 million cost related to equity settlements. The Vice-Principal answered that this figure addressed situations dating back to 2001 and that the agreement was in principle and should soon be finalized.

Senator Knight asked for clarification about how much of the additional tuition fees would accrue to McGill’s operating revenue. The Provost answered that McGill’s share would be \$4 million. The Chair explained that 35% of all tuition goes toward province-wide student aid, but only Quebec students are eligible for this aid. She added that all the extra tuition paid by non-Quebec students went to MELS, which apportions it to all universities. The Chair suggested that she could tabulate McGill’s share of this money when she discussed policy framework issues in the new year.

In answering Senators’ questions about possible solutions to these problems, the Vice-Principal mentioned that the University was looking at diversifying revenue sources, but solutions are still at the planning stage. The Chair added that the University is trying to maximize research revenues through gifts and other sources, with a view to maintaining our priorities in case the government mandates austerity measures.

Senators also asked about salary proportions between academics and non-academics, as well as the MUNACA settlement costs. The Vice-Principal answered that staffing levels will be decreasing, as mandated by Bill 100, but that our staffing salary proportions are similar to other universities', while no answer could be given at this time about the settlement.

Senator Galaty pointed out that donor funding had decreased since 2008. The Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations) answered that development was doing very well and that he would be reporting to Senate in 3 months.

2. Budget Planning 2012-2013: Report I

(D11-25)

The Provost presented this item for the information of Senate. He told Senate that the three key budget messages were:

- Supporting quality and excellence in teaching, research and service;
- Balancing revenues and expenses; and
- Targeting future-oriented investments.

The Provost explained that the next 5-year budget cycle covered the 2013 to 2017 financial years (FY2013 to FY2017). He explained that such medium-term planning required more work, but enabled faculties and the University to attain its performance indicators. He said that going forward, the University would focus on:

- Academic renewal;
- Research quality and quantity;
- The ratios of undergraduate and graduate students to tenure-track professors;
- Career development for all staff; and
- Investments in deferred maintenance.

The Provost provided Senate with forecasts on FY2012, which had a projected deficit of \$6.05 million. He noted the added diligence that deans and vice-principals had provided towards ensuring accurate reporting, but added that there were unknown factors in labour, infrastructure and government funding.

The Provost told Senate that the University anticipated a growth in both revenues and expenses for the FY2013-FY2017 cycle. He noted that the University planned to balance the budget within this timeframe, but should actually be looking for surpluses in order to service its accumulated debt and deferred maintenance. The Provost then described the University's priorities underpinning FY2013 projections, as well as the underlying assumptions of revenues and expenses. He explained that the FY2013 budget aimed at generating revenues without selling our soul; its main priorities are:

- priority SRI cost efficiencies and revenue generating measures
- across the board budget cuts
- managed compensation costs
- determining priority areas for reinvestment
- settling pay equity disputes
- controlling pension liabilities

The Provost finished by informing Senate that the University is currently anticipating a double-digit million-dollar deficit for FY2013 unless it finds additional sources of revenue and/or savings and that he would be providing a further update in the spring.

Senator Acker asked how the University determined the capacity of its various undergraduate and graduate programs. The Provost answered that the administration looks at the existing ratio of undergraduate students to faculty members to determine whether there was room to grow. The Provost indicated that the University has increased its support for graduate students tenfold over the last five years; the deans work with the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to determine how to apportion this money among their faculties.

Senator Harpp asked whether there were any long-term solutions to the funding problems around Quebec. The Provost answered that the Principal and the Vice-Principal (External Relations) had been working with the government to counter its falling support, but the government has other funding shortfalls elsewhere.

Senators asked about the proportion of graduate-student funding that faculty members brought in as well as the proportion of undergraduate research that comes out of faculty members' own funds. The Provost answered that the University's share of support for faculty's budgets is lower than our competitors' because of our lower levels of support and tuition. He added that the University had been supporting undergraduate research and would continue to do so, working with the deans to increase opportunities and resources for these projects.

Senator Crawford asked whether the recent AGSAM settlement was taken into account in the Provost's report. The Provost answered that projections were based on present assumptions for all labour settlements and that adjustments were continuously made.

Senator Misra asked whether self-funded programs were a source of revenue to the University. The Provost answered that these programs generally do not generate enough surplus to significantly contribute to the University. In addition, he explained that one third of all surplus goes to the program itself, one third to its faculty, and one third to the University.

3. Amendment to Regulations on Leaves of Absence for Tenured and Tenure Track Academic Staff

(D11-26)

The Provost called on the Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures & Equity) to present this item for Senate's approval.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved changes to articles 4.1 and 4.2 of the Regulations on Leaves of Absence for Tenured and Tenure Track Academic Staff and the addition of articles 9.1 and 9.2 and so recommended to the Board of Governors.

4. Report of the Academic Policy Committee

a. 433rd Report

(D11-27)

The Provost presented this report and highlighted the Academic Policy Committee's (APC) conclusion that the Revised Thesis Review Procedures met the requirements of the University's policy regarding external thesis reviews and avoided conflicts of interest.

Discussion ensued about the Procedures. Senators questioned the practice of having a supervisor personally call on an external evaluator. Some Senators suggested having departmental or program heads make the calls to ensure consistency. Senator Jonsson asked whether the Master's Thesis review needed two evaluators, including an external.

The Provost and the Associate Provost (Graduate Education) explained that these issues were raised at the committee level and that the APC decided otherwise. The Associate Provost added that the Procedures were implemented to ensure that candidates were reviewed in a timely manner, which had not been the case prior. He noted that the Procedures did not preclude department heads from making calls. The Provost reiterated that the APC was solely tasked with reviewing whether the Procedures fit with the policy, not with reviewing the policy itself.

Senator White noted that prohibitions on supervisors serving as internal evaluators made it difficult for small departments to ensure adequate expertise. The Provost responded that the APC found that the positives of this rule outweighed the negatives. Senator El-Khatib asked whether the word "colleagues" could be changed to "peers" in order to ensure that the supervisor and examiner had not had collaboration. The Associate Provost replied that this was already reflected in the procedures.

The Provost agreed to take some of the issues raised back to the APC for further discussion.

b. Annual Report of the Academic Policy Committee

(D11-28)

Senate received this report for its information.

5. Update on the Strategic Research Plan

(D11-29)

The Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) provided Senate with an update on the Strategic Research Plan (SRP). She reminded Senate of the principles of the SRP and described the consultations that had taken place. The Vice-Principal revealed the draft title "Understanding and Improving the Human condition in a Globalized World."

In discussion with Senate, the Vice-Principal explained that the SRP is formulating questions around its themes, but is still in preliminary stages of linking research topics to those questions. She informed Senate that people could join the SRP Advisory Committee or provide their suggestions by emailing her. Lastly, she added that while the SRP was an imperative of many federal funding agencies, it will also be implemented to further McGill's own aims.

6. Annual Report of the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity

(D11-30)

The Provost called on the Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures & Equity) to present this report for Senate's information. The Associate Provost pointed out that whereas 2 of the Committee's subcommittees had been inactive, they now have chairs and will be populated in the near future.

Senator Han remarked that the extended inactivity of the Subcommittee on First Peoples and the Subcommittee on Race were symptomatic of the absence of racialized voices across the community. She asked whether the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity had reflected on the meaning of these subcommittees' absence and how the absences might be linked to systems or processes in place at the University. The Associate Provost responded that not only had the Committee reflected and discussed these issues, but the University had set up equity committees to look into these issues with regard to staffing.

7. Other Business

As earlier agreed to, Senate moved into a committee of the whole with Dean Aitken as chair (the notes from the Committee of the Whole are attached as Appendix A). Following the Committee of the Whole, the chair passed back to the Principal.

The Chair proposed that Senate live stream its discussion of the Jutras Report at the January meeting. She also proposed that Senate create an ad hoc committee to study the issue of recording and broadcasting Senate meetings and bring forward recommendations to Senate. The Chair clarified that the January session would be treated as an exceptional instance, not as a trial run for future recordings. Senator Harpp noted that a camera filming from the back would limit theatrics. Senator Ferguson raised concerns about people whose cultural backgrounds would preclude them from appearing on camera. Senator Jutras expressed his support for studying both the psychological and technical aspects of broadcasting Senate meetings, adding that the committee should look at debates about recording in other deliberative bodies including the Supreme Court of Canada. Senator Pritz asked for information regarding the geographical locations of those watching the January session, reminding Senate that students at the Macdonald Campus could not be expected to sit in on sessions.

On motion duly presented and seconded, Senate agreed to live stream its discussion of the Jutras Report and to create an ad hoc committee to study the issue of recording and transmitting Senate meetings and report back.

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

END

The complete documents, including presentations at Senate, are kept as part of the official minutes.



REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

In handing the chair to Dean Ellen Aitken, the Principal explained that the Committee would sit for 30 minutes and would discuss her recommendation to reserve live streaming for exceptional circumstances such as the January discussion of the upcoming Jutras Report. The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

Several senators expressed support for streaming meetings, possibly with limits such as leaving it online for 48 hours to permit students to watch if their schedules conflicted with the time of Senate meetings. Student senators informed the committee that they had found the use of social media at SSMU council meetings beneficial. One senator added that it increased awareness and accountability while providing accurate reporting that ultimately led to higher levels of discourse with the community. She said that streaming would reveal how decisions were made, which would increase community buy-in. Senators added that we also needed to look at the impact of not streaming, including the lost opportunity to convey that we are open and visible, especially as a public university with a public role in Quebec and Canada. Others expressed their support out of recognition of the world we live in and the inability to police all media.

Senator Paterson expressed her aspiration to conceive of the University as a safe space where discourse is based on trust. She trusted Senate not to be influenced by tweets, adding that SSMU and the University of Florida offer positive examples of broadcast meetings.

Senator Hynes questioned the philosophy behind Senate's prohibition on recording and transmitting meetings as well as the consequences of lifting this prohibition. The Principal responded that the same issues had been discussed extensively in judicial and parliamentary settings. The Principal also shared her experiences at the University of Toronto, where recordings caused a chill on open discussion, even before the advent of the Internet. She suggested that closed-loop feeds or other mechanisms should be considered as well.

Several senators told the committee that they supported only live streaming in exceptional circumstances. They feared the potential interference and confusion that would result, as well as possible theatrics. Senator Galaty agreed with these statements, but reiterated his profound concern about the larger community's feeling of distance.

Senators opposed to live streaming mentioned that there was already too much pomp and circumstance and that Senate's priority should be to better portray the informal culture of a University. Some senators remarked that their experiences in legislatures demonstrated how broadcasting impacted proceedings, with most of the impact negative. They underlined that Senate must ensure that its decision avoided the same consequences. One senator also questioned the wisdom of sharing our thoughts and strategies with rival institutions. Senators told the

committee that live streaming would put images on the web, forever beyond our control, even if the content was taken down after a specified length of time.

Senator Richard remarked on how live streaming would impact efforts to encourage colleagues to serve on Senate. He noted that while broadcasting might expose people to Senate, it might also discourage camera-shy people from joining.

Senators asked whether the broadcasts would be intended for the McGill community or the worldwide community, suggesting that this should inform the techniques Senate would use. They also called attention to the potential impact both within and outside the McGill context.

Senator Synacore expressed concerns that the committee was discussing an issue without adequate data. Senator Michaud asked the Secretary-General how many people had tuned in to the November meeting. The Secretary-General answered that 836 people tuned in at some point during the November meeting and that we would track the numbers in January. Several senators proposed that we use January as a trial that could be studied to inform the ultimate decision, while others expressed that meetings were generally very boring and not worth the effort at all. Senator Nassim responded boring sessions would be transmitted to a small audience, which would both answer the community's requests for openness and address Senate's worries about the audience.