



Minutes

Wednesday, November 20, 2013 13-14:03

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on November 20, 2013 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT

Aitken, Ellen
 Algieri, Stefano
 Allison, Paul
 Arezki, Amine
 Bader, Darine
 Beheshti, Jamshid
 Bell, Graham
 Bernard, Daniel
 Blais, Guillaume
 Bouchard, Adam
 Boyer, Daniel
 Butler, Cameron
 Cook, Colleen
 Cooke, Rosemary
 Costopoulos, Andre
 Covo, David
 Cowan, Brian
 Dedek, Helge
 DiPaola, Antonia
 Dinel, Haley
 Doucette, Elaine
 Dudek, Gregory
 Dumont, Marie-Josée
 Dyens, Ollivier
 Epstein, Gwenyth
 Ferguson, Sean
 Ferrie, Frank
 Fortier, Suzanne (*Chair*)
 Gehring, Kalle

Goldstein, Rose
 Gholmieh, Yasmeen
 Ghoshdastidar, Jim
 Grant, Martin
 Green, Garth
 Grütter, Peter
 Harman, Christopher
 Harpp, David
 Heath, Nancy
 Hebert, Terence
 Hepburn, Allan
 Hill, Reghan
 Ismail, Ashraf
 Jonsson, Wilbur
 Jutras, Daniel
 Kalil, Alex
 Kreiswirth, Martin
 Kuate Defo, Alvin
 Kuzaitis, Ruth
 Lach, Lucyna
 Lane-Mercier, Gillian
 Lazarus, Darius-Lucian
 Larson, Katie
 Lu, Catherine
 Marcil, Olivier
 Martone, Lydia
 Masi, Anthony
 Michaud, Mark
 Mooney, Jonathan
 Moore, Timothy

Ngadi, Michael
 Nicell, Jim
 Nystrom, Derek
 Pejovic, Andrea
 Potter, Judith
 Price, Cynthia
 Rassier, Dilson
 Richard, Marc
 Roulet, Nigel
 Saroyan, Alenoush
 Schloss, Melvin
 Shaughnessy, Honora
 Shea, Joey
 Sheridan, Kathleen
 Snider, Laurie
 Stewart-Kanigan, Claire
 Stromvik, Martina
 Subhani, Farzan
 Thordardottir, Elin
 White, Lydia
 Wolfson, Christina
 Yalovsky, Morty
 Yue, Stephen
 Zhang, Ji
 Zorychta, Edith
 Zuroff, David
 Strople, Stephen
 (*Secretary*)

REGRETS: Leslie Breitner, Serge Carrier, Renzo Cecere, Stuart Cobbett, Claudio Cuello, John DiGiulian, Michael Di Grappa, David Eidelman, Jim Engle-Warnick, Daniel Gagnier, Natalie Hiles, Jacques Hurtubise, Maya Kucij, David Lametti, Bruce Lennox, Chandra Madramootoo, Christopher Manfredi, Gary Pekeles, Ada Sinacore, Arnold Steinberg, Peter Todd, Marc Weinstein.

The Chair began by welcoming everyone to the third Senate meeting of the 2013-2014 governance year.

SECTION I

1. Memorial tribute: Professor Peter Leonard

Senator Lach rose and read the following memorial tribute, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

It is with great sadness that I and my colleagues in the School of Social Work and the Faculty of Arts mark the death of Social Work Professor Emeritus Peter Terrance Leonard on September 30, 2013.

An educator extraordinaire, a progressive and critical thinker, and a tireless advocate for social justice, it was with two degrees and a post-graduate diploma from the London School of Economics that Peter Leonard set out on his career determined to contribute to making British social services progressive and for the people. Peter was the youngest member of the Seeborn Committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Services, which gave rise to the Social Service Department thus creating the modern social work profession in the UK, a move followed not long after by the Castonguay-Nepveu Commission which created our public health and social services system here in Quebec. Peter was also a founding professor of the Department of Applied Social Sciences at the University of Warwick and as Chair introduced the first social work program. We are fortunate that in 1986, Peter agreed to leave England and come to McGill as Director of the School of Social Work.

Peter Leonard was an exemplar of a progressive era, an intellectual whose biography was constructed by contemporary history of the Left: the crisis of the international Communist movement as it struggled to come to terms with the 1956 events in Hungary; Stalin's crimes against humanity; the internal party debates that produced the British Communist party's Road to Socialism; the populist Marxism Today and its eventual conciliation with social democracy; and the discovery of post-modernism.

But in contrast to many of his contemporaries, Peter was always deeply caring, never sectarian, nor driven by unfounded certainties. The author of more than 11 books, and many articles and international lectures, Peter was an internationally recognized social theorist who produced some of the most important work extant on ideology and subjectivity, social work ontology, and reflexive practice.

To a person, Peter Leonard's colleagues, both here at McGill and elsewhere, admired him and held him in the highest esteem. Michael Loft, a member of the Mohawk community at Kahnawake, writes: "For me, Peter was an extraordinary professor. ... [No one] could ever hold a candle to his immense gift. ... For me, Peter had transcended his privilege and become a universal man respected by all. I once shared this point with him by calling him an "Elder" in every sense of the word. This shook him and his eyes welled up. I'll never forget the man."

But it is perhaps Professor Amanda Grenier, now Director of Gilbrea Centre for Studies in Aging at McMaster University, who was both a student and then a colleague of Peter Leonard here at McGill, who sums up most accurately the full complement of both the professor and the man. She writes:

“Working with Peter as a co-instructor and colleague had a serious impact on my work, and on the type of scholar I became. I can see in my own work, the continuation of an approach that I can only attribute to having had the opportunity to work so closely with Peter –the idea of linking an approach based on social structures, institutional practices, and lived experiences. While complicated in the contradictions, he always believed that this struggle was worthwhile – “Bloody Hard Work” he called it. Peter was not on my doctoral committee, but many people within the field consider me to be Peter's student – an association I consider myself privileged to have. When I met faculty in my travels to England, many would ask about Peter with the same fondness I recognized from students at McGill. I came to know that what I had witnessed at McGill happened wherever Peter went: that worldwide there was an admiration for Peter as a scholar, a teacher, and a person, and that everyone who met him was impacted positively by him in some way.”

2. Report of the Steering Committee

(13:14-03)

The Report of the Steering Committee (13-14:03) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the October 16, 2013 meeting.

Item 2. Approval of the Confidential Minutes of Senate. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee had reviewed the confidential minutes of the meeting of October 16, 2013 and had approved them on behalf of Senate.

Item 3. Senate Open Discussion. The Chair noted that the report indicates that the Steering Committee decided to schedule an open discussion on the legislation for the Charter of Quebec Values for this meeting. In addition, she mentioned that as the budget presentation will occur at the December 4, 2013 meeting of Senate, the Steering Committee decided to defer the open discussion scheduled for December 4 to a meeting in winter 2014.

Item 4. Speaking rights. On a motion duly proposed and seconded, speaking rights were granted for Me Line Thibault, General Counsel, for the Open Discussion: Charter of Quebec Values and Chair's remarks; Dr. Pierre Moreau, Executive Director (Planning and Institutional Analysis) for the item on Key Performance Indicators; Mr. Robert Couvrette (Associate Vice-Principal, University Services) for the item on the Annual Report from the Senate Committee on Physical Development; and to Ms. Kathleen Massey, Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services, for a response to Questions 1 and 2.

Item 5. Confidential Session. On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed that it would enter into Confidential Session for discussion of the item on the Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D13-27).

Item 6. Approval of the Agenda

3. Business Arising: Follow-up on October 16, 2013 Open Discussion

The Chair mentioned that, as promised at the last meeting's open discussion, progress has been made towards establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on the Enhancement of Senate Meetings. She highlighted that the Report of the Nominating Committee (D13-21) contained proposed terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Committee as recommended by the Nominating Committee.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair requested that, exceptionally, given the length of the Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee, and to ensure that Senate receives the report before some Senators have to leave the meeting, the agenda be revised to allow that the Report be presented following item IIB2, Key Performance Indicators. On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the revised agenda was adopted.

5. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began by sharing her reflections on the following meetings, which she attended for the first time as McGill Principal: the American Association of Universities (AAU), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and the U15. Regarding the AAU meeting, she highlighted the association's American focus and underlined issues facing sister universities in the United States, which consisted mainly of serious funding challenges. The AUCC meeting focused on mechanisms to attract skilled immigrants to Canada, including international students, as well as federal government support for increasing support for research and development. The U15 meeting concentrated on ways to increase the global competitiveness of Canadian universities and discussion on a proposal for consideration by the federal government in budget 2014.

The Chair subsequently explained that McGill welcomes the Quebec National Research and Innovation Policy (PNRI), which was announced by the provincial Minister of Post-Secondary Education, Research, Science and Technology in mid-October. She said that the strategic areas prioritized by the PNRI closely align with the University's own research priorities.

The Chair also mentioned that members of the University's senior administration will represent McGill before the *Commission de l'Éducation et de la Culture* on December 3. She explained that all Quebec universities must appear before the Commission every three years to discuss past performance and future goals.

The Chair briefly noted that Fall Convocation ceremonies will be held on November 25 at Place des Arts and will include the conferral of honorary degrees to Richard and Carolina Walls and Mike Babcock.

In her kudos, the Chair highlighted that *Maclean's* ranked McGill as the top university in Canada among institutions offering medical-doctoral programs for the ninth consecutive year. She also mentioned that two McGill cancer researchers, Dr. Phil Gold and Professor Michel Tremblay, are among the 13 winners of the 2013 Prix du Québec. The Chair then thanked the Provost and his office for their work on the F2014 Budget Book which received the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award from the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada. She concluded this section of her remarks by noting that Laurent Duvernay-Tardiff, a Redman football player and fourth year medical student, was named as “Canadian Interuniversity Sport – Top Eight Academic All-Canadian.”

The Chair concluded her remarks by calling on the Deputy-Provost (Student Life and Learning), Professor Ollivier Dyens, to provide an update on McGill's response to an off-campus incident concerning sexual assault involving three students. He explained that McGill is examining disciplinary options under the *Code of Student Disciplinary Procedures*.

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. & 2. Question Regarding Class Scheduling Parameters

Senator Moore asked the following question:

The university has recently issued its new parameters for class scheduling which determines not only the use of classrooms at McGill but also when faculty members will teach. Why has the university chosen to solve a classroom access problem by impinging on the freedom of faculty to organize their time around research, and will it not create a bigger problem among the professoriate than the one it is meant to solve?

Senator Lu asked the following question:

1. What empirical evidence indicates that the current difficulty with course scheduling is primarily due to university-wide faculty unavailability rather than, for example, egregious patterns of abuse in specific units, special challenges in scheduling large classes, and/or overly complicated program requirements, any of which would call for alternative, targeted, or ‘smart’ solutions to the identified problem?

2. McGill is a research-intensive, student-centred university. Research and teaching activities have distinct time requirements. What is the justification for prioritizing course scheduling at the expense of research (see p. 4 of the October 11 document)? Is the University meaning to relegate research to a lesser priority, and are faculty expected now to do research *only after* the needs of teaching (and service) have been fulfilled?

3. McGill has recently gone through a period of academic renewal and is a much younger place as a result. Many of our newer colleagues have young families. Under the new policy, a parent will no longer be able to both drop off and pick up children (p. 4 of the

October 11 document). How can this new policy be justified given the legitimate needs of faculty to fulfill their parental obligations to their school-age children?

4. Why was this new policy not subjected to wider consultation, scrutiny, and debate? Given its universal effects on working conditions of faculty, why was the MAUT Council not properly consulted before the release, much less implementation, of the new policy? Why did the Deputy Provost of Student Life and Learning fail to present the October 11 document for discussion and endorsement in Senate?

5. Why was this new policy not subjected to wider consultation, scrutiny, and debate? Given its universal effects on working conditions of faculty, why was the MAUT Council not properly consulted before the release, much less implementation, of the new policy? Why did the Deputy Provost of Student Life and Learning fail to present the October 11 document for discussion and endorsement in Senate?

In combining the responses to both questions, the Deputy-Provost answered Senator Moore's question as follows:

There seems to be a misconception that the introduction of the Class Scheduling Parameters serves solely to resolve the challenges that Enrolment Services encounters when scheduling classes. In fact, the challenges experienced by Enrolment Services are symptomatic of larger issues. The issues that have surfaced over the last three years probably existed earlier, but were not widely apparent because of the siloed manner in which class scheduling occurred. These are:

- Inequity among instructors – Some instructors have complained about unfairness because their classes are routinely relegated to the margins of the day and week and have suggested that this is, in part, due to unreasonable requests for teaching block offs by other colleagues. Examples communicated to Enrolment Services include blocking off all Mondays and Fridays, or blocking off all mornings or all afternoons because a colleague lives out of town. Cultures vary across departments regarding the way these conflicts are resolved.
- Lack of support for Chairs – It is the role of Chairs to assign teaching responsibilities to instructors, taking into account their other academic duties, such as research. Many Chairs have expressed that it is difficult to respond fair and equitably to requests from colleagues, particularly those who request substantial time away from teaching. They reported having difficulty declining the requests in the absence of clear guidelines from the University.
- Improving the students' experience – Students have complained about the difficulty of accessing important courses that are required for graduation.

With respect to Senator Lu's questions, Senator Dyens replied as follows:

Question 1:

Enrolment Services has worked collaboratively with all 53 units to understand and

address their unique course scheduling needs, often accommodating them. This is no longer sustainable. The average hours blocked per week by instructor and total hours per week blocked by department have become unmanageable and reportedly result in inequity. Using Fall 2013 as an example:

- 48 of the 53 departments have a Chair-approved per instructor average teaching block off of 10 hours or more per week; 24 of these departments have averages of 14 hours or more per week; 9 departments have an average block off per instructor of 20 or more hours per week.
- There is an average of 16 instructors in the 9 departments with the highest number of hours blocked off.
- In terms of total teaching hours per week blocked off by department, 33 departments have more than 100 hours of teaching time blocked off each week; 21 of these have more than 200 hours per week blocked off; 12 units have 296.5 hours or more blocked off
- In total, 10397 hours per week have been blocked off, with instructors unavailable for teaching. Over almost 100 instructors have 1000 of these hours blocked during both the morning and evening of the same day.

Questions 2 and 3:

We placed the student experience and their access to important courses ahead of all other priorities and the proxy for this is to ensure that the departmental ‘course combination rules’ are given top priority.

- Research and teaching are both priorities at McGill and instructors have obligations regarding both. Instructors in the academic units scheduled by Enrolment Services teach an average of 6.6 hours per week (11190 course lecture hours/1702 instructors). There are variations across programs, of course.
- Keeping as much of the week open for the purpose of scheduling classes first allows for important ‘course combination rules’ to be observed. This is good for students. These rules, determined by each department for every course, ensure that key required courses do not conflict and are placed appropriately across the full length of the day and week, giving time for students to complete labs, readings and assignments. By minimizing their ‘unavailability’, instructors help to improve the placement of these courses and the students’ academic experience. There are 3083 such rules in Fall 2013, involving approximately 15,000 courses. Many courses belong to more than one rule set because they are part of multiple programs. Inter-disciplinary and inter-department programs have increased the need to consider course schedules not just within units but also across units.

The University adopted coordinated class scheduling three years ago. Since 2010, both the times and locations of classes have been determined based on instructors’ availability to teach, rules detailing which courses may not conflict with each other, and available time and space. The 2013 Class Scheduling Parameters do not alter the changes made 3 years ago in this regard. Most classes are scheduled between 8:30am-5:30pm, although Continuing Studies and some Management and Education courses are scheduled in the

evenings. In addition there are some courses in 2013-2014 that had to be scheduled during the evening due to insufficient room space during the day; it is possible that this situation will reoccur in 2014-2015.

Rather than restricting instructors' availability for research activities, the purpose of the Parameters, in part, is to equitably distribute the courses across the week, including times of day, so that all instructors have suitable time for their research. Two principles of the Parameters address both equity and research:

1. Fairness and equity: Instructional space and time will be allocated to achieve fair and equitable distribution across disciplines.
2. Research and teaching priorities: Space may be allocated for teaching, research, and other purposes, and the class schedule must be optimized to provide for the fulfillment of these activities.

This being said, we recognize the need for a full day of research. Further to questions raised by the community, we are clarifying a specific commitment to integrate a full, continuous day of research as requested by instructors and approved by the Chair:

'We will normally accommodate requests for a full, continuous day of research, if approved by the Unit Head (departmental chair, directors of schools and deans of faculties where there are no departmental chairs) and the Dean except in rare situations such as team teaching scenario, complicated course combinations, or a blend of the two. In such cases, Enrolment Services will contact the academic unit to consult on the development and use of an alternative option. Further, unless there is a requirement to assign a specific day of the week for research (e.g. coordination of work with another colleague), the day will be determined by ES based on other scheduling constraints.'

Question 4:

Childcare is just one example of the reasons that people request to block whole days or both morning and evening timeslots of the same day. The rationale supporting requests for blocking time are confidential between the Chair and the instructor, and Enrolment Services does not have access to them. However, during our consultations, some Chairs expressed frustration that requests to block both the morning and evening lead to inequities (of course placement) among instructors and yet are difficult to deny in the absence of specific guidelines disallowing them. The limitation to one timeslot has been in practice in at least one faculty at McGill for years. That faculty only approves block-offs for either the morning or evening, but not both.

Requests that would limit an instructor's availability at both the beginning and end of day severely constrain the time available to optimally schedule classes according to the principles of the Scheduling Parameters document, notably optimizing the students' academic experience. This means that courses that should not conflict may have to overlap, creating frustration for students. It also means that other instructors who do not block off the mornings and evenings of the same day have less opportunity to teach at the generally preferred times (10-3pm).

However, we recognize that special circumstances may warrant blocking off both ends of the day. To address this issue, we have changed the wording of the text which now reads:

‘Circumstances of a serious nature (health or family circumstances such as elder-care or child-care for primary school aged children or younger): These requests, which may be made through the online ‘teaching unavailability form’ will be considered. The Unit Head (departmental chair, directors of schools and deans of faculties where there are no departmental chairs), with knowledge of local conditions, is expected to balance the competing demands of individual instructors and the Unit’s obligation and responsibility to participate in the development of a class schedule that meets academic program and University needs and that best benefits students. Given limited space and time resources and increasing enrolment, these requests may be approved by the Unit Head. However, if the implementation of such approved requests is not possible without creating course conflicts, Enrolment Services will contact the unit to discuss alternate options.’

Question 5:

The advisory committee that developed the Parameters was chaired by the Deputy Provost, Student Life and Learning and included student representation, chairs, associate deans, directors of advising, the Director of Teaching and Learning Services, and representatives from Enrolment Services. Members of the advisory committee consulted colleagues at local meetings. The document was reviewed by the Academic Policy Committee, a Senate standing committee with representation from all faculties. It was also presented at the Teaching and Learning Spaces Working Group, another forum with representation from all faculties. It was also presented at the new faculty administrators’ forum.

It is always possible to consult more widely and we welcome advice about other possible approaches to consultation.

As these are administrative parameters, they were not presented to Senate for approval or endorsement. However, APC members were consulted before they were released in recognition of the value of feedback from additional academic colleagues, including those appointed by Senate.

Senator Moore asked Senator Dyens if a top-down approach was the best manner to solve class scheduling issues. Senator Dyens replied that the current system is the most ideal way to do so.

Senator Ferrie asked if the same class schedule parameters tool is used at sister universities in the U15. Kathleen Massey, Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services, replied that this software is commonly used, namely at Queen’s University, Northwestern University and Kent University. The Principal noted that the software does not always result in optimal situations for all, but that at Queen’s University, situations are resolved through collegiality and a spirit of generosity of Faculty members. Senator Ferrie explained that one issue is that the same system is applied to the entire community which does not fit well for all units.

Senator Lu whether the vast majority of units blocked off at least 10 hours per week, which appeared reasonable to her since professors are available to teach for the vast majority of the week. Ms. Massey replied that 24 departments blocked off an average of at least 14 hours per week, while 9 departments blocked off an average of 20 hours or more per week.

The Provost added that campus-wide scheduling, in part, results from the provincial government's requirement that 70% of classes be filled to 70% capacity. The Quebec government implemented this rule to ensure that universities were using their existing spaces efficiently. Given that classrooms are shared between Faculties, this is a University-wide challenge requiring a University-wide solution.

Given the level of discussion, the Chair suggested that Senate could hold an open discussion on this topic if it so wished. Senator Nystrom supported this recommendation.

3. Question Regarding Employment Equity

Senator Stewart-Kanigan asked the following question:

What progress has been made in meeting the goals set out in the Employment Equity Plan following the Federal Contractors Program 2010 compliance review?

How has McGill adjusted its hiring processes to reflect the differentials in access to conventional measures of employment qualification to foster a diversity of backgrounds in the McGill community and support the spirit of the first recommendation of the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence, and Community Engagement?

Senator White answered as follows:

I appreciate this opportunity to clarify McGill's strong commitment to equity at the University. This commitment is realized in a number of ways. All employees are covered by McGill's 2007 Employment Equity Policy which includes a periodic report to Senate on the status of various designated groups. My last report on this policy was in May 2013; I refer Senators to that report for detailed statistics.

In considering employment equity, it is important to note that McGill has identified a broader range of designated groups than required by either the federal or provincial governments. All of us include: women, Aboriginal persons, persons with disabilities, and visible minorities (4). Quebec adds ethnic minorities (5); to that, McGill adds persons of minority sexual orientation or gender identity (6).

Senator Stewart-Kanigan's question asks specifically about compliance with the requirements of the Federal Contractors Program (FCP). McGill reports to both the federal and provincial governments concerning employment of designated groups. The FCP's requirements have been changed and we are waiting to hear what the reporting requirements will be from now on and when this will take place. We report to the provincial government every 3 years – we understand that the next report will be

requested in 2014. In any case, we continue to track the employment of staff in the designated groups in accordance with our internal needs.

As referred to in the question, in 2010, McGill made a commitment to the FCP for an Employment Equity Plan, to monitor progress towards narrowing any gaps in employment of designated groups (where a gap is defined as a difference between our level of employment and the level in the general population as identified by Statistics Canada). As a first step, we have worked on improvements to McGill's self-identification questionnaire for use with current employees, to provide us with more accurate means of assessing the representation of designated groups in employment at McGill, since we are aware that there was considerable under-reporting in this regard. This new questionnaire should be available online by April 2014. Once we have a more accurate picture of the situation at McGill via this survey, we can assess our progress towards narrowing any gaps or barriers identified in our employment of designated groups.

As far as recruitment of academic staff is concerned, we have, since 2009, required all units to complete a report on numbers of designated group members who apply for a position and who are short-listed. Data are based on a voluntary self-identification questionnaire sent to all job applicants. Earlier this year, the data relating to tenure stream appointments for the 2009-2012 calendar years were analysed. The data show that for all designated groups, the proportion of each group short-listed was higher than the proportion of applicants from that group.

While this tracking mechanism is working reasonably well for tenure stream recruitment, the problem remains that there is considerable under-reporting, as many applicants choose not to self-report. In addition, we need to work to ensure that this tracking mechanism is consistently applied to CAS appointments as well. HR needs to develop a similar tracking mechanism for appointments of administrative and support staff. To this end, we have been working on improving the guidelines available on our websites, in order to inform hiring units of what the expectations are with respect to recruitment of designated groups.

Other relevant initiatives in recent years and months involve a special session of ALF relating to recruitment of members of designated groups, involvement of SEDE in equity advising relating to recruitment, and training sessions periodically conducted by HR for HR advisors.

HR has also been involved in considerable outreach recently, including networking with groups on and off campus to encourage applications from members of designated groups. Job advertisements are now posted on the website and in other locations where people who are not McGill employees have access to them.

As the Employment Equity Policy makes clear, McGill does not impose quotas for hiring of members of designated groups, nor does it support reverse discrimination. In other words, to receive consideration for a position, applicants must demonstrate that they meet the job requirements. Adjustments to our hiring processes are being made with a view to attracting more applications from diverse groups of suitably qualified people.

Of course, it is not enough to attract strong applicants. For those who come to McGill, it is important to maintain an inclusive environment and to remove potential barriers, in order to retain people at the University. Here, work is going forward in a number of directions, for example, providing funding for improvements to our buildings for those with physical handicaps, and providing French language programs, which can be particularly helpful for members of designated groups who have not had prior access to French.

Senator Stewart-Kanigan subsequently asked if McGill had considered going beyond the Employment Equity Policy to achieve greater representation of minority groups. Senator White replied that McGill had not. She added that underreporting is an important concern since 40% of employees chose not to respond to the survey and that we do not know if the 60% who did respond are representative of the whole.

4. Question Regarding Equity-related Resources

Senator Butler asked the following question:

What steps has McGill taken to address equity issues on campus, particularly in terms of student experiences and engagement with campus life?

What additional steps does McGill plan to take, both immediately during the 2013-2014 academic year as well as on a long-term basis, to further address equity-related issues at the university?

What work is being done to address the lack of equity-related resources at the Macdonald campus in particular, given its much smaller size and minimal access to resources available at the downtown campus?

Senator White answered:

Senator Butler's question is somewhat related to the previous one, though with a focus on students. As far as students are concerned, equity has been embraced in our policies for many years. As Senator Butler points out, the right to equal treatment is explicitly addressed in article 2.1 of the *Charter of Students' Rights* (1984). Other relevant policies include the *Policy Concerning the Rights of Students with Disabilities* (1986) and *McGill's Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law*, in effect since (2005).

McGill has a committee with an explicit equity mandate, namely the Joint Board Senate Committee on Equity which recommends to Senate and the Board University policy regarding under-represented groups, and which has 5 subcommittees (Persons with Disabilities, First Peoples, Queer Persons, Race and Ethnic Relations, Women) that not only are involved in policy development but also advocate and provide support for members of designated groups on campus.

In addition, McGill has two offices with mandates that are particularly relevant, namely the Office for Students with Disabilities (established in the 1990s), whose role is to

provide accommodations and services for McGill students with documented disabilities, and the Social Equity and Diversity Education Office (SEDE) (established 2005), which is committed to fostering a fair and inclusive environment through education and dialogue. SEDE engages in a number of activities that relate to the issues mentioned in the question, including training and workshops, public events, special consultations, etc., aimed at students, staff and faculty and dealing with topics relating to diversity and discrimination. SEDE has been involved in training of student groups, such as the SSMU executive, the PGSS executive, leaders of student groups, floor fellows in residences, and orientation at the Mac campus.

Recent initiatives relating to equity include the award for Equity and Community Building, awarded for the first time earlier this year. This award includes a student category. Community Engagement Day, held in October of this year for the second time, is another new initiative which involves the McGill community in outreach. Research conducted by Prof. Lisa Spanierman and students on micro-aggression is becoming known on campus.

Additional steps for 2013-14. I will shortly be bringing to Senate a proposal from JBSCE for a new Subcommittee on Family Care, which will certainly be relevant to equity matters for both students and staff. SSMU, SEDE and the Residences have initiated a proposal for Anti-Oppression training in the residences. SEDE will be launching an awareness campaign on equity and discrimination.

In 2013, a diversity survey (Understanding Diversity and Discrimination) was conducted which expanded from the original 2009 survey, to include new questions about the frequency and type of discrimination experience, the reporting of discrimination and observed discrimination. The results of the 2013 survey are not yet available but will be made so during the course of this academic year and a comparison between the two surveys will be conducted.

As far as the student experience on the Mac campus is concerned, there are equity resources available. The Faculty has been working with SEDE to provide support to staff and students, such as workshops and training sessions on inclusiveness. The Student Services Office on the Mac Campus can provide resources to students on equity matters. The Dean's Office, Unit directors and the Macdonald Campus HR Director provide advice and support to staff on equity issues.

In conclusion, the University is making concerted efforts to integrate equity concepts into our policies and practices. Of course, much remains to be done, particularly as regards raising awareness.

Senator Butler further explained that microaggression is prevalent in classrooms and asked what measures are in place for students to report on these issues. Senator White replied that the University is examining options to improve microaggression reporting.

Senator Stewart-Kanigan noted that the SEDE office is facing a significant cut to its budget and has an ambiguous place in the University's structure. She then asked a question which the Chair requested be submitted at the next Senate meeting.

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

Open Session

1. Open Discussion: Charter of Quebec Values (D13-18)

The Chair initiated the discussion by reminding Senate that in September, as part of the consultation on the proposed Charter of Values, she issued a statement reaffirming that McGill respects and promotes values of cultural diversity and inclusiveness. She explained that on November 7, 2013, the Quebec government tabled Bill 60 which retains the provision prohibiting public sector employees from wearing conspicuous religious symbols, and substituting a time-limited transition to the full implementation of the bill for universities and hospitals instead of the previously proposed exemption from this provision. She noted that the National Assembly will be holding public hearings on the Bill starting January 14, 2014 and McGill would use this opportunity to make its views known and to present the University's position. She then called on Me Line Thibault, General Counsel, to further elaborate on how the adoption of Bill 60 would affect the University. Me Thibault explained that the Bill is generally aligned with the secular values of the University, but that certain provisions of the Bill run contrary to McGill's mission and principles. In particular, section 5 prohibits the wearing of conspicuous religious symbols.

Senators agreed that Bill 60 contradicts McGill's mission and principles. Senator Dinel highlighted that the Bill violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the United Nations' Charter of Human Rights. She urged the administration to not only resist the Bill's implementation, but to also actively oppose it. She also questioned how the wearing of religious symbols affects University activities such as teaching, research and learning. Senator Aitken further noted that the Bill encroaches on academic and personal freedoms currently enjoyed by the University's staff. She also mentioned that religious identity and expression are integral to a person's identity; therefore, legislation requiring the removal of religious symbols in effect requires one to erase their religious identity. Senator Aitken concluded by noting that McGill strives to attract the most talented students and staff, which has arguably become more difficult since the tabling of Bill 60, and will be even harder if the Bill becomes law. Senator Saroyan added that not only does the Bill restrict constitutionally-protected rights, but it also contradicts the University's value of creating a safe, inclusive environment, and defies the equity-related work the University has undertaken.

Following discussion, the Chair noted that it was important for Senate to develop a common position fairly quickly as she sought the McGill community's position vis-à-vis the legislation. She then suggested the following resolution for approval:

Be it resolved that while the McGill Senate supports the secular spirit of Bill 60, it strongly objects to the restrictions on the right to wear religious symbols, and in

particular, as described in Article 5 of the draft legislation, which run contrary to the University's mission and values.

Some Senators agreed with the draft motion proposed by the Chair, but suggested stronger language be adopted. Senator Lu further suggested that the motion mention that the University will not enforce the legislation's provisions if the Bill becomes law. Some Senators felt that sections 6 and 7 should be included in the motion since they believed these sections discriminated against Islamic women.

Senator Jutras proposed removing reference to any sections of the Bill in the motion. He also recommended a bilingual motion be adopted.

After further discussion, Senate approved the following resolutions:

Be it resolved that while the McGill Senate supports the secular spirit of Bill 60, it strongly objects to the restrictions on the right to wear religious symbols, as described in the draft legislation, which run contrary to the University's mission and values.

Il est résolu que bien que le Sénat de l'Université McGill appuie l'esprit laïque du projet de loi 60, il s'oppose fermement aux restrictions relatives au port de symboles religieux tel que décrites dans le projet de loi, car elles vont à l'encontre de la mission et les valeurs de l'Université.

2. Key Performance Indicators (D13-19)

Dr. Pierre Moreau, Executive Director (Planning and Institutional Analysis), presented this item for Senate's information. He provided a history of how the key performance indicators were developed and how they were selected. Dr. Moreau also underlined that McGill is the leading university in the province regarding the development of key performance indicators.

Senators asked questions about specific indicators. Senator Saroyan also asked if the University was considering outcome indicators as well. Dr. Moreau responded that this was a possibility the University could consider in the future.

Confidential Session

3. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D13-27)

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

Open Session (continued)

4. 450th Report of the Academic Policy Committee

(D13-20)

The Provost delivered this report for Senate's approval and focused his presentation on the proposed Policy on Research Centres.

Senator Lu asked how funds are allocated to research centres. The Provost explained for research centres in specific Faculties, funds are allocated to Deans who apportion resources according to performance. Senator Goldstein responded that for cross-faculty research centres, there is no guaranteed funding from the central budget, but in some instances, the central budget matches funding raised through research granting agencies.

Be it resolved that Senate approve the proposed Policy on Research Centres for further recommendation to the Board of Governors for final approval.

5. Report of the Nominating Committee

(D13-21)

The Provost presented this report for approval. Aside from appointments to fill vacant positions on various committees, the report contained revised terms of reference for the Senate Nominating and Senate Steering Committees, as well as proposed terms of reference for three Ad Hoc Committees (an Ad Hoc Committee on the Enhancement of Senate Meetings; an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Charter of Students' Rights; an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Livestreaming of Senate Meetings).

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D13-21) to fill vacancies on Senate Standing Committees and on Committees Arising from the University Regulations.

With regard to the proposed revisions to the terms of reference of the Steering Committee, Senators discussed the addition of a Dean, to be appointed by the Provost, on the Steering Committee. Some Senators proposed removing this addition from the Steering Committee's terms of reference. The Provost clarified that the Nominating Committee had considered this very carefully and decided that since a majority of members on the Steering Committee are elected, including an ex officio position on the Committee for a Dean would not disrupt the Committee's balance and would provide a Faculty-perspective view on the Steering Committee.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the revised terms of reference for the Senate Nominating and Senate Steering Committees, as recommended in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D13-21).

With regard to the terms of reference for an Ad Hoc Committee on the Enhancement of Senate Meetings, Senator Lu proposed an amendment to the terms of reference to further clarify that the Committee be mandated to examine the purpose and outcomes of Senate discussions.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the terms of reference for an Ad Hoc Committee on the Enhancement of Senate Meetings as contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D13-21), including the proposed revision to further clarify the Committee's mandate.

Senate reviewed and approved the terms of reference for the two remaining Ad Hoc Committees, as presented in the Senate Nominating Report.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the terms of reference for an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Charter of Students' Rights as contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D13-21).

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the terms of reference for an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Livestreaming of Senate Meetings as contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D13-21).

6. Annual Report from the Senate Committee on Physical Development (D13-22)

Mr. Robert Couvrette, Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) delivered this presentation for Senate's information. He explained that the Committee reviews projects underway at the University and that some of its subcommittees revised their mandates to better focus their activities.

Senator Butler asked what the timeline is for completing the repairs to the damage caused by the fire at Macdonald Campus. Mr. Couvrette replied that the initial steps include finishing the work to secure and winterize the site, and receiving an engineering assessment of the affected silo's condition before determining timelines.

Senator Shea asked if considerations are made for universal design for differently-abled members of the community. Mr. Couvrette answered that this is always considered, but that sometimes detours are required.

Senator Stewart-Kanigan asked how the decision was made to include bicycle gates at the Milton gates. Mr. Couvrette replied that this decision was made by University Services and intended to be a pilot project.

Senator Covo acknowledged the significance of the recent appointment of a full-time curator for the University's art collection, and thanked Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance) Di Grappa and the Provost for this expression of their commitment to the visual arts.

Senator Wolfson asked if McGill has a list of buildings which have not yet become fully wheelchair accessible. Mr. Couvrette said this document may exist and could be provided to Senators at a later date.

7. Annual Report from the Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs (D13-23)

Senator Dyens presented this report for Senate's information. There were no questions.

8. Annual Report of the Committee on Student Discipline (D13-24)

Senator Costopoulos delivered this report for Senate's information. He mentioned that the Office of the Dean of Students is open to suggestions of how granular the report should be without compromising students' identities.

Senator Mooney asked if there is a concern for recidivism for academic offences, noting that in only one instance was a reprimand delivered last year. Senator Costopoulos clarified that a reprimand is a serious consequence which appears on a student's academic record for life and that McGill guards against recidivism through probation of students found guilty of academic offences.

9. Report of the Board of Governors to Senate (D13-25)

The Secretary-General, Mr. Stephen Strople, presented this report on behalf of Senator Price for Senate's information.

10. Report of the Joint Board-Senate Meeting (D13-26)

The Secretary-General delivered this report for Senate's information, highlighting the high turnout for, and stimulating discussion at, the event.

Senator Butler asked what sort of follow-up will occur from the discussion generated at the meeting. Mr. Strople replied that the Senator Dyens will be reconvening the event's planning committee, which included stakeholders from across the University, to consider follow-up actions.

11. Other Business

There being no other business to deal with, on a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

END

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