



Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on December 5, 2012, at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT

Aitken, Ellen
Algieri, Stefano
Beheshti, Jamshid
Belanger, Laurence
Bell, Graham
Bernard, Daniel
Bouchard, Adam
Boudreau, Andrew
Boyer, Daniel
Carriere, Segre
Cecere, Renzo
Cook, Colleen
Costopoulos, Andre
Covo, David
Cowan, Brian
Cuello, Claudio
Dedek, Helge
Di Grappa, Michael
Di Paola, Antonia
Dinel, Haley
Doucette, Elaine
Dudek, Gregory
Eidelman, David
Espinosa, Rodrigo
Ferrie, Frank
Galaty, John
Gehring, Kalle
Gillon, Brendan

Goldstein, Rose
Grütter, Peter
Gutman, Jimmy
Harman, Christopher
Harpp, David
Heath, Nancy
Hebert, Terence
Henry, Evan
Hepburn, Allan
Herrick, Shannon
Hurtubise, Jacques
Hynes, Andrew
Jonsson, Wilbur
Jutras, Daniel
Kalil, Alex
Kirby, Torrance
Kirk, Andrew
Kreiswirth, Martin
Kucij, Maya
Kuzaitis, Ruth
Lane-Mercier, Gillian
Laverdiere, Eric
Lefsrud, Mark
Lowther, David
Lu, Catherine
Madramootoo, Chandra
Manfredi, Christopher
Marcil, Olivier
Masi, Anthony

McCullogh, Mary Jo
Mendelson, Morton
Michaud, Mark
Mooney, Jonathan
Munroe-Blum, Heather
(*Chair*)
Nasr, Mo
Nystrom, Derek
Potter, Judith
Price, Cynthia
Redel, Josh
Richard, Marc
Riches, Caroline
Rush, Avi
Sinacore, Ada
Snider, Laurie
Srinidhi, Nikhil
Stromvik, Martina
Todd, Peter
Vivas, Isabel
Weinstein, Marc
White, Lydia
Wolfson, Christina
Xu, Boran
Yalovsky, Morty
Zorychta, Edith
Strople, Stephen
(*Secretary*)

REGRETS: Paul Allison, George Azmy, Stephanie Bachelet, Leslie Breitner, Stuart Cobbett, Ziad El-Khatib, Sean Ferguson, Charles Gale, Martin Grant, Ashraf Ismail, David Lametti, Bruce Lennox, Arun Misra, Michael Ngadi, Gary Pekeles, Hélène Perrault, Kathryn Peterson, Amir Raz, Nigel Roulet, Melvin Schloss, Honora Shaughnessy, Arnold Steinberg, Elin Thordardottir, Ji Zhang, Max Zidel.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Manuel Laurent Picard

Senator Todd rose and read the following death resolution, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

Senators, it is with regret that I inform you of the death of Dean Emeritus Laurent Picard who passed away on August 29, 2012 at the age of 84.

Professor Picard was born in Québec City. He attended Université Laval where he obtained bachelor's degrees in Arts, Philosophy, and Applied Sciences, and went on to receive a Doctor of Business Administration from Harvard University.

His passion and ingenuity led Professor Picard to outstanding careers in both the public and private sectors. He was a Professor at the Faculty of Commerce of Université Laval, a Research Associate and Assistant at Harvard Business School, and a Professor and Associate Director at HEC Montréal.

He served as President of Marine Industries and was on the Board of Directors at Dorel Industries. He was an Executive Vice-President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and was named President of the CBC from 1972-75. In 1976, he was made a Companion of the Order of Canada.

Professor Picard went on to become the Dean of McGill's Faculty of Management from 1978-1986. I remember him from my days as a McGill Bachelor of Commerce student. He was a visionary leader and a key player in reshaping this Faculty, particularly by strengthening its ties with the francophone business community.

As the current Dean of the Faculty, I have a particular appreciation for all that he accomplished. He was an inspiration to his faculty and students, myself included, as a model of a scholar, business leader, and public servant.

An exuberant, wise, and passionate man, he will be remembered by generations of students, academic colleagues, lovers of public broadcasting, business associates, and members of the McGill community.

Through the annual Laurent Picard Distinguished Lecture Series at the Desautels Faculty, his legacy will continue to be honoured.

We offer sincere condolences to his wife Thérèse, his sons André, Marc and Denys, his brother Guy, and his grandchildren Jean-François, Stéphanie and Alexandra.

2. Report of the Steering Committee (12:13-04)

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the November 14, 2012 meeting.

Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee had reviewed the confidential minutes of the meeting of November 14, 2012 and had approved them on behalf of Senate.

Item 3. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, speaking rights were granted to Dr. Rima Rozen, Associate Vice-Principal (Life Sciences) for item IIB5 (Revisions to the Policy on the Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects). Professor Nathalie Cooke, Associate Provost (Academic Staff and Priority Initiatives), was unable to attend the meeting and thus not granted speaking rights.

Item 4. Confidential Session. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed that it would enter into Confidential Session for discussion of item IIB3, Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

In Professor Cooke's absence, Senator Lane-Mercier agreed to present item IIB9, Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Libraries. On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was adopted as amended.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair opened her remarks with an overview of her recently circulated response to Dean Manfredi's Report on the Open Forum on Freedom of Expression and Peaceful Assembly. She told Senate that this response addressed recommendations concerning clarifications to The Code of Student Conduct, the "James Protocol" and the training program for both permanent and temporary security personnel. The Chair added that work was currently underway to adapt the Provisional Protocol Regarding Demonstrations, Protests, and Occupations on McGill University Campuses into a permanent protocol. She told Senate that she had invited community feedback to the draft protocol and that once feedback had been received and reviewed, the revised protocol would be discussed by Senate and the Board of Governors in January. The Chair said that she had asked Senator White to bring forward recommendations related to the Code of Student Conduct to Senate in March or April and to the Board at a subsequent meeting.

The Chair then discussed government relations, beginning with the planned Summit on Higher Education. She told Senate that the Summit would be held in February in Montreal, and would focus on four themes:

- Quality of higher education;
- Accessibility and participation in higher education;
- Governance and financing of universities; and
- Contribution of institutions and research to Quebec society.

The Chair told Senate that the University was working with CREPUQ and with a subset of universities towards engaging with the public in preparation for the Summit. She said that McGill's goals would be to ensure that:

- quality, along with accessibility, is central to any discussion of the future of universities in Quebec;
- the particular missions of the non-UQ universities are incorporated into funding frameworks;
- the value of universities to Quebec society is recognized; and that
- the underfunding of universities is broadly recognized and that the Summit focus on means to providing the resources we require.

The Chair described four pre-Summit meetings being held on the four Summit themes. She pointed out that none were to be held in Montreal and that the one on research would take place in Rimouski. She added that the provincial government would designate attendees for each meeting and assign exact topics for presentation. She urged Senators to work through their own associations to ensure that McGill had sufficient representation. The Chair briefly discussed the first of the four pre-Summit meetings, which had been on the broad theme of "quality of higher education." At that meeting, CREPUQ had proposed the creation of an independent body to advise the government on the development of the Quebec university network as to preserve the autonomy, independence and academic freedom of universities. She invited Senators to review this proposal and to share their impressions with her.

The Chair then spoke about the recently passed provincial budget and the subsequently announced cuts to universities' funding for the current fiscal year. The Chair reminded Senate that since the Board of Governors had approved McGill's current budget in April, the Quebec government had first reduced its previously confirmed tuition hike, then cancelled the tuition hike completely, and now was forcing universities to cut their spending by 5.2%, with a further cut to universities' operating grants to follow in 2013-2014. She added that cuts to research funding were planned for 2013-14. The Chair indicated that McGill would continue to work through CREPUQ and directly with the Government of Quebec to secure a well-funded Quebec university system, with an emphasis on quality with accessibility, societal impact and autonomy with accountability.

Next, the Chair spoke of the recent joint Board-Senate meeting on the topic of Universal Design. She thanked all who had participated and noted the contributions of student groups and those of the office of the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning). The Chair pointed out that a past joint Board-Senate meeting on Sustainability had resulted in several measures and policies that had served the University well and that she hoped for similar developments from this meeting.

The Chair ended her remarks with highlights of her recent travel to Vancouver, Beijing and Hong Kong. She reported that she had met with senior leadership at universities and government

and public bodies, and had attended important alumni and parent events, including one at the Hong Kong Chamber of Commerce.

Senator Dinel asked the Chair about the University's plans to solicit community feedback in advance of the Summit. The Chair responded that she welcomed input from all constituencies and that Vice-Principal (External Relations) Olivier Marcil was the University's point person ahead of the Summit.

Senator Gutman asked why the University was pushing for higher tuition rather than a single-payer model. The Chair responded that the real issue was how promises relating to sources of revenue had been reneged upon.

SECTION II

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

1. Annual Report on the Financial State of the University (D12-25)

Mr. Michael Di Grappa, Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance), presented this report for Senate's information. He emphasized that McGill was doing well with what it had, but that the University's financial status was fragile. He told Senate that the University's responsible financial stewardship was reflected by a credit rating that is higher than that of the Quebec government, though recent government backtracking on tuition fees had lowered it.

Vice-Principal Di Grappa explained that following a surplus in FY2011 and a balanced budget in FY2012, this year's budget had forecast a \$6M deficit. He added that the recent government announcement would make it much higher. He then broke down the University's sources of funding and its expenditures. Vice-Principal Di Grappa explained that deferred maintenance was an area of insufficient government funding. He outlined the financial challenges that McGill faces, including pressures on total compensation, enrolment numbers, funding sources from the province and tuition and capital requirements that are not covered by the province. Vice-Principal Di Grappa ended by saying that the new government was leading McGill down a path of uncertainty, whereby enhanced creativity would be necessary.

Senators thanked Vice-Principal Di Grappa for this report and for the longer financial statement, and asked for a more detailed breakdown of the "Other Expenses" that constituted 23% of total expenditures in FY2012.

SECRETARY'S NOTE: Following the meeting, Vice-Principal Di Grappa provided information that "Other Expenses" include materials, supplies and publications, contributions to partner institutions, travel, energy and other non-salary expenses as listed in the annual audited financial statements. The detailed report is part of the permanent Senate record.

2. Budget Planning 2013-2014: Report I (D12-26)

Professor Anthony C. Masi, Provost, delivered this report for Senate's information. The Provost began by tying the budget to McGill's strategic priorities and strategic objectives, which derive from the University's academic plan. He provided an update on planning for the FY2014 budget, telling Senate that the current fiscal environment contained uncertainty related to revenues (coming from tuition fees) and expenses (related to compensation pressures and one-time-only costs) and that the recent provincial budget added to this uncertainty. The Provost explained that the University's preliminary budget assumptions included necessary expenditures in order to sustain McGill's standards of excellence as well as cost savings arising from SRI projects. He ended by explaining that resources were constrained by several factors, including compensation and infrastructure needs and limited government support, but that the University aimed to be as efficient as possible without compromising quality and access.

Much of the ensuing discussion related to government support and McGill's ability to find other sources of revenue. Senator Bouchard asked whether the recently announced cuts meant that the University could no longer be guided by the very broad Academic Plan that Senate endorsed. The Provost responded that the Academic Plan laid out the University's commitments and that the challenge would be how to best express them across Faculties.

Senators asked about McGill's relationship with the provincial government and whether the recent cuts demanded a new course of action. The Chair explained that McGill was engaged in discussions both internally and with other Quebec universities about how to best express its views to the government. She added that she rejected notions of "privatization," but agreed that McGill had to ask questions about the relationship of the four medical/doctoral universities with the province.

Senators asked about the status of fees paid by international students in deregulated programs. The Provost told Senate that McGill would prefer having deregulated status attached to students, rather than programs, since many students took courses across regulated and deregulated programs. The Chair added that McGill was the only Quebec university that provided financial aid to international students and that the University's values were incommensurate with tuition at the levels seen in the United States. She added that McGill was lobbying the government to maintain teaching and research grant money with deregulated students.

Senator Gutman asked why SSMU was forced to pay to rent its building, while other Canadian universities provided such services for free. The Provost explained that McGill spent heavily on student life and that lease negotiations involved all concerned parties.

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question Regarding the Relationship Between the MUHC and McGill

Senator Gutman asked the following question:

National and local media have been covering the tenure of Arthur Porter at the MUHC. Media revelations show he also had some involvement at McGill.

According to the Gazette, Arthur Porter was hired as a professor at McGill. He is listed online as a staff Radiation Oncologist. Investigative journalism revealed that other professors in his department never saw him lecture or do anything.

At the heart of the issue lays the relationship between McGill's medical department and the MUHC.

What is the relationship between the McGill Faculty of Medicine and the MUHC?

What are the criteria for cross appointments between the Faculty of Medicine and the MUHC?

Did Arthur Porter go through the appropriate tenure track procedures? What are the procedures for hiring academic staff?

Senator Eidelman, Dean of Medicine and Vice-Principal (Health Affairs), answered as follows:

What is the relationship between the McGill Faculty of Medicine and the MUHC?

The McGill University Health Centre is the principal teaching hospital of McGill University. Although closely associated with the university, it is a separate legal entity, governed by the laws on health care institutions and not those on higher education. It has a separate board of directors and its own mechanisms for appointing directors, administrators, professionals and workers.

The MUHC and McGill have a contract of affiliation, which is required for all hospitals that are recognized as university health centres or “CHU”s. This contract lays out the responsibilities of both parties with regard to educational and research activities within the hospital and its associated research centre. McGill has similar arrangements with the Jewish General Hospital, St. Mary’s Hospital and the Douglas University Mental Health Institute.

What are the criteria for cross appointments between the Faculty of Medicine and the MUHC?

All professionals (physicians, nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, dentists, speech pathologists) who work in the hospital and who have teaching and/or research responsibilities also have university appointments, which are appropriate to their role. In the case of physicians based at the MUHC, besides a few remaining legacy cases, all must be full-time, contract academic staff or tenure-track faculty. Most physicians are

CAS appointees. There are also tenure-track scientists in the MUHC who belong to a variety of departments in the Faculty of Medicine. Some administrators in the MUHC and other teaching hospitals also hold university appointments, particularly in the case of those who have been appointed to their administrative post from a previous academic position at McGill or elsewhere.

Did Arthur Porter go through the appropriate tenure track procedures? What are the procedures for hiring academic staff?

As with most physicians at the MUHC, Dr. Porter did not hold a tenure-track appointment. Instead, he was appointed to the position of Associate Professor, GFT-H in the Department of Oncology at the time of his hiring in 2004. GFT-H was the designation in place before CAS (Clinical) came into use. At the time of his reappointment in 2008, Dr. Porter was put forward for promotion to full-professor by the Chair of the Department of Oncology. This promotion was carried out using the standard procedures and criteria of the university, such as a statutory selection committee.

Although Dr. Porter is now known for other things, his CV met all the criteria for tenure as a university professor and was that of a leader in the field of radiation oncology with ample evidence of scholarship and an international reputation. He has published more than 200 papers, holds several patents and has given numerous invited lectures on his discipline. Moreover, during his time as Director General, he was involved in the supervision of graduate students in management from other universities.

While Dr. Porter did not have a tenure-track position, he did receive a salary from the university. It is currently the policy of the university to contribute to the salary package of the hospital directors general. This reflects the importance of the teaching hospitals to our educational and research missions.

Senator Gutman asked about the loan that McGill provided to Dr. Porter. Senator Eidelman answered that such loans are provided in rare instances as part of recruitment and retention efforts and that this particular loan held interest at a rate consistent with criteria established by Revenu Quebec and Revenue Canada. He added that he could not provide more details as the unpaid loan was a matter before the courts.

Senators asked about Dr. Porter's academic duties. Senator Eidelman explained that Dr. Porter supervised management students from other universities. He added that, like all hospital administrators in the McGill network, he did not supervise individual residents because he was a full-time administrator of an academic unit, with responsibility for the hospital portion of medical education.

Senators Galaty and Mooney asked whether McGill could be more active in addressing public criticism and misrepresentations about University management. Senator Eidelman agreed that this was not an issue of mismanagement and told Senate that there was always a risk of creating a bigger story by responding loudly.

2. Question Regarding Work Group on Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures

Senators Mooney, Grütter, Ismail, El-Khatib, Nystrom, Xu asked the following question:

WHEREAS a Work Group has been struck to examine possible implications of the Manfredi Report for the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures, with specific reference to:

- *Recommendation 1: The Code of Student Conduct should be clarified with regard to sections 5, 6 and 10 of the Code, namely “disruption,” “unauthorized entry and/or presence” and “unauthorized or fraudulent use of university facilities, equipment or services.”*
- *Section 6.3.1 of the Report: Issues related to concealing identity.*
- *How actions taken under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures are reported to the McGill community.”*

WHEREAS the work group has been mandated, among other things, to:

- Obtain input from stakeholders at McGill
- Coordinate the work group’s activities with those of the Steering Group that is already addressing general amendments to the Code of Student Conduct
- Adopt a timeline that will allow, if need be, the presentation of recommendations for amendments to the Code to Senate by February or March 2013 for discussion and by March or April 2013 for formal consideration

WHEREAS the composition with regard to size and representation on the Work Group has been established as:

- Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity) (Chair)
- Dean of Students
- Dean of Law
- Three student Senators (undergraduate, graduate and Continuing Studies)
- Two faculty Senators
- One representative from the Board of Governors

WHEREAS the Senate Nominating Committee is responsible for the nomination of the members of Senate who will be appointed to the Work Group.

WHEREAS the University statutes (6.3.12) state that Senate “shall exercise general disciplinary authority over the student body of the University and may delegate authority to make and enforce student disciplinary regulations to University bodies and officers of its choosing”

WHEREAS the task of considering aspects of the Code may be better suited to an ad-hoc committee of Senate, which would exist within the statutory framework of University governance rather than outside it

WHEREAS the mandate, composition in terms of stakeholder representation, and terms of reference of a committee reviewing the Code might benefit from Senate input.

What is the role of the Senate in the formulation of this Work Group, specifically, with respect to mandate, composition, and terms of reference?

Why was the task of considering amendments to the Code assigned to a Work Group rather than an ad-hoc committee of Senate?

What are the methodology and timelines proposed for consultation by this Work Group with the McGill community?

How will the activities of this Work Group be harmonized with those of the Steering Group currently reviewing the Student Code of Conduct?

What role will the Senate play in the review and approval of changes, if any, proposed by this Work Group for the Student Code?

Senator White, Associate Provost, Policies, Procedures & Equity, answered as follows:

For the sake of clarity, before answering the specifics of the question, I will address some history relating to proposed revisions to the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures (henceforth, the Code) and the working group that has already been considering this matter.

Former Dean of Students, Jane Everett, originally set up a working group in late 2008 to advise her on possible amendments to the Code. This was in response to issues that were being raised by the University community (including the need for provision for students to consult evidence prior to a Disciplinary Interview, disclosure of outcomes of academic cases to complainants, alignment of the Code's definition of plagiarism with other definitions used in University regulations, and the fact that the Code's structure needs to be revised for reasons of clarity).

This advisory working group consisted of two professors, two students nominated by SSMU, one student nominated by PGSS and one member of the Student Advocacy Program. It first met in 2009 and continued thereafter until the end of Dean Everett's term earlier this year, with changing membership. During this period, there was widespread consultation about various aspects of the Code. In March 2012, Dean Everett brought to Senate information about the topics that would be addressed once revisions to the Code were brought to Senate.

Since Dean Everett's mandate ended in the summer of 2012, she established a steering group, to continue consultation and to bring proposed revisions to the Code to Senate for discussion and approval in the Winter term of 2013.

This steering group, following Dean Everett's recommendation to Senate in March, made the decision not to tackle certain sections of the Code until after Dean Manfredi had issued his *Report of the Open Forum on Free Expression and Peaceful Assembly*. The steering group continues to consult on other proposed changes.

As for the work group that is the focus of the question, the Principal reported to Senate on Oct. 17th 2012 that she accepts all the recommendations of the Manfredi *Report of the Open Forum on Free Expression and Peaceful Assembly*. The Principal therefore decided to set up a work group, distinct from the working group/steering group established by Dean Everett, to be chaired by Professor Lydia White, Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity), who is also a member of the steering group.

The focus of the work group is to consider Recommendation 1 of Dean Manfredi's report, pertaining to lack of clarity in sections 5, 6 and 10 of the Code, as well as matters relating to concealment of identity, discussed in section 6.3.1 of Dean Manfredi's report, and the issue of how to report to the McGill community actions taken under the Code. (This latter point relates to section 91(f) of the Code and partly overlaps with one of the original issues that Dean Everett's group looked at.)

To turn now to the 4 points raised in the question:

i. As to the role of Senate in the formulation of the work group, Senate has not had a role in setting up the work group. However, Senate Nominating Committee has been asked to propose names of senators (students and academic staff) to serve on the group, since the Principal felt that senators would provide appropriate representation of the University community on this work group.

It is important to remember that it is typically NOT the case that new regulations and policies - or revisions to existing regulations and policies – involve ad hoc committees of Senate. Rather, such proposals come to Senate from a variety of sources and the role of Senate is, ultimately, to approve amend, disapprove or refer back for further review, regardless of where the proposals originate.

ii. Methodology and timelines for consultation with the McGill community with respect to the work group. My intention is to engage in broad consultation with the University Community, and it would have to be done by March. The work group will determine how this can be done most effectively.

iii. The Principal has asked me, as Chair of the work group, to coordinate the activities of the new work group with those of the existing steering group. It is not my intention to have the work group bring recommendations to Senate separately from those of the steering group. Rather, any recommendations that the work group may come up with in respect of sections 5, 6 and 10 of the Code will be coordinated with the recommendations of the steering group for the Code in general. Indeed, I would expect that there will be a joint meeting or meetings of the two groups. Recommendations will be brought to Senates for discussion and approval in March and April 2013. In other words, Senate will

be asked to consider revisions to the Code in their totality, rather than in separate bits and pieces.

iv. Any proposed changes to the Code of Student Conduct will go through the regular channels, i.e. Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs (CESA), Academic Policy Committee (APC), Senate, and Board. Senate and the Board will be asked to consider and approve a number of changes, many of which originated with Dean Everett and her original working group, and some of which may originate from the work group now being set up by the Principal.

Senator Mooney said that a Work Group comprised solely of Senators could exclude individuals who were well-qualified and knowledgeable. Senator Nasr suggested that there be more students on this committee. Senator Gutman added that unionized staff members should be included in the Work Group. Senator White responded that she would welcome additional members with expertise, but warned that a larger group would inevitably work more slowly. Senator Costopoulos added that the Steering Group would also welcome expertise and additional input.

Senator Lu asked whether concerns were raised about the Dean of Students' possible conflict of interest in heading the steering group. The Principal responded that there was no conflict of interest in the sense of a potential for personal gain.

Part "B" – Motions and Reports from Organs of University Government (contd.)

Closed Session

3. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D12-27)

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

4. Reports of the Academic Policy Committee

4.1 Annual Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D12-28)

Professor Mendelson, Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning), presented this report for Senate's information. He called Senators' attention to the Academic Unit Reviews, which had been conducted following the process approved by Senate. He also told Senate that the Student Exchange Pilot Program was canvassing for participants, with the aim of allowing students with GPA's between 2.50 and 2.99 to participate because exchanges have been shown to have a positive impact on student success.

4.2 442nd Report of the Academic Policy Committee

(D12-29)

Professor Mendelson presented this report for Senate's approval.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed Certificate of Proficiency in Written English – Workplace Communication and the Certificate of Proficiency in Written French – Workplace Communication.

Senator Mooney asked about synergies that were anticipated in the renamed Centre for Research on Brain, Language and Music. Senator White answered that there were parallels between language and music and that overlapping interests would complement each other.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed name change for the Centre for Research on Language, Mind and Brain (CRLMB) / Centre de recherche sur le langage, le mental et le cerveau to Centre for Research on Brain, Language and Music (CRBLM) / Centre de recherche sur le cerveau, le langage et la musique (CRCLM) and so recommended to the Board of Governors.

Professor Mendelson ended the report by calling Senators attention to the Annual Report on Student Exchanges, highlighting the increase in outgoing exchanges. In response to a question from Senator Mooney, he explained that the exchange with the Wharton School was specific to the Faculty of Management and that he did not have any further details.

5. Revisions to the Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects

(D12-30)

Dr. Rima Rozen, Associate Vice-Principal (Research & International Relations) presented the revisions to the *Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects* for approval. She explained that the revisions aimed to maintain compliance with the recently updated Tri-Council policy statement.

Senator Wolfson asked whether section 4.2 (“research in the humanities and the social sciences that poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed”) could include minimal-risk research in epidemiology. Dr. Rozen responded that the extent of scholarly review required would be dictated by the level of risk. Senator Dudek asked whether the policy could stipulate standards for timeliness in the review process. Dr. Rozen responded that the policy did not deal with such administrative parameters.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved, and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval, the proposed revisions to the McGill Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects.

6. Report of the Nominating Committee (D12-31)

Professor Andrew Kirk, Interim Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, presented the Report of the Nominating Committee for approval.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee.

7. Regulations Relating to Maternity, Parental and Extended Parental Leave for Members of the Academic Staff (D12-32)

Professor Lydia White, Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity), presented the report for approval. Before moving the resolution, she suggested an amendment to section 1.4(ii), replacing “by hand” with “by delivery.”

On a motion duly proposed and seconded,

(i) Senate approved the Regulations on Maternity Leave, Parental Leave and Extended Parental Leave for Members of the Academic Staff as amended to replace the Regulations on Maternity Leave for Tenured and Tenure Track Members of the Academic Staff, the Regulations on Parental Leave for Tenured and Tenure Track Members of the Academic Staff and the Regulations on Extended Maternity and Extended Parental Leave for Tenured and Tenure Track Members of the Academic Staff; with effect on January 1, 2013;

(ii) Senate recommended the approval of the new regulations by the Board of Governors; and

(iii) Senate approved the amendment of all references to the replaced regulations in other McGill policies and regulations.

8. Annual Report of the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity (D12-33)

Professor Lydia White, Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity), presented this report for Senate’s information. She highlighted the Committee’s work in developing the Award for Equity and Community Building. She was also happy to report that all of the Committee’s subcommittees were fully composed and functioning well.

9. Annual Report of the Committee on Libraries (D12-34)

Senator Lane-Mercier presented this report for the information of Senate. She highlighted the library’s new acquisitions of the HathiTrust, expanded ProQuest services and the Gale Virtual Reference Library.

10. Report on the Joint Board-Senate Meeting

(D12-35)

Mr. Stephen Stroppe, Secretary-General, presented this item for Senate's information. He reported that this year's meeting was an overall success with a strong turnout by members of Senate and the Board of Governors. He recognized the work of the Office of Students with Disabilities and all the student volunteers who served as animators and rapporteurs.

11. Other Business

Senate recognized Senator Pekeles' many years of service as a Senate representative to the Board of Governors and delivered applause.

There being no other business to deal with, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

END

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