



Minutes

Wednesday, February 15, 2012 11-12:06

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on February 15, 2012 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT	Gonnerman, Laura	Marcil, Olivier
Acker, Tom	Grant, Martin	Masi, Anthony
Aitken, Ellen	Grütter, Peter	McCulloch, Mary Jo
Allison, Paul	Gyakum, John	McDonough, Kevin
Almasri, Mahmoud	Han, Lily	Mendelson, Morton
Barney, Darin	Hashimoto, Kyoko	Michaud, Mark
Beheshti, Jamshid	Hebert, Terence	Misra, Arun
Bernard, Daniel	Hepburn, Allan	Munroe-Blum, Heather (Chair)
Bin Shahid, Usman	Hobbins, Joan	Nassim, Roland
Blachford, Gregg	Hurtubise, Jacques	Paterson, Kady
Bouchard, Adam	Hynes, Andrew	Pekes, Gary
Boyer, Daniel	Ismail, Ashraf	Perreault, Hélène
Breitner, Leslie	Janda, Richard	Peterson, Kathryn
Briones, Emil	Johnson, Juliet	Potter, Judith
Brophy, James	Jonsson, Wilbur	Richard, Marc
Clare, Emily Yee	Jutras, Daniel	Riches, Caroline
Clarke, Ian	Kirby, Torrance	Roulet, Nigel
Cook, Colleen	Kirk, Andrew	Schloss, Melvin
Covo, David	Knight, Maggie	Shaughnessy, Honora
Crawford, Matthew	Kreiwirth, Martin	Sinacore, Ada
Cuello, Claudio	Kurien, John	Todd, Peter
Di Grappa, Michael	Kuzaitis, Ruth	Vivas, Isabel
Dinel, Haley	Laverdiere, Eric	Wapnick, Joel
Dudek, Gregory	Lefsrud, Mark	Weinstein, Marc
Eidelman, David	Lennox, Bruce	White, Lydia
Etemad, Hamid	Leung, Jason	Wolfson, Christina
Everett, Jane	Lowther, David	Zhang, Ji
Ferguson, Sean	Luke, Max	Zorychta, Edith
Gale, Charles	Ma, Annie	Strople, Stephen (Secretary)
Gillon, Brendan	Madramootoo, Chandra	
Goldstein, Rose	Manfredi, Christopher	

REGRETS: Serge Carrier, Renzo Cecere, Roshi Chadha, Stuart Cobbett, Brian Cowan, Elaine Doucette, Brian Driscoll, Ziad El-Khatib, John Galaty, Kalle Gehring, Richard Gold, David Harpp, Alex Kalil, Richard Leask, Michael Ngadi, Alex Pritz, Amir Raz, Arnold Steinberg.

The Chair greeted everyone and explained that, due to concerns about security and Senate's ability to carry out its business, the chambers had been exceptionally reserved for Senators, support staff and campus media. Senator Barney asked whether this decision was based on a specific threat of disruption and why Senate had not been asked to authorize the measure. The Chair explained that recent demonstrations, as well as actions planned over the coming weeks, raised concerns about this Senate meeting and that such procedures are typically reviewed with the Steering Committee, with Senate asked to ratify when appropriate. The Chair moved to have spectators accommodated via a closed-circuit live feed into the Redpath Museum Auditorium. Senator Barney asked whether Senate was also being asked to approve the restrictions on access to the chambers in the same motion. The Chair suggested that Senate deal with the motion that was on the floor.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to have spectators accommodated via a live feed into the Redpath Museum Auditorium.

The Chair informed Senate that this was Senator Blachford's last meeting. On behalf of Senate, she thanked Senator Blachford for his dedicated service to Senate and its committees, as well as to the University as a whole. The Chair also welcomed Senators Vivas and Laverdiere as the newest members of Senate, representing the McGill Association of Continuing Education Students.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Professor Harry M. Bracken

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

It is with real sorrow that the Department of Philosophy notes the death of a former colleague, Prof. Harry M. Bracken. Harry was born in New York in the town of Yonkers in 1926. The descriptions of his early life that he wrote in his retirement are divided into tales about growing up in Yonkers, summering under primitive conditions on Lake Oscawana – a place which he remembered fondly, and where his family had roots dating as far back as the 1870s – and three years in the U.S. Navy during WW II. He enlisted after High School at the age of seventeen, and was shipped on board of USS Laurendale to the Pacific area of operations, where he saw action at Okinawa under kamikaze attacks. One thing that stands out from his tales is his respect for the intelligence and solidarity of the postal workers with whom he worked in the summer in Yonkers, and lack of respect for incompetents in positions of authority in the Navy. The lessons of those years remained with him. Those of you who remember Harry when he was here will be reminded of his respect for the common man and his well-developed nose for administrative incompetence and trenchant criticism of unjustified authority. This was no doubt one of the things about Harry that drew him later in life to develop a close intellectual relationship and personal friendship with Noam Chomsky.

After leaving the Navy, Harry received a BA from Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, an MA from Johns Hopkins, and a PhD from the University of Iowa, one of the few universities in the US that welcomed Jewish intellectuals who had escaped from Hitler's Germany. After teaching at Iowa and then at Minnesota and Arizona State, where he was promoted to Full Professor in 1966, Harry came to McGill, where he remained until his retirement in 1991. While here, he played an important role in the institution of the Jewish Studies department, and held (for as short a time as he could manage) several administrative positions, including chairing Jewish Studies and serving as acting Chair of Philosophy. Ever the gadfly at department meetings, he helped initiate the change from a department with no women in it in the early 1980s to one that has one of the best equity records in Canada. He was also active in progressive causes outside McGill. One colleague once remarked with a mixture of admiration and bemusement that Harry's and his wife's idea of an exciting weekend night out was attending an Amnesty International meeting. Colleagues also remember him as a loyal friend, always ready to advise and help in difficult times.

Harry's specialization was the history of philosophy, and in particular the history of what is called the "modern" period, focusing on the work of Descartes, Leibniz, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and others in the 17 and 18 centuries. His early work focused on Berkeley, but the focus of his intellectual interest later shifted to Descartes. It was likely that this shift was related to his growing interest in and eventual intellectual relationship with Chomsky's work. Harry was one of the few at the time to defend Chomsky's view that his linguistic work had a Cartesian provenance. And – again like Chomsky – he saw in the anti-clerical egalitarianism of several Enlightenment figures, including in part Descartes and Hume, the basis of an anti-authoritarian approach to moral and political issues.

Harry Bracken made significant and lasting contributions to McGill and to the study of the history of philosophy. He and his work will be remembered. Our condolences go to his widow, Elly van Gelderen, and his two sons Timothy and Christopher.

2. Report of the Steering Committee

The Report of the Steering Committee (11-12:06) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the January 18, 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 January 18, 2012 and had approved them on behalf of Senate.

Item 3. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, speaking rights were granted for Ms Kathleen Massey, University Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services, for item IIB2 (Annual Enrolment Report) and for Mr. Drew Love, Director of Athletics and Recreation, for item IIB3 (Report from Athletics and Recreation).

Item 4. Presence of a Photographer from Public Affairs. The Chair informed Senate that the opportunity for a photographer from Public Affairs to take pictures of Senate would be postponed to a date in the future.

Item 5. Update on Teaching and Learning Excellence. The Chair informed Senate that Senator Galaty had provided an update on this item, informing the Steering Committee that he, Senator Clare and Senator Han had met with Teaching and Learning Services and were preparing the March 21 Senate discussion.

Item 6. Update on Review of Faculty Councils. The Provost explained that he had met with Senator Galaty and the Secretary-General and that they were conducting a review of all current practices and organization of Faculty Councils in order to inform their further review.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

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

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began her remarks by discussing her response to the Jutras Report, thanking community members for their input. She informed Senate that, in response to the Report's first recommendation, Professor Christopher Manfredi had begun developing an open forum to discuss the meaning and scope of the rights of free expression and peaceful assembly on campus and that more information could be found on his blog (<https://blogs.mcgill.ca/openforum-expression/>). She encouraged everyone to participate in the events of the Open Forum and to encourage others to do so. The Chair added that Dean Manfredi would be assisted by an Advisory Group comprised of three representatives of Senate, three of the Board of Governors and three appointed by Dean Manfredi.

The Chair explained that the remaining recommendations deal predominantly with security matters and fall primarily under the purview of the Vice-Principal (Administration & Finance) and other members of the senior administration. The Chair informed Senate that she and her colleagues had begun addressing many of these recommendations and, in the months to come, and where appropriate, they would be consulting with members of the McGill community and with peer institutions and reporting further.

The Chair then delivered a message regarding civility. She told Senate that there was a need for the community to reflect upon, and discuss how, the principles of civility, tolerance and inclusivity were respected and enacted at McGill and to debate what Dean Jutras referred to in his report as "the meaning and scope of the rights of free expression and peaceful assembly on campus", as well as to find appropriate parameters of those rights.

Speaking as Principal, the Chair referred to the recent occupation of the offices of the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) by a small group of students, underlining that this was not the way differences of opinion were best expressed at McGill. The Chair told Senate that 300 people worked in the James Building and that their important services – including research,

financial and academic services – were interrupted for 5 days. She reported that numerous attempts to talk to the protestors about leaving the building peacefully had brought the situation no closer to a resolution. The Chair added that the unwelcome occupation of private offices and mocking and disrespectful behavior towards specific individuals was not an appropriate or effective form of protest. The Chair reported that while many wished the occupation could have ended sooner, voluntarily, and without police intervention, they were glad that it was resolved peacefully.

The Chair outlined the University's Provisional Protocol Regarding Demonstrations, a set of guidelines regarding demonstrations, protests and occupations on McGill's two campuses. The Provisional Protocol is intended to ensure that consultation, exchange and debate occur in a safe, civil and respectful manner. The Chair added that the protocol is intended to work in conjunction with the University's deep commitment to the free exchange of ideas to ensure free speech, and does not replace the fora on free speech and civil dissent recommended by the Jutras Report. She said that elements of the protocol could be revised as a result of the Open Forum.

Referring to McGill's 190-year commitment to respect, civil debate, freedom of expression and peaceful assembly, the Chair expressed concern over recent events and reports of hate- or bias-based acts and sentiments on the Macdonald and Downtown campuses. The Chair said that these were in conflict with McGill's tradition of tolerance and attacked the principles upon which the University was founded. In the context of recent and anticipated future protests, the Chair spoke about the University's consultations regarding the protection of freedom of expression and peaceful assembly on the campuses. She said that, while the University awaited the results of this process, she and the senior administration were responsible for ensuring the community's right to a safe and secure work and study place. She highlighted her own work towards a more inclusive, diverse and tolerant community, including task forces on Student Life and Learning and on Diversity, Excellence, and Community Engagement. She called on McGill to be a model for civil debate and community leadership, with a collective vision in which acts of hate, bias or incivility were unacceptable. She said that she and the University leadership were committed to improving relationships among the University's various constituencies.

The Chair then provided remarks on the Strategic Reframing Initiative (SRI), which she placed within the context of anticipated federal and provincial government budgetary restraint and McGill's continued underfunding. She said that the SRI was publicly launched in October 2010 as a disciplined process to examine and improve key areas in the University's administrative practices. The Chair explained that the SRI aimed to allocate McGill's all-too-scarce resources most effectively to support the University's teaching and research missions. The Chair said that the SRI had the goal of maintaining McGill's place as a high-quality and important public university. She explained that the assessment phase of the SRI had produced 71 recommendations, which led to the specific projects of the implementation phase.

Regarding the implementation phase, the Chair told Senate that each project fell under the responsibility of a member of the senior administration, and that each project had its own specific objectives, timeline, measurement for success, and benefits, together contributing to the McGill community in a broad range of areas.

The Chair ended by highlighting several examples of how SRI projects were progressing in the areas of finance, academics and faculty support, enrolment services, research and philanthropy, noting that these and other examples would be placed on the SRI website. The Chair thanked the many McGill students, staff and faculty involved in the initiative, which eventually will lead to tens of millions of dollars of cost-savings and new revenues.

Senator Janda praised the administration's measured response to the recent student occupation and suggested that Senate should have a role in formulating a collective response to the new era of student activism. He asked that Dean Manfredi's Open Forum inform itself of Senate's Committee of the Whole discussion in addition to the Jutras Report itself. Senator Janda also expressed concerns about an apparent culture clash between McKinsey and academic staff. The Chair directed these last two points to Senators Manfredi and Goldstein for their consideration.

Senator Clarke questioned aspects of the Provisional Protocol. He considered the Protocol's second clause ambiguous, since it appeared contrary to rights granted by the Code of Student Conduct. He also worried about the Protocol's indefinite timeframe and the lack of student consultation in Vice-Principal Di Grappa's revision of standard operating procedures. The Chair answered that the ambiguity reflected the need to leave room for good judgment in applying such a protocol. She also stated her confidence that the community would engage via the Open Forum towards agreeing on an appropriate ongoing protocol.

Senator Barney remarked on the Chair's invocation of civility and respectful dialogue. He considered the sentiments laudable and universal, but questioned whether dialogue on campus suffered just as much from inconsequentiality as it did from incivility, citing the administration's treatment of the opt-out provision on student fees.

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question Regarding the Recognition of Student Referenda

Senator Leung asked the following question:

In the Fall 2011 Referendum held by the Students' Society of McGill University, two questions were brought forward regarding the existence of two Independent Student Groups – CKUT Radio, and the Quebec Public Interest Research Group (QPIRG). CKUT is the student-run campus-community radio station that is staffed by over 200 student volunteers. QPIRG- McGill is a non-profit student-run organization that conducts research, education, and activism on environmental and social justice issues at McGill and in the local Montreal community. The two questions received an overwhelming majority "yes" vote - 65.6% in support of CKUT, and 72.3% in support of QPIRG.

In spite of this resounding vote of approval, the McGill administration has deemed these results invalid and is unwilling to recognize the existence mandate supported by these referenda. The questions are constructed in such a manner that a “yes” vote could only mean student support for CKUT and QPIRG’s existences.

As the SSMU is an accredited student union under the Quebec Accreditation Act, the Society is bound to guarantee the legitimacy of the votes of its members in all referenda regarding student activities. The Society has mechanisms within its electoral institutions to ensure legitimacy of all decisions made in accordance with provincial law, and all of these provisions had been adhered to in the Fall Referendum. While concerns have been brought up over the wording of the questions, the results are clear in that a majority of students unequivocally voiced their support for the organizations. What steps will the administration actively take to reflect this student sentiment, and ensure these activities, which greatly enhance McGill students’ academic experience, can continue to exist and are funded properly?

Students are troubled that their democratic processes, and therefore their ability to contribute actively and influence change at their own university, are being threatened. What will members of administration do to guarantee that democratic decisions made by students through legitimate processes are respected now, and in future?

Senator Mendelson answered as follows:

I thank Senator Leung for raising these two questions.

Every five years, before renewing the Memoranda of Agreement with CKUT Radio, QPIRG, Legal Information Clinic, The Daily and The McGill Tribune, the University asks these formally-recognized independent student activities to hold a referendum to ensure current students continue to support their existence. The referenda in fall 2011 for CKUT and QPIRG were meant to fulfill this purpose.

Referenda for undergraduate students are conducted on behalf of these student groups by a service operated by SSMU. I believe that SSMU’s only interest in these referenda is to ensure a fair expression of students’ views.

Student groups running referenda that call for action by the University have been urged to consult with the administration to review their questions. I believe that both CKUT and QPIRG have done this in the past, but they did not do so before proceeding with the fall referendum question, although the administration had sent them the previous referendum question as an example of the question to ask.

When the questions were published, the groups were informed by my office that the questions were problematic, but they replied that it was too late to change or withdraw the questions. Once the results were released, the groups insisted that the results be accepted as an affirmation of the whole question, despite the administration’s expressed concern.

The text of the November referendum question for CKUT is as follows (the QPIRG question used similar language):

Do you support CKUT continuing as a recognized student activity supported by a fee of \$4.00 per semester for full-time undergraduate students, which is not opt-out able on the Minerva online opt-out system but is directly refundable through CKUT, with the understanding that a majority “no” vote will result in the termination of all undergraduate funding to CKUT?

Thus, the question for each group asked several things:

- continuance of the organization, and
- a change of the opt-out able fee on Minerva, to one that is not opt-out able on Minerva, but is refundable directly through the group.

Senator Leung’s first question has been overtaken by events, so rather than answer the question, I will simply inform Senate of what these events were. Further to separate discussions with CKUT and QPIRG that took place since December, 2011, an understanding was reached with CKUT before the occupation of my offices on February 7, 2012. It was agreed that the affirmative response to the question would be interpreted solely as an indication of support for the continuance of CKUT, but not support for a change of the fee or the opt-out method. To avoid future misunderstandings, it was also agreed that wording in the new MOA between CKUT and the University would include wording regarding the particular continuance referendum question to be used in the future.

While discussions were underway with QPIRG before the events of Feb 7th 2012, QPIRG was not willing to come to such an agreement. More recently, in its ruling of February 14, 2012, the SSMU Judicial Board invalidated the Fall 2011 referendum concerning QPIRG, because the question was deemed to address more than a single issue and was therefore unconstitutional. It should be noted that while the CKUT question was similar to the QPIRG question, the CKUT question was not challenged so the referendum on it stands.

In answer to Senator Leung’s second question, the administration is not bound by these student referenda. That should in no way be interpreted as disrespect for the processes or for student opinions. The problem is that student referenda question could be viewed to be:

- linguistically problematic;
- confusing;
- misleading, perhaps by offering incomplete or erroneous preambles;
- not implementable;
- a call for actions that contravene the University’s obligations; and
- addressing issues over which students do not have authority.

Nonetheless, we continue to be open to helping student groups ensure that referenda that address issues legitimately under the authority of the groups are worded in such a way as to achieve implementable results.

For further context to such questions at Senate, Senators are referred to Provost Anthony Masi's message to the community on February 8, 2012, which can be found online (www.mcgill.ca/channels/announcements/item/?item_id=213969) and to CKUT's reply to that message, which is also online (<http://ckut.ca/feb9masi.php>).

Finally, for a review of the issues related to the Minerva on-line opt-out system, Senators are referred to the minutes of the Senate meeting of April, 28, 2010, which document a question raised by Senator Barney and my reply (<https://secureweb.mcgill.ca/senate/sites/mcgill.ca.senate/files/MinutesSenate280410.pdf>).

Senator Barney remarked that Senate had itself voted on two questions simultaneously when it had earlier agreed to close the chambers and to broadcast the proceedings. He also quoted the Chair's earlier comment that ambiguity was part of the real world, suggesting that the University was sending mixed messages in order to protect the online opt-out system. Senator Mendelson responded that, unlike in 2006, the question at hand created problems for students who might support CKUT and not the change to the opt-out system, or vice versa. He also referred Senate to the Judicial Board finding that the QPIRG question was unfair. Senator Knight clarified that the provision against having two issues in one question was a SSMU policy, not a University policy.

Senator Knight then raised the issue of student input into the initial change to the opt-out system. Senator Mendelson replied that there had been extensive consultation with SSMU when the new system was conceived, which led to changes to certain features in the system. He defended the online opt-out as an efficient and ameliorated service for students who did not want to pay a certain fee and framed the issue as one of different parties with competing perspectives.

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

1. Recent Statements concerning Asbestos Research at McGill University (D11-40)

Senator Eidelman, Vice-Principal (Health Affairs) and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, and Senator Goldstein, Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) spoke on this issue. Senator Eidelman told Senate that the issue arose following a CBC television report and an open letter, which made allegations about research into asbestos conducted at McGill. Among the allegations was a claim that Dr. McDonald had engaged in research that violated McGill's rules and regulations on research integrity. Senator Eidelman told Senate that he had taken the matter very seriously and had asked Dr. Rebecca Fuhrer to conduct a preliminary investigation and provide a review indicating whether the matter should be referred to McGill's Research Integrity Officer.

Senator Goldstein provided an overview of research policies at McGill (all available online), which she considered robust and up-to-date. She explained that high standards had developed over the years at McGill and other universities around the world, adding that McGill also had a strong history of standards and procedures for implementing its policies. In cases of industry partnerships, all contracts had to go through legal and other reviews to ensure essential criteria relating to disclosures of conflicts of interest and the free and timely publication of data. Senator Goldstein told Senate that the University was continuously updating its policies to adhere to best practices and to ensure effective implementation. In response to a question from Senator Briones, Senator Goldstein explained that research integrity policies have been continuously evolving over the past 20 years, and she can only speculate that they were quite minimalist when Dr. McDonald's work began in 1965.

In response to a question, Senator Eidelman explained that Dr. Fuhrer's work would have to balance the University's interests and the interests of Dr. McDonald. Senator Eidelman said he would only commit to sharing his conclusions, based on Dr. Fuhrer's review and advice. Senator Almasri asked whether an external review might be appropriate, to which Senator Eidelman responded that it was important for the University to adhere to its standard process, which included this first step by Dr. Fuhrer. Senator Eidelman also clarified that this first step was typically conducted at the departmental level, but due to the public nature of the allegations, he took on the responsibility as Dean of the Faculty.

Senators Janda and Zorychta presented the following motion for Senate's approval:

Be it resolved that Senate strongly encourage University officials to issue a public statement clarifying McGill's position on asbestos research which indicates that:

- a) none of the research on asbestos at McGill refutes the international scientific consensus that chrysotile can cause lung cancer, mesothelioma and asbestosis; and
- b) McGill research does not document that chrysotile use is safe in other countries.

Senators were unanimous in appreciating the spirit of the motion.

Senator Eidelman told Senate that he supported its intent, but he was concerned with the motion's broad reference to "none of the research," as this was impossible to ascertain. Senator Breitner offered adding the word "current" before the word "research" and Senator Cuello suggested adding a note about the review being undertaken by Dr. Fuhrer.

Senator Eidelman also expressed concern about the University being asked to take a position on a matter of social policy, lest it constrain academic freedom. Senator Wolfson said that the resolution spoke about the results of research, not the research itself, and that Senate was not qualified to make such a statement. Senator Richard considered the motion problematic as it asked the administration to take a political stand on science, whereas scientific arguments should be made by experts. Other Senators shared this view, with the Chair adding that statements like these could open the University up to outside lobbying.

Senator Knight told Senate that public sentiment that McGill was promoting asbestos should be counterbalanced by clearly articulated facts from the University. Senator Grant agreed and felt the issue was best dealt with by researchers and by Senators Eidelman and Goldstein. Several other Senators also spoke about the need to clarify McGill's message to the public, albeit by people better situated than Senate.

In response to a question from Senator Wopnick, Senator Eidelman clarified that the research in question had found that chrysotile was not as bad as other types of asbestos, but that this had been taken out of context to imply that it was safe. He added that the review being undertaken was not looking at the safety of asbestos, but rather at whether the research had been undertaken with integrity. Senator Hurtubise expressed concern that the proposed motion would impede Dr. Fuhrer's inquiry.

Senator Janda claimed that McGill's good name was being used by government officials and by the Chrysotile Institute to justify activities that posed public health problems. He added that the University had a responsibility to protect its own reputation and a social responsibility for public perceptions. Senator Janda called on Senate to send a message, to encourage reflection and to demonstrate its belief that this was a matter of significance. Senator Zorychta explained that the motion intended to encourage the University to act, not to speak in the place of the administration.

On a motion of Senator Todd duly seconded, Senate approved the tabling of the motion pending the outcome of the Faculty of Medicine's review.

2. Annual Enrolment Report (D11-43)

Ms Kathleen Massey, University Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services, presented the Annual Enrolment Report. She highlighted the growth in enrolment figures over the past year, especially at the masters and doctoral level. She also noted the increase in campus visitors since the opening of the Welcome Centre. Ms Massey ended her presentation by asking Senate to identify things that could be done at the local level to address opportunities and challenges in enrolment. Senator Clare told Ms Massey that the student caucus would convene and offer suggestions in the near future.

3. Report from Athletics and Recreation (D11-44)

Mr. Drew Love, Director of Athletics and Recreation, delivered this report for the information of Senate. He highlighted the University's partnership with the Alouettes, which covered the operating costs of Molson Stadium, as well as varsity athletes' participation in the Stay in School Program. Mr. Love spoke about the interaction of athletics and academics, with many varsity athletes excelling in the classroom and 7,000 students participating in intramural sports. Mr. Love ended by underlining the importance of athletics and recreation for many alumni, who often give back in time and money. The Chair expressed her own support for the many student-athletes who excelled both on the field and in the classroom.

Senator Madramootoo asked whether Macdonald campus would receive more attention. Mr. Love added that he had been looking at the facilities on Macdonald campus and how to best serve students in the West Island, pointing out that \$900,000 had been invested in the Macdonald Arena. In response to a question from Senator Dinel about first-year students' fitness levels, Mr. Love explained that his department was working with the university residences to encourage participation by first-year students. He added that his department was trying to strengthen connections with other first-year students, during orientation and other times.

4. Annual Report on Student Life and Learning

(D11-45)

Senator Mendelson, Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning), delivered this report for the information of Senate. He told Senate that Student Life and Learning was much larger than his office and featured 675 individuals providing routine services for students like exam scheduling, sorting out visa issues, cleaning residence halls and providing emergency funding and included faculty members and other individuals concerned with student affairs and student success. Senator Mendelson accepted that there was room for improvement, and asked Senate for suggestions on providing a student-centred approach to advising and mentoring.

Senator Paterson pointed out that the best advising often came from matching first-year students with upper-year students. Other Senators echoed this, with Senator Bin Shahid offering up the First Year Office International Buddy Program as a model.

Senator Roulet highlighted the tremendous work of the many advisors he had encountered at McGill, adding that many professors also offered positive mentoring. He suggested that the best results came at the departmental level. Senator Grant described the success of the Freshman Interest Group and Graduate Interest Group programs in the Faculty of Science and suggested that the best programs arose from the grassroots by students or faculty members, typically at the department level. Senator Luke reported that the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Student Advising had struck a work group looking at best practices in advising.

Senator Kuzaitis spoke as a faculty advisor from the Faculty of Arts. She explained that students were often confused between departmental and faculty advisors regarding whom they should see. She regretted that students often came too late for effective solutions. She asked for student input on how to best improve this situation. Senator Clare added that there should be more discussion between various units of the University to learn best practices that are undertaken across McGill.

Senator Sinacore called attention to the unmet needs of immigrant students, who are foreign born, but not supported by International Student Services. These students often faced problems because of assumptions of knowledge and this hindered the effectiveness of advising. Senator Sinacore found that these students would be more likely than others to find advice at Career and Placement Services, where they felt no stigma, suggesting that this be recognized in formal ways.

Senator Ferguson praised the office of the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning), whose efforts towards mentoring and advising had made the present situation much better than when he had been a McGill student.

5. Report on Campaign McGill

(D11-46)

Senator Weinstein, Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations), presented the report to Senate, providing an overview of the achievements of Campaign McGill to date. The presentation provided an update on where the Campaign was today and looked ahead to the challenges and opportunities that would shape McGill's philanthropic future. He recognized the work of deans, students and volunteers across the University and underlined the need for faculties and other offices to work alongside Development and Alumni Relations (DAR).

In discussion, Senator Weinstein explained that the imbalance between McGill's diverse student body and less-diverse donor base was partly due to the challenges in organizing overseas compared to centres like Montreal, Toronto and Calgary. He added that DAR would be working to position itself alongside McGill initiatives like the Quartier de l'innovation as a way of articulating the need for philanthropy. Senator Weinstein also offered to come back to Senate in the fall with plans for where the Campaign would go next.

6. 435th Report of the Academic Policy Committee

(D11-41)

The Provost presented this report. He called on Senator Allison, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, to describe the McGill University-Qatar Institute of Oral Health. Senator Allison explained that this partnership opportunity presents a unique chance for McGill's Faculty of Dentistry to deliver an oral health program involving teaching and research that would enable McGill to promote excellence in education and research on an international level, expand its access to new resources and provide a unique opportunity for staff and students to learn in Qatar. The Institute would be a partnership between McGill and the Qatar Foundation; Qatar would provide the funding, while McGill would retain control and provide the expertise. Senator Allison added that the Qatar Foundation existed for the well-being of the Qatari people and sought the best training for the local population.

Senator Dudek asked about logistics of the Institute. Senator Allison answered that McGill had asked that the Institute be located next to the local academic health centre, which had strong links to the Weill Cornell Medical College and involved other western universities as well. Senator Allison added that the local staff would be McGill staff on three-year rolling contracts.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the creation of the McGill University-Qatar Institute of Oral Health, contingent on the necessary resources being provided by the Qatar Foundation and on the conditions for the successful operation of the programs being agreed on, and so recommend to the Board of Governors.

The Provost also reported that the Academic Policy Committee had revisited the revised thesis review procedures and had reiterated their conformity with the existing Thesis Review Policy. He added that the procedures allowed flexibility as to which person would call an external evaluator. Senator Ismail asked whether a student would have the legal right to obtain all correspondence between a professor and the external evaluator. The Provost answered that it was a properly reviewed internal matter and would not benefit from legal review.

7. Report of the Nominating Committee

(D11-42)

The Provost presented this report.

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

On a motion by the Chair and duly seconded, Senate agreed to extend past 6:10p.m.

8. Budget Planning 2012-2013: Report II

(D11-39)

The Chair prefaced this report with her own comments relating to the upcoming federal and provincial budgets. She informed Senate that on the federal side, McGill was focusing its advocacy on funding to research and knowledge infrastructure programs, making the case that anticipated cuts would erase the government's research and development legacy.

On the provincial side, the Chair reported that the University had been looking at tuition-related implications and McGill's infrastructure needs. On the former, McGill had been advocating for universities to keep all tuition from their students, to ensure that students received the benefit of their fees and that universities were better able to provide levels of support for which their students had paid. The University was also asking that the government not respond to tuition increases with lower governmental support. The Chair also underlined the work being done by Pierre Moreau, Caroline Baril and Senators Marcil and Goldstein.

The Provost presented the Budget Planning Report 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 said that going forward, the University would seek to protect McGill's quality and performance through the implementation of ASAP and SRI initiatives, with a focus on:

- Recruiting and retaining academic talent;
- Research quality and quantity;
- The ratios of undergraduate and graduate students to tenure-track professors;
- Faculty-specific and institutional initiatives;
- Career development for all staff; and
- Investments in deferred maintenance.

The Provost provided Senate with forecasts on FY2012, which projected a deficit of \$6 million. He noted that several unknowns would impact the final budget variance for the year.

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 had the goal of balancing 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 FY2013 projected shortfall, and its underlying assumptions for revenues and expenses. These included increased enrolment figures, increased grant and tuition amounts, increased salary expenses and several discretionary expenses. The Provost reported that the University expected total net savings from the SRI of \$4.1 million in FY2013.

The Provost finished by informing Senate that the key messages going forward were investing in academic priorities outlined in the ASAP 2012 White Paper, as well as achieving SRI and other cost efficiencies and providing for pay equity settlements and pension liabilities.

Senator Eidelman told Senate that his recent experience at the University of British Columbia revealed that McGill's financial situation was more dire than that of other institutions. Senator Eidelman suggested that McGill look to UBC's model of interdisciplinarity as we rethink our structures. Senator Ismail asked the Provost about the no-win scenario whereby the government responded to each improvement in budgetary efficiency with further cuts to funding. The Provost agreed with both statements and reiterated that relief had to come from somewhere.

The Chair then moved to defer further discussion to the next meeting.

9. Annual Report of Policy on Safe Disclosure

(D11-47)

The Chair deferred this item to the next Senate meeting.

Confidential Session

10. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee

(D11-48)

Senate moved into confidential session to discuss the Confidential 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").

Other Business

There being no other business to deal with, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 6:25 pm.

END

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