



Minutes

Wednesday, January 18, 2011 11-12:05

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, January 18, 2012 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT	Gold, Richard	Masi, Anthony
Acker, Tom	Goldstein, Rose	McCulloch, Mary Jo
Aitken, Ellen	Gonnerman, Laura	Mendelson, Morton
Allison, Paul	Grant, Martin	Michaud, Mark
Barney, Darin	Grütter, Peter	Misra, Arun
Bernard, Daniel	Gyakum, John	Munroe-Blum, Heather
Bin Shahid, Usman	Han, Lily	<i>(Chair)</i>
Blachford, Gregg	Harpp, David	Nassim, Roland
Bouchard, Adam	Hashimoto, Kyoko	Paterson, Kady
Boyer, Daniel	Hebert, Terence	Pekeles, Gary
Breitner, Leslie	Hepburn, Allan	Perreault, H��l��ne
Briones, Emil	Hobbins, Joan	Peterson, Kathryn
Carrier, Serge	Hynes, Andrew	Potter, Judith
Clare, Emily Yee	Janda, Richard	Pritz, Alex
Clarke, Ian	Jonsson, Wilbur	Richard, Marc
Cobbett, Stuart	Jutras, Daniel	Riches, Caroline
Cook, Colleen	Kalil, Alex	Roulet, Nigel
Covo, David	Kirk, Andrew	Schloss, Melvin
Crawford, Matthew	Knight, Maggie	Shaughnessy, Honora
Cuello, Claudio	Kreiswirth, Martin	Sinacore, Ada
Di Grappa, Michael	Kurien, John	Todd, Peter
Dinel, Haley	Kuzaitis, Ruth	Wapnick, Joel
Doucette, Elaine	Lennox, Bruce	Weinstein, Marc
El-Khatib, Ziad	Leung, Jason	White, Lydia
Everett, Jane	Lowther, David	Zhang, Ji
Ferguson, Sean	Luke, Max	Zorychta, Edith
Galaty, John	Ma, Annie	Strople, Stephen
Gale, Charles	Madramootoo, Chandra	<i>(Secretary)</i>
Gehring, Kalle	Manfredi, Christopher	
Gillon, Brendan	Marcil, Olivier	

REGRETS: Mahmoud Almasri, Jamshid Beheshti, James Brophy, Renzo Cecere, Roshi Chadha, Brian Cowan, Brian Driscoll, Gregory Dudek, Hamid Etemad, Jacques Hurtubise, Ashraf Ismail, Juliet Johnson, Torrance Kirby, Richard Leask, Mark Lefsrud, Kevin McDonough, Michael Ngadi, Amir Raz, Arnold Steinberg, Christina Wolfson.

The Chair greeted everyone and reminded them that Senate would be recorded and streamed from the outset until the end of the discussion of the Jutras Report. She also welcomed Senators Kalil and Eidelman as the newest members of Senate.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Professor Anas Hamoui

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

Dr. Anas Hamoui passed away on November 9th, 2011, in Montréal. He joined the department of Electrical and Computer Engineering in September 2004, as an Assistant Professor. He had obtained a Bachelor degree from Kuwait University in 1996, after which he joined McGill University for his Master's degree, which he obtained in 1998, followed by a PhD degree from the University of Toronto in 2004.

As soon as he joined McGill University in 2004, he embarked on what promised to be a brilliant career as a teacher and researcher. He planned his career path and development with the rigour and determination that we all grew to know as his trademarks. He was a specialist of Delta-Sigma converters, a field of microelectronics with applications in many areas, including telecommunications and healthcare. For his work, he received funding from NSERC and CIHR, and, during his short but prolific career, which was interrupted several times by medical leaves, he published over 35 refereed journal and conference articles on the subject. In the process he saw two PhD students through to completion, and left two more in the final thesis writing phase.

As a teacher, Anas was beloved by his students: he was “considerate, professional and dedicated”, to quote one of his former students. Two years in a row – the first two years he actually taught at McGill – he was awarded the “Professor of the Year” award by the student society of his department. His dedication to his students, his rigour and genuine interest in their learning, made him sometimes even respond to students emails from his hospital bed... Some of his former students call him an “inspiring teacher”, and the response to the news of his passing in the undergraduate student community testifies to the strength of the relationship he had forged with them.

An active member of the local community, he was well known to his fellow researchers in the Montreal area, as a prominent member of two FQRNT-funded research clusters (ResMiQ and CREER), as a vigorous leader of a local chapter of his scholarly society (IEEE) –for which he received a “chapter of the year award” – and, as always, as a teacher and mentor, for the local student branch of the same society. His service to the IEEE included editorial posts and membership in the board of directors.

Anas was a man of thoroughness and resolve, an example of courage and drive, a perfectionist for whom there was a plan for everything and, in all things written, there was only one draft—the right one, the final one. He had a promising and bright future in our department, but unfortunately fate had decided otherwise, and he was taken away at the young age of 38. He leaves behind his father Adnan Hamoui, and his sister Rima Hamoui and mother Samiha Al-Tinawi, to whom he was very close, and who stood by his side through his long and courageous battle against a disease that eventually would take him away.

He will be dearly missed by his colleagues, students and friends. We extend our sincerest condolences to his family.

2. Resolution on the death of Emeritus Professor Richard Redwood

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

It is with great sadness that the Department of Civil Engineering and Applied Mechanics reports the passing of Richard G. Redwood on October 26, 2011, at an age of 75. Richard Redwood joined the Department in 1965 as an Assistant Professor. He quickly rose through the ranks and served two separate terms as Chair of the Department for a period of nine years. In addition, he has been active on a large number of key Departmental, Faculty and University Committees over the years.

His main field of expertise was the behaviour and design of steel structures. He was recognized as an international expert in this area and played a key role in the development of the Canadian code of practice for the design of steel structures for buildings and for bridges. He carried out pioneering work on composite steel and concrete structures, thin walled beams, beams with openings, braced frames and the non-linear dynamic analysis of steel structures to simulate earthquake effects. In particular, his novel applications of yield line analysis in predicting the behaviour of tubular steel connections has not only sparked further studies by other researchers but has been incorporated in design codes of practice around the world (e.g., US, Germany, Australia and China). Many of his former graduate students have gone on to play leadership roles in industry and at several universities. His colleagues have benefitted from his undeniable integrity and his carefully measured advice.

After retiring from McGill in 1997, Richard was appointed Emeritus Professor and discovered that he had hidden talent. He became a gifted artist who studied and painted in San Miguel de Allende in Mexico. He has had a remarkable career and made significant contributions to McGill University as an excellent teacher, researcher and administrator. He will be missed by all of his colleagues at McGill.

3. Report of the Steering Committee

The Report of the Steering Committee (11-12:05) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the December 7, 2011 meeting.

Item 2. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, speaking rights were granted for Professor Spencer Boudreau, Ombudsperson for Students, for item IIB2 (Annual Report of the Ombudsperson for Students), and for Professor Phil Barker, Interim Director, Montreal Neurological Institute, for item IIB5 (Quartier de l'innovation).

Item 3. Presence of a Photographer from Public Affairs. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee discussed a request from the Office of Public Affairs to take pictures of Senate and referred this request to a later meeting.

Item 4. Committee of the Whole. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to enter into a Committee of the Whole for its discussion of item IIB1 (Report of the Internal Investigation into the Events of November 10) with Senator Aitken as chair.

Item 5. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into Confidential Session for consideration of item IIB8 (Confidential Report of Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee).

Item 6. Topic for Discussion at a future Meeting. The Chair informed Senate that time would be allotted at the March 21 meeting for an open discussion on the topic of Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

Item 7. Amendments to Faculty Councils. The Chair informed Senate that the Provost, along with the Secretary-General and Senator Galaty, would examine the status of Faculty Councils and report to the Academic Policy Committee on the matter. The Provost added that community input would be welcome once the parameters of the review were established. He added that the four areas of examination would be:

- 1) The role of students, faculty, staff and chairs on the councils;
- 2) Optimizing engagement on the councils;
- 3) Standard operating procedures for different faculties; and
- 4) Administrative and governance issues related to faculty councils.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

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

5. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began her remarks by informing Senate that she would only speak to one item, the *Report of the Internal Investigation into Events of November 10*, and by referring Senate to the Kudos that had been distributed.

The Chair thanked Dean Jutras for producing a thoughtful and comprehensive *Report*. She told Senate that she and the other members of the senior administration accepted all six of the recommendations contained therein, and would be implementing them going forward. The Chair also told Senate that, as she committed to in December, she would only confirm plans for their implementation until she benefited from discussions at Senate and the Board of Governors, as well as any feedback in response to her invitation to the McGill community of December 15, 2011. She explained that, once the community had had the chance to consider the Report, she would finalize and make public her written response, which would include plans and a timetable for implementing the recommendations. The Chair added that, as an initial step, she was working with Professor Manfredi, Dean of the Faculty of Arts, on developing a process to address Recommendation 1.

The Chair told Senate that she viewed its Committee of the Whole discussion as an opportunity for Senate to consider the Report together and to reflect on its recommendations and that she looked forward to its continued engagement, guidance and feedback.

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

There were no questions or motions submitted.

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

1. Report of the Internal Investigation into the events of November 10, 2011 (D11-31)

As was earlier agreed, Senate moved into a committee of the whole for discussion of the Report of the Internal Investigation into the Events of November 10, 2011; Senator Aitken chaired the committee (Notes from the Committee of the Whole are attached as Appendix A).

2. Annual Report of the Office of the Ombudsperson for Students (D11-32)

Professor Spencer Boudreau, Ombudsperson for Students, delivered the Annual Report of the Office of the Ombudsperson for Students. Professor Boudreau highlighted the Report's two broad recommendations: improved supervision of graduate students and a commitment to students' mental health. He also pointed out that the Office was now in its 25th year and would be planning a celebration.

In discussion, the Provost explained that the ratio of Ph.D. students to professors has remained relatively constant, but that special attention needed to be placed on preparing professors for the specific tasks related to supervision. Professor Boudreau emphasized that the tracking procedures seemed adequate, but work was needed on their implementation. The Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies said that he felt the tracking process was too complicated and that his office had already begun working on this recommendation, mentioning the Milestones monitoring system that would improve supervisory tracking.

The Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning) thanked the Ombudsperson for raising the issue of students' mental health and told Senate that he would be working on the recommendation in the coming academic year. Senator Zorychta told Senate that professors have become very aware of students' mental health issues and that she hoped that the matter could be more out in the open to help overcome stigmas.

In response to a question from Senator Blachford about the Ombudsperson's half-time appointment, Professor Boudreau reported that his teaching load sometimes presented a challenge to his work as Ombudsperson for Students, but in general, students were well-served. Professor Boudreau added that he appreciated keeping a foot in academia and teaching and that this setup was working well.

Professor Boudreau clarified that while he was not mandated to intervene in disciplinary matters, his Office had explained students' rights to those involved in disciplinary action and had referred them to the Student Advocacy Program.

3. 434th Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D11-33)

The Provost presented this report for the information of Senate.

He also provided an update on recommendations that Senators Gold and Janda had made on thesis review procedures. The Provost informed Senate that he had consulted with Senators Kreiswirth and Galaty and that the Academic Policy Committee would discuss the matter at its next meeting and report back to Senate in February.

4. Report of the Nominating Committee (D11-34)

The Provost presented this report for the approval and information of Senate.

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

5. Quartier de l'innovation

(D11-35)

This item was presented by Dr. Rose Goldstein, Vice-Principal (Research & International Relations), and Dr. Phil Barker, Interim Director of the Montreal Neurological Institute. Their presentation described the Quartier de l'innovation (QI) as a vision of a dynamic neighbourhood, one that would serve as an innovation hub featuring the academic programs, entrepreneurs, businesses, technologies and services required to sustain it. Dr. Goldstein raised the economic benefits demonstrated by similar innovation hubs and that such benefits explained why QI had funding support from all three levels of government. She added that QI tied into her fall presentation on McGill's Research Performance and its premise that the University would benefit from partnerships with external actors. Dr. Goldstein told Senate that QI responded not only to McGill's needs, but to those of the city, province, country and continent as it would improve international competitiveness and would support Montreal's industry and small-and-medium enterprises.

Dr. Goldstein went on to describe the strategic partnership between McGill and École de Technologie Supérieure (ETS), underlining these institutions' complementarity. She explained how, with ETS as an anchor tenant in Griffintown, QI envisioned itself as another hub alongside Montreal's other "Quartiers."

Dr. Barker told Senate that the QI consultation process had included people who would view innovation as tool of commercialization as well as one of social and economic development. He described QI as the vision of a social environment centred on innovation and education. Going forward, QI would engage local and international players involved in social and economic innovation. The Quartier itself would provide innovative ideas in urban renewal, design and architecture with the goal of developing a sustainable urban neighbourhood featuring housing and cultural opportunities for the McGill community and for the city. Dr. Barker also described QI as a focal point consolidating McGill programs centred on entrepreneurship and urban partnerships. He added that QI would regroup private enterprises, government agencies and NGO's who shared its innovation agenda.

Dr. Barker told Senate that, while QI was a neighbourhood, not a building, McGill was considering the acquisition of a building in the vicinity, for the purpose of providing space for innovation-related people and activities. In response to Senator Galaty's question about risks of unfilled office space, Dr. Goldstein assured Senate that QI would proceed judiciously and that other models demonstrated that universities attract participants to such space.

In response to a question from Senator Clarke, Dr. Barker explained that QI was focused foremost on opportunities for McGill students. He described how, beyond facilitating internships and apprenticeships, such a hub would provide a skill set not presently available to students, and would do so in a consolidated way. The Principal added that this was a McGill need pointed out in her Task Force on Student Life and Learning. Senator Knight asked about ethical concerns over the values of corporate partners such as Monsanto and their access to McGill students. Dr. Barker answered that QI would have to work for everybody. He also told Senate that students' specific input was necessary, but that the plan was not yet been ready for such consultations.

Senator Perrault expressed support for QI as it provided opportunities for social innovation linked to the Faculty of Education's support of student retention. Senator Aitken underlined the importance of engaging with organizations that were already in the neighbourhood. Dr. Goldstein welcomed Senator Janda's suggestion that the university develop academic resources linked to social innovation in order to better engage with the project.

6. Amendments to the Constitution of the Faculty of Education (D11-36)

Dean Perrault presented the Amendments to the Constitution of the Faculty of Education for Senate's approval. In discussion, Dean Perrault explained that the shift from a council of all faculty members to one with representatives was suggested by faculty members themselves. She added that the changes had unanimous support at council. Senator Janda asked whether it was premature for Senate to approve these amendments while it was working on guidelines for faculty councils. The Provost explained that these amendments were themselves the Steering Committee's impetus for exploring such guidelines, but that the Faculty of Education needed a properly functioning council in order to carry on its business.

Dean Perrault accepted Senator White's friendly amendment, changing the language of Article 9 to "The presiding member shall recognize as speakers."

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the Faculty of Education's amended Constitution.

7. Report from the Board of Governors to Senate (D11-37)

Senator Pেকেles delivered the Report from the Board of Governors to Senate for its information. Senator Clare asked whether formal minutes would be made available on the Board of Governors website. The Secretary-General answered that the minutes of open sessions and a summary of closed session should be posted and that the Secretariat would be moving to adjust the website.

Confidential Session

8. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D11-38)

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 "B").

Other Business

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.



McGill

McGILL UNIVERSITY **SENATE**

Minutes

Wednesday, November 16, 2011 11-12:05

Appendix A

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Upon assuming the Chair, Dean Aitken reminded the Committee that it was convened to help inform decisions for the future, including those of the Principal in the formulation of her response to the recommendations of the Report. She asked Committee members to focus their comments on the Report's recommendations and on questions of clarification. The Chair also informed the Committee that it would discuss for 60 minutes, with the possibility of extending discussion for up to an additional 20 minutes.

The discussion began with introductory remarks from Senator Jutras. He expressed his gratitude for the opportunity to bring the Report to Senate and to answer questions that may have arisen. He explained that, as the Report had been made public, he did not intend to provide a summary of its conclusions. He described his task as providing the community with an account of the events of November 10, and making, wherever useful, some recommendations that might enable McGill to avoid a repetition of those unfortunate events.

Senator Jutras then addressed three issues: his process, the principles that governed the drafting of the narrative, and where McGill could go from here. Describing the process, Senator Jutras told the Committee that he welcomed input from all community members and received over 150 written submissions. He had requested interviews from many members of the community who had first-hand experience of the events, as well as people outside of the McGill community, including representatives from the Montreal Police and heads of security on other university campuses. Senator Jutras added that he also reviewed all available video and audio recordings of events or any portion thereof and reviewed all factual accounts available in the public domain, including those provided to the student-led investigation that operated in parallel to his. He thanked all those who contributed, especially his assistants Dia Dabby and Kate Glover.

In describing the principles behind the factual narrative, Senator Jutras told the Committee that he only included facts and events that could be confirmed from multiple sources, which resulted in both a more detailed and less detailed account than any individual person could have provided. Senator Jutras also readily accepted that such a narrative could not provide a full account of the subjective feelings of persons present at the events.

Turning to how McGill could move forward as a community, Senator Jutras said he was confident that the Report provided an accurate account of the events of November 10 and could provide an appropriate basis from which to reflect on the key concerns that emerged from these events. He also outlined the three broad directions of his recommendations: open debate and

peaceful assembly, the mandate of security services, and dialogue with off-campus emergency services. Senator Jutras ended by referring to the Report as the beginning, not the end, of a conversation.

The majority of speakers expressed general consensus in thanking Senator Jutras for his work and for the Report itself. Senator Grant expressed his satisfaction with the Report's recommendations, especially Recommendation 1. Senator Covo considered the Committee's very discussion evidence of the quality and appropriateness of the Report. He added that he considered the Report's discussion of the "social construction of space," an understated point. Senator Covo said that the reduction in the diversity of users of the James Building struck at an important part of a university experience: those chance encounters between students and senior members of the administration. Senator Luke asked that the Committee remain cognizant of the goal of establishing a transparent process for the implementation of the Report's recommendations. Senator Barney said that despite concerns about Senator Jutras' mandate, he sought to contribute to the discussion in a constructive manner.

The Committee asked Senator Jutras questions about his Report. Senator Crawford asked Senator Jutras about discrepancies between statements in the record of the November 16 Senate meeting and statements contained in the Report. Senator Jutras stated that he stood by the facts of his Report and confirmed that Senator Crawford had accurately described what was reported therein.

In response to a question from Senator Potter, Senator Jutras explained that he had examined the right to peaceful assembly on other campuses and found that McGill defined the right more widely than elsewhere in the province. He explained that in McGill's Code of Student Conduct, the disciplinary offence of interfering with University activities was subject to the right to peaceful assembly. Senator Jutras added that sit-ins and occupations were not permitted on any other campuses. Lastly, Senator Jutras reported that, at some other universities, security services were more constrained in dealing with students, but this actually resulted in more calls to police services.

Discussing the occupation of the James Building, Senator Barney said that the Report demonstrated that the occupiers had clearly and repeatedly identified their intention for a "peaceful occupation." He referred to this as an act of political protest that he viewed favourably in light of Recommendation 1. He felt that it should have been clear to security who escorted the students out of the secure area that, regardless of what a couple of the protestors might have been wearing, theirs was a political protest and not a violent or criminal incident involving armed or dangerous intruders. Senator Barney also considered the context of the events, stating that, considering the degree to which political activism and disruption had been framed as unwanted diversions from the University's purpose, it was hard to envision a discussion that would expand rather than further constrain the scope for political activism on campus. He told the Committee that the university was supposed to be a place where politics in this sense is not only allowed but, perhaps, uniquely encouraged.

Senator Han quoted the Principal's letter to Dean Jutras, affirming that the implementation of the Report's recommendations should reflect that letter's stated goals of learning from the events and preventing their recurrence. Towards these ends, the Committee should analyse contextual factors in order to determine the root causes of the events of November 10th and the reactions that ensued.

Senator Kirk commented that it would be difficult to ascertain root causes since the occupiers themselves did not communicate demands or a political position. In the spirit of Recommendation 1 of the Report, Senator Kirk suggested that they voice their concerns to facilitate understanding. Senator Crawford told the Committee that while he was not a spokesman for the group of occupiers, he would express his personal intentions and offer views on the group as well as he could. Senator Crawford described the occupation as non-traditional, whereby rather than presenting a set of demands, it sought to confront the figurative alienation of students from the administration by breaking down the physical alienation of the 5th floor offices. He added that recent unilateral decisions of the administration had left students feeling like their voice was merely tokenistic and he called for change. As an example, he cited the closure of the Architecture Café and the overturning of student referenda.

Senator Jonsson shared his personal regret that, over 40 years after the late-60's student occupations of the James Building, successive University administrations had not put measures in place to handle demonstrations and dissent on campus.

Discussing the role of the Police, Senator Barney told the Committee that the Report's account meant that all of the police violence that ensued on that day took place with full knowledge that what was going on – both inside and outside the building – was a political protest, thereby calling into question the administration's explanations. Senator Barney added that the Report confirmed that the occupiers had not committed acts of physical aggression or violence, unlike certain staff members, security personnel and the Montreal Police. He said that any evaluation of the situation must be viewed in this context rather than under the purview of a criminal threat. Senator Barney concluded that the police violence outside the James Building was disproportionate and wholly unjustified. He called upon McGill to heed the call of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association "to make a complaint to the Police Ethics Commissioner so that the matter of the police presence on campus and the actions they took can be properly investigated and dealt with."

Senator Briones asked that the University condemn the violence committed on the part of the Montreal police. The Principal responded that she had met with the Chief of Police to express McGill's concerns about the presence of riot police on campus and their use of pepper spray. She affirmed that she accepted the Report's recommendation that the University build a better relationship with the police.

The Committee raised questions about the University's immediate response to the events. Senator Barney felt the Report implied systemic gaps and failures and called these inexcusable in the context of a university campus, especially in a city with a long tradition of political activism. He added that such failures contributed to the unwarranted violence visited upon political activists and he criticized the Report for remaining silent on the question of accountability. Senator Ma voiced concerns about the lack of services provided to students in times of emergency and asked that the university address this lacuna. The Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning) added that services and shelter were provided at University Hall and in other campus residences, in addition to those provided by SSMU.

Senator Clarke addressed Recommendation 4 and the breakdown in communication between stakeholders in emergency management. Senator Pritz added that there were also communication problems between French and English actors. Senator Clarke spoke of the importance of a wide-ranging consultation plan between community members to develop a policy and procedures for such instances, with a priority on trust, cooperation and safety. He asked about the basis upon which the administration decided not to activate the Automated Emergency Notification System to inform students of the risk presented by the Police. He also suggested that there be a mechanism to teach faculty and staff appropriate responses and standard procedures during such situations. Lastly, Senator Clarke asked for better communication between the appropriate bodies to ensure that services are made available in a timely manner during emergencies.

Senator Han asked the Committee to consider why these 14 students felt the need to occupy the Principal's office that day; why the presence of security resulted in an escalation, rather than a de-escalation, of the situation; and why accountability was not designated for the day's violence, trauma, and mayhem. She suggested that Senate view this as an opportunity to move towards transformative and empowering change, rather than sweeping important matters under a procedural rug. Senator Janda added that the Committee of the Whole should not merely serve as a moment of catharsis, but should be part of the process of dealing with hard questions that go beyond the Report and its recommendations. According to Senator Janda, these hard questions were:

- 1) Should the University file a formal complaint with the Police?
- 2) Where should accountability and responsibility lie, even if it were a collective accountability or blameless responsibility?
- 3) How did the elevated security presence contribute to the events of November 10?

Discussing matters going forward, Senator Clare mentioned that the Principal had remarked that it was her personal decision to have a community member lead the investigation. Senator Clare asked whether the University had guidelines dictating whether to appoint internal or external investigators and with whom this decision lay.

Senator Dinel asked the administration about its specific plans dealing with these issues going forward and asked for a timeline of implementation. The Principal responded that the Vice-Principal (Administration & Finance) was undertaking preliminary steps to address

recommendations about safety, first aid and communication, but that the administration's full plan would await community feedback.

Senator Ma asked whether Senate could form a committee to work on areas that needed improvement. The Secretary-General answered that this was a question for Senate to discuss. Senator Galaty told the Committee that MAUT was forming a committee populated by students and employees as well as faculty, and that this committee would serve as a clearinghouse for all reports that come forth and would formulate its own recommendations. Senator Galaty also highlighted the Report's call for increased dialogue and interaction between stakeholders and expressed his contentment that stakeholders had also been engaging in self-reflection. Commenting on what had taken place since November 10 – including a more subdued occupation of a Board of Governors meeting and comments made in this very Committee of the Whole – Senator Galaty noted that the community seemed already to be learning from the events and that he hoped such self-reflection would continue.

Senator Ferguson told the Committee that a desire for free and open expression to those in power had driven many reforms in history and likely served as the motivation behind a body like Senate. He also pointed out that different Committee members had been approaching the events from conflicting points of view, such as a desire to have fewer people taking care of security and a desire for more. He asked that the Committee keep in mind the conflicting principles at play as it tried to resolve the issues.

Senator El-Khatib asked the Committee to consider how the University could change perceptions towards security and overcome what he perceived as a climate of fear.

Senator Bouchard asked that students not merely be consulted by the administration on the Report's recommendations, but be intimately involved in their implementation, since students, staff, and administrators were all affected by the events. Senator Nassim added that student leaders were responsible for steering the conversation to a place where students would not feel a need to occupy a building.

Senator Cobbett informed the Committee that the Board of Governors discussion of the Jutras Report at its January 31 meeting would be held in open session.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the Committee of the Whole concluded and the chair was passed back to the Principal.