

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, December 6, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232), Leacock Building.

PRESENT:

Algieri, Stefano	Jacobs-Starkey, Linda	Pierre, Christophe
Angus, Adrian	Jobin, Pierre-Gabriel	Quaroni, Enrica
Arnaert, Antonia	Jonsson, Wilbur	Rhéaume, Alexandra
Bartlett, Kim	Kasirer, Nicholas	Richard, Marc
Bouchard, Carl-Eric	Kurien, John	Ryan, Dominic H.
Bracewell, Robert	Levy, Barry	Saroyan, Alenoush
Burns, David	Lewis, Brian	Scott, Marilyn
Cartwright, Glenn	Lin, Charles	Sedgwick, Donald
Chase, Ronald	Lund, James	Skaf, Dora Maria
Cox, Amy	Madramootoo, Chandra	Smith, Michael
Donny-Clark, Aaron	Maheu, Robert	Spithill, Terence
Dowsley, Martha	Manfredi, Christopher	Steinhauer, Karsten
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Frances	Maric, Milan	Stroud, Sarah
Glaser, Alison	Masi, Anthony	Tallant, Beverlea
Glenn, Jane	McGruthers, Lauren	Thérien, Denis
GowriSankaran, Kohur	McLean, Donald	Towell, Jennifer
Grant, Martin (<i>Chair</i>)	McSweeney, Kerry	Upham, Finn
Hanna, Jan	Mendelson, Morton	Vennat, Manon
Harpp, David	Nemes, James	Wade, Kevin
Harris, Ralph	Newlove, Chris	Waugh, Sean
Henderson, Ian	Oxhorn, Philip	Wild, Gary
Henderson, Jim	Pakdaman, Michael	Yalovsky, Morty
Hobbins, John	Paré, Anthony	Zannis-Hadjopoulos, Maria
Hoehsmann, Michael	Pelletier, Johanne (<i>Secretary</i>)	
Itzkowitz, Jake	Peterson, Kathryn	

REGRETS: Hamilton Bennett, Annick Chapdelaine, Anne Dowsett-Johnston, Ciaran Duffy, Sally McDougall, Heather Munroe-Blum, Richard Pound, Robert Rabinovitch, Bernard Robaire, Nigel Roulet, Janine Schmidt, Dider Serero, Honora Shaughnessy, Roger C. Slee, Peter Todd, Sue Whitesides.

1. RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF EMERITUS PROFESSOR BRUCE TRIGGER

The following resolution on the death of Emeritus Professor Bruce Trigger was presented by Dean Christopher Manfredi and adopted unanimously by Senate.

The Department of Anthropology, the Faculty of Arts, and McGill University mourn the death of Bruce Graham Trigger, who passed away December 1 after a long battle with cancer. Bruce Trigger was the leading archaeologist and among the most distinguished social scientists in Canada. His works on Egypt, Canadian indigenous peoples, archaeological theory, and the nature of early civilizations remain not only at the cutting edge of current archaeological and anthropological research, but also have relevance for political science, history and the philosophy of science.

Professor Trigger graduated from the University of Toronto and received his Ph.D. from Yale in 1964. He came to McGill that same year, was promoted to Full Professor in five years, and was a central figure of the Anthropology Department until his death. In 2001, he was named to the first James McGill Professor in the Faculty of Arts, and he became a Professor Emeritus in 2006.

Professor Trigger's works included 24 books and over 250 articles and chapters. His comprehensive history of the Huron, The Children of Aataentsic, was been described as a "masterpiece of historical imagination and literary quality", and Natives and Newcomers, Canada's 'Heroic Age' Reconsidered helped transform our perception of the role of indigenous peoples in Canada's history. A History of Archaeological Thought is the basic reference work on that subject, as is his monumental Understanding Early Civilizations, a comprehensive treatment of the origin and nature of political and social inequality.

Professor Trigger was an outstanding teacher of both graduates and undergraduates. He supervised 10 MA and 14 Ph.D. students to completion, and virtually all of these today are active professional archaeologists. He believed that the synergy between undergraduate teaching and cutting-edge research were an essential part of the University. Indeed, two of his three most important books A History of Archaeological Thought and Understanding Early Civilizations were direct outgrowths of his undergraduate courses.

Professor Trigger was an Officer of the Order of Canada and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. He earned numerous awards including five honorary doctorates, the Prix Victor-Barbeau, the Prix Léon-Gérin, the Society for American Archaeology Lifetime Achievement Award (the highest honour the discipline can bestow), and was the only two-time winner of the Archaeological Society of America award for the best new book. One award that he specially valued was being adopted as a member of the Great Turtle Clan of the Huron, with the name Nyemea meaning "one who finds the way". This was in recognition for his advocacy of the rights of Native Canadians.

Bruce Trigger was an outstanding member of the University community, with a well deserved reputation for integrity and wisdom. He served as Chair of the Department of Anthropology, and served two terms on the Board of Governors. He was an ideal colleague, a source of stability and good sense in the Department. Because of his reputation for fairness, he was often called on at McGill and elsewhere to serve on committees dealing with sensitive or difficult issues. Despite his remarkable achievements, he was truly humble. For instance, he was genuinely surprised to receive the Prix du Québec, which he richly deserved. This humility was grounded in a passionate commitment to the creation of a moral and just society. His humanitarian principles were manifested in his quest to understand the origins of power and human inequality, his contributions to First Nations identity, and his support of their rights. Just as he asked "Who owns the past?" he also asked "To whom do universities belong?" speaking out forcefully on the difficulties faced by universities in the present economic and political climate. He was a champion of the need to maintain the independence of thought and enquiry that are the core of university life.

Please join me in sending our sincere condolences to his wife Barbara, to his daughters Isabel and Rosalyn, and to his two grandchildren, David and Madeleine.

2. REPORT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

The report of the Steering Committee (06-07:04) was received.

Item 1, Chair of Senate, On motion by Professor GowriSankaran, seconded by Ms. Dowsley, the recommendation that Dean Grant chair the meeting was approved.

Item 2, Approval of Minutes of Senate, Professor Mendelson noted a typographical error in Appendices F and G of the Report of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee, communicated to the Secretary of Senate for correction. On motion by Professor Harpp, seconded by Professor Harris, the minutes of the meeting of November 15, 2006 were approved.

Item 3, Confidential Minutes, was noted.

Item 4, Committee of the Whole to Discuss Budget Considerations, on motion by Interim Dean Nemes, seconded by Professor Bracewell, Senate agreed to enter into Committee of the Whole for 30 minutes, with Dean Grant in the chair, to discuss the Budget Considerations (D06-39).

Item 5, Confidential Session, on motion by Professor GowriSankaran, seconded by Professor Tallant, Senate agreed to move into Confidential Session for discussion of the Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee.

3. AGENDA

On motion by Professor Harris, seconded by Professor Wade, the agenda was approved with the addition of the Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D06-31) to Part “B” of the Agenda.

4. QUESTION – DROITS DES ETUDIANTS FRANCOPHONES AT MCGILL UNIVERSITY

Mr. Bouchard presented the following question:

Il existe à l'Université McGill un problème concernant l'implication et les besoins des étudiants francophones. Les ressources disponibles pour les étudiants semblent méconnues, sinon absentes, et les étudiants francophones semblent se sentir peu concernés par la vie étudiante universitaire. L'Université s'engage, à travers plusieurs articles de la Charte des droits de l'étudiant, à garantir certains droits offrant un traitement juste et équitable pour tous les étudiants, peu import la langue utilisée. Pourtant ces droits semblent délaissés par manque de ressources et de volonté. Selon l'article 9 de la Charte,

- « chaque étudiant a le droit à un enseignement de qualité. L'obligation correspondante de l'Université est remplie lorsque celle-ci (c) fait tous les efforts raisonnables pour offrir aux étudiants un milieu propice à l'apprentissage et à l'évaluation ».

De plus, selon l'article 12,

- « l'évaluation du rendement d'un étudiant dans un cours doit être juste et raisonnable et refléter le contenu du cours »

Enfin, selon l'article 15,

- « chaque étudiant a le droit de rédiger ses dissertations, examens et thèses en français ou en anglais, sauf dans le cas des cours dont l'un des objets est la connaissance d'une langue ».

Le respect de ces trois articles n'est présentement pas assuré par la situation problématique qui prévaut à McGill. Concernant l'article 9 et 12, « l'effort raisonnable d'évaluation » et « l'évaluation juste » ne sont pas nécessairement appliqués lorsque par exemple, les délais de correction d'un travail de recherche en français peuvent s'étendre jusqu'à trois semaines de plus que ceux des autres étudiants. De plus, il arrive souvent que les corrections des travaux en français ne contiennent aucun commentaire ou justification en comparaison avec les travaux effectués en anglais. Cela est nuisible au processus éducatif de l'université, en plus de mettre en péril le concept d'équité énoncé par les articles 9 et 12 et le droit d'écrire dans les deux langues énoncé par l'article 15.

Étant donné les faits énoncés ci-haut,

Question:

1. Considérant les ressources semblant insuffisantes, quels sont les moyens à la disposition des professeurs pour respecter les conditions des articles 9, 12 et 15 de la Charte des droits de l'Étudiant? Quelles ressources McGill offre-t-elle à ses professeurs par rapport à l'article 12 et en ce qui a trait à l'article 15?

2. Quelles ressources sont données aux T.A. partageant la responsabilité de la correction par rapport aux travaux écrits des étudiants?

3. Est-ce que l'université à l'intention d'investir des ressources pour l'amélioration des communications avec les étudiants francophones, que ce soit par voie de courriel, de communiqué officiel ou du site web?

4. Concernant «l'Université McGill et l'expérience québécoise», quelles recommandations émergeant du Groupe de Travail de la Rectrice sur la Vie Étudiante et l'Apprentissage seront formulées par rapport aux besoins des étudiants francophones?

Professeur Morton Mendelson, premier vice-principal exécutif adjoint (études et vie étudiante), a remercié M. Bouchard d'avoir soulevé cette importante question. Il a noté qu'il répondra en anglais pour s'assurer que tous les membres du Sénat comprennent sa réponse qui est comme suit :

Institutional Position

As mentioned in the White Paper, we are committed to recruiting the best students from Quebec, the rest of Canada and internationally. We are keen to welcome Quebec francophone students who meet our entrance requirements and who are interested in attending an institution in which the primary language of instruction is English. We accept these qualified students, without asking them to prove their English competency. And the University offers free, intensive English classes to newly admitted students in the summer before the start of their academic program.

Individual Students Right

Once they are registered at McGill, francophone students have "a right to write essays, examinations and theses in English or in French except in courses where knowledge of a language is one of the objects of the course."

This right, contained in the Charter of Students' Rights, is not limited only to Quebec francophone students, but is available to all students attending McGill.

Professorial Ability

Although opportunities are available for McGill professors to improve their French-language skills, not all instructors or teaching assistants can evaluate written material submitted in French. When a student submits written material in French, it is incumbent upon the instructor, with his or her Chair or Director of the unit, to deal with the submission appropriately – whether that be assigning the grading, with suitable guidelines, to an alternate grader or having someone translate the submission orally or in writing so that the original grader can evaluate it.

Whatever method is chosen, the grading should be accomplished in a timely manner so that there are not undue delays in returning written work. Moreover, students who submit work in French should be

accorded the same level of feedback that is accorded students who submit in English. The feedback can be written or verbal and does not have to be given in French.

Going Forward

- *I ask that Chairs and Directors, who are responsible for assigning and monitoring academic duties, ensure that instructors in their units are aware of Article 15 of the Charter of Students' Rights and have in place procedures to respond to the requirement.*
- *To facilitate timely grading, it would be helpful if instructors invited students to inform them before the actual submission dates of their plan to submit in French. Of course, in courses where grading is anonymous, students would have to be able to provide such information anonymously.*
- *I remind all students – whether their work is submitted in English or in French – that they are entitled, under the Charter of Students' Rights to consult any written submission for which they have received a mark and to discuss their submission with the examiner.*
- *There is an Assistant for Francophone Students in the First Year Office, whose position is funded by the administration, not by students' fees. Besides providing services to Francophone students, this individual offers small group meetings during the term to talk to students or instructors about the use of French in their courses. Those who have attended these sessions have found them to be excellent. In future, I will seek to have this service better publicized to promote reaching more students and more instructors in this way.*
- *The issue of effective communications with all students is important to the University, and using French is an obvious way for us to recruit potential students and to ensure the best possible communication with our current students and alumni. Although more progress is anticipated, we are already making strides in this direction, as is evident from a number of examples:*
 - *We are instituting a new program of welcoming badges, so that students at counters are aware that some services are available in French.*
 - *HR French classes are a real boon to staff who are motivated to improve their French.*
 - *We are generally moving toward more French web pages, and continue to maintain efforts in this direction.*

Finally, the Principal's Task Force on Student Life and Learning has made a set of recommendations regarding the need to build a learning community that takes advantage of McGill's unique assets as a leading academic institution with a diverse student body, whose primary language of instruction is English, located in a cosmopolitan and multicultural city, in a French-speaking province. The recommendations will be addressed very seriously in the administrative responses due in February and September.

However, I would like to highlight two of the several specific recommendations that are apropos:

- *Exploring with sister universities in Montreal the possibility of joint programs that would enable McGill students to take advantage of opportunities to fulfil some program requirements at a French-language institution. I am pleased to report that there are already steps underway in this regard.*

- *Exploring the University's ability to provide services to candidates and students in French as well as in English, and to communicate the availability of these services effectively to French-speaking candidates and students. As I have indicated, we are already taking measures in this regard, but we are committed to doing more.*

Ms. Upham raised concerns about the availability of resources to help smaller departments in assisting students to work in their preferred language, asking specifically whether there were central resources available for translation.

Professor Mendelson replied that there are no central resources allocated to translation or to this kind of support, but added that complying with the Charter of Student Rights is an obligation and not an option (regardless of the size of the Unit). He further clarified that providing students with the best education is “part of the cost of doing business” at McGill and this issue is addressed when considering the budget at the departmental and faculty levels.

5. QUESTION RE REAPPOINTMENT PROCESS FOR PROFESSORS

Professor GowriSankaran presented the following question:

There appear to be vast differences in the performance expectations at re-appointment for professors in different Faculties. In extreme cases, this review takes the form of a “mini-tenure” thus subjecting candidates to two tenure considerations. The process creates tremendous stress and anxiety. Some time ago, the Provost promised to speak to Deans across the Faculties and determine if standards had become more stringent and if standards were being applied consistently.

Question: 1 Does the Provost now know if the re-appointment process has become a “mini-tenure” experience in some Faculties? If so, how will the administration let prospective faculty members be aware of this practice?

Q2. If the Provost does not support this process, does he intend to develop an even playing field for all Faculties with regard to the re-appointment process, in the same way that we have tenure values set by Senate rules which each Faculty adopts to suit its specific situation? If so, can the provost give us a time frame by which such a policy will be drawn up?

The Provost provided the following reply:

I cannot say that I am aware that the reappointment process has become a “mini-tenure” experience – or that staff members are being subjected to “two tenure considerations”. It is the case that faculties may vary in their practices and in the documentation required of candidates at the time of renewal, but these should not constitute a tenure review, they should only help the candidate and the Department/Faculty/University in deciding if things are on the right track. Nevertheless, it is clear and I am very aware that the reappointment process is a pre-tenure experience through which nearly all tenure-track academics have to pass.

It would be disingenuous to believe that the two processes are not linked or to argue that they should be two completely separate processes. It is not possible to totally disassociate the reappointment of tenure-track staff (which, from the start of this year, includes both tenure track associate professors and assistant professors) from the issue of tenure. To utilise reappointment standards or criteria that have no bearing on those that must eventually be met by a member of staff to receive tenure would be to risk misleading staff to believe they are indeed on track for tenure when that may not be the case.

Indeed the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff, make that connection explicit. Section 4.1.3 require that academic units establish reappointment criteria which “shall evaluate the staff

member's performance of academic duties in anticipation of meeting the requirements for tenure as set out in Section 5.10" of the Regulations, which as all know calls for "superior" performance in two and "reasonable" performance in the third of a staff member's academic duties.

However, having said that, the standards of performance expected at the time of reappointment are not those required of staff when subject to consideration for tenure. One does not ask, for example, has the candidate achieved superior performance in two of the relevant areas and reasonable performance in the third taking into account the period leading up to reappointment. This would be inappropriate and unfair to candidates who often are launching their academic careers.

Rather, those involved in making reappointment recommendations no doubt attempt to ascertain whether the candidate is making appropriate progress towards meeting - shows appropriate promise of being able to meet the tenure criteria by the time of mandatory tenure consideration. As has been often stated by the University Appeals Committee, the granting of tenure is determined principally on performance, rather than promise – candidate's achievements at the time of tenure consideration are evaluated in terms of results. On consideration for reappointment, however, while results should not be totally ignored, the "promise" of candidates plays the more important role.

Finally, the evidence as to what constitutes appropriate promise warranting reappointment will vary between Faculties, often between departments in a Faculty and between disciplines. That is why the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff require departments and faculties to develop criteria for reappointment and to communicate these to newly appointed tenure track staff so that they will be aware of what is expected of them.

The reappointments process to be followed by chairs and deans and their units is set out in the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff. It is true that the process is not specified in as much detail as is that for tenure but essentially general principles governing the process currently exist. Critical to the process is a candidate's right to be notified of the particular concerns, if any, relating to his/her case for reappointment and to a hearing at relevant stages should there be a "tending to a negative" in his/her case. As Provost, I support this process – and have not heard of any particular difficulties that arise from it. If there are particular difficulties with the process I would very much appreciate being informed of them.

As to the criteria for reappointment, this matter has been already addressed in the response to the first question.

There are no immediate plans to revisit the reappointments process but I am prepared to discuss the matter with the Deans, Chairs, and other interested parties.

Professor GowriSankaran thanked the Provost for his detailed response but noted his concern was that professors expected a greater certainty or promise at reappointment. He also accepted the Provost's invitation to meet to discuss individual cases.

The Provost remarked that the process is taken very seriously and clarified again that a three-year reappointment is not an entitlement. The reappointment is reviewed carefully at the department level and assessed at the faculty level before it reaches the Provost's Office for final approval by the Board of Governors. He explained that in an attempt to improve the process, form letters have been replaced by personal letters sent to each candidate informing them of any matters of concern before the tenure process.

In reply to the concern raised by Professor GowriSankaran regarding stress and anxiety that some professors are faced with, the Provost noted that stress and anxiety could be alleviated by being honest at

the time of review rather than hiding that information from the candidate until the tenure process is underway.

6. CONFIDENTIAL REPORT OF THE HONORARY DEGREES AND CONVOCATIONS COMMITTEE

Senate moved into confidential session to discuss the Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D06-31) (this minute is not published or circulated but is attached to the permanent minutes of Senate as Appendix “A”).

7. 385TH REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

The 385th Report of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (D06-23) was received and noted.

8. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Professor Tallant presented the Report of the Nominating Committee (D06-24).

Item 1. Statutory Selection Committee, was approved.

Item 2. Intellectual Property Appeals Committee, Senate approved and agreed to recommend to the Board of Governors the appointment of Mr. Fadi Shehata, Masters Student in Experimental Medicine, to the Intellectual Property Appeals Committee for a term commencing immediately and ending August 31, 2007.

9. PRESENTATION ON BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

The Provost delivered a presentation on the University’s “Budget Considerations”, noting that the powerpoint presentation (given a document number on the Senate Agenda) would be made available to Senate (D06-29). The Provost began his presentation noting that the budget is now a joint responsibility of the Provost and the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance).

Following the presentation, as agreed, Senate moved into Committee of the Whole, with Dean Grant in the Chair. The notes from this Committee of the Whole are attached to these minutes as Appendix “B”.

10. AMENDMENT TO THE POLICY FOR THE ACCOMMODATION OF RELIGIOUS HOLY DAYS

Interim Dean Starkey presented the motion to amend the Policy for the Accommodation of Religious Holy Days (D06-25). She moved, seconded by Professor Quaroni, approval of this amendment.

Dean Levy stated that according to his understanding of Canadian law, there is an issue regarding how the requirements of observance are determined.

Interim Dean Starkey explained the process, noting that the associate dean (student affairs) would ask for proof of the requirements of religious observance and may require official documentation. Once requirements of the religious observance are confirmed, there would be no verification of whether the student has or has not participated in the religious observance.

Dean Levy clarified that he was referring to a Supreme Court decision stating that it is up to individuals to make decisions about the requirements of religious observance, rather than clergy or experts in religion. He added that this has enormous implications on how these determinations are made by the University.

Professor Mendelson explained that it is not up to the associate dean to ask for authentication that a particular student is an observant student; however, it may be necessary to seek outside advice on whether the religion itself calls for such observance. In other words, it is sufficient for the student to claim a religious obligation.

Professor Chase asked what constitutes an official document and who would be authorized to provide an official document.

Interim Dean Starkey replied that there are two main types of documents. The first would be the interfaith calendar of dates. The second would be additional information that the student might provide from a representative of the religion or that the associate dean might obtain by consulting the McGill Chaplaincy Service. She further clarified that an “official document” is any information provided by someone, other than the student, who has information about the requirements of the religion.

Professor Quaroni explained that the associate dean has the option of asking a student for documentation from officials confirming that the religious observance is required – but cannot ask for proof of the student’s own participation. Interim Dean Starkey commented that this was the main reason for deleting the word “affiliation” from the policy.

Professor Jobin proposed that the proposed policy amendment be referred back for more extensive legal review, citing support for the concern regarding the Supreme Court decision as raised by Dean Levy.

Ms. Glaser moved, seconded by Ms. Upham, an amendment to strike “undue hardship” from article “C” of the Policy for the Accommodation of Religious Holy Days. Interim Dean Starkey accepted this as a friendly amendment.

The Provost requested that the record show his objection to the acceptance of the friendly amendment.

Mr. Donny-Clark moved, seconded by Professor Jobin, that the motion be tabled until a clear explanation would be made to Senate on how the proposed policy relates to the recent Supreme Court ruling.

Professor Mendelson spoke against the motion, noting that the proposed changes to the policy make it better than the existing policy. He noted that there are many problems with the existing policy, including one aspect that is in clear violation of the Supreme Court ruling. Interim Dean Starkey reiterated Professor Mendelson’s concerns, noting that the existing requirement that a student provide official confirmation of religious affiliation is not appropriate.

In response to a question from Professor Glenn directed to the Secretary-General, Ms. Pelletier affirmed Senate’s understanding that the proposal brought forward by Interim Dean Starkey had received a review by the University’s legal counsel.

The vote was called and the motion to table was defeated.

The main motion as amended by friendly amendment was voted upon and carried.

11. AMENDMENT TO THE CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

Interim Dean Starkey presented the amendment to the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures (D06-26). She moved, seconded by Ms. Glaser, that Senate approve the amendment to Article 8 of the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures.

The vote was called and the motion carried.

12. POLICY ON HAZING AND INAPPROPRIATE INITIATION PRACTICES

Interim Dean Starkey presented the proposed Policy on Hazing and Inappropriate Initiation practices (D06-27). She moved, seconded by Ms. Cox, that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors approval of this policy.

Professor Harris moved the following amendments to the Policy:

1. Deletion of the phone numbers from the policy (on the premise that contact information of this nature is likely to change and better suited to another non-policy document).
2. Replacement of the word “swearing” by “profane or obscene language” in Appendix 1 of the policy. The term “swearing” has broader use (as in “swearing allegiance”).
3. Typographical error - remove the bullet in front of the word “substance” in Appendix 1 of the policy.

Interim Dean Starkey accepted these amendments as friendly amendments.

Mr. Itzkowitz moved, seconded by Ms. Upham, to vote on the policy and the Appendix separately. The Chair asked Mr. Itzkowitz to clarify the nature of his motion.

Mr. Itzkowitz explained that he is in favour of the policy but cannot support the Appendix as it includes behaviours that could be used in team-building exercises.

Professor Quaroni suggested that the Appendix did not include behaviours that could be viewed as positive and asked that Mr. Itzkowitz further clarify which of the behaviours listed might be considered appropriate.

Mr. Hobbins asked why the policy referred to both University property and University “context” and asked for clarification of the latter.

Interim Dean Starkey explained that the policy applies to behaviour on University property but also applies off McGill property where the parties are brought together in the context of a University activity. She cited the example of a McGill team in another city representing the University as an example of “University context”, where the team is congregated as a McGill team even if they are not on McGill property.

Professor Mendelson corrected a typographical error in the policy statement: Charter of Student Rights should read Charter of *Students’* Rights.

Profesor Glenn suggested that the word “yelling” be removed from the first point in Appendix 1, suggesting “yelling” might well apply in team and sports contexts. Interim Dean Starkey accepted the suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Ms. Upham reiterated Mr. Itzkowitz’s concern regarding the Appendix, noting that while she is in favour of the policy, the Appendix may raise debate among clubs and sports teams on campus and might be misunderstood.

Interim Dean Starkey explained that both the Policy and the list were discussed extensively prior to and at the Committee on Student Affairs (CSA) meeting. The two sentences in the beginning of the list and at the end were inserted to help ensure clarity. She explained that in approving this policy, the CSA and the workgroup worked extensively on wording. She emphasized the list of activities is illustrative rather than

exhaustive and was developed as a guide to help students understand the nature and quality of hazing and inappropriate initiation rituals.

The vote was called and the motion to sever the Appendix from the policy was defeated.

Mr. Angus moved a motion to strike the Appendix from the policy. The Chair ruled this motion out of order as a similar motion as it would have the same effect as the motion to sever the Appendix from the policy.

The Chair called the vote. The motion to approve the policy as amended by friendly amendments was carried.

13. REPORT TO SENATE ON POLICY CONCERNING COMPLAINTS OF HARASSMENT

The Provost explained that this Report (D06-28) is presented to comply with the Policy on Complaints of Harassment (also referred to as the Interim Harassment Policy). He noted that this would be the first and final Report to Senate on the Interim Policy as it ceased to have effect with Senate's approval in April 2006 of the new Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law.

14. FINAL REPORT, PRINCIPAL'S TASK FORCE ON STUDENT LIFE AND LEARNING

The Final Report, Principal's Task Force on Student Life and Learning (D06-30) was received.

**Senate
Committee of the Whole
Budget Considerations**

In reply to a question from Professor Spithill on whether McGill will get a new allocation of CRC chairs, the Provost noted that the recalculation of the original allocation (using the amount of tri-council grants awarded) has not worked to McGill's advantage. In 2000 McGill anticipated 169 chairs to be filled over a cycle of five years. By 2005–2006 the number had dropped to 157 chairs. He confirmed that the program would continue until at least 2011, but that McGill would get more chairs only if its relative research performance has been better than the Canadian average and it filled its original allocation. He added that the program had hold backs, e.g. 6% of the chairs being allocated to small universities.

In reply to a supplemental question from Professor Spithill regarding CRC claw back in fiscal year 2007-08, the Provost said that as in 2006-07, there would not be a clawback.

Mr. Angus asked whether undergraduate enrolment increase would be targeted to faculties which have not had over enrolments (rather than Arts and Management).

The Provost explained that enrolments would be targeted to areas where growth and expenditures are related to space and professorial hires, i.e. where additional students can be sustained, and not in faculties that have high student/staff ratios.

Mr. Itzkowitz asked how the University expects to fund the recommendations of the Principal's Task Force and further why McGill is prioritizing increased graduate student funding.

The Provost explained that increases in graduate student funding and research funding constitute the number one priority of the University's *White Paper*. Regarding the first question, he stated that following its first response in February, the administration will review internal reallocations that would help meet some of the immediate objectives. A budget plan, outlining new resources needed, would be developed with the detailed response to be submitted in September. He added that it is unlikely that there would be major expenditures related to the recommendations of the Principal's Task Force in 2007-08.

Mr. Hobbins asked about the time frame for developing a policy that would help speed up retirement issues. The Provost explained that the academic handbook addresses situations facing individuals up to the age of 65 only and is silent on post-65 retirements. He explained that post-65 retirements present a variety of situations and considerations. The University attempts to support deans or chairs making recommendations, with the means to fund them, but there is no framework per se. He stated that the Associate Provost (Budget and Planning) has reconstituted a group whose goal is to develop a meaningful retirement framework.

Professor Bracewell stated that the accumulated deficit at both Université Laval and Université de Montréal is \$100 million greater than that of McGill. These universities are using their deficits as means of providing resources to their universities. He asked whether this was a model McGill might follow, and whether the Québec government would provide relief toward university deficits.

Regarding the second question, the Provost explained that the government has previously intervened to help relieve university debt on the basis of the total grant and not on the basis of the total accumulated deficit, so that McGill would not be given less relief simply because it has a smaller deficit. On the first question, the Provost replied that an increased deficit was approved by the Board of Governors last year as a means of meeting our obligations. He further explained that if the unexpended balances carried forward were spent, our debt would be much higher than currently estimated. He stressed that the University's best interest will be to have a deficit strategically concurrent with our Quebec counterparts but not be at the head of the pack.

Professor Mendelson commented on the reply to Mr. Itzkowitz, noting that spending on graduate support is one of the recommendations of the Principal's Task Force. He further explained that the Principal's Task Force recommendations will be supported not only by central money but also would be by funds from philanthropy. The launching of the capital campaign is expected to increase the amount available for the priorities identified by the Principal's Task Force.

Professor Harris referred to the concept of frugality in the Provost's presentation and asked how members of faculties should encourage deans to behave in respect to running deficits. He further asked about how faculties get rid of deficits.

The Provost reminded Professor Harris that the actual allocations to faculties already include deficits, in that the University has increased its deficit to fund faculty needs. He stated that he would be inclined to place any faculties consistently running deficits under trusteeship, but that some faculties and units had not received appropriate allocations and in these limited cases a deficit may be viewed as reasonable. He stressed that deans were of course not encouraged to run deficits but that a debt might be forgiven if appropriate rationale was provided.

In reply to a question from Professor Zannis-Hadjopoulos about the possible conversion of McGill Dawson chairs to CRC chairs, the Provost replied that this would be done only if McGill risks having to give up a chair because it has not been filled. McGill does not intend to abandon its policy of using CRC chairs to recruit outside the University.

Professor Spithill referred to the increase of \$1.5 million for support staff and asked if this is an ongoing commitment and whether it is shared across faculties.

The Provost explained that the deans usually make their cases as to the number of staff they require. The deans have the responsibility to indicate how the staff would be distributed within the faculty – this is not a matter for the central administration.

Ms. Cox referred to the \$1.5 million increase for graduate student funding, referred to as fellowships, recruitments and special programs, and asked whether differential fee waivers (DFWs) were also part of the plan particularly for international students.

The Provost replied that the funding would be used in the first instance for PhD students and in the second instance to provide top-up awards to students who have received funding from other sources.

Ms. Rhéaume asked whether there is any intention to increase the amount of scholarships for undergraduate students. She further referred to the funds for improving buildings at McGill and asked whether there are any funds involved in this to improve the environmental efficiency and to making McGill a more sustainable University.

The Provost cited Vice-Principal Yalovsky's extensive work and attention to environmental initiatives including the "cleaning and greening" efforts on campus, and the focus on sustainable practices in new construction (such as the new Cancer Centre) – this focus is expected to continue where possible in all new construction. Regarding the first question, the Provost stated that McGill attracts the best undergraduate students in the country and would like to make sure that no qualified student stays away from McGill for financial reasons. He noted however that there is a direct relationship between tuition and funding available for scholarships, and any increase in tuition would result in more money for scholarships. He noted that McGill's policy in the case of a tuition increase is to have 30% put towards student aid at the undergraduate level and 20% towards student aid for international students. He noted that McGill is exceptional in its provision of student aid to international students.

In reply to a question from Mr. Bouchard regarding research support for undergraduate students, the Provost affirmed the wish for research to be a part of the undergraduate learning experience at McGill. He added however that research expenses have to be covered by research funding. He noted that he would like to create the infrastructure from operating budget and other sources that would allow undergraduate students to participate in research activities, but funding for undergraduate research is not a major priority at this time.

Mr. Itzkowitz asked whether there would be additional funds in addition to the \$1 million for classroom renovations.

The Provost explained that the \$1 million would indeed be used toward a range of infrastructure projects including renovation to teaching and research space, and added the faculty also spend another \$1 million on IT infrastructure.

In reply to a question from Professor Harris regarding the availability of the powerpoint presentation, the Provost apologized for not making the document available previously and agreed to ensure the document is available to Senate as soon as possible.

Senate rose from Committee of the Whole.