

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on Wednesday April 16, 2008 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232), Leacock Building.

PRESENT:

Aitken, Ellen	Levin, Richard I.
Angus, Adrian	Lewis, Brian
Arnaert, Antonia	Low, Bronwen
Barralet, Jake	Lowther, David
Beheshti, Jamshid	Lund, James
Vikram Bhatt	Luther, Ryan
Blachford, Greg	Madramootoo, Chandra
Blackett, Adelle	Manfredi, Christopher
Borkotoky, Aneerudha	Masi, Anthony C.
Boulet, Benoit	McIntosh, Matthew
Bracewell, Robert	McLean, Donald
Burgoyne, John Ashley	McSweeney, Kerry
Burns, David	Mendelson, Morton J.
Butler, Ian	Moore, Timothy
Carli, Franco	Munroe-Blum, Heather (<i>Chair</i>)
Cartwright, Glenn	Ngadi, Michael
Champoux-Williams, Lynne	Oong, Daniel
Chase, Ronald	Oxhorn, Philip
Chiang, Albert	Paré, Anthony
Cooke, Rosemary	Pekeles, Gary
Dear, Judy	Pelletier, Johanne (<i>Secretary</i>)
Etemad, Hamid	Peterson, Kathryn
Everett, Jane	Pierre, Christophe
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Frances	Quaroni, Enrica
Fujinaga, Ichiro	Richard, Marc
Gehr, Ronald	Robaire, Bernard
Goldbloom, Michael	Roy, François R.
Gowrisankaran, Kohur	Schmidt, Janine
Grant, Martin	Sedgwick, Donald
Harpp, David	Smith, Michael
Henderson, Ian	Stroud, Sarah
Henderson, Jim	Tallant, Beverlea
Hobbins, John	Thérien, Denis
Holdsworth, Phillip	Todd, Peter
Ismail, Ashraf	Van der Vooren, Jessica
Itzkowitz, Jake	Vennat, Manon
Jean-Claude, Bertrand	Wade, Kevin
Jonsson, Wilbur	Waugh, Sean
Karmouty, Harry	Weinstein, Marc
Kasirer, Nicholas	Whitesides, Sue
King, Daniel	Wolfson, Christina
Kreiswirth, Martin	Yu, Qing Jane
Kurien, John	Zannis-Hadjopoulos, Maria
Labban, Margaret	
Lai, Pamela	

REGRETS: Stefano Algieri, Roshi Chadha, Annick Chapdelaine, Steve Jordan, Richard Pound, Robert Rabinovitch, Nigel Roulet, Dominic H. Ryan.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the Death of Professor Michael Herschorn

The following resolution on the death of Michael Herschorn was read by Professor Martin Grant, Dean of the Faculty of Science, and adopted unanimously by Senate.

It is with regret I must inform Senate that Professor Michael Herschorn died on March 2, 2008, in his 75th year. He had been ill for some time.

Michael Herschorn attended the legendary Baron Byng High School from which he graduated as one of the top ten high school students in the province. Thereafter he spent almost his entire academic life at McGill. He obtained his B.A.honours degree in mathematics and physics in 1953, and his Masters and Doctoral degrees in the Department of Mathematics by 1958. He won the coveted Anne Molson Gold Medal as the top undergraduate student in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. Michael joined the Department of Mathematics in 1958 as an Assistant Professor and retired in 1998 from the renamed Department of Mathematics and Statistics, as a Full Professor.

From early on Michael committed himself to teaching and administration. In both he demonstrated his sharp mind and obsessive attention to detail. Starting out in the early 70's as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the Faculty of Arts and Science for two years, he then served as Associate Dean in the Faculty of Science for six years, followed by four years as Dean of Students. He was Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics for two terms. Michael was a truly professional administrator with a great sense of justice and an encyclopedic knowledge of most things to do with McGill. It seemed impossible that not only did he know every course in his own department but he seemed to know courses from many others. Student advisors who attempted to make inappropriate course substitutions would be inevitably mildly admonished by the ever-vigilant Michael. In addition, he was a member of the University Senate, and the Board of Governors.

Michael Herschorn taught in the rapidly disappearing blackboard and chalk tradition. He was, quite simply, outstanding and loved by his students – very tough, and yet the emphasis was not on intimidation but on mathematics as a subject to be done rather than on a subject to be passively absorbed. Therefore, proofs were left unfinished, to be completed by his students at home. The next class, students were randomly called upon to show the results of their efforts to their fellow students. Needless to say, very few proofs remained unfinished.

Beyond the grey-suited, always smartly dressed, Michael Herschorn the academic, there was a person who showed great concern for his colleagues and his staff. Several have stories of how Michael, with his strong medical connections, arranged for a quick appointment and even ensured that they had the right surgeon.

Senate extends its condolences to Michael Herschorn's wife, Cynthia, daughters Madelyn and Sally, his son-in-law Ed, his grandchildren, Shana and Joshua, and to his many friends. We have lost a colleague who greatly enriched the life of this university. Those of us who knew him will not forget him.

2. Resolution on the Death of Professor Dixie Ross-Neill

The following resolution on the death of Dixie Ross-Neill was read by Professor Don McLean, Dean of the Schulich School of Music, and adopted unanimously by Senate.

Madame Vice-Chancellor, Senate colleagues:

I rise today to pay tribute to a great musician, and a wonderful teacher and colleague, Prof. Dixie Ross-Neill, Director of Opera McGill, and Professor in the Department of Music Performance from 1993 to 2007.

Dixie Ross was born in Lincolnton, N.C. on May 28, 1940. As a child she studied violin and piano, and sang revival music. Dixie's vocal 'debut' was in the local church, where, at age 3, she belted out 'Don't fence me in' before a rather surprised pastor. It might be considered her 'theme song'. She graduated with a Bachelor of Music magna cum laude from UNC Greensboro and continued her master's studies at the University of Texas, where she met her husband, tenor William Neill.

Dixie led a long and distinguished career as an opera educator, vocal coach, and collaborative artist. Her work took her to Germany, New York, and Amsterdam, where she was Musical Director of De Nederlandse Operastichting Studio. She prepared operas for Chicago, Houston, Washington, Boston, and New York, and worked with singers such as Ben Heppner, Daniel Lichti, and Jane Henschel, and with conductors such as James Levine and John Mauceri. Though her hometown friends probably considered her stint as a judge for the 1985 Miss America competition her real moment of fame!

Dixie never quite lost her southern roots: indeed, her ability to modulate her accent from situationally-appropriate southern belle to hillbilly howl was alone a wonder to behold! Dixie had a phenomenal command of the repertoire (just about any repertoire!) and the practical professional knowledge of what was needed to pull any of it off. That knowledge allowed her to step in and fix things (vocal, instrumental, theatrical) in an instant. But she was even more remarkable for her ability to find great team players and to give them the space to develop their potential.

*Dixie served as Director of Musical Studies for the Canadian Opera Company from 1986-1991. Her time as Director of Opera McGill, 1993-2007, put our School on the international opera map. Memories of her Opera McGill productions are too numerous to cite with any sense of balance, but performances of *The Magic Flute*, *Ariadne auf Naxos*, *Falstaff*, *The Rake's Progress*, and our amazingly gutsy 100th Anniversary revival of Canada's National Opera, *Louis Riel*, are truly among the proudest moments in the artistic and pedagogical history of the Schulich School.*

Many McGill colleagues will also remember Dixie's extraordinary recital accompanying Ben Heppner on the occasion of Ben's honorary degree from McGill in 2002, which established the Bernard and Phyllis Shapiro Scholarships in Voice and Opera. In 2003, Dixie and her husband McGill Voice Professor William Neill were the recipients of Opera Canada's prestigious "Ruby" Award recognizing professional excellence and outstanding lifetime achievement in Opera, Vocal Training and Education. After she was diagnosed with ovarian cancer in 2005, Dixie continued to teach at McGill, demonstrating the kind of ferocity of dedication, courage and

professionalism for which she was so justly admired. She passed away in Montreal on her 67th birthday, May 28, 2007.

This past January 27, 2008, the Schulich School of Music gathered Dixie's family, friends, former students now professional singers, current and former Opera McGill members, for Remembering Dixie ... A Tribute to the Musical Legacy of Dixie Ross-Neill. Among the many moving highlights of this evening was a performance by Ben Heppner of Amazing Grace, accompanying himself at the piano, in intimate tribute to Dixie's spiritual roots. Dixie Ross-Neill was one of the most remarkable women many of us had the privilege to know: some of us through the relation of student to teacher in the studio, others as fellow professional musicians and theatre people on the production path, others as friends, colleagues, and admirers. She was an exceptional piece of work: a superb musician, an extraordinary coach, and an absolutely crazy, wonderful, human being. Through the generosity of Music Faculty Advisory Board Member, Elizabeth Wirth, the Dixie Ross-Neill Scholarship in Opera and Voice has been established in her memory. We will miss her dearly.

3. Report of the Steering Committee

The report of the Steering Committee (07-08:09) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of March 26, 2008, were approved.

Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate, for information.

Item 3. Speaking Rights and Committee of the Whole. Senate, on motion duly proposed and seconded, granted speaking rights to Ms. Sylvia Franke for item A2 (Question re Administrative access to user files), and to Professor William Foster for items B1 (Report of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Academic Personnel) and B2 (Annual Report of the Standing Committee on Sabbatic Leaves).

On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into Committee of the Whole for 30 minutes, for discussion following a brief presentation of item IIB-1 (Report, Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Academic Personnel) with the Principal in the Chair.

Item 4. Chair of Senate, on motion duly proposed and seconded, Dean Chandra Madramootoo was approved to step in as chair following the Principal's departure at 4:30 pm.

Item 5. Senate Confidentiality, for information.

Item 6. Information Items, Convocation dates, Spring 2009, were presented for information.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

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

5. Chair's Remarks

The Principal opened her remarks by congratulating Marc Weinstein on his recent appointment as Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations). A McGill alumnus, Mr. Weinstein took over as Assistant Vice-Principal (DAR) in 2005. Since fall 2007, he has been responsible for the management of the DAR portfolio and was the driving force behind the successful launch in October of Campaign McGill, McGill's most ambitious comprehensive fundraising campaign to date.

The Principal also announced the appointment of Professor Paul Allison of McGill as Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, beginning June 1, 2008. A William Dawson Scholar, Professor Allison is currently the director of the Network for Oral and Bone Health Research as well as the Director of the Division of Oral Health and Society of the Faculty of Dentistry. The Principal also thanked Dr. James Lund for his dedication and service to McGill as Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry for the past 13 years.

The Principal announced the appointment of Dr. Judith Potter as Dean of Continuing Education, beginning August 1, 2008. Dr. Potter is currently the Executive Director at the University of New Brunswick's College of Extended Learning, and was the founding Director of the program. The Principal thanked Dr. Glenn Cartwright for serving as interim Dean of Continuing Education since 2006.

The Principal asked Professor Bernard Robaire, who has served on the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation as part of a group looking at *les défis et buts d'un system universitaire*, to speak about the report. Professor Robaire stated that this report will be released at the end of April, and will be an overview of the entire Quebec university system ranging from the mission of the system to the level of education of the population, and it will contain 12 major recommendations. Professor Robaire added that it is important that the McGill community be aware of this document, which will be accessible on the conseil's web site, with an English summary, French summary and full text in French (<http://www.cse.gouv.qc.ca/EN/0/index.html>). The Principal thanked Professor Robaire for his work on this committee.

Regarding the teaching assistant strike, the Principal mentioned that McGill is currently involved in a labour dispute with the AGSEM, the association representing graduate student teaching assistants at McGill. McGill's collective agreement with the AGSEM expired last year, and for the past several months, McGill has been meeting and negotiating with the union, with the association and the University currently at the bargaining table.

The Principal noted that Campaign McGill, which was launched with \$325 million in gifts and pledges, has just surpassed the \$400 million mark, which is 53% of the \$750 million target. The Principal stated that the gift that pushed us over this milestone is particularly significant, from long-time McGill friend and alumnus Lars Firing, who passed away in February 2007. A strong believer in McGill's mission of international engagement, he established the Lars and Alberta Firing Graduate Fellowships in Engineering. His estate gift of \$500,000 completes the \$1 million endowment of these fellowships.

The Principal mentioned that later this month McGill will be launching the History in the Making Tour, to bring McGill, the alumni association and the Campaign to key economic and alumni centres around the world. Over the next few months, the tour will travel to Calgary, Boston, Toronto and then to the Middle East, and by the end of 2008, New York, Vancouver, California and Washington in North America, and in Shanghai, Beijing, Singapore, and Hong Kong in Asia.

In each case, McGill faculty will be travelling with the Principal, discussing their work and its relevance to alumni and friends in the region.

The Principal also noted that McGill had received its conditional grant (*subvention conditionnelle*) from the Ministry of Education. The grant highlights the importance of the current McGill budget process, and the need for a careful and considered approach to our annual budgets, so as to allow McGill to continue to invest in academic priorities at the same time as we are managing our finances effectively. She also mentioned that McGill's credit rating from Standard and Poor's was affirmed last week at AA-, which is an indication not only of our financial performance, but also of the demand for our programs, the quality of our faculty and the quality of our researchers.

The Principal congratulated Dr. Nahum Sonenberg, James McGill Professor in the Department of Biochemistry and the McGill Cancer Centre, on being awarded the Gairdner International Award, which recognizes outstanding discoveries and contributions to medical science. Dr. Sonenberg's work in molecular and cellular biology has led to a better understanding of basic biological processes in normal and cancer cells and to groundbreaking discoveries in cancer treatment, obesity treatment, memory impairment and virus infections.

The Scarlet Key Society recently recognized student leaders who have made a significant contribution to the McGill community, and the Principal congratulated all of the students who received this award – in particular, those present at Senate - Adrian Angus, Aneerudha Borkotoky, Jake Itzkowitz, and Jessica Van der Vooren.

The Principal congratulated Dr. Harvey Guyda, Chair of the Department of Pediatrics, on winning this year's Ross Award, the highest award in Canadian pediatrics, given annually by the Canadian Pediatric Society in recognition of excellence in research, education and advocacy for child health in Canada.

She also noted that James Martin, a McGill writer and the editor of the McGill publication, *Headway*, has won the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education gold medal for best writing, for his profile of Vicky Kaspi in the *McGill News*.

The Principal concluded her remarks by welcoming any questions or comments. Professor Paré asked whether, as a result of the TA strike, there would be any move on the part of the administration to help the faculty members deal with the resulting additional work, or provide additional remuneration. Professor Mendelson replied that there had been a meeting with the Deans earlier that day regarding issues related to the strike, and that the Deans would be communicating with their Chairs about various issues related to the strike by the end of the week at the latest. Instructors should be consulting their Chairs for further information on this subject.

Professor GowriSankaran suggested that normal deadlines for submission of marks be waived given the additional workload for academics. Professor Mendelson commented that the priority for submission of marks was for graduating students, and the administration is currently evaluating its processes and IT support in terms of ensuring that students can graduate on time, and will be revising schedules as necessary. These would only apply to courses where there are TAs, and for those courses without TAs, current deadlines would be strictly enforced. Professor Kurien commented that it could be problematic to enforce schedules for instructors who might have a TA for one course but not for another.

Mr. Burgoyne asked who graduate students who are also sessional instructors should be consulting regarding these issues. Professor Mendelson responded that individuals who are sessionals, whether they are graduate students or not, should be consulting the Chair or Director of their unit.

Professor Jonsson mentioned that some of the people working in the Office for Students with Disabilities are TAs, and wondered if there were any arrangements to relieve the burden of potential additional work for remaining staff. Professor Mendelson responded that this had been discussed with the Director of the Office for Students with Disabilities and the Executive Director of Services for Students, and with faculties who manage their own exams, and an appropriate plan is in place.

SECTION II

PART “A” – QUESTIONS AND MOTIONS BY MEMBERS

1. Question re Regulations regarding emeritus and retired professors

On the invitation of the Principal, Professor Butler asked the following question:

PREAMBLE:

Over the past several years, there has been much discussion about the regulations concerning the designations and benefits of emeritus and retired professors. It is my understanding that the university administration and MAUT reached agreement regarding amendments that would be proposed to Senate on this subject. A definitive version of the agreed proposal was distributed to the interested parties in September 2007 and was expected to be presented to Senate for discussion at the December 2007 meeting. However, this did not occur.

QUESTION:

What is the current status of the proposed amendments to the regulations regarding emeritus and retired professors?

The Principal invited the Provost to answer. Professor Masi responded as follows:

This issue is still under discussion as there is a strongly held view that the emeritus designation should continue to be restricted to retired full professors who deserve special recognition. I would note that further discussions will take place shortly – a meeting is scheduled for early May – at which it will be proposed that there be developed an alternative mechanism for recognizing retired members of the academic staff who are deemed deserving of special recognition. It is hoped that a satisfactory solution, that is acceptable to all, will be reached to the current impasse.

Professor GowriSankaran inquired as to how retroactive these measures would be. The Provost responded that all details would be discussed at the upcoming meeting in May.

2. Question re Administrative access to user files - McGill Computing Facilities

On the invitation of the Principal, Mr. Hobbins asked the following question:

PREAMBLE:

Use of the McGill Computing Facility (MCF) is governed by the Code of Conduct for Users of McGill Computing Facilities, and its ancillary documents Companion Document to (Code of Conduct) Policy and Management Guidelines. Adopted and unrevised since 1994, they remain the current policies and still appear on the website of the Chief Information Officer. Under these policies and guidelines, user files are considered confidential and not open to access by others unless there was a compelling reason. Such reasons would be protection of the MCF or suspicion that the user was using the MCF inappropriately. The clear intent of the policy is that when such access occurs the user should be notified beforehand unless there is some strong reason to the contrary. In such cases the user should be notified as soon as possible following the access. In view of this:

QUESTION:

1. a) *Is such access by administrators reported to the CIO/Provost? If so, can the Administration report the number of times that user files have been accessed, in the past three years and the types of reasons why files are accessed? Were the users informed even afterwards, that such access had taken place? And if not, why not?*

b) *If such access is not reported to the CIO, would the Provost take measures to ensure such reporting occurs as soon as possible?*

2. *What plans does the Administration have to update the existing policies so users will know under what conditions their files on the MCF are subject to administrative scrutiny, and what safeguards will exist against arbitrary and unreasonable access?*

The Principal invited Sylvia Franke, Chief Information officer, to answer. Ms. Franke responded as follows:

Thank you for the opportunity to answer the question regarding the McGill Computing Facilities (MCF).

The “Code of Conduct for Users of McGill Computing Facilities” states that users have a right to privacy, but that is subject to reasonable expectations. It is important to acknowledge that all systems are made available to the community for the purposes of supporting the academic mission and the administrative functions of the University, and that reasonable expectations should be determined in that context.

The Code says:

“The level of privacy does not exceed, however, that of reasonable expectations. System failures or design faults may compromise this privacy and users should also recognize that authorized McGill personnel may have access to data and software stored on MCF while performing routine operations or pursuing system problems. Users should further recognize that, as specified in the relevant administrative policies at McGill, authorized McGill personnel have the obligation to take reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure the integrity of MCF and to ensure that this code is observed.” (Excerpt from Code of Conduct for Users of McGill Computing Facilities)

Let me emphasize two parts of this statement: “authorized McGill personnel may have access” and “as specified in the relevant administrative policies at McGill”. Those are the parameters.

Electronic files are accessed by systems staff in the course of normal operations and to protect the integrity of the system. Access to any e-mails, files or databases maintained on systems is provided upon request to the Internal Auditors or to heads or supervisors in academic units and administrative departments that require such access in the ordinary course of their work or due to exceptional circumstances requiring intervention. (For example, a staff member may be away, and information must be accessed to ensure appropriate response on an issue or there could be reasonable grounds to believe that our systems are being used in violation of the law or of University policy). Approximately 10 such exceptional requests were fulfilled last year by central IT staff. I assure you that our IT staff are attuned to the need to avoid invading the privacy of users as much as possible.

Similar practices are likely in place for computing facilities that are not administered by central IT services, but rather by other units on campus. There is no regular reporting mechanism for this type of access to the CIO, but the regulations, policies and procedures relative to facilities controlled by the CIO apply equally to computing facilities that are part of McGill’s infrastructure, regardless of how those facilities are funded.

The Office of CIO, in consultation with other campus administrators and academics, will undertake a review of the Code of Conduct, together with the McGill Computing Facilities management guidelines this year. A revised document for discussion will be brought forward in 2008-2009 timeframe, and I am prepared to have it brought to Senate and the Board for input and discussion. Revisions will reflect changes in technology and how IT infrastructure is delivered on our campuses (for example, the web was not in common use in 1993 and is not even mentioned in the current Code) and current best practices in IT governance related to ensuring confidentiality, integrity and availability of data. During the course of that revision, we will also review what type of reporting is appropriate to the CIO on an annual basis related to the Code of Conduct and its application on campus, including those units that do not have an official reporting relationship to the Chief Information Officer.

The Principal thanked Ms. Franke for her response, and opened the floor to supplemental questions.

Mr. Hobbins asked if we routinely inform individuals that their files have been accessed. Ms. Franke replied that it depends upon the circumstances of the case, and the practices of the unit. Mr. Itzkowitz inquired as to whether, for example, Chairs could have access to files (such as a faculty member’s e-mails). Ms. Franke responded that they could where necessary to ensure the appropriate functioning of the department. Mr. Borkotoky asked how documents related to disciplinary cases are handled. Ms. Franke responded that if access is required in the normal course of McGill’s administrative needs, or according to McGill policies, access will be granted as needed. Professor Paré suggested that any revisions to the code be specific about the fact that researchers have obligations related to the privacy of research data. Ms. Franke responded that confidentiality issues must be explicitly addressed in the revision, but that McGill’s current practices are to respect the full range of obligations the University has regarding its data.

3. Question re Academic discipline in group work

On the invitation of the Principal, Mr. Borkotoky asked the following question:

PREAMBLE:

The handbook of student rights and responsibilities (Green Book) defines plagiarism and states that:

Upon demonstration that the student has represented and submitted another person's work as his or her own, it shall be presumed that the student intended to deceive; the student shall bear the burden of rebutting this presumption by evidence satisfying the person or body hearing the case that no such intent existed (Handbook, section A,III, 15, b)

The Green Book does not make any specific mention of plagiarism cases which occur when the student is working in a group situation. Many courses at McGill require students to work in groups. Group work is an essential pedagogical tool for educators as it gives students a chance to work in collaborative settings and to interact with others in the learning process. This is especially true in the faculties of Management and Engineering.

However, it can be the case that an individual within a group may engage in plagiarism without the knowledge of the other group members. It would seem that, under the current policies, the group as whole would be considered to have engaged in plagiarism and that the punishments or consequences outlined in the regulations would fall on the group as a whole.

QUESTION:

How are current University policies and regulations related to disciplinary procedures interpreted with regards to group work?

Is it the opinion of the Administration that plagiarism as it can occur in group situations is different from a plagiarism involving an individual?

What is the current disciplinary procedure when a member of a group, rather than a group as whole, is involved in plagiarism?

What procedures are in place to ensure that the pedagogical requirements of a course do not encourage group-plagiarism?

The Principal invited Professor Everett to answer. Professor Everett responded as follows:

Background:

The handbook of student rights and responsibilities (Green book) defines plagiarism and states that:

Upon demonstration that the student has represented and submitted another person's work as his or her own, it shall be presumed that the student intended to deceive the student shall bear the burden of rebutting this presumption by evidence satisfying the person or body hearing the case that no such intent existed (Handbook, section A,III, 15, b)

The Green book does not make any specific mention of plagiarism cases which occur when the student is working in a group situation. Many courses at McGill require students to work in groups. Group work is an essential pedagogical tool for educators as it gives students a chance

to work in collaborative settings and to interact with others in the learning process. This is especially true in the faculties of Management and Engineering.

However, it can be the case that an individual within a group may engage in plagiarism without the knowledge of the other group members. It would seem that, under the current policies, the group as whole would be considered to have engaged in plagiarism and that the punishments or consequences outlined in the regulations would fall on the group as a whole.

How are current University policies and regulations related to disciplinary procedures interpreted with regards to group work?

Articles 9c and 10 of the Charter of Students' Rights tell us that the instructor determines the conditions for assessment in his/her course and relays them to his or her students. For group work, the responsibilities of the individual and the group are assumed to be shared wholly, unless otherwise specified. Ideally, the instructor reminds students that each member of a group is responsible for all parts of a group project or, alternatively, assigns responsibilities to specific members (or stipulates that the group must assign tasks to specific members).

Is it the opinion of the Administration that plagiarism as it can occur in group situations is different from a plagiarism involving an individual?

The definition of plagiarism does not change, as the nature of the offence – using the work of another person without attribution – does not change, whatever the type of work being done.

What is the current disciplinary procedure when a member of a group, rather than a group as whole, is involved in plagiarism?

The procedure is identical up until the disposition: i) an allegation, along with supporting material, is forwarded to the Disciplinary Officer (DO); ii) the DO reviews the material and investigates further, if necessary; iii) if available evidence warrants, the DO will pursue the matter, and will invite each member of the group(s) involved to a Disciplinary Interview; iv) the DO discusses the allegation with each student, requesting clarification on points that may be unclear and inviting the student to address the allegation.

At the next stage, that of the Disposition, the DO will make a determination as to whether or not plagiarism occurred and, if it did, who among the group members was/were responsible for it. The DO may decide to exonerate one, some or all of the members of the group(s). Or the DO may sanction one, some or all of the members of the group.

It should be noted that the differences at the Disposition stage are the same ones that pertain in 'individual' cases, i.e. they concern the circumstances in which the alleged offence occurred and the sanctions available to the DO.

What procedures are in place to ensure that the pedagogical requirements of a course do not encourage group-plagiarism?

There are no 'procedures' as such, but reminders about academic integrity abound, as do resources outlining strategies that instructors and students can use to educate themselves and others about academic integrity and how to ensure that it is respected.

The importance of academic integrity to the University's mission is emphasized in the preamble to Section III of the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures, which deals with academic offences: 'The integrity of University academic life and of the degrees that the University confers is dependent upon the honesty and soundness of the teacher-student learning relationship and, as well, that of the evaluation process. Conduct by any member of the University community that adversely affects this relationship or this process must, therefore, be considered a serious offence.'

Instructors must include the Academic Integrity statement – 'McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures (see www.mcgill.ca/integrity for more information).' – on their course outlines and are encouraged to discuss what this means in the context of the course and of their discipline. They are reminded to include the statement in their outlines via an e-mail announcement sent just prior to the beginning of every term.

Among other resources available via the Academic Integrity website, are guides for in-class discussion of academic integrity developed for the use of instructors of undergraduate courses and for that of supervisors and instructors of graduate students. A link to both guides is included with the reminder about the Academic Integrity statement that is sent out to instructors every term.

Finally, in annual presentations to new faculty, and at orientation for new undergraduate students, new graduate students and new postdoctoral fellows, the Dean of Students talks about academic integrity at McGill and mentions a number of best practices – among them, the importance of instructors and students discussing limits to collaboration in the context of both individual and group work.

The Principal thanked Professor Everett for her response.

PART "B" – MOTIONS AND REPORTS FROM ORGANS OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

1. Report of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Academic Personnel (D07-49)

The Provost presented the report of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Academic Personnel (D07-49) for information. As agreed, Senate moved into Committee of the Whole for 30 minutes, with the Principal in the Chair, for a discussion of item IIB-2 "Interim Report to Senate of the Non-Tenure Track Academic Staff Task Force". The notes for this Committee of the Whole are attached to the minutes as Appendix A.

2. Annual Report of the Standing Committee on Sabbatic Leaves (D07-50)

Professor Foster presented the Annual Report of the Standing Committee on Sabbatic Leaves (D07-50).

Professor Butler asked if all the sabbatic leaves in the report were full leaves. Professor Foster replied that 14 were split leaves. Mr. Borkotoky inquired as to what procedures were in place to ensure adequate staffing levels of tenure-track professors. Professor Foster answered that it was the responsibility of the Chair of each Department to address this, which was the reason for some of the deferrals.

3. Presentation by Vice-Principal (Health Affairs) and Dean of Medicine (D07-51)

Vice-Principal (Health Affairs) and Dean of Medicine Levin presented *Academic Medicine in the 21st Century* (posted on the Senate website as D07-51 - <http://www.mcgill.ca/files/senate/AcademicMedicineinthe21CenturyR.ppt>)

Dean Madramootoo assumed the Chair and thanked Vice-Principal Levin for his presentation and opened the floor to questions and comments.

Professor Butler stated that it might be interesting to do an overlay on the obesity graph indicating the introduction of fast food. Vice-Principal Levin responded that this had indeed been looked at, and the introduction of fast food preceded the increase in obesity.

4. 400th Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D07-45)

The Provost presented the Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D07-45).

I. For Approval

A. New Teaching Programs

Item I.A.1, Faculty of Law: LL.M. in Air and Space Law; Non-Thesis, was approved.

Item I.A.2, Desautels Faculty of Management: B.Com.;Honours in Investment Management, was approved.

Item I.A.3, Faculty of Science: B.Sc.; Joint Major in Computer Science and Biology; B.A. & B.Sc.; Major Concentration in Software Engineering; B.Sc.; Science Core Component in Software Engineering [Liberal Program], were approved.

III. Approved in the Name of Senate and IV. For Information

Presented for information.

5. Motion to amend the University Statutes (D07-46)

The Provost spoke briefly to the Motion to amend the University Statutes, and moved that the proposed amendments to Article 13.1, adding the degrees Master of Science, Applied, in Occupational Therapy, M.Sc.A (O.T.) and Master of Science, Applied, in Physical Therapy, M.Sc.A (P.T.) be approved. He mentioned that the University is planning to amend the Statutes so that they do not include the list of degrees McGill confers as the process to amend the Statutes when this list changes is cumbersome.

The motion to amend the University Statutes was approved.

6. Report of the Nominating Committee (D07-47)

Professor Tallant presented the Report of the Nominating Committee (D07-47).

I. For Approval by Senate

Item 1. Statutory Selection Committees were approved.

a) For a professor in the Department of Medicine

Professor Maureen Simmonds (School of Physical and Occupational Therapy)
Professor Jean Gotman (Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery) [alternate]

Professor Donald Kramer (Department of Biology)
Professor Lauren Chapman (Department of Biology) [alternate]

b) For a professor in the Department of Medicine

Professor Shari Baum (School of Communication Sciences and Disorders)
Professor Laurence Kirmayer (Department of Psychiatry) [alternate]

Professor Mary MacKinnon (Department of Economics)
Professor George Grantham (Department of Economics) [alternate]

c) For a professor in the Departments of Medicine and Human Genetics

Professor Philip Barker (Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery)
Professor Walter Mushynski (Department of Biochemistry) [alternate]

Professor Gerald Pollock (Department of Biology)
Professor Bruce Lennox (Department of Chemistry) [alternate]

d) For a professor in the Department of Medicine and the School of Physical and Occupational Therapy

Professor Jack Antel (Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery)
Professor Jacques Corcos (Department of Surgery) [alternate]

Professor Yuriko Oshima-Takane (Department of Psychology)
Professor Siegfried Hekimi (Department of Biology) [alternate]

e) For a professor in the Department of Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery

Professor Ellis Cooper (Department of Physiology)
Professor Paul Clarke (Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics) [alternate]

Professor Michel Loreau (Department of Biology)
Professor Timothy Moore (Department of Geography) [alternate]

f) For a professor in the Department of Anesthesia

Professor Gerald Fried (Department of Surgery)
Professor Francis Gloriux (Department of Surgery) [alternate]

Professor Keith Franklin (Department of Psychology)
Professor Mark Baldwin (Department of Psychology) [alternate]

g) For a professor in the Department of Psychology

Professor Mark Brawley (Department of Political Science)
Professor Ronald Chase (Department of Biology) [alternate]

Professor Mary Dean Lee (Desautels Faculty of Management)
Professor Georg Schmidt (Department of Mathematics and Statistics) [alternate]

Item 2. Annual Review of University Tenure Committees, addition of new members, was approved.

7. Calendar of Dates (D07-48)

Dean Everett presented the Calendar of Dates (D07-48), and moved that the Calendar be approved. Dean Madramootoo thanked Dean Everett for her presentation, and opened the floor to questions and comments.

Mr. Oong inquired whether there had been any substitutions of days for the last week of classes. Dean Everett responded that there was one instance of this being done in the first term, and none in the second. Mr. Itzkowitz asked if there would be any changes to the schedule of exam periods for 2009/10. Dean Everett responded that, as the calendar had to be approved two years in advance, the earliest that changes could take place would be in 2010/11.

The Calendar of Dates was approved.

8. University Budget Update (D07-44)

The Provost presented the University Budget Update (D07-44). Dean Madramootoo then opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Hobbins asked if there was a possibility that the graph for administrative and support staff could be divided into categories (M,T,L,C) in order to show the increase in each area. The Provost responded that he will take this into consideration.

Professor Stroud inquired as to why, in the academic renewal graph, the line indicating departures for 08/09 was shown as solid (confirmed), and not dotted (projected). The Provost replied that the line was actually dotted. Professor Stroud then asked why there were higher increases in the category of administrative and support staff, both as a percentage of this year's operating budget and in levels over the period from 2003 to 2007, than in either tenure-track staff or undergraduate enrolment over the same period. The Provost responded that during the budget cuts of the 1990s, the administration protected its academic programs, and as a result let their levels of administrative and support staff drop far more precipitously than those of their academic staff. Further, as part of the recovery process, the growth in academic staff began in 2000, but the growth in administrative and support staff only began in 2003.

Professor Butler wanted to know if funding for post-doctoral candidates was being addressed in the budget. The Provost answered that they now must register post-docs as students, so that post-docs receive tax breaks on their earnings. The administration has been lobbying the government for additional compensation for post-docs, but has not received a positive response at this point.

Professor Butler then asked if the 1.5% priorities pool included the upcoming CFI competition. The Provost responded that he is working with the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance) and the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) to identify what amounts would be needed if McGill is successful up to its expectations in the CFI competition, but that the resulting expenses be incurred only in 2009/10. A priorities pool will have to be built for the resulting CFIs but will not be part of the upcoming budget year.

Professor Wade asked about CRCs being indicated as revenue, and what would happen if the program terminates, and this would become an expenditure. The Provost responded that these funds are safe until 2011/12, and they are beginning to model where they would like to be in the future with regards to these positions.

Professor Paré asked if increases in non-tenure track academic salaries have been included in the budget considerations, based on the potential changes to non-tenure track academic classifications. The Provost replied that the administration, working with Human Resources, is still trying to get a costing for these, but if the NTT changes were implemented for the fall, the budget provisions would be reflected only be in the following year's budget.

Mr. Itzkowitz stated that the ancillary fee regulations should not be viewed as restrictions, but as an opportunity to work with students to potentially put the same fees to referenda for increases. The Provost responded that while they welcome opportunities to work with students, and have been doing so, in this issue it is a re-regulation of an area and therefore he cannot budget for it. However, the employees who provide the services are subject to McGill salary policy. Therefore, if we must provide additional salaries, in the absence of layoffs, we will have to make cuts somewhere.

Ms. Cooke inquired if it was possible to indicate how many of the administrative and support staff were working in units directly supporting the professoriate and students. She added that she felt that it would be helpful to know the number of administrative and support staff and professoriate prior to the cuts, to put the increases shown in better perspective. Additionally, she requested a clarification of the term "non-merit-based salaries". The Provost replied that he would not be going into that level of detail in the budget book, although there are annual reports made to Senate of the changes in the composition of each of those categories, and the historical data can be included there. In response to the question on "non-merit-based salaries", the Provost explained that in the 1990s, a portion of the salary of all individuals who left the university (through retirement, resignation or death) was put into a merit pool, which is used to feed a portion of increases under the salary policy. As this pool cannot be used for other purposes, the merit component cannot be touched in a budget cut.

Professor Robaire asked why the projection for McGill's allocation of MELS funding was approximately 10 percent, which seemed disproportionately lower than usual. He added that he appreciated the clarification that there is no freeze on hiring academic staff. The Provost said the 10% figure is based on the amount that the administration thinks can be put into general revenues. A large portion of the MELS funding will go to indirect costs of research, and McGill must to compete to get the research funding, so we may not see it in time for the 2008-2009 budget. The objective with Deans and researchers is to try and maximize participation in and dollars received from the provincial competitions to increase indirect cost support. Further, as some of the Quebec money is targeted, it will not be available for general purposes. Regarding the hiring of academic staff, the Provost replied that it was not a freeze, but a replacement model to look at rebalancing across units.

Ms. Peterson requested clarification as to what "academic services" on the Total Operating Budget by Function chart refers to. The Provost explained that these are services in direct support of the academic mission of the University, such as expenditures in libraries and IT infrastructure. Ms. Peterson also asked if the new money from MELS that is mission-specific was the same as that for targeted items. The Provost responded that some of it is. He underlined that he wanted conservative about the amounts that were clearly available to help achieve the objective of a \$10 million deficit and still fund the University's priorities.

Professor Tallant inquired as to whether, as a result of higher energy costs, there would be any new policies developed regarding when the heat should go on or off. The Provost replied that Associate Vice-Principal Nicell was doing a spectacular job of helping the administration to understand the expenses associated with McGill's energy utilisation. He noted that certain practices are market-driven or safety-related.

Mr. Angus asked whether the possible deregulation of international tuition referred to a change in how much of the tuition would be retained by McGill, or a change in the total amount being paid by international students. The Provost affirmed that it was the former, but that this was all speculative, as any new revenue could be offset by a reduction of the government's support for international students, therefore it would be budget-neutral.

Mr. Burgoyne asked, referring to the targeted increase in graduate enrolment, who would make the decision as to which units are targeted, and what criteria would be used. The Provost responded that it was a generalized principle that we think we can sustain a larger number of graduate students in research programs, based on the size of the tenure-track faculty complement that we now have. At the undergraduate level, the Deputy Provost and Director of Enrolment Services are running a strategic enrolment management exercise to help the University understand where we have additional capacity at the undergraduate level, particularly those areas where the number of academic and support staff members has grown but enrolment has not.

Dean Madramootoo thanked the Provost for his presentation and noted that at the last meeting of Senate on May 21, Professor Masi would be presenting the version of the budget going to the Board for approval.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Committee of the Whole

Interim Report to Senate of the Non-Tenure Track Academic Staff Task Force

Chair: Principal Heather Munroe-Blum

On the invitation of the Principal, the Provost presented the Interim Report of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Academic Personnel (D07-49). The Principal thanked the Provost for his presentation and opened the floor to questions and comments.

Professor Pekeles asked whether the Task Force composition had been changed to include GFT(H) representation. The Provost replied that the Faculty of Medicine was originally supposed to have embarked upon a parallel process of its own, and as a result there had been no GFT(H) representation on this Task Force. However, the Associate Dean of Medicine has been included on it, and many Chairs, Associate Chairs, and non-tenure track faculty have been consulted. Professor Pekeles stated that he and others had had no opportunity for input to the committee, and wanted to know if the committee composition could be changed at this point. Professor Wolfson echoed Professor Pekeles' concerns. The Principal suggested, that the Provost explore mechanisms for obtaining the relevant input and responses.

Professor Robaire congratulated the Provost and Task Force for the document, and stated that he fully supported all of its recommendations. He suggested that the wording be more explicit in reference to NTT appointments (2.1), as the current wording could encompass a much larger number of individuals than intended. He also recommended that a modification be made to the table shown in Proposal B to include the option of Faculty Lecturer moving to Assistant Professor Level, instead of directly to Associate Professor Level.

Professor GowriSankaran thanked the Provost and Task Force for their efforts. He suggested that, regarding benefits, sabbatic leaves for NTT be considered for possible inclusion in this document.

Mr. Hobbins voiced concern over the fact that, in termination of contracts as a result of dismissal for cause, there did not appear to be any form of tribunal or committee to aid non-tenure track staff, and this should be rectified.

Mr. Richard suggested that two columns be added to the table, one under tenure-track stream and one under non-tenure track stream, to list the ranks of Assistant, Associate and Full Librarians. Mrs. Schmidt replied that the Librarian regulations of last year have brought those classifications into the documentation.

Professor Tallant voiced her support for the option for non-tenure track staff to move into tenure track. She indicated a preference for Proposal B. Professor Henderson agreed that Proposal B had greater merit with regard to clarity of nomenclature.

Dean Lund suggested it would be preferable for non-tenure track academic staff in the Faculties of Medicine and Dentistry that the word "clinical" not be included as part of their titles, and that they be called lecturer, assistant professor, etc. as is the case with non-clinical academic staff. Dean Grant said he disagreed, stating that titles should reflect actual credentials, otherwise we

devalue those titles that have been earned. Vice-Principal Levin said he agreed with Dean Lund and said he did not feel one could say that the titles were not earned. He suggested that should a distinction need to be made between these two categories of faculty member that it be done other than through the titles given them.

Professor Smith inquired if, regarding Proposal 6, there was a designated list of what constitutes an academic administrative position, and suggested that, regarding Proposal 12, the wording be clarified. The Provost responded that, regarding what constitutes academic administrative positions, this is being looked at, and should be added to the document as an appendix.

The Provost closed his remarks by stating that there is a considerable divergence of opinions regarding the way forward, and he will look into ways of getting further input. Given that the task force has only a month to return to Senate with a proposal, the Provost requested that any comments regarding this document be forwarded to him. He thanked Bill Foster and Laura Winer for their assistance in editing this document, and the task force for its work.

Senate rose from Committee of the Whole.