



Minutes

Wednesday, November 16, 2011 11-12:03

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, November 16, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT

Acker, Tom
 Aitken, Ellen
 Allison, Paul
 Almasri, Mahmoud
 Barney, Darin
 Beheshti, Jamshid
 Bernard, Daniel
 Bin Shahid, Usman
 Blachford, Gregg
 Bouchard, Adam
 Boyer, Daniel
 Breitner, Leslie
 Briones, Emil
 Brophy, James
 Chadha, Roshi
 Clare, Emily Yee
 Clarke, Ian
 Cook, Colleen
 Covo, David
 Crawford, Matthew
 Di Grappa, Michael
 Dinell, Haley
 Doucette, Elaine
 Etemad, Hamid
 Everett, Jane
 Ferguson, Sean
 Galaty, John
 Gale, Charles
 Gehring, Kalle

Gillon, Brendan
 Gold, Richard
 Goldstein, Rose
 Gonnerman, Laura
 Grant, Martin
 Gyakum, John
 Han, Lily
 Harpp, David
 Hashimoto, Kyoko
 Hebert, Terence
 Hepburn, Allan
 Hobbins, Joan
 Hynes, Andrew
 Janda, Richard
 Jonsson, Wilbur
 Jutras, Daniel
 Kirby, Torrance
 Kirk, Andrew
 Knight, Maggie
 Kreiswirth, Martin
 Kurien, John
 Kuzaitis, Ruth
 Leask, Richard
 Lefsrud, Mark
 Lennox, Bruce
 Leung, Jason
 Lowther, David
 Luke, Max
 Ma, Annie
 Mandramootoo, Chandra

Manfredi, Christopher
 Marcil, Olivier
 Masi, Anthony
 McCulloch, Mary Jo
 Mendelson, Morton
 Michaud, Mark
 Misra, Arun
 Munroe-Blum, Heather
(Chair)
 Nassim, Roland
 Ngadi, Michael
 Paterson, Adam
 Perreault, H  l  ne
 Peterson, Kathryn
 Potter, Judith
 Richard, Marc
 Richards, Michael
 Riches, Caroline
 Roulet, Nigel
 Schloss, Melvin
 Todd, Peter
 Wapnick, Joel
 Weinstein, Marc
 White, Lydia
 Wolfson, Christina
 Zhang, Ji
 Zorychta, Edith
 Strople, Stephen
(Secretary)

REGRETS: Sam Benaroya, Serge Carrier, Renzo Cecere, Stuart Cobbett, Claudio Cuello, Brian Driscoll, Gregory Dudek, Keelin Elwood, Peter Gr  tter, Jacques Hurtubise, Ashraf Ismail, Juliet Johnson, Kevin McDonough, Gary Pেকেles, Andrew Piper, Amir Raz, Honora Shaughnessy, Ada Sinacore, Arnold Steinberg.

The Chair welcomed everyone and asked for the exceptional leave of Senate to live stream the meeting up to and including a proposed session of a committee of the whole. On motion duly proposed and seconded, leave was granted to live stream the proceedings.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Professor J. Brian Bird

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

It is with regret that I must inform the Senate that Professor J. Brian Bird passed away on August 20, 2011, at his Fitch Bay home.

Born in Birmingham, England in 1923, Brian Bird was a student at Cambridge University, whose education was interrupted by the Second World War. He served as a Captain in the Royal marines from 1942 to 1945 and completed his B.A. degree in Geography in 1947 and M.A. degree in 1949. He moved to Canada in 1947, first as Lecturer at the University of Toronto and then as an Assistant Professor of Geography at McGill University in 1950, being promoted to Associate and Full Professor in 1954 and 1961, respectively.

At McGill in the 1950s and 1960s, he was one of a group of faculty responsible for forging the very high reputation of the Department of Geography. He taught physical geography, supervised 35 Masters and Ph.D. theses and conducted field-work primarily in the Canadian Arctic, southern Canada and Barbados. The research generated numerous papers and monographs and two books, one on the *Physiography of the Canadian Arctic* and the other on the *Natural Landscapes of Canada*.

Brian Bird also played a key role in the development of Geography at McGill, Canada and internationally. He served as Chair of Geography twice, from 1967 to 1974 and from 1980 to 1987. He was instrumental in establishing the McGill network of field stations at arctic Axel Heiberg, subarctic Schefferville and tropical Barbados, which continue to today. He was a founding member of the Canadian Association of Geographers, served as President in 1958-1959 and was honoured with its Award for Service to the Profession of Geography.

He was a strong, rugged character who provided clear leadership, was caring and supportive of his colleagues and firmly nurtured the development of Geography and McGill University.

During the 1950s and 1960s, he was involved in the McGill Geography Department summer school based at Stanstead College, Québec. From this experience grew Brian's fondness for the region. In 1974 he purchased a country home in Fitch Bay and spent much of his time there enjoying vegetable gardening into his retirement.

The Senate of McGill University and the wider academic community extend deep condolences to Prof. Bird's children, Colin, Neil and Joanne.

2. Report of the Steering Committee

The report of the Steering Committee (11-12:03) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the October 19, 2011 meeting.

Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee reviewed the confidential minutes of the meeting of October 19, 2011 and approved them on behalf of Senate.

Item 3. Fall 2011 Convocation Approval of Degrees, Certificates and Diplomas. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee approved the Fall 2011 Convocation degrees, certificates and diplomas on behalf of Senate and empowered the Secretary of Senate to make changes to the lists as necessary.

Item 4. Speaking Rights. On motion duly proposed and seconded, speaking rights were granted for Professor Cynthia Weston, Director (Teaching and Learning Services) for item IIA1; Ms Jana Luker, Executive Director (Services for Students) for item IIB2.2; and Professor Michael C. Mackey, Department of Physiology for item IIB3.

Item 5. Confidential Session. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into Confidential Session for consideration of item IIB1 (Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee, D11-17).

Item 6. Academic Issues for Discussion at a Future Meeting. The Chair informed Senate that time will be allotted at future meetings for a discussion of issues of academic import at McGill that are not part of the regular business of Senate. The Steering Committee reviewed topics including “variations in student assessment practices across faculties” and agreed to further discuss placing this and other topics on a future Senate agenda.

Item 7. Spectator Access to the October 19, 2011 Senate Meeting. The Secretary-General apologized for the confusion and failure of communication at the previous Senate meeting with regard to visitor access to Senate chambers. The Secretariat has taken steps to better coordinate spectator access and will continue to look at other measures to address the issue.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

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

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair limited her remarks to the events of November 10. She noted everyone's dismay in what transpired on our campus, particularly as it came on the heels of a series of well-planned and well-executed student demonstrations about the tuition freeze.

The Chair enumerated the troubling experiences for many members of the University community. She remarked that people across the board were hurt, intimidated and threatened.

The Chair added that as Principal, she is deeply sorry that events so at odds with the culture and values of the University have happened here at McGill. She added that she is not alone in regarding these events as very regrettable and something that we hope never to see repeated. The Chair remarked that the events last week hurt many members of the direct community as well as those connected to us: parents, families, alumni, volunteers and those in general who care about McGill.

The Chair noted that there have been and will be a number of processes that people will engage in to come together, to share experiences, to offer support, to understand and to strengthen our community and went on to express her thanks to everyone who quickly moved to offer such support.

The Chair reminded senators that she has asked Daniel Jutras, Professor and Dean of Law, to undertake an independent investigation of these events. She referenced her letter to him, which outlined his terms of reference, and his communication to the community, noting that the mandate has been established and the process was under way. She urged senators to read his communiqué and to contribute to his investigation where they have experiences that will shed light on the events and help us move forward. The Chair iterated that Dean Jutras' report will be made public, that there will be opportunity for debate and comment and that it will be placed on the agendas of Senate and the Board of Governors.

The Chair remarked that she and other members of the academic leadership will be meeting with student and other groups, as well as participating in other fora, including a webcast where members of the community will be invited to email questions relating to the events, for her response in real-time. Through these and other measures, the Chair is committing herself to providing an opportunity for all members of the University community to express their ideas and feelings about the events and to help us regain our balance as a community. She asked that we all support each other in doing so.

The Chair related a conversation she had held the previous night with a group of senators who suggested that we allow Senate to hold a discussion on the events of recent days at today's Senate meeting. She expressed her support for such a discussion and informed Senate that the Steering Committee had conveyed its agreement that morning.

The Chair ended her remarks by proposing that Senate move into a committee of the whole for the purpose of discussion. She invited a motion to that effect with the appointment of Dean Manfredi as chair. She added that the Steering Committee had agreed to recommend that Senate

should allocate 45 minutes for discussion, with the option of continuing for up to 15 additional minutes in the case that speakers or points of view had not been heard.

On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate moved into a committee of the whole, with Senator Manfredi as chair. The notes from the committee of the whole are attached as Appendix A).

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question Regarding the Use of Technology in the Classroom

Senator Ma asked the following question:

A presentation and subsequent discussion on teaching, learning, and educational technology was started by Professor Cynthia Weston, Director of Teaching & Learning Services at the Senate meeting of 23 March 2011. Topics covered included the lecture recording system (including statistics supporting their extensive use), deep learning vs. surface learning, classroom size, and the effect of technology on attendance. At the 8th Annual Teaching & Technology Day held 4 May 2011, there were discussions on a wide variety of educational technologies, including document cameras, lecture recordings, Adobe Connect, social media and learning managements systems. It is clear that any implementation for the enhanced use of technology will need to be well-planned and researched.

Given that the adoption of lecture recordings varies widely by teaching unit, with some units, such as those in Science, achieving extensive adoption and others, such as Engineering, with very few adoptions, what steps will the University take to implement such technology across the campus and to encourage more professors to use available electronic resources (including lecture recording systems)?

Many students in McGill have large classes of at least 100 people until their last year, such as in the Department of Physiology. Also, in many cases, students will only get see their single midterm grade after as long as a month from the midterm. This means no evaluation is available until about the 10th week of the semester. What can the University do to have smaller classes, more extensive and rapid feedback and enhanced access to professors?

The Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) answered as follows:

I would like to thank Senator Ma for raising questions of such academic importance. To address the first question, lecture recording capability is available across the university to any professor who wishes to use it, either through dedicated hardware installations or software based systems. The use of such technology, however, may not be appropriate for all types of classes, so it is at the discretion of individual instructors.

Our goal is to make sure that instructors are aware of the tools available to them, to identify new tools and services as appropriate to the teaching and learning needs of McGill instructors and students, and to maintain those tools and services in ways that ensure users have the best possible experience with them. Orientation sessions for faculty members and introductory workshops and webinars are offered each semester. Students can, of course, make their wishes for class recordings known to their instructors, who can then contact the IT help desk (3398) for assistance in implementing class recordings.

The first issue of feedback to students is indeed important and one on which McGill scores poorly on student surveys. We know that formative feedback leads to improved student learning gains, so providing such serves an important educational purpose. We also know that multiple, small assessments (even when some are ungraded) improve student performance. Therefore, we should move towards expanding in-class feedback, which can be done in many ways. We continually work with professors to support them in designing courses to include ongoing feedback throughout the semester. In large classes, one method of doing this is through the proper use of clickers – technology that has been introduced successfully in many courses, but which requires ongoing support, particularly for instructors during their first semester of use. As a University, we need to nurture a culture within faculties and departments that values and rewards professors' commitment to and development of their teaching.

Another issue was increased access to professors. Access is most obviously limited in very large courses, where the numbers constrain the amount of time that instructors can interact individually with students in their courses. In such cases, increased office hours would likely not significantly address the problem, but that could be a start. Moreover, technology might provide assistance, for example, through on-line discussions. Many units are striving to increase opportunities for undergraduate research, which often involves one-to-one interactions with professors or involvement of undergraduates in lab meetings held by professors. In either case, there is increased student-faculty interaction. Changing the use of in-class and out-of-class time could also address this issue. Rather than use lectures to convey information, information-transmission could take place outside the classroom, and in-class time could be used to create more opportunities for meaningful interaction. Professor-student interaction will be increased as we continue to redesign classroom environments for enhanced interaction.

Smaller classes may be one way to address the legitimate concerns about increasing feedback and faculty-student interaction. The University is exploring a number of possibilities; these will be appropriate to different circumstances, but there are undoubtedly others as well. One approach would be to introduce main topics through large lectures – either face-to-face or virtual – preferably taught by senior, outstanding professors. These lectures would then break into smaller classes (as opposed to tutorials), which would allow for active and collaborative application and discussion of concepts. Of course, this systemic response would face largely financial constraints related to more personnel and possibly more classrooms. Large classes are not, in and of themselves, problematic. Indeed, there are many large classes that achieve their goals and receive

very positive feedback from students. Large-enrolment courses that involve multiple instructors can present additional challenges, such as lack of coherence. In some cases, problems can be addressed by ensuring that there is shared course design and an active course coordinator who participates throughout the semester. This, of course, would not address the issue of smaller classes, but tag-team teaching with disconnected lectures can be problematic for students and may be one of the things that prompts them to ask for smaller classes.

Again, I thank the Senator for raising these important issues regarding teaching and learning at McGill. We are working to find creative solutions given the resource constraints of the University. I will undertake to bring these issues to the APC Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning to ensure that they are discussed further, with the goal of generating additional solutions and possible directions for implementing them.

Senator Ma expressed her fear that not all students have the courage to approach their professors. The Deputy Provost said that this was understandable, but students can also approach faculty chairs and various student associations. Senator Bin Shahid suggested that students could vote on whether to record the classes in their faculty. The Deputy Provost answered that professors retain discretion on whether or not it is appropriate to do so.

Senator Ma reiterated that Professors should avail themselves of all tools to encourage more discussion in classes. Senator Galaty added that the discussion should include having an adequate corps of teaching assistants, which he believes is the most important element of quality teaching.

2. Question Regarding the Disciplinary Hearing Process

Senator Clarke asked the following question:

On October 14th, two students were served with a notice for an alleged violation of Article 5(a) and 6 of the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures for their participation in a student demonstration on campus. After a private hearing on October 28th, the charges were dropped due to a clear lack of evidence; one of the students had not even attended the event.

A disciplinary hearing places a student in an extremely stressful situation and should only be used where there is clear evidence of an offence. The negative impact of a hearing is amplified when it is served in a discretionary and arbitrary manner. At best, students may be confused and worried about academic repercussions. They must also take time out of their busy schedule to prepare for and attend the hearing. At worst, students could feel intimidated, alienated and potentially harassed by the McGill administration. The amount of stress caused by an unsubstantiated claim is unacceptable, especially if we are a part of a university which endeavours to foster a welcoming and safe environment for all students. To quote the Principal Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement:

“Our policies reflect and support our diversity through hiring, promotion and recognition, with the goal of creating and sustaining a spirit of inclusivity, openness, and respect that extends throughout the University, an intellectually-diverse community, in which everyone can fully participate and where diverse opinions, methodologies, and ideologies are welcome.” [emphasis added]

While the context in which the disciplinary hearing arose may have aggravated the issue, it has shed light upon an opportunity to re-examine the student disciplinary process. An institution of certain checks & balances could reinforce the process’ integrity as the aforementioned case leaves the impression of a one-step process from the submission of a security report to the notice of a private hearing.

Will the McGill Administration undertake a review of the current disciplinary procedure in order to ensure such misuses does not reoccur?

What forms of recourse do students have if they have been negatively impacted by the disciplinary procedure in a similar way?

The Dean of Students answered as follows:

I would like to thank Senator Clarke for raising this important issue in Senate.

The preamble to the question states that two students were served with notice for an alleged violation of the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures for participating in a student demonstration on campus and that, 2 weeks later at a private hearing, the charges were dropped due to a clear lack of evidence.

According to McGill policy, which was approved at Senate, outcomes of specific disciplinary proceedings are confidential, so I cannot comment on a particular case, but I can offer some general remarks in response to the two questions.

The Charter of Students’ Rights confers the following procedural right to all McGill students:

Every student is presumed innocent of a disciplinary offence unless he or she is found guilty on the basis of clear, convincing and reliable evidence laid against him or her.

Upon receiving a report that a student has breached the Code, a Disciplinary Officer can privately interview the student to inquire into the alleged offence. The procedures for notifying students and conducting the interview are meant to protect students’ rights and enable disposition of cases in a timely manner. They are well-defined in the Code and need not be reviewed here.

However, the aim of the interview is to allow an open discussion of the allegation, which may lead to the charge being dropped. In the terms of the Code, the student would be

exonerated, indicating that an alleged violation of an article of the Code was not supported by clear, convincing, and reliable evidence. Cases in which students are rightfully exonerated confirm that the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures in fact functions well.

We appreciate that it can be stressful for a student to be called either to a disciplinary interview or to a hearing before the Committee of Student Discipline. However, the Code appropriately balances the rights and obligations of students and the University. The University takes these matters very seriously, as do Disciplinary Officers.

A student who has not been exonerated of an allegation may ask for a full hearing of the Committee on Student Discipline. A student who has been exonerated but who has been negatively impacted by a disciplinary procedure may raise the matter with the Ombudsperson for Students, who may be able to provide advice specific to the circumstances. Finally, if one or both of the following conditions hold, a student may also seek appropriate redress by filing a grievance under the Code of Student Grievance Procedures:

- The student feels that a right accorded to him or to her under the Charter of Students' Rights has been infringed by a member of the University.
- The student feels he or she has been subject to an arbitrary act or a failure to act by a member of the University occupying a position of authority vis-à-vis the student in a University-related matter.

Although I do not believe that the issue described here is cause for a review of the Code, I would like to remind Senate that a review of the Code was undertaken last year, that consultation is underway regarding proposed changes, and that the proposed revisions will be brought to Senate for discussion and approval in the current academic year, providing us all with an opportunity to discuss these matters.

Discussion ensued about how much discretion University officials should have regarding the evidentiary threshold to call a student before a disciplinary body. Dean Everett answered that this will be taken into consideration in proposing revisions.

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

1. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D11-17)

Senate moved into confidential session to discuss the Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (this minute is approved by the Senate Steering Committee and is not published or circulated, but is attached to the permanent minutes of Senate as Appendix "B").

2. Items deferred from the October 19, 2011 meeting

2.1 Association of American Universities Data Exchange/Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education Survey Presentation (D11-11)

The Provost presented the results of the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) and Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) faculty satisfaction surveys. These surveys intend to assess levels of satisfaction among faculty members for the key aspects of their academic lives and to provide the University with data that can be compared to peer institutions. The AAUDE report showed a high overall satisfaction rate among faculty, with middling satisfaction for professors' research resources. The COACHE survey focused solely on tenure-track assistant professors. It too exhibited high overall satisfaction rates, but suggested that junior faculty would appreciate greater clarity for tenure practices as well as more mentorship.

In discussion, the Provost explained that the surveys' small sample size made it impossible to release full results without compromising respondents' anonymity. However, he assured Senate that the survey represented a balanced demographic sample. The Provost pointed out a discrepancy between junior staff's belief that mentorship was wanting and senior staff's belief that mentorship was pervasive. He allowed that this may be due to each respondent's individual characterization of the term, but underlined that additionally effective mentorship would resolve the discrepancy. The Chair added that the Strategic Reframing Initiative was looking at how to make better use of resources to address absolute and comparative weaknesses displayed in these surveys.

2.2 Annual Report of the Committee on Student Services (D11-12)

The Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning) presented the Annual Report of the Committee on Student Services for information. He drew Senate's attention to section 3 of the Annual Report, highlighting the new Manager of Student Assessment. He added that high priority is assigned to Student Health Services and Mental Health Services. The Deputy Provost asked senators to think of ways to foster ties between student services and academic units, suggesting that this could be placed on a future agenda.

2.3 Annual Report of the Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs (D11-13)

The Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning) presented the Annual Report of the Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs for information. He drew attention to the Committee's work on the academic calendar of dates and on vetting the University's admissions standards and policies. The Deputy Provost noted that section 4.3 should read that the report will be forthcoming.

3. 432nd Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D11-18)

The Provost presented this report, highlighting the new student exchange partnerships. He introduced the Committee's recommendation for the creation of the Centre for Applied Mathematics in Bioscience and Medicine and invited Professor Michael C. Mackey to describe the rationale behind the Centre. Professor Mackey explained that the Centre is a collection of mathematicians from eight universities, working together towards the goal of training students in applied mathematics alongside Canadian industry.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the creation of the Centre for Applied Mathematics in Bioscience and Medicine (CAMBAM) / Centre des mathématiques appliquées en bioscience et médecine (CMABM) and so recommended to the Board of Governors.

4. Report of the Nominating Committee (D11-19)

The Provost presented the report, which recommended appointments to the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee, the Committee on Student Services, and the Advisory Committee for the Selection of a Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations).

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

5. Annual Report of the Committee on Student Discipline (D11-20)

The Dean of Students presented this report for information. Senator Han asked about the large increase in the number of non-academic hearings from 2008-09 to 2010-11. The Dean of Students answered that most of the incidents occur in residences where the population has increased. In addition, adjustments have been made to the delineation between mere violations of residence rules and violations that warrant student discipline. The Dean of Students finished by saying that her office and the Committee review the data in order to address trends.

6. Annual Report of the Committee on Libraries (D11-21)

The Provost presented this report for information. It was pointed out that Fair Use is a misnomer and should read Fair Dealing; the Provost agreed to make that change.

7. Motion to Amend the Statutes of McGill University (D11-22)

The Secretary-General introduced the proposed amendment to the Statutes of McGill University to add a new *ex officio* member of Senate, the University Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services. The proposed resolution was duly moved and second. Following a request for additional information about the current and historical composition of Senate, Senate agreed to table the motion to a future meeting.

8. Report on the Joint Board-Senate Meeting

(D11-23)

The Provost presented this report for information. The topic of the meeting was Research and Innovation in the Undergraduate Educational Experience. In response to a suggestion from Senator Knight, the Provost agreed to take under advisement the circulation of discussion questions to senators in advance of future joint meetings. Finally, he informed Senate that the main themes that emerged from this meeting's discussion are being considered in the design of the White Paper (ASAP 2012); he invited senators to provide feedback to either SRP@mcgill.ca or whitepaper@mcgill.ca.

9. Other Business

There being no other business to deal with at the meeting, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.

END

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



McGill

McGILL UNIVERSITY **SENATE**

Minutes

Wednesday, November 16, 2011 11-12:03

Appendix A

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

In taking the chair, Dean Christopher Manfredi began by explaining that the purpose of the Committee was to maximize open discussion, free of the rules of Senate. He noted that a committee of the whole does not make decisions on behalf of Senate, but does report to the assembly. The Committee was granted 45 minutes to discuss, with an option to add an additional 15 minutes if needed.

Senator Jutras described the investigation he was asked to conduct on the events in and around the James Building on November 10, 2011. He was asked to report on appropriate recommendations regarding practices, processes and policies within McGill University's control and jurisdiction. The terms of reference for this investigation arose from a letter from the Principal, copy of which had been recently circulated to all members of the University community. He noted that he sent a message to the community explaining the scope of the investigation and the process by which he intends to carry it out.

Senator Jutras said that the ultimate purpose of the investigation and report is to allow McGill to learn from the events of November 10 and to allow the University to take steps that would reduce the likelihood of a recurrence. He described the task as a fact-finding exercise and primarily forward-looking. He stated that the final report will describe the events of November 10 and will gather relevant information explaining how they came about.

The report will not include any nominative assessment of individual conduct or responsibility because, in a society governed by due process and the rule of law, the allocation of blame for wrongdoings of any sort is subject to strict procedural safeguards, and those procedural constraints and safeguards do not apply in the context of an internal investigation such as this one. Senator Jutras added that as he has no power to compel testimony or to order the production of documents, representations to him will be made on a voluntary basis, meaning he will not necessarily receive representations from all sides of every issue. He stressed that he has no authority to determine whether any persons committed wrongdoings or offences of any kind and cannot supersede, interfere with, or replace the University's established procedures to do so. He underlined that he has no authority to pass judgment on the conduct of Montreal Police on campus or to assign blame to individual police officers and will not do so.

Senator Jutras told the Committee that he will proceed with care, respect and integrity, without bias of any sort. His report will speak for no one but himself and will serve no person but the University community as a whole. His investigation will cover events that occurred on campus on that day, both within and outside of the James Administration building, and the ways in which those events came about. Senator Jutras invited all members of the community to assist him by sharing their written submissions concerning the events of November 10, 2011. Written submissions must be received by him before November 25, 2011. He stated that members of the

McGill community may also submit photos or videos of the events of November 10 by electronic mail. Submissions could be made by electronic message or delivered to his office and all submissions will remain confidential and their content will not be made public or disseminated or communicated to any person other than Senator Jutras, his legal advisor and his assistants.

Senator Jutras added that he may solicit interviews with members of the community who send information or who can shed light on the events. Interviews would not be recorded or transcribed. He noted that he will take personal notes to assist with the preparation of his report, but these notes will not be made public or disseminated or communicated to any person other than his legal advisor and his assistants. Senator Jutras intends to review relevant documents, written policies and other logs that may shed light on the events of November 10, 2011. Senator Jutras indicated that he has retained Me Giuseppe Battista as his legal advisor and two doctoral students in the Faculty of Law at McGill to provide him with logistical support. He hoped all members of the McGill community would cooperate in this effort.

Senator Jutras noted that while he is prepared to hear any comments or views that Committee members may wish to share regarding the events of November 10 and their causes, he will request the Chair's permission to withdraw for all discussion on the scope, structure and suitability of his investigation.

Senator Acker told the Committee that his friends and peers were assaulted by members of the riot police, leading to trepidation and fear. He characterized the problem as an issue of trust, and described the severe distrust that students have of the administration. Senator Acker stated that the administration was conveying a message that student voices are not valued and for thereby hindering reconciliation.

Senator Briones said that students' relationship with the University needs to be rebuilt and that the University should avail itself of services to help students heal.

Senator Dinel told the Committee that she was surprised that there was no system in the James building to deal with such a security breach. She added that other universities have security training drills and suggested that McGill do so as well to prepare in case of future incidents.

Senator Knight noted the administration's delay in offering services following the events, especially when compared to past incidents. She said that this left students feeling unsupported and suggested that the administration views students as a threat. Senator Knight regretted that SSMU was burdened with providing medical services to injured students. Ultimately, Senator Knight called for more compassionate dealings.

Senator Barney told the Committee that what happened was a consequence of the growing securitization of the campus, which suggests the potential for violence. He called on the University to reverse this trend by reversing its injunction against MUNACA picketing, which he felt carried an explicit threat of coercive enforcement and prevents the campus from providing the widest possible space for freedom of expression and assembly. Senator Barney also called on the University to rename James Square as Community Square, and to recognize November 10 as Freedom Day.

Senator Bin Shahid characterized the events as the result of students being increasingly ignored across the institution over several years. He expressed his belief that McGill has failed to learn from its mistakes of not properly treating students as members of the community.

Senator Galaty stated that autonomy is fundamental to the university and the space it occupies, in terms of expression, learning and research. Within such space, there is no room for politics or external policing. While we cannot bar the police from our urban campus, he called on McGill to assert the philosophical principle that we do not want police on campus.

Senator Clare read testimonial from a student who crossed James Square on her way to her job at the Redpath Museum. The student explained how she was allowed onto campus by a police officer, only to find herself having to flee the riot police. She described how the riot police behaved aggressively without regard for the well-being of either bystanders like herself or the protesters. The student considered the riot police's operations clumsy and dangerous.

Senator Ma asked why McGill did not make use of its emergency text message system when riot police were on campus and members of the community were being pepper sprayed.

Senator Grant noted his pride in the November 11 Remembrance Day ceremony, which welcomed police, soldiers and schoolchildren to campus in commemoration of the tens of thousands of Canadians who died for our freedom. He was also proud that MUNACA and the administration had come to an agreement allowing union members to take part in the ceremony. Senator Grant recalled the events at Ecole Polytechnique and at Dawson College, which indicate that we sometimes need the police on campus and value their services when we do.

Senator Crawford shared his perspective as one of the occupiers of the 5th floor of the James building. He stated that McGill security cannot carry out their role without safeguards. He said that these safeguards include: never laying hands on students; always providing names and licenses; never wantonly calling police when a peaceful demonstration enters campus; ensuring interactions are carried out in a protective, not cruel tone. He informed the Committee that this was not how he was treated.

Senator Janda described the events as something that will mark the history of the McGill community. He shared his own students' suggestions, as follows. First, the events of November 10 cannot be interpreted in isolation from how they arose. Second, anything that gave rise to such antagonism requires truth and reconciliation as a process of healing. Finally, the investigation cannot solely look at harm to victims, but also to the grievances that gave rise to this response. Senator Janda also spoke of Senate's ability to interpret the events and to enable a pathway toward truth and reconciliation. He applauded the Committee's tone in its deliberations and ended by asking members to think of how Senate could contribute to the community.

With the Chair's approval, Senator Jutras left the chambers to allow members to discuss the issues about the investigation. Irrespective of their views on the events or the investigation, members who spoke were consistent in acknowledging their respect for Senator Jutras and confidence in his abilities.

The comments below are anonymized and presented in summary form in order to maintain the commenters' distance from the investigation.

Several senators questioned the appearance of legitimacy and independence of having a dean as sole investigator, albeit without questioning the terms of reference of the investigation. Their suggestions included adding a member of faculty and a student to your team. One senator told the Committee that she initially questioned the investigation's use of the word "independent," but added that she has been reassured that the administration will not interfere and appreciates that Senator Jutras had appointed an external advisor.

One senator said that the investigation should look at what did not happen during the events of November 10, such as the lack of communication to staff members about what was happening or what they should do.

Another senator noted that the investigation should consider the presence of riot police as merely the trigger of the investigation, while its goal should be to examine the escalation from a group of people protesting in James Square to the arrival of riot police. This senator considered each step of escalation reasonable, but suggested that the investigation should study how the sequence of events occurred.

A senator said that the investigation should look at the structures and systems in place that led to the events, including the mandate, training and supervision of McGill security systems and suggested a need to investigate how the University is structured.

One senator added that the investigation should not detach the events inside the building from those outside, since the occupiers were communicating false impressions about the situation to those outside. He stated the importance of understanding the nature of the occupation on the fifth floor, including the wearing of scarves and hoods by some, and the use of force to gain entry. He added that the investigation should also take note of the efforts to get the occupiers safely out of the building.

Another senator said that the report should be brought to Senate for discussion and guidance before being finalized and Senate should be seen as part of the investigation procedure. Senator Jutras should be open to being guided by Senate and reporting on how Senate's feedback helped him.

A senator said that the investigation should be sure to request all video security footage from the James building on November 10.

The Principal told the Committee that while they can make suggestions to Dean Jutras, the terms of reference of his investigation were accepted and that the investigation is already under way. She added that she established the parameters after consulting with people who are experts in commissioning such investigations and that Dean Jutras was considered the best person to accomplish this task. The Principal said that the University operates on the basis of trust and expressed her absolute confidence that Dean Jutras will operate with the utmost integrity in carrying out his work. She urged everyone to share their information with him in the most expedient manner.