

**Minutes**

Wednesday, April 20, 2016 15-16:08

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, April 20, 2016 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building)

**PRESENT**

Allison, Paul  
Barg, Lisa  
Bartlett, Joan  
Bede, Jacqueline  
Benrimoh, David  
Bernard, Daniel  
Brunot, Benjamin  
Campbell, Angela  
Carter, Mindy  
Cere, Daniel  
Chatel-Launay, Nicolas  
Chen, Allen  
Costopoulos, Andre  
Covo, David  
Crelinsten, Gordon  
Damha, Masad  
Di Grappa, Michael  
Dudek, Gregory  
Dumont, Marie-Josée  
Dyens, Ollivier  
Eidelman, David  
Farid, Doaa  
Fuhrer, Rebecca  
Galaty, John  
Gehr, Ronald  
Geitmann, Anja

Gold, Richard  
Goldstein, Rose  
Gore, Genevieve  
Green, Garth  
Gruenheid, Samantha  
Grütter, Peter  
Gyakum, John  
Harpp, David  
Hastings, Kenneth  
Hébert, Terence  
Holmes, Amanda  
Hooton, Brett  
Ibrahim, Kareem  
Jutras, Daniel  
Kalil, Alex  
Kamen, Amine  
Kpeglo-Hennessy  
Alexander  
Kuzaitis, Ruth  
Lennox, Bruce  
Lowther, David  
Manfredi, Christopher  
Marcil, Olivier  
Massey, Kathleen  
McCulloch, Mary Jo  
Meadwell, Hudson  
Mills, Devin

Mineau, Guy  
Moore, Timothy  
Mucci, Alfonso  
Nalbantoglu, Josephine  
Nicell, Jim  
Noyhouzer, Tomer  
Oxhorn, Philip  
Potter, Judith  
Rassier, Dilson  
Richard, Marc  
Riches, Caroline  
Ritchie, Fiona  
Robaire, Bernard  
Rourke, Chloe  
Saroyan, Alenoush  
Smailes, Marina  
Sobat, Erin  
Steinhauer, Karsten  
Stephens, David  
Strople, Stephen  
(*Secretary*)  
Toccalino, Danielle  
Waters, Natalie  
Winer, Laura  
Yalovsky, Morty  
Zorychta, Edith

**REGRETS:** Darine Bader, Isabelle Bajoux-Besnainou, Parvesh Chainani, Julie Choi, Kathleen Chu, Stuart Cobbett, Terence Coderre, Colleen Cook, Rosemary Cooke, Antonia Di Paola, Elaine Doucette, Eleanore Elstein, Jim Engle-Warnick, Sean Ferguson, Suzanne Fortier, Kalle Gehring, Reghan Hill, Ashraf Ismail, Mari Kaartinen, Lucyna Lach, Gillian Lane-Mercier, Marcelo Lannes, Margaret Levey, Michel Martel, Michael A. Meighen, Felicia Moyer, Ram Panda, Trevor Ponech, Cynthia Price, Saibal Ray, Nigel Roulet, Devon Sanon, Laurie Snider, Joshua Thon, Marc Weinstein, Josefina Zalba.

## **SECTION I**

### **1. Approval of Senator Nicell as Chair of the April 20, 2016 Senate Meeting**

In the Principal's absence, the Secretary-General convened the meeting and asked Senate to approve item 3 of the Report of the Steering Committee (Recommendation of Senator Nicell as Chair of Senate for the April 20, 2016 Meeting).

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the appointment of Senator Nicell as Chair of Senate for the April 20, 2016 meeting.*

### **2. Welcoming Remarks**

The Chair welcomed Senators to the eighth Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 governance year. He explained that Principal Fortier was unable to attend the Senate meeting as she was participating in the Business Higher Education Roundtable. He then reminded Senators, guests and spectators that the use of electronic devices is permitted for viewing meeting documents, but that the *Senate Rules of Procedure* prohibit the recording of sound or images, and the communication or posting of Senate deliberations.

### **3. Report of the Steering Committee** (15:16-08)

Senate received the Report of the Steering Committee (15-16:08).

*Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate – March 23, 2016.*

*Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate – March 23, 2016.*

*Item 3. Recommendation of Senator Nicell as Chair of Senate for the April 20, 2016 Meeting.*

*Item 4. Speaking rights.* Upon approval of the report, speaking rights were granted to Professor Ghyslaine McClure, Associate Provost (Budget & Resources), and Mr. Real Del Degan, Interim Director (Office of the Budget) for item IIB1 (Proposed McGill University Budget 2016-17) and for Mr. Glenn Zabowski, Associate Dean of Students, for item IIB5 (Further Revisions to the University Student Assessment Policy).

*Item 5. Senate Questions.*

*Item 6. Approval of the Agenda.*

Senator Sobat noted that the Report of the Steering Committee stated that the question concerning the Polish Institute of Arts and Science in Canada (PIASC) dealt with building and space issues and was therefore not a matter of interest to the Senate. He stated that this is an important matter for many members of the McGill community, as can be seen from the petition that was conducted, and that the PIASC has close links with certain academic departments on campus.

Senator Manfredi reiterated that the PIASC is a community-based organization that has no formal affiliation with McGill University. He stated that there have been discussions over the past fifteen years over the fact that the PIASC would have to eventually vacate the premises. He mentioned that since the building is no longer suitable for occupation, it must be vacated and the University does not have alternate space to provide the PIASC. However, Senator Manfredi explained that he is working with the PIASC to find alternative accommodations and has reached out to other institutions in Montreal. He added that the PIASC's large collection of approximately 50,000 books will be, at shared cost between McGill and the PIASC, put into temporary storage, with the exception of 10,000 volumes that will be held at McGill Libraries.

Senator Dyens asked that speaking rights be granted to Ms. Robyn Wiltshire, Interim Senior Director of Student Services, for the Question Regarding Universal Design for Learning, Mental Health and Neurodiversity. Senators had no objections.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the Report of the Steering Committee.*

#### **4. Business Arising from Previous Senate Minutes**

##### **4.1 Additional Information Concerning the Question Regarding Course Outlines (Question at February 17, 2016 Senate Meeting)**

Senator Dyens informed Senators that he collaborated with Senator Winer, Director of Teaching and Learning Services and Senator Massey, University Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services, to create a platform for professors to upload their course outlines. The proposal and challenges associated with it were described in the memorandum circulated prior to the Senate meeting.

Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy asked when the program would be implemented. Senator Winer stated that she is currently reaching out to the different departments and would be able to provide a response at the next Senate meeting.

Senator Gehr asked why course outlines from previous years cannot be posted automatically onto the LOR. Senator Winer responded that they cannot be extracted since there is no naming convention for course outlines. However, professors can manually publish them to the LOR.

Senator Brunot asked whether students could view a course outline without being registered for the course. Senator Winer responded in the affirmative, noting that the only requirement is to be a registered student.

## **5. Principal's Remarks**

Given the Principal's absence, her remarks and kudos were circulated electronically before the meeting.

Regarding government relations, her remarks informed Senators that, as announced in the 2016 budget, the Federal government launched the new Post-Secondary Institutions Strategic Investment Fund, which will provide \$2 billion over three years to accelerate eligible construction, repair, and maintenance activities at universities and colleges across Canada. McGill is preparing its submission under the direction of Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance) Di Grappa. The remarks also updated Senators on the progress with respect to the feasibility study of the viability of the RVH site, noting that the project management team was selected but a public call for tenders is underway for an architectural team. The Principal also mentioned in her remarks that several other public tenders will take place in the coming weeks, and that the results of the study are expected to be submitted to the Quebec government for consideration in Fall 2017. If approved, a decision will be required by December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2017, on whether the conditions to proceed to the next phase are met.

Regarding external relations, the Principal reported that McGill has accepted an invitation to be a member of the Global University Leaders Forum (GULF) of the World Economic Forum and that Finance Minister Bill Morneau invited her and Professor Christopher Ragan to participate as members of the new Advisory Council on Economic Growth.

Regarding community relations, the Principal shared that she attended meetings and events in Hong Kong with Senator Weinstein and McGill alumni, supporters, partners and representatives of the Canadian government, noting that they had productive discussions with donors interested in helping the University advance its mission.

Regarding kudos, the Principal congratulated Professor Isabelle Daunais on receiving the Canada Council Killam Prize for the Humanities and Professors Charles Gale, Andrew Gonzalez and Stephen McAdams on being awarded Killam Research Fellowships. She shared that a team led by Dr. Jake Barralet will receive \$1.65 million from NSERC. She then congratulated Professor Daniel Wise, who was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship, Dr. Mark Wainberg, who was presented with the 2016 Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease Canada (AMMI) Lifetime Achievement Award, Professor Adam Oberman, who was named a 2016 Simons Fellows in Mathematics as well as the student teams from the Desautels Faculty of Management, who won the 2016 National Investment Banking Competition. She also congratulated the students, staff, and faculty who were recognized at the 6th Annual Catalyst Awards for Sustainability and shared that the Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre (RI-MUHC) will lead a pan-Canadian network named CHILD-BRIGHT that aims to improve life outcomes for children with brain-based development disabilities, which will be funded by CIHR.

## **SECTION II**

### **Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members**

#### **1. Question Regarding the Resolution of Grievances under the Committee on Student Grievances**

Senators Rourke and Brunot submitted the following question:

Whereas, students have indicated that it takes a long time to issue a decision once a student grievance is filed;

Whereas, appeals of grievances involve an additional process;

Whereas, pursuing informal resolution is a pre-requisite to filing a grievance as described in the Code of Student Grievance Procedures and may be a lengthy process in it of itself;

Whereas, the time and effort required may deter some students from filing a grievance;

Whereas, similar concerns were raised in a question submitted to Senate in 20071; The Secretary-General provided the following written response prior to the Senate meeting:

1. What is the process for considering:
  - a. A grievance?
  - b. An appeal?
2. How long, on average, has it taken to issue a decision once a student grievance was filed with the Committee on Student Grievances over the past five years?
3. How long, on average, has it taken to issue a decision once an appeal was filed over the past five years?
4. What is the proportion of grievance cases, in the past five years, where students filed an appeal? How long did it take for the leave for appeal to be granted or denied?
5. What are the processes and mechanisms in place to examine the efficiency of the grievances and appeals processes?
6. Has the University attempted to evaluate the satisfaction of students who have pursued recourses through informal channels (e.g. Ombudsperson, Dean of Students) or formal channels (e.g. Committee on Student Grievances, Appeals Committee)?
7. What are the process and variables that affect timing?

The Secretary-General provided the following written response prior to the Senate meeting (the tables have been omitted from the minutes):

- 1a) Once a student files a grievance with Secretariat, it is provided to the Chair of the Student Grievance Committee for consideration. As provided for in the regulations, the Chair directs the process. After review, the Chair may indicate to Secretariat that there are key details missing from the original grievance documents or that clarifications are necessary. Clarification is often sought regarding descriptions of the steps towards resolution that were taken by the grievor prior to the filing of the grievance. In some cases, the Chair may suggest that the grievor explore additional steps towards resolution through the Ombudsperson, the appropriate Faculty, Service Point, the Dean of Students or through other means, before starting the grievance process.

The Secretariat coordinates and administers the implementation of the grievance process in accordance with the regulations and the direction provided by the Chair and the subcommittee. Such support includes the transmission of grievance materials to all parties and to the subcommittee, the scheduling of the hearing, notification of the parties of the hearing and other grievance-related communication, and the dissemination of the decision report.

A subcommittee comprised of two academics and a student, supported by the Legal Assessor and the Secretary, will hear the oral presentation and arguments of the grievor and the respondents. Each of the parties may be accompanied by an advisor and each may call witnesses. The committee deliberates following the hearing and reaches a decision by consensus, or by a majority vote. The Chair drafts a written decision with reasons and circulates the draft to the subcommittee for their feedback and eventual sign-off. The decision, once signed, is communicated to the parties by the Secretariat.

- 1b) An appeal to a student grievance may be filed by either party to the grievance. Once filed with Secretariat, a copy is transferred to the Chair of the Appeal Committee for Student Discipline and Grievances for consideration. After review, the Chair may indicate to Secretariat that there are key details missing from the appeal documents or clarifications that are necessary.

The Secretariat coordinates and administers the implementation of the appeal process in accordance with the regulations and the direction provided by the Chair and the subcommittee. Such support includes the transmission of grievance materials to all parties and to the subcommittee, the scheduling of the hearing, notification of the parties of the hearing and other appeal-related communication, and the dissemination of the decision report.

A first level of hearing is held by a three member subcommittee of two academics and one student on whether the appeal should be heard. If the subcommittee determines a full or partial hearing should be scheduled, a new committee of two students, two academics, a Legal Assessor and the Dean of Students (or Associate

Dean), supported by the Secretary, is struck to hear the case. The decision of this committee cannot be appealed. For both levels of hearings, advisors can accompany the parties, and witnesses may be called.

- 2) While the regulations set out timelines for various stages of the grievance process, each case is assessed on its own merits through a process that is appropriate to the particular circumstances of the case. Consequently, generalities, comparisons, or averages may not be meaningful measures of the process.

Table I appended to this response provides summary information on each of the grievances filed since 2011.

- 3) As with grievances, the length of the process depends on the particular circumstances of the case. Table II appended to this response provides summary information on each of the grievances filed since 2011.

- 4) Variables that affect timing include:

- Timing of the Senate nominations and approval of student committee members;
- Requirement and availability of committee members for annual training;
- Availability of the parties and the committee members;
- Requests for extensions by either party for the submission of documentation;
- Finding a date for the hearing that is acceptable to the committee;
- Requests from either party to reschedule a hearing;
- The time of year the grievance is filed, as hearings do not occur during the months of July and August;
- Matters or requests arising from the subcommittee preliminary review;
- Complexity and consultation involved in the writing of the decision;
- Number of grievances or appeals occurring at the same time;
- Other unforeseen circumstances;

- 5) During the last five years, approximately one-quarter of the student grievance decisions have been appealed.

- 6) There is a review from time to time of the *Charter of Students' Rights* and a review is currently in progress by a committee chaired by the Dean of Students. Reviews made to the charter would lead to a subsequent review of the *Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures*. In each case, Secretariat monitors the process and will remind the Chair of any further steps required to bring a process to its conclusion.

- 7) We are unaware of any evaluation process of this nature.

Senator Rourke asked that the date of the incident be reported in the tables. She explained that students often spend a long time navigating informal channels before filing a grievance; knowing the date of the incident would give an estimate of how long the whole process takes. The Secretary-General responded that the information can be extracted from the grievance. Senator

Kpeglo-Hennessy then asked about progress with respect to the review of the *Charter of Students' Rights*. The Secretary-General responded that an update will be provided by the Office of the Dean of Students at the next Senate meeting. Senator Sobat asked about student satisfaction with the grievance or appeals process. The Secretary-General responded that the suggestion of surveying students on their satisfaction with the grievance or appeals process has not been raised in the past but that it would be possible to consider suggestions and or proposals in this regard. Senator Farid asked if a column may be added to the tables indicating the type of grievance filed. The Secretary-General explained that providing a reference to the section of the *Charter of Students' Rights* that was the subject of the grievance may be possible but providing a summary of the grievance would violate confidentiality. Senator Rourke expressed interest in reviewing the grievance procedure, including the informal channels required prior to filing a grievance. The Secretary-General explained that there will be most likely a review of the *Code of Student Grievance Procedures* once the review of the *Charter of Students' Rights* is completed.

## **2. Question Regarding Universal Design for Learning, Mental Health and Neurodiversity**

Senator Brunot submitted the following question (Appendix A was omitted from the minutes):

Whereas mental health (“MH”) issues and unrecognized neurodiversity generate disabling situations and barriers to learning for McGill students,

Whereas the attached fact sheet (Appendix A) provides some useful background on these issues,

Whereas accommodations relative to neurodiversity (encompassing MH issues, ADHD and situations of learning disability) composed at least 55% of the service delivery of MyAccess/Office for Students with Disabilities (“OSD”) in 2010-2011<sup>1</sup>,

Whereas numbers in MH services delivery do not reflect the actual needs of the population, since only 25% of MH issues are treated, often because of stigma<sup>2</sup>, and those who ask for help face barriers to access services and long waiting times<sup>3</sup>,

Whereas “the traditional “accommodations” approach to disability is an ad hoc process of retrofitting, repeated each semester, for each course, for each individual student making a request”<sup>4</sup>,

Whereas “this process in itself is a non-renewable use of resources and does not conform to McGill’s objectives in terms of sustainable development (Vision 2020),<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.mcgill.ca/osd/policies/universal-design>

<sup>2</sup> <http://publications.mcgill.ca/reporter/2013/11/mental-health-mcgill-tackles-a-widespread-community-issue/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.mcgilldaily.com/2015/10/still-on-the-waitlist-for-better-mental-health-services/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.mcgill.ca/osd/facultyinfo/universal-design>

<sup>5</sup> Idem



Whereas Universal Design for Learning (UDL), “by focusing on modification to the environment, constitutes a sustainable approach to the management of the diverse needs of learners,”<sup>6</sup>

Whereas the number of users of the services offered by MyAccess/OSD has been multiplied by three in the decade 2002-2012 from the last statistics retrievable<sup>7</sup>, and SSMU estimates it to be a seven-fold increase in the decade 2005-2015,<sup>8</sup>

Whereas new needs relative to MH and neurodiversity are emerging, as shows the recent initiative of McGill students on the autism spectrum to form a student club and advocate for their needs,

Whereas MyAccess/OSD was already predicting a 15% deficit in its budget a year ago due to internal budget reallocation at McGill<sup>9</sup>, and MH Services estimated that it lacked \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 to hire the 25 new full-time staff that would be required to meet current demand,<sup>10</sup>

Whereas Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) Ollivier Dyens conceded that “while possible, [increasing MH services funding] would create unsustainable expectations,”<sup>11</sup>

Whereas McGill’s current model of accommodations will not be able to meet upcoming students accessibility needs without allocating substantially more resources and budget to service delivery units like OSD/MyAccess, Counselling and MH Services.

1. What are the statistics:
  - a. of accommodations provided to students at McGill through MyAccess/OSD (with a breakdown by faculty and a breakdown by type of accessibility barrier)?
  - b. of the number of students served at
    - Counselling Services
    - Mental Health Services
    - MyAccess/OSD,
  - c. by calendar year or by school year, from 2012 to 2015, for the entire student body, including a breakdown by number of services used by individual students (i.e. indicating how many students are using 1, 2 or 3 of those services) and a breakdown by faculty.

---

<sup>6</sup> Idem

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.mcgill.ca/osd/policies/universal-design#UDL>

<sup>8</sup> <http://ssmu.mcgill.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/12.-Motion-SSMUs-Commitment-to-Universal-Design-for-Learning-UDL.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.mcgilltribune.com/news/office-of-students-with-disabilities-projects-deficit-of-15-per-cent/>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.mcgilldaily.com/2015/06/post-grads-interrogate-deputy-provost-about-student-services-finances-at-council/>

<sup>11</sup> Idem

2. How is McGill making sure that OSD/MyAccess, Counselling Services and Mental Health Services have enough resources to meet the accommodation needs of students on the short and medium terms?
  
3. What are the university objectives, timelines and assessment processes to implement UDL as an institutional approach to its teaching and learning activities?

Senator Dyens provided the following written response prior to the Senate meeting (Appendix B has been omitted from the minutes):

Dear Senator Brunot,

Thank you for your question on this important topic.

The attached report (Appendix B) from the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) provides a breakdown of accommodations from 2012-2013 to 2014-2015. Because of privacy issues, we unfortunately cannot provide Senate with a breakdown by Faculty. Further, although it would be of interest, we are also unable, at this time, to provide a breakdown to show the number of other services used by individual students. Our health and wellness service units use different information systems for intake and scheduling (e.g., Omni-Med, AndX). As a result, the reporting outputs yield very different reports. We are in the process of compiling and comparing the outputs in an effort to standardize our reporting.

Our four health and wellness units (Health, Mental Health, Counselling Services and the Office for Students with Disabilities OSD) are working collaboratively on a number of projects to improve services for McGill students. Work is under way to align services delivered in the four units through a single intake and triage area, and to implement a common Electronic Medical Record for more effective cross unit collaboration. The Health and Wellness Steering Group will continue their work together to improve case management, early alert and crisis management systems, and to move to a more seamless, stepped care model for service delivery.

Our students, and student groups, are also working on many fronts including peer programs by students with lived experience and are a key partner with us to improve many aspects of health literacy.

Finally, we're setting in motion a health shift at McGill that will affect the whole campus. We believe that the healthier you are, the better you learn and the better you work. We are developing a Wellness Strategy that will strengthen and expand our services, but it will go further. Through reframing policy and increasing education, students, faculty, staff, and alumni will learn how to care for themselves and each other. The goal is to have interconnected supports in place that will treat both the body and mind, and be accessible when the need arises. McGill's campus will be a healthier environment, and it will feel like a more caring community.

It is recognized that the implementation of UDL has wide reaching effects for all members of the McGill community. As such, Teaching and Learning Services (TLS) and OSD are committed to actively exploring collaborative opportunities to foster broad institutional discourse regarding UDL, and to identify and engage the appropriate stakeholders in the establishment of a shared vision and plan for its implementation across teaching and learning activities. Through an initiative funded by the Quebec Ministry of Education Chantier III, a context-specific and research-driven online toolkit regarding UDL will be launched in the Fall of 2016 as a complementary resource to the teaching community of McGill.

As far as resources are concerned, the University is working to better understand the impact on the OSD budget of recent changes to the funding provided by government, and has provided an allocation in FY17 to OSD to start bridging the gap between services and demands. Because we realize this may not be sufficient in the future, we are working strategically and collaboratively with other units in the University, as you can see above, to implement a better, proactive system.

Senator Dyens added that many of the issues raised will be discussed in the Report on McGill's Mental Health and Wellness Strategy. A progress report on the subject will be presented at the next Senate meeting. He also explained that he was unable to provide a more detailed response to Senate due to privacy concerns but invited Senator Brunot to contact Ms. Wiltshire directly should he want more information. Senator Brunot expressed interest in collaborating with Senator Dyens and his team outside Senate to find synergies between the mental health services and determine how many students at McGill use the wellness and health services offered. Senator Sobat suggested that the statistics provided in the response be included in future annual reports of Student Life and Learning. Senator Dyens was in favour of the suggestion.

### **3. Question Regarding Opportunities and Mechanisms for the Employment of Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Trainees**

Senator Saroyan submitted the following question:

Whereas McGill has recently signed the first collective agreement with McGill Course Lecturers and Instructors Union (MCLIU);

Whereas this collective agreement specifies that MCLIU members are second in line after "Regular Academics and Visiting Professors" for being assigned courses;

Whereas article 15.03 of this collective agreement specifies that, "A Hiring Unit may choose not to post Courses when it hires students registered in post-graduate programs at the University, Post-Doctoral fellows, retired Professors, Adjunct Professors, Managers or Professionals. The number of Courses not posted in one Academic year and for the whole University may not exceed fifteen percent (15%) of the total of Courses not allocated to Regular Professors.";

Whereas with decreasing budgets for part time instructors, overall, fewer courses are available for part-time instructors;

Whereas teaching is considered part of the academic training of graduate students and postdoctoral trainees and an important step in making our graduates competitive in landing academic positions;

Whereas many programs take into account remuneration from teaching courses as part of the funding package they offer to graduate students;

Whereas graduate students and postdoctoral trainees are not likely to compile sufficient points to compete with part time instructors who have a long standing history of teaching at McGill;

1. What opportunities and mechanisms are in place to ensure that our graduate students and postdoctoral trainees aspiring for academic careers will gain the experience of preparing and teaching at least one full course during their studies and meet standard expectations for academic positions?
2. How will the fifteen percent of courses that are exempt from posting be distributed across Faculties, Departments, and other teaching units?

Senator Manfredi provided the following written response prior to the Senate meeting:

To address your first question, graduate students and postdoctoral trainees do regularly have opportunities to teach undergraduates either as primary course instructors, and teaching assistantships are offered in many programs across the University. Additionally, the Skillsets program, offered jointly by Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and Teaching and Learning Services, offers a variety of workshops designed to help develop teaching competencies to prepare participants for teaching at McGill and in future academic appointments at other institutions. However, the University is not in a position to ensure that students and trainees who might wish to teach a course during their studies may have the opportunity to do so. Teaching assignments are made at the department level (or at the Faculty level where there are no departments), and are determined by the needs of the unit and budget availability, both of which may vary from year to year.

With respect to your second question, the MCLIU agreement allows that fifteen percent of courses not taught by ranked academic staff may be exempted from the posting process required by the agreement. The University administration is working with the Faculties to determine the best way to distribute these exemptions across the University with individual course assignments remaining the responsibility of the hiring department or Faculty. It should be noted that graduate students and postdoctoral trainees are eligible to apply for positions posted through the regular process.

Senator Saroyan stated that the Skillsets program is a valuable program but it is not a substitute for practical experience. She noted that teaching assistant positions have diminished and students cannot compete with part-time lecturers because of the scoring system currently in place. She also noted that departments without undergraduate programs have fewer opportunities for

teaching. She stated that doctoral students and post-doctoral trainees need to be given teaching experience in order to ensure that they acquire meaningful positions, especially in academia. She then asked if the fifteen percent of courses that are exempt from posting can be reallocated from faculties that do not assign teaching positions to their students to the faculties that see teaching as an important part of their graduate and post-doctoral training. She also wondered if Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies will be involved in the second round of negotiations, noting that it needs to look after the welfare and training of McGill's doctoral and post-doctoral students. With respect to the first question, Senator Manfredi responded that the distribution is based on needs expressed by deans. With respect to the second question, he responded that Senate is not the forum to discuss labour negotiations.

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

### **Open Session**

#### **1. Proposed McGill University Budget 2016-17 (D15-50)**

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate's information, noting that it was presented to the Finance Committee of the Board of Governors on April 19, 2016 and will be presented to the Board of Governors for approval on April 21, 2016.

He began the presentation by highlighting that the projected deficit for FY2017 is \$2.7 million. He noted that the projected deficit for FY2018 is higher mainly due to increased costs associated with the deferred maintenance bond. He informed Senators that the University will face important challenges, for example, there will be increased pressure on the operating revenue due to capital projects, the upcoming tri-annual evaluation of the pension plan and the additional costs to carry the financed accumulated deficit once interest rates increase. As a result of these and other considerations, the Finance Committee recommended that the expenditure contingency amounts for FY2019 and FY2020 are increased.

Regarding the year-end projections for FY2016, Senator Manfredi noted that the annual financed operating deficit forecast is \$4.7 million while the budgeted deficit was \$4.5 million. He explained that the largest variance is the higher than anticipated grant from the provincial government. He stressed that these are only projections and that the financial statements of the University will contain all final conclusions. He highlighted that the projected operating revenue for FY2017 is \$795.6 million, of which 78% comes from provincial grants, tuition and fees. He noted that the assumptions underlining that amount include an indexed increase to the grant, no cuts for the next three years, and slightly higher increases to tuition and fees. He mentioned that enrolment growth is projected to remain steady at the undergraduate and master's levels but faculties are anticipating stronger growth at the PhD level. He mentioned that the operating expenses for FY2017 are projected to be \$798.2 million, the major expenditure being salaries. With respect to the five-year outlook, the Finance Committee asked for additional expenditure contingencies in FY2019 and FY2020 thus \$3 million contingency buffers were included in the expenses to allow for new strategic developments, unexpected expenses, and/or relaxations.

Senator Manfredi then provided highlights of the academic priorities, noting that the list included in the presentation is not a complete list. Firstly, he mentioned that academic renewal remains one of the priorities. He explained that a new provostial complement was created to facilitate strategic hiring for certain initiatives and it will include spousal hires. He added that the My Workplace initiative, led by Senator Di Grappa, is a priority initiative and that allocations are in place for more rigorous leadership training programs for new academic administrators. With respect to equity, he mentioned that equity training will be offered to search committees and an equity review process on the hiring process will be instituted. Also, changes to the *Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law* will be made. He then mentioned that the University is committed to bringing a sexual assault policy to Senate by the end of 2016 and budgetary provisions have been made to support that policy. He noted that the budget also contains an allocation to support a task force on indigenous studies and education that will be launched in the fall. Regarding internationalization initiatives, Senators will be receiving a memorandum from the Principal confirming and providing further details on the transfer of the international portfolio from the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). He mentioned that the results of the competition for the CFREP program in neurosciences are expected in June 2016. No allocations have been made in the budget for the University's contribution but placeholders have been included. Senator Manfredi also mentioned that the new School of Public Policy will launch in September 2017 and accept its first students in 2018. It is largely supported by a \$10 million commitment from a philanthropic source but the University will be generating additional operating revenues through enrolment in the School's programs.

Finally, he thanked the members of his team for their hard work on the budget, particularly Ghyslaine McClure (Associate Provost, Budget & Resources), Real Del Degan (Interim Director, Office of the Budget), and Marilyn Baron (Director, Resource Allocations).

Senator Mills asked how the University will ensure that graduate programs are comprehensive and available to all the students in light of the rise in doctoral students but slow-down in tenured positions. Senator Manfredi clarified that the slow-down is in the rate of increase but a net growth is still expected. He stated that he is working with the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to ensure that McGill has robust graduate programs, noting that the University has a strong funding model.

In response to Senator Robaire's question on spousal hires, Senator Manfredi stated that the change is in how they are funded. He explained that currently spousal hires are co-funded as follows: one third by the receiving faculty, one third by requesting faculty and one third by the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). Going forward, they will be fully funded from the academic salary pool. He mentioned that there are some other technical changes, such as how they are counted against faculty complements. He explained that they will be counted against the provostial complement for six years and then will be counted against the faculty complement. Senator Galaty asked whether this measure will cover individuals hired in the past. Senator Manfredi responded in the affirmative.

Senator Brunot asked why benefits are separate from salaries with respect to expenditures and if there were plans to change allocations of funds to student services, mental health, wellness initiatives and what the global vision of budget allocation towards student experience in general.

Senator Manfredi responded that the Student Life and Learning portfolio is one of the largest budget items. The University is working on a mental health strategy and once it is in place there will be discussions on the allocations required to support it. Mr. Del Degan added that the budget reflects the categories found in financial statements. He noted that the proportion of benefits for academic staff versus non-academic staff is roughly the same as the salary breakdown.

Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy asked about the sexual assault policy and wondered about the consultation that will occur, noting that the process to this date has been largely student-driven and student-oriented. Senator Manfredi responded that the point of departure will be the latest draft of the document prepared by the working group. He stated that the standard consultation process will be followed, stressing that this process involves consultation with all the relevant stakeholders, including student groups. In response to Senator Smailes's question on where the resources for the sexual assault policy will be housed, Senator Manfredi responded that they will be placed in the Office of the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning).

Senator Crelisten asked whether the revenue from the sale of the Redpath properties was included in the projected budget. Senator Manfredi responded in the negative since it was not anticipated. Senator Crelisten asked whether any sales of assets are anticipated in the future. Senator Manfredi responded in the negative, reiterating that the University does not sell assets to contribute to the operating budget, and noting that opportunities to sell non-strategic assets are dealt with as they arise.

Senator Rourke asked whether the increased overhead charges on self-funded operating revenues will be applied to all units, including units that are fee funded by students, namely athletics and student services. She explained that the concern is that students are paying fees that go towards these units with a specific understanding of what that fee is being charged for. Secondly, she stated that the demand for student services, specifically from the Office for Students with Disabilities and for mental health services are increasing therefore applying the increase universally across the board will adversely affect those units that are struggling to keep up with the demand for services. Mr. Real Del Degan responded that the increase applies across the board but there are exceptions for certain student fees as well as revenues coming from endowments. Senator Sobat asked what those exceptions are and wondered about the legality of charging overhead costs on student services funded through provincially regulated ancillary fees. Mr. Real Del Degan and Senator Manfredi responded that a full list of the exemptions may be provided upon request.

Senator McCulloch asked about the reduction in administrative staff expenses and how to contribute to the leadership training programs for new academic administrators. Senator Manfredi responded that the decrease is largely due to attrition and normal departures since the individuals are normally replaced by employees at a lower salary level. With respect to the training program, he responded that comments can be sent to Leigh Yetter (Senior Director, Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic)). Senator Farid asked if the program is mandatory for all high level administrators. Senator Manfredi responded that participation was included as a condition in all appointment letters and he has directed deans to include it as a condition as well. He stated that the intention is to make it mandatory going forward and will consider expanding it to include previous hires.

Senator Gehr asked whether the projected decrease in university Quebec student enrolment for the next five years refers to undergraduate enrolment and wondered whether there have been any discussions to cap growth given the University's space constraints. Senator Manfredi responded that it generally refers to undergraduate enrolment. He stated that McGill is basically at a steady state with respect to undergraduate enrolment, although there is some variation across programs. He mentioned that the University is below the complement number with respect to the tenure track complement but once it is reached, the University will be in steady state, unless there is a major development that will allow it to grow.

Senator Benrimoh then raised a point of order. He stated that Part III of the Senate *Standing Rules of Procedure* regarding spectator and press attendance has not been followed. He noted that the Rules provide that a system of passes be established to allow at least sixty spectators at Senate meetings and that passes be available at the door just before Senate meets for those who did not reserve them in advance. He explained that when he arrived for the Senate meeting, he was asked for his name and only Senators were allowed to the meeting. Moreover, he stated that the protest with respect to the sexual assault policy organized outside Leacock was peaceful and expressed his disagreement with increasing security presence every time an item is controversial.

The Chair called on the Secretary-General to discuss the arrangements for the meeting. The Secretary-General explained that, to his knowledge, at least sixty passes were available at the registration desk and that no visitors were denied entry. With respect to the increased security presence, he stated that the Principal provided a response at the last Senate meeting and reiterated that safety is a primary concern for the University. He added that there is a department responsible for security and the security present is proportional to the department's views on what is needed to ensure the safety and stability of the event in question. Senator Benrimoh asked whether it is safe to assume that any student gathering at the time of Senate from this point on will be considered a threat and security will respond by increasing its presence and limiting the movement of free persons. The Secretary-General responded in the negative adding that that is a gross overstatement.

Senator Brunot mentioned that five weeks ago, he filed a complaint with Security Services after he was robbed in the basement of the Faculty of Law and has yet to receive a response. He was informed by the Faculty of Law that the building is a public space and that anyone may enter it during regular business hours. The Faculty advised him that he is not entitled to more security in that building than in any other public area. Senator Brunot therefore concluded that Senators should not be entitled to more security than the constituents they represent. The Chair undertook to raise this concern with Security Services to ensure that the necessary follow-up takes place outside Senate.

[Secretary's Note: the Chair contacted Security Services about the matter raised by Senator Brunot after the meeting, on April 20, 2016.]

**2. 472<sup>nd</sup> Report of the Academic Policy Committee** (D15-51)

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate's consideration. He reminded Senators that at the last meeting, there were some questions raised with respect to the application of the policy, noting that the policy was referred back to the Academic Policy Committee (APC). The APC



considered the feedback from Senators and the policy was further revised to specify that it applies to all students, including those who reach limitation prior to Fall 2016.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed changes to the Time Limitation Policy, as detailed in Appendix A of D15-51.*

**3. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D15-52)**

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate’s consideration. He moved to approve recommendations to fill vacancies on Committees arising out of University Regulations and to two Advisory Committees.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained within the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D15-52) to fill upcoming vacancies on Committees Arising out of University Regulations and to appoint Senate representatives and alternate Senate representatives on advisory committees.*

Senator Manfredi moved to approve the proposed revisions to the terms of reference of the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity (JBSCE), which was duly seconded. Senator Ibrahim then moved to amend the proposed revisions by inserting “including but not limited to women, visible minorities, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and persons of minority sexual orientation or minority gender identity” after “historically disadvantaged social groups”, which was duly seconded. He expressed the view that the list of groups should not be removed from the terms of reference since it serves the groups better if they are named, noting that first-generation students and individuals with dependents can also be added to the list.

In the subsequent discussion, Senators voiced their support or disapproval of the amendment. Senator Campbell informed Senators that the revision was an initiative of the membership of the JBSCE, which includes the Chairs of the subcommittees representing each one of the named groups. She explained that the issue arose because the new Subcommittee on Family Care did not see it itself reflected in the JBSCE’s current terms of reference. The JBSCE, as a whole, felt it was important to create ample space for inclusion in the terms of reference. She further explained that identifying protected classes, even preceded by “including but not limited to” would force non-enumerated groups to ask how analogous they are to the groups listed. The JBSCE therefore felt that more general language was required for other groups to feel included and that their stakes are represented by the JBSCE.

Senator Gehr spoke against the amendment, noting that there is no end to the categories that could be added. However, Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy expressed the view that many people have a poor understanding of equity and the JBSCE’s terms of reference help demonstrate to the McGill community who equity seeking groups include. He also stated that no definition of equity found in policies or legislation allows for the inclusion of every single group. Senator Rourke added that, with respect to equity, people generally think of gender and race therefore it is important to provide other examples of categories. Senator Zorychta noted that adding the term “including but not limited to” indicates that other categories exist. However, Senator Manfredi stated that it would be difficult to determine what those other categories are, as evidenced by the

Supreme Court of Canada's struggle to interpret section 15 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Senator Mucci was undecided but noted that the new proposal is very inclusive.

Senator Richard asked about the debate that took place at the meeting of the JBSCE and wondered if the Committee members considered the various arguments currently raised at Senate. Senator Campbell responded that this matter has been examined since the fall and that the revisions were unanimously endorsed by the JBSCE. However, she is unaware of the discussions that took place at the meetings of the subcommittees. She then asked that the matter be referred back to the JBSCE. Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy supported the idea of a more comprehensive review, noting that he sits on one of the subcommittees and this matter was never discussed at any of the meetings. Senator Brunot added that this matter was not discussed at the subcommittee he sits on either.

Senator Robaire proposed that the amendment be withdrawn and then moved that this item be referred back to the JBSCE for further consideration. Senator Ibrahim agreed to proceed in this manner.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved to refer the proposed revisions to the terms of reference of the JBSCE to the JBSCE and to the Senate Nominating Committee for further review and consideration.*

**4. Appointment of Assessors under the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law (D15-53)**

Senator Campbell presented this report for Senate's consideration. She explained that it contained recommendations to replace assessors whose terms are expiring at the end of June.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approve the appointments of Ms. Anne-Marie Durocher, Me Ali Martin-Mayer, and Mr. John Poliquin for three-year terms beginning 1 July 2016 and ending 30 June 2019, as assessors under the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law.*

**5. Further Revisions to the University Student Assessment Policy (D15-54)**

Senator Dyens presented this report for Senate's consideration. He explained that subsections 5.8.1 and 6.1.3 of the *University Student Assessment Policy* were revised to reflect the feedback received at the last Senate meeting. He also explained that, further to a suggestion by Senator Meadwell prior to the Senate meeting, the last sentence of subsection 6.1.3 was amended for added clarity.

Senator Saroyan asked if there is a process in place to provide suggestions for future revisions to the Policy. Senator Dyens stated that he is hoping to bring forward more revisions by the end of the calendar year. He explained that Professor Elizabeth Wood will be striking a taskforce that will look into developing principles for the Policy and will present her findings at the next meeting of the Enrolment and Student Affairs Advisory Committee (ESAAC). He stated that it is too early in the process to send suggestions and it is preferable to wait until after Professor Wood

has delivered her presentation to the ESAAC. In response to Senator Farid's question on whether the provision applies to the comprehensive exam for graduate students, Senator Nalbantoglu responded in the negative. Senator Covo asked about the intent of subsection 5.8.1 of the Policy. Senator Winer responded that the in-class student response system may be used for participation or quizzes but a cap was added due to concerns about invigilation and other potential problems that would arise with stakes higher than 10% of the final grade.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed revisions to the University Student Assessment Policy, as detailed in the revised version of D15-54.*

**6. Revised Form for Declarations Pursuant to the Regulation on Conflict of Interest (D15-55)**

Senator Campbell presented this report for Senate's information. She explained that revisions were made due to concerns over the cumbersome nature of the current version of the form. Senator Richard asked if the members of the academic staff will receive an annual notification reminding them to file their statement of conflict of interest. Senator Campbell was in favour of the office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) issuing a reminder each spring. Senator Sobat noted that part one of the form provides that external funding paid for by an institution of higher education, an affiliated research institute, an academic teaching hospital, a medical centre, or by a federal, provincial, or local government agency does not have to be disclosed. He asked how this squares with the response to the "Question Regarding Management and/or Ownership of Companies by McGill University Professors" discussed at the December 2, 2015 Senate meeting. Senator Campbell responded that this exception relates to public bodies in particular. Since they normally have reporting requirements, information on potential conflicts can be accessed through those public bodies. She noted that questions were added to ensure researchers declare conflicts with respect to any graduate student stake holding within private companies.

**7. Report of the Joint Senate Steering and Board Executive Committees Meeting (D15-56)**

The Secretary-General presented this report to Senate for information. He reported that on March 22, 2016, the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors and the Senate Steering Committee met to select a topic for the 2016-2017 Joint Board-Senate meeting, which will be held on November 10, 2016. Following a review of topics, members agreed that the topic for the 2016-2017 Joint Board-Senate meeting will be "McGill's Sustainability Plans and Initiatives".

**8. Other Business**

There being no other business to deal with, on a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**END**

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