

Minutes

Thursday, April 20, 2017 16-17:08

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Thursday, April 20, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building)

PRESENT

Arseneault, Louis
Bartlett, Joan
Bayen, Stephane
Beauchamp, Yves
Bede, Jacqueline
Bernard, Daniel
Buddle, Christopher
Campbell, Angela
Chin, Joshua
Cleveland, William
Coderre, Terence
Cook, Colleen
Covo, David
Cumming, Julie
Damha, Masad
Di Paola, Antonia
Doucette, Elaine
Dow, Alexander
Dyens, Ollivier
Eidelman, David
Engle-Warnick, Jim
Fortier, Suzanne
Fussmann, Gregor
Galaty, John
Gehr, Ronald
Gehring, Kalle

Goldstein, Rose
Gore, Genevieve
Gyakum, John
Harpp, David
Hastings, Kenneth
Hébert, Terence
Hocevar, Casarina
Holmes, Amanda
Hooton, Brett
Kartinen, Mari
Kalil, Alex
Kamen, Amine
Krupiy, Tetyana
Lane-Mercier, Gillian
Lennox, Bruce
Lowther, David
Maciasz, Eva
Magdzinski, Alexandre
Manfredi, Christopher
Massey, Kathleen
McCullogh, Mary Jo
Mineau, Guy
Montaque, Amanda
Nalbantoglu, Josephine
Nicell, Jim
Nichol, Jarrod
Oxhorn, Philip

Ponech, Trevor
Potter, Judith
Quitoriano, Nathaniel
Ray, Saibel
Richard, Marc
Roulet, Nigel
Russo, Mitchel
Rogowska, Edyta
(*Secretary*)
Saroyan, Alenoush
Savaria-Carriere, Jerome
Snow, Shannon
Sobat, Erin
Stephens, David
Taylor, Sean
Waters, Natalie
Weinstein, Marc
Winer, Laura
Yalovsky, Morty
Zorychta, Edith

REGRETS: Paul Allison, Isabelle Bajeux-Besnainou, Lisa Barg, Mindy Carter, Stuart Cobbett, Jade Corriveau, Gordon Crelinsten, Nicholas Dunn, Elizabeth Elbourne, Eleanor Elstein, Guy Ettlin, Victor Frankel, Rebecca Fuhrer, Anja Geitmann, Richard Gold, Lawrence Goodridge, Peter Grütter, James Gutman, Charles Keita, Lucyna Lach, Marcelo Lannes, Hans Larsson, Robert Leckey, Margaret Levey, Antonia Maioni, Michael A. Meighen, Felicia Moye, Alfonso Mucci, Ram Panda, Cynthia Price Verreault, Dilson Rassier, Caroline Riches, Fiona Ritchie, Bernard Robaire, Jaaved Singh, Laurie Snider, Karsten Steinhauer, Nellie Voudouris,

SECTION I

1. Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed Senators to the eighth Senate meeting of the 2016-2017 governance year. She 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.

2. Memorial Tribute for Professor Mark Wainberg

Senator Eidelman read the following memorial tribute for Professor Wainberg, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

It is with great sadness that we share the news of the sudden death of a true medical giant, Dr. Mark Arnold Wainberg. Dr. Wainberg was Professor in the Departments of Medicine, Microbiology and Immunology, and Pediatrics at McGill University, as well as Director of the McGill AIDS Centre and head of HIV/AIDS research at the Lady Davis Institute of the Jewish General Hospital.

Born in Montreal in 1945, Dr. Wainberg trained at McGill, receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in 1966. This was followed by a PhD from Columbia University in 1972 and post-doctoral research at the Hadassah Medical School at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

In the early 1980s, Mark Wainberg turned his attention to HIV research. He became the first person in Canada to work directly on the disease and the first to establish a bio-containment facility equipped to handle this specialized research. His transformative research led to the discovery of the anti-viral drug 3TC, or Lamivudine, an essential component of the drug combination used to treat those affected with HIV. 3TC has helped save millions of lives across the globe. Dr. Wainberg had recently focused his attention on finding a cure for the disease. He believed his work was not yet done and hoped his laboratory would one day be recognized for contributing to an HIV cure, which today remains elusive.

Mark Wainberg was also a social activist of world renown and a passionate advocate for those affected and endangered by HIV/AIDS. He served as the voice for the voiceless, pushing hard for equitable treatment of all regardless of social status, sexual orientation or ethnic origin. He was unafraid to stand up for his beliefs, even if this meant calling out government leaders abroad and at home. As President of the International AIDS Society from 1998 to 2000, he organized the thirteenth International Congress on AIDS in Durban, South Africa, at a time when that country's leadership refused to accept the viral origin of AIDS, using that as a basis for refusing to offer treatment to its population. That congress drew unprecedented international attention to the issue of drug access.

A fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, an Officer of the Order of Canada, an Officer of the Ordre National du Québec, an honorary fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and

Surgeons of Canada, and a Chevalier in the Légion d'Honneur of France, in 2015 Mark Wainberg was inducted into the Canadian Medical Hall of Fame.

In an e-mail to a classmate in the fall of 2016, Mark Wainberg said, "I am very proud to have been a member of the McGill class of '66 and perhaps even more proud to have been a member of the McGill Faculty for more than 40 years." We at McGill and in the Faculty of Medicine consider ourselves tremendously proud and deeply privileged to count Mark Wainberg among our own.

Mark Wainberg will be remembered for his wonderful scientific insight, his commitment to his work, his dry wit and his deep desire to bring relief and hope to those in need. His loss is a great one for the McGill and Jewish General Hospital communities, for Montreal, for Canada and for the world.

The McGill flag is lowered today in his memory.

We extend our heartfelt condolences to Dr. Wainberg's wife, Susan Hubschman, his sons, Zev and Jonathan, his daughters-in-law Cara and Sarah, his three grandchildren, his brother Lawrence and sisters-in law, and to his extended family, friends and colleagues.

3. Report of the Steering Committee (16:17-08)

Senate received the Report of the Steering Committee (16-17:08).

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate – March 22, 2017.

Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate – March 22, 2017.

Item 3. Speaking Rights Upon approval of the report, speaking rights were granted to Mr. Bradley Tucker, Executive Director, Analysis, Planning and Budget, and Professor Ghyslaine McClure, Associate Provost (Academic Priorities and Resource Allocation), for item IIB1 (Proposed McGill University Budget 2017-18); and Ms. Angelique Mannella, Associate Vice-Principal (Innovation), for item IIB2.2.1 (Proposed Revisions to the *Policy on Intellectual Property*).

Item 4. Confidential Session – item IIB11, Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee Part II.

Item 5. Senate Questions

Item 6. Approval of the Agenda.

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

4. Business Arising from the March 22, 2017 Senate Minutes

4.1 Further Response to the Question Regarding Sale of Lecture Materials by Students and Companies

Further to Senator Hastings's question on whether the University has ever followed up on issues of copyright infringement under the *Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures*, Senator Dyens stated that Legal Services has no record of any such action from the University. He added that article 18 of the Code that states "it shall be an offence knowingly to procure, distribute, or receive, by any means whatsoever, any confidential academic material such as pending examinations or laboratory results from any source without prior and express consent of the instructor," is invoked a very small number of times per year.

5. Chair's Remarks

Before beginning her remarks, the Chair expressed her condolences to Dr. Wainberg's family and friends, stating that the world has lost an exceptional researcher and a caring humanitarian.

The Chair then discussed government relations. She began by sharing that the science panel chaired by David Naylor released its final report regarding Canada's fundamental science system. She noted that the recommendations included the need to reinvest in discovery research across disciplines, strengthen international and interdisciplinary collaboration, and support researchers throughout their careers. She also noted that the report recommended a four-year phased-in investment of \$485 million directed to funding investigator-led research across disciplines, shifting funding from CFI to a more sustained and predictable annual budget model, and advised the government to increase funding to the Research Support Fund until the reimbursement rate is 40% for all institutions with more than \$7 million per year of eligible funding. Finally, she noted that the report advocates for creating a National Advisory Council on Research and Innovation whose mandate would be to oversee all components of the funding system.

The Chair then spoke about the provincial and federal budgets that were tabled in March. With respect to the Quebec budget, she reported that it provided, over the next six years, \$1.17 billion in general funding to universities and CEGEPs, \$834 million to research and innovation initiatives related to higher education and \$343 million in financial aid to students. She shared that, in terms of operational funding, universities will receive \$497 million over five years, beginning in fiscal year 2017-18, and it is expected that the funding will be distributed according to the current formula (the *subvention normée*). She mentioned that the \$834 million for research and innovation includes an additional \$180 million for the *Fonds de recherche*. She also noted that some of the funds would go to specific organizations, including *Génomique Québec* and the National Optics Institute, and that \$100 million was allocated for an Artificial Intelligence Supercluster. With respect to the federal budget, the Chair reported that no new Tri-Council funding was announced, but the reinvestment announced in last year's budget has been maintained. She noted that new commitments include the launch of a Pan-Canadian Artificial Intelligence Strategy, as well as funding of \$117 million over eight years for 25 research chairs, funded with resources reallocated from the existing CERC program. She noted that there were also investments that would benefit

students, such as investments in the Work-Integrated Learning Program and Mitacs. Finally, she noted that investment for business-led Innovation Clusters increased to \$950 million.

The Chair then informed Senators that Claude Corbo released his report on the creation of a *Conseil des universités du Québec*. She noted that, for the most part, his report is aligned with the recommendations of the *Bureau de coopération interuniversitaire* had made to Mr. Corbo as part of the consultations.

Regarding external relations, the Chair spoke about her participation in a meeting of the Business Higher Education Roundtable. She noted that a pilot project was launched in work-integrated learning with the Toronto Financial Services Sector Association. She mentioned that other similar initiatives are underway, including initiatives in aerospace, manufacturing, construction and mining. She also shared that she attended a special World Economic Forum meeting at the new Center for the Fourth Industrial Revolution in San Francisco.

Regarding community relations, the Chair reported that she participated in the Management Forum conference, noting that the theme was “Connecting. Learning. Sharing”. She mentioned that the keynote address was delivered by McGill alumnus Phil LeNir who co-founded a peer-coaching program with Prof. Henry Mintzberg. The Chair then shared that Student Housing and Hospitality Services’ Waste Education program, the Supplier Code of Conduct initiative, the IT Asset Management Regulation program and third-year Environmental Science student John Lindsay were honored at the Office of Sustainability’s 7th annual Catalyst Awards.

The Chair concluded her remarks by giving highlights of the kudos circulated prior to the meeting. She congratulated Prof. Ehab Abouheif (Biology) on receiving a Guggenheim Fellowship and Prof. Vicky Kaspi (Physics) on receiving the 2017 *Prix d’excellence* of the *Fonds de recherche du Québec – Nature et technologies*. She shared that Senator Weinstein has been selected as the 2017 recipient of the Outstanding Achievement Award by the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education (CCAEE). She also shared that Prof. Juliet Johnson (Political Science) and Prof. Emeritus Dan Levitin (Psychology) have had their books shortlisted for the 2017 Donner Prize, noting that the winner will be announced at a gala in Toronto on May 15. She congratulated Dr. Bernard Lapointe (Palliative Care McGill) on being selected as the 2017 winner of the Canadian Society of Palliative Care Physicians (CSPCP) Lifetime Achievement Award as well as McGill Basketball player Dele Ogundokun and hockey player Mélodie Daoust on being named male and female athletes of the year, respectively, at the 40th annual McGill varsity sports awards gala.

The Chair then opened the floor to questions and comments. Senator Snow commented that the email to the McGill community sent on April 10 by the Principal and Senator Manfredi (Reflections and looking ahead) did not mention mental health and well-being. She stated that a petition regarding the state of mental health services at McGill has garnered over 1,000 signatures of students. The Chair stated that demands for services related to mental health are increasing, and that she has asked Senator Manfredi to undertake a full review of the services and determine how to increase resources allocated for mental health. Senator Snow noted that many members of Senate and students are knowledgeable in this area and suggested they be included in the review process. The Chair agreed, noting that students were among the first groups to bring this important topic to the floor and have been deeply involved in helping improve and add new services in this area.

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question Regarding Academic Freedom of Academic Administrators

Senators Hastings, Saroyan and Galaty submitted the following question:

The events surrounding the reaction to Professor Andrew Potter's article in Maclean's and his subsequent resignation have raised questions regarding how academic freedom is protected at McGill University. In an article in the Globe and Mail in which the Principal defends the necessity of such a resignation, she stated that "the job of a university administrator has different responsibilities than that of a professor" and that "when you are an academic administrator, there are things you must be more prudent about doing". These statements suggest that with respect to the protection of academic freedom the Administration draws a distinction between regular academic staff members and academic administrators, with the latter enjoying less protection than the former.

- 1) What criteria does the Administration use in forming its opinion that such a resignation from an academic administrative position has become necessary?
- 2) What safeguards are in place that assure fair treatment of an academic administrator in such cases as well as protection of the fundamental principle of academic freedom?

2. Question Regarding Academic Freedom

Senators Gore and Hébert submitted the following question:

McGill University is a vibrant community of diverse opinions. To imply that the "university" itself can take a position on statements made by members of its community, other than positions that have been officially adopted through community mechanisms such as Senate, runs counter to the notion of intellectual diversity and academic freedom.

Many have raised concerns about a chilling effect in this regard implicit in the tweet from McGill's official Twitter account (from @mcgillu: "The views expressed by @JAndrewPotter in the @MacleansMag article do not represent those of #McGill") sent by the "university" in response to Prof. Potter's article.

The selective disavowal of contentious positions taken by members of the academic community represents a real danger to academic freedom.

- 1) What was the intended purpose of the tweet?
- 2) How and when can the "university" have such an opinion?

- 3) What steps can be taken such that future communications by the university will not be perceived as a selective disavowal of contentious opinions?

Response to Questions 1 and 2

As Questions 1 and 2 dealt with similar matters, the Principal provided the following response to both questions:

Thank you, Senators Galaty, Hastings, Hébert, Gore, and Saroyan for your questions. As they address related issues I have provided here a single response.

Academic freedom is fundamental to any university. This is obviously true of McGill, whose mission statement affirms that “the principles of academic freedom, integrity, responsibility, equity, and inclusiveness” are critical to “the advancement of learning and the creation and dissemination of knowledge, by offering the best possible education, by carrying out research and scholarly activities judged to be excellent by the highest international standards, and by providing service to society.”

Let me state unequivocally that academic administrators enjoy the full protection of academic freedom in the pursuit of their scholarly activities. At the same time, they assume institutional administrative responsibilities with respect to both the University and the unit they lead. Although University officers may not interfere with the academic freedom of academic administrators and, moreover, have a duty to respect and protect it, they also have an obligation to ensure that administrative responsibilities are discharged effectively to the highest institutional standards, in a manner that pursues the academic mission and responsibilities of the unit that they are charged with overseeing.

Tensions or conflicts between the exercise of academic freedom by academic administrators and their obligation to execute their administrative responsibilities effectively are rare. So are tensions or conflicts between the University’s duty to protect the academic freedom of academic administrators and its obligation to ensure effective execution of administrative responsibilities. None of these tensions or conflicts can be resolved through bright-line rules. Moreover, their resolution also depends on the nature, level, and category of the administrative responsibilities in question. Ultimately, it is a matter of judgment on the part of both academic administrators and senior university officers, acting carefully and with due regard for institutional neutrality and free inquiry.

When academic administrators no longer believe that they are able to discharge their administrative responsibilities effectively, then it is reasonable for them to step down from those responsibilities. Similarly, the University may, through the relevant institutional procedures appropriate for each case, replace academic administrators who are no longer able to discharge their responsibilities effectively. In either case, with the exception of a finding of serious misconduct, there is no impact on the academic administrator’s status as a scholarly member of the university community.

Members of the scholarly community are not normally understood to be speaking on behalf of the University. However, when scholarly members of the community make statements in

their capacity as academic administrators, ambiguity may arise as to whether their views do, in the absence of information to the contrary, represent those of the University. In those rare instances where such ambiguity arises, it may be necessary for either the academic administrator or the University to provide clarification. This was the intent of the message released via Twitter, but I recognize that it raised its own ambiguities about the University's commitment to academic freedom and the general norm that extramural statements by faculty members do not represent the views of the University. I regret this ambiguity.

In accordance with the *Senate Rules of Procedure*, the Secretary-General assumed the role of Chair for the duration of the supplementary questions.

During the supplemental question period, Senators Saroyan, Hébert and Galaty expressed that the University's reputation was negatively impacted by the way this situation was handled. Senator Saroyan stated that there is a general agreement that this is a complex and rare case but expressed that it should be discussed and not left to individual discretion. Senators Saroyan, Hébert and Galaty stated that there is a need for clear policies that define and protect academic freedom with respect to administrators. They expressed interest in discussing this case further, including the specifics of the case, and wondered why a single mistake would lead to dismissal or resignation. Senator Galaty added that he would like to see Professor Potter reinstated and invited to convene a meeting looking at critical journalistic discourse with regard to Quebec governance. The Principal reiterated that members of the academic staff enjoy full protection of academic freedom. She explained that the complexity arises when it is unclear whether a scholar is speaking as a faculty member or as the head of an administrative unit. As these occasions are extremely rare, she expressed that they are a matter of judgment, better addressed on a case-by-case basis. She stated that it is inappropriate to discuss a personal case in Senate, particularly without the individual directly involved present. She noted that when administrators have lost their ability to fulfill their duties and diminished their credibility in their role, the proper course of action is for them to step down.

Senator Saroyan asked what steps would be taken to ensure that all future actions of the University are guided by the Statement of Academic Freedom. Senator Richard reminded Senators that the commitment made when the Statement of Academic Freedom was adopted was that the Statement would be taken into account in developing new policies and regulations and revising existing ones. Senator Hébert asked what steps would be taken such that future communications by the university would not be perceived as a selective disavowal of contentious opinions. The Principal explained that many people in the larger community are unaware of how universities operate and might understand certain statements as being the view of the University, especially when administrative titles are used. She stated that the necessity to clarify that a given opinion is not the view of the University is a matter of judgment. She further explained that actions are guided by McGill's principles, which were endorsed by Senate and the Board of Governors, noting that responsibility is among those principles.

Senator Bernard echoed the need for a policy regarding the academic freedom of academic administrators and asked what a less ambiguous statement would look like. The Principal responded that it is a matter of judgment for a scholar to indicate, after expressing his or her opinion, that the views expressed are his or her personal views and not the views of his or her unit or the university. Senator Bernard noted that nothing in Prof. Potter's article identified him as the

Director of MISC and the mention of his administrative role could have been an editorial decision by Maclean's. He asked if the outcome would have been different if the editors of the magazine has only identified him as a professor. The Principal responded in the affirmative, noting that if there were no indication of his administrative leadership position, there would have been no reaction from the University.

The Principal resumed the Chair.

3. Question Regarding Student Diversity Initiatives

Senator Sobat submitted the following question:

Whereas, the draft Academic Strategic Plan 2017-2022 includes an objective to expand diversity and enhance accessibility for students from underrepresented groups, including significantly increasing enrolment for Indigenous students, expanding financial aid, and improving physical accessibility and cultural inclusivity;¹

Whereas, a number of McGill units are involved in efforts to improve access, support, and retention for marginalized students, including but not limited to the Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office, Enrolment Services, Student Services, Student Housing and Hospitality Services, and the academic Faculties;

Whereas, Enrolment Services has conducted an initial survey regarding the diversity and demographics of the entering undergraduate class of 2016;

Whereas, the 2016 Strategic Enrolment Management (SEM) report to Senate includes data on student categories including degree, basis of admission, and country of origin, as well as several initiatives intended to improve diversity in recruitment and admissions;²

Whereas, the SEM report does not include data from the new survey nor other means of evaluating the cited projects;

Whereas, student research has found that successful programming to improve access and retention for marginalized groups must address barriers found throughout the full student lifecycle, including but not limited to recruitment, admissions, student development, reflection, and graduation;³

Whereas, specific initiatives may include comprehensive data tracking and assessment; outreach to local communities; dedicated financial aid; cohort-based admissions; and peer mentorship initiatives;

¹ https://www.mcgill.ca/senate/files/senate/6_d16-37_open_discussion_-_strategic_academic_plan_2017-2022.pdf

² https://www.mcgill.ca/senate/files/senate/6_d16-43_sem_report_to_senate.pdf

³ <http://ssmu.mcgill.ca/ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Fostering-Post-Secondary-Success-March-2017.pdf>,
<http://ssmu.mcgill.ca/ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Striving-to-Place-The-First-Generation-Student-Experience-at-McGill.pdf>

Whereas, the success of such initiatives necessarily requires collaboration and coordination between multiple units.

- 1) Does the administration centrally track or collect data on programs to increase access, retention, and success for marginalized student groups?
- 2) Does the administration strategically coordinate such initiatives at the senior level? If so, where is this led from?
- 3) Can a structure be developed for better collaboration and coordination of such program between different units (e.g. a student diversity strategy and/or steering committee)?

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

Dear Senator Sobat,

Thank you for this important question. Starting in 2016, we have asked incoming undergraduate students and students who have not accepted our offer of admission to voluntarily fill out a survey that includes demographic and diversity questions. The survey was created in collaboration with SSMU (under then President Kareem Ibrahim) SEDE and OSD. The data thus collected is useful but incomplete. This being said, we are seriously looking at how many students from minority groups attend McGill and successfully complete their McGill education. It is however early in the process, and more diversity data will need to be collected in the coming years to have a better picture of the situation. However, we routinely gather and review retention and graduation data for all undergraduate students.

The Provost and the Principal have made increased accessibility to McGill a priority and this will be reflected in the new Strategic Enrolment Plan now being drafted (which will need to be approved by Senate). The plan will ensure coordination and collaboration between different units and different programs (e.g. recruitment and financial aid). However, please note that accessibility is a complex issue that is not limited to recruitment, financial aid, admission standards, or structured student support and retention programs, but also includes social perception, the image of the university, feeling welcome on campus, and support from one's personal family, social and cultural networks. Most importantly, accessibility must include retention and graduation rates. Our goal is to not only bring in more students from minority groups on campus, but to ensure their personal, social, psychological wellbeing and their academic success. To that end, we are working on a project that will focus on the difficult transition points that students face (from recruitment to graduation and beyond), focusing also on the challenges faced by students from minority groups.

Further, in his draft Academic Plan, the Provost has committed resources to increase accessibility and diversity:

Expand diversity McGill University believes that social, economic, and intellectual diversity among our student body and workforce is a matter both of fairness and of enriching the advancement of our academic mission. Opportunities for intellectual, academic, and professional growth flourish in communities that reflect a diverse set of social identities and experiences.

We will also enhance accessibility for students from underrepresented groups, especially Indigenous students, with the goal of increasing Indigenous student enrolment to 1000 University-wide by developing pathway programs in partnership with Indigenous communities. In pursuit of accessibility, we will aim to increase student aid from all sources to 30% of total net tuition revenues. Beyond financial assistance, we will also take measures that enhance physical accessibility and cultural inclusivity in support of student success.

Senator Sobat noted that the Strategic Enrolment and Management (SEM) Plan primarily looks at recruitment and admission and does not consider the full student lifecycle and other aspects mentioned in the preamble of his question. He asked if the next SEM plan would be broader in scope and if students would be involved in the process. Senator Dyens responded in the affirmative, noting that it would include some of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic)'s priorities (including recommendations from the Provost's Task Force on Indigenous Studies and Indigenous Education) and the increase in financial aid. He stated that different groups would be consulted. Senator Sobat then asked for further details about the project regarding difficult transition points. Senator Dyens explained that it is a program targeting difficult transition points for students (e.g. from high school or CEGEP to McGill, from first year to second year, from graduation to post graduation) and work on the project just started thanks to a grant received from the Quebec government. He mentioned that he would also like to use part of the funding to address issues faced by minority groups.

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

Open Session

1. Proposed McGill University Budget 2017-18 (D16-51)

Senator Manfredi delivered the last of three presentations concerning the proposed FY2018 University budget for Senate's information. He reported that the year is likely to end with a deficit of \$2 million rather than the budgeted \$2.7 million. He mentioned that significant reinvestments in higher education were announced in the 2018 Quebec Economic Plan, noting that McGill should receive an additional \$4.3 million in FY18, rising to \$21.5 million incremental increases in subsequent years. He highlighted that budgeting decisions for FY2018 and beyond are driven by the University's strategic priorities and that deferred maintenance remains a priority. He shared that the provincial budget and surplus accumulated in 2016 will allow the University to invest in institutional and academic priorities, including \$4 million in permanent new funding for faculties, \$1.2 million in one-time and recurring funding for initiatives in Indigenous Studies and Education, \$1.9 million for Student Life and Learning, and \$560,000 to Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for additional graduate student funding and doctoral student recruitment. He then highlighted that

salary policy commitments will increase the salary mass by \$16.3 million. He stated that a deficit of \$9.9 million is expected for FY2018, noting that it may be less once the cost of moving the Ingram School of Nursing is capitalized. He informed Senators that resiliency was built in the budget, enabling the University to increase strategic spending or to address a drop in revenue or unanticipated expenses. Finally, Senator Manfredi noted that the accumulated financed deficit is projected to remain around 12% of annual revenues.

Senator Saroyan asked what proportion of the \$385,000 allocated to support summer studies, on-line course development and co-op programs would be allocated to online studies. Senator Manfredi agreed to provide the information.

[*Secretary's Note: \$107,250 will be allocated to online studies.]

In response to Senator Quitariano's question regarding deferred maintenance, Senator Manfredi, stated that McGill currently requires \$1.3 billion for deferred maintenance, noting that he will be looking at the Facilities Management budget with respect to regular maintenance so as not to fall further behind. Senator Beauchamp added that almost 25% of the \$1.3 billion is due to the patrimonial aspect of the buildings. He explained that McGill will work with the provincial and municipal government on solutions for covering these costs. Senator Snow asked if accessibility issues are included in the budget for deferred maintenance, especially in ensuring that the campus is accessible during the transition phase. Senator Manfredi responded in the affirmative. Senator Beauchamp added that it is mandatory to ensure accessibility, noting that the University will work closely with the general contractors to ensure compliance.

In response to Senator Maciasz's question regarding the decrease in benefits, Senator Manfredi noted that it is due to the end of the voluntary retirement program and the decrease in cost of servicing the pension plan due to better interest rates.

Senator Cleveland asked about the increase in overhead charges on self-funded operating revenues. Senator Manfredi explained that the increase is necessary to continue delivering the services, noting that it represents a fraction of the actual overhead costs necessary to maintain the services.

Senator Gehr asked if the budget includes provisions for the Bellairs Research Institute, noting that the wastewater continues to be discharged directly in the ground. Senator Manfredi agreed that this matter needs to be addressed but was unsure if provisions were made in the budget.

Senator Sobat asked from which areas of the budget a potential increase in resources for mental health services would be drawn. Senator Manfredi noted that the Deputy Provost will determine the way the funds are allocated within Student Life and Learning. He mentioned that he has been thinking of deferred maintenance in a broader sense to include processes for support services.

In response to Senator Gehring's question regarding the additional regulatory burden due to the audits for Tri-Council spending, Senator Manfredi explained that it is a challenge as the additional obligations were imposed without increasing the overhead rate on grants. He noted that the university continues to make the case that the overhead provided on federal grants is too low.

2. 480th Report of the Academic Policy Committee

(D16-52)

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate's consideration. He moved that Senate approve six new teaching programs.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed Graduate Certificate in Translational Engineering within the Faculty of Medicine.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed Ph.D. in Kinesiology Science within the Faculty of Education.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed the proposed M.M. in Analytics; Non-Thesis, within the Desautels Faculty of Management.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed Graduate Certificate in CPA Professional Education (24 cr.) within the School of Continuing Studies.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed Graduate Certificate in Legal Translation (15 cr.) within the School of Continuing Studies.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed McGill Arctic Field Study Semester (15 cr.) within the Faculty of Science.

Senator Manfredi then moved that Senate approve a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences to rename the School of Dietetics and Human Nutrition.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval the renaming of the School of Dietetics and Human Nutrition to the School of Human Nutrition.

Senator Manfredi then moved that the Ludmer Centre for Neuroinformatics and Mental Health be approved. Senator Galaty noted that the Centre is composed of four units (neuroinformatics, neuroimaging, epigenetics and statistical genetics) and wondered why neuroinformatics was chosen in the name of the Centre. Senator Eidelman explained that the core technology is neuroinformatics, largely the work of Dr. Alan Evans whose research at the MNI is built around creating platforms that allow scientists from around the world to collaborate and share multi-dimensional data.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval the creation of the Ludmer Centre for Neuroinformatics and Mental Health/ Centre Ludmer en neuroinformatique et santé mentale,, on the understanding that the honorific naming is subject to approval by the Board of Governors, in accordance with the Policy Relating to the Naming of University Assets.

Senator Goldstein thanked Senators for their input at the last meeting with respect to the revisions to the *Policy on Intellectual Property*. She explained that the changes implemented further to the

last Senate meeting and the Academic Policy Committee meeting include corrections to minor typos in section numbering, using the generic term “Technology Transfer Office” instead of “IDEA” and clarifications suggested by Senator Gold. She also noted that the revision process was updated to shorten the review period at Senate’s discretion, and an annual review was added.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed revisions to the Policy on Intellectual Property.

[*Secretary’s Note: The Board of Governors approved the repeal of the Policy on Intellectual Property and the approval the Policy on Inventions and Software and the Policy on Copyright]

Finally, Senator Manfredi moved a motion for the approval of the creation of the Tanenbaum Open Science Institute.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval the creation of the Tanenbaum Open Science Institute/Institut de sciences ouvertes Tanenbaum, on the understanding that the honorific naming is subject to approval by the Board of Governors, in accordance with the Policy Relating to the Naming of University Assets.

3. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D16-53)

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D16-53).

4. McGill University Strategic Academic Plan 2017-2022 (D16-54)

Senator Manfredi presented the McGill University Strategic Academic Plan for Senate’s endorsement. He noted that no significant changes were made since the February Open Discussion.

Senator Hastings asked what provisions will be made to mitigate any additional administrative burden on academic staff resulting from implementing some of the ideas in the Strategic Academic Plan. Senator Manfredi responded that he is committed to reducing administrative barriers, which would alleviate the burden on administrators and students. Senator Saroyan added that establishing course grade equivalencies in certain faculties is the responsibility of professors, noting that departments can receive over 100 requests. Senate Manfredi stated that he is aware of the burden and has ideas on how to alleviate it. Senator Bede asked how the plan to deliver online programs aligns with the communication received from the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) stating that online courses might prevent American students from accessing student loans. Senator Manfredi clarified that the aim is to create online degree programs to project the McGill experience to new students off campus instead of enhancing online courses for current students. Senator Gehring suggested addressing the barriers student face with respect to going on exchange during their final semester at McGill. He stated that there is an issue with getting grades in on time, causing delays in graduation. Senator Manfredi stated that this would be among the implementation barriers he will be looking at.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate endorsed the McGill University Strategic Academic Plan 2017-2022.

5. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law (D16-55)

Senator Campbell presented this item for Senate's information. She explained that the *Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law* was reviewed due to a need for more support, training, and professionalization of processes associated with the Policy. She highlighted that this need was addressed by creating the position of Senior Equity and Inclusion Officer (SEIO).

Senator Maciasz suggested allowing third parties to be Complainants to alleviate the stress related to the process for victims. Senator Campbell stated that it would lead to difficulties in advancing complaints, especially due to the credibility of third party testimonies. She noted that other mechanisms are used to address the difficulties faced by Complainants, for example, they never have to be in the same room as the person responding to the complaint and they can be accompanied by an Advisor. She stressed the need for prevention, noting that the SEIO and the SEDE Office are working on reducing the number of complaints. Senator Maciasz also asked for further details regarding the SEIO. Senator Campbell stated that the current SEIO is Pascale Legros and she reports to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). In light of concerns raised on the SEIO not being at arm's length, Senator Campbell mentioned that the SEIO's office was moved from the James Administration Building to 550 Sherbrooke and noted that the SEIO is not involved in investigations and decision-making. Senator Bernard suggested indicating the process by which the SEIO is appointed or his or her qualifications. Senator Campbell agreed that indicating the credentials associated with the position would be appropriate.

6. Update on the Implementation of the Policy against Sexual Violence (D16-60)

Senator Manfredi provided an update on the implementation of the *Policy against Sexual Violence* for Senate's information. He highlighted that, as per Policy requirements, an Implementation Committee was established to develop a plan for the Policy's implementation and an Ad Hoc Panel was established to conduct a study of sexual violence on campus. He also noted that Department Chairs, Institute Directors, Associate Deans and Deans have been urged to take part in an Academic Leadership Forum dedicated to their roles and responsibilities in relation to campus sexual violence. He mentioned that the Office for Sexual Violence Response, Support and Education has been established at 550 Sherbrooke and is staffed by two specialized full-time staff members with training and expertise in sexual violence prevention and responding to survivor disclosures and reports. He noted that they are supported by part-time staff members. He explained that the Office could be accessed by any member of the McGill community regardless of where or when the incident occurred. He also mentioned that specialized Disciplinary Officers are being identified and trained to deal with incidents of sexual violence and software for the timely and confidential reporting and tracking of incidents of sexual violence will be purchased. Finally, he noted that work is ongoing with respect to education and training programs.

Senators Dow and Cleveland asked about the plans for the maintenance and sustainability of the Office and how the University would ensure sufficient mental health services for survivors. Senator Manfredi responded that an assessment would be made after the reports of the Implementation Committee and the Ad Hoc Panel are available. Senator Dow then asked how the University would commit to expanding the jurisdiction of its disciplinary procedures for incidents that occur off campus. Senator Manfredi responded that it will be examined by the Ad Hoc Panel and by the review that Senators Buddle and Campbell will be conducting on the meaning of “university context”. Senator Sobat asked why the full-time staff are on contract. Senator Buddle responded that it is the standard process with respect to the creation of new positions at the University.

7. Annual Report on Student Life and Learning (2015-16)

(D16-56)

Senator Dyens presented this report for Senate’s information. He highlighted that an interactive report is available on <http://mcgillslreport.ca/>. He also informed Senate that Senator Massey will be leaving the University after nearly 10 years as Registrar and Executive Director (Enrolment Services) and thanked her for her contributions.

Senator Snow mentioned that there has been instability in the administration at Student Life and Learning, noting there have been five Directors of Student Services within the past two years and there has not been a Director of Clinical Services for nearly six months. She expressed concern with the new Counselling and Mental Health Services, noting that a petition was circulated. She also stated that the psychiatrists were not consulted about the new system and now it is too late to make any changes. She wondered what is being done to address concerns. Senator Dyens explained that every HR decision and change in management or structure is taken with a view of improving services. He stated that the system was at a breaking point and the process was changed in order to reduce wait lists. He mentioned that transparent consultations took place and that Student Life and Learning is committed to ensuring students are part of any future consultations. He acknowledged that there have been implementation issues but expressed that the current system is a strong model, noting that it is not too late to implement changes. Senator Snow suggested improving communication with all parties involved. She stated that there are already forums in place for consultations, such as the Mental Health Advisory Board, and offered to discuss this matter further with Senator Dyens.

Senator Krupiy suggested looking at the classroom environment. She stated that students experience high levels of stress and pressure as they are constantly examined. Senator Dyens noted that he is looking at ways of ensuring a healthy teaching and learning environment in order for students to be challenged in a healthy way. Senator Snow added that the Office for Students with Disabilities is one of the national leaders in universal design for learning and is creating an online platform for educators. Senator Montaque suggested looking at formative and summative assessments as it is important for professors to give feedback to students without it being part of the student’s permanent record. Senator Dyens informed Senators that principles are being developed for the Student Assessment Policy and they touch on the matter of summative and formative assessments.

8. RVH: Academic Vision and Development Plan (D16-57)

Senators Manfredi and Beauchamp presented this item for Senate’s information. They provided an overview of the academic vision, as well as the project’s planning and organizational framework.

Senator Dow stated that communications with respect to the co-design session were sent to student representatives three days before the requested RSVP date and expressed concern over the number of students involved. Senator Beauchamp responded that there will be two students per table of eight. Senator Snow asked if Indigenous stakeholders have been consulted and invited. Senator Beauchamp responded that the invitation was sent to various people but the sessions were not designed to have representation from specific cultural groups. Senator Campbell added that the report of the Provost's Task Force on Indigenous Studies and Indigenous Education is expected to mention space and symbolic institutional representation.

Senator Montaque suggested that the design promotes health and wellness and includes spaces for people to convene and converse. Senator Zorychta expressed her hope that the atrium would be retained in the final design as the University is in need of a large theater. In response to Senator Krupiy’s question on allocating a space to postdoctoral fellows at the RVH site, Senator Beauchamp stated that it is still early in the process but it can be considered.

Senator Keita asked if Senate would receive a report from the co-design session. Senator Beauchamp responded that the co-design session is mainly for the architect and urban planner but offered to provide Senate with an update.

9. Report of the Joint Senate Steering and Board Executive Committees Meeting (D16-58)

The Principal presented this report for Senate’s information. She reported that on March 30, 2017, the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors and the Senate Steering Committee met to select a topic for the 2017-2018 Joint Board-Senate meeting, which will be held on November 15, 2017. Following a review of topics, members agreed that the topic will be “Building stronger communities and citizenship through mentorship.”

10. Other Business

There being no other business to deal with, Senate moved into confidential session to receive the Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee.

Confidential Session

11. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D16-59)

Senate moved into confidential session to review the 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 A).

There being no other business to deal with, on a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

END

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