

**Minutes**

Wednesday, December 2, 2015 15-16:04

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, December 2, 2015 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building)

**PRESENT**

Bader, Darine	Gehr, Ronald	Mucci, Alfonso
Barg, Lisa	Gehring, Kalle	Nalbantoglu, Josephine
Bartlett, Joan	Goldstein, Rose	Nicell, Jim
Bede, Jacqueline	Gore, Genevieve	Noyhouzer, Tomer
Benrimoh, David	Green, Garth	Nystrom, Derek
Bernard, Daniel	Gyakum, John	Oxhorn, Philip
Brunot, Benjamin	Harpp, David	Panda, Ram
Campbell, Angela	Hébert, Terence	Ponech, Trevor
Cere, Daniel	Hill, Reghan	Potter, Judith
Chainani, Parvesh	Holmes, Amanda	Price, Cynthia
Chatel-Launay, Nicolas	Hooton, Brett	Ray, Saibal
Chen, Allen	Ibrahim, Kareem	Richard, Marc
Chu, Kathleen	Ismail, Ashraf	Riches, Caroline
Coderre, Terence	Jutras, Daniel	Ritchie, Fiona
Cook, Colleen	Kalil, Alex	Robaire, Bernard
Cooke, Rosemary	Kaartinen, Mari	Rourke, Chloe
Costopoulos, Andre	Kpeglo-Hennessy, Alexander	Sanon, Devon
Covo, David	Kuzaitis, Ruth	Snider, Laurie
Damha, Masad	Lach, Lucyna	Sobat, Erin
Di Grappa, Michael	Lannes, Marcelo	Steinhauer, Karsten
Di Paola, Antonia	Lane-Mercier, Gillian	Strople, Stephen (Secretary)
Dudek, Gregory	Levey, Margaret	Thon, Joshua
Dumont, Marie-Josée	Manfredi, Christopher	Toccalino, Danielle
Dyens, Ollivier	Marcil, Olivier	Waters, Natalie
Ferguson, Sean	Martel, Michel	Winegardner, Amanda
Fortier, Suzanne	Meadwell, Hudson	Zalba, Josefina
Fuhrer, Rebecca	Mills, Devin	Zorychta, Edith
Galaty, John	Mineau, Guy	
Gaulea, Nely	Moore, Timothy	

**REGRETS:** Paul Allison, Isabelle Bajoux-Besnainou, Mindy Carter, Julie Choi, Gordon Crelinsten, Stuart Cobbett, Elaine Doucette, David Eidelman, Eleanore Elstein, Jim Engle-Warnick, Anja Geitmann, Richard Gold, Samantha Gruenheid, Peter Grütter, Kenneth Hastings, Amine Kamen, Bruce Lennox, David Lowther, Kathleen Massey, Mary Jo McCullogh, Michael A. Meighen, Felicia Moye, Dilson Rassier, Nigel Roulet, Alenoush Saroyan, Marina Smailes, David Stephens, Marc Weinstein, Laura Winer, Morty Yalovsky.

## **SECTION I**

### **1. Welcoming Remarks**

The Chair welcomed Senators to the fourth Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 governance year. As this was the last Senate meeting of the calendar year, she wished student Senators good luck on their exams and all Senators a relaxing and joyful holiday period. She thanked Senator Winegardner, one of the representatives of the Post-Graduate Students' Society on Senate, for her service as this was her last meeting.

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 David Williams**

Senator Ponech read the following memorial tribute for Professor Williams, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

The Department of English salutes Professor David Williams with much sadness and regret at his passing. He was Professor Emeritus in this Department and a much-published, internationally noted scholar and teacher, especially in medieval studies, yet with wide-ranging literary and historical interests in both his writing and pedagogy. He died at his home in Montreal on Sunday, October 18, 2015.

Born in Boston, Massachusetts, on 12 February 1939, he studied first at Boston University from 1957 to 1961, where he obtained a B.A. in English Literature. He then proceeded to The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies at the University of Toronto, where he received an M.A in English and Medieval Studies in 1964 and a Ph.D. in 1970. The central topics of his graduate studies were the great Old English poem *Beowulf*, Anglo-Saxon law, and medieval biblical exegesis.

In 1967 David came to McGill's Department of English as a Lecturer, then became Assistant Professor in 1970, Associate Professor in 1974, and Professor in 1985. He did great service to the Department of English by chairing it for many years, from 1979 to 1990, through which he profoundly influenced its future development. He was a member of McGill's Senate from 1972 to 1975 and from 1989 to 1992, and served on numerous Senate Committees. In 1992, he became President of the McGill Association of University Teachers, and between 1983 and 1999 he provided extensive additional service to this Association and its members as a Grievance Officer. He further helped found the Catholic Studies program at McGill, and was the first scholar named to the Kennedy Smith Chair of Catholic Studies, a position he held from 2000 until 2002. Upon his retirement from this university, he became Visiting Professor at Ave Maria University in Naples, Florida, and taught there from 2004 until 2011. He was appointed Professor Emeritus by McGill University in 2006.

A prolific author, David published five monographs, including two on the poetry of Geoffrey Chaucer, and twenty-one articles, besides co-authoring, editing, or co-editing four additional books. His most acclaimed monograph, *Deformed Discourse: The Function of the Monster in Mediaeval Thought and Literature*, was awarded the Raymond Klibansky Prize (now called the Canada Prize) for the Most Outstanding Book in the Humanities in 1999. In 2000, he was elected a member of the *Académie Européenne des sciences, des arts et des lettres*, and in 2002 he was named *Chevalier dans l'Ordre des Palmes Académiques* by le *Ministre de l'Éducation nationale de France*. He also gave several invited lectures at the Sorbonne.

Both within and beyond the Department of English, David gave his former students and colleagues in the academy many fond and enduring memories of his uniquely droll and ready wit, his deep learning and acuity, his panache, and his profound dedication to the advancement of younger scholars, the Department of English, the university, medieval studies, and the humanities. In the words of Geoffrey Chaucer, 'And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche.' He is sorely missed.

**3. Report of the Steering Committee** (15:16-04)

Senate received the Report of the Steering Committee (15-16:04).

*Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate – November 18, 2015.*

*Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate – November 18, 2015.*

*Item 3. Senate Open Discussion – December 2015*

*Item 4. Speaking rights.* Upon approval of the report, speaking rights were granted to Professor Ghyslaine McClure, Associate Provost (Budget and Resources), for item IIB5 (Annual Report of the Committee on Libraries (2014-2015)).

*Item 5. Confidential Session – item IIB7, Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee.*

*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 November 18, 2015 Senate Minutes**

There was none.

## **5. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair began her remarks by discussing government relations. She informed Senators that a plan addressing deferred maintenance and information technology needs has been developed with the Board of Governors and approved by the Quebec government.

Regarding community engagement, the Chair shared two highlights from the third annual McGill Innovation Week, which was organized under the leadership of Senator Goldstein. She noted the launch of Salon 1861, a project that transformed St-Joseph's Church in Little Burgundy into a hub of cultural innovation and social entrepreneurship, and the Thinkathon, a competition co-organized by the McGill Dobson Centre for Entrepreneurship and the Office for Student Life and Learning, where twelve student teams collaborated to re-think the McGill experience. One of the ideas brought forward was a mobile application to find free study space during exam periods.

Regarding external relations, the Chair spoke about her attendance at the Royal Society of Canada's ("RSC") Annual General Meeting, with Senator Goldstein, in Victoria, BC. She shared that McGill was well represented during the Induction and Awards Ceremony which welcomes new Fellows into the RSC. She noted that Professor Bell recently completed his two-year term as President of the RSC and took this opportunity to thank him for his service. While in Victoria, the Chair also met with McGill alumni and participated in the Universities Canada Digital Futures Workshop. She chaired a panel discussion entitled "Students as Innovators in a Digital World" where four panelists, including McGill student Clélia Magali Cothier, talked about how digital technologies are changing the way students engage with each other.

The Chair concluded her remarks by giving highlights of the kudos circulated prior to the meeting. She congratulated Mr. Kazumi Fraser Hoshino-Macdonald, an International Development Studies honours student, on receiving the prestigious Rhodes Scholarship. Mr. Hoshino-Macdonald will be entering Oxford University next September as McGill's 139<sup>th</sup> Rhodes Scholar, preparing to pursue a Master's degree in Development Studies. She also shared that the McGill Office for Science & Society was awarded the 2015 Science Promotion Prize by the Canadian Council of University Biology Chairs in recognition of its contribution to the promotion of biology in Canada. Finally, she congratulated Dr. John Bergeron, Emeritus Robert Reford Professor in the Department of Medicine of the MUHC Research Institute, on receiving the Research Canada Leadership Award by Research Canada.

The Chair then opened the floor to questions and comments. Senator Benrimoh asked about the funding of deferred maintenance. Senator Di Grappa responded that McGill will borrow \$400 million, over a period of forty years, in four equal phases of roughly \$100 million dollars each, beginning over the upcoming winter months. It is possible that in the first phase more than \$100 million will be borrowed depending on interest rates and the interest of potential investors. Senator Di Grappa noted that interest rates will be locked-in at current rates and the contracts will be reviewed by the Ministry of Finance. A list of projects was submitted to the provincial government and approximately \$200 million has already been approved in support of these projects. However, McGill will have flexibility with respect to the projects in order to adapt to changing priorities. A final report will be submitted to the government indicating how funds were spent. Senator Di Grappa also explained that funds are being put aside and invested to

ensure the principal amounts are paid as they become due. In response to Senator Benrimoh's question regarding the list of projects, Senator Di Grappa explained that a working list was prepared after assessing the condition of the various buildings, in collaboration with Facilities Management and Ancillary Services and the Board's Building and Property Committee. The projects were discussed with the government, and will be considered for approval in accordance with University processes.

## **SECTION II**

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

#### **1. Question Regarding Management and/or Ownership of Companies by McGill University Professors**

Senators Mills, Toccalino, Winegardner, and Chatel-Launay submitted the following question:

WHEREAS an unknown number of professors at McGill University receive monetary incentives for their work in consulting, managing and/or owning local and international companies;

WHEREAS an unknown number of graduate students complete their research within such companies;

WHEREAS a recent publication in the McGill Tribune<sup>1</sup> highlighted the potential for conflicts that may emerge around intellectual property between graduate students and supervisors in a corporate or industrial environment;

1. What data is available that assesses the prevalence of professors at McGill University receiving monetary incentives for their work in consulting, managing and/or owning local and international companies?
2. What data is available that assesses the prevalence of graduate students completing their research within such companies?

With regard to the consultancy, management, and/or ownership of private companies by professors, we ask the following questions:

3. What current regulations, if any, emphasize the professor's priority to the student(s) s/he supervises over the pecuniary interest they have in such companies?
4. What current regulations, if any, address the role such companies may play in graduate student research?

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://mcgilltribune.com/news/mcgill-student-sued-for-destruction-of-masters-thesis-111715/>

5. What current regulations, if any, provide protections to the student and their intellectual property when conflicts of interest between a professor's supervisory obligations to a student and their pecuniary interest in a private company involve the student's own research?
6. What regulations are in place to ensure that students performing research remain accountable to the university in their role as students and not accountable as labourers to private companies in which their supervising professors have a pecuniary interest when these companies become involved in student research?

Senators Nalbantoglu and Goldstein provided the following written response prior to the Senate meeting:

Regarding question number 1, the University does not have a central source of data that would assess the prevalence of professors at McGill University receiving monetary incentives for work in managing and/or owning local and international companies. Work involving consulting is disclosed by the professor to the Department Chair pursuant to the Regulation on Conflicts of Interest.

Regarding question number 2, there is no centrally available data that would assess the prevalence of graduate students completing their research within such companies.

Regarding questions 3 to 6, there are many sources of guidance for professors who have interests in companies in which they own equity or to which they provide consulting services.

## **1. UNIVERSITY LEVEL**

### **Regulation on Conflict of Interest**

At the University level, the main applicable policy is found in the Regulation on Conflict of Interest, and the guideline that supports its application. Pursuant to section 2.1 (i) of this Regulation, members of the University community, which include not only professors but all staff members and individuals serving on various governance related committees, are expected to *“act responsibly, ethically and fairly with care, diligence and loyalty and be accountable for his or her actions and decisions in the workplace”*. Further, under section 2.1 (iii) members of the University community are obliged *“to disclose conflicts of interests as soon as they become aware of them and to address or manage them in the best interests of the University community”*.

In the Regulation, the notion of conflict of interest is defined broadly at section 1.2. The application of the Regulation is supported by a guideline titled *“Recognizing Conflicts”*. It gives several examples of situations that potentially cause conflicts of interest, in relation to students, research, human resources, financial matters and, also, in relations to the University itself.

Section 1.2 provides that not only real conflicts of interests, but also perceived conflicts of interests must be managed, or if they cannot be correctly managed in the opinion of the person who is the ultimate decision maker, the person in the perceived conflict must desist from the situation in question. In the case of a member of academic staff, the decision maker is the Chair of the Department. In doubt, the Chair may, and often will, seek advice from the Dean, the Dean of Students, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Secretary General, and Legal Services if necessary.

In practice, where a conflict exists or can be reasonably expected to exist between a professor and a graduate student under his or her supervision, the Dean of Graduate Studies will propose measures meant to manage the conflict; co-supervision of the student for example, in such a way that the supervisor in conflict is not the sole person making decisions about the academic merit of the student. Advisory thesis committees, and involvement of the Graduate Program Director are also safeguarding measures that serve to ensure that the work of students is assessed fairly and without undue influence of individuals who may be in a conflict of interest. Pursuant to the Regulation, Conflicts of Interests must be disclosed by professors, in writing on pre-approved forms that can be found on the website, along with the Regulation and the Guidelines on application of the Regulation. They are detailed forms that are meant to ensure full disclosure and good management of situations that may present risks. The Regulation, Guidelines and Reporting mechanisms can be found at: [https://mcgill.ca/secretariat/policies/research/conflict of interest](https://mcgill.ca/secretariat/policies/research/conflict%20of%20interest).

### **Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct**

In some circumstances, conflicts of interests may constitute research misconduct, and in such cases they may be investigated pursuant to the Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct. The Regulations may be found at: [http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/research-misconduct-regulations-concerning-investigation-of\\_0.pdf](http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/research-misconduct-regulations-concerning-investigation-of_0.pdf)

### **Regulation on the Conduct of Research**

The Regulation on the Conduct of Research also contains provisions directly relevant to the protection of students when their professors or supervisors have interests in companies that are funding their research, including companies in which they may have a personal interest. Section 3.3.2 (iv) provides that: “*A supervisor of Students engaged in Research shall take reasonable measures to...disclose to the Students any special conditions concerning such matters as constraints on publication, limitations on future use of Data, and ownership of intellectual property that may influence a Student’s decision to participate in the Research.*”

Section 3.5 (i) of this Regulation adds that: “*A Researcher who engages in Research which is not part of his or her academic duties for Persons external to the University shall ... comply with the disclosure requirements of the Regulatory Framework governing conflicts of interest, and conflicts of commitment and consulting activities; ...*”

These Regulations may be found at:

[http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/conduct-of-research-regulation-on\\_4.pdf](http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/conduct-of-research-regulation-on_4.pdf)

### **Policy on Intellectual Property**

In addition to the above regulations, the Policy on Intellectual Property also allows for the management of conflicts of interests. Whenever an invention is disclosed, the inventors must be correctly identified and agree among themselves on their respective contribution to the inventions. Students do not have to agree with what is being proposed, and can seek guidance from the Office of Sponsored Research (OSR) in that respect. OSR can refer potential conflicts of interests to the VP Research & International Relations, the Chair or anyone in a position to help manage them. The Policy may be found at:

[http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/intellectual-property-policy-on\\_0.pdf](http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/intellectual-property-policy-on_0.pdf)

## **2. OTHER SAFEGUARDS – GRANTING AGENCIES**

Granting Agencies also have rules governing conflicts of interests. Researchers must abide by these rules and failing to do so puts their funding at risk.

The policy frameworks of the FRQ are summarized in their document on Responsible Conduct of Research found at: [http://www.frq.gouv.qc.ca/hxtNx87eSZkT/wp-content/uploads/2015-04-07\\_Politique-sur-la-CRR\\_couleur\\_2014\\_EN-VF.pdf](http://www.frq.gouv.qc.ca/hxtNx87eSZkT/wp-content/uploads/2015-04-07_Politique-sur-la-CRR_couleur_2014_EN-VF.pdf), and similarly for the Tri-Agencies, found at: <http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/>. These are the most relevant to McGill researchers. The NIH also has stringent rules concerning conflicts of interests and they apply to some research carried out at the University.

## **CONCLUSION**

There is no regulation preventing students from working anywhere, including for corporations in which their supervisor has an interest. However, nothing obliges them to accept such employment. Such employment is often welcome by students who are looking for sources of income in addition to stipends or salaries derived from employment at the University. It often provides valuable professional experience. We do not think it would be right to deprive students of such opportunities. However, we do think that such situations need to be managed, and we believe that all the Regulations described here give the tools necessary to manage them. It is worth mentioning that students who believe they are incorrectly treated by their supervisors have access to advice and support through their Program Directors, thesis advisory committees, Associate Deans of Graduate Studies, ombudsperson, etc. They can also file grievances pursuant to the Code of Student Grievance Procedure, found at [http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/code-student-grievance-procedures-2013\\_may.pdf](http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/code-student-grievance-procedures-2013_may.pdf). Anyone can also make use of the Policy on Safe Disclosure for cases that are within the purview of that Policy. It may be found at: [http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/safedisclosure-policyon\\_6.pdf](http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/safedisclosure-policyon_6.pdf).

Senator Mills noted that the regulations cited in the response place a great emphasis on the trust within the student-supervisor relationship, with the onus of raising concerns upon the student. He then requested a confidential review of past decisions by the Committee on Student Grievances and the Appeal Committee for Student Discipline and Grievances. He stated that the purpose of the review would not be to reopen cases, but to ensure the overall adherence to the applicable policies and to identify potential gaps and/or areas of ambiguity in the policies. He expressed the view that such a review would be timely in the context of other policy reviews currently underway. He also asked whether the progress tracker, which is required by all graduate students, could be modified for next year to include a section regarding conflicts of interest requiring acknowledgment by both the supervisor and the graduate student as well as the committee members of the program concerned. Senator Nalbantoglu responded that she will look into these questions.

Senator Nystrom noted that the spur to this question appears to be the case reported in the McGill Tribune, cited in the preamble of the question, about the student whose Master's thesis was ordered to be destroyed (the "Case"). He added that the Case raises a host of issues that need to be addressed, given that McGill is a public institution receiving public funds for public research.

Senator Dudek noted that there are factual inaccuracies regarding what is being said and reported about the Case and cautioned against jumping to conclusions. He noted that there is already a requirement to report conflicts and potential conflicts as well as an annual review regarding research misconduct. He therefore expressed that it is unnecessary to add more reporting requirements.

Senator Benrimoh asked whether the University is prepared and able to step in and support its students in situations similar to the Case, as well as the integrity of its degrees, especially when there are legal fees involved causing students financial hardship. The Chair noted that the details surrounding each situation are important, therefore decisions should be made on a case per case basis.

Senator Rourke noted that the McGill Tribune article highlights the relationship between the student and supervisor and the power dynamics that are in play. She acknowledged that guidelines and recourses are already in place but noted that they failed the student in the Case, resulting in a long, costly, legal battle. She expressed concern that many students would not pursue legal action and wondered how less severe cases would be handled. She suggested that the University did not intervene early enough and did not seem to intervene in a way that adequately protected the student's rights. She also expressed concern over how the Case applies more broadly to graduate students' rights with supervisor relationships. Senator Nalbantoglu noted that the Case was presented to Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies from the start but it went on to litigation.

The Chair reminded Senators that the University does not have regulatory authority over activities outside of the student/employee relationship within the University. However, she added that it may be appropriate to have clearer guidelines that would allow individuals to be more informed and ready to ask the relevant questions before engaging in certain activities.

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

### **Open Session**

#### **1. Open Discussion – “Research Funding and Support” (D15-22)**

The Secretary-General assumed the role of Chair to allow the Principal to participate in the discussion. Senator Hébert started the discussion by expressing his discouragement with the response of the U15 and McGill to the funding issues. He stated that these universities do not appear to be striving for solutions. The Principal responded that the U15 has been active in promoting investment in research. She explained that there are no reports in the media since the work is being done in a collaborative manner with the government.

Senator Hébert also commented that there are funds (such as CFI) for large infrastructure projects, which place an emphasis on the procurement of new, cutting-edge equipment. In contrast, there is generally little to no money for smaller or routinely used pieces of equipment that are nonetheless essential. This money often comes from indirect costs (at least in places like the U.S.), but the indirect cost rate from the Tri-Councils makes this challenging to implement at McGill. The Principal agreed that methods of funding common (core) equipment in Departments, Centres, etc. should be discussed.

Senator Gehr remarked that the data provided in the background documents could be presented as ratios, notably, as dollars per student or dollars per professor, number of graduate students per dollar of grants, etc. He suggested that this would allow for a more comprehensive understanding of how funds are distributed. Senator Robaire spoke in favour of data that would include the success rate, both nationally and at McGill, as well as the consequent implications for professors, particularly those trying to get tenure and become full professors.

Senator Bernard asked for the University’s position with respect to the current leadership and reforms at CIHR. The Principal responded that there were challenges related to the implementation of the reforms and noted that it is best to work with the current leadership in order to address them. She stated that the reforms are a pilot and CIHR needs time to address the issues. She also mentioned that a list of steps taken by CIHR to remedy some of the issues encountered during the first round of foundation grants is available online. Senator Goldstein added that the Office of the Vice-Principal, Research and International Relations, has compiled its own feedback on the reforms and has conveyed opinions and suggestions directly to CIHR. Senator Bernard suggested that the reforms were not a ‘pilot’ project due to their system-wide impact. He also expressed a preference for a face-to-face review since it provides greater accountability and noted that McGill can and should take a leadership role to address challenges linked to the reform. Having served as a virtual chair for both pilots, Senator Hébert echoed Senator Bernard’s concerns.

Senator Oxhorn encouraged the University take a more proactive role in helping researchers identify and obtain non-traditional sources of funding. Senator Sobat noted that looking for funding outside the traditional sources is a time-consuming activity that is becoming expectation for academic staff. He expressed that students should be included in the process for identifying new sources of funding as their participation would help to develop their skills. He suggested that this new trend be reflected in the graduate student and honours programs.

Senator Hébert mentioned that the current situation is discouraging students from pursuing careers in research. He stated that the students are aware of the struggles of their mentors and supervisors to get funding and see the poor state of the lab's basic equipment. Senator Hébert expressed an interest to see broader engagement with society to ensure a greater understanding of the value of supporting basic research.

Senator Ritchie shared that her main obstacle is balancing her teaching obligations with research. She noted that the Research Time Stipends were eliminated from SSHRC programs and wondered whether the University can offset this lacuna. Senator Manfredi noted that 30 to 40% of academic duties are devoted to research. He mentioned that some departments developed policies around the ability to buy out time for research and encouraged all departments to consider this option.

Senator Bernard asked whether the University is prepared to recommend a percentage of funding that should be directed to investigator-driven research versus targeted research. The Principal responded that it is a question of balance. She explained that the prevailing view is that a balance of 70% investigator-driven research and 30% targeted research is a healthy environment that favours curiosity-driven research. However, the actual percentage varies greatly around the world. She also mentioned that one of the issues may be that too many small programs are being targeted, particularly by CIHR.

Senator Galaty stated that there appears to be a crisis due to the disproportion between the number of researchers and the funding available. Senator Robaire agreed, adding that this situation will continue since more and more people are competing for funds. The Principal expressed the view that there is a deteriorating environment in Canada rather than a crisis, particularly because the total level of funding has not increased with inflation and the Canadian dollar has lost some purchasing value. However, she indicated that most people agree that there seems to be a crisis in the biomedical research area, both in Canada and the United States.

Senator Robaire shared two suggestions with Senators. Firstly, he suggested having a mandatory mentoring system for newly appointed professors at McGill. He explained that mentoring is currently left to the discretion of the Chairs of the Departments. Secondly, he suggested that a committee be struck to review and determine the allocation of funds researchers receive for direct costs. He stated that the 17-18% received in direct costs is inadequate and mentioned that studies indicate the appropriate percentage is 40-55%. Senator Manfredi noted that there is a formula in place to determine the amounts sent to the Faculties. The Faculties then have their own methods of distributing the funds. Senator Robaire believes the process needs to be reviewed, especially considering the deans' discretion in allocating funds. Senator Manfredi responded that the discretion is limited by the restrictions imposed by the Tri-Council Agencies and the annual report detailing how funds are used.

Senator Gehr commented on the categories used to divide the funding. He noted there are many distinctions that can be made, such as investigator-driven vs. targeted, curiosity-driven vs. target-driven, useless vs. useful, etc. He suggested that the distinctions are problematic and the focus should be on what the researcher is passionate about since this leads to good research. The Principal noted that investigator-driven vs. targeted is the simplest distinction to make since it is defined by the granting agencies, but it is not the only one. She added that problems arise when inaccurate associations are made, for example when targeted research is associated with applied research since in reality, targeted research can be either basic or applied research.

Senator Mucci suggested that a part of the problem is the \$20-\$30 million research grants. The Principal responded that many countries are offering even larger grants to attract the best talent and Canada is trying to stay competitive. It is therefore a difficult matter to address.

Senator Ismail asked whether the priority of the University is to mentor students or conduct research and wondered if the University would prefer to be characterized as a “student-centered research-intensive university” or a “research-intensive student-centered university”. The Principal responded that the University is committed to being both student-centered and research-intensive. However, since McGill is a university and not a research institution, she would put “student-centered” first. She explained that “research-intensive” gets translated by McGill having students involved in the research activities of the University and making research part of their learning environment, even during their undergraduate years. Senator Ismail added that the University needs to ensure professors have a minimum level of funding to mentor students by involving them in research.

Senator Bernard spoke in favour of helping pre-tenure faculty and exploring alternative approaches to graduate training. With respect to the latter, he explained that although graduate students generate revenue for the University, there are limited research dollars to support their research activities. He also emphasized that many students do not go on to careers in research. Therefore, there is an argument to be made for diversifying the training experience. That is, rather than simply focusing on research training, students need other skills that are attractive to the market place. The challenge is that most students are paid from research grants or scholarships, which are intended to support research activities only. Therefore, to diversify the training experience, the required changes need to be defined and alternative sources of funding need to be identified to support the students when they are actively engaged in research.

In response, the Principal clarified that the desire to attract graduate students is not linked to generating operating funds. She explained that graduate students play a part in building a strong research environment and they make valuable contributions to the research activities of the University. She mentioned that universities with high international rankings have a higher percentage of graduate students than McGill and, in some cases, there are even more graduate students than undergraduate students. The Principal agreed that training and funding of graduate students to meet the realities of their career trajectories should be examined.

After the discussion, the Principal resumed the chair. She thanked Senators for their input and suggestions.

**2. 468<sup>th</sup> Report of the Academic Policy Committee** (D15-23)

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate's consideration.

He moved a motion to approve the creation of the Institute for Human Development and Wellbeing (IHDW) which was duly seconded. Senator Robaire noted that the term "human development" has different meanings. He asked whether the proposed institute has a link to the field of basic biology and developmental biology. Senator Manfredi stated that institutes evolve over time and agreed to relay the message to Professor Mitchell, the director of the proposed institute.

Senator Richard noted that the IHDW clearly identifies itself as the "proposed McGill Institute for Human Development and Well-Being" on its website and documents. He reminded Senators of the discussion that took place at the September 24, 2015 Senate meeting and expressed his appreciation that Senators' points were heard and understood.

Senator Chainani noted that there are no Honours programs in the Faculty of Education therefore the undergraduate students from that faculty are excluded as members of the institute. Senator Goldstein agreed to inform Professor Mitchell of this matter.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved, and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval, the creation of the Institute for Human Development and Wellbeing (IHDW)/Institut de recherche pour le développement et le bien-être humain à l'université McGill.*

Senator Manfredi then moved a motion to approve the transformation of the Faculty of Religious Studies into a School within the Faculty of Arts, which was duly seconded.

Senator Richard noted that documents indicate the Faculty of Arts unanimously passed the motion to integrate the Faculty of Religious Studies into the Faculty of Arts. He wondered what the degree of support for the motion was within the Faculty of Religious Studies. Senator Manfredi responded that a large majority voted in favour of the motion.

Senator Chainani asked how the proposed changes will affect the Department of Jewish Studies and the program in Catholic Studies. Senator Manfredi responded that they will remain separate within the Faculty of Arts, as will the Institute of Islamic Studies. Moreover, the School of Religious Studies will continue to play an important role in the program in Catholic Studies.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved, and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval, the transformation of the Faculty of Religious Studies into a School within the Faculty of Arts.*

**3. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee** (D15-24)

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate's consideration. He explained that it contained recommendations to fill vacancies on a Senate Standing Committee and Committees arising out of University Regulations. It also contained proposed revisions to the Academic Policy

Committee's ("APC") terms of reference. The proposed revisions would allow the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and the Director of Teaching and Learning Services to name a delegate to serve in their place. They also provide for the addition of the University Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment Services to APC's membership, with a voice but no vote.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained within the Senate Nominating report (D15-24).*

#### **4. Appointment of Harassment Assessors** (D15-25)

Senator Campbell presented this report for Senate's consideration. She explained that two new assessors under the *Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law* are required to ensure that more than one-half of assessors will have experience in this role by the summer 2016 term. Moreover, the goal is to expand the assessor team from eight to ten members in the long term so as to widen the base of individuals positioned to address effectively harassment complaints arising at the University.

Senator Nystrom noted that the two proposed assessors are men and asked whether gender balance was discussed by the committee. Senator Campbell responded that she solicits nominations directly from deans and administrative managers across campus for recommendations of individuals to serve in this role. She understands the importance of gender parity however, the Policy also requires diversity and the appointment of the two nominees would increase the diversity of the group of assessors.

Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy, asked whether there are term limits and caps on renewals. Senator Campbell noted that appointments are for three-year terms but will review the Policy to determine whether there is a cap on renewals. In her opinion, it is best not to have caps since it is beneficial to have experienced assessors and it is difficult to fill this role.

[\*Secretary's Note: The Policy is silent as to reappointment of assessors and the number of times that an assessor may be reappointed.]

In response to Senator Benrimoh's question regarding the candidates' qualifications and expertise, Senator Campbell responded that none of the assessors are experts in harassment or discrimination, however training is provided.

Senator Bader wondered whether students can be appointed as assessors. Senator Campbell explained that membership is defined in the Policy and is limited to academic and non-academic staff.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approve the appointments of Mr. Eamon Duffy and Mr. Romesh Vadivel for three-year terms beginning 1 January 2016 and ending 31 December 2018, as assessors under the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law.*

**5. Annual Report of the Committee on Libraries (2014-2015) (D15-26)**

Professor Ghyslaine McClure, Chair of the Committee on Libraries, presented this report for Senate's information. The report contained an overview of the Committee's activities undertaken last year, as well as plans and priorities for the current academic year.

Senators had no question regarding this item.

**7. Other Business**

The Chair reminded Senators of the symposium hosted by Teaching and Learning Services ("TLS") entitled "Teaching What's Important: Educating Students for Today and Tomorrow". The event, which is taking place on December 11, 2015, is a follow-up to the 2011 Joint Board-Senate Meeting on Undergraduate Research and Teaching. The Chair noted that this is a great initiative by TLS and encouraged all Senators to participate.

**Confidential Session**

**8. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D15-27)**

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 4:53 p.m.

**END**

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