Minutes

Wednesday, October 17, 2012   12-13:02

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on October 17, 2012, at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building.)

PRESENT	Harman, Christopher	Mooney, Jonathan
Aitken, Ellen	Harpp, David	Munroe-Blum, Heather
Algieri, Stefano	Heath, Nancy	*(Chair)*
Azmy, George	Henry, Evan	Nasr, Mo
Bachelet, Stephanie	Hepburn, Allan	Pekeles, Gary
Beheshti, Jamshid	Herrick, Shannon	Perrault, Hélène
Bernard, Daniel	Hurtubise, Jacques	Peterson, Kathryn
Bouchard, Adam	Hynes, Andrew	Potter, Judith
Boudreau, Andrew	Jacobs Starkey, Linda	Redel, Josh
Boyer, Daniel	Jonsson, Wilbur	Richard, Marc
Cecere, Renzo	Jutras, Daniel	Roulet, Nigel
Chiang, Edward	Kalil, Alex	Rush, Avi
Cook, Colleen	Kirk, Andrew	Schloss, Melvin
Cowan, Brian	Kreiswirth, Martin	Shaughnessy, Honora
Covo, David	Kucij, Maya	Sinacore, Ada
Di Grappa, Michael	Kuzaitis, Ruth	Snider, Laurie
Di Paola, Antonia	Lametti, David	Stromvik, Martina
Dinel, Haley	Lane-Mercier, Gillian	Vivas, Isabel
Doucette, Elaine	Laverdiere, Eric	Weinstein, Marc
Eidelman, David	Lennox, Bruce	White, Lydia
El-Khatib, Ziad	Lowther, David	Wolfson, Christina
Espinosa, Rodrigo	Lu, Catherine	Xu, Boran
Ferguson, Sean	Madramootoo, Chandra	Yalovsky, Morty
Ferrie, Frank	Manfredi, Christopher	Zhang, Ji
Gillon, Brendan	Marcil, Olivier	Zidel, Max
Grant, Martin	Masi, Anthony	Zorychta, Edith
Grütter, Peter	McCullogh, Mary Jo	Strople, Stephen
Gutman, Jimmy	Misra, Arun	*(Secretary)*

REGRETS: Paul Allison, Laurence Belanger, Graham Bell, Leslie Breitner, Serge Carrier, Stuart Cobbett, Claudio Cuello, Helge Dedek, Gregory Dudek, John Galaty, Charles Gale, Kalle Gehring, Rose Goldstein, Terence Hebert, Ashraf Ismail, Torrance Kirby, Mark Lefsrud, Morton Mendelson, Mark Michaud, Michael Ngadi, Derek Nystrom, Amir Raz, Caroline Riches, Arnold Steinberg, Elin Thordardottir, Peter Todd.

SECTION I

1.   Resolution on the death of Arthur Boorman

Senator Aitken rose and read the following death resolution, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

> The Faculty of Religious Studies notes with sadness the Death of the Rev. Dr. John Arthur (Art) Boorman. Arthur died peacefully at the Chateau Dollard, Kirkland, on January 22, 2012 in his 93rd year. Husband of the late Margaret Robertson, father of William and Lois (James Crawford), brother to George, Betty and the late Sam and the late Mary, uncle to many nieces and nephews. Born in Alberta, he was ordained in The United Church of Canada, serving churches in the Peace River country (travelling by horseback one summer) and Edmonton. He pursued graduate studies at Union Seminary and Columbia University in New York, earning a Ph.D. in social ethics. In 1957 he came to McGill University as lecturer in philosophy and ethics, later appointed Professor of Christian Ethics. He was Principal of the United Theological College from 1969 to 1978, and continued to teach in the Faculty of Religious Studies until his retirement in 1986. Arthur was a contributing member of many committees of the church both regionally and nationally He was founding editor of Christian Outlook, an interdenominational journal of opinion and conviction, concerned with many social issues. It was staffed chiefly by his colleagues in Religious Studies. Within the discipline of social ethics, Arthur's main area of academic interest became that of privacy, particularly in our age of technological environment. Arthur was very active in Beaurepaire United Church where he was an Honorary Associate Minister until the time of his death.

2.   Report of the Steering Committee   (12-13:01)

 The Report of the Steering Committee (12-13:01) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the minutes of the September 20, 2012 meeting.

Item 2. Approval of Confidential Minutes of Senate. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee had reviewed the confidential minutes of the meeting of September 20, 2012 and had approved them on behalf of Senate.

Item 3. Confidential Session. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed that it would enter into Confidential Session for discussion of item IIB1, the Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D12-08).

Item 4. Themes and Discussion Topics for Discussions at Future Senate Meetings. The Chair informed Senate that the Steering Committee had a long list of themes from which it would select the topics to be discussed by Senate at meetings this governance year.

Item 5. Business Arising from the Minutes. The Chair called on Senator Madramootoo to deliver an update on the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Recording and Transmission of Senate Meetings. Senator Madramootoo informed Senate that the Committee had finished its deliberations and that its report was being finalized in advance of its presentation at the November Senate meeting.

Item 6. Approval of Agenda.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair moved to amend the Agenda so that item IIB2 (Business Arising: Update on Matters Concerning Asbestos-Related Research) would be placed immediately after the Chair's Remarks. On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was adopted as amended.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began by giving a brief overview of the 2011-2012 Principal's Report, which, she explained, focuses on the people who make up McGill's community, their engagements and their interactions. Next, the Chair spoke about student enrolment, explaining that McGill was aiming to raise its ratio of graduate students to tenure-track staff to 4.5 to 1 and was working with government and other funding agencies toward this goal.

The Chair then commented on the recent drop of Canadian universities in the Times Higher Education rankings. She explained that the shift resulted from developing countries investing significant resources in post-secondary education, whereas Quebec was not keeping up. She emphasized the need to invest in students and faculty members, in research and scholarship, and in top-flight infrastructure. The Chair reported that she was looking forward to the planned provincial summit on higher education, where she would continue to advocate for higher quality in higher education, not simply higher participation.

The Chair went over recent developments in innovation in pedagogy, which were being overseen and encouraged by the Provost. She also acknowledged Senator Harpp and Senator Madramootoo, who were each being awarded honorary degrees at the University of Guelph.

The Chair ended her remarks by highlighting recent developments in the area of community engagement, including Community Engagement Day, the Academic Freedom conference and the Centraide Campaign. She called on Senators Di Grappa and Redel to speak about the Centraide Campaign. Senator Redel encouraged students and the entire McGill community to contribute to the city in which they lived, worked and studied. Senator Di Grappa said that the Centraide Campaign was about "helping those who help those who help others" and that as co-chair of the Campaign Committee, he was looking forward to working with representatives from across the University in harnessing the power of the McGill community. He referred Senators to the Campaign Calendar of Events. The Chair pointed out that Centraide Campaign participation rates are widely reported in the Montreal media and expressed hope that McGill could have the highest rate this year.

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

1.   **Business Arising: Update on Matters Concerning Asbestos-Related   Verbal Report**
        Research

Professor David Eidelman, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, presented the Research Integrity Officer's "Consultation Report to Dean David Eidelman." He explained that last winter, following allegations made about the involvement of McGill researchers with the asbestos industry, he had undertaken an initial inquiry. Subsequent to that inquiry, he asked Dr. Abe Fuks, McGill's Research Integrity Officer, to provide advice under section 4.2 of the *Regulations Concerning Investigation of Research Misconduct*.

Senator Eidelman told Senate that he was struck by the quality of the Report and had therefore asked Dr. Fuks' permission to make it public in the interests of transparency. Senator Eidelman said that the Report cast light on the context of the research in question and provided background of why people might have made accusations. Senator Eidelman told Senate that he accepted Dr. Fuks' finding that there was no basis for an investigation of misconduct. He also said that he agreed with the Report's recommendation that McGill hold a conference on asbestos and its effects.

Senators thanked Dr. Fuks for the thorough and high-quality report. Several Senators asked about McGill's public response and its strategy for dealing with similar issues in the future. Senator Eidelman explained that he would be making a public statement that same afternoon. Senator Lu said that this process demonstrated how naturally people could make their own connections about research done at McGill and added that issues like these could harm the reputation of all researchers. She suggested that the proposed conference look more broadly at connections between research and industry in general. Senator Eidelman thanked her for the suggestion. Senator Wolfson said that she felt that the Report covered two distinct issues: the research of Corbett McDonald and the integrity of McGill and that the University's messaging should ensure that the two issues remained separate.

Senator Gutman asked about asbestos-company executives who have served on McGill's Board of Governors. Senator Eidelman responded that this question was outside the scope of his mandate.

Senator Zorychta told Senate that she considered this a successful ultimate outcome after last year's Senate discussions around the matter.

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1.   Question Regarding Undergraduate Cross Faculty Course Accessibility

Senator Dinel and Senator Zidel asked the following question:

> While there are many important reasons why interfaculty and cross-departmental course registration is not always permitted, there are also many situations in which doing so is extremely beneficial and sometimes even necessary for a student's academic program. Clearly, the limited number of spaces available to major and minor students as well as the extra-departmental inaccessibility of certain specialized courses and programs need to be respected; but surely not at the expense of interdisciplinary learning opportunities and even program requirements that mandate a student to do so.

> This issue is threefold, and likely each component will need to be addressed separately. Firstly, in the absence of faculty and university wide policies, departments have developed very different attitudes toward and procedures for allowing course registration from students outside their own department; in doing so they often make such registration either impossible or unduly tedious. Secondly, faculty degree policies for the most part prevent students from taking more than a small number of credits in another faculty, if they allow it at all. Finally, and ultimately contrary to the university's vision, very few academic programs and research opportunities are cross-faculty, or even cross-departmental in nature, again making it difficult for students to engage in innovative and interdisciplinary learning and research.

> In what ways can McGill encourage and remove barriers preventing interfaculty and interdepartmental course registration?

> In what ways can McGill foster cross-faculty and inter-departmental programming?

The Provost answered as follows:

> First, I would like to thank Senators Dinel and Zidel for raising this important question in Senate. The tone and content of the question clearly indicate frustration with certain extant practices at McGill and indicate that while we find talking the talk of inter-disciplinary studies easy, we definitely have some trouble walking the walk!

> The facile answer to their question would be to point out that McGill is a large and complex institution. It is challenging, if not impossible, to satisfy the requests of individual students. Or to turn it around and ask why and when "external" courses are necessary. The University wants to provide students with latitude in pursuing their educations, but we work within a serious set of constraints.

A more appropriate answer starts with McGill's aspiration and commitment to providing the best education possible and where we can with the broadest possible array of choices. However, as the questioners recognize, certain pragmatic concerns and practical issues necessarily limit the ability of students to register in courses outside their programs, departments or Faculty.

For all course offerings at McGill, priority must be given, first and foremost, to students to register in those courses that are required within their major or minor degree programs. Resource constraints, in academic staff, support personnel and space, characterize McGill's environment. So this consideration (priority to major and minor students) has to supersede learning opportunities that could otherwise enrich a student's education, but are not required for degree completion. Stated simply, our course schedules reflect what we can do, and while it would be nice to offer unlimited opportunities to take elective courses, we must make courses available first to students enrolled in programs of study that require them.

Some program requirements, which vary from Faculty to Faculty, do indeed stipulate how many credits students may take outside the Faculty in which they are enrolled. Such Faculty regulations were designed with the best of intentions – namely to ensure that programs meet the highest quality standards. Sometimes, in practice, however, it means restricted choices and restricted access. Students in many programs, however, do enjoy considerable – albeit not unlimited – leeway from the point of view of their program requirements to select electives, even outside their Faculty. However, even here, given resource constraints, it would not be justifiably to allow students wishing to take courses as electives to displace students who must take those courses to fulfill program requirements.

On the other hand, some electives outside the student's Faculty may be in the category of "required electives", but remain unavailable in practice to students wishing to enroll in them. The Deputy Provost has been working to address some of the obvious constraints on the choices for courses that are available to students and will continue to do so. For example, coordinated scheduling across the University ensures that courses are more evenly distributed across the timetable, helping to eliminate timetable conflicts.

Another initiative has been to work with the Deans of the Faculties to reduce very-low-enrolment courses in order to free up instructors time. In certain cases, these resources are now being used to teach additional sections of over-subscribed courses.

I must caution that choices and trade-offs have to be made: reducing the number of courses to increase more access to some courses may mean that some students will benefit, but others might lose out.

We have purposively created many interdisciplinary opportunities for students, and we will continue to do so. Realistically, it is impossible to ensure that every student can pursue any and all interests; it is also not possible for McGill to proliferate niche programs with very few students.

There are, however, some things that we can and will do. I will undertake to have APC explore the wide variability in Faculty-specific, departmental-specific, or program-specific limitations on allowing external course selections or restricting outsiders from enrolling in certain courses. I will address the issue directly with Deans by asking them to examine program structures and regulations or practices that restrict students from taken courses outside of their Faculties or that discourage students from other Faculties from enrolling in courses in their units. The Deputy Provost will continue to encourage the elimination of very-low enrolment courses and very low enrolment programs with an eye redeploying the resources so as to increase opportunities for meaningful seminar experiences, some of which by their nature would be interdisciplinary and cross-Faculty.

Senator Zidel asked the Provost if he could elaborate upon how students are consulted on inter-disciplinary programs. The Provost answered that McGill programs arose at the level of a faculty or department, and were discussed by the Academic Policy Committee (APC) and its subcommittees. He added that the APC's discussions focused on the availability of resources for each program, and said that he would speak with the Deans about ways of ensuring that inter-disciplinary programs could also be provided adequate support. Senator Redel said that students would be interested in having more power to self-identify inter-disciplinary courses that would be beneficial to their programs. Senator Nasr agreed, adding that students in the Faculty of Science often felt that there was a lack of consultation with students about these issues and that many science students would appreciate the opportunity to take courses that were complementary to the hard sciences. Senator Grant said that while this is true of some students, others sought programs with more intense focus on science.

Sentor Dinel asked the Provost what problem areas had been identified and whether McGill would consider a more "Liberal Arts" type approach. The Provost answered that the APC was discussing those attributes that every McGill graduate should have and how to best incorporate these into all programs – interdisciplinary or not. Senator Aitken told Senate that she was leading a working group on undergraduate learning outcomes addressing these issues and welcomed their input.

2.   Question Regarding Postgraduate Supervision

Senator Mooney asked the following question:

> The student-supervisor relationship has been described in the literature as, "a personal and professional relationship that rivals marriage and parenthood in its complexity, variety and ramifications for the rest of one's life" (Zhao, Golde, & McCormick, 2007, p. 263; Baum, 2010). The Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (2010) has noted,

> "In a context where the growth rate of the graduate student population has surpassed that of the faculty, issues related to the availability of supervisors to mentor graduate students have been observed. Moreover, challenges can also arise from the dual relationships between professor/employer and student/employee: In a case where the latter receives payment for his or her participation in a research project of the former, the objectives of training and the production of outcomes may come into conflict. For this reason, many universities have established policies and procedures that clearly outline the rights and responsibilities of each (graduate student/fellow, professor, university)."

> In the Twenty-Fifth Report (2012), McGill's Ombudsperson for Students noted that the following issues have been raised by graduate students:

> - lack of regular access to the graduate supervisor;
> - lack of constructive feedback on progress and/or advising;
> - lack of assistance from the graduate program director;
> - access to stipend payment;
> - intellectual property/authorship issues;
> - supervisors' research priorities vs. students' progress;
> - interpersonal conflicts;
> - inappropriate behavior

> The Ombudsperson recommended, among other things, "That all new academic hires without prior experience of graduate supervision be required, as part of their academic duty, to attend a supervision workshop organized by the Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies office in their first academic year at McGill before being assigned the supervision of graduate students" (2012).

> The PGSS has been working closely and collaboratively with the Dean of Graduate Studies, Teaching and Learning Services, and other stakeholders to try to develop proposals to improve student-supervisor relationships at McGill, and several important initiatives are underway. To provide Senate with the opportunity be informed about these plans and open up a discussion on the issues, we pose the following questions:

> What efforts are underway to ensure that newly-hired faculty receive proper training in supervision?

What efforts are underway to assess graduate students' and postdoctoral fellows' experience with regard to supervision?

In the *Regulations Relating to the Employment of Tenure Track and Tenured Academic Staff*, postgraduate supervision is considered a sub-category of teaching rather than an independent academic duty in the evaluation. How do tenure committees evaluate quality of supervision? Why is quality of supervision not considered an independent academic duty in the evaluation, and what can be done to ensure its importance is properly recognized in the tenure process?

The academic literature has shown unambiguously that many observables related to quality of supervision, such as frequency of meetings between students and supervisors, degree of collaboration on research articles, and extent of supervisor mentoring, are directly correlated with key performance indicators such as time to completion, attrition rate, and productivity of students with regard to scholarly publications (Heath, 2002; Paglis, Greene, & Bauer, 2006; Seagram, Gould, & Pike, 1998). What efforts are being made to actively monitor and improve quality of supervision in these respects and to ensure proper compliance with McGill's *Guidelines and Regulations for Academic Units on Graduate Student Advising and Supervision*?

Senator Kreiswirth, Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, answered as follows:

Thank you Senator Mooney for your question, which provides me an opportunity to talk about the supervisor-supervisee relationship, perhaps the most significant and most challenging issue in graduate studies, and to bring to Senate some of McGill's ongoing and planned activities related to it.

Enhancing the graduate and postdoctoral supervisory relationship is one the university's high-level priorities (expressed in all academic planning documents) and one of the top three initiatives that GPS is focusing on for the next three years, in, of course, close partnership with all stakeholders – Faculties, MAUT, PGSS, Administrative units (Ombudsperson), etc.

The first question concerns McGill's efforts to train newly-hired faculty regarding best-practices in supervision. Like all research-intensive universities, McGill has become much more self-reflexive and proactive regarding the need for training, mentoring and development of all academic staff. Supervision is at the centre of much of this training and, at McGill, has been provided in various venues across the university— by Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, Teaching and Learning Services, Research and International Relations, Faculties, departments, and research institutes.

Over the last three years, 18 graduate supervision events were organized and supported by TLS and GPS and attended by 373 faculty members and 25 postdoctoral fellows. Post-event surveys show a satisfaction level of around 80%. There have also been activities specifically focusing on supervisees and the specifics of their responsibilities and challenges regarding this cardinal relationship.

This year we are launching some new events to complement the existing supervisor/supervisee workshops, including one specifically designed to address characteristic problems in the supervision of writing. Sessions on mental health and well-being in supervision, forming graduate supervisory committees, and leading practices in graduate supervision in medicine will also be offered. There are 15 workshops of this kind scheduled; as well, Supervision was a major topic at the Consultation Fair yesterday, and will be the central focus of McGill Strategic Enrolment Management Conference in November.

It is well-recognized, however, that supervisor/supervisee workshops and conferences can only do so much, and that many more challenges remain. Some of the specific issues raised in the Ombudsperson's report have been echoed in CGPSS surveys and by PGSS, the GPS Associate Deans, and other stakeholders across the university.

One of the issues Jonathan raises is with respect to the evaluation of the quality of supervision during the tenure process. Current tenure regulations do indeed include graduate supervision, a category specifically identified in the teaching portfolio guidelines. Not only do all tenure candidates address it, but Departmental and University Tenure Committees take supervision very seriously in their assessment of candidates, and major concerns relating to quality or quantity of supervision can result in denial of tenure.

Nevertheless, there is little doubt that a more detailed and nuanced understanding of the actions, behaviors, and needs of supervisees and supervisors at McGill, and the regulations and procedures that guide them is a necessary step in actively monitoring and improving the quality of supervision.

The first of two new collaborative projects is the launch of "a supervision health scan," a series of surveys designed to look at the scope of issues facing supervisors and supervisees, as well as to assess the overall strengths and weaknesses of the supervisory relationship at McGill. In collaboration with PGSS, Planning and Institutional Analysis, Teaching and Learning Services, MAUT, and other stakeholders across the university surveys on supervisory expectations and experiences have been designed for both supervisors and supervisees. These surveys will be given in November and the data will then be analyzed individually, and in parallel, and also assessed against existing CGPSS data on supervisory satisfaction. (Such parallel analysis, stressing data that can comment on the supervisory relationship, incidentally, is unique in graduate education.) The analysis of these data should be able to isolate those elements in the supervisory relationship that function smoothly and those that need to be strengthened. Analysis will also be able to address cross-university needs and seek answers to questions such as the importance of mandatory supervisory training for new academic staff.

At the same time, McGill will be launching a new Supervision Knowledge Base that was created in collaboration with Oxford University and the Australian National University, covering 40 topics in graduate and postdoctoral supervision. Each topic is presented under three headings: 1) McGill information – relevant policies and regulations; 2) scholarly research and leading practices; 3) ideas and tools - gathered from McGill faculty, students and postdocs. The Knowledge Base will be available to all McGill faculty, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows and will support all supervisory initiatives.

Working with groups across the university from various units – Faculties, PGSS, MAUT, TLS,--we will use the Health Scan and Knowledge base to create plans—academic, regulatory, pedagogical— for specific actions designed to enhance the supervisory relationship at McGill that will be put in action for the next 18 months.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to these issues, which are of great concern to me and which are central to the core of the University community as a whole.

Senator Mooney thanked Senator Kreiswirth for his answer. He also noted the power differential inherent in the student/supervisor relationship and said that many students had spoken about the absence of advocates who could help them confront issues with their supervisor. Senator El-Khatib proposed that post-doctoral fellows be used to fill the gap between graduate students and supervisors, serving as mentors or co-supervisors.

Senator Roulet raised concerns about a University-wide statistical analysis for evaluating supervision. He explained that McGill's various programs had different cultures that must be taken into account and suggested that the culture of the more successful programs could inform the evaluation process.

**Part "B" – Motions and Reports from Organs of University Government (continued)
Confidential Session**

2.   Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee   (D12-08)

Senate moved into confidential session to discuss 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").

Open Session

3.   Achieving Strategic Academic Priorities 2012   (D12-09)

The Provost delivered this item for Senate's endorsement. He began by thanking all those who had participated in the many consultations and planning exercises over the past months. The Provost explained that the process in developing this new Academic Plan was driven by factors identified in Strengths and Aspirations, the Principal's Task Forces and various conversations around the University over the past years.

The Provost presented the lessons learned throughout the consultation process, which led to the following three strategic priorities:
1) Advancing McGill's academic success, profile and reputation for excellence, nationally and internationally;
2) Achieving a sustained student-centred focus that will enhance educational, research and extra-curricular life and learning for students at all levels;
3) Managing existing resources and diversifying and optimising revenue sources for maximum impact in support of educational programs, research activities, and community engagement.

The Provost then went over the broad goals and the cross-cutting themes of internationalization, sustainability and innovation. He presented some of the major strategic objectives of ASAP 2012, including academic renewal, professional development and performance indicators. He told Senate that over the next five years, ASAP 2012 would set academic priorities, provide a roadmap for McGill's excellence and serve as the driver for the University's financial plan and budget allocations.

Senators Richard and Nasr asked for clarification about "endorsement" and Senate's role in the Plan's implementation steps going forward. The Provost explained that Senate would be asked to approve policies arising out of this plan that fell under its realm. He added that faculties would be responsible for implementing the plan at the local level and that each faculty would be free to find their own way.

Senator Gutman asked if McGill still aimed for more Nobel Prizes as markers of excellence, and suggested that the University follow Alfred Nobel's example of celebrating positive world contributions rather than weapon research. The Provost answered that McGill had standards and rules, but warned against prejudging or predicting the outcomes of research.

Senator Xu asked what steps the University was taking to increase the ratio of graduate students to faculty. The Provost said that McGill had increased graduate funding funding tenfold and that he was working with Deans to attract the best students.

Senator Roulet suggested that the Provost provide mechanisms whereby Deans, Chairs and other faculty members across the University could consult on how to best implement the Plan. The Provost said that the broad consultation undertaken in developing ASAP 2012 was continuing, and pointed out that one of its working groups had evolved into a permanent committee. Senator Gillon agreed with Senator Roulet, adding that such mechanisms were necessary for proper academic planning, in particular for interdisciplinary programming. Senator Perrault said that the Faculty of Education welcomed the framework provided by ASAP 2012 and appreciated the support that it could provide for decisions at the faculty level.

Senator Gillon shared his reservations about the Plan's use of performance indicators. He explained that while it was good for the University to collect and monitor data, it was important to assess what such data actually measured and what it did not. Senator Mooney added that he found the Plan too broad in certain places to provide clear guidance or benchmarking. The Provost responded that mechanisms would have to be in place to measure progress, but that action plans would arise from the faculties. The Chair proposed that a template be provided for Senate to monitor.

On motion proposed and seconded, Senate approved the following:

> *Be it resolved that Senate endorse the basic principles and broad outline of ASAP 2012 as McGill's strategic academic plan with the understanding that all items emanating from this plan that require academic governance oversight be returned to this body for appropriate deliberation and action.*

4.   Final Administrative Response to the Principal's Task Force   (D12-10) on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement

The Provost presented this report for Senate's information. He offered background on the Task Force itself and its three broad recommendations:

1) a firm commitment to the recruitment, retention, and professional development of a diverse and excellent academic, administrative and support staff, and student community;
2) a broadened definition of excellence that would ensure the indicators with which we measure ourselves reflect the University's distinctive mission; and
3) an affirmation of McGill's service to society that builds on our history and expands the University's commitment to positive engagement with—and impact on—external communities.

The Provost told Senate that the administration had accepted all three recommendations. He encouraged Senators to read the entire report, and highlighted examples of responses to each recommendation. In responding to the first recommendation, the Provost spoke to the growth of the SEDE office and the University's numerous outreach initiatives towards underrepresented communities. For the second recommendation, the Provost spoke of McGill's plans for interdisciplinary programs. For the third recommendation, the Provost told Senate that there were plans for a resource centre that would track and publicize McGill's engagement with the community.

Senator Richard asked how Senators could provide input on the McGill Academic Staff Information (MACSI) project, which was looking at a standardized CV format for academic staff. The Provost answered that all members of the community could provide their input to Professor Nathalie Cooke, Associate Provost, Academic Staff and Priority Initiatives and that a draft would be available online. Senator Richard also asked about the proposed title of University Professor. The Provost confirmed that it was an honorific title and not a higher rank, and that it would recognize McGill's highest achieving professors.

Senator Gutman asked about the Aboriginal Sustainability Project, which was only given a 2-year mandate. The Provost answered that new projects like this one were often given a set time frame, after which they evolved based on reviews of the initial experience.

Senator Dinel asked how the inclusion of "equity" in the title of the Associate Provost, Policies, Procedures and Equity would be reflected. Senator White said that this change has been in place since she began and was already reflected in her work. Senator Mooney asked whether there was a risk of siloing equity into one office rather than making it part of the institution. The Provost answered that this change actually raised the profile of equity around the entire University. Senator Shaughnessy pointed out that McGill had an Equity Office in the early 1990's, which had lacked institutional support. She commented that she was happy to see that its profile has been elevated to the level of the Provost.

Senator Dinel also asked who would be responsible for the additional attention to family care. The Provost answered that it would be handled jointly by the offices of the Provost and the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance).

Senator Nasr asked about progress with the co-curricular records pilot. The Provost answered that the project was not underway, but that a draft would be made available.

Senator Mooney asked about bridge funding and cross-subsidization for faculties. The Provost answered that bridge funding was an important way to support McGill's excellence. He added that bridge funding was the responsibility of the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations).

Senator Mooney also asked whether McGill was considering affirmative action admissions policies. The Provost answered that McGill was instead looking at ways to make its admissions process holistic to take into account all of a person's contributions, and was not considering affirmative action.

5.   Report of the Open Forum on Free Expression and Peaceful Assembly   (D12-11)

The Principal and Vice-Chancellor presented this item for Senate's information. She reminded Senate that the Open Forum on Free Expression and Peaceful Assembly arose out of her response to one of the recommendations of the Jutras Report. The Principal thanked Professor Christopher Manfredi, Chair of the Open Forum, for his work in developing, planning and leading the Forum's discussions and for producing a thoughtful and informative Report. The Principal informed Senate that she and the members of the Senior Administration accepted all three recommendations. She said that she was committed to finalizing and making public her written response – including plans and timetable for implementation of the recommendations – by November 23. The Principal then called on Professor Manfredi to speak to the Report.

Professor Manfredi began by thanking the members of the Open Forum Advisory Committee, as well as doctoral students Emma Richez and Erin Crandall, for their assistance. Professor Manfredi explained that the Report dealt mostly with "peaceful assembly" on campus and that he had asked all participants to consider where to draw the line between peaceful and non-peaceful. He said that there was widespread agreement on the following opinions: the University should be a violence-free zone; absence of violence is a necessary condition for peaceful assembly, but is not sufficient; and the University cannot be, nor even should be, a disruption-free zone.

Professor Manfredi said that the Open Forum sessions identified a set of factors that would inform how to best strike a balance that would allow disruptions but ensure that they would not become non-peaceful. The factors listed in the Report are: intentionality; intensity; duration; and location. Professor Manfredi ended by detailing the Report's three recommendations: clarifying the *Code of Student Conduct*; revising the "James Protocol;" and ensuring proper training of McGill Security Services.

Senators were unified in extolling the Report and in thanking Professor Manfredi for his work. The Principal explained that the James Building Protocol had already been revised, but that additional changes would be considered by the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance). Senator Lu mentioned a recent instance of a graduate student being denied entry to the James Building. The Principal suggested that Senator Lu share her concerns with the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance), adding that there was a fine balance between providing a sense of security and providing openness.

Senator Mooney spoke about the Report's recommendation that sections 5, 6 and 10 of the *Code of Student Conduct* be clarified and suggested that it would be better to articulate broad principles rather than specific instances. He also suggested that the Committee on Student Discipline record and archive its precedents and report on them to Senate in order to provide consistency in the disciplinary process.

15

Senator Lu said that the University needed ways of dealing with disruptions other than the formal disciplinary process or threats thereof. Senator Nasr said that not all disruptions should give rise to disciplinary cases, and that peaceful disruptions should be welcome on a University campus. Professor Manfredi said that the Report agreed that the University could not be a disruption-free zone.

Senator Redel remarked that security at McGill was shared between University employees and Securitas employees, with the latter having their own hiring criteria and training processes. He asked Professor Manfredi whether he believed that Securitas' independent operations would be a roadblock to change. Professor Manfredi considered this question beyond the scope of the Report.

Senator Dinel told Senate that she, Senator White, Senator Jacobs-Starkey and Senator Lowther were members of the committee working on revisions to the *Code of Student Conduct* and invited Senators to communicate with them.

6.   440th Report of the Academic Policy Committee   (D12-12)

Professor Anthony C. Masi, Provost presented this item for Senate's information and highlighted the Committee's role in reviewing items arising out of ASAP 2012.

7.   Report of the Nominating Committee   (D12-13)

The Provost presented the Report of the Nominating Committee for approval.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained in the Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D12-13).

8.   Other Business

There being no other business to deal with, on motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.

END

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