



## Minutes

Thursday, September 24, 2015 15-16:01

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Thursday, September 24, 2015 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building)

### PRESENT

Allison, Paul	Geitmann, Anja	Mucci, Alfonso
Bader, Darine	Gold, Richard	Nalbantoglu, Josephine
Bajeux-Besnainou, Isabelle	Goldstein, Rose	Nicell, Jim
Bartlett, Joan	Gore, Genevieve	Noyhouzer, Tomer
Bede, Jacqueline	Gruenheid, Samantha	Nystrom, Derek
Benrimoh, David	Grütter, Peter	Oxhorn, Philip
Bernard, Daniel	Gyakum, John	Ray, Saibal
Brunot, Benjamin	Harpp, David	Richard, Marc
Campbell, Angela	Hébert, Terence	Riches, Caroline
Carter, Mindy	Hooton, Brett	Ritchie, Fiona
Cere, Daniel	Ibrahim, Kareem	Robaire, Bernard
Chainani, Parvesh	Ismail, Ashraf	Roulet, Nigel
Chatel-Launay, Nicolas	Jutras, Daniel	Rourke, Chloe
Chu, Kathleen	Kamen, Amine	Sanon, Devon
Cook, Colleen	Kaartinen, Mari	Saroyan, Alenoush
Cooke, Rosemary	Kpeglo-Hennessy, Alexander	Smailes, Marina
Costopoulos, Andre	Kuzaitis, Ruth	Snider, Laurie
Covo, David	Lach, Lucyna	Sobat, Erin
Damha, Masad	Lannes, Marcelo	Steinhauer, Karsten
Di Paola, Antonia	Lane-Mercier, Gillian	Stephens, David
Dudek, Gregory	Lowther, David	Strople, Stephen (Secretary)
Dyens, Ollivier	Levey, Margaret	Thon, Joshua
Eidelman, David	Manfredi, Christopher	Toccalino, Danielle
Elstein, Eleanore	Martel, Michel	Waters, Natalie
Ferguson, Sean	Massey, Kathleen	Weinstein, Marc
Fortier, Suzanne	McCulloch, Mary Jo	Winer, Laura
Fuhrer, Rebecca	Meadwell, Hudson	Yalovsky, Morty
Gaulea, Nely	Mills, Devin	Zalba, Josefina
Galaty, John	Mineau, Guy	Zorychta, Edith
Gehr, Ronald	Moye, Felicia	
Gehring, Kalle	Moore, Timothy	

**REGRETS:** Lisa Barg, Allen Chen, Paul Gordon Crelinsten, Stuart Cobbett, Terence Coderre, Michael Di Grappa, Elaine Doucette, Marie-Josée Dumont, Jim Engle-Warnick, Garth Green, Kenneth Hastings, Reghan Hill, Amanda Holmes, Alex Kalil, Bruce Lennox, Olivier Marcil, Michael A. Meighen, Ram Panda, Trevor Ponech, Judith Potter, Cynthia Price, Dilson Rassier, Amanda Winegardner, Ji Zhang.

## **SECTION I**

### **1. Welcoming Remarks**

The Chair began by welcoming returning, re-elected and new Senators as well as the new Governance Officer for Senate to the first Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 governance year. She thanked Senators for their engagement and commitment to the University community. She also expressed her hope that Senators who attended the orientation and lunch earlier today found both events fruitful and enjoyable.

The Chair reminded Senators that guests and spectators are welcome to attend and observe Senate meetings. Regarding the use of electronic devices, the Chair noted that their use 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. She reminded Senators that, in accordance with the recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Livestreaming of Senate Meetings, a recording of the livestream would be accessible on the Senate webpage until the meeting minutes are approved at the following meeting.

### **2. Memorial Tributes**

The Chair noted that over the spring and summer months, the McGill community was deeply saddened by the loss of four of its prominent members: Professors Gerald W. Farnell (Faculty of Engineering), William Marshall (Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences), Anthony Dobell (Faculty of Medicine) and Wendy Macdonald (Faculty of Medicine).

Senator Nicell read the following memorial tribute for Professor Farnell, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

It is with great sadness that we note the passing of Professor Emeritus Gerald Farnell on April 30, 2015. We have lost an outstanding researcher, a well-loved teacher and a highly respected academic leader as well as a philanthropist and committed friend of McGill.

The son of Alice (Turner) and Jack Farnell, Jerry was born in Toronto on August 31, 1925. He was a proud and grateful Canadian who had an abiding affection for Montreal and the province of Quebec, his home for the last 65 years of his life.

After graduating from Danforth Technical High School in 1942, he served in the Canadian Army and began his studies at the University of Toronto as a member of the Army Officer Training Course. In 1950, having earned a Master of Science degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Jerry arrived at McGill as a lecturer and PhD graduate student.

While at McGill he served as Professor of Engineering Physics and Electrical Engineering, including terms as Chairman of the Electrical Engineering Department (from 1967 until 1972) and Dean of the Engineering Faculty (from 1974 until 1984). In 1991 he retired from McGill as Professor Emeritus.

During his decades at McGill, Jerry gained a reputation as an outstanding researcher. In collaboration with colleagues and graduate students, he registered three patents, published 93 papers and earned international recognition for his research on the propagation of Acoustical Surface Waves in anisotropic materials leading to the development of radio frequency filters, now ubiquitous in mobile phones.

As a Nuffield Fellow, he spent 1960 to 1961 at the Clarendon Laboratory in Oxford and became a Fellow of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) in 1970. From 1972 to 1973, he was Engineering Consultant for Thomson CSF in Cagnes-sur-Mer and Visiting Professor in the Laboratoires d'Électrooptique at the Faculté des Sciences in Nice, France. Elected president of the Ultrasonics Society, he served from 1988-1989, received the IEEE Achievement award in 1991, the Distinguished Service Award of the Society in 1997, and the Lord Rayleigh Award in 2001. He was named a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1996.

A dedicated and enthusiastic teacher, Jerry was one of the first to offer a course on semiconductors and transistor electronics at a Canadian University, obtaining some of the first transistors from AT&T Bell Labs to demonstrate to his students. Eli Yablonovitch, who founded the field of photonic bandgaps, credits his later success to what he learned from Jerry's Solid State Electronics course when Yablonovitch was an undergraduate physics student at McGill.

Jerry truly believed in the mission of McGill and the Faculty. During the last 50 years Jerry contributed annually to the Alma Mater Fund, the only source of discretionary funding for McGill. In addition to supporting the Faculty, he and his wife, Norma, also contributed to other McGill units, such as the Montreal Neurological Institute. In 2000, Jerry established a fund in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering to support laboratory maintenance. Then, in 2012, Jerry and Norma endowed multiple Summer Undergraduate Research in Engineering (SURE) awards, an act that will ensure that many more undergraduate students will gain exposure to advanced research in Engineering. And, in December 2014, he demonstrated his exceptional commitment to McGill yet again by donating funds to establish Faculty Teaching Scholar positions in Engineering to enhance teaching quality.

Jerry is survived by his wife of 66 years, Norma (McRae), his daughter Sandra (John Peacock), his son Douglas (Anne Tchipeff), his sister Doreen (Al Thomsen), grandsons Anthony Farnell (Samantha Guedes) and Alexander Farnell (Annie Rivard), granddaughters Erika Moisl (Remi Lacroix) and Katherine Farnell (Maxwell Insley) and great grandson Evan Insley.

On behalf of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, the Faculty of Engineering, and friends, colleagues and students from across McGill, we take this occasion to send our heartfelt condolences to Jerry's entire family.

Senator Ismail read the following memorial tribute for Professor Marshall, which Senate subsequently unanimously approved:

Professor William Marshal passed away on April 14th, 2015, after a two-year courageous fight against cancer. Just a few weeks earlier, he attended the defense seminar of his last student (who was in a wheelchair), demonstrating his commitment and dedication towards his students and a great sense of responsibility and professionalism. His quiet demeanor, kindness, and his patience have been a source of inspiration to all students and staff alike. Bill had a unique way of putting students at ease and allowing them the opportunity to reflect on how to best answer his questions.

He was born in Halifax, Nova Scotia in 1946 and obtained his PhD in 1973 from McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario in Natural Product Chemistry. After a brief period in industry, he moved to Agriculture Canada as a Research Scientist in the Environmental Chemistry section where he served between 1973 and 1979. He accepted the position of Assistant Professor in the Department of Agricultural Chemistry and Physics in 1979 and was promoted to the rank of Associate Professor in the newly formed Department of Food Science and Agricultural Chemistry in 1982 and subsequently in 1990 he was promoted to the rank of full professor in the same department. Professor Marshall dedicated his professional life to studying the environmental fate of pesticides and organometallic compounds and made significant contributions to development of innovative methodologies for their detection and speciation. Professor Marshall served as the chair of the department from 2003 to 2008. He never sought credit for his tireless efforts as Chair, as he was guided more by doing “what is right” over what is convenient or expedient. Professor Marshall retired in June 2012 as Professor Emeritus.

He is survived by his wife Lyse, two daughters Catherine and Mélanie, his only son Eric, and five grandchildren; Lehlo, Maximilian, Nadia, Jack and Sofia. His outstanding contributions to McGill University as a professor and as chair are greatly appreciated by his colleagues and he will be missed by all.

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

It is with great sadness that we inform you of the passing of one of McGill’s medical pioneers, Professor Emeritus Anthony Dobell, who passed away June 17, 2015, at age 88.

After completing medical school at McGill in 1951 and following an internship at The Montreal General Hospital, Dr. Dobell went to Philadelphia to train in General and Thoracic Surgery at Jefferson Medical College, under John H. Gibbon Jr., who pioneered the first heart-lung machine. In Dr. Gibbon’s iconic textbook “Gibbon’s Surgery of the Chest” one can see Dr. Dobell pictured during the first operation using the heart-lung machine.

In 1956, Dr. Dobell returned to Montreal and was one of the first physicians to perform open-heart surgery in Canada. Shortly thereafter he established the training program in Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgery at McGill University. During his career, he performed more than 2,000 heart operations on children.

Dr. Dobell served as the Director of the McGill Division of Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgery for almost 20 years, from 1973 to 1992. He was the Surgeon-in-Chief at The Montreal Children's Hospital from 1974 until 1992 and also served as chair of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada Committee in Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgery, where he played an important role in establishing national standards for training in this specialty. In 1997, he was named a member of the Order of Canada for his contributions to medicine and in December 2012, the McGill Faculty of Medicine and the Montreal Children's Hospital of the MUHC came together to celebrate the creation of the Anthony Dobell Chair in Pediatric Surgery, in recognition of his pioneering contributions to both pediatric and adult cardiovascular thoracic surgery.

The consummate teacher and mentor to generations of surgeons, Dr. Dobell was beloved by his patients, their families, his colleagues and the wider community, as a caring gentleman with extraordinary skill. He has left a wonderful legacy at McGill and its pediatric and adult teaching hospitals where he worked his entire career. He will be missed by his family, by his friends and by the many whose lives he influenced over the course of his career.

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

It is with great sadness that we inform you of the passing of a true McGill legend, Dr. Wendy MacDonald on August 28, 2015, at the age of 70.

A graduate of McGill's medical school, Dr. MacDonald's remarkable career spanned nearly four decades with the Faculty of Medicine during which time she became synonymous with undergraduate medical education in pediatrics.

Long before medical education was a topic for discussion and serious consideration, Dr. MacDonald fashioned a curriculum and evaluation standards that provided every medical graduate at McGill a core clerkship experience that gave them the basics in child health, no matter what eventual career path in medicine they chose to pursue. For many medical students, this experience fashioned by Dr. MacDonald was a key reason why they chose pediatrics or one of its sub-specialties.

As much as Dr. MacDonald loved clinical medicine, the mentoring and teaching of students became her passion. Her excellence in teaching was renowned as exemplified by her receipt of no less than four Osler Awards from the graduating class. This award is given to the Faculty member recognized by the class as their best teacher in the undergraduate medical curriculum. Her multiple Osler Awards are without peer at McGill and resulted in the implementation of the "MacDonald Rule" in which a single Faculty member can now receive the honour only once every 10 years.

Within the Faculty, Dr. MacDonald was always appreciated for her lack of pretention and her straight-forward pragmatic approach to all issues. She was and will continue to be an inspiration.

She will be missed. She will be remembered.

**3. Report of the Steering Committee**

(15:16-01)

Senate received the Report of the Senate Steering Committee (15-16:01).

*Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate (meeting of May 12, 2015).*

*Item 2. Speaking Rights.* Upon approval of the report, speaking rights were granted to Mr. David Syncox, Coordinator of the Assessors, Teaching & Learning Services, for item IIB3 (Annual Report on the *Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by law* (2014-2015)) and item IIB4 (Annual Report of the Joint-Board-Senate Committee on Equity (2014-2015)).

*Item 3. Approval of Agenda.*

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

**4. Business Arising from the May 12, 2015 Senate Meeting Minutes**

The Chair informed Senators that open discussions on “Funding for Investigator-Driven and Discovery-Oriented Research” and “Employment Equity” are scheduled for the fall and winter terms respectively. These two topics were of great interest to Senators at the last meeting. However, the question period was insufficient to discuss them in more detail. She also took this opportunity to mention that an open discussion on “McGill’s International Strategy” is scheduled for this fall.

**5. Chair’s Remarks**

The Chair began her remarks by discussing orientation week. She noted that collaboration between the University, the student groups, the Police and the Milton Park Community was exemplary and thanked the student groups for their dedication. She noted that incidents involving students at Frosh have greatly decreased in the last several years and expressed her hope that there will be zero incidents in the future. Regarding the incoming class, she noted that the statistics are roughly the same as last year’s.

The Chair called on Senator Eidelman, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, to provide Senate with a progress report on a number of items identified in a recent accreditation review of the Undergraduate Medical Education program conducted by U.S. Liaison Committee for Medical Education (LCME) and the Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS). Senator Eidelman reported that the items identified are administrative in nature and explained that documents related to the review are published online. He noted that a working group, which he chairs, was put in place to ensure that corrective measures are implemented efficiently. He informed Senators that a consultation visit took place last week by the accrediting bodies. Regarding the timeline, an updated set of documentation on accreditation must be submitted to the accrediting bodies in November 2016 and a formal report containing the Faculty’s action plan is due by December 1, 2016. There will be a limited site visit by the accrediting bodies in February 2017 to ensure all issues have been corrected. The Faculty of

Medicine expects that its report will be accepted in early 2017 and that it will be off probation in spring 2017.

The Chair then discussed McGill's efforts to help Syrian refugees. She informed Senators that McGill is working with the government, other Canadian universities as well as World University Services Canada. She noted that McGill has a number of existing services that are well positioned to assist, including the Multicultural Clinic at the Montreal Children's Hospital.

The Chair was proud to announce that it has been another strong year for McGill with regard to international university rankings: McGill moved up from 67<sup>th</sup> to 64<sup>th</sup> in the Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities and is now 24<sup>th</sup> in the QS World University Rankings.

Regarding government relations, the Chair informed Senators that an agreement with the Provincial Government has been reached to complete a feasibility study, led by Senator Di Grappa, for the RVH site. The Chair also recently met with the Minister and Deputy Minister of Education, Higher Education, and Research. Topics of discussion included the need for additional investment in Quebec universities and a new approach to financing universities in Quebec. At the municipal level, the Chair noted that last week, Mayor Coderre appointed Richard Deschamps, an elected official, to be responsible for relations with the City's universities and stated that this was a positive step to reinforce McGill's status as one of North America's leading universities. Finally, at the federal level, the Chair informed Senators that McGill will be submitting a proposal this fall for the second round of the Canada First Research Excellence Fund awards, where up to \$950 million is available for distribution.

Regarding external relations, the Chair informed Senators that she participated in two panels at the World Economic Forum's ninth Annual Meeting of the New Champions (Summer Davos) where she exchanged on innovation, science and technology with leaders from over ninety countries. She is also serving as vice-chair on the Science and Technology Innovation Council.

Every fall, McGill raises money for Centraide of Greater Montreal. The Chair noted that last year, McGill had the most successful campaign in Montreal in terms of increasing donations and participation. It raised \$468,000, which was \$43,000 more than the original objective. Senators Goldstein and Jutras have agreed to return as co-chairs of the 2015 campaign. They will be joined by Senator Ibrahim, president of the Students' Society of McGill University.

The Chair concluded her remarks by giving highlights of the kudos circulated prior to the meeting. She shared the recent achievement of Professor René Provost who was awarded the prestigious Trudeau Fellowship. She noted that earlier this month, the Royal Society of Canada (RSC) announced 87 new Fellows, including 14 new Fellows from McGill, and earlier this week, it named the incoming 48 members of The College of New Scholars, including six new members from McGill. The RSC also awarded Professor Aashish Clerk with the Rutherford Medal in Physics. She congratulated the team of McGill students for winning the IFTSA & MARS Product Development Competition. She also praised the School of Continuing Studies on its project entitled "Découvrez le "French Side" de McGill" and invited Senators to view the website <<http://vivreenfrancais.mcgill.ca/>>, which showcases all the offerings, services and opportunities in French at McGill. She noted that the School of Continuing Studies will receive a multi-year grant totalling over \$1.2 million from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

Canada, and Professor Emeritus Charles Taylor was awarded the \$1.5 million John W. Kluge Prize for Achievement in the Study of Humanity, which he will share with German philosopher Jürgen Habermas. Finally, she noted that researchers from McGill and its hospital-affiliated institutes received \$91.5 million from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

The Chair then opened the floor to questions and comments. Senator Benrimoh, on behalf of all the medical students, thanked Senator Eidelman and the Faculty of Medicine for being transparent in handling the accreditation issue and involving the students in every aspect of the process. He noted that students are fully confident in their medical school and that involving them in the process has been a very positive experience for them.

## **SECTION II**

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

#### **1. Question Regarding Planning for the Future of Biomedical Research at McGill and in Canada**

Senators Hébert and Bernard submitted the following question:

At the May 12, 2015 Senate Meeting, we raised questions concerning the impacts of the flattening of Tri-Council funding on the research enterprise at McGill and in Canada. In her response, (please see Minutes of May 12 elsewhere in the materials for this meeting) Principal Fortier agreed that these complex issues should form the basis for an Open Discussion at a future Senate meeting. Whereas we appreciate and agree with this approach--particularly if such a Discussion produces tangible action items--there have been several developments since the May meeting that further threaten research at McGill and throughout Canada. It is our contention that these developments require a more proximate response from the Principal, in advance of the Open Discussion.

The results of the 1st live pilot of the new CIHR Foundation funding scheme as well as the transitional open operating grants program (tOOGP) were announced in mid-July. These results are cause for alarm. Only 120 of the 1366 Stage 1 applicants in the Foundation scheme were ultimately funded (<9%). New investigators were particularly disenfranchised, though investigators at all career stages reported significant problems with the new and untested online review process. Indeed, a review of both ‘winners and losers’ reveals many surprises at McGill and elsewhere. In addition, though CIHR committed to funding 450-600 tOOGP proposals, only 383 grants were ultimately awarded and each endured a budget cut of almost 30%. Unfortunately, these numbers cannot be construed as anomalies associated with the transition to new funding schemes (i.e., bumps in the road). Calculations based on CIHR projections (since taken down from their website) suggest that, annually, the number of project and foundation grants will be 300-500 and 120, respectively. This is down from more than 800 grants funded per year in the previous system. We can also anticipate that the large across-the-board budget cuts will continue. In addition, CIHR cancelled funding of its MD-PhD program. At the provincial level, the FRQNT cancelled several programs this year and clawed back 20%

of the direct costs on existing grants. It is not hyperbole to suggest that we will soon reach a crisis if current trends continue.

Funding problems are not unique to the Canadian context. Indeed, one can see parallels, for example, in the US, where the NIH budget has been flat for more than a decade. An important difference, however, is the concerted effort among American investigators, institutions, non-profit organizations, and private citizens to challenge lawmakers and funding agencies to turn the ship around. For example, recently the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a leading public research-intensive university, initiated an interdisciplinary dialogue about strategies to rescue biomedical research in the US see: <http://elifesciences.org/content/4/e09305>). Though we can benefit greatly from the products of their discussions, we need a set of made at McGill and made in Canada solutions.

- 1) As one of Canada's most prestigious universities, should McGill be taking a leadership role in driving discussions about the trajectory of research funding in Canada?
- 2) If so, how would the University define this role and what steps is it prepared to take to enact it?
- 3) Even if McGill spearheads or contributes to efforts to alter current funding trends, it will take years to turn things around. Therefore, what are the University's short- and long-term plans to address the impacts of funding decreases on its overall research mission, its capacity to train the next generation of researchers, and the ability of its research faculty to pursue their academic careers?

The Chair, in her capacity as Principal, provided the following written response in collaboration with Senator Goldstein, prior to the Senate meeting:

McGill is taking an active leadership role in discussions with the federal government about research funding through multiple avenues.

We are engaged both formally and informally in ongoing dialogue and frequent interaction with decision makers within the federal and provincial governments, both elected members and public servants. We are also an active member of Universities Canada and the U15, organizations that support and advocate for the research enterprise at Canadian Universities.

A main area of advocacy for McGill over the last several years has been the importance of discovery research and the need for increased level of funding in the federal Tri-Agencies.

Research funding from the Tri-Agencies accounts for 40% of McGill's total research revenues on an annual basis. In addition, McGill has consistently argued for an increased level of indirect costs as well as for investments in the CFI.

The research landscape in Canada has changed, though, over the past decade with a variety of new programs available for support of fundamental and applied research as well as research training. There are also opportunities for research funding from sources

other than the Tri-Agencies and the CFI, including Genome Canada, Brain Canada and MITACS, as well as from foundations and philanthropic gifts. These are not viewed as replacing the Tri-Agency funding but rather as complementary sources.

For most researchers, it is no longer possible to recruit the full level of research funding needed to pursue their research programs from a single source. The Research and International Relations portfolio as well as research administrators within Faculties are increasingly providing support to researchers not only in submitting and administering research proposals but also in identifying possible sources of research funding.

Because of the importance of this topic for the McGill research community, the Steering Committee of Senate will be scheduling an open discussion at Senate this academic year to get a broader view and insight from Senators on the question brought to us by Senators Terry Hébert and Dan Bernard.

The Secretary-General assumed the role of Chair while the Principal provided some additional comments. An addendum containing a chart entitled “Federal Government Funding of R&D in the Higher Education Sector (1990-2014)” was circulated prior to the meeting. The Principal noted that the chart shows a fairly rapid increase of funding followed by a flattening of the budget over the last several years. She stated that the same applies to CIHR.

She explained that the University, and primarily Senator Goldstein’s office (Research and International Relations), is reaching out to all the participants of the competitions to get a better understanding of the funding situation. In that regard, she stated that a meeting with the President of CIHR, Dr. Beaudet, has been scheduled.

She noted that the most important issue is the fact that the budget has not increased while the demand for funding has increased. She reiterated that McGill continues to have meetings with members of government, influential people and key opinion leaders to get its message across. For example, she mentioned the event on Parliament Hill, hosted by the Minister of Health and the Minister of State (Science and Technology) where McGill showcased some of its best research in the health sector and the impact of the research.

The Principal added that she is part of a subgroup at the Association of American Universities that is looking at biomedical funding. She noted that the US is facing the same challenges. However, she pointed out that the US and Canada are very different in terms of their governments, especially with regard to the budget process. She explained that the US has an open budget process and consequently, a lot of lobbying, while Canada, with its parliamentary government, has a more of a closed budget process. In practical terms, this means that advocacy is conducted differently in Canada than in the US.

Senator Hébert stated that McGill needs a proactive, “made at McGill” solution that will address the real problem, which, in his view, is the steep decline in funding at CIHR over the past few years. He asked the following follow-up questions:

How do we transmit this message to a broader audience (government, funders, trainees, the general public) to restore funding?

What is McGill going to do if the situation cannot be improved? Young faculty are expected to develop an independent research program but all of the funding appears to be tailored to applied, industry-driven and government priority-driven research. How do we navigate in this changing landscape to protect our young (and not so young) faculty?

The Principal responded that in her view, there was no steep decline in funding but rather a flattening. She stressed the importance of circulating the correct data prior to the open discussion to accurately pinpoint the issues. In addition, she noted the need to know where the funds are being allocated in order to decide where to focus our advocacy. The goal of the open discussion could include establishing concrete actions the University can take.

She noted that unless a researcher is fortunate enough to get a foundation grant at CIHR, he/she will have to go to different sources to obtain enough funding. She acknowledged that more resources will be required to help researchers identify sources of funding and prepare the submissions. She noted that the US shares the same concerns with respect to spending more time on submissions than on research.

Senator Hébert noted that fewer researchers are being funded for discovery-based research. In the past, 800 researchers were funded and it is predicted that next time, only 600 will be funded. He advanced the belief that the open operating grant competitions are being reduced. The Principal responded that if the budget flattens and the size of the grants increases for a selected number of people, the consequence is that fewer researchers are funded.

Senator Bernard expressed his hope that the open discussion will lead to action items. As a follow-up question, he asked whether there is a process in place to inform departmental and/or university tenure committees about this situation since the current review criteria for tenure would penalize young faculty members. He believes the realities of the funding situation should be taken into consideration during their evaluation. The Principal responded that evaluations occur within a context. Senator Manfredi undertook to discuss this matter further with the Associate Provost.

In response to Senator Benrimoh's concerns over the MD-PhD program, Senator Eidelman stated that the Faculty wrote to CIHR, as did most MD-PhD directors across Canada. He added that most of them consider this to be a policy failure, especially at a time where clinician-scientists are encouraged.

The Principal resumed the Chair.

## **2. Question Regarding McGill's Response to the Truth and Reconciliation Report**

Senators Rourke and Sobat submitted the following question:

Whereas, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada recently released a report on "Calls to Action" regarding the legacies of the residential school system for Indigenous people in Canada;

Whereas, recommendations of the report include calls for the federal government “to develop with Aboriginal groups a joint strategy to eliminate educational and employment gaps between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians” (Article 7), and “to provide adequate funding to end the backlog of First Nations students seeking a post-secondary education” (Article 11)<sup>1</sup>;

Whereas, realizing these recommendations must necessarily occur in collaboration with Canadian post-secondary institutions;

Whereas, many Canadian Universities have developed comprehensive, measurable strategies to improve Indigenous enrolment on their campuses, including but not limited to the University of British Columbia’s 2009 Aboriginal Strategic Plan<sup>2</sup>;

Whereas, the McGill Aboriginal Affairs Work Group (AAWG) has developed a suite of programs to improve educational access and enrolment for Indigenous students<sup>3</sup>, however McGill currently lacks a university-wide strategic plan;

Whereas the University of British Columbia’s Aboriginal Strategic Plan extends beyond increasing enrolment and seeks to foster closer relations between local Indigenous communities and the University<sup>4</sup>;

How can McGill work with the federal government and Indigenous groups to increase access to education for Indigenous students?

Specifically, what concrete steps can be taken to increase the enrolment and retention of Indigenous students?

Will McGill consider adopting a university-wide strategic plan on Indigenous education in response to the Truth and Reconciliation report?

What efforts is McGill undertaking to build relationships with local Indigenous communities?

Senators Dyens and Costopoulos provided the following written response prior to the Senate meeting:

McGill recognizes the importance of the Call to Action and the need to ‘develop with Aboriginal groups a joint strategy to eliminate educational and employment gaps between Aboriginal and non- Aboriginal Canadians.’ In addition to the many current initiatives at McGill (please refer to the response to a January 2015 Senate question reproduced in the annex below), and the progress made in recent years (Aboriginal applicants to McGill

---

<sup>1</sup> Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action

[http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Calls\\_to\\_Action\\_English2.pdf](http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> UBC Aboriginal Strategic Plan. <http://aboriginal.ubc.ca/files/2013/01/ASP-FinalComplete.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Aboriginal Affairs Work Group. <https://www.mcgill.ca/deanofstudents/aboriginaloutreach>.

<sup>4</sup> UBC Aboriginal Strategic Plan. <http://aboriginal.ubc.ca/files/2013/01/ASP-FinalComplete.pdf>.

roughly doubled in number from 152 in 2009, to 302 in 2014. However, the number who actually registered only increased by 9 students, from 40 in 2009, to 49 in 2014). In response, McGill is drafting a plan to increase its numbers by addressing access issues First Nations students may need to overcome to attend post-secondary education. This plan, called 'Portage', follows on the Principal's Taskforce on Diversity, Excellence and Community engagement, and is aimed at actively reaching out to Aboriginal students. Portage McGill is a new process to help these applicants and potentially other under-represented groups gain admission to McGill.

Once implemented, Portage McGill applicants will enroll in the Bachelor of Arts degree program all starting at U0 level (freshman) and will take 18-24 credits over two semesters. Course offerings will include existing 100 and 200 level courses (such as, Effective Writing, Freshman Level Math and Sciences, Social Science and Humanities, Indigenous Studies, etc.). On-line credit courses may comprise part of the program in the future but the preference will be to complete coursework on campus in close proximity to other students and all support services.

The committee members in charge of developing the plan (Kakwiranó:ron Cook, Aboriginal Outreach Administrator, André Costopoulos, Dean of Students, Kathleen Massey, Registrar and Executive Director, Enrolment Services and Kim Bartlett, Director of Admissions, Enrolment Services) will work closely with the Faculties to bring the plan for approval by Senate within this academic year.

Senator Manfredi added that he considered this issue at a meeting with the Deans in early September. They believe that McGill has an opportunity to be a leader in this area, from recruitment of Aboriginal students, to research and teaching on Aboriginal issues in Canada and abroad, to recruiting more Aboriginal faculty members. Discussions are currently ongoing and an inventory is being created listing the measures that have already been taken.

Senator Rourke noted that offers of acceptance have increased substantially however acceptance of those offers has not. One of the reasons cited is a lack of funding, specifically in the Faculty of Arts. As a follow-up question, Senator Rourke asked whether the University could look into this matter further and either increase funding or push for more federal funding for this specific issue. She also noted that there are a lot of initiatives happening out west at our peer institutions and asked whether McGill would consider having a cohesive, strategic plan, similar to the one developed at UBC. Senator Dyens responded that his office is working with Senator Weinstein's team (University Advancement) on getting more funding. He explained that funding often depends on whether a student is registered in a degree program. Portage McGill would solve this issue and allow students to get funding from their own band. Senator Manfredi responded that no major university east of the Manitoba-Ontario border is really active in this area but he believes that McGill could be.

Senator Oxhorn added that there are many initiatives through the Institute for the Study of International Development. He noted in particular that Marie Wilson, one of the three Commissioners for Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission, will be in residence at McGill next semester teaching a course on reconciliation.

### **3. Question Regarding McGill’s Alleged Violation of Bill 100**

Senators Benrimoh, Sobat, Kpeglo-Hennessy and Rourke submitted the following question:

Whereas, the academic mission of McGill University is supported by an annual funding grant from the government of Quebec;

Whereas, Quebec’s Bill 100 regulates pay raises for employees of public institutions, including disallowing performance-based bonuses;

Whereas, the Quebec Ministry of Education has recently announced that McGill is in violation of Bill 100 for excessive executive salary raises over the past five years<sup>5</sup>;

Whereas, it was stated that the administration believes it “[has] been following Bill 100 directives,” but that “in a recent meeting with the government, we realized we are using different definitions of terms and therefore more clarification is needed by both parties”<sup>6</sup>;

Whereas, while the salary, contract and expense information for McGill’s Principal and Vice-Chancellor is publicly available online, this is not the case for other executive positions;

Whereas, some other Canadian universities make top executive salaries, benefits and bonuses publicly available so as to increase transparency<sup>7</sup>

- 1) Have there been further developments or communications from the government on this matter?
- 2) What has been McGill’s current practice with regards to executive salary increases in the context of Bill 100?
- 3) If the government requires the university to repay the difference in salaries, where will these funds be drawn from? How might this affect McGill’s budget for FY16 and following?
- 4) How might this affect McGill’s budget for FY16 and following?
- 5) How is the University working to ensure compliance with Bill 100 in future?
- 6) Will the University consider increasing transparency measures such as making top executive salaries, benefits and bonuses publicly available?

---

<sup>5</sup> McGill’s executive pay raises were illegal, Quebec says <http://montrealgazette.com/news/local-2>

<sup>6</sup> Workers on campus troubled by alleged Bill 100 violation <http://www.mcgilldaily.com/2015/09/workers-on-campus-troubled-by-alleged-bill-100-violation/>

<sup>7</sup> University of Victoria Executive Compensation Report <http://www.uvic.ca/universitysecretary/assets/docs/bogec/executivecompensation.pdf/>

Senator Di Grappa, who was unable to attend the Senate meeting, provided the following written response prior to the meeting:

- 1) We have been in discussions with the Ministry since the spring when these concerns first came to light. Since then we have responded to all questions asked, we have submitted all documents requested, we have carefully explained the contents of every document and made ourselves available to Ministry officials at all times.

A meeting was held in Quebec City on September 10 with representatives of the Ministry and McGill University to discuss this matter. I attended along with Lynne Gervais, Associate Vice-Principal, Human Resources, Diana Dutton, Senior Director for Human Resources, Cris Tinmouth, University Controller and Line Thibault, General Counsel.

It was clear from our meeting on September 10 that this issue revolves around differences of interpretation of the provisions of the law and the manner in which salary increases for senior administrators should be determined. The Ministry is reviewing the documents we provided and will be communicating back to us.

- 2) The process followed in determining a senior administrator's annual salary increase is similar to the process followed for all management personnel at the University. That is, there is an "economic increase" that is awarded to all and a second component based on a review of the attainment of performance objectives set with the person's supervisor during the year. These are not bonuses but a modulation of an individual's base salary for the coming year based on a performance review. Linking increases in base salary to performance review is best practice around the world in both the public and private sectors. In the Quebec Government's model of remunerating public servants, every employee receives an increase based on indexation and progression through the ranks.
- 3) This question cannot be answered until we reach final resolution on the issue.
- 4) Given that we do not know the amounts in dispute, it is impossible to know the impact on the current fiscal year budget or future years' budgets. While it is still too early to determine the exact amount in question, our preliminary estimates, based on discussions to date, lead us to conclude that the amount in question is less than half of one tenth of one percent of our annual operating budget.
- 5) The University remains convinced that it is in compliance with Bill 100. We did not learn anything at our meeting of September 10 that would indicate that we should change any of our remuneration practices.
- 6) This is information that has always been publicly available, on demand. Moreover, every year, provincial law obliges each university to submit to the government a statement of salaries and benefits of senior administrators. Anyone who wants to see this information can do so.

As a follow-up question, Senator Benrimoh asked whether the performance-based increases referred to in the response are proportional to the pay increases of employees at lower managerial levels and even at the unionized and professorial levels.

The Chair, in her capacity as Principal, responded that there are two kinds of senior administrators: academic administrators (who come from an academic Faculty) and non-academic administrators. In the case of academic administrators, the level of increase of pay follows the Academic Compensation Policy exactly as would be the case for professors. Academic administrators normally have administrative stipends for the duration of their service and that portion follows the non-academic administrator pay increase which is the same as all of the managers' increase. Therefore, it is exactly the same at different levels. However, there was one exception: in 2012-13, the University was informed that it would have to absorb a serious budget cut and all the senior administrators agreed to take a 3% cut in salary that was not imposed at other levels.

McGill is well within the framework of the Quebec government; it simply applies the levels differently. Salary increases are merit-based and occur after a performance evaluation. In response to Senator Chainani's question on how administrators evaluate performance at McGill, the Principal explained that at the beginning of the year, administrators and their supervisors will sit together to define detailed performance objectives. Mid-year, there is often a discussion on where administrators are in meeting their objectives and at the end of the year, a report on objectives and achievements is submitted.

Senator Nystrom suggested that salary information be published directly online to increase transparency as well as the appearance of transparency. Senator Hooten noted that McGill salary scales and policies are readily available online on the HR website. He added that the amounts in question are rather low and the information portrayed in the media is often disingenuous.

#### **4. Question and Response Regarding Physical Accessibility on Campus**

Senator Rourke submitted the following question:

Whereas, McGill University made the decision to borrow \$400 million in order to address deferred maintenance projects on campus in Winter 2015, upon the recommendation of the Board of Governors Finance Committee;

Whereas, McGill's physical infrastructure on campus has been identified as a barrier for the implementation of universal design on campus at the 2012 Joint Board-Senate Meeting<sup>1</sup>;

What current processes and evaluation procedures are in place within McGill's decision making structures to ensure the prioritization of physical accessibility on campus?

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Joint Board-Senate Meeting [https://www.mcgill.ca/senate/files/senate/d12-35\\_joint\\_board-senate\\_report\\_0.pdf](https://www.mcgill.ca/senate/files/senate/d12-35_joint_board-senate_report_0.pdf)

What steps are being taken to ensure that the Office for Students with Disabilities plays a role in any decision making about space use and renovations made by Campus Space and Planning?

Is McGill willing to open all renovation project or design teams to a representative with expertise in physical accessibility to ensure that the physical development of campus meets accessibility standards and the needs of its community members with disabilities?

Senator Di Grappa provided the following written response prior to the Senate meeting:

With respect to all new major construction and renovation projects, McGill's Universal Design standards form a mandatory component of each new project to ensure that all future projects provide for physical accessibility.

The Office for Students with Disabilities recognizes that it does not have expertise in this area, and has therefore agreed to have the Design Office in Facilities Management and Ancillary Services ensure that these standards are met. Where necessary, the Design Office engages external consultants who are experts in this field. The costs of meeting these standards are built into the funding of each project.

For the purposes of retrofitting existing facilities and establishing priorities, in 2013, the Provost created the Universal Access Capital Projects Working Group. Chaired by the Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity), the Working Group includes representatives of all major stakeholders, including the Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office, the Office for Students with Disabilities, and students. The Working Group annually solicits proposals from the community for priority projects which promote accessibility. The group has an annual capital budget of \$400,000 and makes recommendations to the Provost on an annual basis on physical accessibility priorities and where these funds should be allocated.

As a follow-up question, Senator Sobat asked whether there is a list of priorities with regard to improving accessibility features of our physical spaces. Senator Campbell, Chair of the Universal Access Capital Projects Working Group, responded that the Working Group has a list of projects that are underway for the current academic year. The projects relate to physical access and other matters such as gender-neutral washrooms on campus. More information will be available after the first meeting of the Working Group in early November.

Senator Sobat asked how priorities are determined. Senator Campbell responded that every year, the Committee solicits suggestions from Deans and heads of units across campus as to improvements or renovations that would improve physical accessibility for buildings, or parts of buildings on campus. Since there are currently many items carried over from last year, the Working Group will decide at its first meeting whether it is necessary to solicit additional suggestions.

Senator Rourke suggested having a space audit of the campus to determine the most pressing accessibility needs, followed by regular reporting on how McGill is addressing those needs. The Chair responded that she would confer with Senator Di Grappa and potentially with the Board of Governors.

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

### **Open Session**

#### **1. 466<sup>th</sup> Report of the Academic Policy Committee** (D15-01)

Senator Manfredi introduced this report, which contained four items for Senate's consideration.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the Professional Development Certificate in Business Valuation.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed renaming of the McGill Centre for the Study of Reproduction to the McGill Centre for Research in Reproduction and Development/Centre de recherche en reproduction et développement, and so recommend to the Board of Governors.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the creation of the McGill Cystic Fibrosis Translational Research Centre/Centre de Recherche Translationnelle sur la Fibrose Kystique and so recommend to the Board of Governors.

Senator Manfredi then moved to approve the creation of the McGill Space Institute (MSI), which was duly seconded. However, Senators expressed concern over the MSI not following proper governance procedure. Senator Richard noted that the MSI requires Senate and Board approval but it is portraying itself as though it were already in existence. He stated that the MSI either thinks it has already been approved or is taking Senate's approval for granted. At Senator Lannes's suggestion, Senator Manfredi undertook to expressly note in his follow-up correspondence with the MSI that proper governance procedure was not followed. Senator Saroyan expressed her disappointment that Senators were simply asked to approve the creation of the MSI without giving them an opportunity to provide more meaningful input.

[\*Secretary's Note: Following the Senate meeting, Senator Manfredi contacted the MSI and the Cystic Fibrosis Translational Research Centre (CFTRc), via Senator Goldstein, the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) and Professor Antonia Maioni, the Associate Vice Principal (Research and International Relations). He informed them of Senate's comments and concerns and reminded them to follow proper governance procedure.]

Senator Dudek asked about the policy regarding nomenclature, especially with respect to the difference between "centres" and "institutes". Senator Manfredi explained that institutes often have three types of mandates: research, teaching and public outreach. The names of academic entities were discussed at length at the APC meeting and it was decided that "institute" was the best term to describe the MSI's functions. Senator Grütter added that the term "centre" is not appropriate since centres in this field are associated with rocket launch sites and space museums.

Senator Galaty asked whether the MSI has a teaching program and stated that in his view, there would be a considerable overlap with the Faculty of Engineering. Senator Manfredi responded that the APC discussed looking at other relevant activities at McGill. It requested that MSI reach out to the McGill Institute of Air and Space Law, however, this does not preclude other connections and collaborations as well. Senator Grütter added that a teaching program will be developed once the MSI has official status.

Senator McCulloch noted that the CFTRc has a website, services, as well as publications since 2004. She asked whether a website or Senate approval comes first. In the discussion that ensued, there was some confusion regarding whether the CFTRc was a new centre. Senator Goldstein clarified that it is a new centre but it was previously carrying on activities under another name.

[\*Secretary's Note: Following the Senate meeting, Senator Goldstein explained that a research group must show evidence of collaborations, large-scale funding, publications and training in order to be recognized by McGill as an official centre. Therefore, it is difficult for a group to obtain approval as a Centre without operating as one. There are "centres" that operate for years and have a web presence before obtaining formal approval. Possible solutions include encouraging prospective centres to obtain provisional status for a period of up to two years, or requesting that prospective centres signal on any documents and web pages that Senate approval is pending.]

Senators then voted on the motion to create the MSI.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the creation of the McGill Space Institute/Institut Spatial de McGill and so recommend to the Board of Governors*

Senator Manfredi then presented the report from the APC Subcommittee on Courses and Teaching Programs for Senate's information. It contained a list of program and course revisions and retirements. Senator Toccalino asked why some of the joint honours programs listed are 30 or 36 credits while others are 60 credits. Senator Manfredi responded that some of the programs are cross-faculty programs while others are single faculty programs.

## **2. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee**

(D15-02)

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate's consideration. He explained that it contained recommendations to fill vacancies on Senate Standing Committees, Committees arising out of University Regulations, the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Charter of Students' Rights and Advisory Committees.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained within the Senate Nominating report (D15-02).*

Senator Manfredi also informed Senators that the Senate Nominating Committee is discussing the need for additional legal assessors on certain committees and exploring ways of alleviating the burden this imposes on the Faculty of Law.

**3. Annual Report on the Policy on Harassment, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law (2014-2015)** (D15-03)

Senator Campbell, Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity), presented this report, prepared by her predecessor, Lydia White, for Senate's information. She highlighted that complaints under the Policy were down and most pertain to harassment. She commended SEDE for its support and efforts in preventing complaints and thanked the assessors for their hard work.

In response to Senator Mills's question regarding the role of assessors, Mr. Syncox stated that assessors address complaints received from the McGill community and have an investigative role. If a complainant goes beyond the complaint stage, the assessor will work with the complainant and respondent.

Senator Sobat noted that the number of complainants has clearly dropped since the Policy was instituted. However, that does not correlate with actual instances of assault or sexual assault on campus. In Senator Campbell's opinion, a drop in complaints does not necessarily mean less harassment. She noted that there is also an increased sensitivity to issues regarding harassment and added that an individual who is assaulted will not necessarily launch a discrimination or harassment complaint. The two items are therefore unrelated.

Senator Ritchie asked whether there is an issue regarding students not knowing they have recourses under the Policy and asked what can be done to improve awareness. Senator Campbell confirmed that the Policy applies to students. She believes there is awareness, as evidenced by the charts in the report that break down the identity of the complainant. Sometimes students are even on the respondent side. She added that she is keen on looking into ways of making the process more effective and ensuring a safe environment for those who wish make a disclosure.

Sanator Bader asked how Continuing Studies students were classified in the report. Mr. Syncox indicated that their classification would be based on their program of study. For example, a student pursuing a graduate certificate would be classified as a "graduate student".

Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy was interested in why some complaints do not proceed to the formal resolution stage. Senator Campbell stated that there is no follow-up since it is important to respect the autonomy and the maturity of the individual who comes forward. The rate of attrition may seem alarming, but it is the same as any other mechanism for complaints or dispute resolution.

Senator Rourke wondered if there is any difficulty recruiting assessors and asked about the training that is provided. Senator Campbell responded that in the past, the roles have been filled without any problems. In terms of recruitment, this task involves consultations with Deans and the heads of different units to determine who would be appropriate. Regarding the training, Senator Campbell collaborates with Line Thibault, General Counsel, Legal Services.

**4. Annual Report of the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity (2014-2015)** (D15-04)

Senator Campbell presented this report, prepared by her predecessor, Lydia White, for Senate's information. She highlighted some of the Committee's activities during the 2014-2015 academic year, such as the creation of the new Subcommittee on Family Care and the change in McGill's Mission Statement. She noted that goals for this academic year include greater integration with the subcommittees, finding more support for SEDE, preparing an open discussion on employment equity and resuming work on the Traditional Territory Acknowledgment Statement.

Senators had no questions concerning this item.

**5. Annual Report of the Committee on Student Services (2014-2015)** (D15-05)

Senator Dyens, Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning), presented this report for Senate's information. The report provides an overview of the issues that the Committee addressed during the 2014-2015 academic year and its plans for 2015-2016.

Senators had no questions concerning this item.

**6. Other Business**

Senator Ibrahim asked for information regarding the process of creating an ad hoc committee to review a policy. The Secretary-General responded that the first step would be to identify the need to review a policy. A discussion would then ensue to determine whether the establishment of an ad hoc committee would be appropriate. If appropriate, the matter would then be referred to the Senate Nominating Committee.

There being no other business to deal with, on a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

**END**

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