Memorandum

TO:	Senate
FROM:	Dr. Rose Goldstein, Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations)
SUBJECT:	Report of the Joint Board-Senate Meeting
DATE:	November 19, 2014
DOCUMENT #:	D14-21
ACTION REQUIRED:	☒ INFORMATION ☐ APPROVAL/DECISION
ISSUE:	Presentation of the report of the joint Board-Senate meeting 2014-2015.
BACKGROUND & RATIONALE:	The Statutes of McGill University state: 6.3.9.1 The Senate and Board of Governors shall hold an annual joint meeting in the fall term. At this meeting, the Principal, the Provost, the Deputy Provost, and the vice-principals, as appropriate, shall present for discussion matters they consider relevant to the University's mission for the ensuing year. At the joint Executive Committee/Senate Steering Committee meeting of March 27, 2014, the following topic was proposed and agreed upon for the next joint Board-Senate meeting: "Strengthening McGill's Engagement with the External Community through Research and Innovation." The joint Board-Senate meeting was held on November 4, 2014.
MOTION OR RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL:	N/A
PRIOR CONSULTATION:	N/A
NEXT STEPS:	N/A
APPENDICES:	Appendix A - Report of the Joint Board-Senate Meeting of November 4, 2014

Report of the Joint Board-Senate Meeting of November 4, 2014

The Chancellor welcomed the 84 Senators, members of the Board of Governors and guests who attended the joint meeting, and introduced the meeting's topic, "Strengthening McGill's Engagement with the External Community through Research and Innovation." The Principal also welcomed attendees reminding participants that the annual joint meeting provides an opportunity for Governors and Senators to explore an important matter affecting the University's mission.

Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) Goldstein elaborated on innovation activities and how they can serve as drivers of community engagement. The meeting also involved a moderated panel discussion on innovation projects and engagement at McGill, which included the following panelists: Professors Mark P. Andrews (Faculty of Science), Steve Maguire, (Desautels Faculty of Management), Mr. Gaétan Lantagne (Acting Senior Director, Hydro-Québec Research Institute) and Ms. Cécile Branco-Côté (Student, Faculty of Arts).

Following the panel discussion, Senators and members of the Board of Governors engaged in a breakout session (roundtable discussions) on innovation and community engagement. The breakout session was based on the following set of questions which had been circulated before the meeting:

- How does (and how could) university-based research and innovation foster deeper engagement with the broader community? How can students benefit from this engagement?

- What are the top three community engagement actions, related to research and innovation, that McGill stakeholders can take to significantly enhance the value of the University as a partner in the external community?

- What are the top three actions that Senators and Board members can take to enable this increased value and engagement?

The questions generated a lively discussion and a number of valuable ideas. Points shared following the roundtable discussion are attached as Appendix 1.

The Vice-Principal Goldstein synthesized the discussion, highlighting that increased communication both amongst members within the University community, and between the University and the external partners would further facilitate community engagement and innovation. The administration will be considering possible follow-up items coming out of the discussion, which will be reported to Senate and the Board of Governors later in the governance year.

Feedback provided from Senators and members of the Board of Governors was generally positive (see Appendix 2) and will be taken into account in planning future joint Board-Senate meetings.

McGill Joint Board-Senate Retreat (Roundtable Discussion – Main Points)
November 4, 2014

Table 1
- Importance of taking prompts from community, 2-way relationship
- Examples taking classroom knowledge and translating into world (Arts Internships)
- Encourage risk-taking, innovation, experiential learning vs. conventional approaches to metrics, measuring success: how do we change this?
- Experiential learning: how do we do this in a way that enriches the experience, but still being driven by our priorities and values

Table 2
- Having problem-driven research and make space for communities to define their needs, will work out better for communities and let students see them through
- Taking down barriers to interdisciplinarity; well-rounded students are very valuable for the community and society
- Incentives to participate in community engagement; expand the definition of what research is, how it's recognized by the University; integrated into reviews, research, teaching, etc.
- Having more representation of interdisciplinary researchers and bodies on Senate
- Charging Senate and BoG with the mission of community engagement; creating committees that must report, create a clear plan of action
- Critically defining what community engagement and innovation are; ensuring the definitions encapsulate grassroots work and matched by having space

Table 3
- Should act as a leading university, creating local impact, be vigilant about principles as a university
- Create critical thinkers among students
- Engaging students more, systematic outreach, design community projects, better visibility, supporting R&D in small business in QC and Canada
- Senators and Governors act as connectors, thinking about how policies reflect values, design an incentive system

Table 4
- A broader scope is needed when discussing innovation; need to redefine, example of SEDE, inspiring students to solve problems
- Need for structure for our actions, lack of central office for community-based research, need to connect opportunities
- Need for balance, see the community needs, not just publishing
- More recognition from upper administration to emphasize community engagement and impact
- Better engagement with community to see needs

Table 5
- Focus on innovation can lead to focus on short-term goals and results, which is not always advantageous for university
- Need for better communication; public needs to see the value of universities, we don't know what the public wants; poor communication between Faculties; top-down communication often fails
- Ideas to improve communication:
    - Do more to foster community ties, connecting professors to decision makers, help networking
    - Advertise smaller opportunities directly to students, rather than top-down approach, making small projects have maximum output
    - Better publicizing research at McGill, take research and publicize to the community, raising awareness; professors need assistance

Table 6
- Important aspect of definition of innovation: applied during a reasonable time scale
- Need to make students curious, building upon strong students, faculty, city
- Follow best practices and examples, e.g. Gates Foundation
- Take advantage of our international connections
- Tell our story, develop a narrative: internships, undergrads in research
- Change culture to be more interdisciplinary, getting outside silos
- Carry on message of what is happening and accomplished
- Promote money flowing toward pilot projects, debate about creativity or investment first
- Recognizing internships and practicum more effectively

Table 7
- Key to innovation is curiosity, serendipity
- Need to connect more with various groups
- Easier to stay with current structure, so we need to try and break down barriers and find new logistical means to do so
- Encourage unexpected connections and results
- Time is an asset: high-pressure environment, need to reduce barriers by providing time, chance encounters
- Research leave, not same as sabbatical, without time-sensitive aspect, lessening pressure
- Return on investment is knowledge, not always monetary
- Education public on how we benefit them
- Connect more dots than creating stand-alone projects
- Reduce barriers to innovation
    - Increase pride in institution and what we do

Table 8
- Innovation process was the focus:
  - People are innovative when they see problems, learn what communities are facing
  - Be more attuned to the local communities, dedicating our research to the communities and their needs
  - Example: courses use more real-world problems, vs. abstract lessons
- Incentives should be augmented, e.g. social rewards, incentives
- Encourage, support intrinsic motivators
- McGill can:
  - Connect innovators, creating spaces to come together
  - Better support for interdisciplinary research, classes, more collaboration between classes across disciplines, but around similar projects
  - Make interdisciplinary the first thought, rather than an afterthought
  - Expand the definition of innovation, role for humanities
  - Build on McGill's diversity, opportunities to innovate within
  - Create mini-semester, focusing on one project, serve as an incubation period
  - Innovation adapted into what we do already

Table 9
- Formal programs for research and innovation, especially for undergrads, some exist, but should be expanded = foster a culture of innovation
- More connection between innovation and the benefit to society, showcase the connection, better publicize, show that innovation is not only in sciences, but also arts and social sciences
- Bring the outside world to labs and libraries, create more and better interaction between McGill's human capital and external partners in society
- Example of Gatorade, royalties that flow back to the University of Florida
- McGill should look to develop specific products, requires more risk-taking; take more risks
- Raise public awareness around high-impact, far-reaching projects
- Build long-term relationships with external stakeholders
- Be the leader when we work with other universities; showcase our leadership, and being #1 in Quebec
- Senate and BoG can:
  - Push more organizational innovation, hard to make changes, reduce obstacles and be helpers; more flexible
  - More communication about Senate and BoG, social media
  - BoG members and Senators to be liaisons between faculty and the governing bodies, talk about what is important on the ground

Table 10
- Research should be led by the community; open our doors more, let community pose the questions and use our resources to answer these
- Non-lateral approaches to our system, new ways of being in the community
- Connect theoretical learning with practical experience; asking the right questions, leading to the next question

- Top community engagement actions:
  - Faculty more clearly communicate to the communicate, making research accessible and out in the community, tailored to audiences, more training
  - Open innovation, use models that allow students to work in incubators, at all levels (macro and micro), draw on the alumni network for opportunities
  - Tracking success: new ways of measuring our actions
- BoG and Senate
  - Avoid excess bureaucracy
  - Enable working across disciplines
  - Key performance indicators, revisiting and tracking; how to we measure impact on a broader scale

Common themes
- Engage more within our community
- Communicate better

Evaluation of the Annual Joint Board-Senate Meeting: November 4, 2014

Total number of attendees = 84
Number of surveys completed = 37

1.	**Please rate the following from 1 to 3 (1 indicating dissatisfaction and 3 indicating satisfaction):**

	Location	1= 1	2= 5	3= 31
	Time allotted	1= 3	2= 10	3= 24
	Panelists/Presenters	1= 5	2=18	3= 14

2.	**I found the meeting topic interesting and stimulating (1 indicating disagreement with the statement and 3 indicating strong agreement):**

	1= 3	2= 13	3= 21

3.	**I found the discussion informative and engaging (1 indicating disagreement with the statement and 3 indicating strong agreement):**

	1= 3	2= 19	3= 13 (*2 blanks)