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SECTION I

1. Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed Senators to the sixth Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 governance year.

She reminded Senators, guests and spectators that the use of electronic devices is permitted for viewing meeting documents, but that the Senate Rules of Procedure prohibit the recording of sound or images, and the communication or posting of Senate deliberations.

2. Memorial Tributes

There were none.

3. Report of the Steering Committee (15:16-06)

Senate received the Report of the Steering Committee (15-16:06).


Item 2. Speaking rights. Upon approval of the report, speaking rights were granted to the following individuals: Ms. Anne-Marie Durocher, Senior Planning Analyst, for item IIB1 (Open Discussion: “Employment Equity at McGill”); Professor Ghyslaine McClure, Associate Provost (Budget & Resources) for item IIB2 (Budget Planning 2016-17: Report II); Mr. Real Del Degan, Interim Director (Office of the Budget) for item IIB2 (Budget Planning 2016-17: Report II); Professor Dimitrios Berk, Ombudsperson for Students, for item IIB6 (Annual Report of the Ombudsperson for Students (2014-15); and Professor Jane Everett, Chair of the Advisory Council on the Charter of Students’ Rights, for item IIB7 (Annual Report on the Advisory Council on the Charter of Students’ Rights (2014-15).

Item 3. Senate Open Discussion (February 2016).

Item 4. Confidential Session.

Item 5. Approval of the Agenda.

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

4. Business Arising from Previous Senate Meetings

Senator Goldstein presented a follow-up to the December 2, 2015 open discussion on “Research Funding and Support”. She highlighted three key findings in the data. Firstly, the available data from the past decade show that the success rate for researchers from McGill increases gradually from early to mid-career and then from mid-career to established researchers for operating grants from CIHR and NSERC. Over the past three years, early-career researchers have achieved the highest success rates in SSHRC programs. Secondly, among NSERC programs, McGill
researchers consistently achieve a higher market share in partnership programs than in operating grants. For CIHR and SSHRC, researchers appear to garner a larger percentage of individual operating funding than partnership funding. Finally, there appears to be little difference in CIHR success rates when comparing McGill researchers based on campus to those based at its affiliated hospitals. McGill-based researchers generate, on average, more funding per award than the affiliates. In response to a question about why that is, Senator Goldstein responded that there was no analysis done with the old programs but going forward, an analysis will be done with the new programs.

Senator Robaire asked what measures will be taken to improve McGill’s performance with respect to CIHR grants. Senator Goldstein responded that action items are included in the report circulated prior to the meeting and that the University will continue to invest in resources to support researchers in preparing proposals. Senator Gehr asked about McGill’s research output (publications, students graduated, etc.) relative to the funding received. Senator Goldstein responded that the data is not yet available.

5. **Chair’s Remarks**

The Chair began her remarks by discussing government relations. She informed Senators that she met with the Minister of Finance, Carlos Leitão, to present the University’s priorities for the upcoming provincial budget. These priorities include attraction of talent, changes to the funding formula, investments in infrastructure, and a fund for entrepreneurship. She also noted that Minister Leitão hosted a pre-budget consultation town hall meeting at McGill on February 15, 2016, geared primarily towards students. This was the first time such an event was held by the provincial government on a university campus. The Chair mentioned that Pierre Moreau is the new Minister of Education, and Dominique Anglade is the new Minister of Economy, Science, and Innovation of Quebec. She noted that Minister Anglade was the former President and CEO of Montréal International and McGill has worked with her in the past on matters such as the attraction of talent to Montreal and the reform of university financing. The Chair then noted that it was a great honour that the United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, chose to speak at McGill last week as part of his three-day working visit to Ottawa and Montreal.

Regarding external relations, the Chair spoke about her participation as a guest of the Global University Leaders Forum (GULF) in the World Economic Forum in Davos. She noted that McGill was the only Canadian university represented in Davos. The topic of the forum this year was the Fourth Industrial Revolution. The Chair described her participation on three panels (Women and Science; A new Chapter for Canada; Global Science Outlook) as well as her speaking role in a private meeting with Prime Minister Trudeau, five of his Ministers and CEOs of top organizations in Canada. She also mentioned her participation in a private afternoon session with the university presidents.

The Chair concluded her remarks by giving highlights of the kudos circulated prior to the meeting. She congratulated Professor Vicky Kaspi on receiving the Gerhard Herzberg Canada Gold medal for Science and Engineering, which is the highest honour awarded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). She also congratulated Professor Elena Bennett on receiving an E.W.R Steacie Memorial Fellowship and doctoral candidate Yasser Gidi on winning NSERC’s Gilles Brassard Doctoral Prize for Interdisciplinary...
Research. The Chair then shared that McGill graduate Marc Tessier-Lavigne (BSc, ’80) was named President of Stanford University and, subsequently congratulated Chelsea Rus on winning the 2016 Wirth Vocal Prize. She noted that the prize is named after Montreal philanthropist Elizabeth Wirth, who made a significant donation to the Schulich School of Music in March 2015. Finally, the Chair shared that a team of McGill students won the Bank of Canada’s Governor’s Challenge.

The Chair then opened the floor to questions and comments. Senator Richard noted that over the past fourteen years, Quebec has had ten different ministers of education.

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question Regarding Course Outlines

Senators Kpeglo-Hennessy and Sobat submitted the following question:

Whereas for the majority of students, initial registration for an academic year falls in early April;¹

Whereas the Charter of Student Rights only requires that course outlines be made available to students within the first week of classes in each respective term;²

Whereas the McGill eCalendar contains short descriptions of course content, but not methods of evaluation;

Whereas for many reasons, such as variation in instructors, past course outlines (where available) may be inaccurate;

Whereas MyCourses opens access to course materials on the first day of classes and only to those registered or on the wait-list of a class;

Whereas even tentative course outlines would provide more information than is currently available to many students.

1. With the existing system of the eCalendar in place, could methods of course evaluation be added to course descriptions, given that this already occurs elsewhere at McGill?³

2. What other procedures and practices exist, centralized or decentralized, across the university regarding when syllabi must be completed or posted?

¹ https://www.mcgill.ca/students/courses/add/when
³ For example, on the Department of English website: https://www.mcgill.ca/english/undergrad/2015-16-undergraduate-courses/200-level-introductory-courses
3. Is the university willing to ask for tentative course outlines, subject to change, that include basic information such as a breakdown of assignments in order to facilitate student course registration?

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

1-The undergraduate portion of the eCalendar is finalized in late January – early February each year. Having course syllabi and methods of evaluation included in the eCalendar would prove difficult and also counterproductive in some instances. We expect professors to be at the forefront of research in their discipline and asking for definite course syllabi 9-12 months in advance of the start of the course would not allow most of them to include the most up to date research in their courses. Please also remember that some courses do not yet have instructors by the time the eCalendar goes into production. Further, some departments and Faculties already have very regulated assessment processes (Law, Dentistry, and Medicine, for example) which are usually known in advance by all concerned.

Professors often use the summer months to redesign their courses based on feedback from students, discussions with colleagues, and newly available pedagogic strategies and tools. Producing a course outline for the next year before the current year has concluded would significantly limit opportunity for revision based on feedback and new developments. It may also cause unintended confusion if the final syllabus distributed at the start of the course differs from the tentative one produced for the eCalendar.

2-McGill's rules and regulations state the following:
10.2 Every instructor shall provide students during the first week of lectures with a written course outline. This information should include, where appropriate: (a) A description of the topics to be considered in the course, (b) A list of required and recommended readings and other materials, (c) A description of the means of evaluation to be used in the course, (d) A statement regarding the right of every student to submit in English or in French written work that is to be graded (not applicable to courses in which acquiring proficiency in a language is one of the objectives). (e) The instructor’s office hours for students, office location and telephone number for office appointments. (http://www.mcgill.ca/secretariat/files/secretariat/charter-of-students-rights.pdf)

3- Departments are free to make course outlines available as soon as possible and some departments have adopted the practice of making them available to students ahead of the start of term, but ultimately I believe this remains a decision best made at the departmental level.

Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy commented that the preamble to the question indicates that even “tentative” course syllabi would be useful while the response focuses on “definite” course syllabi. Senator Dyens responded that having different versions of a syllabus may create confusion and that the definite version may differ considerably from the tentative version resulting in no added benefit to the students. Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy asked if there are best practices that exist across the University to identify barriers or decisions that come into play.
when deciding when to release course syllabi. Senator Dyens noted that the biggest barriers are getting the syllabi ready before the first week of classes and making them available to students. He noted that the practice at McGill is no different from most universities across North America.

Senator Brunot expressed the view that accessing syllabi earlier would allow students to choose courses that are compatible with their learning style. He wondered if there were any pilot projects that would allow students to choose their preferred mode of evaluation. Senator Dyens responded that while McGill does have a principle of universal design, there are limits that constrain greater variation in evaluation modes, such as the discipline in question and pressures from professional orders. He expressed the view that students should be exposed to different learning styles and pedagogy since they will be confronted with different styles when they are outside the university setting.

Senator Saroyan agreed that assessments should not drive learning. She added that professors need to consider the backgrounds of their students and recent innovations when preparing a syllabus and that cannot be done nine to twelve months in advance. Senator Chainani expressed the view that students should decide for themselves what is best for them and be able to make informed decisions when choosing courses. He noted that many professors have over one hundred students in their class. He therefore expressed that it would be difficult to see how syllabi can be tailored to the students in such a context.

Senator Sobat wondered whether departments can, at the very least, provide more detailed course descriptions. Senator Dyens responded that such a request should come directly from students and encouraged them to have this discussion with their respective departments and faculties.

2. **Question Regarding Post-Doctoral Fellows Teaching Opportunities at McGill**

Senators Noyhouzer, Toccalino and Milles submitted the following question:

The vast majority (81%) of Canadian Post-Doctoral Fellows (PDFs) survey respondents, when embarking on their fellowship, view an academic position as their primary career goal (CAPS/Mitacs, 2013\(^4\)). With approximately 40% of PhD graduates working in the post-secondary (PSE) sector (Conference Board of Canada, 2015\(^5\)), a postdoctoral fellowship should provide the experience and training necessary to facilitate an academic career.

Teaching is a fundamental aspect of an academic career. A number of McGill’s equivalent universities have structured teaching training programs and extensive teaching


opportunities for PDFs. At these institutions, PDFs play a valuable role in contributing to course development and teaching at undergraduate and graduate levels. The provision of teaching and training opportunities is vital not only for attracting the best post-doctoral candidates to McGill, but also for the personal development of the PDFs. Acquiring such an experience and skills will make PDFs more attractive in the workplace following the completion of their fellowship.

1. What teaching training programs and teaching opportunities are currently available to PDFs at departments across McGill?

2. Does McGill have any plans to develop a teaching training program and consistent teaching experiences for PDFs across McGill?

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

As written in the Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Commitments of Postdoctoral Scholars and Supervisors, postdoctoral training is an important stage in scholarly development and career advancement. The training is conducted under the supervision of a professor who is a member of McGill’s academic staff qualified in the discipline in which training is being provided and has the abilities to fulfill responsibilities as a supervisor of the research and mentor for career development. Postdoctoral trainees are expected to perform research (either in collaboration with the supervisor or independently under general supervision), to be able to write manuscripts and research proposals, and to present their research effectively, all at a competitive level. In addition to research skills, it is important that Postdocs achieve proficiency in other professional skills essential for embarking upon a successful career. Although responsibilities other than research, such as teaching, are usually minimal, such activities can be pursued in the context of the Postdoc’s personal training goals. The practice of engaging Postdocs varies from Faculty to Faculty.

The Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Commitments of Postdoctoral Scholars and Supervisors may be found at:

Regarding question number 1, McGill supports PDF teaching development by offering multiple opportunities for PDFs to develop skills relevant to teaching.

**Learning to Teach Day:** This one-day conference is led by McGill professors, TAs, and graduate students. Topics discussed include effective teaching and grading strategies in an interactive and engaging atmosphere. The conference aims to equip graduate students and postdocs with the tools and knowledge to help them maximize teaching potential and create a successful learning environment for students. In 2014 and 2015, a total of 58 postdoctoral fellows participated in Learning to Teach Day.
The Postdoctoral eBulletin (Archives): SKILLSETS creates a customized eBulletin sent twice monthly to all postdoctoral fellows that advertises and promotes upcoming teaching, skills, and career events. Here are a few examples:

1. Teaching what’s important: Educating students for today and tomorrow
2. Leading Effective Discussions Workshop
3. Teaching at a CEGEP
4. “Assessment: The Silent Killer of Learning” with Prof. Eric Mazur
5. Introduction to Course Design and Teaching Workshop

The Postdoctoral Research Day: Intended to recognize the contributions of postdoctoral fellows in the Montreal community, the event provides skills development opportunities such as networking, presentation skills, and communication. Postdoctoral fellows present short oral talks and poster presentations to an audience that includes professors, industry partners, and government agencies.

Graphos Peer Writing Groups and Workshops: Postdoctoral fellows can apply to convene and lead peer writing groups of graduate students. PDFs can also apply to develop and lead writing workshops for graduate students.

All of the above are opportunities for PDFs to enhance their skillset for teaching.

Regarding question number 2, currently there are no such plans in place but GPS welcomes suggestions for the development of a teacher training program and teaching opportunities for PDFs so long as any opportunity or requirement to participate is in line with the fellows’ appointments.

McGill is also exploring ways to support further skills development for PDFs. As written in the Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Commitments of Postdoctoral Scholars and Supervisors, Postdocs are responsible for creating an Individualized Training Program, meaning articulating their own career goals and particular objectives for the training period, including development of research and other professional skills.

In order to support and encourage Postdocs to articulate career goals and training objectives, McGill is currently promoting the development of IDPs (Individual development plans) for postdocs. An IDP supports postdocs in planning their professional goals and taking steps to attain their goals. IDPs are common practice in peer institutions in the United States, and mandatory for all NIH-funded postdocs. A commonly used tool for postdocs in STEM disciplines is MyIDP (http://myidp.sciencecareers.org/), an online tool developed by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). Similar tools are in development for social sciences and humanities.

The PDFs can outline in the IDP the complementary training they will need to meet the objectives set out for the training period and set themselves up to meet their career goals. As stated above, McGill provides a wealth of training opportunities that develop skills related to teaching.
Senator Noyhouzer noted that one of the duties of the supervisor is to “assist the Postdoc in developing an individual plan for career development over the course of the training period.” He stated that this includes finding teaching opportunities and since there are a limited number of teaching opportunities available, the supervisor cannot fulfill his or her duty in this regard. He noted that many of the available resources are theoretical and stated that there is no substitute for real-life experience. He shared that the PGSS conducted a survey indicating that almost 80% of postdocs are interested in teaching. However, the majority of postdocs are unable to teach or are unaware of any teaching opportunities. The findings also show that there is a need to inform departments/units on the opportunities available to postdocs or to create new opportunities. He noted that the PGSS and the Association of Postdoctoral Fellows (APF) are willing to collaborate with GPS to implement IDPs and find new teaching opportunities.

Senator Nalbantoglu responded that supervisors mostly provide postdocs with teaching opportunities on an ad hoc basis. For example, if a supervisor is teaching a course, he or she may invite the postdoc to give a lecture. However, in certain faculties such as the Faculty of Arts there are forty or fifty postdocs who teach as part of their training. She stated that these differences should be examined and kept in mind when developing the IDPs.

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

Open Session

1. Open Discussion – “Employment Equity at McGill” (D15-33)

Senator Richard started the discussion by commenting that maternity leaves and extended parental leaves have had negative effects on the salary growth of female academic staff. He was therefore pleased to read in the background documents (document D15-33, hereinafter referred to as the “Report”) that methods are being considered to address this matter. He asked whether the suggested initiatives apply to librarians. Senator Campbell responded in the affirmative. Senator Chainani commented that the Report lacks data on the proportion of ethnic and visible minorities in senior administration and in leadership positions in the different faculties. Senator Campbell responded that there is no such data at the moment. However, she explained that there is a working group on systemic discrimination conducting a survey of the experiences of tenure track and tenured professors and its report should be publicly available in March. Senator Smailes suggested obtaining statistics on individuals who identify in more than one category. Senator Campbell agreed that would be useful since the Report may be over-representing the diversity at McGill. She explained that while people can already self-identify in more than one group, a way to account for that when compiling the statistics is still required.

Senator Benrimoh shared that he read a newspaper article stating that female residents in the University’s affiliated hospitals are told not to get pregnant during their residency. Senator Campbell expressed the view that other channels would be more appropriate to address that issue since it concerns workplace dynamics, harassment, and potentially discrimination.

Certain Senators expressed the view that McGill’s Employment Equity Policy (the “Policy”) should be reviewed and that targets should be implemented. More specifically, Senator Farid
stated that the Policy seems vague compared to the ones of other universities and suggested that specific steps be included with respect to hiring members of certain designated groups.

Senator Zorychta explained that merit awards differ from year-to-year depending on, among other factors, the University’s budget. She mentioned that if a woman is on maternity leave during a year when the merit award is high, she will miss out on a substantial salary increase for the rest of her career. Senator Campbell agreed that this matter required attention but also noted that issues of salary disparity arising from leaves with gender implications may be addressed through anomaly and retention allocations.

Senator Sobat suggested that an implementation plan be included either in the Policy or as a separate document. He also suggested including equity efforts and initiatives that have been undertaken in the review process for deans, chairs and other senior administrators. He expressed concern over SEDE having to carry all the burden of implementation, and suggested dedicating a staff member in the academic personnel and human resources offices to this matter. Finally, he noted that the Policy mentions the possibility of allocating endowed or research chairs for designated candidates in certain fields. He shared that the University of Victoria added the world’s first chair in transgender studies, which is also chaired by a transgender person. Senator Campbell responded that the Report outlines several steps that are already in place and explained that demographic shifts take time. She expressed the view that SEDE is the appropriate office for taking the lead since it is under the office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). She stated that challenges related to equity measures in the recruitment process are more of an issue of awareness rather than policy. She noted that the Principal has agreed with the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) that equity-based training will be provided to advisory committees in the new academic year.

Senator Rourke noted that there has not been an increase in the representation of any of the designated groups in a meaningful way since the implementation of the Policy. She expressed the view that peer institutions are much further ahead than McGill in terms of the diversity of their academic staff. Senator Campbell responded that the right population groups must be compared when making comparisons. For example, other institutions may include contract staff and the full staff of their university while the Report only includes tenure track and tenured professors.

Senators asked about the diversity in the applicant pool and whether the University should target specific groups during the recruitment process. Senator Campbell noted that headhunting is reserved for positions at the senior administrative level but agreed that the University must be ensuring diversity of candidates in applicant pools. She explained that part of the training provided by SEDE relates to drafting and placing recruitment ads.

Senator Ritchie noted that certain universities gave salary increases to all female faculty to deal with a gender-based salary discrepancy. Senator Robaire added that over the years, many in-depth analyses have been performed and in every instance, an increase was given to female employees. Following the presentation of the “Administrative Response to the CASP Report on Academic Salary Differentials by Gender” (D08-70), a commitment was made to report on salary differentials every other year to prevent a gap. He asked whether the University has followed through with this process. Senator Campbell explained that the situation at McGill is
different than at other universities. She noted not being familiar with the commitment made by the former Provost but stated that it is useful to review salary differentials periodically. However, she expressed the view that there are bigger areas of concern, such as the strong disparity between men and women in terms of how often retention is allocated. Also, as can be seen in Chart 1 of Appendix B of the Report, men are two and a half times more present in the highest paying units (quartile #1). She reminded Senators that when chairs and deans identify anomalies, the anomaly allocation should be used.

[*Secretary’s Note: The University has been providing Senators regular updates on salary differentials. Former Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity) Lydia White presented this data in the “Update on Academic Salary Differentials by Gender” (D12-72) at the May 15, 2013 Senate meeting and in the “Report on Employment Equity” (D14-58) at the May 12, 2015 Senate meeting.]

Senator Brunot noted that the vast majority of the upper administration is white Canadian. He asked if there is a desire to diversify the management team. Senator Campbell reiterated that equity education would be offered next year to all advisory committees for senior administrative appointments at the University. In response to Senator Farid’s question regarding equity education, Senator Campbell responded that she will be working with SEDE to provide training similar to what is currently provided. She noted that SEDE has been providing unit specific training for a while upon request. She also noted the abundance of academic literature on the topic.

Senator Bader suggested that the hiring process should include a follow-up with applicants who are not retained. Senator Chainani expressed the view that such a measure would reduce systemic discrimination. Senator Campbell responded that following-up with applicants is more of a human resources issue and an issue of time given the volume of applications received. She added that a candidate who is not selected for a position already has the right to ask for feedback.

Senator Zorychta suggested improving the mentoring system for new faculty. She stated that new faculty would benefit from having two mentors: one in their field of study and another with a similar background.

Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy noted that the population of indigenous people at McGill is quite low. He asked whether this matter is a priority for the University, especially considering the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s final report and the geographical location of McGill. Senator Campbell responded that the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) has already indicated that this is a priority.

Senator Sobat suggested that a follow-up to this open discussion be presented to Senators by the end of the year, focusing on the long-term implementation strategy, the benchmarks and goals to improve the diversity of the University community, retention and support.

The Chair thanked Senators for their comments and suggestions. She also thanked the Open Discussion Working Group noting that it did a great job in presenting the relevant data and providing a useful path forward.

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate’s information. Regarding the FY2016 results, he highlighted that the University is within 1% of the total budget approved by the Board of Governors. He noted that there have been some key positive variances since the presentation was prepared (for example, a sale of land) and some negative variances (for example, additional pay equity costs and unanticipated pension contributions associated with the voluntary retirement program). Regarding FY2017, the University is still operating with limited information. He noted that there are higher than anticipated costs for deferred maintenance. He explained that the University had planned to borrow $400 million in four equal tranches of $100 million. However, the first tranche was quite successful which raised the interest costs. He added that capital repayments may start a year later than projected leading to savings in FY2019.

Senator Manfredi concluded his presentation by touching on certain key commitments. He noted that salary policy commitments beyond FY2017 are yet to be finalized for some large groups within the University. He mentioned that a slowdown of academic renewal will generate some savings in the overall budget. With respect to administrative and support staff, he stated that no extraordinary measures are anticipated in the short to medium term. He also noted that this year, the overall replacement rate was one to one and that it is being managed by salary mass rather than head count. Lastly, he noted that faculty carry-forwards are still a challenge to be addressed.

Senator Mills noted that the Quebec student union made a statement regarding a 25% increase on the international student tuition. He asked whether this information is accurate. Senator Manfredi explained that there were some discussions at the deputy ministerial and the rector level about raising the prime charged by universities on the international student tuition from 10% to 25%. However, to his knowledge, this approach is currently no longer being considered.

In response to Senator Robaire’s question on where McGill’s deficit lies with respect to other universities, Senator Manfredi noted that McGill is in the middle of the range.

Senator Galaty asked about the sale of land. He expressed the view that selling assets is generally not a sound financial decision. Senator Manfredi confirmed that the University does not intend to sell property in order to respond to financial challenges. Senator Di Grappa responded that McGill sold the Redpath properties but further explained that the condominiums on the property were built pursuant to an emphyteutic lease. The owners of the condominiums were having difficulty selling their units because McGill owned the rights to the land. They therefore approached the University with an offer to purchase it. After a thorough analysis, the University decided it was in its best interest to accept the offer. Senator Manfredi noted that the funds will go towards a special project in sustainability sciences.

Senator Sobat asked about the increase in enrolment-driven revenues. Mr. Del Degan responded that is due to a slight increase in enrolment and the fact that tuition is expected to grow by $24 net to the University next year. Senator Sobat then asked if a breakdown of the ancillary fees (FIOs) are included in the Budget Book, and how much revenue is generated from each of them. Mr. Del Degan responded that FIOs are included in the Budget Book and noted that they increase at the same rate as tuition, unless students vote for a greater increase. However, they
represent an exhaustive list of over a hundred different fees. Therefore the breakdown is not included but it is available at Financial Services.

Senator Brunot asked about the goods and services are sold by the University. As examples, Senator Manfredi mentioned residences, food services, non-credit courses and special training programs.


Senator Manfredi introduced this report, which contained three items for Senate’s consideration.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed Ph.D. in Family Medicine and Primary Care.*

Senator Manfredi then moved to approve the proposed grading scheme for professional development certificates, which was duly seconded. Senator Chainani wondered why there is no C grade and why the pass grade was set at 65%. Senator Potter responded that the grading scheme mirrors the proposal for the professional grading scheme approved by Senate last year. She explained that the programs covered by this grading scheme are high-level mastery programs and therefore require a higher pass grade.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the proposed Grading Scheme for Professional Development Certificates.*

Senator Manfredi then moved to approve the creation of a School of Public Policy within the Faculty of Arts, which was duly seconded. Senator Moore expressed concern that the proposed School is confined too tightly to the Faculty of Arts and that there are no opportunities for students to acquire knowledge of public policy issues within their own programs. Senator Galaty echoed the concerns that the School does not have linkages to other units at McGill relating to policy issues and wondered what impact it would have on recruitment of academic staff. Senator Farid suggested that the School reach out to the Institute for Health and Social Policy. Senator Manfredi responded that although it is being placed in a single faculty, the School of Public Policy is designed to be a multi-faculty and multi-disciplinary school. It is anticipated that, once established, the School will develop over time. Senator Meadwell explained that the appointments would be joint appointments with the School and other units and new hires would be able to teach at the undergraduate and PhD levels. Senator Moore proposed a friendly amendment to the motion submitted by the Faculty of Arts and the Academic Policy Committee to ensure that the School of Public Policy will work with units and departments inside and outside the Faculty of Arts. Senator Manfredi noted that this amendment was unnecessary since this has always been the understanding and will be the intent going forward. The amendment was therefore withdrawn.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved, and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval, the creation of the School of Public Policy within the Faculty of Arts.*
4. **Report of the Senate Nominating Committee**  
(D15-36)

Senator Manfredi presented this report for Senate’s consideration. He explained that it contained recommendations to fill vacancies on Senate Standing Committees and Committees arising out of University Regulations. In addition to the recommendations contained in the report, Senator Manfredi asked Senate to approve the appointment of Professor Phillip Servio (Engineering) to the University Tenure Committee Senate List, for a three-year term beginning May 1, 2016 and ending April 30, 2019.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendation contained within the Senate Nominating report (D15-36), as amended.*

5. **Proposed Revision to the Regulations Concerning Sabbatic Leaves for Tenure Track and Tenured Academic Staff**  
(D15-37)

Senator Campbell presented this report for Senate’s consideration. She explained that it contains an amendment to section 2.2.1. The Regulations currently provide that a professor who is recruited laterally and has spent at least two years in an academic tenure track position may count those years towards a sabbatical. However, some members of the academic staff join McGill after holding positions elsewhere that, while not formally in the tenure stream, substantively mirror tenure track posts. The revised Regulations would allow these “equivalent positions” to count as credited service as well.

*On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved, and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval, the proposed change to the Regulations on Sabbatic Leaves for Tenure Track and Tenured Academic Staff as detailed in Appendix A of D15-37.*

(D15-38)

Professor Berk, the Ombudsperson for Students, presented this report for Senate’s information. He highlighted that the report shows a decline in the total number of requests for assistance, especially relating to academic issues. However, he noted that requests relating to inter-personal issues have remained constant.

In response to Senator Brunot’s question on whether certain issues are more prone to intervention than others, Professor Berk responded that there does not seem to be a difference.

Senator Benrimoh noted that many students are unaware of the existence and the role of the Office of the Ombudsperson and expressed an interest in promoting it. He wondered if the Office would be able to handle an increased workload. Professor Berk responded that it would depend on the increase. Senator Chen asked whether visibility is a concern. Professor Berk expressed the hope that the decrease in requests is not due to a lack of visibility and noted that he tries to improve visibility as much as possible, for example by meeting with student associations and through the Office’s website.
Senator Kpeglo-Hennessy asked whether the Ombudsperson has identified any key issues or would recommend systemic change. Professor Berk responded that he is new in this position. However, he noted that many issues relate to the relationship between supervisors and students and explained that GPS is taking measures to deal with them. Senator Smailes asked if students can approach the Office with suggestions of systemic change. Professor Berk responded in the affirmative.


Professor Everett presented this report for Senate’s information. She explained that since no issues were referred to the Advisory Council in the 2014-15 academic year, it did not convene. However, she has met with students and directed them to more appropriate channels since their issues were more properly treated through the grievance process, Student Affairs or the Dean of Students.

8. Other Business

Senator Rourke announced that SSMU is hosting a Mental Health Forum on March 11, 2016, at 4 p.m. and that all members of the McGill community are invited to participate. Senator Benrimoh then informed Senators of the articles in The McGill Tribune regarding smoking on campus and noted that there will be a report on CJAD. He encouraged all members of the McGill community to send SSMU their feedback on this matter.

Confidential Session

9. Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D15-40)

Senate moved into confidential session to review the Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (this minute is approved by the Senate Steering Committee and is not published or circulated, but is attached to the permanent minutes of Senate as Appendix A).

There being no other business to deal with, on a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

END
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