



Minutes

Tuesday, May 12, 2015 14-15:08

Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on Tuesday, May 12, 2015 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232, Leacock Building)

PRESENT

Algieri, Stefano
 Ayukawa, Courtney
 Arezki, Amine
 Bader, Darine
 Benrimoh, David
 Bresler, Yony
 Coderre, Terence
 Cooke, Rosemary
 Corkery, Christopher
 Costopoulos, Andre
 Covo, David
 Di Grappa, Michael
 Di Paola, Antonia
 Doucette, Elaine
 Dudek, Gregory
 Dyens, Ollivier
 Eidelman, David
 Elstein, Eleanore
 Fortier, Suzanne
 Galaty, John
 Gehring, Kalle
 Gold, Richard
 Grant, Martin

Gyakum, John
 Harman, Christopher
 Harpp, David
 Hastings, Kenneth
 Heath, Nancy
 Hébert, Terence
 Hill, Reghan
 Hooton, Brett
 Hurtubise, Jacques
 Ibrahim, Kareem
 Ismail, Ashraf
 Kalil, Alex
 Kamen, Amine
 Kreiswirth, Martin
 Lane-Mercier, Gillian
 Lu, Catherine
 Madramootoo, Chandra
 Marcil, Olivier
 Martel, Michel
 Massey, Kathleen
 Masi, Anthony
 McCulloch, Mary Jo
 Meighen, Michael A.
 Moore, Timothy

Murray, Jennifer
 Nicell, Jim
 Oxhorn, Philip
 Panda, Ram
 Potter, Judith
 Rassier, Dilson
 Richard, Marc
 Riches, Caroline
 Rourke, Chloe
 Saroyan, Alenoush
 Scebba, Maximillion
 Snider, Laurie
 Snyder, Dan
 Stewart-Kanigan, Claire
 Stromvik, Martina
 Strople, Stephen
 (*Secretary*)
 Thordardottir, Elin
 Waters, Natalie
 Weinstein, Marc
 White, Lydia
 Yalovsky, Morty
 Zhang, Ji
 Zorychta, Edith

REGRETS:, Paul Allison, Graham Bell, Daniel Bernard, Mindy Carter, Paul Gordon Crelinsten, Stuart Cobbett, Colleen Cook, Masad Damha, Marie-Josée Dumont, Jim Engle-Warnick, Sean Ferguson, Rebecca Fuhrer, Nabeel Godil, Rose Goldstein, Garth Green, Jacob Greenspon, Morgan Grobin, Peter Grütter, Ian Henderson, Natalie Hiles, Daniel Jutras, Sarah Kimmins, Maya Kucij, Ruth Kuzaitis, Lucyna Lach, David Lametti, Alfonso Mucci, Alexandru Munteanu, Derek Nystrom, Trevor Ponech, Cynthia Price, Saibal Ray, Bernard Robaire, Marina Ulemek, Rui Hao (Leo) Wang, Laura Winer, Yuanhang Yang, Stephen Yue.

SECTION I

1. Welcoming Remarks

The Chair began by welcoming Senators to the ninth and final Senate meeting of the 2014-2015 governance year. The Chair thanked Senator Manfredi for acting as Chair for the eighth meeting of the Senate. The Chair also noted that the Senate agenda ought to include an item for business arising from the previous meeting of the Senate.

2. Report of the Steering Committee

(14:15-09)

Senate received the Report of the Steering Committee (14-15:09).

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate (meeting of April 22, 2015)

Senator Stewart-Kanigan requested that two minor amendments be made to the minutes of the eighth meeting of the Senate. The amendments have been made and incorporated in the April 22nd meeting minutes.

Item 2. Approval of Agenda

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

3. Business Arising

Senator Lu inquired about procedures in place to monitor and uphold commitments to provide follow-up information made during meetings of the Senate. The Secretary-General said that Secretariat would assume an enhanced role to ensure that such undertakings are respected.

Senator Lu asked the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning), Senator Dyens, whether he had information regarding the average wait-times for students seeking services offered by Mental Health Services and the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD). Senator Dyens responded that as of March 9th, 2015, there were ninety students awaiting their initial assessment appointment with Mental Health Services. These students experienced, on average, a wait-time of approximately three weeks. Twenty-five students, following an initial assessment appointment which recommended psychiatric follow-up, were waiting an average of three weeks for an appointment with a psychiatrist. As of April, 28th, 2015, there were 223 students who, following an initial assessment appointment which recommended psychological follow-up, were waiting an average of five months to see a psychologist. Finally, for Counselling services, there is currently a three week wait-time for appointments with therapists.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began her remarks by addressing the recent tragic earthquake in Nepal, and noted that McGill has measures and procedures in place to provide services and support to members of the community affected by disaster. After the earthquake in Nepal, the Office of the Dean of Students reached out to McGill's nine Nepalese students to remind them of the services available. Several of those students have come together to organize support for people in Nepal as well as members of the McGill community. The Chair praised these students' initiative.

The Chair went on to discuss Government relations, specifically, two recent meetings with Provincial Ministers. First, while meeting with Minister of Finance, Carlos Leitão, the Chair discussed matters of interest to McGill and, more broadly, to higher education in Quebec. The Minister was told that the province must move towards a vision of higher education that is better aligned with the global environment in which it now exists, and that the provincial funding formula must equip McGill to operate in that context. Emphasis was placed on the key role that McGill could play in promoting Government priorities of economic development and innovation. The Chair noted that these messages were well received by the Minister.

Second, Vice-Principal (Communications and External Relations), Olivier Marcil, represented McGill at a meeting with François Blais, the new Minister of Education, Higher Education and Research. The Minister, meeting for the first time with all Rectors, Presidents and Principals from Quebec universities, outlined his vision for higher education, as well as his views on university governance and research. The Minister expressed his awareness of the need to change the provincial funding formula and called on the universities to work with the Ministry to develop a proposal to which all could agree. Minister Blais also confirmed that cuts to university funding would amount to \$73 million in 2015-16, which will result in an estimated \$11 million in cuts to McGill. The Chair noted that these cuts were anticipated in the FY2016 budget.

The Chair then moved to the efforts of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and the U15 to prepare for the forthcoming fall Federal election, which would result in significant turnover regardless of the outcome. AUCC and U15 will continue to work with all national parties on matters of interest to the University sector.

The Chair then discussed a breakfast event to be held May 14th on Parliament Hill, organized by CIHR and McGill and hosted by the Minister of Health, Rona Ambrose, in recognition of contributions to health research made by McGill researchers. McGill researchers received more major international scientific awards than any other Canadian university in 2014, including: Profs. Nahum Sonenberg (Wolf Prize), Alan Evans (Margolese National Brain Disorders Prize), Brenda Milner (Kavli Prize and the Dan David Prize) and Brigitte Kieffer (L'Oreal-UNESCO for Women in Science Award). The Chair said that the event would provide an opportunity to showcase these achievements and to highlight the importance of investment in research.

The Chair then invited Senators to visit "The Principal's Priorities" website (<https://www.mcgill.ca/principal/five-priorities>) for updates on actions taken in pursuit of McGill's five priorities. The Chair went on to discuss how the priorities have been embraced by the student population and highlighted four student-led initiatives: One regarding the mobilization of students to help operate free health clinics in developing countries; the Solar Backpack project, which enables children in rural Kenya to study at night by leveraging solar energy; "My Vision", which helps students around the world launch social business initiatives; and finally, "The Centre

Magnétique Project”, which aims to help rejuvenate and rebuild businesses in downtown Lac-Mégantic. The Chair expressed her pride and pleasure at seeing the vision, energy and thoughtfulness demonstrated by McGill students in these initiatives.

The Chair moved to kudos, beginning with Chancellor Meighen, who received the Top Salmon Conservation Award for his commitment to the conservation, restoration and protection of wild Atlantic salmon. Nahum Sonenberg, James McGill Professor in the Department of Biochemistry and a member of the Goodman Cancer Research Centre, was elected by his peers to the US based National Academy of Sciences (NAS) as a foreign associate for his outstanding contribution to research. Six McGill students, Marc Chelala (Engineering), Dayna Goldman (Education), Nazanin Hojjati (Dentistry), Anne Iavarone-Turcotte (Law), David Peretz-Larochelle (Education / Music), and Frédéric Rivard (Agriculture and Environmental Sciences) received the Lieutenant Governor of Québec Award for having distinguished themselves both in their academic studies and in extracurricular activities that make positive change in their communities. Three McGillians were honoured by YWCA as Women of Distinction: Professor Susan J. Bartlett (Faculty of Medicine) in the Education category, Martha de Francisco (Schulich School of Music) for Arts and Culture, and Brigitte Vachon (Department of Physics) in Science and Technology. McGill graduate and president of Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), Johanne Liu, was named one of TIME Magazine’s 100 Most Influential People for her leadership during the Ebola epidemic. Finally, the Chair noted that McGill achieved the highest rate of growth in the sector during this year’s Centraide campaign and that as a result, McGill would be recognized as a “Top Achiever” in next year’s campaign. The Chair congratulated the leaders of McGill’s campaign, Senators Daniel Jutras, Rosie Goldstein and Courtney Ayukawa, for having set and surpassed such lofty goals.

Finally, this being the final meeting of Senate for the academic year, the Chair thanked all Senators for their service and commitment to academic governance, and acknowledged those who were completing their term in Senate and encouraged them to consider a further term in the future.

The Chair then ceded the floor to the Provost, Senator Masi, who introduced McGill’s two newest Deans. First, Isabelle Bajoux-Besnain who, after a two-year search, was named Dean of the Desautels Faculty of Management. Dr. Bajoux-Besnain, currently a Professor of Finance and an Associate Dean at George Washington University, will begin her term as Dean in September 2015. Second, Anja Geitmann was named Dean of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. A Professor in the Department of Biological Sciences at the Université de Montréal and head of the Plant Biology Institute, Dr. Geitmann will commence duties as Dean this September.

SECTION II

Part "A" – Questions and Motions by Members

1. Question Regarding McGill's Response to the Federal Budget

Senators Hébert and Bernard submitted the following question:

After the Federal Budget was announced on April 21st, 2015, McGill University publicly expressed gratitude for funding earmarked for the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and other industry-focused grant programs. Little comment was made about the flattening of Tri-Council funding (CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC) for basic research. While polite and politically expedient, such responses create the impression that the University views research funding as a zero-sum game. That is, as long as funds come to the University, it does not matter for what they are intended. Given McGill's academic mission as a leading research university and its commitment to academic freedom, we would pose the following questions.

1. How can McGill professors (especially new hires and junior faculty) expect to develop or advance their research programs when funding for investigator-driven research continues to decline?
2. Does McGill plan to alter its tenure and promotion criteria accordingly? If so, how?
3. Can McGill do more to convince the Federal government that funneling money away from investigator-initiated grants toward industry-partnered initiatives is an open assault on both innovation and academic freedom?

Provost Masi responded the written response was not ready for circulation before the meeting of Senate. The Provost's answer was subsequently posted on the Secretariat website and is reproduced in these minutes:

I thank the Senators for their questions, minus some of the editorial comments.

The pillars of strong research support are: peer-reviewed grants, indirect cost recoveries, infrastructure support, graduate student and post-doctoral fellowship funding, and some monies for strategic initiatives and/or fleeting opportunities. Not all of these can be addressed in every budget, so we expect trade-offs and cycles in fiscal announcements coming from governments.

Now I will turn to your questions.

Let me start with the third one. McGill is an active participant at various tables and committees of the AUCC and the U15 in developing position papers, policy suggestions, and memoranda on federal budgets that support the research enterprise at Canadian institutions of higher learning. We advocate for research excellence at these tables, not the university's bottom line.

McGill is very active in bringing the case forward, but not always successful in getting what has been requested. We have always taken the opportunity to emphasize the importance of research funding through the federal granting councils.

In the university's August 2014 submission to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance, we explicitly addressed the importance of discovery research, noting that "Canada's three federal granting agencies – the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) – as well as funding organizations such as Genome Canada and Network of Centres of Excellence (NCE), provide the funding crucial to supporting Canadian research. The importance of discovery research cannot be overestimated – it is the cornerstone of innovation" (p. 2).

Furthermore, ASAP 2012-2017 (ASAP) and the associated Strategic Research Plan (SRP) express McGill's core commitments to ideas, innovation, sustainability, collaboration and partnership, and social engagement in research. Such activities require funding from a variety of sources, notably the federal Granting Councils and CFI.

Once again, we have and do make collective and individual representations when things go in directions that are not helpful to advancing the creation and dissemination of new knowledge.

With regard to the first question, we have not seen a decline in tenure dossiers reporting success at the tri-council level, or a decline in establishing funding levels that would prevent our younger professors from being on track to tenure. We have been working to ensure that the young professors that we recruit to McGill are among the very best in the world. McGill hires professors who are extremely competitive and who generally do much better than the average in national competitions for research funding.

At the same time, we have seen increases in funding from non-governmental sources, including targeted-philanthropy for specific research endeavours. Such diversification away from single source dependence for funding is important for the stability of funding for researchers, but often does not have adequate support for indirect cost recoveries thus putting pressure on the University while protecting the freedom of academic inquiry.

I should also point out that the research councils' recent emphasis on team-based and partnership-driven research is not necessarily a bad thing. Partnerships do not necessarily have to be forged with corporate entities to meet Council expectations. Nor does the research have to be market-driven, or profit-oriented – though the implication that such a thing would be a betrayal of 'true' scholarship is itself an oversimplification. Indeed, McGill is home to several large, successful, federally-funded partnership projects that include community organizations, arts groups, and other not-for-profit entities among their 'partners'. The point is not to sell-out scholarship, but to find opportunities to do scholarship on different platforms, with different people, for different audiences, and to different ends. It can be healthy for us as an institution, a body of scholars, and representatives of long scholarly traditions to work outside our own sandbox from time to time.

On the second question, we regularly and carefully study McGill's tenure and promotion criteria as described in the Regulations. The three academic duties – research and scholarship, teaching and supervision, and service and other contributions – allow for significant inputs at multiple levels. None of these requires monolithic performance indicators. True enough, research funding continues to be important, but it is not the exclusive input into the first element in tenure decisions – outputs are generally weighted much more than inputs in that process.

McGill's professors, at all career stages, have shown remarkable resilience and persistence in the face of stiff competition for federal research dollars, and on a per capita basis we remain one of the top three to five universities in the country in grant applications, grants won, and dollars awarded at all three federal research councils. We look even better when standardized for size.

So, we continue to monitor recruitment, reappointment, and tenure dossiers in light of shifting funding, but we have not yet seen the need to modify McGill's regulations or guidelines regarding tenure.

As I undertake my review of tenure files, this year, however, I will be particularly attentive to these matters in light of the issues raised in these questions.

In the subsequent discussion Senator Hébert thanked the Provost for his response, but expressed concern that McGill's strategy is not forward thinking enough given changes to the CIHR application process and the current talk of fusing the Tri-Council agencies into a single entity, both of which may irrevocably alter the nature of Tri-Council funding. Senator Hébert noted his dismay that complaints from the academic community regarding changes to Tri-Council funding models have been ignored both by agency managers and by the Federal government and expressed concern that McGill might itself follow this trend of bottom-line expediency to the detriment of investigator-driven research. The Provost responded by saying that his prepared response would have been different if the question had included the concerns about the organizational structure of the Tri-Council agencies. The Provost noted, however, that McGill does take positions and make representations regarding these structural concerns and that those positions are determined by what is in the best interest of scholarship and research, not the University's bottom line. He noted that these priorities are manifest in that McGill pursues opportunities that carry with them financial costs, such as CFI and Canada Excellence Research Chairs competitions. The Provost added that the implications of changes to CIHR procedures and the potential melding of the Tri-Council Agency remain to be seen, and that those implications and McGill's position relative to them will be studied in due course.

Senator Lu expressed concern about the trend toward targeted funding at the expense of investigator-driven research. Senator Lu would like to see a more robust discussion regarding the representations of the University in these matters and wondered if McGill's disappointment with these trends should be more pointedly expressed. The Chair said that McGill has always made the case for investigator-driven and discovery oriented research. The Chair noted that while it is true that money is not flowing to individual projects, the vast majority of funds go towards basic research. The Chair said that when it comes to targeted research, McGill has pushed for broad targets, and that, in fact, most of the existing categories are quite general. Nevertheless, the Chair stressed that McGill is always making the case for more funding for individual researchers.

Senator Hébert reiterated that CFI funds are not really aimed at basic research and that funding for investigator-driven research is at best flat-lining. He also endorsed Senator Lu's call for an open discussion regarding McGill's strategy. The Chair expressed regret that a scheduled announcement by CFI which was to take place at McGill was cancelled, but assured Senators that they would be pleased with the investment made in discovery research. It was suggested that this could be a topic for an open discussion next year.

Senator Ismail commented that he doesn't share the view that government funding is necessarily good and business partnerships are necessarily bad.

Senator Benimroh, noting that research funding priorities are essentially a political decision and that we are in an election year, asked whether McGill has pre and post-election strategies on how to lobby for change. The Chair said that the AUCC and the U15 are working with universities across Canada, including McGill, and are talking to all the national parties about research funding policies.

2. Question Regarding Access to Student Services for Continuing Studies Students

Senator Arezki submitted the following question:

Whereas the University receive a grant for Student Services, on a count of the Full Time Equivalency, which include Continuing Studies Students.

Whereas student on Continuing Studies taking 3 and 6 credits per semester are excluded from opting in on Student Services.

Whereas Student Services include essential services like Mental Health and Counselling Services.

What is the proportion of the government grant for Student Services that come from the Full Time Student Equivalency count of Continuing Studies students? What is the justification that we don't offer any student services to continuing studies students taking 3 and 6 credits per semester if a grant is received for that purpose?

Senator Dyens read the following written response, which, while it was not circulated prior to the meeting of Senate, was subsequently provided to Secretariat and posted on the web:

Thank-you very much for the question.

Question 1:

Over the past five years the proportion of Full Time Equivalency students in the School of Continuing Studies at McGill has been stable at about 5.5%. Given these numbers, in fiscal year 2015, the proportion of the government grant for Student Services that come from the Full Time Student Equivalency students in the School of Continuing Studies is \$133,000 of a total \$2.4 million. Please note that since these amounts are calculated on the basis of FTEs and that FTEs are credit-based, any students/programs/courses that are non-credit (i.e. either zero credits or CEU-based) do not generate FTEs and therefore do not generate any funding from the MEESR.

Question 2:

It is understandable that students in the School of Continuing Studies, who bring grant moneys for student services to McGill, would want access to those student services. Please note however that we are currently reviewing our ability to offer differential fees for all part time students given that any fee paying student, full or part time, can access the services at a full time rate. Therefore, I am committing to working with students from the School of Continuing Studies to determine if they would like to run a referendum to pay the mandatory student services fees. Should those students indicate that they would like to pay the full time student service fees, all eligible students would then pay for the full suite of services. We, unfortunately, are not able to provide part time services.

Senator Arezki expressed his satisfaction with the answer provided and thanked Senator Dyens for his sensitivity and responsiveness in addressing this issue. He also took the opportunity to express his thanks to Senator White for her leadership during the revision of McGill's Mission Statement.

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

Open Session

1. 465th Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D14-56)

Senator Masi introduced this report for Senate's consideration. He explained that the APC reviewed and recommended that Senate approve the creation of Graduate Interfaculty Studies (GIFS) as a graduate interfaculty organizational and reporting structure. The Provost explained further that this is not a proposal to create a new unit but rather a request to approve a change in the University's information systems for recording and record keeping purposes. The change is technical in nature and will allow students in the new interfaculty M.Eng and Ph.D in Biological and Biomedical Engineering graduate programs (BBME) to be properly documented in the student records system and to record the activities of the programs so that they accurately reflect the interdisciplinary and interfaculty organizational structure.

In the subsequent discussion, Senator Richard sought clarification regarding the attached appendix and asked whether a disclaimer could be inserted stating that this change is being made purely for record-keeping purposes. Senator Hébert suggested that the wording in the appendix be changed from "but it is a Faculty only for the purpose of recording and record keeping" to "but it takes the form of a Faculty only for the purpose of recording and record keeping". The Provost accepted both suggestions as amendments.

Senator Costopoulos noted that there is a precedent for this type of solution, namely, the Bachelor of Arts and Science program, where it has worked well. The Provost noted that the structure created by this motion could be used by other interfaculty graduate programs without requiring further Senate approval.

Senator Hastings asked whether Senate was making an academic decision that is driven by a purely technical issue. The Provost clarified that this is a technical decision that arises as a consequence of the academic decision made by Senate to create the BBME.

Senator Galaty asked if there are any other programs analogous to BBME and, if so, how they functioned without the structural change proposed in this motion. The Provost answered that the analogous program (Integrated Program in Neuroscience) has been set up in the information system as its own distinct unit rather than as an interfaculty entity. That program could, once GIFS is created, opt to make use of it for improved recording and record keeping.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the creation of organizational units to support the interfaculty Biological and Biomedical Engineering Graduate programs.

Senators were also informed of courses and teaching programs which APC approved. Senator Saroyan asked for clarification concerning the creation of the M.Sc.; Family Medicine; Medical Education program within the Faculty of Medicine. Senator Saroyan, who is the Program Director for a similar program wondered why more consultation had not taken place in order to ensure that resources are not unnecessarily allocated to duplicate programs. Senator Eidelman invited Senator Saroyan to discuss the matter.

2. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee (D14-57)

Senator Masi presented this report for approval. He explained that it contained recommendations to fill vacancies on the Senate Standing Committees and Committees arising out of University Regulations. In addition to the individuals included in the recommendations contained in the report, the Provost asked Senate to approve additional names, which were obtained earlier that day. He proposed the following additions for one-year terms:

- Chloe Rourke, Nancy Zhang, and Erin Sobat to the Academic Policy Committee;
- Evan Vassallo to the Committee on Libraries;
- Marina Smailes to the Senate Committee on Physical Development;
- Alex Kpeglo-Hennessy to the Advisory Council on the Charter of Students' Rights;
- Benjamin Brunot to the Appeal Committee for Student Discipline and Grievances;
- Allen Chen to the Committee on Student Discipline;
- Alex Kpeglo-Hennessy and Benjamin Brunot to the Committee on Student Grievances.

Senator Stewart-Kanigan expressed thanks to the Provost for accepting the last-minute nominations. Senator McCullough pointed out that Wes Cross had retired and should no longer be listed as a member of the Student Services Committee. Senator Ayukawa asked for the rationale behind the absence of a SSMU or undergraduate student representative on the Committee on the Rights of Senate. The Provost noted that these nominations are to fill existing or upcoming vacancies and that no changes to the composition or the terms of reference were considered.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate approved the recommendations contained within the Senate Nominating report (D14-57).

3. Report on Employment Equity (D14-58)

Senator White provided a report on Employment Equity as required by McGill's Employment Equity Policy. Senator White called attention to some of the data in the report: table one showed

that the proportion of male to female staff has remained relatively stable since 2008 with the exception of Contract Academic Staff, Associate Professors; Table two contained data drawn from voluntary self-reporting (with a response rate of 80%) which showed that there has been no significant change in the percentage of employees self-identifying as a member of a designated group.

The data on recruitment of tenure-stream professors shown in tables three and four are drawn from optional self-reports collected and reported by departmental administrators. Senator White noted that the intention is to create an online survey which will alleviate the administrative workload within departments and hopefully improve the quality of the data by increasing the response rate which is currently below 60%. Senator White noted that while current data only accounts for applicants and people to whom a position was offered, updates to the survey will also provide data for shortlisted candidates.

Senator White highlighted that table five showed that females are not winning awards at the rate that would be expected. Senator White expressed concern at the disparity between tables six and seven which showed that salaries for female professors are consistently lower than for men despite the fact that females receive consistently higher merit ratings. Finally, table eight showed the gender disparity in the mean number of years it takes to progress from the rank of Associate to Full Professor.

Senator White then noted that statistics are only available from statutory selection committees where there is no significant gender disparity. However, there is no data at the department and Faculty level. Anecdotal evidence suggests that, in certain Faculties, female Associate Professors are reluctant to apply for promotion. Senator White also mentioned anecdotal evidence of systemic gender discrimination in some Faculties, but that these claims cannot be substantiated owing to the lack of statistical data.

Senator Eidelman asked whether the data in tables six and seven (reflecting mean salary and merit ratings by gender) took into account number of years since appointment as, at least within the Faculty of Medicine, female Professors tend to be younger, which because of how cost of living and merit awards function, might skew the data. Senator White said she would need to double-check.

Secretary's note: It was subsequently confirmed that the data presented did not control for number of years since appointment.

Senator Zorychta noted that the salary gap between genders is greatest at the level of Assistant professor and diminishes thereafter. She asked whether there is data regarding starting salaries that could explain this. Senator White said she believed that this information is available but that it has not been analyzed and undertook to do so in the future. Senator Ismail later posited that perhaps the disparity in starting salary could be explained by disparate negotiation skills rather than by discrimination.

Senator Snyder asked whether McGill's Employment Equity Policy dictated that in the case of equal merit between candidates, a candidate identifying as a member of a designated group would be selected on that basis. Senator Snyder questioned whether the policy goes far enough given that it has failed to yield the desired changes in the demographics of McGill's workforce. Senator White said the policy could be interpreted that way but that the policy was not intended to promote

positive discrimination, while also noting that hiring decisions are based primarily on academic qualifications.

Senator Ibrahim pointed out that the University recently decided that it would not accept student funding targeted to racial minorities because there is no way to monitor student demographic information. He went on to ask why McGill was comfortable with self-reporting for employees but not for students. Senator White explained that student information is outside the scope her responsibilities. She also noted that the surveys given to prospective and current employees are strictly optional and that therefore the data would tend to be incomplete.

Senator Stewart-Kanigan suggested that the current Employment Equity Policy is doing little more than reporting the status quo, and called for concrete plans to be put in place to pursue its stated objectives, citing measures that have been taken at other Universities. Senator Stewart-Kanigan asked whether the McGill would commit to creating a working group aimed at revising this policy. Senator White responded by saying that steps were being taken, highlighting the work underway by the Academic Leadership Forum and the Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office, while conceding that more needed to be done. Nevertheless, Senator White opined that resources should be focused on implementation of the policy before revising the policy itself.

Senator Rourke asked about changes anticipated to the forthcoming version of the Employment Equity survey, particularly with regard to allowing for identification as a member of multiple designated groups, and to adding minority gender identification and sexual orientation to the list of designated groups. Senator White said that minority sexual orientation has already been added to the recruitment survey and will be included in the new version of the survey for all staff.

The Chair proposed that employment equity be added as a topic for open discussion in a meeting of next year's Senate.

Senator Benrimoh, noting the anecdotal evidence mentioned by Senator White indicating the possibility of systemic discrimination, asked what steps could be taken immediately, and what measures would be put in place once more robust data becomes available. Senator White informed the Senate that the Joint Board Senate Committee on Equity has established a working group on systemic discrimination to investigate the matter further, and said that if the anecdotal evidence is corroborated by the data, considerable education and support would be required and could be implemented fairly easily.

Senator Dudek pointed out that unbalanced applicant pools made change slow and difficult despite the best efforts of the University. Senator Murray, noting that the data in table eight showed that mean years to progress from the rank of Associate to Full professor had, since 2008, decreased for men but increased for women, suggested that future data be broken down by Faculty and take parental leaves into account. Senator White agreed.

Senator Stewart-Kanigan closed the discussion by reiterating that she is dismayed by the lack of progress towards a more inclusive, accessible, representative and equitable community at McGill. She also said that SEDE is overburdened by the requirement to collect ever more data, a task to which it is not suited. Senator Stewart-Kanigan called for stronger leadership to ensure that concrete steps be taken, including changes to infrastructure, to bring McGill up to the standards set by other universities.

4. Progress Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Charter of Students' Rights Verbal Report

Senator Costopoulos presented a verbal report. He said that there had been very little progress since his fall 2014 update because his office has been focused on other policy initiatives prioritized by students and other members of the community such as the proposed Sexual Assault policy. Senator Costopoulos said that an annotated version of the current Charter identifying inconsistencies between articles as well as areas requiring clarification or simplification had been completed, and that the Ad hoc Committee would continue its work in the next academic year.

5. Update on the Review of the Policy on Safe Disclosure (D14-59)

Senator White provided an update on the progress of the working group in their review of the Policy on Safe Disclosure. While the group's suggestions were not ready to bring to this meeting of Senate, Senator White said that issues of transparency and accessibility were priorities, noting that people don't seem to know where to find the policy and have a hard time understanding it when they do. Senator White gave examples of some possible changes, including replacing the term "Safe Disclosure" with "Whistleblowing", and the creation new reporting mechanisms such as online forms and a hotline. She indicated that interim measures would be taken to make the policy more visible.

6. Report of the Board of Governors to Senate (D14-60)

Senator Panda presented the report of the Board of Governors to Senate. He highlighted a few items which had been recently approved by the Board of Governors, including the appointments of Dr. Bajeux-Besnainou as the Dean of the Desautels Faculty of Management and Dr. Geitmann as Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

7. Senate Calendar of Dates 2015-2016 Verbal Report

The Secretary-General informed Senate that the fall 2015 Senate meeting dates had been circulated earlier in the year, and that the final meeting dates for winter 2016 would be circulated in the coming days.

8. Other Business

Senator Ibrahim made a motion from the floor to create an ad hoc committee to review McGill's Employment Equity policy. Senator Stewart-Kanigan informed Senate that the policy did not include a review provision and that no review had been conducted since 2007. Senator White pointed out that there is already the Joint Board Senate Committee on Equity, though its mandate does not include review of the policy itself. She also said that there was no reason to favour the creation of an ad hoc committee over a regular review committee. The Secretary-General clarified

that the procedure would be to refer questions relating to policy review to the Senate Nominating Committee.

Finally, the Secretary-General informed Senate that this would be the final meeting in Senator Masi's term. He praised Senator Masi's long and exemplary record of service dating back to 2000. The Secretary-General highlighted some of Senator Masi's accomplishments, which included: the presentation of strategic academic plans, responses to two significant Principal's Task Forces, and over thirty budget presentations to Senate which, the Secretary General noted, have increased transparency as well as Senate's understanding of University finances. The Secretary-General acknowledged and thanked Senator Masi for the tremendous effort he put into his role as Senator, and for his deep engagement in academic governance, all of which have been of great value and significance to the academic wellbeing of McGill. The Chair added her praise for Senator Masi before giving him the floor.

Senator Masi thanked the Senate for the opportunity to serve over the past fifteen years. He said that his service had been very rewarding and edifying. He also expressed his confidence that the incoming Provost, Senator Manfredi, would continue to uphold the values of the University.

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

END

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