

October 5, 2005

Minutes of a Meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Room E3-262 Engineering Building

Members Present

Dr. E.J.E. Szathmáry,
Chair
Mr. K. Adane
Prof. W. Akinremi
Prof. J. Anderson
Prof. T. Anna
Prof. U. Annakkage
Prof. R. Baydack
Prof. T. G. Berry
Prof. M. Birouk
Prof. T. Booth
Ms. J. Bunn
Dr. P. Cattini
Prof. K. Clare
Prof. L. Connor
Prof. K. Coombs
Prof. J. Cooper
Dean J. de Vries
Dean J. Doering
Prof. B. Dronzek
Ms. A. Ducas
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Dean G. Feltham
Prof. M. Gabbert
Prof. J. Ghomeshi
Ms. E. Goldie
Prof. Y. Gong
Mr. D. Gordon
Ms. B. Hamilton
Prof. P. Hawranik
Mr. L. Hildebrand
Dr. J. Hoskins
Dean D. Hrycaiko
Dr. J. Keselman
Dean L. King
Prof. P. King
Prof. S. Kirby
Prof. L. Kirshenbaum
Prof. G. Krause
Prof. C. Kristjanson
Ms. M. Kuzmeniuk
Ms. C. Leach
Mr. N. Lesage
Dr. R. Lobdell

Dean D. Lonis
Prof. K. MacKay
Prof. R. Mazurat
Ms. D. McCallum
Prof. S. McLachlan
Prof. A. McNicol
Ms. A. Meisner
Mr. B. Miller
Mr. A. Moreau
Dr. D. Morphy
Prof. J. Owens
Dean A. Percival
Prof. S. Pistorius
Prof. S. Prentice
Ms. C. Presser
Ms. L. Robson
Dean D. Sandham
Mr. T. Sargeant
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Dean R. Sigurdson
Mr. D. Smith
Prof. D. Smyth
Rector J. Stapleton
Ms. C. Steer
Prof. T. Sullivan
Prof. C. Taylor
Dean M. Trevan
Prof. C. Trott
Prof. J. Van Rees
Prof. M. Vrontakis
Prof. L. Wallace
Prof. J. Welsh
Dean M. Whitmore
Ms. L. Woodrow
Mr. C. Yeung
Prof. A. Young
Mr. R. Zegalski
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Ms. N. Schneider,
Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Dean I. Diallo
Mr. P. Dueck

Ms. M. Gallant
Prof. N. Hunter
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. K. Matheos
Ms. C. Van De Kerckhove

Regrets

Ms. A. Aziz
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. M. Brabston
Ms. H. Brownlee
Dean D. Collins
Ms. A. Dufour
Ms. H. Fernandes
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. G. Geller
Dr. K. Grant
Prof. G. Hatch
Prof. P. Hultin
Prof. T. Ivanco
Dr. R. Kerr
Mr. G. Kler
Prof. B. Law
Prof. J. Long
Prof. M. McKay
Dean R. Mullaly
Prof. P. Nickerson
Dr. W. Norrie
Prof. J. Page
Mr. S. Reddy
Dean M. Reimer
Ms. C. Schultz
Dean H. Secter
Prof. S. Taylor-Henley
Prof. G. Thompson
Ms. C. Wallcraft
Dean J. Wiens
Dean D. Witty

Absent

Prof. S. Abeysekera
Ms. A. Atkinson
Dr. C. Blais
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. E. Epp
Prof. C. Eyland
Ms. B. Famuyide
Prof. E. Forget
Dr. G. Gerbrandt
Prof. J. Irvine
Mr. G. Jawanda
Dr. D. Jayas
Ms. M. Maharaj
Prof. S. Mai
Prof. J. Nagy
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dr. C. Rabinovitch
Dr. J. Raymond
Dean D. Ruth
Prof. P. Singal
Ms. M. Wayne
Prof. K. Wrogemann
Prof. P. Zahradka
Mr. S. Zamick

Also Present

Ms. T. Angus
Mr. D. Barbour
Prof. D. Care
Ms. J. Dewbury
Ms. D. Kaspersion
Ms. L. Leonhardt
Prof. J. Perry
Ms. D. Brown
Dr. L. Smith

Dr. Szathmáry advised Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive was Dean Leslie King.

PRESENTATIONS

Dean Dennis Hrycaiko and Ms. Debbie Brown, United Way Campaign Co-Chairs, announced the kick off of the United Way Campaign at the University of Manitoba and introduced Meghan Laube, Program Coordinator of Housing and Student Life at the University of Manitoba. Ms. Laube works with students and staff at the University. Each year a team building activity is chosen and this year's activity was the United Way "Day of Caring". Megan provided an overview of the activities that took place and the impact they had on the students who participated and the community. The presentation was met with a round of applause.

I CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES, DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES – October, 2005

Page 17

Mr. Neil Marnoch, the Registrar, in speaking to the report, noted that the first graduates from the Master of Occupational Therapy program will be convocating this October. He also noted that this year has the largest graduating class ever.

Dean King MOVED on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, that the list of graduates provided to the University Secretary by the Registrar be approved, subject to the right of Deans and Directors to initiate late changes with the Registrar up to October 7, 2005.

CARRIED

II REPORT ON MEDALS AND PRIZES TO BE AWARDED AT THE OCTOBER CONVOCATION

Mr. Dueck, Executive Director of Enrolment Services, in speaking to the report, noted that there was still one prize choice to be named, the Paul David Russell Gold Medal in Philosophy. The list should be complete by the end of the week

Dean King MOVED on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the report on medals and prizes provided to the University Secretary, be approved by Senate.

CARRIED

III MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - None

IV MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE - None

V MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards**

Page 18

At its meeting on September 1, 2005, the Senate Committee on Awards approved 10 new awards, 13 award amendments and 1 award withdrawal [as set out in the report of the Senate Committee on Awards dated September 1, 2005]. All these award decisions comply with the published guidelines of November 3, 1999, and are reported to Senate for information.

VI **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

Page 27

Dr. Szathmáry briefly reviewed her written report. She had received an item distributed by the Dean of The Faculty of Music; *Downbeat* magazine, the number one international magazine for people interested in jazz. Included in the magazine is an article that featured the University Jazz Program and its Director, Professor Steve Kirby.

Dr. Kerr, Vice-President (Academic) and Provost is in Brazil, therefore he sent a written report that was included as an addendum to the report of the President.

Dr. Szathmáry updated the enrolment numbers for September 2005. These numbers were based on the end of course change period. There was an increase of 377 students over the same day last year, resulting in a total of 28,641 students. This represents an increase of 1.3% over the previous year. Undergraduate enrolment is up 1.2% and graduate enrolment is up 1.7%. International students have increased by 15.2%, for a total of 2,719 students compared with 2,350 last year.

For University budgeting, there had been a projection of a 1% increase in university credit hours. However, there has only been an increase to this point of 0.5%.

University 1 enrolment was up by 3.5%. The Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources had an increase of 26.8% in enrolment. Other faculties with an increase of more than 5% included: Agricultural and Food Sciences (6%), Human Ecology (9.3%), Medical Rehabilitation (16.7%) and Physical Education and Recreation Studies (7.1%). Official numbers will be available on November 1, the date the University reports enrolment information to Statistics Canada.

The President also highlighted the fact that the University of Manitoba has made efforts to welcome faculty and students from the Hurricane Katrina affected area.

Recent fundraising initiatives have been very successful. A gift of \$1 million was received from Dr. Don Wright, as well a \$1-million research endowment fund was received from Husky Energy Inc.

The Government Relations Office has been very busy by bringing people to campus from various government levels.

Dr. Szathmáry reported on the recent exciting announcement from Genome Canada and its award of a \$22.6 million grant for the “knockout mouse” project headed by Dr. Geoff Hicks.

Mrs. McCallum, Vice-President (Administration), reported that many projects have been completed on campus. The Gritty Grotto has re-opened after having been flooded. The Bannatyne Campus Parkade construction is underway. The parkade should be open in June, 2006. Alternate arrangements have been made for people who parked in E lot. Next spring the Aboriginal Student Centre and the new Welcome Centre should be started on the Fort Garry Campus

The apartment building on corner of Emily Street and McDermott has been torn down. This will be the site of the new Pharmacy building, which is currently in the design stage.

Deans, Directors, and Department Heads would have received a memo from Terry Voss discussing the challenges with implementing the new Human Resources Information System (HRIS). The system had to be put in as the mainframe is obsolete and can no longer be supported by the vendor. It appears that there is money in certain budgets when there actually is not. Corrections are being made, but there is more work, more modifications, and more training needed, and more resources needed to deal with it. However, measures are being taken to deal with the challenges. There have also been some issues with payroll. The quantity of errors is not as large as some think. 70,000 payroll slips were processed between April and August. Only 670 had errors. This is less than a 1% error rate. The system is a good one, and will do great things in the future. Mrs. McCallum thanked everyone for their patience and assured Senators that the system’s operations would become smoother soon.

Mrs. Goldie, Vice-Present (External), reported Homecoming was a success. There were 3,500 in attendance compared with 2,400 in 2004. She thanked all who participated, especially Deans who hosted events.

Mrs. Goldie reported there are two upcoming events: October 21 will be the naming and dedication of the William Norrie Centre and November 10 will be a Remembrance Day ceremony in Marshall McLuhan hall.

VII QUESTION PERIOD

The following question was received from Cathy Van De Kerckhove, on behalf of the Student Senate Caucus:

“There has been a great deal of concern raised over the years about corporate influence creeping into public institutions and how this could affect research and ultimately academic freedom on campuses. And now, from recent local and national media coverage, infringement on academic freedom seems to be happening at our own institution. Why does it appear that University of Manitoba officials are attempting to prevent the distribution of publicly funded research and what has been the response

received from academic staff and university researchers, at the U of M and from across the country, about this threat (perceived or otherwise) to academic freedom?"

Dr. Keselman, Vice-President (Research) responded to the question and for clarity, her response is as follows: Certainly there has been discussion over the years regarding public-private partnerships, including those between academic institutions and private corporations. This discussion has not been restricted to public-private partnerships in research but has also involved discussions related to other activities of the universities, including fundraising and administrative contracting practices.

Indeed, in 1999, a question was raised on the floor of Senate about the conditions under which the University engages in research contracts with third parties. I answered that question for Senators by detailing the principles that guide the University in negotiating all research contracts, principles that are designed to ensure the academic integrity of the University. First and foremost among these is the right of the University, through its faculty and students, to present or publish fully the results of research arising under all research agreements.

I should also note that, since that discussion, Senate has been provided for its information, on bi-annual basis, with a listing of all research contracts into which the University has entered on behalf of university researchers.

I mention this to acknowledge that Senate has, indeed, discussed this matter, and to affirm that one of the University's most important fundamental principles is the right of faculty and students to conduct research and disseminate their research findings. Indeed, this principle is the foundation of all major research universities.

Two questions have been raised.

First Question: Why does it appear that University of Manitoba officials are attempting to prevent the distribution of publicly funded research?

Second Question: What has been the response from academic staff and university researchers, at the U of M and from across the country, about this threat (perceived or otherwise) to academic freedom?

Answer to First Question: Why does it appear that University of Manitoba officials are attempting to prevent the distribution of publicly funded research?

First, I'd like to clarify with Cathy that she is referring to media coverage about the video documentary, *Seeds of Change*, that was initiated by an article in the Sept 12/05 issue of the Winnipeg Free Press. Assuming this, I will begin by providing a bit of background information.

The video in question was developed independently of the University by a faculty member and graduate student and others. This is by their own admission. The

connection to the University is that this video contains, among other things, raw video footage obtained as the result of a university research project that received funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Under Board of Governors ByLaw #26, which deals with Patents and Copyright Bylaw, the University has an interest in every recording, made on tape, film, etc. produced in the course of university activities. Further, according to this bylaw, staff members wishing to use such recordings for any purpose must secure the permission of the dean or associate dean of their faculty or head of the department involved.

To date, approval to use the raw video footage from the dean/director or department head has not been sought by the faculty member or graduate student. So, permission to use this raw video footage could not have been denied by those in the position to grant such approval. So this is the first point that I would like to make.

What the faculty member and graduate student have been discussing with the University for some time are a variety of business transactions with private companies, companies interested in distributing the video documentary for commercial and/or educational purposes.

The faculty member and graduate student initially approached the University regarding a potential agreement with a private, offshore investor in Bermuda, who was interested in globally distributing the video for commercial purposes. As I understand it, the faculty member and graduate student had already entered into a discussion with this private investor to this effect, prior to approaching the University about this business transaction.

More recently, discussions have focused on a request that the University transfer its interest in the raw video footage to the faculty member and graduate student who would, in turn, transfer this interest to a private production company in which the faculty and graduate student are shareholders, along with another individual who is independent of the University.

At various times, this production company has had an interest in distributing this video for either commercial or educational purposes. The faculty member and graduate student have already transferred their interest in the raw video footage to this company and, in essence, are requesting that the University do the same.

In attempting to negotiate these various business arrangements, the University has advanced a variety of agreements, each of which have been completely consistent with the terms and conditions that the institution abides by when entering into contractual agreements with third parties. These conditions are designed to protect the integrity of the University in its dealings with outside parties, which is precisely the matter of concern that was raised by Senate when this matter was raised some years ago.

With respect to the matter at hand, the University has not deviated in any respect from its standard business practices. In each case, the third party in question has refused to

accept these standard terms and conditions. This is the second point that I would like to make.

Throughout these discussions, another overriding concern of the University's has been to ensure that the raw video footage be used in a fashion that is completely consistent with the terms under which it was developed in terms of its intended use. That is, that the research subjects, through the informed consent process, were aware of and consented to be videotaped and also agreed that their raw video footage could be used subsequently in the development of a video. As Senators will know, the process of informed consent and the contents of the informed consent form must be detailed in the associated research protocol and this protocol must be approved by the University Research Ethics Board. In fact, the informed consent form associated with this project did not make reference to the use of the raw video footage for production purposes but rather indicated that video recording was being undertaken for the purposes of producing a transcript of the proceedings. The consent form further stipulates that the data will be kept strictly confidential and will only be accessed by those directly involved in the project. It also indicates that a final report will be produced that presents the results and that, where individual responses are presented they will be done so anonymously.

The University has requested written confirmation that all research participants have been re-contacted and have granted to use their raw video footage in this new way, specifically by providing copies of these executed personal releases. These have not been provided. It is absolutely critical that the University protect the interests of the research subjects in this regard and that it be completely sure on this matter, prior to granting permission to use this raw video footage, should such permission be requested. This is the third point that I would like to make.

I would like to conclude by indicating that, in my view, this case is not a matter of academic freedom. Indeed, it is my understanding that the faculty member and graduate student have presented results arising from this university-based research project on at least two occasions at academic conferences. Further, in February of 2004, the University itself issued a press release drawing attention to the university-based research project and to the importance of the work being undertaken. Rather, in my view, this is a matter about the conditions under which the University will enter into business arrangements with outside private companies who are requesting access to materials in which the University has an interest and materials the proper use of which the University has an fundamental obligation to ensure.

Second Question: What has been the response from academic staff and university researchers, at the U of M and from across the country, about this threat (perceived or otherwise) to academic freedom?

As mentioned in the article in the Sept 12/05 issue of the Free Press, the faculty member involved in the development of this video documentary has filed a grievance regarding this matter. Also, in their September issue the Canadian Association of University

Teachers (CAUT) has expressed its views on the matter based on the facts as they know them. There is nothing else to my knowledge.

Dr. Szathmáry asked if Ms. Van De Kerckhove was satisfied with the answer, to which Ms. Van De Kerckhove replied that she was.

The following question was received from Mary Kuzmeniuk, a Senator from the Faculty of Arts:

“It has been brought to my attention, over and over again, by staff and students as to why the new pay statements and cheques display home addresses of employees? This is a huge concern especially for our students. Their mailboxes are in an open area and we have had several instances where statements have been opened - not by the student - and left out on display. I had spoken to HR and Payroll but have had no response. However, it was relayed to me that something was going to be done.”

Mrs. McCallum responded to the question. There are two addresses on the pay stub, the campus address and the home address. It was recognized that this might be an issue, and was discussed by the implementation committee. However it was recognized that there are many employees who need to have the pay stubs mailed to their home. For example the instructors in Continuing Education, some Physical Plant employees, Food Services employees and staff that work at remote locations. If separate envelopes were to be used, it would mean that labels would have to be prepared, and envelopes stuffed on a manual basis which would increase staff and costs substantially. Inclusion of home addresses on pay stubs is common in other organizations; however, the inclusion was checked with FIPPA to ensure that there were no violations in having the home address on the pay stub. If the addresses were to be suppressed, would require customization/modification to the software which would have delayed the implementation and increased the costs of the system. Also, for T4 information, home addresses are required because there are many people who were employees, but by the time of T4 slips are issued they are not. Last year, 17,000 T4's were issued but there were not that many employees at the time of T4's. Eventually the intent is to offer an option to an employee to receive the pay stub electronically.

The second part of the question dealt with opened pay slips. It does not relate to the home address issue, but it is a concern. Mrs. McCallum suggested a review of security process. If mail is being opened, Security Services should be contacted.

Dr. Szathmáry asked if Ms. Kuzmeniuk was satisfied with the answer, to which Ms Kuzmeniuk replied she was.

Ms. Gallant stated wasn't satisfied with the answer to the first question. Her understanding was that the University was part of the negotiation with the person who was ready to distribute the video, and at that time there were no concerns with ethics and that SSHRC had signed off and was willing to have the video distributed and it was only when the final copy was made available that consent became an issue and Ms.

Gallant does not feel that was reflected in the comments that were made in response to the question. Dr. Szathmáry asked for clarification with regard to SSHRC, and asked who had told Ms. Gallant they had signed off, to which Ms. Gallant replied that she was under the impression that SSHRC had signed off on the video releases. Dr. Szathmáry wondered why SSHRC would sign off on it. SSHRC releases research monies to be administered by the University when the confirmation that the protocol submitted for the research project has been approved by the ethics board. Dr. Keselman did describe the protocol that called for signed releases which guarantee confidentiality of the individuals who participated in the project, and that the video would be used to help transcribe the interviews. Dr. Keselman responded that SSHRC has nothing to do with ethics other than to ensure the University complies with the Tri-Council Guidelines. Ms. Gallant replied that the point she was trying to make was that there seems to have been a shift in the approach the University took to this video at some point and there has not been any discussion as to why that happened.

Dr. Szathmáry stated that when questions are received they are answered according to the statement of the question received by Senate. The question raised was a complicated one, and the questioner who submitted the question was satisfied with the response received. The issue is also under grievance and would not do that process justice to have further discussion on the matter in Senate.

Professor Prentice stated that there are still unanswered questions, and though she was not one of the questioners but she had raised this question at Senate Executive, expecting that Senators would have questions on the issue. The media reports raise questions regarding the suppression of academic freedom that are distinct from individual freedom. She wonders if it would be wise for Senate to refer the matter to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and have the Committee do an inquiry and a full report of this matter. Dr. Szathmáry replied that the issue was raised at Senate Executive and that she indicated that she would discuss with the University Secretary if that Committee was the appropriate one to handle the question surrounding this issue. That committee is not a tribunal, it could not adjudicate and make a decision and the issue does not fall under the terms of reference of the committee. The questioner had indicated she was satisfied with the response to the questions and so the matter will be left at that. Dr. Szathmáry indicated that she will discuss further with the University Secretary if this matter could be considered by Senate Committee on Academic Freedom.

**VIII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2005**

It was MOVED by Dean Doering, seconded by Professor Anderson, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on September 7, 2005 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

Professor Hunter, Chair of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee, reported that many points raised at SPPC and are included in the observations of the report. The committee was convinced that the program could go forward within the current resources available to the department of Community Health Sciences.

Dean King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor Cooper, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the proposal of the Faculty of Graduate Studies to introduce a Master of Public Health [as endorsed by the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on May 17, 2005, and the report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee dated August 30, 2005].

CARRIED

2. Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions

a) re: Proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to increase minimum GPA admission requirement

Page 88

Currently, all Pharmacy applicants are ranked for admission selection according to 70% Adjusted Grade Point Average (AGPA) and 30% Written essay (problem-solving exercise). For applicants in both the Academic and Special Consideration Admission Categories an Adjusted Grade Point Average of 3.00 or more is required in order to be eligible for further consideration.

It is proposed that the minimum acceptable Adjusted Grade Point Average be increased from 3.0 to 3.5 in an effort to inform prospective Pharmacy applicants of the level of academic achievement that is more realistically required for them to be considered as competitive applicants. The proposal has been recommended by the Senate Committee on Admissions.

Dr. Dave Morphy, Chair, Senate Committee on Admissions while speaking to the proposal, stated that the new GPA would more realistically reflect admission requirements.

Dean King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

Dr. Morphy MOVED, on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Admissions

concerning increasing the minimum GPA admission requirement to the Faculty of Pharmacy, effective for the 07R regular academic session [dated September 1, 2005].

CARRIED

- b) re: Proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the subcategories of its Special Applicant Category admission guidelines**

Page 89

There are currently four applicant categories that exist in the selection process to the undergraduate dentistry program at the University of Manitoba. They are: Regular Applicant Category; Canadian Aboriginal Applicant Category; Special Applicant Category; Transfer Applicant Category. Within the Special Applicant Category, there are three subcategories; applicants who hold Master's or Ph.D. degrees; applicants who have had previous work experience in a health-related field; applicants who hold a dental degree from a university outside of Canada.

With the establishment of the International Dental Degree Program at the University of Manitoba in 2003, holders of non-Canadian dental degrees have an alternative route in obtaining a Canadian dental degree. Thus, the Faculty of Dentistry is proposing the deletion of the non-Canadian dental degree subcategory from the Special Applicant Category.

Dean King advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

Dr. Morphy MOVED, on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Admissions, concerning the proposal of the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the subcategories of its Special Applicant Category admission guidelines, effective for the 07R regular academic session [dated September 1, 2005].

CARRIED

- c) re: Proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend "distant-past" academic history admission requirements**

Page 90

The Faculty of Dentistry believes that a distant-past poor academic history should not disadvantage an applicant who has recently completed all the prerequisite courses with better academic results. Eight years is being proposed as the minimum period between courses of study, i.e. under the proposal, applicants will be able to request that courses

completed more than eight years prior to the commencement of the applicants most recent program be excluded from the calculation of the Adjusted Grade Point Score for the purposes of admission.

Dean King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

Dr. Morphy MOVED, on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning the proposal of the Faculty of Dentistry to amend “distant-Past” academic history admission requirements, effective for the 07R regular academic session [dated September 1, 2005].
CARRIED

**3. Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations
re: Student Vacancies on Senate Committees**

This report consists of nominations to standing committees of Senate of both students and academic staff.

Professor Dronzek, Chair of the Senate Committee on Nominations, spoke to the report. A list of vacancies that had come to the June Senate meeting. Since then there have been some resignations. In the report, there are two academic staff members added to SPPC and Joint Senates Committee on Master's Programs and one community member added to the Senate Committee on the Ethics of Research Involving Human Subjects. In addition at this time of the year, there is a list of students to fill vacancies on Senate Committees. The report contains a complete list of nominations.

A question was asked if all the student nominees needed to be Senators. Ms. Van De Kerckhove responded that while selecting students, the Student Nominating Sub-Committee reviewed the by-laws to ensure Senators and students-at-large were nominated where appropriate. Ms. Van De Kerckhove indicated that there was a change on the student's nominations. The Senate Committee on Libraries has Ginger Arnold listed as a Graduate Students and it should be Mercedes Rich from Science. This change is necessary as the Committee should contain two graduate students and two undergraduate students.

Dean Whitmore wondered about Mr. Scott Armstrong, the nominee for the Senate Committee on the Ethics of Research Involving Human Subjects, and asked whether more information given about this person. Professor Dronzek responded that he had worked with Dr. Peter Cattini on recruiting a member for the committee. Professor Dronzek agreed to get information on Mr. Armstrong for the next Senate meeting.

Professor Dronzek MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Nominations dated October 3, 2005.

CARRIED

XII ADDITIONAL BUSINESS NONE

XIII ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 14, combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 90, distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on October 5, 2005.

/nis