University of Windsor

SG260225A

NOTICE OF MEETING

There will be a meeting of the
Senate Governance Committee (SGC)
Wednesday, February 25, 2026, at 2:30-4:00pm
LOCATION: Room 209 Assumption Hall or MS Teams

AGENDA

1	**Approval of Agenda**	
2	**Approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 3, 2025**	SGC251203M
3	**Business arising from the minutes**	
4	**Outstanding Business**	
5	**Reports/New Business**	
5.1	**Delegating Authority for Approval of Graduands**	**Darling**-Approval SGC260225-5.1
5.2	**Integrative Biology Department Proposed Name Change**	**Barrette-Ng**-Approval SGC260225-5.2
5.3	**Policy and Procedures on University of Windsor Human Participant Research**	**Johnson/Zand**-Approval SGC260225-5.3
5.4	**Proposed Revisions to Bylaws 31, 54, 55 and Policy on Grading and Calculation of Averages**	**Dutton**-Approval SGC260225-5.4
5.5	**Honorary Degree Criteria – Revisions**	**McMurtry**-Approval SGC260225-5.5
5.6	**Honorary Degrees *(in-camera)*** *[to be distributed separately]*	**McMurtry-**Approval SGC260225-5.6
6	**Question Period/Other Business**	
7	**Adjournment**	

Please carefully review the 'starred' (*) agenda items. As per the June 3, 2004 Senate resolution, 'starred' items will not be discussed during a scheduled meeting unless a member specifically requests that a 'starred' agenda item be 'unstarred', and therefore open for discussion/debate. This can be done any time before (by forwarding the request to the secretary) or during the meeting. By the end of the meeting, agenda items which remain 'starred' (*) will be deemed approved or received.

University of Windsor
Senate Governance Committee

5.1: **Delegating Authority for Approval of List of Graduands**

Item for: **Approval**

Forwarded by: **Registrar**

MOTION: That Senate delegate authority to the Deans of the Faculties, in consultation with the Registrar's Office, to approve students for graduation, with a complete and accurate final list of graduates filed with Senate after convocation has concluded.

Background
Currently, the Registrar's Office is required to submit a list of graduating students to Senate for approval in advance of the June and October convocation ceremonies. Because this approval occurs prior to the ceremonies, the list is inherently provisional: students are routinely added or removed due to late academic outcomes or student requests. While the Registrar's Office and Faculties already exercise delegated authority to manage these changes, the final post-ceremony list is not returned to Senate for approval and instead enters the public record through the Secretariat.

This process results in unnecessary duplication of effort and administrative burden at a peak operational period, without adding meaningful academic or governance oversight.

Proposed Change
It is proposed that Senate formally delegate authority to the Registrar's Office and the Faculties to approve students for graduation in full, with a complete and final list of graduates provided after convocation has concluded. This would align formal approval with the point at which academic requirements are definitively met and accurately recorded.

Rationale:
- Improves accuracy and integrity of graduation records by approving only final outcomes
- Reduces redundant work and administrative risk during convocation preparation
- Clarifies accountability by aligning authority with existing practice
- Brings the University into alignment with other Ontario universities

This approach is consistent with practices at other Ontario universities, including Wilfrid Laurier, Ontario Tech, and Trent (survey below).

Implementation
If approved, this change would take effect beginning with the June 2026 convocation.

Environmental Scan

Do you have delegated authority to approve graduates before convocation?	
University	**Policy**
Guelph	No
Laurier	This authority was delegated to the Registrar in 2008.
McMaster	Yes, Senate approves our graduands. The list goes in prior to convocation. We have a process where each faculty office has to approve the senate report. We also submit a 'Senate Amendment Report' which includes all graduands identified past the original report deadline. This is submitted to Senate after convocation.
OCADU	Senate approves prior to convocation. I sometimes make a motion to include permission for delegated approval for late grads in situations where I know a student has a fee payment that hasn't hit the books or there is some error on our part we are still trying to sort out for the student. Really trying to avoid this as much as possible.
Ontario Tech	Senate approves graduation in principle, and they are not presented with a roster, but rather a motion to let us confer degrees as the delegated authority to do so…this is the motion going forward this month for spring/summer graduation: MANDATE: Article 1.1(a)(g) of By-law No. 2 provides that Academic Council has the authority to establish the procedures necessary to grant bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, doctoral degrees, honorary degrees and all other degrees, certificates, and diplomas in any and all branches of learning. MOTION for CONSIDERATION: That pursuant to the recommendations of each Faculty and the Registrar, Academic Council hereby confirms the eligibility for graduation of those students who have fulfilled all degree requirements at the end of the Spring 2024 session and recommends the conferral of degrees by the Chancellor.
Ottawa	Done before convocation and we have "urgent power" processes for late comers.
RMC	If a student has not met all the requirements to graduate when Senate sits they are automatically told to reapply to graduate for the next convocation. Only Senate can grant the degrees – I am just the keeper to ensure everyone on the list has met the requirements. In 3 truly exceptional circumstances over the past 9 years, Senate agreed to add a name if certain information came in before the actual convocation.
Trent	There is a motion that goes to Senate at Trent each year providing the Registrar and Dean of Graduate Studies authority to grant degrees to those who have fulfilled requirements. Lists are then provided to the University Senate for record following each conferral period.
Windsor	A list is sent to the last Senate meeting prior to convocation and then an updated list is sent to Senate after convocation.

University of Windsor
Senate Governance Committee

5.2: **Integrative Biology Department Proposed Name Change**

Item for: **Approval**

Forwarded by: **Faculty of Science**

MOTION: That the Department of Integrative Biology be renamed the *Department of Biology*.

1. Background
In 2019, the life sciences programs within the Faculty of Science at the University of Windsor were restructured, generating the Department of Integrative Biology and the Department of Biomedical Sciences.

At the time, it was felt that the name "Integrative Biology" would best describe the breadth of the expertise, research strengths, and teaching excellence represented by the faculty and staff within the department in areas including aquatic and terrestrial biology, neuroscience, physiology, model systems, climate change biology, conservation biology, ecology, environmental science, evolution, genetics, microbial ecology, and systems biology.

The Department of Integrative Biology offers the following undergraduate programs:

- Honours in Biological Sciences program
- Honours Behaviour, Cognition, and Neuroscience (BCN) program, and
- Combined Honours program that includes Honours Biological Sciences.

In Fall 2025, 628 students were enrolled in departmental undergraduate programs, which is a 20% increase from the 524 students we saw in Fall 2021. In addition, the Department also participates in the concurrent B.Ed. program, with 19 students in Fall 2025 pursuing a biological sciences core.

The Department also offers thesis-based MSc and PhD programs, with 69 students enrolled in Fall 2025 (similar to Fall 2021 levels).

2. Objective and Rationale
The Department of Integrative Biology wishes to rebrand and adopt the following new name: *Department of Biology*.

This decision is based on the following three reasons:

(a) Consultations with students (current and incoming) and guidance counsellors

The name *Integrative Biology* provides a good description of the diversity of contemporary approaches and techniques used to study how biological systems develop, function, interact and evolve in a complex and changing world. However, this name is not familiar to high school students. The term *integrative biology* is not used in the high school biology curriculum, which makes it challenging for incoming students and their guidance counsellors to understand what the department offers. The re-branding of Integrative Biology to the *Department of Biology* will ensure that our teaching, research, and outreach missions align to focus on providing undergraduate and graduate students with the type of broad and experiential training experience that is relevant and expands and promotes career opportunities available to these students.

(b) An analysis of biology-related departments and programs at comparator institutions

Table 1 provides a summary of our analysis of comparator institutions.

Table 1: Survey of comparator institutions

Comparator institution	Department name	Undergraduate programs offered
Western University	Department of Biology	Honours with specialization in: animal behaviour, biodiversity and conservation, biology, ecosystem health, genetics, genetics and biochemistry, synthetic biology, or interdisciplinary health.
University of Guelph	Department of Integrative Biology and the College of Biological Science	Honours in biodiversity (paused), biological science, ecology, marine and freshwater biology, wildlife and conservation, or zoology
Brock University	Department of Biological Sciences	Honours in biological sciences
York University	Department of Biology	Honours in biology
McMaster University	Department of Biology	Honours in biology (with different specializations available)

The University of Guelph is the only comparator institution with a Department of Integrative Biology. However, they operate within the College of Biological Sciences.

(c) Errors in marketing materials

Differences between the current name of the department and the name of our Honours BSc in Biological Sciences undergraduate program are causing confusion. On a few occasions, marketing materials for prospective students were created that erroneously advertised an Honours BSc in Integrative Biology, instead of an Honours BSc in Biological Sciences. This error also appeared on the OUAC system. Due to these errors, we have received several inquiries from prospective students worried that the University of Windsor no longer offers an undergraduate degree program in the biological sciences. Re-branding to the *Department of Biology* should simplify marketing and make it easier for prospective students to find the outstanding experiences that await them in the Honours BSc in Biological Sciences.

3. Resources

The re-branding of the *Department of Biology* will not alter current office, research, or teaching space needs. Other than the time required to make changes to the appropriate University of Windsor websites, no additional resources are needed to implement the name change.

4. Timeline

We wish to implement the re-branding of the department by May 2026, prior to the start of the recruiting period for the 2026-2027 academic year.

5. Growth and alignment with future plans

The purpose of the proposed re-branding of the *Department of Biology* is ultimately to better serve students, staff, and faculty associated with the discipline of biological sciences. The re-branding also aligns with planned changes to the Honours BSc in Biological Sciences, which are in the process of being submitted to the appropriate committees for approval. Once accomplished, the re-branded department and updated biological sciences degree program will grow through new recruitment of students in the region and through active campaigns to attract the highest achieving undergraduate and graduate students across Canada, and indeed, globally.

Approvals:

The proposal was approved by the Department of Integrative Biology Council (January 30, 2026) and the Faculty of Science Coordinating Council (February 5, 2026).

University of Windsor
Senate Governance Committee

5.3: **Policy and Procedures on University of Windsor Human Participant Research**

Item for: **Approval**

Forwarded by: **Vice-President, Research and Innovation**

MOTION: That the Guidelines on Research with Humans (2023) be rescinded and the proposed Policy and Procedures on University of Windsor Human Participant Research be approved.

Rationale:

Background
Since the University was established, research, scholarship and creative activities have been a vital part of our work, informing our teaching and inspiring our connections to the world, such as community partnerships in Windsor, businesses in Canada, and academic collaborators abroad.

Whether our research is funded or benefits from indirect support, Tri-Agency grants and awards are essential to our work. In this time of economic uncertainty and fiercer competition for fewer resources, that financial support will be even more important. At the same time, with so many post-secondary institutions in Canada and elsewhere in flux and under greater scrutiny, we must continue to uphold our commitment to the responsible conduct of research and scholarly integrity, and acknowledge the interconnectedness and interdependence of our work and our university with our broader community. Our research and scholarship are not siloed activities; rather they rely on coordinated support from units across campus. To help make our research enterprise more visible both on and off campus, while also improving support for researchers, and the transparency and accountability of our processes, my office is working to standardize institutional research policies maintained and approved by the Office of the VPRI. [Board of Governors Bylaw #16 Schedule A, states that the Vice-President Research and Innovation shall *take primary responsibility for leading policy development on research matters, and for implementing new, or maintaining current, University policy related to research*].

Human Participant Research
The University's commitment to excellence in teaching, research and scholarship rests on the integrity of our work. Our integrity framework includes personal conduct and regulatory/legal requirements, as well as scholarly and professional standards, which are the standards we adopt as members of the academic community. Our standards, and the processes to ensure they are met, are described in our faculty collective agreement and in our institutional policies. Many of these standards are reinforced by legal, financial and other accountabilities consistent with being a publicly funded institution.

Further, the Tri-Agency Agreement on the Administration of Agency Funds and Awards by Research Institutions requires institutions receiving Tri-Agency funds to establish policies and processes to uphold the responsible conduct of research and promote the importance of research security in general as well as adherence to specific policies for all research, funded or not, involving human participants and all research, teaching and testing involving the use of animals. In addition, institutions are required to establish and maintain appropriate systems and standards to administer Tri-Agency funds and to guard against real, potential or perceived conflict of interest in decision-making related to Tri-Agency funded research.

For the past number of years, ethics review of human participant research has relied extensively on the work and commitment of the REB Chair, with support by the two staff members within the Office of Research Ethics (ORE). Two REBs, a network of Delegated Reviewers and several committees were established based on subject matter expertise. Working from strength to strength, Dr Rachel Zand, Interim REB Chair, and the Office of the Vice-President Research and Innovation are navigating a transition to a single REB that meets semi-monthly, efficient review processes and tailored resources for the REB, ORE, and research community, while we continue to search for administrative efficiencies across our research integrity processes.

Proposed Policy Suite

Based on a review of human research ethics policies and organizational structures at universities in Ontario and across Canada as well as our existing standards, we propose that the existing Guidelines for Research Involving Humans (Guidelines) be rescinded and replaced with the attached Policy statement and related Procedures. The current Guidelines quote and paraphrase the TCPS. The proposed documents rely on incorporation by reference to the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS). Consequently, the proposed University's Policy and Procedures will be shorter and easier to navigate and update. Importantly, by linking our Policy to the TCPS, we will ensure that the Policy remains current.

Consistent with the TCPS, the proposed policy provides both that the REB shall be independent in its decision-making **and** that the REB is accountable to the institution for the integrity of its processes. The proposed Human Participant Research Roles and Responsibilities Procedure describes in greater detail how the University, researchers, the REB, the ORE, and the Office of the Vice-President (Research and Innovation) work together to *navigate a sometimes difficult course between the two main goals of providing the necessary protection of participants and serving the legitimate requirements of research* (TCPS Chapter 1 The Core Principles - Conclusion).

So that our ethics review processes and standards are as transparent as possible, while also providing appropriate confidentiality for review processes, the Human Participant Research Structure, Application and Review Procedure describes how the REB is constituted as well as its decision-making and review processes. These align with the proportionate approach to ethics review described in the TCPS and employ the same language used in the TCPS and at many other research-intensive universities. This Procedure also includes an overview of the application and review processes for new studies and amendments to existing studies, as well as reporting processes for incidents and unanticipated adverse events. Finally, the Appeal Procedures describes an appeal process for those rare cases where a researcher and the REB are otherwise unable to resolve their concerns through the ordinary cycle of revisions and reconsideration.

To promote wider discussion and understanding of research ethics requirements and the TCPS going forward, we propose that future policy amendments and related changes be routed to the Senate via the Associate-Deans Research Committee and the Senate Research and Innovation Advisory Committee. This will ensure that researchers and research administrators have the opportunity to discuss proposed changes and help build understanding and awareness of current ethics requirements and changes.

This omnibus package presents two motions to the Senate:

1) First, that the current Guidelines on Research with Humans (2023) be rescinded;
2) Second, that the proposed Policy on Human Participant Research and the three related Procedures be approved to take effect immediately.

The policy and procedures have been reviewed by the Deans, the Associate Deans Research, and the Senate Advisory Committee on Research and Innovation.

See attached:

1. Human Participant Research Policy
2. Human Participant Research Policy: Human Research Roles and Responsibilities Procedure;
3. Human Participant Research Policy: Research Ethics Board (REB) Structure, Application and Review Procedure; and
4. Human Participant Research Policy: Human Research Appeal Procedure

Policy Title: Human Participant Research Policy

Date Established:

Office with Administrative Responsibility: Office of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation

Approver: Senate

Revision Date(s): N/A

Introduction

Research is an essential component of the mission of the University of Windsor, and the University is justifiably proud of the contributions to society and to the advancement of knowledge that have resulted from the research of its academic community. The University is committed to excellence in all its research based on the highest national and international standards.

Purpose

To cultivate an environment in which human participant research performed within the jurisdiction or under the auspices of the University of Windsor follows the highest ethical standards;

To adopt, and promote awareness and understanding of, the core principles, described in the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS)*:

> Respect for persons that recognizes the intrinsic value of human beings and the respect and consideration they are due. Respect for autonomy and the need to seek free, informed and ongoing consent flows from respect for persons;
>
> Concern for welfare is broadly construed to mean all aspects of a person's life, including their physical and mental health, spiritual well-being, and other elements of their life circumstances. Concern for welfare includes respect for the person's privacy and confidentiality and requires that Research Ethics Boards (REB) and researchers adopt an attitude that aims to protect the welfare of research participants, minimize foreseeable risks to those participants and their communities, and inform research participants of those risks; and
>
> Justice which requires that people be treated equitably and fairly. The principle of justice takes into account the vulnerability of the person, the difference in power between participant and researcher, and seeks to equitably distribute the risks and benefits of research participation.

To identify the relationship between this Policy, the TCPS and the Tri-Agency Agreement on the Administration of Agency Funds and Awards by Research Institutions;

To establish the jurisdiction and mandate of the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board (REB) and to define the key elements in the structure and implementation of this Policy and its Procedures;

To provide that research involving humans may not be commenced by a researcher unless first approved in accordance with this Policy and its Procedures and if approved may only be undertaken in accordance with any such approval and any requirements or conditions contained in or imposed in accordance with this Policy and its Procedures; and

To authorize the REB to accept the review of decisions of an external REB through formal Board of Record (BoR) agreements or informal arrangements, consistent with the TCPS.

Application and Scope of Policy

This Policy applies to all members of the University who conduct human participant research within the jurisdiction or under the auspices of the University. Members of the University include but are not limited to, faculty, professors emeriti, sessional lecturers, staff, trainees, clinical faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, adjunct professors, visiting professors, visiting scholars, professional affiliates, associate members, residents, and postdoctoral fellows (PDFs) at the University.

This policy also applies to research with human participants undertaken by any person or Institute/Centre associated with the University, or using any University resources including persons (i.e., students, staff, faculty), or if funds for such research is administered by the University.

Policy

1. The University regards the conduct of research involving humans as a privilege requiring a balance between scientific inquiry and the protection of the welfare of those involved as research participants. The University is committed to promoting the conduct of well-designed, responsible research with human participants and recognizes its value in advancing knowledge, scholarship and teaching.

2. The University of Windsor adopts as a part of this Policy the articles of the TCPS to apply in the implementation of this Policy and its Procedures and shall be guided by the application sections of the articles. In the event of any conflict between any adopted article of the TCPS and any other provision of this Policy or its Procedures, the adopted article shall apply and take precedence. If additional requirements to the adopted articles are imposed pursuant to this Policy or its Procedures or are dictated by provincial, territorial, federal, international or other requirements, those additional requirements shall not be considered to be in conflict with any adopted article of the TCPS and shall also be applied in the implementation of this Policy and its Procedures. This Policy and its Procedures conforms to the requirements of the Tri-Agency Agreement on the Administration of Agency Funds and Awards by Research Institutions.

3. Research Involving Humans, as described in the TCPS, may not be commenced by a researcher, including through contact with, or recruitment of, potential participants, until ethics approval has been requested and an approval has been granted according to this Policy and its Procedures. An ethics approval must be in place for the duration of the participation of humans in the research study. The maximum duration of an ethics approval is twelve months and it is the responsibility of the researcher to apply for any required renewal of the approval or to submit a final report in accordance with the Procedures. Failure to obtain approval for new, continuing or modified research is non-compliance and may constitute research misconduct.

4. The Senate of the University of Windsor establishes an REB (or additional REBs as determined appropriate) by the Vice-President (Research and Innovation). The University will provide sufficient financial and administrative resources via the Vice-President (Research & Innovation) to support the REB(s) in the fulfillment of its duties. The REB(s) shall be independent in its decision-making on individual ethics applications, and accountable to the Vice-President (Research and Innovation) for its ethics review processes. The REB(s) shall be responsible for and capable of considering the full range of ethical principles of the TCPS. If there is more than one REB, each REB shall have a specific area of expertise and must also be capable of considering a broad range of potential research methods, contexts, populations and risk. The REB(s) is mandated to approve, reject, propose modifications to, or terminate the approval of any proposed or ongoing research that is subject to review under this Policy.

5. Where an approval for minimal risk research involving humans is required from the University of Windsor REB and ethics approval is also required from a REB of one or more other institutions according to the human research ethics requirements of the other institution(s) - sometimes referred to as multi-jurisdiction review - the Windsor REB may accept the review of the REB of one of those other institutions, in accordance with the TCPS, without establishing a formal agreement.

   The VPRI, on behalf of the University, may establish formal agreements with another institution or multiple institutions eligible to administer Tri-Agency Funds to: establish a conjoint REB to review human participant

research involving some or all of the participating institutions; to delegate review of research to the REB of another institution; and to accept delegation of review by another institution.

Review By:
Whenever the TCPS is amended or every five years, whichever is sooner

Cross References
1. Human Participant Research Policy: Human Research Roles and Responsibilities Procedure (attached);
2. Human Participant Research Policy: Research Ethics Board (REB) Structure, Application and Review Procedure (attached); and
3. Human Participant Research Policy: Human Research Appeal Procedure (attached).

Related University of Windsor Policies
Research Integrity and Responsible Conduct of Research Policy
Senate Policy on Faculty Duties and Responsibilities
Policy on Responsibilities of Principal Investigators
Policy on Conflict of Interest or Commitment

See also WUFA Collective Agreement
- Article 5 – Rights, Duties and Responsibilities
- Article 60 – Ethical Conduct of Research

External Resources
Tri-Agency Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions
Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research
Tri-Agency Research Data Management Policy
Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS)

Policy Title: Human Participant Research Policy: Human Research Roles and Responsibilities Procedure

Date Established:

Office with Administrative Responsibility: Office of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation

Approver: Senate

Revision Date(s): N/A

Overview
The University of Windsor serves the community by the dissemination of knowledge through teaching and the discovery of knowledge through research and scholarship. The University's commitment to excellence in its research and scholarship is demonstrated by its adoption of, and adherence to, the highest national standards for human participant research as described in the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans.

The University's **Human Participant Research Policy** (the Policy) requires a statement of the terms of reference, composition and responsibilities of the Research Ethics Board (REB)(s) as well as the responsibilities of researchers, the Office of Research Ethics (ORE), and the Office of the Vice-President (Research and Innovation) (VPRI) in advancing the ethical conduct of human participant research.

Purpose
- Describe the terms of reference and composition of the REB and the responsibilities of its members.
- Describe the roles and responsibilities of the researchers.
- Describe the role and responsibilities of the ORE.
- Describe the role and responsibilities of the Office of the VPRI and the Senate Committee on Research and Innovation.

1. RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD (REB) TERMS OF REFERENCE

   a. Scope and Mandate
   The REB shall review the ethical acceptability of all research, whether unfunded or funded and regardless of the source of funding, involving human participants and human biological materials derived from living and deceased individuals conducted within the jurisdiction or under the auspices of the University of Windsor, regardless of the location of the research. The REB is mandated to approve, reject, propose modifications to or terminate or suspend the approval of any proposed or ongoing research that is subject to review under this Policy. Further, as described in the Application and Review Procedure, the REB will provide post-approval review and monitoring of ongoing research, including review and approval of amendments; and review and approval of annual reports and renewals, unanticipated events and closing reports. In fulfilling its mandate, the REB shall provide impartial, fair, informed and balanced review, using a proportionate approach consistent with the TCPS.

   b. **Authority**
   The REB shall be independent in its decision-making with respect to the ethical acceptability of individual proposed research projects. University offices and personnel shall respect this authority delegated to the REB and may not overturn a decision by the REB. Per the HPR Appeal Procedure, researchers may appeal a decision by the REB with respect to their research. Approval by the REB is not, in itself, authorization for the research to proceed and researchers shall obtain such additional operational approvals as required by their research.

c. REB Membership and Composition

The REB(s) shall be multi-disciplinary in nature and will meet the requirements outlined in the TCPS. The guiding principle is to ensure that the membership is of adequate size and composition to effectively manage the REB's workload and to ensure a reasonable pool of expertise to review applications normally received by the REB, recognizing it may also draw on *ad hoc advisors* as needed.

Potential REB members (who include REB Chairs) shall be recruited through nomination by the ORE, current REB members, the VPRI, Deans and Chairs, researchers at the University and by other organizations and institutions regularly participating in the University of Windsor ethics review process by special agreement.

The ORE Manager and any other ORE staff who fulfil the expertise required of other members, may be appointed as non-voting members of the REB.

The REB Chair(s) shall be appointed by the VPRI following consultation with the ORE, the REB, and Deans and Chairs as appropriate. REB members, other than the Chair, shall be appointed by the Director – Research and Integrity Services and the REB Chair. Normally, REB members will be appointed for staggered three-year terms to allow for continuity of the research ethics review. The term of appointment for each member, including the REB Chair shall be established at the time of their appointment and may be renewed. To further ensure the independence of the REB's decision-making, senior institutional administrators will not serve on the REB. The ORE shall review and make recommendations to the Director - Research and Integrity Services, as necessary, on the maintenance and adjustment of REB membership to ensure the same meets the needs of the REB and the research community.

d. Roles and Responsibilities

All REB members shall fully acquaint themselves with the Policy and its Procedures and any other relevant policies for ethics review, including in particular the Tri-Council Policy Statement. Members are expected to complete the online TCPS - Course on Research Ethics (CORE) training and be fully engaged with, and maintain high levels of participation in, their assigned reviews and REB meetings and discussions. Members who fail to actively participate in their responsibilities shall be asked to reaffirm their commitment to the REB. Such members, other than the REB Chair, may be removed at the discretion of the Chair following consultation with the ORE and the Director - Research and Integrity Services, or, in the case of a member who is a REB Chair, by the VPRI in consultation with Director - Research and Integrity Services.

The REB Chair provides overall leadership for the REB. With the ORE, the REB Chair is responsible for ensuring that REB review processes conform to the TCPS and this Policy and Procedure and that REB decisions are recorded accurately and communicated clearly to researchers in writing.

All REB members must be aware of and declare, when first aware of the same and when otherwise required by the Procedure, any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interests (COI) relevant to the REB activities in general and to specific REB applications and applicants.

2. RESEARCHERS

Researchers, whether principal investigators, co-investigators, collaborators, trainees (including undergraduate and graduate students, post-doctoral fellows and residents) or supervisors, are responsible for the scientific and ethical conduct of their research. This entails understanding the requirements of this Policy and Procedure and the TCPS, as well as any relevant institutional, provincial or federal legislation or policies governing their research, for example the Tri-Agency Framework on the Responsible Conduct of Research or the University Conflict of Interest or Commitment Policy. Where their projects involve First Nations, Métis or Inuit communities, researchers are expected to be familiar with the requirements and considerations specific to those communities. In the case of US funded or other international research, researchers must conform to any additional requirements.

Researchers are required to complete current CORE training and provide the ORE with their certification. The ORE will maintain records of this training.

When supervising student research involving human participants, faculty members have additional responsibilities, as follows:

- Ensuring (with the supervisory committee, as appropriate) that the proposed research has adequate scientific merit and that it is feasible given the time and resources available;
- Ensuring that his/her student has a general understanding of the principles of the ethical conduct of research involving humans and specifically understands the ethical issues presented by his or her proposed research and appropriate management of those issues;
- Ensuring the research data management plan describes what will happen to the data once the student or trainee graduates/completes his or her program; and
- Ensuring that there is a clear rationale if a student or trainee proposes to undertake above minimal risk research.

3. OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The ORE reports to the Director – Research and Integrity Services. It administers and works in close association with the REB and operates according to the same requirements, including this Policy and Procedure and the TCPS. It is responsible for the operationalization of the Procedure and shall advise the REBs of this Procedure as well as the administrative and operating procedures of the Office. ORE shall maintain standard operating procedures (SOPs) aligned with the Policy and Procedures that further describe the operation of the REB and the Office.

The ORE is responsible for identifying REB replenishment requirements, education and training of REB members and researchers, and the securing of associated resources. To promote awareness of the contributions of the REB members, the ORE shall send an annual letter to Department Chairs, Deans, or Associate Dean of Research for consideration in annual evaluation processes, copied to the VPRI, detailing the nature of the duties and responsibilities of and commenting on the performance of a REB member on the REB. The Director - Research and Integrity Services, in consultation with the ORE, will provide a similar letter, signed by the VPRI, for the REB Chair.

The ORE shall be responsible for providing administrative support for the activities of the REB(s). Such support shall include recruitment, supervision, training and management of ORE staff, liaison and information sharing with internal and external offices on ethics administration issues, (e.g., Office of Research and Integrity Services), support for educational, training activities and the like.

The ORE is responsible for developing and maintaining guidelines, templates and other resources that reflect current best practices to assist researchers with REB review processes and preparation of their ethics application. In addition, the ORE will develop and deliver educational materials to faculty, students and other Windsor personnel involved in human participant research.

To augment the expertise of the REB(s), the ORE, in consultation with the REB Chair and the Director – Research and Integrity Services, will maintain a roster of individuals who may be called on as ad-hoc advisors to, and guest reviewers for, the REB(s) in order to ensure the best possible inclusion of specialized expertise in the review of ethics applications. Individuals on this roster will be 'on-call' to the REB Chair(s) and delegated reviewers. Ad hoc advisors may attend REB meetings and provide reports as requested, but shall not vote on any motion before any REB.

Further, the ORE is responsible for: liaising with REBs at other institutions to share best practices and optimize review processes for all University of Windsor human participant research; keeping the Director - Research and Integrity Services apprised of any substantive policy, process and compliance issues; and providing an annual report to the Senate Committee on Research and Innovation that includes general statistics related to REB review processes, new initiatives and other developments.

In the event of an appeal, the Director of Research and Integrity Services is responsible for convening an *ad hoc* Appeal Board by drawing on the active members of the REB (or REBs) of other Ontario universities that are eligible to administer Tri-Agency funds.

4. THE SENATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

The Senate Advisory Committee on Research and Innovation shall be responsible for developing and monitoring the University policy concerning human participant research.

The Senate Advisory Committee on Research and Innovation is responsible for reviewing relevant policies and procedures, from time to time, to ensure their currency and relevance to national and other policies. These policies and procedures can be revised, subject to normal University approval procedures in order to maintain compliance with relevant policies and procedures inside and outside the University.

The Senate Advisory Committee on Research and Innovation shall receive the annual reports from the ORE on the activities of the REB and transmit them to the Senate.

5. THE VICE-PRESIDENT, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

As delegated by the Senate, the VPRI is responsible for the development and implementation of all University policies and procedures related to research. These include: the responsible conduct of research; administration of research funding; human participant research; research data management; research security requirements, animal care and use, and biosafety. In support of these policies, the VPRI will work with Deans and Chairs to foster a culture of research integrity. With respect to human participant research, the VPRI will promote awareness of this policy and support researchers, the REB(s) and the ORE to advance the ethical conduct of research by balancing the protection of research participants and the advancement of science and scholarship.

Policy Title: Human Participant Research Policy: Research Ethics Board (REB) Structure, Application and Review Procedure

Date Established:

Office with Administrative Responsibility: Office of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation

Approver: Senate

Revision Date(s): N/A

Overview
The University of Windsor serves the community by the dissemination of knowledge through teaching and the discovery of knowledge through research and scholarship. The University of Windsor is committed to excellence in research based on the highest national and international standards which resulted in the adoption by the University of the

Policy on Human Participant Research (the Policy) and requires a statement of the structure of REB(s), the decision making and review requirements of the REB(s) and the application and review process.

Ethics review processes focus on the ethical acceptability of the proposed research and are intended to offer a level of assurance first and foremost to research participants, and laterally to researchers and the University, that the proposed research is well-designed and ethically sound. Importantly, ethics review processes increase the likelihood that all known and anticipated risks are adequately communicated to prospective participants as part of recruitment and informed consent processes that are free of coercion and undue influence. As well, REB review addresses appropriate protection of the participants' privacy and the confidentiality of their data and determines both that the potential benefits of the proposed research outweigh the known and potential risks and that participants can withdraw their consent at any time without fear of reprisal.

Purpose
- Define the structure of REB(s) at the University of Windsor.
- Define the decision making and review requirements for ethics review of research involving humans.
- Describe the basic procedures for application and ethics review of research involving humans.

PROCEDURE

1. <u>STRUCTURE OF REBs AND GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>

a. The Senate of the University of Windsor shall establish such number of REB(s) as determined appropriate from time to time by the Vice-President (Research and Innovation) which REBs shall be organized around specific ethics concerns.

b. Each REB established by the Senate of the University of Windsor shall be composed of a sufficient number of members to ensure quorum for each Full Board meeting, in accordance with TCPS, and other regulatory requirements when applied to a specific study (e.g. Health Canada, U.S. Office of Human Research Protections). Each REB will have membership that has expertise and experience in the disciplines, fields, and methods that it reviews.

c. The REB(s) shall apply the ethical principles described in the TCPS and adopted pursuant to the Policy in review of an application, in order to consider the ethical acceptability of the research described in the application. The REB and its members should not base their approval on epistemological, ontological,

methodological or theoretical preferences, but should be aware of, and be willing to consider and suggest, a range of approaches to promote the ethical conduct of research involving humans.

d. The REBs shall adopt a proportionate approach to research ethics review. The more potentially harmful the proposed research is to participants, the greater shall be the level of scrutiny that it receives. Ethics review shall be based upon fully detailed ethics applications submitted for review to the Office of Research Ethics (ORE), using such forms and processes as determined by the ORE. In the event the University maintains two or more REBs, approval by only one REB is necessary and no ethics application shall require approval from more than one REB. An applicant shall not submit the same application to more than one REB.

e. The REB(s) shall function impartially, provide a fair review to a researcher with respect to an application and provide reasoned and appropriately documented opinions and decisions. The REB(s) should make its decisions on the ethical acceptability of research in an efficient and timely manner, in accordance with recognized standards across Canadian REBs, and shall communicate all approvals and refusals to researchers in writing, in print or by electronic means.

2. DECISION MAKING AND REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

a. The Principal Investigator will advise, through questions in the ethics review application, the level of risk they deem the research to be – no greater than minimal risk, or greater than minimal risk.

b. The REB Chair, in discussion with ORE senior staff will make the final determination of risk level. If the proposed research involving humans does not involve more than minimal risk, the application may be eligible for Delegated Review, as described in the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS) and adapted by the ORE. There may be other reasons, beyond risk, that requires a study to receive Full Board review.

c. While the disposition of any individual review rests solely and exclusively with either the REB or, in the event of an appeal, with the Appeal Board, the REB(s) is accountable to the University of Windsor for their processes and procedures. In the event of a disagreement as to the interpretation or application of processes or procedures, other than the Procedures, the Director of Research and Integrity Services shall have final authority.

d. An approval, in the absence of a renewal, is valid for twelve (12) months from the date of issuance or for a shorter period of time, as specified in the approval letter. Where research involving humans requires ongoing REB approval in excess of the period for which an approval applies, it is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that an application for renewal of the approval, including reporting of any changes to the study protocol or staff (including any adverse events in the research) is made in sufficient time prior to the expiry date of the approval to permit prior review of that application for renewal. The REB Chair or Delegated reviewer may require a researcher to submit a fully detailed updated version of the original application by way of an application for a renewal of an approval or when otherwise deemed appropriate by such REB Chair.

e. Prior to implementing any substantive change to approved research involving humans, except where necessary to eliminate an immediate risk to the participants, the applicant must submit, and receive REB approval for, a request for amendment. Where a substantive change necessary to eliminate an immediate risk to participants is made without the applicant submitting a request for amendment, such request shall be submitted as soon as reasonably possible following implementation of that change. In case of doubt as to whether a change is substantive the applicant should discuss the change with the ORE and may rely on the decision of the ORE staff as to whether such change is substantive. Any request for an amendment shall be considered according to the proportionate approach to review regarding the risk associated with the change proposed as well as the degree of departure from the original proposal.

f. Requests for exceptions to review procedures stated in this Procedure to apply “typically” shall be considered by the REB Chair or delegated reviewer(s) on a case-by-case basis. An applicant must justify the need for the exception, appealing to particular obligations to meet particular criteria as set out by specific research contexts, agreements or international requirements. The REB(s) shall endeavour to review these exceptions as quickly as possible once all necessary information has been provided by the applicant.

3. APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCESSES

a. General Requirements
All applications for human ethics review at the University of Windsor shall be routed to the ORE and follow the application processes established by the Office, except as noted in 3.a.1.

1 Pedagogical, course-based research, whereby no new knowledge or generalizable results are generated, in accordance with TCPS, may be reviewed by a non-REB reviewer from the respective department, as determined by the ORE.

b. If there is more than one REB available to review an application, applicants shall choose one REB to review their application. The ORE may redirect any application that would be more suitably reviewed by another REB and notify the applicant as necessary. Upon completion and submission, applications for REB review shall be received by a delegated reviewer or the REB Chair following which the REB Chair or delegated reviewer shall make the assessment referred to in Section 2 a. above.

c. Where special cases of research require unique ethics review processes, for instance stem cell research or research funded by the US Department of Health and Human Services, ORE will ensure that the requirements shall be met either through modification to regular review processes, including the addition of REB members in the case of Full Board Reviews, or delegation to an external REB experienced in, and constituted to review, such research.

d. Delegated Review
In the case of a Delegated Review, the ORE shall send the application to a designated member of the REB who is delegated the authority to both review and approve the application. The following process applies to Delegated Review.

1 The delegated reviewer shall either confirm or reject the preliminary determination of the ORE (referred to in Section 2 a. above) that the application is no more than minimal risk and therefore suitable for Delegated Review.

2 If the delegated reviewer rejects the preliminary determination that the proposed research involving humans in an application for approval is no more than minimal risk the application shall be referred for Full Board Review.

3 If the delegated reviewer confirms the preliminary determination that the proposed research involving humans in an application for approval is no more than minimal risk, then the single designated reviewer shall proceed with an assessment of the application.

4 The delegated reviewer may call on other reviewers who are members of the REB for assistance in the delegated reviewer's assessment of the application. If the delegated reviewer determines additional expertise, beyond that which can be provided by other reviewers who are members of the REB, is necessary for appropriate review, the delegated reviewer shall seek the assistance of an *ad hoc* advisors or other appropriate assistance.

5 The delegated reviewer may refer the application for Full Board Review if the delegated reviewer deems the same appropriate.

6 The delegated reviewer may in the assessment of the application request further information or clarifications from the applicant and the applicant shall provide the designated reviewer with such information or clarifications.

7 If the delegated reviewer considers a negative decision resulting in the refusal of approval that potential negative decision shall be referred to the full REB for review and endorsement before the decision is communicated to the applicant.

8 The delegated reviewer may in the assessment of the application request changes to the study protocol and supporting materials judged to be necessary to bring the proposed work into compliance with, or to permit the request for approval to be granted pursuant to, the Policy and its Procedures.

9 This Delegated Review process is normally completed in writing, supported by the ORE.

10 The applicant shall respond to the requests of the delegated reviewer and if the delegated reviewer is satisfied with such response the delegated reviewer shall issue the approval.

11 The issuance of an approval through a Delegated Review shall be then reported to the Full Board at its next meeting for information.

12 In the case of Delegated Review the decision of the delegated reviewer, on behalf of the REB, to issue an approval shall be final and shall be reported to the full REB for information only to permit the REB to maintain surveillance over its Delegated Review process.

e. Full Board Review

1 In the case of a Full Board Review, the application shall be distributed to all members of the REB, but shall be specifically reviewed by two primary reviewers as well as the REB Chair or Associate/Vice Chair, and the community member(s) who is/are required to participate in all Full Board Reviews.

2 Any REB member having an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest (COI) with a proposed study or any other member believing that another member has a COI, shall declare that conflict to the Chair as soon as possible. If a conflict is determined to exist, the member shall be recused from participating in the deliberation and voting on the proposed study. At the discretion of the REB Chair, however, the recused member may stay in the meeting to provide any information about the application that the REB requires, prior to being excused while the REB deliberates and votes.

3 If the REB Chair or one of the primary reviewers determines additional expertise, beyond that which can be provided by other members of the REB is necessary for appropriate review, the assistance of an ad hoc advisor or other appropriate assistance shall be sought.

4 Typically, the applicant (and if the applicant is a trainee, that applicant's supervisor) may be invited to attend the REB meeting at which the application of the applicant is being considered. The primary reviewers shall to the extent they deem it necessary discuss the application with the applicant to be satisfied that they understand the proposed research sufficiently to determine the ethical implications of the proposed research involving humans. The primary reviewers shall to the extent they deem it necessary also specifically discuss the relevant ethical implications of the proposed research involving humans with the applicant. All members of the REB shall be entitled to ask questions of the applicant and the community member shall comment on the application. These discussions typically take about fifteen (15) minutes per applicant.

5 If the REB determines that an approval may be issued following satisfaction of requirements imposed by the REB with respect to such research involving humans, including the supporting material (such as an information letter or consent process) required in relation to such research involving humans, those requirements shall be communicated in writing to the applicant by the ORE. Upon the REB Chair (or designate) confirming that the applicant has complied with those communicated requirements to the satisfaction of the REB Chair the approval shall be issued.

Policy Title: Human Participant Research Policy: Human Research Appeal Procedure

Date Established:

Office with Administrative Responsibility: Office of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation

Approver: Senate

Revision Date(s): N/A

Overview
A researcher has the right to request, and a Research Ethics Board (REB) has an obligation to provide, reconsideration of a decision by that REB to reject or provide conditional approval of a request for ethics approval of research involving humans. If the researcher and the REB cannot achieve agreement through such reconsideration, the researcher may appeal that disputed decision of the REB in accordance with this Appeal Procedure.

Purpose
To describe the basic procedure for the appeal of a disputed decision by a REB.

PROCEDURE

1. RIGHT TO AND INITIATION OF APPEAL
   a. If after exhausting all reasonable informal attempts to resolve a disputed decision of a REB cooperatively, including deliberation, consultation or advice, and following reconsideration of that disputed decision, an applicant continues to dispute that REB decision, the applicant may appeal that decision.

   b. An appeal of a disputed REB decision may be made by an applicant only in writing outlining the grounds for the appeal, including any alleged breaches to the established research ethics review process or any elements of the REB decision that are not supported by the **Policy**, and accompanied by supporting documentation. The written appeal and supporting documents must be submitted to the Director - Research and Integrity Services within thirty (30) working days (days that the administrative offices of the University of Windsor are open for business) of receipt by the applicant of the written REB decision of such reconsideration. The disputed decision may be the subject of only a single appeal by the applicant.

   c. The Director - Research and Integrity Services shall acknowledge receipt of the appeal in writing to the applicant and shall forward a copy of the appeal and supporting documentation to the REB Chair. The REB Chair shall provide a written response to the appeal within ten (10) working days of receipt of the request.

   d. The written response of the REB Chair shall minimally include the following information:
      i. all documents available at the REB meetings related to the decision being appealed;
      ii. a response to the applicant's grounds for appeal; and
      iii. the steps taken to resolve the dispute.

      The Director - Research and Integrity Services shall ensure that each of the appellant and the REB Chair receive copies of all materials provided by the other and a list of the members of the Appeal Board. The Director - Research and Integrity Services shall provide each member of the Appeal Board with a notice of the appeal.

e. Any timeline set forth in this Appeal Procedure, other than that set forth in paragraph 1 b., may be modified prior to its expiration by agreement between the appellant and the REB Chair.

2. SELECTION OF APPEAL BOARD

a. The Director - Research and Integrity Services will work with their counterparts at other Ontario universities to request the assistance of an REB of another institution eligible to administer Tri-Agency funds to hear the appeal, for example the REBs of Brock, Waterloo and McMaster. The members of the REB identified to hear the appeal must, within ten (10) days of receipt of the notice of appeal from the Director - Research and Integrity Services, disclose real or potential conflicts of interests (COI) to the Director - Research and Integrity Services. If any such real or potential conflict of interests is disclosed, the member disclosing such conflict shall not participate in the appeal. No member of the REB whose decision is under appeal shall serve on the Appeal Board.

b. Both the appellant and the REB Chair have the right to challenge any member of the Appeal Board regarding COI. Challenges may only be made on the grounds that the member has a real or potential (COI) and must include written reasons to support the challenge. An Appeal Board member who is challenged by either the applicant or the REB Chair shall not be called on to serve on the Appeal Board unless the challenge is, in accordance with the balance of this paragraph, determined to be not valid. If the Director of Research and Integrity Services determines in relation to an appeal that the number of members of the Senate Committee on Research and Innovation excluded through automatic acceptance of challenges would prevent the selection of the required number of qualified members to serve as an ad hoc Appeal Committee, the Director of Research and Integrity Services shall consider each challenge and shall make the final decision as to whether or not each such challenges is valid.

c. The Director of Research and Integrity Services shall select no fewer than five REB members from the other institution not otherwise excluded by challenge or recusal, to serve as an hoc Appeal Committee and shall designate one of those members as the Chair of the Appeal Committee. The composition of the Appeal Committee must reflect a range of expertise and knowledge similar to that of the REB whose decision is under appeal.

d. The Appeal Committee may approve, reject or request modifications to the research proposal to which the disputed decision rates.

3. APPEAL

a. The Director - Research and Integrity Services shall convene a meeting of the Appeal Board within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the appeal. That meeting shall include provision for presentations by the applicant and the REB Chair.

b. The Appeal Board may request additional material from either the applicant or the Responding Chair, may seek advice from an expert witness and may have a resource person or persons attend any or all portion of its hearings.

c. The Appeal Board shall, as part of the appeal process, determine whether all reasonable attempts to resolve the disputed decision cooperatively have been exhausted. If it determines such reasonable attempts have not been exhausted, it may require the applicant and the REB whose decision is being appealed to continue those reasonable attempts prior to completing the hearing of the appeal.

d. The applicant shall be given the opportunity to present the grounds for the appeal and speak to the issues. The REB Chair shall be given the opportunity to present the reasons for the decision of the REB and speak to the issues. The applicant, the REB Chair and the Appeal Board may call witnesses and question the parties.

e. The Appeal Board, having heard the oral presentations of both parties and having reviewed the written presentation and supporting documentation, shall, following *in camera* deliberations, reach a decision by majority vote.

f. The Appeal Board may approve, reject or request modification to the research proposal to which the disputed decision relates.

g. The Appeal Board shall, within ten (10) days of the appeal hearing, provide a written decision to the Director - Research and Integrity Services. The Director - Research and Integrity Services shall transmit the decision to the applicant and, through the Responding Chair to the REB, whose decision was appealed, the latter for implementation and follow-up as required. The Director - Research and Integrity Services shall also transmit the decision to such other parties as deemed appropriate by the Appeal Board.

h. All decisions made by the Appeal Board are final and binding.

University of Windsor
Senate Governance Committee

5.4: **Proposed Revisions to Bylaws 31, 54, 55 and Policy on Grading and Calculation of Averages**

Item for: **Approval**

Forwarded by: **SGC Bylaw Review Committee**

MOTION 1: That the proposed revisions to Bylaw 54, Bylaw 55, and the Policy on Grading and the Calculation of Averages be approved.

Proposed Revisions:
[revisions are in track changes]

Policy on Grading and the Calculation of Averages
[…]
Aegrotat standing is the exceptional granting of credit for a course based on the successful completion of the majority of the assignments/evaluations or where the student has demonstrated achievement of sufficient learning outcomes for the course, as defined under the appropriate Faculty policy and provided that all accreditation and safety requirements have been met. Where the assessment of aegrotat standing results in a passing grade, an AEG will be assigned. Where the assessment of aegrotat standing does not result in the granting of credit, a non-pass aegrotat (NPA) may be assigned. Aegrotat standing (AEG and NPA) notations are recorded on the transcript and have no numeric grade equivalent.

[…]

A grade of IP is recorded at the end of the first term of a two-term course. Pass/Non-Pass (P/NP) and Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U) grades are recorded on the transcript but have no numeric grade equivalent.

[…]

For (i) and (ii) above, an "Incomplete" must be changed to a grade not later than six weeks following the release of official final grades by the Office of the Registrar. If no grade has been assigned by that date, a final grade of 0% (where numeric grades are assigned) or Non-Pass (where Pass/Non-Pass grades are assigned) is automatically entered in the student's record by the Office of the Registrar.

Bylaw 54:
[…]
2.18.3 In the cases outlined in 2.18.1-2.18.2 above, the Instructor may grant an "aegrotat standing" of pass (AEG) or non-pass (NPA), as defined in the Policy on Grading and the Calculation of Averages, or assign an "incomplete" (IN) specifying what further work is required. If further work is required, the instructor is responsible for notifying the student of both the work required and the deadline by which it is to be submitted. The instructor's response will be forwarded to the Office of the Registrar using any approved procedure for submitting final grades. A final grade must be submitted no later than six weeks following the release of official final grades by the Office of the Registrar.

Deleted: S
Deleted: ,
Deleted: following a positive review of a student's request for consideration based on health, bereavement, or extenuating circumstances. …
Deleted: S
Deleted: but
Deleted: *
Deleted: *[*where credit cannot be granted, an NP will be assigne*
Deleted: after the last date of the examination period.
Deleted: grade on the basis of term work
Deleted: grade indicating
Deleted:
Deleted: and the deadline by which such work must be completed…
Deleted: the
Deleted: followed

[…]

2.19.2 The average of a student who receives an "Incomplete" grade will not be calculated until the final mark is assigned. An "Incomplete" grade must be changed to a numeric grade no later than six weeks following the release of official final grades by the Office of the Registrar, at which time, if no grade has been assigned, a final grade of 0% (where numeric grades are assigned) or Non-Pass (where Pass/Non-Pass grades are assigned) will automatically be entered in the student's record by the Office of the Registrar, except in exceptional circumstances in which case the Dean of the Faculty offering the course shall specify a period of time greater than six weeks.

Deleted: after the last date of the examination period

Deleted: failing

Bylaw 55:

[…]

1.11.3 In the cases outlined in 1.11.1-1.11.2 above, the Instructor may grant an "aegrotat standing" of pass (AEG) or non-pass (NPA), as defined in the Policy on Grading and the Calculation of Averages, or assign an "incomplete" (IN) indicating what further work is required. The instructor's response will be forwarded by the Head of the AAU offering the course to the Dean of Graduate Studies for final approval. The Dean of Graduate Studies shall inform the Office of the Registrar using any approved procedure for submitting final grades. If further work is required, refer to the graduate section of the Policy on Grading and the Calculation of Averages.

Deleted: grade on the basis of term work

Deleted: grade

Deleted: and the deadline by which such work must be completed

Deleted: the

Deleted: followed

Rationale:

- The revisions provide greater clarity around the use of aegrotat, particularly where the review results in a failing grade. The new NPA designation acknowledges that there were external and extenuating factors that impacted the students ability to succeed in the course.
- The revisions also provide flexibility to the instructor or Associate Dean by reframing the determination of determining whether to grant aegrotat standing based on an assessment of achievement of sufficient learning outcomes for the course, particularly where there is no Faculty policy relating to aegrotat standing. It also recognizes that aegrotat standing is granted to students based on compassionate grounds and so flexibility in assessing whether to grant aegrotat (AEG or NPA) is essential.
- Undergraduate Incompletes are converted to 0% six weeks after official grades are posted by the Office of the Registrar (not six weeks after the last day of the exam period). For graduate courses, where work is not completed, the Incomplete remains on the transcript indefinitely.
- Graduate IN grades and processes associated with them are defined clearly in the Policy. It is unnecessary to repeat this in the bylaw.

MOTION 2: That the proposed revisions to Bylaw 54 and Bylaw 55 be approved.

Proposed Revisions:
[revisions are in bold and strikethrough]

Bylaw 54:

"Final examination(s)" shall mean any final testing procedure (written test, oral interview, essay, take home test, etc.) that takes place or falls due during the examination period.

1 The following regulations apply to first-entry undergraduate programs

~~1.1 All courses shall have some type of non-optional, meaningful, final examination during the examination period~~.

1.~~2~~**1** Two to three-hour examination slots will normally be scheduled in the formal final examination periods in each semester for all courses which terminate in that semester. All final examinations shall take place (or fall due,

as the case may be) during the two to three-hour final examination slot so scheduled. Asynchronous online examinations must commence or end within the scheduled time slot. The actual duration of testing procedures during the scheduled final examination slot may be less than the scheduled time, at the discretion of the individual instructor.

If oral or other special types of examinations cannot be accommodated in the two to three-hour final examination slot, and satisfactory arrangements cannot be made with the course instructor, notice will be given to the Registrar by the AAU Head and special arrangements will be made.

1.2 The final examination period is reserved for the course's final testing procedure, which cannot exceed 40% of the final grade per 2.5.1 and 2.18.2. All in-term evaluations or assignments must take place or fall due prior to the last seven calendar days of classes.

[…]

2.2 Instructors may not alter the date of final examinations if scheduled and announced by the Registrar. All other final examinations may be scheduled only during the University's official examination period.

2.17.3 Stays

2.17.3.1 During ~~the course of~~ any appeal ~~procedure described throughout~~ **under** paragraph 2.17.2 **or petition to the Procedural Irregularities Committee under Bylaw 32**, ~~a stay on~~ all lower decisions affecting a student's standing in a program or eligibility to proceed with a course of study shall be **stayed** ~~in effect~~ until a final decision **is** ~~has been~~ reached, **with the exception that students shall not continue in or enter placements involving vulnerable populations (eg, patients, minors, etc.)**. **If the appeal or petition is decided in the student's favour, the Department or Faculty shall provide an equivalent alternative placement to avoid delaying the student's progression in the program.**

~~2.17.3.2 The stay shall also be in effect if the matter is being considered by the Procedural Irregularities Committee, under Bylaw 32.~~ In the event that a decision adverse to the student is reached by the Procedural Irregularities Committee, the student will receive the original grade assigned or the grade assigned on appeal, as the case may be.

[…]

2.19 Alternate evaluations must be equivalent in terms of type, format, and level of difficulty as the original evaluation and as outlined in the course syllabus (per 2.1.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.17, 2.18).

[…]

2.2**3** Alternative Examinations **due to Religious Observances**

Bylaw 55:

1.12.2 Formal Grade Appeals

[…]

1.12.2.5 Stays

During ~~the course of~~ any appeal ~~procedure described throughout~~ **under** paragraph 2.17.2 **or petition to the Procedural Irregularities Committee under Bylaw 32**, ~~a stay on~~ all lower decisions affecting a student's standing in a program or eligibility to proceed with a course of study shall be **stayed** ~~in effect~~ until a final decision **is** ~~has been~~ reached, **with the exception that students shall not continue in or enter placements involving vulnerable populations (eg, patients, minors, etc.)**. **If the appeal or petition is decided in the student's favour, the Department or Faculty shall provide an equivalent alternative placement to avoid delaying the student's progression in the program.**

~~The stay shall also be in effect if the matter is being considered by the Procedural Irregularities Committee, under Bylaw 32.~~ In the event that a decision adverse to the student is reached by the Procedural Irregularities Committee, the student will receive the original grade assigned or the grade assigned on appeal, as the case may be.

1.12.2.6 In cases where the assigned grade prevents the student from achieving the requirements for promotion, the requirements as defined by the Faculty will be applied.

[…]

1.12.4 Petitions to the Procedural Irregularities Committee

Where a student alleges procedural irregularities with respect to academic instruction, academic evaluation, or academic grade appeals, a petition may be filed by the student in accordance with Senate Bylaw 32. In such cases, a stay ~~on all lower decisions affecting a student's standing in a program or eligibility to proceed with a course of study~~ **normally** shall be in effect **on all lower decisions** until a final decision has been reached~~ by the Procedural Irregularities Committee.~~ **as outlined under 1.12.2.5.**

1.13 Alternate evaluations must be equivalent in terms of type, format, and level of difficulty as the original evaluation (per 1.1.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.11, 1.12)

1.1**4** Alternative Examinations **due to Religious Observance**

Rationale:

- It is not sound pedagogy to require that there be a final examination. This should be left to the instructor to determine how best to assess students. In practice, there are routinely several courses that do not have final examinations.
- Some instructors are using a loophole where they do not have anything due in the last seven calendar days of classes consistent with 1.3, but then they make the last in-class assignment due during the final exam period in addition to the final exam. Students then not only have to study for their final examinations, but must also focus on completing other assignments. This contravenes the principle in the bylaw which specifically sets out an additional period for the purposes of the final examination as well as the Senate policy defining the length of semester courses as 12 weeks.
- A stay on a lower decision ensures that a student's progression through their program is not negatively impacted where the original decision is overturned. Without a stay on lower decisions, students who later have their appeal upheld would nonetheless have been denied registration in required courses while the matter was under review, resulting in extra time and costs to complete their programs. This, however, needs to be balanced with health and safety considerations in situations where student placements involve vulnerable populations, and the matter under consideration relates to whether the student has adequately demonstrated achievement of the learning outcomes and professional standards to the level required to safely be placed in placements.
- Additional language regarding alternative evaluations refers to the Senate bylaw ruling that any alternative evaluation is to be equivalent in terms of type, format, and level of difficulty to be compliant with the various sections of the bylaw. In addition to there not being any changes permitted to the course syllabus (including types and formats of evaluations) after the first two weeks of classes, an appeal that has been granted signifies that the reasons for the student's appeal were justified. It is a procedural irregularity to then penalize the student with a harder evaluation or different format than those who did not experience legitimate issues or challenges. If the student's rationale for the appeal does not seem sufficient, the appeal simply should not be granted.

MOTION 3: That the proposed revisions to Bylaw 31 be approved.

Proposed Revisions:

[revisions are in bold and strikethrough]

Bylaw 31:

Head means head of the academic administrative unit or program offering the course in which the alleged misconduct occurred and includes Heads of Departments**, and** Directors of Schools **(or their designate as approved by the Dean)**, and Program Administrators as designated by the Dean. Where the instructor reporting the misconduct is also the Head that will be reviewing the matter, the Dean of the Faculty shall appoint a designate to act in their capacity under this bylaw on that particular matter. In the event of the temporary absence or inability to act of the Head, the faculty member appointed in a temporary acting capacity will act in the Head's place under this bylaw.

Rationale:

- This allows for delegation of authority as needed to ensure timely resolution of matters.

University of Windsor
Senate Governance Committee

5.5: **Honorary Degree Criteria – Revisions**

Item for: **Approval**

Forwarded by: **SGC Honorary Degree Committee**

MOTION: That the proposed revisions to the Honorary Degree Criteria, Guidelines, and Procedures be approved.

Rationale:

- All of the honorary degree criteria and policies reviewed at other Canadian institutions include policy and procedures for the revocation of an honorary degree. Not having such a policy places the University at risk should there be a time when a revocation may be warranted. Such clauses are rarely, if ever, used. However, it is best to be proactive, rather than reactive.
- The policy incorporates leading practices at other universities in terms of setting out grounds and procedures.
- Additional revisions were made to the general process to reflect current policies and allow flexibility in timelines, where appropriate.

See attached.

University of Windsor
Honorary Degree Criteria, Guidelines, and Procedures

NB: The term 'Honorary Degree Committee' or 'Committee' is used to represent the Special Appointments Committee augmented by one Board member per Senate Bylaw 3, 1.2.3.3.5.

If you are nominating someone, please do not inform them of your nomination!

Criteria:

An honorary degree is intended to recognize exemplary individuals who have achieved exceptional levels in their profession or who have made outstanding contributions to culture and society in Canada or elsewhere in the world. Candidates must demonstrate local, national or international excellence and have a proven distinction in their field. They should provide inspiration and leadership to students, the university community, and/or the community at large. Consideration will be given to candidates who exemplify the University's core values and mission. Successful candidates will possess qualities to which our students will aspire.

Guidelines:

- The Honorary Degree Committee is not bound to identify an honoree for each convocation. It is important that high standards are maintained to ensure the quality of an honorary degree from the University of Windsor. Therefore, the Honorary Degree Committee may only identify 2 or 3 honorary degrees in a given year, generally at least one in the Fall and two in the Spring.
- In a given year, at least two genders will be represented, where there is more than one recipient.
- Special efforts will be made to identify members of designated groups.
- Over time, there will be an effort towards some balance across the academic and professional disciplines at the University.

Restrictions:

The University will not normally award honorary degrees:

- posthumously
- in absentia
- to active politicians
- to current members of its own faculty, staff or Board of Governors

Process:

a) The Committee will call for nominations annually in September for all Convocations during the following year. Only nominations that are completed on the official form, with the required supporting documentation will be reviewed by the Committee. The Nomination form, criteria and historical information are available at http://www.uwindsor.ca/secretariat/31/honorary-degrees. Nominations must be completed by September 28th. Nominees should *not* be informed of their nomination. This protects the individual and the University, if the nomination is not accepted.

b) The Committee will normally meet annually, at the end of the calendar year, to consider nominations. Committee members may make nominations from the floor but only if they are supported by the information required on the nomination form. The Committee normally will complete its work by the end of the Fall term.

c) As much as possible, the Honorary Degree Committee will operate by consensus. Nominations will normally require the two-thirds approval of the Honorary Degree Committee members present and voting, before they can

Deleted: equity seeking

Deleted: accepted

Deleted: in

Deleted: October/November of each

Deleted: (see nomination form)

Deleted: may meet on several occasions during October but must normally complete its work by November.

Deleted: and Senate Governance

Deleted: s

Deleted: unanimous

Deleted: consent (no dissenters)

be taken to the Senate Governance Committee for approval.

d) A list of approved honorary degree candidates will be maintained and reviewed by the Honorary Degree Committee in accordance with the Policy on the List of Approved Honorary Degree Candidates.

e) The President will contact approved candidates taking into consideration the need for diversity and a balance across the academic and professional disciplines at the University of honorary degree recipients.

f) There will not normally be carry over of nominations from one year to the next.

g) See Policy on the List of Approved Honorary Degree Candidates for review process for approved names.

Revoking an Honorary Degree:
In exceptional circumstances, an honorary degree may be revoked where new information or subsequent conduct fundamentally undermines the integrity of the award or the values of the institution.

Grounds for revocation include, but are not limited to:

- the recipient has been convicted of a criminal offence; been removed from a professional body for misconduct; obtained the degree through fraud, deception, or misrepresentation; or engaged in conduct or actions that significantly conflict with the University's values or bring disrepute to the institution.

Process

1. *Initiation:*
   Revocation is only available for Honorary Degrees awarded where a recommendation to do so is initiated by the President. Faculty, staff, or students may request that the President consider recommending the revocation of an honorary degree to the Honorary Degree Committee by submitting such request, with detailed rationale and clear evidence, to the University Secretariat.

2. *Honorary Degree Committee Consideration:*
   The committee will assess the evidence against the established criteria and may consult the original nomination record. A recommendation to revoke requires a two-thirds majority vote of the committee members present.

3. *Final Decision:*
   The recommendation is forwarded to Senate Governance Committee, which has delegated authority over honorary degree awards, for in-camera consideration. A two-thirds majority vote of members present is required for revocation.

Deleted: The Honorary Degree and Senate Governance Committees may approve one or more alternate candidates in a given year (in case one or more of the nominees declines the nomination or is unable to attend an appropriate Convocation).

Deleted: nominees each year and is empowered to contact alternate nominees in the order specified by the Senate Governance Committee if one or more nominees on the primary list decline or are unable to attend an appropriate Convocation

Deleted: Except in cases where there are approved recipients or alternates not used from the approved Senate Governance Committee list. In this case, these names will be forwarded to the committee for the following year. The committee will be notified as to their origin.

Policy on the List of Approved Honorary Degree Candidates
[Approved: November 16, 2021]

1. Following review and approval by the Senate Governance Committee, on the recommendation of the SGC Honorary Degree Committee, successful nominees will be added to the list of approved honorary degree candidates, maintained by the University Secretariat.

2. Approved honorary degree candidates will remain on the list for a period of three years, after which time their candidacy will be reassessed by the Honorary Degree Committee, which will determine whether to retain the names on the list for a further two years. Where the Honorary Degree Committee concludes that a name should be removed, a recommendation to this effect will be forwarded to the Senate Governance Committee for approval.

3. Names that have been on the list for five or more years will be automatically removed. Exceptions may be made by the President, where deemed appropriate.

The purpose of this policy is to ensure the currency and relevancy of the List of Approved Honorary Degree Candidates. After more than five years on the approved list, the connection or relevance of a candidate to the current priorities of the University, as well as the currency of the information on which the decision was made, are called into question.

Nothing prevents a new nomination of a candidate removed from the list, accompanied by an updated nomination package.