

**AGENDA**

- I **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION** - None
- II **MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE** - None
- III **MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION** - None
- IV **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**
- V **QUESTION PERIOD**

Senators are reminded that questions shall normally be submitted in writing to the University Secretary no later than 10:00 a.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

- VI **CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 1, 2003**
- VII **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**
- VIII **REPORTS OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
AND THE SENATE PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE**

- 1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**
  - a) **Monthly Report** Page 17
  - b) **Report on the allegations made by the  
Animal Alliance of Canada and Environment Voters** Page 18
- 2. **Report of the Senate  
Planning and Priorities Committee**

The Chair will make an oral report on the Committee's activities.

**IX      REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES OF SENATE,  
FACULTY AND SCHOOL COUNCILS**

- |    |  |         |
|----|--|---------|
| 1. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on<br/>Curriculum and Course Changes</u> | Page 20 |
|    | <u>Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee</u>              | Page 23 |
| 2. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions</u>                        |         |
|    | a) <u>re: Continuing Education Division</u>                                | Page 25 |
|    | b) <u>re: Faculty of Social Work</u>                                       | Page 27 |
|    | c) <u>re: Faculty of Education</u>   | Page 29 |
|    | d) <u>re: Faculty of Education Advanced Standing Policy</u>                | Page 30 |
| 3. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations</u>                       | Page 31 |

**X      ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

**XI     ADJOURNMENT**

Please Call Regrets to 474-6167.

/jml

October 15, 2003

## **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**

### **Preamble**

1. The terms of reference for the Senate Executive Committee are found in Section 7.2 of the *Senate Handbook* (revised 2000).
2. The Senate Executive Committee held its regular meeting on October 15, 2003.

### **Observations**

1. **Speaker for the Senate Executive Committee**

Professor Barbara Payne will be the Speaker for the Executive Committee for the November meeting of Senate.

2. **Comments of the Senate Executive Committee**

Other comments of the Executive Committee accompany the report on which they are made.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Emőke Szathmáry, Chair  
Senate Executive Committee

Terms of Reference: *Senate Handbook* (revised 2000), Section 7.

/jml

October 15, 2003

## **Report of the Senate Executive Committee on the allegations made by the Animal Alliance of Canada and Environment Voters**

---

### **Preamble**

1. The terms of reference for the Senate Executive Committee are found in the Senate Handbook Section 7.2.
2. At its meeting on September 17, 2003, Senate Executive received a letter and attached documentation from Animal Alliance of Canada and Environment Voters alleging irregularities in procedures in the use of animals for research and teaching purposes by the University of Manitoba. Also received were correspondence from the Chair of Senate to the Acting Vice-President (Research), Dr. Digvir Jayas, and his response.
3. Senate Executive established a small *ad-hoc* subcommittee to review the allegations made by the Animal Alliance of Canada and Environment Voters, and the response provided by the Chair of the Senate Committee on Animal Care (Dr. Jayas). The members of the subcommittee were Dr. Dale Lonis, chair, Dr. Richard Sparling and Dr. Juris Svenne. Ms Erin Prosser, Vice President of UMSU and assessor of Senate Executive joined the subcommittee as assessor.

### **Observations**

1. The claims made in the letter from Animal Alliance of Canada and Environment Voters are as follows:
  - That the University of Manitoba has failed to comply with its own policy and those of CCAC on use of animals in research, in particular as these apply to requirements of training of researchers who are to be working on experiments that use animal subjects.
  - That the University of Manitoba has failed to honour the terms of its dog procurement contract with the City of Winnipeg.
  - That the University of Manitoba must begin an active program to comply with the 3Rs of animal care: Replace, Reduce and Refine.
2. On the first point, the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) assesses all universities on a rotating schedule for their compliance with the Tri-Council policy on the use and care of animals in research, the CCAC guidelines, and the university's own policies. The University of Manitoba was evaluated in April, 2001, and full compliance was granted for three years. The next evaluation is scheduled for 2004, likely in the spring.
3. With regard to training, The CCAC policy on training at the present time, 2003, is more stringent than that in place in 2000-2001, the dates of the protocols examined by Animal Alliance of Canada and Environment Voters. The University of Manitoba is, in fact, ahead of the CCAC policy requirements with regard to training. The 2003 requirements were fully implemented here as of January 1, 2003, while the CCAC, by email of December 20, 2002 to Dr. J. Keselman, Vice-President (Research), called for implementation of the requirements on training, defined by CCAC in September 1999, to begin on January 1, 2003 and be phased in over a three-year period.

October 15, 2003

4. The City of Winnipeg terminated its contract to supply pound dogs to the University of Manitoba in 2003, not because of any breach of contract, but due to public pressure. Therefore the issue of this contract is now a moot point. However, our investigations have shown that the terms of this contract, in particular with respect to the use of pound dogs for acute experiments **only**, not for chronic ones, were never violated.
5. With regard to the 3Rs, The University of Manitoba already has an active program of compliance with the 3Rs. It is part of Policy 1404, Care and Use of Animals, which explicitly calls for the application of this policy by the Protocol Management and Review Committee in evaluating protocols, and by the University veterinarians acting as resource persons to researchers. As an example, between 2000 and 2002, there has been a reduction of 33% in the number of animals used in research and teaching, while research funding had increased by 17% during the same time.
6. Notwithstanding the above, and since there have been significant and on-going changes in the CCAC guidelines which, according to policy 1404, we are required to follow and adhere to with respect to animal care, an annual review of the procedures for animal care might be beneficial.

### Recommendations

1. That Senate approve this report from the Executive and ask the Chair of Senate and the President and Vice-Chancellor of the University to reply to Animal Alliance of Canada and Environment Voters, on the basis of this report.

Further, since constant vigilance over our animal care procedures is essential, the Executive recommends:

2. That the Senate Committee on Animal Care (SCAC) review current policies and procedures regarding the use of animals for research and teaching, with particular emphasis on ensuring that our policy 1404 maintains consistency with CCAC guidelines, as these are continuously being revised.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. E.J.E. Szathmáry, Chair

Senate Executive Committee

/jps

**Comments of the Senate Executive Committee:**  
**The Senate Executive Committee endorses**  
**the report to Senate.**

## Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes

---

### Preamble

1. The terms of reference of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes (SCCCC) are found in section 8.21 of the *Senate Handbook*, wherein the SCCC is charged "to recommend to Senate on the introduction, modification or abolition of undergraduate programs, curricula or courses"
2. SCCC met on August 21, 2003 to consider course and program change requests from the Faculty of Education and the School of Medical Rehabilitation.

### Observations

#### 1. Faculty of Education

The Faculty of Education is requesting that the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education be re-designated as the Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Education (PBCE). This request stems from the report of the Cross-Functional Committee on Non-Degree programs, which recommended that the Faculty review whether a change in designation would be appropriate.

The re-designation of the PBCE to a Post-Baccalaureate Diploma is consistent with the Taxonomy on Non-Degree Programs as approved by Senate in November, 2001.

#### 2. School of Medical Rehabilitation

The Office of Institutional Analysis has recommended a re-numbering of undergraduate courses in the School of Medical Rehabilitation to allow for courses offered by the departments of Respiratory Therapy, Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy to be differentiated. Currently all courses are designated with the School prefix '068'.

### Recommendations

1. THAT the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education be re-designated as the Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Education, effective for all students admitted after January 1, 2004, and that current students in the PBCE be allowed to choose which designation they wish to have.
2. THAT the 44 School of Medical Rehabilitation Courses be re-designated as outlined below.

Respectfully submitted,

Professor B.L. Dronzek, Chair  
Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes.

/jml

Comments of the Senate Executive Committee:  
The Senate Executive Committee endorses  
the report to Senate.

**PROPOSED CHANGES IN COURSE NUMBERS - SCHOOL OF MEDICAL REHABILITATION  
BACHELOR OF MEDICAL REHABILITATION (PHYSICAL THERAPY)**

<b>CURRENT NUMBER</b>	<b>PROPOSED NUMBER</b>	<b>COURSE TITLE</b>	<b>CREDIT HOURS</b>
068.170	167.170	Psychosocial Issues	6
068.173	167.173	Physical Therapy Management	10
068.174	167.174	Cardiorespiratory Clinical Education	8
068.175	167.175	Rehabilitation Exercise 1	6
068.191	167.191	Pathology and Clinical Manifestations	5
068.272	167.272	Electro-Physical Agents in Physical Therapy Management	3
068.275	167.275	Rehabilitation Exercise 2	2
068.276	167.276	Orthopedic Assessment and Management 1	6
068.277	167.277	Orthopedic Assessment and Management 2	6
068.278	167.278	Musculoskeletal Clinical Education	10
068.279	167.279	Physical Therapy Management of Musculoskeletal Disorders	8
068.289	167.289	Rehabilitation Biomechanics	3
068.370	167.370	Fundamentals of Physical Therapy Management	11
068.373	167.373	Advanced Musculoskeletal Topics	3
068.374	167.374	Integrated Tutorials	3
068.388	167.388	Clinical Education in Neurological Disorders	8
068.392	167.392	Summer Internship	8
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>106</b>

**PROPOSED CHANGES IN COURSE NUMBERS - SCHOOL OF MEDICAL REHABILITATION  
BACHELOR OF MEDICAL REHABILITATION (RESPIRATORY THERAPY)**

<b>CURRENT NUMBER</b>	<b>PROPOSED NUMBER</b>	<b>COURSE TITLE</b>	<b>CREDIT HOURS</b>
068.127	169.127	Respiratory Anatomy and Physiology	3
068.128	169.128	Medical Microbiology	2
068.129	169.129	Cardiopulmonary Pharmacology	2
068.132	169.132	Applied Sciences for Respiratory Therapy	3
068.133	169.133	Technical Aspects of Respiratory Therapy	3
068.136	169.136	Treatment Administration in Respiratory Care	3
068.137	169.137	Ventilatory Support Principles	6
068.138	169.138	Basic Fieldwork 1	4
068.230	169.230	Respiratory Clinical Assessment	6
068.231	169.231	Clinical Aspects of Ventilatory Management	3
068.232	169.232	Ventilatory Support Instrumentation	6
068.233	169.233	Pulmonary Investigations	3
068.234	169.234	Physiologic Measurements and Interpretation	3
068.235	169.235	Cardiology	3
068.236	169.236	Pediatrics	3
068.237	169.237	Anesthesiology	3
068.330	169.330	Seminars in Respiratory Care	3
068.331	169.331	Clinical Education in Intensive Care	10
068.332	169.332	Clinical Education in Pediatric Respiratory Care	3
068.333	169.333	Clinical Education in Neonatal Respiratory Care	4
068.334	169.334	Clinical Education in Maternal/Fetal Health	1
068.335	169.335	Clinical Education in Pulmonary Diagnostics	3
068.336	169.336	Clinical Education in Anesthesia	3
068.337	169.337	Clinical Education in Community Care	4
068.338	169.338	Clinical Education in Respiratory Care	4
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91</b>

**PROPOSED CHANGES IN COURSE NUMBERS - SCHOOL OF MEDICAL REHABILITATION  
UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY**

<b>CURRENT NUMBER</b>	<b>PROPOSED NUMBER</b>	<b>COURSE TITLE</b>	<b>CREDIT HOURS</b>
068.409	168.409	Independent Study	3
068.413	168.413	Re-Entry Fieldwork	8
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11</b>



August 25, 2003

**Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee on the request of the Faculty of Education to change the designation "Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education" to the "Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Education".**

**Preamble**

1. The terms of reference for the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC) are found in Section 8.32 of the *Senate Handbook*, wherein SPPC is charged to make recommendations to Senate on academic programs.
2. The Taxonomy of Non-Degree Programs also mandates SPPC to review and recommend to Senate on new Post-Baccalaureate Diplomas.
3. SPPC met on July 30, 2003 to consider a request of the Faculty of Education to re-designate the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education as the Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Education.

**Observations**

1. The Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education was approved by Senate at least 15 years ago and has been offered ever since. It is a program consisting of 30 credit hours of course work, and is used by educators as a professional development tool.
2. With the approval of the Taxonomy of Non-Degree programs, definitions were given to the various non-degree credentials offered by the University. Under the new Taxonomy, the program is more accurately defined as a Post-Baccalaureate Diploma. At the time the Taxonomy was approved, the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education was granted an exemption from the new nomenclature, but it was noted that the " Faculty of Education will review to determine whether it would be more appropriate to upgrade to [Post-Baccalaureate] Diploma status". Such a review has occurred, and the Faculty recommends the change.
3. The Taxonomy of Non-Degree Programs also calls for the sponsoring unit, as part of the approvals process, to consult with the Libraries and IST to determine resources needed. As the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education is an existing program, and presumably has the required resources, this was not felt to be necessary in this case.
4. SPPC considered the matter of students currently in the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate program and recommends that such students be permitted to choose the designation that they wish to receive, Post-Baccalaureate Certificate or Post-Baccalaureate Diploma.

**Comments of the Senate Executive Committee:**

The Senate Executive Committee endorses the report and recommendations.

**Recommendations**

The Senate Planning and Priorities Committee recommends that:

1. Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the re-designation of the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education as the Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Education, effective for all students admitted after January 1, 2004.
2. That all students currently registered in the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Education be allowed, upon completion of their program, to choose which of the two designations they wish to receive.

Respectfully submitted,

Juris. P. Svenne, Acting Chair  
Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

/jml

**Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Continuing Education Division (CED) to change the admission requirements for General Studies, effective for the September 2005 intake (2003.09.23)**

**Preamble**

Dr. Anne Percival, Dean of the Continuing Education Division, struck a committee in the spring of 2002 to review General Studies. Review Committee members included Dr. David Kirby, CHERD, (Chair); Dr. Beverly Cameron, University 1; Mr. Peter Dueck, Enrolment Services; Ms Joan McConnell, Science; Mr. Walt McKee, Physical Education; and Mr. Harry Sutcliffe, Arts. The Committee reported in January, 2003, with seven recommendations, and recommendation # 2 stated “that the University should reconsider the policy of admitting students directly from high school who do not have the standards for entry to University 1,” especially if additional supports like mandatory study-skills courses, foundation courses, and pro-active advising and counselling (as outlined in recommendation # 3) could not be provided to this group of students.

Subsequently, the CED Council passed a motion on May 7, 2003, recommending “an admission requirement such that any student admitted to General Studies directly from high school must meet the minimum entrance requirements established for admission to University 1.”

**Observations**

1. Of the 1456 students admitted to General Studies for the 2001-02 regular academic session, 279 were rejected by University 1 but met the general entrance requirements of the University of Manitoba. These applicants would have had high school averages between 50 percent (the general entrance requirement) and 63 percent (the University 1 entrance requirement) or would not have satisfied the specific subject requirements for University 1 (usually English and/or mathematics).
2. In response to a request for outcome data, Jack Hermiston, Senior Research Analyst, Office of Institutional Analysis, prepared a report, “A Comparison of Continuing Education General Studies Students to University 1 Regular Students for the Years 1998-9 to 2001-2”. There were considerable differences in the outcome data between the full-time General Studies (GS) and University 1 (U1) students. The mean grade point average for the full-time GS students differed significantly from that of the U1 students, 1.32 compared to 2.49. Also there were significant differences between the retention rates, migration rates, and graduation rates for the two groups of full-time students. The GS students were more likely to drop out between years one and two, less likely to migrate to degree programs by the beginning of year two, and considerably less likely to have graduated after four years, as compared to the full-time U1 students.
3. The Review Committee raised the question “of whether these students should be admitted to The University of Manitoba directly from high school given an apparent lack of maturity, in addition to their weak academic entry characteristics”, adding that “it may be preferable to have these students wait for a couple of years and then seek entry to The University of

Manitoba under the 'mature status student' entry category", which would allow them access to University 1 and its greater advising capacity.

4. In its recommendation # 3, the Review Committee went on to say that if the University chooses not to align the entrance requirements for General Studies with those of University 1, "then additional support should be provided to this group of students" who cannot meet the standards for entry for University 1. "Consideration should be given to the provision of mandatory study-skills courses, foundation courses, and pro-active advising and counselling services. Given that the University was not in a position to provide the funding and other resources needed to provide these additional supports, the CED Council voted to adopt recommendation # 2 and amend the entrance requirements for General Studies.
5. There was some concern expressed by members of the Senate Committee on Admissions that raising the admission requirements for General Studies would block entry to the University for some students who had the capacity to do well, though it was generally agreed that the University should not be admitting and accepting tuition fees from students who were unlikely, on average, to succeed in their studies. As well, it was considered appropriate for the University to have a common set of admission standards for students admitted to the University directly from high school.

### **Recommendation**

The Senate Committee on Admissions concurs with the Continuing Education Division Council and recommends that the admission requirements for General Studies be amended "such that any student admitted to General Studies directly from high school must meet the minimum entrance requirements established for admission to University 1".

Respectfully submitted,  
 Dr. D.R. Morphy, Chair,  
 Senate Committee on Admissions

Terms of reference: Senate Handbook (revised 1992), pp. 10.6-10.8

Comments of the Senate Executive Committee:

The Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

**Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Faculty of Social Work to change its entrance requirements for its Fort Garry campus Bachelor of Social Work program (2003.09.23)**

**Preamble**

The current entrance requirements for the on-campus Bachelor of Social Work (B.S.W.) program allow for three broad categories of admission. Approximately 75 students are admitted for each in-take, with 25 being admitted from a rank-ordered list of candidates with the highest entrance averages, another 25 being admitted from a random-ordered list of eligible candidates, and 25 being admitted from those eligible in five educational equity priority groups, including applicants who are Aboriginal (13), disabled (3), refugees or recent immigrants (3), from visible minorities (3), or from the University's Access program (3). The Educational Equity (EE) Committee in Social Work recommended to the B.S.W. Admissions Committee in June, 2002, that a new approach be used to re-allocate spaces among and from the educational equity priority groups when unused spaces occur in one or more of these groups during the selection process.

**Observations**

1. Under the current policy, unused spaces are assigned to the Aboriginal category first (and then to the random-ordered list) independent of the ratio of applicants from the various equity groups. The EE Committee proposed that unused spaces be allocated across all of the equity groups on a rotating basis in the July 2002 meeting. The B.S.W. Admissions Committee requested that the EE Committee provide a statistical rationale for changing the current re-allocation approach.
2. At its meeting in June 2003, the B.S.W. Admissions Committee acknowledged that the current formula for re-allocating unused spaces had been devised quite some time ago. It recommended that new statistical information be obtained, not only for the purpose of re-allocating unused spaces, but so that the overall policy for allocating spaces among the educational equity priority groups could be updated. The intent would be to consider the re-allocation of unused spaces as part of this broader review.
3. The B.S.W. Admissions Committee agreed to recommend that the policy be changed on an interim basis while the EE Committee conducts the review required to revise the current policy on the allocation of spaces, such that any unused educational equity priority spaces be distributed by lottery among the remaining equity groups. This recommendation was subsequently approved by the Social Work Faculty Council.
4. Members of the Senate Committee on Admissions expressed a concern that the review needed to support the larger policy review in this area might take an indefinite period of time to complete but were assured by representatives of the B.S.W. Admissions Committee and the Social Work Educational Equity Committee that this work would be completed within two years.

**Recommendation**

The Senate Committee on Admissions concurs with the Social Work Faculty Council and recommends to Senate as follows: Whereas the Faculty of Social Work is committed to increasing the representation of all marginalized groups among its student body; and whereas the Faculty's Educational Equity Committee recognizes the urgent need to review and change the existing admissions policy concerning educational equity priority group students; it is recommended that, until such a time as a new policy is in place, any unused educational equity priority spaces be distributed by lottery among the remaining such groups.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dr. D.R. Morphy, Chair,  
Senate Committee on Admissions

Terms of reference: Senate Handbook (revised 1992), pp. 10.6-10.8

Comments of the Senate Executive Committee:  
The Senate Executive Committee endorses  
the report to Senate.

**Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Faculty of Education to change the admission requirements for its B.Ed. Program (2003.09.23)**

**Preamble**

One of the requirements for permanent professional certification in Manitoba is for individuals to present evidence as having completed at least 30 credit hours of successful study in a major teachable area and at least 18 credit hours of successful study in a teachable minor area. In June 2003 Manitoba Education and youth expanded the list of teachables to include Native Studies.

**Observation**

The Faculty of Education has repeatedly been informed that not having Native Studies as a teachable major represents a significant barrier to Aboriginal student enrolment in the teacher education program. This recommendation is consistent with our institutional priority of accessibility as noted in "Building for a Bright Future - A strategic academic plan for the University of Manitoba". The Faculty of Education is very supportive of Manitoba Education and Youth's decision to add Native Studies as a teachable area.

**Recommendation**

Accordingly, the Senate Committee on Admissions recommends to Senate, effective for the September 2004 intake:

1. that Native Studies be added to the list of Teachable Majors for admission to the Early Years and Middle Years Streams of the Bachelor of Education Program; and
2. that Native Studies be added to the list of Teachable Majors and Teachable Minors for admission to the Senior Years Stream of the Bachelor of Education Program.

Respectfully submitted,  
 Dr. D.R. Morphy, Chair,  
 Senate Committee on Admissions

Terms of reference: Senate Handbook (revised 1992), pp. 10.6-10.8

**Comments of the Senate Executive Committee:**  
 The Senate Executive Committee endorses  
 the report to Senate.

**Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Faculty of Education to set its advanced standing policy for its B.Ed. Program (2003.09.23)**

**Preamble**

The Faculty of Education proposes to formalize its practice setting the length of time that can elapse after which students cannot receive advanced standing for Education courses taken outside the Faculty.

**Observation**

1. The advanced standing policies of the Faculties of the University of Manitoba allow students to bring in courses from outside those Faculties, varying between five and ten years after those courses were taken. The Faculty of Education has chosen to place a limit for possible advanced standing of six years since the courses were taken.
2. When coupled with the current policy requiring students to complete the B.Ed. program within six years from the time of admission, this proposed policy will allow students to satisfy graduation requirements with advanced standing credits up to 12 years old.

**Recommendation**

The Senate Committee on Admissions recommends to Senate that students admitted to the B.Ed. Program, effective for 2004-05, may not receive advanced standing for any Education course which is more than six years old at the point of their admission to the Faculty of Education.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dr. D.R. Morphy, Chair,  
Senate Committee on Admissions

Terms of reference: Senate Handbook (revised 1992), pp. 10.6-10.8

Comments of the Senate Executive Committee:  
The Senate Executive Committee endorses  
the report to Senate.



Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations

---

**Preamble**

1. Since last reporting to Senate (October 1, 2003), the Senate Committee on Nominations considered the last vacancy to be filled on a standing committee of Senate.
2. The terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Nominations (SCN) are found in Section 8.31 of the Senate Handbook.

**Observations**

4. Appendix A indicates the nominee for one academic staff vacancy for the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee.

**Recommendation**

THAT Senate approve the nomination of Dr. Brenda O'Neill, Faculty of Arts, to fill the final vacancy on the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Professor B. Dronzek,  
Chair, Senate Committee on Nominations

/lrj

**REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS**

---

---

**APPENDIX A**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Nominee(s)</b>	<b>Faculty/School</b>	<b>Term Ending</b>
Senate Planning & Priorities Committee	Dr. Brenda O'Neill	Arts	31.05.07