



Douglas College

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF EDUCATION COUNCIL
Held Monday January 21, 2008 at 4:15 pm
New Westminster Campus, Boardroom

1. ROLL CALL:

Members Present:

Trish Angus (Ex-Officio)
Graeme Bowbrick (Vice-Chair)
Marilyn Brulhart
Sebastian Bubrick
Kathy Denton
Anne Gapper (Acting Recorder)
Gerry Gramozis
Leon Guppy
Bruce Hardy
Dianne Hewitt
Ted James
Ann Kitching (Ex-Officio)
Jan Lindsay (Acting for S. Witter)
Elizabeth McCausland
Debbie McCloy
Susan Meshwork (Chair)
Colleen Murphy
Teryl Smith
Sandy Vanderburgh
Titus Yip

Regrets:

Wendy Case
Susan Witter (Ex-Officio)

Absent:

Alan Yang

Guests:

Geri Paterson
Jan Carrie

-
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: In order to accommodate the guests the Chair requested a fluid agenda as amended. Council agreed.
3. APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 10, 2007 MINUTES: Under Item 4.3 Curriculum Committee Recommendations, MARK 4433 should read MARK 4483.

MOVED by M. Brulhart; SECONDED by B. Hardy

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT Education Council approve the December 10, 2007 Minutes as amended.

The Motion was CARRIED.

There was a change requested to the November 19, 2007 Minutes under Item 4.5 Curriculum Committee Recommendations. BHIN 2440 should read CCSD 2440. This was a clerical error; the correct curriculum guideline had been approved by the Committee.

MOVED by D. McCloy; SECONDED by K. Denton

THAT Education Council approved the amendment to the November 19, 2007 Minutes.

The Motion was CARRIED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Educational Policy Revisions

a) Withdrawals, Course and Status Changes Policy

D. McCloy indicated that the feedback from her FEC was that the suggested changes to this policy made sense and that they supported the change.

There being no further discussion

MOVED by M. Brulhart; SECONDED by C. Murphy

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve a revision to the procedures section of *Withdrawals, Course and Status Changes Policy*, as follows :

3. A credit or audit student may register for the same graded course a maximum of two times unless they are registering in DVST course. Students may register in DVST graded courses a maximum of three times, unless the individual Department or Discipline has a different policy. A student who withdraws will be considered to have “registered” if the withdrawal occurs after the course change period at the end of the second week of classes. This regulation applies to all cases of registration, whether or not the course is successfully completed. Students

retain the right of appeal for special consideration of exemption to the Registrar.

The Motion was CARRIED.

b) Credentials Awarded at Douglas College Policy

There was discussion about the wording of the suggested changes to this policy. The main points raised were as follows:

- It was suggested that it would be more grammatically correct to place 'is required for graduation' at the end of the sentence rather than in the middle.
- There was some discussion about the clear definition of 'established program'. T. James suggested that that perhaps it would help to have a definition of 'established program' in the policy.

The Chair took a straw poll and Council all agreed that this matter should go back to the policy committee to clarify the phrase 'established program'.

4.2 Process for Reviewing Departmental Grading Policies

There was extensive discussion about the proposed review process. Feedback from Education Council constituencies and Council members is summarised below:

- The definition of 'principles of natural justice' was unclear to some. G. Bowbrick explained that it meant that due process was followed with procedural fairness. He explained that policies require well defined processes to ensure that students, departmental decisions and appeals are dealt with in a procedurally fair manner if there are questions or concerns. This would include having processes that allow students to raise concerns and be heard, and have the opportunity to have a full and fair hearings and decisions from unbiased decision makers. G. Bowbrick confirmed that the Education Council Policy Review Group (PRG) would circulate a definition of natural justice and that the Policy Review Group would be able to work out the fine details while reviewing departmental policies.
- The Chair indicated that the Policy Review Group (PRG) needed to be sure that policies are not arbitrary and that they are substantively fair. G. Bowbrick indicated that grading and promotional policies need to assess that consequences fit the offences. He further explained that the Courts would look at this to make sure a student is being dealt with fairly. Departmental standards need to be defined and not arbitrary.
- Comment was made that as long as the College had defined appeal policies and processes, the requirements of application of the principles of natural justice and due process were dealt with.

- Comment was made that it would be preferable that the 'legal requirements' of policies be considered in the policy development and approval process which would hopefully result in fewer appeals in general as well as appeals that could be settled at a lower level. G. Bowbrick informed Council that he and the Education Council Chair would be running an Appeals Training session on March 27 to help all involved understand the concepts of due process and natural justice more clearly. The training may help to minimize the number of appeals in general as well as mitigate how far they go.
- There was some concern expressed from one FEC that the proposed process as written seemed to be top heavy and there was desire to include FECs in a more formal manner. It was agreed to amend the proposed review process to include a formal and clearly stated role for FECS/DECS. The Chair confirmed that the intention of the proposed process was that the FECS/DECS, faculty and Deans would be doing all the initial policy review work but agreed that the written description of the process could be clearer on that point. She reiterated that the departments would be supplying a person to work on the Policy Review Group (PRG) who would act as a full committee member and as a conduit of information flow between the PRG and the department. She explained that while the proposed process would, by definition and design, be very consultative at the end of the day, Education Council does have the responsibility to approve the policies.
- It was agreed to take out the term 'grading' in #1 and throughout the proposed review process description, and to replace it with only the word 'policies'. This clarified that the policy review would deal with all departmental policies relating to standards affecting students.

Moved by M. Brulhart, Seconded by E. McCausland

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council supports the amended departmental policy review process recommended by the Policy subcommittee in the attached Appendix A

The Motion was CARRIED.

- 4.3 Revisions to Program Development and Consultation Control Sheets
There was extensive discussion on this topic which is summarised below:
- The Chair indicated that this was an opportunity to look at the complete development and consultation process. She explained that EOF (Educational Operations Forum) had offered Education Council many comments and suggestions. More EOF comments would be included in future Educational Council packages. She

further explained that numerous faculty had questioned many aspects of Education Council consultation requirements over the three years she had been chairing Education Council

- Council agreed to gather the information received from constituencies at the January 21, 2008 Education Council meeting, and decide how to proceed at a future meeting.
- The number of departments on the signatory list was questioned but it was pointed out that other people cannot imagine what another person's job entails.
- It was agreed that some signatories were included on the list more for information rather than for consultation over educational approval issues. The Chair wondered if Education Council was working outside its mandate when it required consultation related to administrative or service issues. She suggested that while administrative and service consultation was vital and needed, it might not be Education Council's work.
- It was agreed that most of the complaints about the present forms were about the onerous and time consuming nature of completing them and connecting person to person with each department.
- A suggestion from EOF was that the forms sit on a protected site and that control sheets would go to EOF which meets monthly so operational consultations on the administrative and service side of the house could be discussed and signed off at the EOF regular meetings.
- J. Lindsay stressed that early consultation is required by the new program approval policies and suggested that the current consultation process (based on old approval policies) did not support early consultation.
- T. James indicated that the form could be changed to an institutional form rather than an Education Council form so it could include the academic as well as the operational consultation lists. He suggested a new process could be developed for consultation but that only the one form be used.
- It was stressed by T Angus that it would be important to keep one form because of the possibility of concerns being raised by an administrative or service department which might occur after Education Council approved the educational aspects of a new or revised programme. This kind of glitch could cause the program to be changed which would then require that Education Council deal with approving a revised program. She explained that Education Council could end up looking at the same program many times. All agreed this would not be desirable
- It was suggested that all the current signatories be put on a listserv. Program/course developers could put their work on the listserv and request comment by e-mail. Responders could be given 2 weeks to reply either to state their concerns or to indicate they had no concerns. Sign off that consultation had occurred could be done via the e-mail and concerns could be dealt with

between departments before the approvals were discussed at Education Council.

- Members agreed that the onus should be on the signatories to respond on time and that Education Council would wish that the time frame be adhered to unless there were extenuating circumstances.
- There was general agreement, though no formal decision, that electronic communication would be very helpful and that emails could stand in place of signatures.
- The Chair stated she understood from the discussion that the current level of consultation was still required but that Council wanted Education Council to consider new ways to do the consults. The Chair agreed to include some different proposals for change in the package for the February 18, 2008 meeting.

Action : Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the February 18, 2008 Education Council meeting.

4.4 Curriculum Committee Recommendations

E. McCausland confirmed the changes to the Bachelor of Therapeutic Recreation were included for approval.

There was unanimous consent to short-cycle a Motion to Approve the Curriculum Committee recommendations as presented.

MOVED by G. Gramozis; SECONDED by E. McCausland

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the submitted curriculum guidelines for:

**THRT 1205, THRT 2406, THRT 3505, THRT 3506,
THRT 4702, DOPT 2401, DOPT 2411, DOPT 2413,
DOPT 2501, DOPT 2511, DOPT 2513, DOPT 2611,
PHIL 1180, AHTT 2106, AHTT 2107, AHTT 2108,
AHTT 2109, AHTT 2110, AHTT 2303, AHTT 2304,
AHTT 2305, AHTT 2307, AHTT 2309, BIOL 1103,
BIOL 1109, BIOL 1203, BIOL 1209**

and the withdrawal of THRT 4705

The Motion was CARRIED.

4.5 Admissions and Language Competency Committee Recommendations

Item 6 b) Bachelor of Physical Education and Diploma in Sport Science was carried forward from the December 10, 2007 agenda. There being no discussion.

There was unanimous consent to short-cycle a Motion to Approve the Admissions and Language Competency Committee Recommendations.

MOVED by S. Vanderburgh; SECONDED by E. McCausland,

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the recommendations of the Admissions and Language Competency Committee as follows:

“The GPA for Post-secondary students is lowered to 2.33 from 2.5 for all entrance options. Outlined below are changes with regard to the various intake options for intake into the BPEC program.

- 1. Specific entry options changes in the BPEC – by year and option.**

BPEC Year 2 Elementary:

- 1. All elementary option first year requirements.**
- 2. Completion of a minimum of 30 undergraduate credits with a minimum GPA of 2.33; including 9 Sport Science or equivalent credits;**

BPEC Year 2 Secondary:

- 1. All secondary option first year requirements.**
- 2. Completion of a minimum of 30 undergraduate credits with a minimum GPA of 2.33, including;**
 - a. 9 Sport Science or equivalent credits; and**
 - b. Biology 1109 and 1209 or equivalent; and**
 - c. Chemistry 12 or Chemistry 1108 or equivalent;**

BPEC Year 3 Elementary:

- 1. All elementary option second year requirements.**
- 2. Completion of a minimum of 60 undergraduate credits with a minimum GPA of 2.33, including;**
 - i. SPSC 1103, 1105, 1164, 1195, 2205, 2275 or equivalents; and**
 - ii. Math 1191 or equivalent; and**
 - iii. English 1130 or equivalent;**

BPEC Year 3 Secondary:

- 1. All secondary option second year requirements.**
- 2. Completion of a minimum of 60 undergraduate credits with a minimum GPA of 2.33, including;**
 - a. SPSC 1103, 1105, 1164, 1195, 2205, 2275 or equivalents; and**
 - b. Math 1234 or Math 1191 or equivalent; and**
 - c. English 1130 or equivalent; and**
 - d. Biology 1310 or (Biology 1110 and 1210) or equivalent; and**
 - e. Chemistry 1110 or equivalent”**

The Motion was CARRIED.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Bachelor of Therapeutic Recreation Degree Program Revision

J. Carrie and G. Paterson were invited to the table to speak to this item. J. Carrie explained the changes included the removal of THRT 4705, the replacement of THRT 4806 with PHIL 4706 and various revisions and adjustments.

Action : Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the February 18, 2008 Education Council meeting.

5.2 Requests for Affiliation Agreements

- a) Catholic University of Pusan, Korea
- b) Kunkuk University, Korea

The Chair explained that Education Council's role in assessing requests for Affiliation Agreements was to ensure that Members were comfortable with the caliber of institution the College was proposing an affiliation with. Education Council approval was necessary before an affiliation agreement could be signed.

In response to a question as to which area of the College was targeted, J. Lindsay responded that in this case the target area was Health Sciences. She further explained that when the connections are made there is usually one main target area but the College was also open to other areas being involved. She explained that S. Witter and G. Ouyang had made a number of connections at a conference in Norway and she further explained that they looked particularly for connections with the College's degree programs, adding that preliminary general discussions are always held with the Deans.

Action : Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the February 18, 2008 Education Council meeting.

5.3 2008/09 Budget

The Chair reported the College Board was supporting the direction of the proposed 2008/09 Budget. In response to a question J. Lindsay confirmed that the courses in the new degree programs would be funded.

B. Hardy questioned what a 'one time only reduction' was. J. Lindsay replied that this was a position that would be reassessed in the following year; such a situation would be if a person was on leave and was returning the following year.

J. Lindsay confirmed the expansion at David Lam was separate from this budget but that Phase 1 of the renovations at New Westminster is included. She further stated that the College was fortunate that it was in a favourable position compared to other colleges. She confirmed that the funding situation right now was very volatile, with no guarantees. She also confirmed that the College may get a portion of the inflationary grant but it would depend on whether there was a surplus. She explained that the Treasury Department had not responded to the Ministry of Advanced Education yet.

Action : Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the February 18, 2008 Education Council meeting.

6. REPORTS

6.1 Report from the Chair

The Chair reported that a Groupwise “All” message had been sent out alerting the College community to the specific changes to policies since September 2005. She confirmed that in the future any time a change to a policy was approved by Education Council, an alert would be sent to the College community via Groupwise. This information will also be posted on the Education Council website.

T. Angus was appreciative of this initiative, confirming that it would be a great help to the Registrar’s Office. She requested that the date of implementation also be included. The Chair requested the Registrar’s Office inform the Education Council secretary if a delay was necessary.

6.2 Report from the President

J. Lindsay, acting for S. Witter, confirmed that the President’s Report had been issued on January 11, 2008.

6.3 Report from the Board Representative

Ann Kitching confirmed the appointment by the Lieutenant Governor of two new members to the College Board. They have joined the board as of January 2008 and are Chris Codrington who has a human resource background and Paul Wates who has a Certified General Accountant background.

6.4 Report from the Secretary

There was no report.

6.5 Report from the Curriculum Committee

There was no report.

6.6 Report from the Educational Excellence Committee

There was no report.

- 6.7 Report from the Research Ethics Board
There was no report.

- 6.8 Report from the Standing Committee on Admissions and Language Competency Standards
There was no report.

- 6.9 Report from the Standing Committee on Educational Policies
There was no report.

- 7. OTHER BUSINESS – For Information and Circulation

There was no other business.

- 8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair _____ Secretary _____

Memorandum

To: Education Council
From: Ted James, Policy Subcommittee Chair
Date: November 29, 2007
Re: Proposed Departmental Grading Policy Review Process

The Policy Subcommittee is proposing that a smaller group be struck to review unapproved departmental grading policies. This group could include some Policy Subcommittee members, Education Council members who have relevant experience or skills, and a department faculty member from each department submitting grading policies who would provide much needed context and professional expertise. The Education Council Chair will serve as the chair for this Policy Review Group (PRG).

The review process would be as follows:

1. Department faculty, FECs/DECs and Deans review their policies for readability and clarity as well as consistency with current College policies and the principles of natural justice.
2. Departments submit the policy documents to the PRG which reviews the policies from the perspective described above and communicates any concerns back to the departments via the department faculty representative.
3. Departments may make whatever changes are recommended and re-submit the amended documents back to the PRG.
4. When documents are ready for recommendation, the PRG recommends approval to Education Council via the Policy Subcommittee.
5. Education Council considers approval of the policies in the usual two month process.

The Policy Subcommittee is asking Education Council to endorse this process for the review of unapproved departmental grading policies.

Please discuss this process with your constituents and be prepared to come to a decision on this proposed process at the January Education Council meeting.