



Douglas College

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF EDUCATION COUNCIL
Held Monday October 15, 2007 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
Wendy Case
Kathy Denton
Anne Gapper (Acting Recorder)
Gerry Gramozis
Leon Guppy
Dianne Hewitt
Ted James
Ann Kitching (Ex-Officio)
Elizabeth McCausland
Debbie McCloy
Susan Meshwork (Chair)
Susan Witter (Ex-Officio)
Alan Yang
Titus Yip
Sandy Vanderburgh

Regrets:

Bruce Hardy
Jan Lindsay
Colleen Murphy
Teryl Smith

Guests:

Rosilyn Coulson
Anna Helewka

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: The Chair advised that 4.3 (a) was removed from the Agenda and 4.3 (b) was changed to a Notice of Motion. In order to accommodate the guests, the Chair asked members to approve a fluid agenda as amended. Council agreed.

The Chair welcomed two new members to Council, the student representatives for the New Westminster Campus, Wendy Case and Alan Yang.

3. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2007 MINUTES:

D. McCloy requested that a sentence be added to page 7 of the Minutes in the second paragraph as follows :

“... legal responsibilities when students are in practicums. *She was concerned that patients must be protected and kept safe – public protection is obligatory to Health Science licensed professionals.*”

E. McCausland requested that on page 4, Item 4.5, the first bullet read as follows:

“ *The Chair* pointed out that the proposed changes were significant in that there has always been a certain level of scrutiny from Education Council in the past. *E. McCausland* inquired about changes ...”

The minutes were approved as amended.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

- 4.1 Educational Excellence Committee Recommendations – In Camera
R. Coulson was invited to the table to speak to this item. She requested Council ratify the Education Excellence’s Sub-Committee’s recommendation on the student excellence award for 2007.

There being no further discussion.

MOVED by G. Gramozis; SECONDED by M. Brulhart,

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council ratify the Education Excellence Sub-Committee’s recommendation of the student recipient of the 2007 Douglas College Educational Excellence Award.

The Motion was CARRIED.

R. Coulson requested that Education Council send this recommendation to Senior Management Team.

- 4.2 Policy Items
a) Credentials Awarded at Douglas College Policy Revision – Addition of The Training Group Credential
There being no discussion.

MOVED by T. James, SECONDED by S. Vanderburgh,
BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the addition of the following paragraph identifying and defining a new Douglas College Credential.

“Training Group Certificate: issued when a formal credential of successful completion for a Training Group non credit program is required. Appropriate evaluation of learning outcomes is planned and conducted.”

The Motion was CARRIED.

- b) *Credentials Awarded at Douglas College Policy Revision – Addition of Discipline Specialties*
There being no discussion.

MOVED by G. Gramozis; SECONDED by E. McCausland

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the revision of the Credentials Awarded at Douglas College Policy by amending the definition of Associate Degree under the heading of Types of Credential as follows:

“Associate Degree: as defined in provincial legislation, in Arts or Sciences, requiring a minimum of 60 credits of first- and second-year university-transfer courses; may include a thematic emphasis or *discipline* specialization. A *discipline specialization* is met by completing 18 or more credits, including at least 9 credits of second-year courses, in a given academic discipline.”

The Motion was CARRIED.

- c) *Program Approval Policy – New or Revised Degree Revision – change to Curriculum Grid Definition*
E. McCausland pointed out that if the change is made as proposed the Deans would be responsible for making sure the appropriate consultations are carried out. She expressed that it is her experience that if only one person is responsible that sometimes things can be missed. She felt that Council should keep an eye through the FECs that the consultation process is occurring correctly. She emphasized that she was in support of the change as recommended.

There being no further discussion.

MOVED by L. Guppy; SECONDED by S. Bubrick,

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the revision of the Program Approval Policy – New or Revised Degrees to include a change in the definition of the Curriculum Framework as follows:

“A grid that *lists the program requirements* to be included in *the first two years of the program and in the final two years of the program*. In addition, the curricular framework will include a brief description of the content to be covered in each *required* course and a statement of how the program content meets relevant accreditation or regulatory requirements.”

The Motion was CARRIED.

d) *Academic Performance Policy Revision – Addition of Professional Practice Course Grading Standards Policy Language*

There was extensive discussion about the ramifications of the Policy subcommittees recommended amendments to the Academic Performance Policy. The main points are summarized below:

- D. McCloy reported that her FEC was concerned that a process to approve departmental policies had not been established. She then cited the example of a department/program in Health Sciences receiving an edict from a professional body to establish a policy. She was concerned that the normal Education Council timelines to have policies approved would be too long. Health Sciences wondered if a sub-committee would be able to assist and approve policy changes quickly. The Chair indicated that normally Council could be asked to consider short-cycling such requests and that Council can not delegate its policy approval responsibilities to any other body. T. James pointed out that if policies were sent to a sub-committee the process would be slowed down. He felt that a professional body’s standards would be compelling for Council to approve. G. Bowbrick agreed that the process for approving policies needed to be addressed.
- E. McCausland reported that Print Futures were delighted to see the changes and were eager to get their policies approved.
- The Chair indicated that the Child, Family & Community Studies FEC were in agreement with the policy as amended and wanted it noted that they thought it important that an efficient process to review and approve such policies be developed.
- G. Bowbrick recommended that departments take proactive measures to forward their policies to Education Council for

approval otherwise they would run the risk of successful student appeals.

- The Chair confirmed that if departmental policies were not approved by Education Council they would not be enforceable and also stated that any changes made with regard to amendments would also have to come to Council.

There was extensive discussion about the amendment to the wording as suggested at the September 17, 2007 meeting by adding the words ‘as approved by Education Council’ to various sections of the policy.

- G. Bowbrick stated that he felt the wording ‘as approved by Education Council’ would be redundant as all such grading standard policies have to be approved by Council according to the College and institutions Act. He further stated that if this wording was added to this policy and not to other policies it could arguably cause problems in the future if a policy is not specified as being ‘approved by Education Council’.
- T. James stated the policy committee would not mind either way but if the words were redundant then they should not be included. G. Bowbrick felt there should be consistent language throughout a policy.
- T. Yip and M. Brulhart both suggested that by leaving the words in that the policy may be more ‘user friendly’.
- T. Yip further added that the words may act as an incentive for departments to get their policies forward to Council in a timely manner. D. McCloy indicated that there was a high motivation from her faculty to have their policies approved and T. Yip replied that his comments were more related to departments other than Health Sciences.
- After lengthy discussion, a straw vote indicated that the majority of members were in agreement not to include the words ‘as approved by Education Council’ to the policy but to amend the rest of the policy as recommended by the Policy Subcommittee.
- Council all agreed that the word ‘some’ should be added, before the words ‘limited enrollment programs’, to the policy amendments proposed by the Policy subcommittee at the September 17, 2007 meeting.

There being no further discussion.

MOVED by M. Brulhart; SECONDED by D. McCloy,

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the amendments to the Academic Performance Policy as shown in the attached Appendix A.

The Motion was CARRIED.

4.3 Program Revisions

- a) Bachelor of Science Psychiatric Nursing Program Revision
The Chair explained that the Motion to Approve the Bachelor of Science Psychiatric Nursing Degree program revisions were contingent on the approval of curriculum changes that were still going through the Curriculum Committee review process and so this item will be postponed to the November 19, 2007 meeting.
- b) Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing
The Chair explained that Education Council should consider the addition of a revision to the sequencing of the course PSYCH 1130 in the Diploma Program a new revision and that since Education Council had not considered this aspect of the requested program revision last month we should consider this version of the Diploma revision as a new Notice of Motion. Anna Helewka was invited to the table to speak to this item. There was no further discussion.

Action: Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the November 19, 2007 Education Council meeting.

4.4 Restructuring of the College Professional Development Reporting Structure

The Chair explained that under the College Board Planned Change Policy it was reasonable for Council to have some discussion and give feedback for Senior Management Team on the restructuring of the College Professional Development reporting structure. She further explained that EDCO does not have a formal advising role or an explicit approval role on this matter. As B. Jensen was away, S. Witter was speaking on his behalf.

Most members indicated that they had already forwarded their constituencies' comments directly to either B. Cowin or B. Jensen. The Chair requested that those who had not already done so, forward their input to either individual.

A summary of comments that were brought forward at the meeting are as follows:

- The new plan was not clearly defined and B. Jensen's review paper provides only a generalized view of the new structure.

- The report was confusing in that it was being presented as a restructuring of the 'reporting structure' but the changes outlined in the report seemed to have larger implications
- There was support for the need and the benefits of professional development but there was a lack of clarity around the rationale for the proposed change
- The budget impacts are unclear
- There was a strong indication that faculty should continue to play a lead role in classroom-related technological training rather than this being the main responsibility of the Centre of Educational & Information Technology
- Some clarity in the use of terminology would be helpful
- It would be beneficial to define the proposed roles of the new 'Centre' as well as the role of Employee Relations in professional development in general
- There was support for faculty professional development being involved in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning but concern about the failure of the review to recognize the importance of discipline-based and off-campus faculty professional development opportunities
- The Employee Wellness program was not defined and there was concern that mental health wellness would be ignored.
- General funding for conferences was discussed but there was no mention of funds being available to staff who wanted access to funding for P. D. training
- There was support for the Douglas Development written response from Student Development and Language, Literature and Performing Arts and it was indicated that it was felt that it was not necessarily desirable to separate staff and faculty professional development

S. Witter indicated that the implementation plan would list the details and that a survey was being conducted to assess needs. She confirmed that the plan was to keep the budget as is for now. She explained that there was currently duplication and overlap in some administrative aspects of professional development and that one goal of the restructuring was to place more emphasis on scholarly activity under the academic division. She said she did not envision a lot would change other than there would be more team focus in the 'Centre'. She mentioned that Employee Relations currently deals with a lot of general professional development and she imagined that was not widely known.

In response to a question as to what the next steps would be, S. Witter indicated that B. Cowin and B. Jensen would be amalgamating all the responses received and would bring a report to Senior Management Team. Implementation was planned for Spring 2008.

The Chair indicated that B. Jensen had commented to her that some of the written response from Douglas Development seemed to make assumptions based on information that was not correct; he felt that maybe there was some misunderstanding behind the response. S. Witter confirmed that an example of this was that the Professional Development Committee would be taken over by Employee Relations but this was incorrect, the Committee would be staying as it is currently. The changes that would move to Employee Relations were mainly administrative.

K. Denton stated that there seemed to be a lot of confusion around clarity and language and she indicated that it was important there be a follow up where people were aware that their input had been heard. She felt that this would make the implementation process smoother. S. Witter said she understood that B. Cowin would be doing this.

4.5 Admissions & Language Competency Committee Recommendations
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 L. Guppy,

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the amendment of the admission requirements for the Dispensing Optician Program by the removal of the requirement for two reference letters.

The Motion was CARRIED.

4.6 Curriculum Committee Recommendations
E. McCausland advised that the PNUR 4885 course should read PNUR 4585 and that the PSYC 4706 should read PHIL 4706.

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

MOVED by D. McCloy; SECONDED by T. James,

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the new and revised guidelines for BHIN 1240, BHIN 1256, CCSD 2340, CCSD 2440, THRT 2444, PNUR 4585, NURS 3130, NURS 3200, NURS 3210, NURS 3220, NURS 3300, NURS 3301, NURS 4110, NURS 4131, PHIL 2360, PHIL 4706, PSYC 3308, PSYC 3320, PSYC 3330, PSYC 3331, PSYC 3342, SPSC 1316, SPSC 1317 and the withdrawal of THRT 2477, THRT 4806, PHIL 1280, PSYC 2308, PSYC 2320, PSYC 2330, PSYC 2331, PSYC 2342

The Motion was CARRIED.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Certificate in Child and Youth Care Program Withdrawal

There was no discussion

Action: Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the November 19, 2007 Education Council meeting.

5.2 2008/2009 Academic Calendar

T. Angus reported that there were no changes from the previous calendar. There was no further discussion.

Action: Please take this to your constituencies and bring their formal advice to Senior Management Team to the November 19, 2007 Education Council meeting.

6. REPORTS

6.1 Report from the Chair

The Chair confirmed that she had distributed a list of Education Council Committee assignments and asked if there were any errors and omissions. T. James pointed out that the list contained only Education Council members on the committees and did not include members of the College Community who also sat on the committees.

6.2 Report from the President

S. Witter notified Council that the Ministry had turned down the Bachelor of Music degree even though it had been approved by the Degree Quality Assessment Board. She noted that five other degrees had been turned down in the last month at other Colleges in the Province. She read excerpts from a letter from the Ministry.

“While there is projected current and future labour market demand, there is also a demographic decline occurring within the key K-12 age group, which will mitigate future need for both public and private music teachers ... there is no compelling evidence that a degree in music provides a strong labour market advantage over a diploma. ...other lower mainland institutions offering Bachelors of Music.”

She advised that the Language, Literature and Performing Arts faculty may make another submission in about a year after studying where they could strengthen any weak areas. She also advised that she felt that the Campus 2020 report and declining enrolment were also contributing factors.

S. Witter advised that the collaborative degree, Bachelor of Performing Arts, was currently with the Ministry.

S. Witter advised that the President's report had been sent to the College Community that morning. She reported that four years ago the College had received 1,500 FTEs from the Provincial Strategic Investment Fund. However, last year the Ministry reallocated some of these FTEs based on the Government's priorities and redirected them to aboriginal, trades and graduate seats. She advised that this will happen again this year. The College is supposed to get 190 FTEs, 168 of which are used for the implementation of the College's new programs, the 3 Degrees, 2 Diplomas and some Certificates. The College may receive less than 168 FTEs which will mean that Senior Management Team will likely have to look at programs with significant declining enrolment as well as service areas when discussing the next year's budget. There is the possibility that the College will have to downsize in some areas, notably 1st and 2nd year Arts and Science and Business. The College is strong in every other area.

The Chair advised that budget items will be appearing on future agendas. S. Witter advised they would be planning a couple of budget scenarios.

In response to a question if the declines mentioned were in utilization rates or in the number of students, S. Witter replied that it was in both areas.

6.3 Report from the Board Representative

There was no report.

6.4 Report from the Secretary

The Secretary indicated that an updated Member List had been provided I the package to reflect the addition of the new Student Representative from New Westminster, Wendy Case.

6.4 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

- 7.1 2007 Douglas College Fact Book
The College Fact Book was attached for information and circulation.

- 7.2 Retention and Transfer of Douglas College UT Students
A report from B. Cowin was attached for information and circulation.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by K. Denton; Seconded by S. Bubrick, the meeting adjourned at 5.35 pm

Chair _____ Secretary _____

Appendix A

Academic Performance

Policy name: Academic Performance	Overseen by: Vice President Instruction	Effective Date: Winter semester 2005	Related Policies: Admission Student Appeals
Category: Education	Approved by: Education Council	Review Date: September 2010	

Purpose

Policy Statement

Procedures

Purpose

Douglas College provides an environment that encourages and celebrates academic excellence, individual initiative and responsibility as students make progress toward their educational goals. This policy outlines the commitment to academic performance expected of all students and the consequences for unacceptable academic performance.

Policy Statement

Students who register in courses/programs at Douglas College are expected to maintain acceptable standards of academic performance as outlined below. In

addition, students in some limited enrollment programs are expected to maintain standards of professional practice as determined by specific program policy.

Students whose academic performance is of a superior standing will be recognized by the College.

- ~~Students whose semester or cumulative GPA falls between 1.99 and 1.71 (regardless of the number of credits attempted) will be placed on Academic Alert standing.~~
- ~~Students whose semester or cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA) falls below 1.71—based on nine credits or more attempted, or on nine credits attempted in a single semester. will be placed on Academic Probation standing. Failure to maintain this minimum average may result in dismissal from the College.~~

- ~~Students will be placed on the Dean's List if they:~~

~~**Either:** complete a minimum of 12 credits in one semester and achieve a semester GPA of 4.00 or better;~~

~~**Or:** complete a minimum of 12 credits over more than one semester and achieve a cumulative GPA and semester GPA of 4.00.~~

- ~~Students will be placed on the Honour Roll if they:~~

~~**Either:** complete a minimum of 12 credits in one semester and achieve a semester GPA of 3.5 to 3.99;~~

~~**Or:** complete a minimum of 12 credits over more than one semester and whose cumulative GPA and semester GPA is 3.50 to 3.99.~~

Procedures

Academic Alert

The student whose semester or cumulative Grade Point Average (regardless of the number of credits attempted) falls between 1.99 and 1.71 will be notified in writing by the College. This notification will indicate the student is being warned that his/her academic performance is weak and that further weakness in performance will lead to Academic Probation.

The student will be encouraged to seek help to improve his/her academic performance and will be provided with a list of the various sources of educational help available to students at Douglas College.

Academic Alert standing will not be recorded on the student's permanent record.

Academic Probation

The student whose semester or cumulative Grade Point Average falls below the minimum requirement of 1.71 (based on at least nine credits attempted in a semester or on a total of at least nine credits attempted) will be notified in writing of his or her probationary status and required to book an appointment with a counsellor to discuss his or her academic progress and receive clearance to remain enrolled. If the student does not meet with a counsellor, he or she will be deregistered from all courses and/or will not be permitted to register in further courses until such a meeting has taken place.

The student's academic performance will be reviewed upon completion of a further minimum of six credits. If the Grade Point Average over those credits is 1.71 or better, the student will be taken off probation. The student will no longer be under any restrictions regarding course load or selection. If the Grade Point Average over those credits is below 1.71, the student will be required to withdraw for one major semester, as determined by the Registrar.

A student who has been required to withdraw must make application for readmission. Permission for readmission will be granted by the Registrar, in consultation with the Department Chair/Program Coordinator, if needed. A student readmitted after being required to withdraw is initially limited to a maximum enrollment of nine credits in which he or she must achieve a grade point average of 2.00 or better. A student who does not attain this level over the first nine credits after his or her return will be required to withdraw from the

College for two years and may be readmitted only by approval of the Educational Policy Appeals Committee.

Program Progression

Students enrolled in some limited enrollment programs must maintain the academic and practice performance standards as outlined in the specific policies of the program.

Students whose academic and/or practice performance falls below the standards set by program policy will be notified in writing by the Program Coordinator about the specific concerns and remedies required by the student for progression in the program within the next semester or other appropriate time period. Failure to improve performance could result in the student being prevented from enrolling in practicum, clinical or practice courses and/or being advanced to the next semester, in accordance with specific program policy.

Academic Excellence

Students whose academic performance is of a superior standing will be recognized as follows:

Dean's List

Students will be placed on the Dean's List if they:

Either. complete a minimum of 12 credits in one semester and achieve a semester GPA of 4.00 or better;

Or. complete a minimum of 12 credits over more than one semester and achieve a cumulative GPA and semester GPA of 4.00.

Achievement on the Dean's List will be noted on a student's Permanent Record (including the official transcript) and the student will receive a Letter of Congratulation from the College.

Gold Cord

Students whose GPA score ranks in the top ten percent of student GPA scores in each Faculty/credential (on qualifying courses) will be recognized at graduation with the presentation of a Gold Cord Award.

Honour Roll

Students will be placed on the Honour Roll if they:

Either: complete a minimum of 12 credits in one semester and achieve a semester GPA of 3.50 to 3.99.

Or: complete a minimum of 12 credits over more than one semester and whose cumulative GPA and semester GPA is 3.50 to 3.99.

Achievement of Honor Roll status will be noted on the student's Permanent Record (including the official transcript).

Student Excellence Awards

These may be awarded by each Faculty to students who meet excellence criteria as determined by each Faculty.

Students who achieve the Dean's List, Gold Cord, Honor Roll or a Student Excellence Award will be publicly recognized through publication of a Douglas College Honours Recognition List that will be displayed at the graduation ceremony and other public venues (provided that students give prior permission for public recognition).

This policy was last revised March, 2005