![Douglas College logo]

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF EDUCATION COUNCIL
Held Monday October 20, 2008 at 4:15 pm
New Westminster Campus, Boardroom

1.   ROLL CALL:

Members Present:

Deb Anderson	**Regrets:**
Trish Angus (Ex-Officio)	Ted James
Graeme Bowbrick (Vice-Chair)	Ann Kitching (Ex-Officio)
Marilyn Brulhart	Jan Lindsay
Sebastian Bubrick	Gerry Gramozis
Kathy Denton	Susan Witter (Ex-Officio)
Leon Guppy	David Guedes
Bruce Hardy	Anna Robinson
Dianne Hewitt	
Elizabeth McCausland	**Guests:**
Debbie McCloy	Joy Page
Susan Meshwork (Chair)	Jan Carrie
Lidia Peter-Wallesch (Acting	Cheryl Jeffs
Recorder)	Joyce Olson
Teryl Smith	
Mike Tarko	
Titus Yip	

2.   APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

The Chair announced the election of two new EDCO student
representatives; David Guedes and Anna Robinson. Neither was present
but both would be attending the November EDCO meeting.

The Chair asked that Council correct the title of agenda item 5.1 to read
"Business Management Diploma General Business Option Program
Revision" rather than Hotel and Restaurant Management.

In order to accommodate the guests, the Chair asked members to
approve a fluid Agenda. Council agreed and the Agenda was approved.

3.   APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2008 MINUTES:
      The minutes were approved as submitted.

4.   BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

      4.1   Revisions to the Program Development and Consultation Control
             Sheets
             The Chair explained that the changes suggested last month had
             been incorporated. She highlighted the new Senders/ Responders
             box and explained that aside from the typographical corrections
             requested and new formatting, there were no other substantive
             changes.

             The Chair indicated that although no one from the DVST faculty
             was able to attend the October 20, 2008 EDCO meeting, they had
             been invited to come to Council. The Chair agreed to invite a DVST
             faculty member to the November 17, 2008 EDCO meeting.

             Discussion followed about whether to add Developmental Studies
             (DVST) to the forms and whether the clarifying statement on the
             suggested revision was required or not. Council was not sure it was
             necessary to add DVST and wanted to get input from their
             constituencies on the matter. Discussion will continue at the
             November EDCO meeting.

             T. Yip asked what would happen if someone sent out a request for
             consultation during the summer months. He was concerned that
             setting time limits would not deal with the problem of people being
             away and not being able to respond in time. He suggested that
             clarification about when e-mail could and could not be used might
             be useful.

             The Chair suggested that the Program Development and Approval
             policies and Curriculum Development and Approval policy require
             very early consult and that since the program and course
             developers were unlikely to be here in the summer either it might
             be unlikely that many things would go out for consultation in the
             summer.

             The Chair advised that she will be adding a list of specific control
             sheet "consultee" names to the EDCO website in future, in order to
             help developers know who the "go to" person for each area is at
             each campus.

G. Bowbrick pointed out that at the bottom of page 2 there was no place for signature of approval by department. The Chair advised that FEC approves first, not the department.

E. McCausland indicated that the purpose of the Course Control Sheet is to keep track of who is doing what, basically a tracking mechanism. She also indicated that the policy actually says "the curriculum guideline should be approved by the Chair of the department", but some departments follow different procedures and have Department "Chair" approving CGs. The Chair indicated this will need to be clarified but we will all have to follow a common interpretation of the Curriculum Development and Approval policy until we decide to revise it.

D. McCloy suggested there should be an additional line to print the department name under the group consulted category on the Course Control Sheet,

The Chair asked council if Council could agree to send the draft forms out for feedback as Notice of Motion even though further discussion on the DVST addition and some other issues were outstanding. Council agreed to do so.

ACTION: **Please take this back to your constituencies for feedback and discussion at the November 17, 2008 Education Council meeting.**

4.2   a) Academic Freedom Policy

The Chair explained that since there was considerable feedback and many suggestions for change to the policy, SMT has decided to ask J. Page to review and revise the draft policy somewhat. A revised draft will go back to the EDCO Policy subcommittee for review and recommendation to EDCO when ready.

There was vigorous discussion about the draft policy and a summary of comments follows. Written submissions from many EDCO constituencies are attached as appendices to these minutes (Appendix "A" to Appendix "F").

Humanities and Social Sciences
G. Bowbrick reported that feedback and concern was raised by H & SS. Faculties suggest it is very important to get this policy right. H & SS suggested that the College not reinvent the wheel and that policies of the major universities should be used as models. He also indicated that concerns were raised about the narrow references to dissemination of truth and would like to

encourage more definition. He indicated that the reference to faculty and students within the policy goes without saying that it is already subject to legal limitations. He suggested some of what was said in the policy did not need to be said since it was clear in the law.

G. Bowbrick also suggested that it would be better to rephrase the portion dealing with trust and limitations with respect to librarians and intellectual freedom to something like "librarians have responsibility to promote keeping with principles of Librarian Associations". Dianne Hewitt indicated that she will send the written language to the Chair.

> "Librarians have a responsibility to promote and maintain intellectual freedom in the institution in keeping with the principles expressed in the Canadian Library Association Position Statement on Intellectual Freedom and the British Columbia Library Association Statement on Intellectual Freedom."

Staff
G. Gramozis referred Council to his written submission (attached to these minutes). He emphasized that staff and Administrators should be covered under the policy.

Science and Technology
L. Guppy reported that "staff" was missing from the policy and that it doesn't identify student responsibilities. He suggested the CAUT statements be sent to the Chair to EDCO and that his FEC saw no reason to deviate very much from the CAUT policy. He reported that he assumed that whoever is writing the policy would like to have this information.

Language Literature and Performing Arts
E. McCausland indicated that it was very important to include "staff" and clearer reference to limits. She emphasized that the meanings and distinctions made in the section of the draft referring to "knowledge and belief" is very vague and unclear. She suggested that if the intent of the section was to ask faculty not to promote personal religious beliefs for example, the language should do so more directly. She suggested the document could be reviewed for clarity of meaning of other sections as well.

There was a general question about how the policy would address academic freedom of students.

K. Denton stated that it would be helpful if a revised draft document could show the changes made so that Council could follow the thinking behind the change, she suggested that showing tracking changes could be useful.

The Chair suggested that if this remained an Educational Policy it should reflect only the EDCO mandate and jurisdiction. She suggested that it might be better housed as an Administrative Policy since it is the Administration that would be "guaranteeing" and protecting the rights of Academic Freedom. She suggested some careful thinking about where the policy is housed was very important.

b) Grading Policy/Evaluation Policy – Postponed to November 17, 2008 meeting

c) Research Ethics Policy
As discussed under 7.1

4.3   CE Certificate in Intervener for Individuals with Deafblindness Intervener Program

C. Jeffs and J. Carrie have been working with J. Olson to develop this new program. She explained that this program is often confused with programs teaching sign language interpreting. Deafblindness disability is very complex and while it has a low incidence, deafblind people have very high needs. It is a securely funded provincial program funded through the Ministry of Advanced Education and has been funded for the last for 18 years. It is financially protected and the Ministry pays for the instructors with no cost to Douglas College. These courses are offered around the province in various communities.

ACTION: Please take this back to your constituencies for consideration for approval at the November 17, 2008 Education Council meeting.

4.4   Academic Schedule 2009/2010

The Chair reminded Council that the College was seeking EDCO advice on the 2009/2010 academic schedule under its advisory responsibilities .There was brief discussion of the suspension of classes for the 2010 Olympics.

Education Council is comfortable with the 2009/2010 academic schedule as proposed and the Chair will pass this advice to SMT and the College Board.

4.5   Admissions and Language Competency Committee
       Recommendations

       There were no recommendations

4.6   Curriculum Committee Recommendations

       There being no discussion.

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

       MOVED by B. Hardy; SECONDED by M. Tarko

       BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

       **THAT Education Council approve the submitted Curriculum
       Committee recommendations as follows:**

       **(The new or revised)CCSD 2335, GEOG 2251, GEOG 3311
       and to approve the withdrawal of: GEOG 2321.**

       The Motion was CARRIED.

5.   NEW BUSINESS

5.1   Request for Revision of the Hotel and Restaurant Management

       The Chair reminded Council to change the agenda item title from
       "Hotel and Restaurant Management" to "Business Management
       Diploma General Business Option".

       L. Laberge indicated that he wished to correct an error made years
       ago when revising the program at EDCO that would reflect the
       correct HORM courses required for completion of the program.

       **There was unanimous consent to short cycle a Motion to
       Approve the Business Management Diploma General Business
       Option recommendations as presented.**

       MOVED by K. Denton; SECONDED by M. Brulhart

       BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the submitted program revision that reflects the following course requirement corrections: Hospitality and Restaurant Management Diploma required course is HORM 1115 rather than a combination of the old and incorrect course numbers HORM 1110 and 1140.

The Motion was CARRIED.

5.2   Business Management – Program Revision

a), b), c), and d).

L. Laberge requested that BUSN 2275 replace BUSN 4470 as a required course for the Financial Services Management, Business Management, Marketing Management and Accounting Management Diploma Programs.

There was unanimous consent to short cycle a Motion to Approve the replacement of BUSN 4470 with BUSN 2275 as a required course in the Business Management, Financial Services Management, Marketing Management and Accounting Management Diploma Programs.

There being no further discussion.

MOVED by K. Denton; SECONDED by M. Brulhart

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

THAT Education Council approve the replacement of BUSN 4470 with BUSN 2275 as a required course in the Business Management, Financial Services Management, Marketing Management and Accounting Management Diploma Programs

The Motion was CARRIED.

5.3   Draft Academic Plan
The Chair informed Council that revisions to the Draft Academic Plan based on the College Wide forums will be circulated to Council when ready.

ACTION: Please take this back to your constituencies for consideration of formal advice to SMT at the November 17, 2008 Education Council meeting.

5.4   2009/2010 Budget Guidelines

The Chair stated that SMT is requesting EDCO feedback on the Budget Guidelines and reminded Council that EDCO does not have advisory or explicit responsibilities over the budgeting guidelines.

ACTION: Please take this back to your constituencies for discussion and feedback at the November 17, 2008 Education Council meeting.

6.   REPORTS

6.1   Report from the Chair

The Chair informed Council that she will be will be away from November 5 to December 11 and that G. Bowbrick will be chairing the November 17, 2008 meeting. The Chair indicated that she will be able to do some EDCO work electronically while away but will not be able to accommodate last minute November agenda items or documents.

The Chair advised that committee assignments are complete and that D. Anderson has volunteered for the Policy Committee. She also advised that we will have new students on EDCO in November and hoped we might get more students on EDCO committees soon. Please advise the Chair if you would like to change committees.

6.2   Report from the President
There was no report.

6.3   Report from the Board Representative
There was no report

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

K. Denton advised that she now has created documents that will help applicants through the REB approval process. The REB Policy is now under review and there could be more changes to

process in future. She indicated that often people don't know where to send or get REB related documents

The new draft Ethics policy has a section that refers to types of administrative college research that are exempt from REB review and explained that the REB does not need to approve this type of administrative research.

6.8 <u>Report from the Standing Committee on Admissions and Language Competency Standards</u>
There was no report.

6.9 <u>Report from the Standing Committee on Educational Policies</u>
There was no report.

6.10 <u>Report from the Academic Signature</u>
There was no report.

7. <u>OTHER BUSINESS – For Information and Circulation</u>

7.1 <u>New Administrative Policies</u>

a) Commercialization of Intellectual Property;

b) Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans;

c) Integrity in Research and Scholarship;

d) Research and Scholarly Activity.

J. Page explained that these four policies have been developed to allow the College to go forward for eligibility for NSERC grants. The College wishes to apply for the grants within the next 2 months so SMT wants to approve them soon. The Chair explained that the policies could be revised later if problems became apparent.

Joy page suggested that EDCO input was sought on the content of these Administrative policies but there was some confusion over EDCOs jurisdiction to advise or discuss or provide feedback on them. The Chair agreed to clarify the intended consultation process with SMT and report back to Council.

There was a question on whether legal opinion had been sought on the drafts policies. J. Page said it had been sought and received.

The comment was made that <u>all</u> of these policies will have a substantial effect on faculty and staff. It was suggested that they be consulted

broadly. J. Page suggested that they would be consulted through the DCFA/SMT constituency group communication process.

There was some discussion of the content of the draft policies. Summary of the discussions follow.

a) <u>Commercialization of Intellectual Property</u>

There was a question about why we needed this policy when we did not yet have an Intellectual Property Policy.

J. Page commented that two other policies related to this one have been approved by SMT. They are: - Copyright and Conflict of Interest policies. She added that the college is developing a policy on Records Retention and Management and that Carol Compton-Smith is working on it.

b) <u>Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans</u>

The Chair stated that after careful review she realized that the current Research Ethics Policy does not fall under EDCO's mandate as defined by the College and Institutes Act. She explained that the REB policy should therefore not remain housed as an Educational Policy. She agreed with J. Page that it might be more appropriately housed as an Administrative policy. She explained that the REB policy was housed at EDCO originally because the Tri Council required that an REB had to operate independently and at arm's length from Administration. The new draft policy ensures that the REB will operate as an independent stand alone body that will have authority to approve research. She further explained that the new draft policy set the REB up as a new type of committee for Douglas College because while the organizing REB policy had to be approved by one of our internal approving bodies, it was not going to be accountable to EDCO or Administration. The Chair advised that the EDCO Policy Committee supported a decision to move the REB policy from an Educational Policy approved by EDCO, over to an Administrative policy approved by SMT. She explained that since EDCO had no authority over the REB policy under the Act, the administration did not require EDCO approval to move it. The chair asked for discussion. A summary of comments follows:

There was a question on the role of the Administrator on the REB. K. Denton indicated that the administrator on the Board is a resource person who manages the business of the REB and Chairs the REB when asked to do so. She explained that the REB administrator is a non-voting member of the REB.

M. Brulhart wondered how the REB could be at arm's length from Administration if Administration approved the policy. The Chair explained it was peculiar on the surface but suggested that the text of the policy assured the REBs independence. She further explained that we have only the three options of an approving body at Douglas College; the Board, EDCO or Administration.

B. Hardy agreed that the REB policy does not belong under EDCO and indicated that he was unsure what the best alternative was. He agreed that given our internal options of Board, Administrative or EDCO policies, the choice of Administrative seemed acceptable.

D. Anderson indicated that the section dealing with appointment of the REB community member "states that the member is selected by senior management. She thought this was problematic. She suggested that the administration should not appoint any voting REB members. G. Bowbrick suggested that the REB might find its own community member or that a committee that had no vested interests in the composition of the REB could be struck to elect a community member.

The Chair agreed to send all feedback to J. Page. She explained that J. Page will make changes as she wishes and Administration will approve the new policy "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans" in future.

c) Integrity in Research and Scholarship

It was suggested that Collective Agreement and/or Employee Relations issues could be involved and the suggestion to communicate with DCFA and ER was made.

d) Research and Scholarly Activity Policy

There were no comments

8. ADJOURNMENT: MOVED by K. Denton, SECONDED by S. Bubrick, the meeting adjourned at 6:02 pm.

Chair _____ Secretary _____