



Douglas College

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF EDUCATION COUNCIL**  
**Held Monday September 17, 2007 at 4:15 pm**  
**New Westminster Campus, Boardroom**

---

1. ROLL CALL:

**Members Present:**

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

**Regrets:**

Bruce Hardy  
Ann Kitching (Ex-Officio)  
Trish Angus (Ex-Officio)  
Susan Witter (Ex-Officio)

**Absent:**

Michael Reddy  
Alan Yang

**Guests:**

Anna Helewka  
Karen McCredie (Acting for T. Angus)

- 
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: In order to accommodate the guests, the Chair asked members to approve a fluid agenda. Council agreed.

The Chair welcomed the new members of Council, namely Sandy Vanderburgh, Dean of Science and Technology and Titus Yip, new representative for the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration. She introduced Karen McCredie who was acting for T. Angus.

3. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 18, 2007 MINUTES:

M. Brulhart requested that the typographical error in 4.9 be changed from “-C” to “C –“.

The minutes were approved as amended.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Elections

(a) Ratification of Elections – Position of Chair and Vice-Chair

The Secretary called for a ratification of the vote at the April 16, 2007 meeting to elect S. Meshwork as Chair.

There being no further discussion, S. Meshwork was duly elected. She accepted and congratulations were extended.

The Secretary called for ratification of the vote at the April 16, 2007 meeting to elect G. Bowbrick as Vice-Chair.

There being no further discussion, G. Bowbrick was duly elected. He accepted and congratulations were extended.

(b) Election for the position of Appeal Tribunal Panel Member

The Chair explained that in the past she had appointed the third member of the Appeal Tribunal Panel. However, this member should have been elected.

C. Murphy nominated M. Brulhart to stand as the elected member of the Appeal Tribunal Panel. E. McCausland seconded the nomination.

There were no further nominations.

M. Brulhart was elected as the third member of the Appeal Tribunal Panel by acclamation.

4.2 Policy Items

a) Grading Systems Policy

T. James explained that the suggested changes were minor and would provide consistent language for the policy, making it more parallel. He confirmed the Policy Sub-committee was recommending the changes as presented in his memo of June 6, 2007.

E. McCausland expressed some concern from her FEC that introducing another grading definition change into the Calendar would create additional confusion as all past and current grades are posted. T. James explained that this proposed change was basically a

housekeeping change and K. McCredie confirmed the change would be added to the change made in the spring and would not appear as a 'new' change.

There being no further discussion.

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED :

**MOVED by T. James; SECONDED by M. Brulhart**

**THAT Education Council approves the changes in language to the Grading Systems Policy as recommended by the Policy Sub-Committee as follows:**

**MAS – Mastery**

***Student has participated in course activities and met and mastered ....***

**And**

**UNW – Unofficial Withdrawal**

***Student has not participated in course activities and has completed less than 70% ....***

**The Motion was CARRIED.**

b) Program Approval Process – Continuing Education and Contract Training (Non Credit) Certificate Program Policy

T. James explained the policy had been rewritten to make it easier to understand and the Chair confirmed that the Continuing Education Department had been consulted and would like approval of the revised policy to proceed as recommended by the Policy Committee.

There being no further discussion.

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

**MOVED by E. McCausland, SECONDED by C. Murphy;**

**THAT Education Council approves the revisions to the Program Approval Process – Continuing Education and Contract Training (Non-Credit) Policy as recommended by the Policy Sub-Committee as attached to these minutes in Appendix A.**

**The Motion was CARRIED.**

4.3 Revisions to the Credentials Awarded at Douglas College Policy

T. James confirmed the Policy Sub-committee had reviewed K. Denton's memo of May 9, 2007 and were recommending that Council approve the revisions as submitted and as follows:

*“Associate Degree .....may include a thematic emphasis or **discipline** academic 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.”***

**Action: Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the October 15, 2007 Education Council meeting.**

- 4.4 Revision to the Credentials Awarded at Douglas College Policy  
T. James confirmed the Policy Sub-Committee was recommending that Council approve the revisions to the Credentials Awarded at Douglas College Policy as suggested in J. Gardner’s memo of May 10, 2007, to include a Training Group Certificate credential to the policy after the section *Continuing Education Certificate of Program Completion* as follows:

***“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.”***

**Action: Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the October 15, 2007 Education Council meeting.**

- 4.5 Revision to the Program Approval Policy – New or Revised Degree Programs  
T. James confirmed the Policy Sub-committee were recommending Council approve the revisions to the Program Approval Policy – New or Revised Degree Programs as suggested in the memo from K. Denton dated May 28, 2007. He explained the proposed changes would streamline the revision of existing programs. A summary of the extensive discussion 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 to a program from year 2 to 3 and K. Denton confirmed that such changes would have to come to Education Council for approval.
- S. Vanderburgh inquired at what level revisions to programs that were not being presented at Education Council would be approved. The Chair responded that it would be at FEC level. J. Lindsay confirmed this.

- S. Vanderburgh also asked how other areas affected by changes would be consulted or notified. J. Lindsay confirmed that the Deans would have this responsibility.
- K. Denton pointed out that course designers would need to be careful when designing programs. Electives should be designated elective and not named. She further stated that required courses could be prescribed but the sequencing should be left open. If electives were changed to prescribed courses, these would have to come to Education Council for approval.
- The Chair questioned if these policy changes might also be applied to the revision of non degree programs. K. Denton had not looked at the Non Degree Approval Policy but she agreed the revision could also apply to the non degree approval process. The Chair stated that this topic would be placed on a future agenda.
- The Chair clarified that Education Council's responsibility for and ability to scrutinize program revision would be impacted and changed by the suggested policy revision. She encouraged members to make the issues clear to their constituents.

**Action: Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the October 15, 2007 Education Council meeting.**

#### 4.6 Revisions to the Academic Performance Policy

T. James indicated there were two typographical errors on the policy included with the agenda package under Program Progression

- the first paragraph 'specifics' should read 'specific'
- in the second to last line, a comma should be inserted between practicum and clinical.

T. James explained the revisions to the Academic Performance Policy had resulted from some confusion because the current policy does not mention professional practice grading standards. As these standards can vary from one program to another, he stated that the Policy Sub-committee thought there was no sense in trying to define each one in the policy. He reported that Policy Committee thought it made better sense to refer to the local departmental policies already developed. He explained that the major suggested change to the policy was the introduction of a new category entitled Program Progression in the Procedures section.

T. James also indicated that the section recognizing students' academic performance had not been changed in content but had been moved within the policy.

G. Bowbrick pointed that not all limited enrollment programs have professional practice standards and suggested that the word 'some' be inserted before 'limited enrolment programs' under 'Program Progression'.

G. Bowbrick further stated that as Education Council has responsibilities for academic standards as stipulated by the College & Institutes Act and for the final level of grade appeals. He suggested further that professional practice standards' grading standards must approved by Education Council or they would not be enforceable. J. Lindsay stated that she had asked the Deans to investigate where procedures and policies come under existing College policies. She confirmed that department level policies should be approved by Education Council. She suggested that Education Council consider a "grandfather" approach to approvals of past practice departmental policies.

T. James pointed out that some of the professional performance standards will be determined by professional bodies. G. Bowbrick agreed but his concern was that standards should be to a certain level and that Education Council be responsible for approving the standard. He further stated that appeals involving student grade appeals need to be clear. The Chair inquired whether this discussion was directly related to the Academic Performance Policy revisions at hand. She thought it was an important discussion but wondered if it was best to address on a future agenda.

G. Bowbrick suggested the discussion was very relevant to the policy revision because approval of the suggested revisions would mean that Education Council was approving all existing departmental professional practice grading standards and policies without reviewing them.

The Chair confirmed that G Bowbrick was correct in his interpretation of Education Council's responsibility for approving academic standards and final grade appeal processes over grading and academic standards matters under the College and Institutes Act. She agreed the issue was relevant to the decision on approving the suggested revisions to the Academic Performance Policy.

C. Murphy indicated that the Child, Family & Community Studies faculty welcomed the addition of professional practice language in the policy but agreed with G. Bowbrick and stated that she could not approve policies she had not seen.

J. Lindsay discussed an example of a past dispute about a professional practice grading decision. She pointed out there was no language in the current Academic Performance Policy that referred to professional practice grading standards and therefore no overarching College Policy supporting the Department's grading decision in the professional practice course. She further stated that there was a need to introduce a process for approving existing departmental policies and that Education Council could

consider doing that and then take a stronger review role as further departmental professional practice policy gets developed. The Chair stated that Council should have the opportunity to review all current departmental grading standards and policies prior to approving this policy revision.

D. McCloy stated that the Health Sciences FEC was pleased to see the language as proposed. She further pointed out that Health Sciences really needed to have their departmental policies to protect the College and to deal with the legal responsibilities when students are in practicums. Practicum sites rely on Douglas College to ensure students are safe to practice. She also added that practicum sites would be able difficult to secure if students from Douglas were deemed to be unsafe when allowed to go out on practicums.

T. James suggested one way this issue could be dealt with was to amend the wording in the policy to add to the Policy Committee suggestion the words.... 'In accordance with existing program policy as approved by Education Council'. The onus would then be on the departments to bring their policies forward for Education Council's review and would ensure that the criteria set for academic standards in professional practice courses would be presented to Education Council for approval. M. Brulhart suggested a friendly amendment to this effect. The Chair indicated that Council could not amend a Notice of Motion but that Council could consider amending the Motion for Approval next month. The Chair recommended that Members take the amendment suggestions back to their constituencies and bring their feedback to the next meeting.

D. McCloy inquired as to what would happen in the interim. J. Lindsay explained that in such situations that past practice procedure (status quo) would continue until Policy changes were approved by Education Council.

K. Denton inquired as to how current appeals would be affected. G. Bowbrick replied that appeal panels would have to make decisions based on the status quo. He further stated that limited enrollment program departments would have to come forward and ask Education Council to approve Departmental professional practice academic standards quickly in order to avoid vulnerability to external review.

**Action: Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the October 15, 2007 Education Council meeting.**

4.7 Admission and 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 K. Denton; SECONDED by E. McCausland,**

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

**THAT Education Council approve the change of four years to two years recency on the Douglas College Writing Assessment substitution and to add two admission requirements for admission to Access I Nursing and Access II Nursing, namely English 1130 or equivalent with a minimum grade of C and an English elective (UT) three credits with a minimum grade of C.**

**The Motion was CARRIED:**

4.8 Curriculum 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 M. Bruhlhart,**

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

**THAT Education Council approve the following new and revised guidelines: HORM 1210, OADM 1322, OADM 1325, PHIL 2220, PHIL 2280, CMNS 3100, STSU 1100 and the withdrawal of AMGT 245.**

**The Motion was CARRIED.**

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Revision to the Bachelor of Science in Psychiatric Nursing Degree Program

Anna Helewka was invited to the table to speak to this item.

The Chair advised Council that the memo from A. Helewka that was distributed electronically required some amendments.

The amendments were described as follows:

- The subject heading should read: Bachelor of **Science** in Psychiatric Nursing ...
- Items Nos 1, 2 and 3 were to be considered Notices of Motion
- Item No 4 should be considered a request to short cycle a motion to approve



- Item No 5 should be deleted because the action has already been approved at Education Council
- PNUR 4585 should be deleted from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> set of bullets on page 2
- Item 2) on page 2 PNUR 1170 paragraph and rationale should be deleted as this course has already been approved.

The Chair explained that the Psychiatric Nursing Department's request for approval of program revision was complicated procedurally because the Program design change was in part contingent upon changes to some curriculum guidelines which would be dealt with by the Education Council Curriculum Committee.

#### Request to Short Cycle a Change in Course Sequencing

A. Helewka explained that the desire to change the course sequencing arose because some of these courses were supposed to be offered online but the department later learned that it did not have funding to do this. The courses had to be resequenced so the classes could be taught in class without presenting too big a course load for the students. She spoke at length explaining the background and rationale for the change in sequencing.

A. Helewka explained they were requesting this part of the program revision be short cycled because of the Calendar deadline and because their student coordinator needed to inform the students of the changes.

A. Helewka further explained that the change in design was an internal change and did not affect other areas/Departments of the College. She confirmed that she had already consulted most departments and also confirmed that the sequencing changes would apply to the advanced diploma program as well.

There being no further discussion.

**There was unanimous consent to short-cycle a motion to approve the change in sequencing as presented.**

**MOVED by D. McCloy; SECONDED by S. Bubrick,**

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

**THAT Education Council approve revisions to the Bachelor of Science in Psychiatric Nursing and the Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing changing the sequence of courses offered as follows: PNUR 3341 be offered in Semester 4; PNUR 3171 be offered in Semester 6; and PNUR 3272 be offered in Semester 7.**

**The Motion was CARRIED.**

### Notices of Motion for Changes in the Program Design

A. Helewka explained that the Degree Quality Assessment Board had asked the Psychiatric Department to include a Concurrent Disorders course in the program. As there are already 123.5 credits to the program, they were proposing to delete PNUR 4511 Directed Studies from Semester 7 and to remove the assessment component from PNUR 4503 to reduce this course from 3 credits to 1.5, thus allowing the concurrent disorders course to be added without increasing the total credits.

Discussion followed about the wisdom of removing the Directed Studies course and the Chair suggested members bring this information back to their constituencies.

In response to a question about limiting the number of credits, A. Helewka confirmed that typically the range for similar programs was 119.5 to 127 and J. Lindsay confirmed that the Douglas College Credentials Policy set a guideline limit of 120.

**Action: Please take this to your constituencies for feedback and consideration of a Motion to Approve at the October 15, 2007 Education Council meeting.**

## 6. REPORTS

### 6.1 Report from the Chair

The Chair reported that she was in the process of organizing the Committee memberships for the upcoming year. She mentioned that committees all have different meeting dates and times and that they are often developed each year as new members join committees. S. Bubrick confirmed that the Admissions Committee regularly met on the last Wednesday of the month.

The Chair stated that it had come to her attention that some faculty were not hearing about Education Council approved policy revisions in a timely way. She reported that she and J. Lindsay have agreed to a new practice that will allow Education Council to send a Groupwise 'All' message every time an educational policy is amended. She also informed Council that the acting Education Council secretary had created a new Education Council web page titled 'Educational Policy Change Alerts' Summaries of educational policy revisions will be described and links to the amended web posted policies will be listed.

The Chair reported that she has received consistent feedback that the consultation sign-off process for program and course development and

revisions is time consuming and inefficient. She asked members of Council for feedback on any ideas they may have to alter and streamline the current sign-off process but asked that the spirit of the significant consultation that Douglas has always valued be kept in the suggestion mix.

6.2 Report from the President

In S. Witter's absence, J. Lindsay confirmed that the President's Report had been sent out earlier that day and included a report about the updating of the Academic Plan. J. Lindsay confirmed that this will involve Education Council as they come forward with revisions. She stated that they are currently deciding on the framework and how to proceed. She also stated that the updating is currently being discussed at Vice Presidents' Academic Council and Senior Management Team and she confirmed that she wanted open involvement and the opportunity to receive feedback from the College community.

6.3 Report from the Board Representative

There was no report.

6.4 Report from the Secretary

The Secretary indicated that there were two changes on the deadline dates for April and May 2008 on the revised meeting schedule included with the packages.

She also reported that the Agenda Package would now also be posted on the Education Council webpage under 'Agenda Packages' as well as a hard copy being distributed. This page is a password protected site and she confirmed that she would be emailing all the members with the user name and password. M. Brulhart expressed that she found it very useful to receive the packages electronically as it was easier for her to distribute information to her colleagues.

6.4 Report from the Curriculum Committee

There was no report.

6.6 Report from the Educational Excellence Committee

G. Gramozis reported that the Educational Excellence Committee is currently looking for interested faculty members; a minimum of three is required. He stated that this is a very positive committee with only about five meetings a year.

He confirmed that the nomination form for Education Excellence was up on the website and was included in the package. The deadline is September 24, 2007.

G. Gramozis also reported that all three Douglas College students nominated for the Canada Millennium Scholarship have been awarded either a second or third level award. In addition he reported that Robert

Austin, one of the College’s three nominees for the Garfield Weston Merit Scholarship for Colleges was selected for a GWMSC National award.

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

T. James reported that the committee was still working on a large number of policies, including the Academic Freedom and Grading Systems Policies and they were working on the review to develop

7. OTHER BUSINESS – For Information and Circulation

7.1 Educational Excellence Nomination Form

This form was included in the package for use by staff, faculty or students in nominating students for this award.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair reminded Members to bring feedback to the October 15, 2007 meeting from their constituencies on the Reorganization of the College Professional Development Reporting Structure introduced at the June 18, 2007 meeting (Item 5.6).

Moved by K. Denton; Seconded by S. Bubrick, the meeting adjourned at 5.55 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 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 limited enrollment programs must maintain the academic and practice performance standards as outlined in the specifics 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 September 2007*