



Douglas College

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF EDUCATION COUNCIL  
Held Monday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005 at 4:15 p.m.  
New Westminster Campus, Boardroom

1. ROLL CALL

**Members Present:**

Trish Angus (Non-Voting)  
Graeme Bowbrick  
Marilyn Brulhart  
Jan Carrie  
Rich Chambers  
Sam Cheng

**Regrets:**

Heidi Taylor

**Absent:**

Sean Hibbitts

~~Neil Hoggins 368050 Cynthia 273050 Egleton 2750t~~ Heidi  
J a n L i n d s a y K i t

Les Marshall  
Elizabeth McCausland  
Susan Meshwork (Chair)  
Colleen Murphy  
Brenda Pickard (Secretary)  
David West  
Susan Witter (Ex-Officio)

\*Part of the meeting

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

\_\_\_\_\_ : In order to accommodate the guests, the Chair asked members to approve a fluid Agenda. The Agenda was approved.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 17, 2005 MEETING The Minutes were approved as circulated.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Professional Development Day Schedule

The Chair advised members that, as stated in the College and Institute Act, Council has an advisory role regarding setting the academic schedule. She introduced Cynthia Fulton and Lin Langley to speak to this item.

Lin advised members that, after the 2005 Professional Development (PD) day was cancelled, Council supported the next PD day be held in February, 2006. She advised members that this has thrown the dates off the original 2-year schedule. She added that, in addition to avoiding the coordination of two major PD events in one year (Douglas College Professional Development day

- It was suggested to remove the reference to “Asian students” in the first paragraph under Exit Transition on page six.
- LLPA found the ideas very valuable; however, they found it difficult to pull out key themes and suggested that an executive summary with key goals be provided at the beginning of the document.
- DVST has an issue with the coordinated assessment and will provide Blaine with something in writing.

The Chair advised members that she will write a formal memo to Blaine containing Council’s feedback.

#### 4.3 Program and Service Evaluation Guide

Blaine Jensen advised members that previous programs reviews (formally called unit reviews) have been unsuccessful in providing a sustainable process and acceptable results. He noted that work began in 2004 to develop a new review mechanism. This document was brought before Council in the fall of 2004 and received supportive feedback for the general direction of the reviews. Blaine added that the most noteworthy change sees “periodic reviews” becoming “comprehensive reviews” which would be conducted on an as-needed basis rather than according to a predetermined cycle. He noted that the “very occasional ‘rationalizations’ will now become ‘restructuring reviews’”.

In response to a question, Blaine advised members that the responsibility for ensuring that each program or service is reviewed annually rests with the Dean or Director of the area in consultation with Chair, Coordinator, Manager and Supervisor, as appropriate.

**ACTION Please take this to your constituency groups for feedback and formal advice at the December meeting.**

The Motion was CARRIED.

4.6

Curriculum Committee Recommendations

There was unanimous consent to short-cycle the Curriculum Committee recommendations.

**MOVED** by M. Brulhart; **SECONDED** by J. Carrie,

BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:

**THAT Education Council approve the submitted curriculum guidelines for CCSD 4569; INTR 1225; PSYC 1150; MATH 1101; MATH 1120; MATH 1125; MATH 1130; MATH 1160; MATH 1191;**

Members gave the following feedback:

- T. James cautioned that, if there is no requirement written in policy for a minimum GPA, it would be difficult to enforce. In response, Kathy advised members that a mechanism would be put in place to advise students that if they fail to reach the standard, they will be required to see the Coordinator.
- A question was raised as to whether the GPA standard would fluctuate from semester to semester (to fall in line with SFU and UBC). In response, Kathy advised members that only in extreme cases would the requirement fluctuate.
- A. Kitching advised members that, rather than being punitive, she would like to see good students being rewarded. Kathy responded by saying letters do go out to students.
- T. Angus reminded members that students who do not maintain a GPA standard are not required to withdraw from the College, only the Limited Enrolment program.
- Some members advised that they felt maintaining 30 credits per year seemed high.
- R. Chambers advised that most limited enrolment students are “high performing” students.
- There was a suggestion that the language change was vague and allowed for arbitrary decision-making on the penalty for falling below expected GPA requirement.
- Concern was raised that the department was not giving students enough information regarding the standards they are required to meet and subsequently would that increase the number of appeals?
- It was suggested that there are other models such as if a student doesn't maintain a certain GPA they are moved into a part time program.

**There was unanimous consent to short-cycle the motion.**

**MOVED by J. Lindsay; SECONDED by L. Fuentes;**

**BE IT AND IT WAS RESOLVED:**

**THAT Education Council approve the change in maintaining status in the Associate of Arts program. The language in the “NOTE” section will be College, on 50 d-e**

5.2 Affiliation Agreement between Douglas College and Luoyang University

6.3 Report from the Board Representative  
There was no report.

6.4 Report from the Secretary  
The Secretary reminded members th9Rport T12 0 0 1oec8503(n1 Ti6m)8. .06595y(tr85)e