



Douglas College

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF EDUCATION COUNCIL**  
Held Monday October 20, 2008 at 4:15 pm

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



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.





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 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





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) Commercialization of Intellectual Property

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) Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans

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 \_\_\_\_\_