

**Okanagan College Education Council
Minutes of Thursday, January 17, 2019 4:00 pm
Room S 103B Student Services Boardroom – Kelowna Campus**

Draft

Present: A Hay, R Johanson, D Marques, C Newitt, R Tyner, N Bowman, K Douglas, W Gillett, T Walters, A Krebs, N Lee-Ran, C Farrow, A Lang, A Pope, D Silvestrone, R Sawatzky, B Burge, S Cook

Regrets: R Alejandre, D Freeman, J Hamilton

Absent: N Davis

Guests: S Cousins, S Sakakibara, L Lerner, D Birtwistle, D Warren, J Nastos, L Thurnheer, A Rice, J Rouse, G Balint

Recorder: M Welsh

1. Determination of Quorum and Call to Order

C Newitt called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Motion: R Johanson/ D Silvestrone

That Education Council approves the agenda as presented.

Carried

3. Approval of the Minutes

Motion: A Lang/ A Pope

That Education Council approves the minutes of the December 6, 2018 Education Council meeting as presented.

Carried

4. Business Arising

5. New Business

5.1 CPRC – T/A Curriculum

a. Program revision: Trades Technology Teacher Education Diploma

Motion: R Tyner/ D Silvestrone

That Education Council approves the program revision: Trades Technology Teacher Education Diploma as recommended by the CPRC – T/A:

- S Cousins explained that the department has found more students are wanting to attend the program part time, since many are currently working as teachers or in trades. Two courses have been moved around in order to even out the terms and spread out the work load to better accommodate students.

Carried

5.2 CPRC – STH Curriculum

a. **New course: BIOL 160** **Introductory Biology for Viticulture**

Motion: R Johanson/ A Lang

That Education Council approves the new course: BIOL 160 Introductory Biology for Viticulture as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- S Sakakibara explained that the course was developed as an introductory biology course specifically for the Viticulture Diploma program. The combination of topics taught in this course was not offered in any other introductory biology course, therefore a new course was created.
- A member questioned why BIOL 160 has high school prerequisites while CHEM 151 does not. S Sakakibara confirmed that the discussion of prerequisites had occurred with J Rouse and that they conform to the entrance requirements for the Viticulture program.
- A member questioned if BIOL 160 would be restricted to students in the Viticulture program. S Sakakibara explained that BIOL 160 does not apply for transfer credit, therefore it is unlikely for other students to have any incentive to take the course.
- A member questioned why the outline included a specific statement on how assignments must be a student's own work. She wondered why the entire plagiarism policy was not included. After some discussion, it was confirmed that the entire plagiarism policy would be in the formal outline, but had not been included in order to condense the agenda.
- A member stated that he did not believe that Education Council should be approving outlines and that they are meant for information only. Course outlines change all the time depending on instructor. C Newitt agreed, but noted that if a course outline did not reflect the course presented, that was problematic.

Carried

b. **New course: CHEM 151** **Introductory Chemistry for Viticulture**

Motion: K Douglas/ A Hay

That Education Council approves the new course: CHEM 151 Introductory Chemistry for Viticulture as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- L Lermer explained that CHEM 151 is a combination of topics from different first year chemistry courses. This course is specific to the chemistry that occurs in viticulture. The course will not delve too deeply into any particular topic.
- L Lermer addressed the issue of prerequisites and noted that the students in the Viticulture Diploma program come from a variety of backgrounds and while many might have some chemistry background, others do not. The MATH 125 prerequisite will give students a good base of knowledge to succeed in CHEM 151.
- A member questioned if other students could take this course. L Lermer clarified that students must be in the Viticulture program to take the course. He is not concerned about other students taking it because it is non-transferable and is not listed in the Applied Science program. The member then asked if students with previous college chemistry credit would be able to use that for credit. L Lermer clarified that they would not.
- A member noted that the implementation date should read, "*January 1, 2020*".

Carried

c. **New course: MATH 125** **Mathematics for Viticulture**

Motion: T Walters/ A Lang

That Education Council approves the new course: MATH 125 Mathematics for Viticulture as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- D Birtwistle explained that currently, in the first year of the Viticulture program, students are taking existing math courses. This does not work well, it does not help students, and does not prepare them for the field. The Viticulture department requested a new math course. It is a unique course, designed specifically for Viticulture students.

- A member noted that no expiry dates were indicated for the math prerequisites and wondered if even very old math courses would be accepted. D Birtwistle confirmed that it was doable for this particular course.

Carried

d. New course: COSC 316 iOS Application Development

Motion: R Johanson/ D Silvestrone

That Education Council approves the new course: COSC 316 iOS Application Development as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- J Nastos noted that this course has run several times before as a topics course. iOS app development is very relevant and the department would like to convert the topic into a regular offering.
- A member noted a redundancy in the course description. The description will now read: "...development on the *iOS platform*. Topics include *the* Swift programming language..."

Carried

e. New course: COSC 326 Android Application Development

Motion: K Douglas/ C Farrow

That Education Council approves the new course: COSC 326 Android Application Development as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- Rationale as above.
- "The" will be added before "Android" in the course description.

Carried

f. Course revision: COSC 219 Client-side Web Systems

Motion: A Lang/ D Silvestrone

That Education Council approves the course revision: COSC 219 Client-side Web Systems as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- D Warren explained that the course description is out of date and too generic.
- J Nastos added that all curriculum changes in the program have been approved by the department and they are all in support.

Carried

g. Course revision: COSC 224 Projects in Computer Science

Motion: R Tyner/ A Lang

That Education Council approves the course revision: COSC 224 Projects in Computer Science as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- D Warren explained that this course will act as a gatekeeping course in order for students to enter upper year courses.
- J Nastos added that for students in the two year diploma program, this course acts as an exit point for students to showcase what they have learned.
- A member noted a typo in the rationale.

Carried

h. Course revision: COSC 236 Object-Oriented Systems Analysis and Design

Motion: R Johanson/ K Douglas

That Education Council approves the course revision: COSC 236 Object-Oriented Systems Analysis and Design as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- J Nastos explained that the word "design" is being added before "patterns" in the course description for clarification as "patterns" could mean a variety of things.

Carried

i. Course revision: COSC 320 Analysis of Algorithms

Motion: A Hay/ C Farrow

That Education Council approves the course revision: COSC 320 Analysis of Algorithms as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- J Nastos noted that while this course has not been offered in many years, the department would like to bring it back, but with less emphasis on the “analysis” of algorithms. “Analysis” will be removed from the title.
- A member questioned if the course description needed to change as well if the title was changing. J Nastos clarified that the same topics will be discussed, just without the need to mathematically prove everything taught. The current description is adequate.
- D Warren added that the change in title is to clarify that the emphasis of the course is not on analysis. While some analyzing will still occur, it is not a full analysis course.

Carried

j. Course revision: COSC 331 Middleware Development

Motion: C Farrow/ A Lang

That Education Council approves the course revision: COSC 331 Middleware Development as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- D Warren explained that the revisions here were to modernize the course and include new technologies.

Carried

k. Course revision: COSC 360 Server-Side Web Systems

Motion: R Johanson/ C Farrow

That Education Council approves the course revision: COSC 360 Server-side Web Systems as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- D Warren explained that the course is out of date and revisions needed to be made.

Carried

l. Course revision: COSC 417 Topics in Computer Networks

Motion: A Krebs/ R Tyner

That Education Council approves the course revision: COSC 417 Topics in Computer Networks as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- J Nastos explained that the current prerequisites were only allowing fourth year students to take the course. He confirmed that third year students were also qualified to take the course as long as they are taking COSC 318 and COSC 328 concurrently.
- After a question from a member, J Nastos confirmed that students could take this course more than once, as topics change.

Carried

m. Course deletions

Motion: N Bowman/ D Marques

That Education Council approves the course deletions as recommended by the CPRC – STH:

- COSC 119 Markup Languages and Productivity Software
 - COSC 127 Computer Applications for Water Engineering Technology (WET)
 - COSC 220 Software Evaluation and Selection
 - COSC 250 Digital System Design
 - COSC 350 Microprocessor Programming and Control
- J Nastos explained that these courses have not been taught in many years and the department wants them off the books.

Carried

n. Program revision: Bachelor of Computer Information Systems Degree

Motion: C Farrow/ A Pope

That Education Council approves the program revision: Bachelor of Computer Information Systems Degree as recommended by the CPRC – STH.

- J Nastos explained that the program requirements were created in a time where there were not as many upper year offerings. There are now more options available to students and the program should make that clear.
- D Warren added that the changes will also make the program requirements easier to understand for students.
- A member asked why PHIL 331 and BUAD 123 were specifically singled out in the summary paragraph of the program requirements. J Nastos explained that it was because they are required for all three specialty options.
- A member wondered why BUAD 123 was a requirement for students. J Nastos explained that having a business sense is an asset for students to have in seeking employment.

Carried

Break at 4:58 pm

Resume at 5:05 pm

5.3 CPC – BUS Curriculum

a. Course revision: TOUR 200 Tourism CO – OP

Motion: R Johanson/ A Pope

That Education Council approves the course revision: TOUR 200 Tourism CO – OP as presented.

- A Rice explained that TOUR 200 is no longer a co-op course. The completion of a co-op is now a graduation requirement for the program and is controlled by the co-op department.
- A member questioned how the course could still be justified as six credits. A Rice explained that student commitment is the same as it would be in a co-op.
- J Rouse confirmed that the course is two TLUs. A member wondered how TOUR 200 could be two TLUs when a three-hour science lab is 0.5 TLUs. C Newitt confirmed that these do not necessarily correspond.
- The member asked if TOUR 200 was the only six credit course in the Business department. A Rice confirmed that it is, but it is not uncommon to see six credit courses at other institutions. The department wants to offer students different experiences. While not necessarily a co-op, this course will have the same level of vigour.
- A Rice added that this is essentially a Capstone project for the two year diploma.
- A member confessed that he was struggling to imagine what TOUR 200 looks like on a weekly basis. Since the course is no longer a co-op, he can not see how it has changed. A Rice explained that it involved weekly checks with the instructor, work throughout the term, three major assignments, and a final paper. From an assessment point of view, it is significantly more than a traditional business course. This will be addressed in the study plans set out between the instructor and students.
- Another member was puzzled by the six credits. She wondered why TOUR 200 was not split into two courses. She felt it was not really tidy. She understood why the course was six credits when it was a co-op but not anymore. A Rice noted that instead of a work placement, students would have a volunteer placement. The member noted that this sounded touchily close to a free internship, which is illegal and wondered how this would work. A Rice explained that it has an open structure. There will be a series of experiences that can be amalgamated in the study plan.
- B Gillett added that the study plan will be developed with the student, who will engage in experiences but also reflect on them and be analyzed by the instructor. It is more academic than a co-op.

- A member wondered if students could choose to use the co-op structure to fulfill requirements for this course. A Rice noted they could not do a co-op and this course at the same time, as the co-op would likely take place before.
- The member saw this as akin to an honour's thesis. A Rice would not call it an honour's thesis, although there is a paper. The bulk of the assessment is frequent contact with the faculty member and directed assignments.
- Another member agreed that TOUR 200 seemed ambiguous. He wondered how it could be consistent from student to student, other than talking to the instructor and making a plan. A Rice confirmed that it was consistent in the learning outcomes. Whatever a student's plan is, it must meet the course objectives. Assessment is consistent no matter what the experience is. There will be a set process, although it will vary from experience to experience.
- A member noted that this was not clear in the forms. It depends on the faculty member involved how structured the learning plan will be. She would want to see a more sustainable description or expectations. A Rice was not sure how to further answer the question.
- A member asked if the course was essentially getting a job and writing about it. A Rice clarified that it was not a job per say. Students have to identify an experience as part of your education and it must be substantial enough to meet the objectives of the course.
- A member noted her own experience in a class very similar to TOUR 200 last semester. It involved coming up with a plan with the instructor and partnering with the community. She understood TOUR 200.
- A Rice noted that experiential learning is the direction tourism education is heading nationally. This is happening at other institutions.
- B Gillet added that the experience must be a found activity in the tourism sector to learn from, engage in, express learning, and assess.
- A member pointed out that the rationale suggests students could be writing about and exploring something they have already done. Other members agreed. A Rice confirmed that students must engage in the experience during the course.
- A member noted her experience with grade appeals and was concerned with the description being so open. What constitutes an experience is widely open to interpretation.
- A Rice confirmed that the evaluation matrix is detailed and laid out.
- A member added that while he was coming around to the course, TOUR 200 does not read as a six credit Capstone project course. It does not read as a culmination of the students' learning.
- A Rice added that Education Council approved a six credit co-op and that TOUR 200 is much more academic. He does not expect students to put in any less effort in this than a co-op. The prerequisites ensure students cannot take TOUR 200 until certain topics have been learned.

Carried

b. Program revision: Tourism Management Diploma

Motion: R Johanson/ A Lang

That Education Council approves the program revision: Tourism Management Diploma as presented.

- A Rice explained that this revision was simply to tie up the issues that revising TOUR 200 has created. A revised proposal has been presented to Education Council members as the original proposal forgot to include a change in program description to reflect the change in TOUR 200. The completion of a co-op is now listed as a graduation requirement. BUAD 227 has also been added as an option in the program outline.
- A Hay questioned if there were entrance requirements for the co-op. A Rice noted that the co-op is run by the co-op office. A Hay added that the department must also specify eligibility requirements. A Rice believed this would be the same as any other business

program. A Hay noted that the Tourism Management Diploma would have to be added to the list in the calendar of programs eligible for co-op.

- A member added that she struggles with required co-ops because there is the possibility that students might not find a job. A Rice clarified that there is a current and projected labour shortage in the sector and he does not envision this as a problem, especially in Revelstoke. If students can not demonstrate their ability to get a job, then they do not demonstrate the ability to complete the diploma. The member added that students might have a disability that hinders them from completing the co-op. She noted that for a practicum, students are assisted in finding placement. A Rice noted that this is the standard practice in the Business department. J Rouse clarified that completion of a co-op is part of the core, provincial curriculum and has been demanded by the industry.
- A Rice confirmed that the co-op office is in support of the revisions.

Carried

c. New course: VITT 125 Introduction to Viticulture and Wine

Motion: D Silvestrone/ A Lang

That Education Council approves the new course: VITT 125 Introduction to Viticulture and Wine as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.

- G Balint explained that the revisions to the Viticulture Technician Diploma program were done based on feedback from the industry, the PAC, instructors, and also based on his own experience. The program is still in the pilot stage, however the Business department expects it to be a permanent program. There has been difficulty in trying to match up industry needs with academic requirements. The program is very unique. G Balint has moved around certain courses to match what students are learning with what is going on in the industry at the time.
- A member questioned if VITT 125 was meant to replace VITT 130. J Rouse confirmed that this was eventually the plan. G Balint explained that the differences between the courses are that VITT 130 does not have a lab component and that certain topics have been moved to other courses as they are too advanced for an introductory class.

Carried

d. New course: VITT 135 Grapevine Science

Motion: C Farrow/ R Johanson

That Education Council approves the new course: VITT 135 Grapevine Science as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.

- G Balint explained that the original program included an introduction to grapevine biology course. While VITT 135 is similar, it is not pure biology. It will look at oenology, different physiological parts of the plants, cultural practices affecting the grapes, climates, and so on.
- A member questioned what was lacking in BIOL 120 that has been added to VITT 135. G Balint clarified that the course looks at external factors affecting the grapevine biology.
- The member was concerned that VITT 135 was essentially a science course existing outside of the Science department. He felt that BIOL 120 and VITT 135 looked basically the same.
- J Rouse noted that the department worked closely with the Chemistry and Biology departments to work this out. VITT 135 is an applied academic course that applies specifically to Viticulture students. VITT 135 is the structure all departments felt was best. The member noted that he had heard the Biology department was not happy with the way consultation ended.
- The member questioned why only VITT 125 was a prerequisite for the course and not BIOL 160, which seems like the natural prerequisite for the course. G Balint noted that VITT 125 is more related to grapes and will focus on more related topics.
- Another member had a similar question and wondered how students will get the foundational biological knowledge if not from BIOL 160.
- N Bowman left at 5:52 pm.

- Another member questioned why science courses were being offered under the business umbrella. J Rouse clarified that these courses are under the umbrella of food, wine, and tourism, which covers a broad spectrum.
- A member questioned if BIO 120 would be removed. J Rouse noted that that was up to the Biology department. While BIOL 120 was created for Viticulture originally, at the end of the day it is a Biology course and it is their decision.
- The member read the course description for BIOL 120. He noted that the description is very similar to VITT 135. He felt BIOL 120 was being made redundant and he was uncomfortable with that.
- A member asked why the department created VITT 135 instead of amending BIOL 120. J Rouse reiterated that the department spent a lot of time with the Chemistry and Biology departments. This is a course specifically designed for Viticulturists to understand. Everyone felt this was the best way forward in terms of expertise and the ability to deliver and communicate the content.
- Another member felt it difficult to cast a vote on the motion as he did not feel like he had all the information. He felt there was an important conversation that had gone on between STH and Business of which Education Council was not aware. He questioned if it was an issue for one portfolio to make another portfolio's course obsolete. He questioned if Education Council had standing in this scenario or would it be sorted out elsewhere. He was not comfortable voting if it meant causing issues elsewhere.
- C Newitt confirmed that Education Council does not have an official role in that process but the direction the Council is going will address this issue and be more transparent. There needs to be open and honest consultation and discussion as to why a new course is better than the previously offered course. He agreed it was an uncomfortable scenario. The problem is that Education Council does not see evidence of consultation or discussion in the agendas and instead must rely on peoples' fair and open discussion.
- A Hay agreed with C Newitt and felt the important thing was for relevant departments to have had consultation.
- J Rouse reiterated that the department met with Chemistry and Biology. The department had to adhere to external partners, the PAC, and the BC Wine Grape Council. They identified all outcomes and standards and looked at how best the departments could take on that body of knowledge. In the end, they decided to go with the content experts to provide this information. As members will see moving through the program, Viticulture is more science rich this time around. He stated that consultation did occur and everyone is aware of the outcome.
- A member questioned if the industry asked for this specific content over what the College currently offers. J Rouse clarified that they worked together with the industry to form the curriculum and have not lost any macro outcomes. Brock University was supportive of this program and felt it was strong. G Balint added that Viticulturists have a strong biology background.
- A member noted that he knew the consultation with STH was lengthy but he did not hear that everyone came to the same agreement at the end. G Balint noted that based on their consultation with the Chairs, the departments are all on the same page. There is not written evidence that anyone is against this.

Carried with one opposition.

e. New Course: ONOL 210

Wine Chemistry and Microbiology

Motion: R Sawatzky/ A Pope

That Education Council approves the new course: ONOL 210 Wine Chemistry and Microbiology as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.

- G Balint explained that students had requested more knowledge of wine making in order to be more attractive to the industry.
- A member felt 10% of the assessment being allotted to attendance was excessive. G Balint explained that if students attend and pay attention, they learn more. Having students present in class is more beneficial for everyone.

- The member noted that in the Science department, outlines must say how much the lab component is worth. The distribution of marks presented here does not say this. G Balint clarified that students will not receive marks for each lab. This will be evaluated in the final exam. Another member noted that he has a course assessed similarly.
- Another member noted that the outline mentions field experience taking place in the lab component. He questioned if the field experience is the lab component or is there a traditional lab taking place as well. G Balint confirmed that not all labs will take place at the College, some will take place at wineries.

Carried

f. New course: ONOL 230 Winery Operations

Motion: R Johanson/ A Lang

That Education Council approves the new course: ONOL 230 Winery Operations as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.

- G Balint noted that the department is assuming students will have a good science background by this point in the program. This course will teach the safety and business of wineries. All labs will take place in wineries across the valley.

Carried

g. Course revision: VITT 140 Viticulture Technology

Motion: A Lang/ C Farrow

That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 140 Viticulture Technology as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.

- G Balint explained that certain topics in this course have been moved around to make sense for the industry. For example, the lesson on pruning used to take place in the fall. This is not reflective of the industry as no pruning happens in the fall.

Carried

h. Course revision: VITT 150 Vineyard Health and Nutrition

Motion: A Hay/ D Silvestrone

That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 150 Vineyard Health and Nutrition as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.

- G Balint explained that this course has been reworked and is now an intensive six-week course offered in the spring/early summer. It is intensive to accommodate the field work.
- A member questioned why the contact hours have doubled, as the hours have not technically increased, just condensed. J Rouse confirmed that the contact hours are the same, just compressed.
- C Newitt agreed that while the weekly contact hours have changed, the overall course hours have stayed the same. The revision of contact hours will be removed from the proposal.

Carried

i. Course revision: VITT 160 Irrigation and Trellis Systems for Vineyards

Motion: K Douglas/ C Farrow

That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 160 Irrigation and Trellis Systems for Vineyards as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.

- The same revision to the proposal applies here as above. The contact hours are not changing, just being condensed. The revision of contact hours will be removed from the proposal.
- G Balint explained that the order of the topics covered is changing to better reflect the schedule of the industry.

Carried

- j. Course revision: VITT 170 Vineyard Operations**
Motion: R Tyner/ R Johanson
That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 170 Vineyard Operations as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.
- New topics have been introduced to VITT 170 in order to help students become certified to spray. Many safety related topics are also covered.
- Carried**
- k. Course revision: VITT 210 Soil and Water Management for Vineyards**
Motion: A Lang/ C Farrow
That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 210 Soil and Water Management for Vineyards as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.
- Certain topics have been changed around to make more sense to students.
- Carried**
- l. Course revision: VITT 220 Grape Harvest and Sensory Principles**
Motion: D Silvestrone/ A Pope
That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 220 Grape Harvest and Sensory Principles as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.
- Changes have been made to put more emphasis on the sensory component of the course.
 - Members agreed the wording of the course description was awkward. The description will now read: “Different wine styles and *methods* to distinguish...”
- Carried**
- m. Course revision: VITT 250 Vineyard Management**
Motion: A Lang/ R Johanson
That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 250 Vineyard Management as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.
- More prerequisites are being added to the course as VITT 250 is meant to provide students with the big picture of the program.
- Carried**
- n. Course revision: VITT 270 Viticulture Capstone Project**
Motion: R Tyner/ A Lang
That Education Council approves the course revision: VITT 270 Viticulture Capstone Project as recommended by the CPRC – BUS.
- Students will be exposed to different research methods and given the opportunity to research and debate various topics of interest to the local industry.
 - Members agreed that the new title did not make it clear that this is a researching course. The title will be changed to: “Research Methods in Viticulture”.
- Carried**
- o. Program revision: Viticulture Technician Diploma**
Motion: A Lang/ C Farrow
That Education Council approves the program revision: Viticulture Technician Diploma as recommend by the CPRC – BUS.
- J Rouse explained that the program revision is a culmination of the previous motions.
 - A member was concerned that the admission requirements stated students must be physically able. She questioned how students would demonstrate this. J Rouse explained that students needed to be aware of the conditions and circumstances of the program. While students could theoretically apply without being physically able, they should still be aware. The member did not feel this was appropriate as an admission requirement. J Rouse agreed that it was not an admission requirement but still felt students should be aware somehow.

- A member questioned if there was an age requirement to the program. J Rouse clarified that students must be 19 years old to participate in consumption components of the class. Students under the age of 19 will not be able to taste, but can still participate in other sensory components.
- A member questioned if stating physical ability as an admission requirement complied with human rights legislation. J Rouse reiterated that he agreed it was not an admission requirement, but that students should be aware. A member noted that physical ability was a requirement for a lot of jobs.

Carried

5.4 Standing Committee Reports

- a. Operations Committee
 - Minutes of the January 8, 2019 meeting to come in the in camera session.
- b. ARP Committee
 - ARP will meet this month to discuss a new policy.
- c. CCC Committee
 - Not yet met.
- d. Tributes Committee
 - The January 9, 2019 meeting of the Tributes Committee was cancelled as the weather caused a lack of quorum. The meeting has been rescheduled and there will be a report at March's Education Council meeting.

5.5 In Camera Session

Motion: D Silvestrone/ D Marques
That Education Council moves in camera.

Carried

- a. **Motion:** K Douglas/ A Hay
That Education Council accepts the minutes of the January 8, 2019 Operations Committee meeting as presented.

Carried

Motion: D Silvestrone/ A Krebs
That Education Council moves ex camera.

Carried

6. Reports

6.1 Council Chair's Report – C Newitt

- C Newitt announced that the College will be purchasing new curriculum and calendar software. His motivation for the software is to increase the dialogue through the Education Council process. Education Council should be the culmination of discourse within the institution to make sure curriculum meets student needs as well as the values and visions of the institutions. He noted his experience at meetings and the sense that not everyone has been consulted on a proposal. Education Council should be aware of the full issue when voting.
- The software will give Education Council members the opportunity to see the whole history of a proposal back to its department. All discussions will be available so that the same arguments are not revisited at every step.

- The portfolios will be included in the process as every portfolio is unique in its own way.
- The software will benefit departments in their consultation and aid CPRCs as well. C Newitt hopes it will improve the process for everyone.

6.2 President & Vice-President Education Report – A Hay

- B Gillett discussed students' continued success at Business competitions. The debate team is currently competing in a competition and are doing well. The Tourism team has moved on to the next level of their competition in Vancouver.
- A Hay noted that nominations were open for the annual employee excellence awards. The more nominations that come forward, the more people can be recognized.
- The Applied Degree has gone through the DQAB process and is currently with the minister.

6.3 Registrar's Report – B Burge

- No report.

6.4 Board of Governor's Report – S Cook

- S Cook noted that she is happy to be here. She has been getting acquainted with the College over the past couple months. She is an OC alum. She has a great passion for program and curriculum development and noted that Education Council does important work. She will report Education Council's good work to the Board of Governors.

5 **Date, Time of Next Regular Meeting** – Thursday, February 7, 2019 at 4:00

6 **Deadline for Agenda Items** – Wednesday, January 23, 2019

9. **Adjournment** at 6: 53 pm.