

**Okanagan College Education Council
Minutes of Thursday, October 21, 2010
Room S103B Student Services Boardroom – Kelowna Campus**

Approved

Present: J Hamilton, A Hay, R Huxtable, T Kosowick, C Kushner, A Leimert, S Marken, K Matthews, A McKinnon, J Muskens, M Nicholson, H Schneider, S Seaton, J Short, I Wheeler

Regrets: A Anderson, R Gee, B Nudd

Absent: L Rozniak

Recorder: D Crommer

1. Determination of Quorum and Call to Order

M Nicholson called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Motion: K Matthews/S Seaton

“That Education Council approve the agenda as circulated.”

- Add item 4 - Date of next meeting and Item 5 – Adjournment.

Carried as revised

3. New business – Long Term Education Plan

M Nicholson suggested that the each ‘Discussion Paper’ be discussed separately and in order. She added that she would like to have a time limit for each discussion paper without restricting the discussion.

A Hay provided an overview starting on handwritten page four. There are a series of discussion papers to help develop the Long-Term Education Plan (LTEP). Discussion groups were held at all the campuses to gather input and feedback is also accepted electronically. The purpose is to create the opportunity for employees to have real input.

The ‘Discussion papers’ each have different ideas and allow for more input. The Deans Forum will receive all input and help formulate the LTEP. The Discussion Papers are not meant to be definitive and are still in a rough format. There is some overlap among papers. Some information is from the ‘View Book’ and copies are available in the Library. The Deans Forum is looking for input and all input is valued and used. A Hay advised that Education Council has a very important voice for input to the Deans Forum. He added that recommendations are included in order to provoke discussion.

Process

- Members were provided an opportunity to provide feedback on the process.
- A member indicated that the process is not consistent with the MVV as a connection seems to be missing as the LTEP is read. A Hay noted that this is a fair comment and added that the final document will have a better connection to MVV. The document must align with the MVV or we have an element missing.
- It was noted that there are ‘musts and wants’ and some musts are not up for negotiation. It is difficult to discuss and these could be included at the

beginning of each discussion paper and be separated from wants. This is a process issue for some people.

- A Hay added that OC also wanted to look at Ministry directions and may want to have discussions with Ministry to see if there are options for flexibility
- J Hamilton added that some things that are musts are imperatives and not likely to change. Another example would be around innovation and applied research. Originally the government response was that we could not even use the word research and now it appears that this is starting to change. This is in part due to some work that has been done by the group of colleges and work that has been done and is being done. Our core mandate is teaching and this is an opportunity to say that in the LTEP. We need to be able to say how this effects us and why and what may help. In some areas we need to have this conversation even though there is direction in place.

a.) Definitions

- There were no questions on the Definitions.

b.) Discussion Paper #1 - Growth and Size of Okanagan College

- The general planning context seems to be missing students and refers to government and refers to labour market.
- How is trades funded with regard to FTEs and how is it done; target is 105%.
- It was noted that institutions have not always been funded equitably and that previously, institutions that were under capacity used to get more money and over-capacity institutions would receive less funding. This has changed in recent years so that those institutions that are over capacity are funded where those operating under capacity are penalized.
- A Hay added that in 2005, OC was higher in support services relative to instruction and the focus was on instruction. Student numbers have increased and we need to achieve a balance.
- ITA enrolments have increased.
- J Hamilton pointed out that OC is funded differently than school districts. SD's are funded on a per student basis. We have the opportunity to influence FTE targets. Over time some have made a connection between funding and FTEs. This is a bit of a dilemma and the Ministry does recognize this and is trying to recognize where student demand is.
- A member asked about enrolments, student participation and why grade 12 transition rates are lower in the Okanagan. A Hay advised caution in this area as the system does not track students that leave the province. He added that some areas of the province have low transition rates while other areas have higher rates and we have seen some improvements in transition rates.
- A member asked if this is coming from the school system where there is not an expectation that students will continue. A Hay added that this is something that needs to be factored in. Other factors include the greying of population with women and minorities being under-represented in highest ranks.
- A member asked if this is meant to be at OC or does this apply to Canada in general and is there more information on this. A Hay advised there are studies on this and information can be forwarded. If people would like a copy of the report, they should contact him directly. A member added that it is good to see the Canadian information and be able to make the connection back to OC.
- A member suggested we look at our own population demographic model as we draw students from all over the province to attend our Trades programs. A Hay noted this is a good observation. In Business we draw students from

across Canada and internationally as well. There are opportunities beyond our region.

- Referring to points 1.1 and 1.3, it was asked that if there are lots of students and not much space is that where capital funding comes in.
- A member noted there is a difference between 'where space is available' and 'where space may be made available'.
- J Hamilton added that he is having trouble with this as well. He added that we need to consider what this means if we have a surge in Arts enrolments and not enough space does that mean that we don't enrol students. He added that we need to tie this into Master Capital plan and either have space available or space can be made available or leased.
- A member wondered that if this means at a regional campus, if there are enough students that want a course that it will be offered.

c.) Discussion Paper #2 - The Effect of Changing Demographics on the Relevance of Programming

- A member mentioned that they were having a hard time getting from a high level plan to a working plan.
- A member had asked staff at a regional campus if they had any concerns to bring forward. The member indicated it is a good idea and the problem is what seems to happen is that people do not see anything coming of it. It is important that ideas are not lost and people are kept apprised of where changes were initiated. One of the challenges will be to see the high-level plan operationalized.
- A member expressed that this is too much like the strategic plan. This discussion paper seemed to miss that there is a strategic plan in place.
- A member added that it is hard to see the next step. A Hay advised that it is hard as Education Council is seeing one piece at a time.
- A member noted that UBCO is not necessarily getting local students but are getting lots of Aboriginal student enrolments. It was noted that UBCO initiatives are more proactive. It seems that they may set aside more seats for Aboriginal students and are doing more recruiting in that area. If there is a 'no fail' policy for students, instructors need to know. Creating spaces is a problem if we are just trying to get them through. We need more help with recruiting.
- A member added that some institutions have a transition person to help due to high failure rates. Another member added that NVIT has a business program that requires all students go through.
- A member noted there are different kinds of success.
- J Hamilton added that the institution is making a concerted effort to have employee diversity better represent our communities. He does not believe that UBCO has a higher percentage of Aboriginal students and believes we have the better percentage numbers. We need to have Aboriginal people teaching and working in our institution. We need to be aware of the perception that the one group of students receives preferential treatment.
- A member noted that they had gone to school with many Aboriginal students and in general they did not have a line of vision on post-secondary. It was not in their interest. There needs to be support in the secondary schools so this can be started earlier.
- Clarification was requested on 'Internationalization at home'. A Hay advised this would include having international students here and having the students mix better with other students. This would also include having our students attend school as international students in another country.
- A member suggested this would fit better at the beginning of the document.

J Muskens left the meeting at 5:05 pm.

- d.) Discussion Paper #3 - Program Profile and Development
- Programming Profile
 - o A member indicated this is confusing.
 - o Another member suggested this section needs some work and not wordsmithing.
 - o A suggestion was made to try something new at cost recovery. A Hay asked if this meant to be at full cost recovery.
 - o Referring to Recommendation 3.1, a member suggested that 'meets the needs of external' should read as 'anticipates and meets the need'.

 - Role of Continuing Studies
 - o A member asked how CS works. A Hay advised that CS works differently in different areas or portfolios. The problem is that in one area or region, a course might be offered as a CS course and in Kelowna the same course may be offered as a Trades course. Having the facilities in Kelowna is a factor. Some portfolios have little connection with CS.
 - o There are some internal issues that need to be sorted out.
 - o A member asked about bringing up the issues or going further and bringing up what other institutions are doing. If so what would or should we look at. A Hay asked if we would want to base fund these courses or programs or keep them as cost recovery. We have one of the largest and most successful CS departments in the province.
 - o It was suggested that we might have CS within the portfolios.
 - o A member wondered what will influence our decision on this issue.
 - o C Kushner added that asking what the other models are is a good question. She advised there as many models as there are institutions. (If members want more information, they are to contact C Kushner.)
 - o A member asked if CS was decentralized and became part of the portfolios would that mean that CS would cease to exist or if for example, the business courses would become part of the portfolio if taken over by the portfolio. A Hay advised that there is more to CS continuing as an entity and working with the portfolios. One model would be to have a small group of CS people work alongside of portfolio management. A Hay added that an example would have someone work in the portfolio to focus on CS stuff and to develop programming. For example, CS would register and collect money and do the same admin work they now do.
 - o A member asked how that would work. We are not sure at this time.
 - o A member expressed concern with possible conflict of interest in a portfolio and what mechanism would be in place to ensure this would not happen. C Kushner advised that we cannot take anything out of existing course/program offerings and offer it as cost recovery. The Government is really clear on this.
 - o J Hamilton added that he is wondering if CS belongs in the LTEP as we are not considering any other program area and where it belongs. CS is one of the most entrepreneurial areas of the institution and this area can respond to needs and wants. CS is able to access federal and provincial money for contracts. This is a development area for programming that is flexible, short term. Is how we do CS really a LTEP discussion item?
 - o M Nicholson suggested that perhaps there should be a discussion item or discussion paper on CS and its role in the organization. There seems to be questions about staffing, credentials, collective agreements, etc.
 - o A member was intrigued by how they are able to respond to change.
 - o A member expressed concern that if set aside, this area may be chipped away at and become part of something for the sake of a place to put it. It is an area of the institution that is complicated to understand.

- A member suggested that recommendations 3.3 and 3.7 don't tie well to discussion.
- Recommendation 3.5 is general and would be a good discussion paper to develop further. A Hay advised that we need to be careful as paper #5 does not talk about signature programs. Is AME a signature program or is the BBA a signature program that will only be offered in Kelowna.
- A member added support for some of the recommendations included as they are important to Arts for university transfer purposes.
- A member expressed that recommendation 3.7 does not seem to flow. A Hay advised it is a general recommendation.
- A member asked for clarification about the signature theme and if this means that in each region there would be programs offered that would be distinct and only offered in that region. These courses will not be offered at all campuses.
- It would mean that core programming offered at all campuses. Certain programs offered at specific campuses, e.g. HKIN in Penticton.
- C Kushner added that CS attempted signature program in specific campuses and found that it left it open to competitors. This is a challenge that is not included.
- M Nicholson urged caution in that we are not locating a program to build up a campus – build it and they will go model does not always work.

A Leimert left at 5:35

R Huxtable left at 5:45

Fifteen minute break from 5:45 – 6:00

J Hamilton left at 6:00

Discussion Paper #4 - Learning and Teaching at Okanagan College

- M Nicholson likes this recommendation. Reviews what instructors and faculty need in the classroom.
- A member noted that instructors are learners as well.
- A Hay advised that this section is more focused on faculty and instructors than on students.
- A member referred to the section on 'Accountability' and indicated that he would expect to see evaluation included. This sounds like support for leadership in learning and teaching.
- A member added that this should include staffing in the learning centres and that the staffing be at an adequate level.
- A member noted that this is very interesting and suggested that it could mean that students at a regional campus like Salmon Arm would be able to take higher-level courses via Skype.
- A member noted this section is really important and is disappointed with the recommendation that is to develop a detailed report of what we do. A Hay elaborated that this was not intended to be interpreted in this way.
- A member suggested that the institution use more technology for DE courses. Examples include Skype or other ways to expand communication.
- M Nicholson referred to B, C and D and asked how can we deal with small class sizes. Our use of technology has not kept up with the changes in technology and sometimes the existing technology does not work. A suggestion was made that one heading could be 'Using Technology to Deliver Learning'
- A member asked about the ILLT and its role.
- A member added that they will provide support if asked for assistance in a certain area.
- A member expressed support for recommendation 4.3 adding they are still not sure of their role on Education Council.

- A member added that at Nova Scotia Community College, students get a portfolio and are portfolio ready.
- Referring to recommendation 4.4, a member suggested that labour market research be done. We need to do more than pay lip service to improving our relationships. The member indicated he was looking for something more inspirational on deepening our relationships.
- A member indicated non-support for this recommendation.
- A member suggested that this needs to be more than forging relationships, there needs to be a whole culture shift. People need to break down walls.
- A member supported this recommendation adding she is not sure how to change the structure, but it might improve things.
- A Hay advised that some people indicate that we do have silos and others say we do not. We need to analyze whether or not we have silos.
- A member liked the topic for recommendation 4.7 and suggested the recommendation is boring. The member added that this is supposed to be a discussion paper and there is no discussion.
- A member added there is no real mechanism for engaging students.
- A member suggested the homepage be improved.
- A member suggested that we move to a new era and use Twitter. A Hay added that we do use Twitter.
- A member added that when it comes to innovation, we are too cautious.
- A member referred to 4.7 adding that a report using the best available research, benchmarks and definitions of quality. Take it one step further.
- A member said the website is professional but not creative.
- A member added that this will need to be resourced. We need to talk to students and learn how we get them excited to be here. It is a struggle to provide the level of engagement.
- Referring to recommendation 4.9, a member expressed that they did not like this as it is being left to volunteers.

e.) Discussion Paper #5 - Signature Element

- M Nicholson noted that this is a short paper with two recommendations.
- A member suggested that this is a huge topic and the discussion is disappointing. There is a lot more that could be done. We should discuss the advantage of learning. There is no discussion around pros and cons or any other ideas.
- A member added that we should have a signature element that draws people in and these programs are a basic requirement.
- A member asked if the paper was supposed to summarize previous papers. We are looking at OC as a whole and trying to determine what makes us different and what is good about that. There needs to be more of what a student would look at included in the document.
- A Hay suggested that members keep in mind that what this is trying to say is that our signature element is that the student experience is great at OC. This is a discussion paper. The question is should we have a signature element not what is our signature element but should we have one.
- A member advised that what she hears from students is that they like the small classrooms, accessibility to instructors, good instruction.
- A member added that recommendation 5.2 is very good.

f.) Discussion Paper #6 – Innovation

- A member referred to model C adding that we need to make it clear that part of applied innovation is teaching. The teaching part is often dropped.

- When people attend a conference, the college is represented.
- A member suggested this should be considered as part of our signature. The fact the many combine teaching with applied research is a benefit.
- A member added there is responsiveness to students.
- A member noted that engaging in the community is being a volunteer. Research, presenting at conferences and community involvement are all volunteer work. This can be exhausting. How can support for this be created?
- A member added that this is recognized in recommendation 6.5.
- A member suggested that if we don't do that, then we lose whatever signature we want to have.

General comments

- A member indicated he has seen difficulties with topics not being clearly defined and the intent misunderstood. We need to define what we want to say in this document.
- It was suggested that in many cases, discussion, models and recommendation and missed connection to discussion. It seems as some recommendation would appear to be unsupported.
- A Hay advised that this is a result of how the recommendations were generated. Leadership Team reviewed the discussion papers and then added the recommendations; what is missing is a description of the discussions that took place with the Leadership Team, making the recommendations appearing somewhat disconnected at times.

What is not included or a glaring omission.

- This should be a subject for continual review.
- A Hay advised that this is not how the final plan will look. Over time, adjustments will have to be made as circumstances change. Strategies of the current education plan will be adjusted.
- Succession planning is not covered with many pending retirements. There should be strategies for this.
- When recruiting, what are the key skills we are looking for.
- A member added that this goes into greying demographic and we should be worried about replacing our staff. IHA has the highest average age for nurses in the province.
- A member talks with students on career goals and most want to enter the field of education. Who is available in five years is different than who is available now.
- The committee expressed appreciation for the work of A Hay and his group in preparing this document.

The motion was struck as this is a discussion paper only and a motion was not required.

4. Date, Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, November 12, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.

5. Adjournment at 7:10 p.m.