

*MEETING DATE: September 14, 1998*

*AGENDA NO: 2*

*PREPARED BY: Barbara Melnyk*

*EDUCATION COUNCIL*

---

*ISSUE:*

**MINUTES**

*ACTION:*

**THAT the Minutes of the Meetings held on June 1 and June 15, 1998 be approved.**



EDUCATION COUNCIL

June 1, 1998 – 2:00 p.m.  
Surrey Campus Boardroom (C230)

MINUTES

<u>Present</u>	Jim Adams Larry Anderson Doug Boyer Brian Carr Barbara Craig Derek Francis Balbir Gurm	Stephanie Howes Wendy Parry Don Reddick Maureen Shaw Ann Stafford Jim Gunson (Chair)
<u>Absent</u>	Manfred Baur T.N. Foo (ex officio) Christopher Golden Jim Jamieson	Sarah Kanakos Colleen McGoff Dean Raymond Tang Skip Triplett
<u>Guests</u>	Dana Cserepes Jack Finnbogason Kathryn Zmetana John Slattery Jim Gillis Barbara Duggan	
<u>Recorder:</u>	Barbara Melnyk	

1. Confirmation of Agenda

Item #8, Block Transfer Agreement – Horticulture Core Curriculum – withdraw.  
The revised agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of Minutes (May 4, 1998)

The Minutes were approved by consensus.

### 3. Chair's Report

The Chair thanked those Council members who attended the Board's dinner meeting on May 13, 1998. As well as partaking in a delicious dinner, there was a vibrant information exchange on such issues as Prior Learning Assessment, and other prominent issues in the educational system today. It was suggested that the two groups should meet annually, and that if another joint meeting is planned, that the new Council might prepare informative issues in advance of the meeting.

The newly formed Ethics/Research Task Force will complete their work sometime this summer and will report back to Education Council in the Fall. Further consultation will be discussed once Education Council has had a chance to review the report.

At the April 20, 1998 Education Council meeting, a motion was passed stating that students with undergraduate degrees from recognized Canadian post-secondary institutions be exempt from taking the required liberal education component of all applied design degree programs. Council would like to amend the motion to state:

Moved by J. Adams/seconded by B. Gurm:  
THAT students with undergraduate degrees from recognized Canadian post-secondary institutions be exempt from taking the required liberal education component of the Bachelor of Applied Design in Interior Design Program as it is presently constituted.  
CARRIED

The Chair stated that the widely circulated Course Outline Manual seems to be working well. We are making notes of suggested revisions and tightening up some of the wording in the document. In reference to a motion adopted at the Humanities Curriculum Committee meeting on May 15, 1998, the Chair notes that no formal memo has been received from the Dean of Humanities. With regard to the absence of guidelines on the number of weeks or hours per class, this omission has now been added to the course outline.

### 4. Committee Reports

#### 4.1 Student Applicant Eligibility

*Topic Comment*

D. Francis reported that he and Skip Triplett are working with Adrienne Olnick to develop an assessment program to test a sample of new incoming students for their English language competency. This assessment will in no way deny access; it will simply test English competency, and will compare the student's performance from one semester to another. One of the challenges has been to determine a measurement tool or test that will be applicable to native English speakers as well as ESL. Another challenge is that students will have to be notified prior to their application to Kwantlen that English competency testing is compulsory.

#### 4.2 Degree Proposal Assessment Committee

*Consultation re Possibility*

Council requested that a note be sent to Dianne Crisp, in appreciation of her excellent job as Chair of DPAC.

4.3 Employability Skills

No report

4.4 Curriculum Approval

The following course outlines were reviewed by the Curriculum Approval Sub-committee, and are recommended for approval subject to minor revisions:

LBED 3110 – Work Technology and Society  
LBED 3120 – Study of Cultures  
LBED 3140 – Science and Technology – An Historical and Philosophical Overview  
LBED 3310 – Power Relationships I  
LBED 3311 – Power Relationships II

These are the liberal education courses that form part of the already approved Bachelor of Technology in Information Technology and Bachelor of Business in Entrepreneurial Leadership programs. These courses will be reviewed in one year.

JAPN 2200 – Intermediate Japanese I  
JAPN 2201 – Intermediate Japanese II

Intermediate Japanese courses will enable students to acquire a more advanced and sophisticated level of Japanese; accuracy and fluency will be enhanced and cultural knowledge increased. Council recommends that Kwantlen extend Japanese instruction into the second year.

CMNS 1105 – Introduction to Interactive Communication

This Applied Communication course is specially designed for students in the Horticulture and Floristry programs.

INFO 3110 – Professional Communications in Information Technology  
ENTR 3550 – Professional Business Communications

These two Applied Communication courses are specially designed for students in the Bachelor of Business Administration and Bachelor of Information Technology Programs.

<p><u>Moved</u> by A. Stafford/<u>seconded</u> by J. Adams, THAT the above course outlines be approved, subject to revisions. CARRIED</p>
---

ENLT 0110 – English Language Training I  
ENLT 0210 – English Language Training II  
ENLT 0310 – English Language Training III  
ENLT 0410 – English Language Training IV  
ENLT 0510 – English Language Training V  
ENLT 0610 – English Language Training VI

This represents a change from continuous to fixed entry, and therefore, a change in the teaching mode. Concern was expressed regarding faculty workload and that KCFA should be kept informed of these issues.

Moved by M. Shaw/seconded by W. Parry,  
THAT a complete Education Council package (including curriculum information and course outlines) be sent to KCFA and BCGEU.  
CARRIED

**ACTION:** The Chair will discuss the above motion with the Vice President, Education to ensure a mechanism is put in place to vet curriculum through the appropriate channels, prior to Education Council meetings.

Moved by D. Francis/seconded by J. Adams,  
THAT the ENLT course outlines (part-time program only) be approved on a two-year trial basis.  
CARRIED

FINA 1170 – Photography I  
FINA 1166 – Colour Theory and Practice

Moved by J. Adams/seconded by L. Anderson,  
THAT Education Council recommends approval of FINA 1170 and FINA 1166 with the proviso that internal transfer arrangements are made with IDDS.  
CARRIED

#### 4.5 Grants Application Panel

Education Council reviewed the balance of the recommendations concerning the funding of projects from Kwantlen's internal curriculum development fund. The following projects are recommended for approval:

Associate Arts Degree for Design Draftsperson -	\$ 8,000
Bibliographic Instruction for College Resources -	\$ 8,150
Fine Arts for Humanities	\$ 8,622
Diversity Training Video for Faculty of Social Sciences & Music -	\$ 9,143
Collaborative Nursing Program for Community and Health Studies	\$ 28,803
Japanese for Employment Purposes (if an LIP Grant not forthcoming)	\$ 5,349

<p>Information Technology and Computer Support Specialist: Course C453 Internet and Media Online Specialist: Course C452 Alarm Installation Program CARRIED</p>
---

11. Next Meeting: September 14, 1998 – 4:15 p.m. – Surrey Campus Boardroom
12. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.



EDUCATION COUNCIL

June 15, 1998 – 3:00 p.m.  
Surrey Campus Boardroom (C230)

MINUTES

---

Present

J. Adams  
L. Anderson  
D. Boyer  
B. Craig  
D. Francis  
B. Gurm  
J. Jamieson  
C. McGoff Dean  
D. Reddick  
M. Shaw  
A. Stafford  
J. Gunson (Chair)

Absent

M. Baur  
T.N. Foo  
C. Golden  
S. Howes  
S. Kanakos  
G. Kilcup  
W. Parry  
R. Tang  
S. Triplett

Guests

R. Elmes  
J. Hayes

1. Curriculum Approval: Changes to the Music Curriculum

Moved by J. Adams/seconded by L. Anderson;

THAT the Certificate in Music Program require the following courses:

- Rudiments of Music I and II (MUSI 1010 and 1020)
- Listening to Music I and II (MUSI 1013 and 1023)
- Certificate Aural Musicianship I and II (MUSI 1011 and 1021)
- Major Instrument (MUSI 1105 and 1205)
- Large Ensemble I and II
- Elective courses from Music or University Transfer courses

For a total of at least 30 credits.

CARRIED

The certificate program provides a basic introduction to music. The current program required students to spend 28.5 hours in class per week divided between eight courses. The

requirements were onerous and students had no choice in course selection save for the two academic electives.

Moved by J. Adams/seconded by D. Boyer;  
THAT the Diploma in Music – Music History Program, be discontinued and the title of the Diploma in Music – Music Theory Program be changed to Diploma in Music – University Transfer.  
CARRIED

Currently, two streams within the Diploma in Music exist with the same requirements; except that the history stream requires that two electives be languages. The music faculty regard this requirement as unnecessary as they do not require any specialized courses in either music history or theory to warrant a distinction. the effect of this motion is to collapse the two streams into one without the language requirement.

Moved by J. Adams/seconded by M. Shaw;  
THAT the Diploma in Music – General Studies be revised to require the following courses:  
Music History – 6 credits (MUSI 1153 plus one of MUSI 1253, 2353, 2453)  
Music Theory – 4 credits (MUSI 1150 and 1250)  
Musicianship skills – 4 credits (MUSI 1151, 1251, 1154, 1254)  
Performance – 16 credits (Private Instruction and Large Ensemble for four semesters)  
Electives – 30 credits. Students may choose from:  
Further courses in Music Theory, History, Aural Musicianship and Class Piano (MUSI 2351, 2451, 1253, 2453, 2350, 2450, 2354, 2454)  
Additional Music courses (MUSI 1102, 1202, 2360, 2460)  
Chamber Music (MUSI 1166, 1266, 2366, 2466)  
University Transfer courses and those required by the BBA in Entrepreneurial Leadership Degree.

The revised stream provides more flexibility for the student. Apart from the core content, students are permitted to choose a wide range of electives from both music and other areas. Requirements for electives to be chosen from English and a non-music area have been removed. In particular, this permits a student to progress from the program to the BBA degree program.

Moved by A. Stafford/seconded by L. Anderson;  
THAT the Education Council approve the following Music courses:

MUSI 1000 – Ensemble Musicianship  
MUSI 1010 – Rudiments of Music I.  
MUSI 1020 – Rudiments of Music II  
MUSI 1011 – Aural Musicianship and Rhythm Training I



MUSI 1021 – Aural Musicianship and Rhythm Training II  
MUSI 1013 – Listening to Music I  
MUSI 1023 – Listening to Music II  
MUSI 1014 – Introductory Class Piano I  
MUSI 1024 – Introductory Class Piano II  
MUSI 1016 – Certificate Chamber Ensemble I  
MUSI 1026 – Certificate Chamber Ensemble II  
MUSI 1017 – Kwantlen Strings I (Certificate)  
MUSI 1018 – Kwantlen Wind Ensemble I (Certificate)  
MUSI 1019 – Kwantlen Chorus I (Certificate)  
MUSI 1105 – Major Instrument  
MUSI 1015 – Kwantlen Guitar Ensemble  
MUSI 1166 – Diploma Chamber Ensemble I  
MUSI 1266 – Diploma Chamber Ensemble II  
MUSI 2366 – Diploma Chamber Ensemble III  
MUSI 2466 – Diploma chamber Ensemble IV  
MUSI 1167 – Kwantlen Strings I (Diploma)  
MUSI 1267 – Kwantlen Strings II (Diploma)  
MUSI 2367 – Kwantlen Strings III (Diploma)  
MUSI 2467 – Kwantlen Strings IV (Diploma)  
MUSI 1169 – Kwantlen Chorus I (Diploma)  
MUSI 1269 – Kwantlen Chorus II (Diploma)  
MUSI 2369 – Kwantlen Chorus III (Diploma)  
MUSI 2469 – Kwantlen Chorus IV (Diploma)

2. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

At the June 1, 1998, Education Council Meeting, Council approved in principle a number of CE Programs. Details at the course outline level have still to be considered.

Moved by M. Shaw/seconded by D. Francis;  
THAT Continuing Education courses and curriculum be vetted through curriculum sub-committees of Education Council with these committees having the power to second expertise as needed.  
CARRIED

Following the motion, it was suggested that the Executive Committee examine each CE Program and make a judgment on which curriculum committee should review it. If there is not a relevant committee, then the Executive Committee will recommend a group of experts to vet the program.

3. Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for September 14, 1998 at 4:15 p.m. in the Surrey Campus Boardroom.



## EDUCATION COUNCIL

September 14, 1998 – 4:15 p.m.  
Surrey Campus Boardroom (C230)

### A G E N D A

---

1. Confirmation of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes (*June 1, 1998 and June 15, 1998*)
3. Chair's Report (*verbal*)
4. Committee Reports
  - 4.1 Student Applicant Eligibility (*please see Agenda Item #7*)
  - 4.2 Degree Proposal Assessment (*no report*)
  - 4.3 Employability Skills (*no report*)
  - 4.4 Curriculum Approval (*to be reviewed by Curriculum Approval Sub-committee prior to meeting*)
    - ENVI 2425 – Contaminated Site Health and Safety
    - HRTT 1305 – Ergonomics, Safety & Productivity
    - HRTT 1306 – Greenhouse Systems
    - HORT 1265 – Nursery Experience II
    - HORT 2364 – Nursery Production of Trees & Shrubs in the Field
    - HORT 2412 – Landscape Estimating & Contract Administration
    - HORT 2436 – Golf Course Management
    - HORT 2464 – Nursery Production of Plants in Containers
    - HORT 2477 – Production Horticulture Management
    - HORT 2483 – Nursery & Garden Centre Management
  - 4.5 Grant Applications Review (*no report*)
  - 4.6 Liberal Education Curriculum (*no report*)
  - 4.7 International Education (*no report*)
  - 4.8 Prior Learning Assessment (*see att'd. under "For Information"*)
5. Election: Member-at-Large (*att'd.*)
6. For Approval: Degree Program Concept - Bachelor of Accountancy (*att'd.*) – *see attached criteria*
7. Student Eligibility Committee (*att'd.*)

*Final Atk 1210*

8. For Information: Name Change – Automotive Mechanics to Automotive Service Technician (*att'd.*)
9. For Review: *Policy B.12: Program Review (att'd.)*
10. For Approval: Base Requirements for a Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.) (*att'd.*)
11. Next Meeting: October 5, 1998 – 4:15 p.m. – Surrey Campus Boardroom (C230)
12. Adjournment

Attached for Information

*Degree Proposal Assessment Committee Minutes*

*Divisional Curriculum Minutes*

*"Highlights – Entry Level Trades Training 3 Year Outcomes Research Project"*

*"Revised" Membership List*

*Fall Semester Meeting Schedule*

*Prior Learning Assessment: Year End Report (May 26, 1998)*

*Article: University of Calgary Gazette, July 13, 1998*



## Inter Office Memo

**Memo To:** Management Team  
**From:** Adrienne Olnick (Planning Assistant) (#3256)  
**Subject:** English Language Testing for Kwantlen Students  
**Date:** June 1, 1998  
**C:** Education Council

### Overview

Over the last few years, the issue of English language entrance requirements has been raised on several occasions. A portion of the Kwantlen's faculty are concerned about a perceived decline in Kwantlen students' English language skills. Consequently, they have suggested that Kwantlen University College adopt a policy of English language entrance requirements. Due to the potentially serious impact on both Kwantlen University College and the communities it serves, a study is needed to examine the issues at hand. Before a policy stipulating English language entrance requirements can be adopted, objective research must be conducted to examine newly entering Kwantlen students' English language skills, the potential relationship to student performance and their actual performance.

### Approach To Research

#### *Previous Research:*

The report, Monitoring High School Student Trends, examined the high school grade distributions for students entering Kwantlen within one year of high school graduation and compared this to the total provincial grade distributions. Since 1993, the average English 12 grade within the province has been increasing, while the average English 12 grade for students entering Kwantlen within one year of high school graduation has been decreasing.

To my knowledge, no other study of English language skills has been conducted at the institutional level within B.C. Therefore, this research will be both exploratory and descriptive in nature. Due to its exploratory nature, it is important to move through the research process diligently. Once this project is complete, it is likely to receive outside attention from not only the Ministry, but also from other institutions in B.C.

#### *Research Questions:*

What is the overall English skill level of now students entering Kwantlen University College in the fall of 1998?  
 Is there a relationship between students' English language skills and their performance in Kwantlen courses?

### Data To Be Collected

#### *Student Profile and Demographic questions (survey)*

Questions such as age, gender and number of years of education in Canada would be included to help examine the test score results. English Language Skill Test results and responses to student profile questions will be collected. The data will be tracked in a simple Access database.

#### *Testing Tool:*

Scores from an English language test will be recorded and analyzed. The level of analysis will be determined by the type of test that is selected for this research project.

### Concerns

1) It is very difficult to determine the best measurement tool for this research project. Among many features, the test must have the ability to examine both native and nonnative English speakers. The task of choosing a test to examine Kwantlen students' English language skills is one that should not be taken lightly, as the quality of the test will have a direct impact on the reliability and validity of this study's results. With testing planned for September 1998, we have less than three months to choose a test.

2) In order to get a representative sample to assess English language skills, students need to be required to take the test. Simply requesting their participation will bias the results as many students will simply refuse to take the test. In other words, students who refuse to take the test will skew the research results.

**Recommendations**

Due to the serious nature of these concerns, I would strongly recommend that the following actions be taken:

- 1) Set the testing date forward to the fall of 1999.
- 2) Request the English Department begin work on the testing tool. If an appropriate test does not exist, then the department may take the opportunity to develop such a test.
- 3) Contact the Ministry and CEISS to assess their level of interest in the project.
- 4) Ensure that information about the research project be included in the next Kwantlen University College Calendar. This information will inform students about the testing and require them to participate.



Review Date:

Section No. 1 Ends  
 No. & Title: **1.11 COMPREHENSIVENESS**  
 Approved by: Board of Governors  
 Effective: 22 April 1998  
 Revised:  
 April 1999

## POLICY

### COMPREHENSIVENESS

1. We recognize the responsibility we bear to develop well educated, balanced citizens. Kwantlen University College is committed to meeting the educational needs of the students and communities it serves by offering a comprehensive portfolio of post-secondary programs.

#### Breadth

2. We will meet career, personal and social education needs by offering a balanced mix of preparatory, career, trades, vocational, and university studies offerings. We will meet citizens' education needs by incorporating both liberal education and employment skills components in all appropriate programs.

#### Depth

3. We will offer all post-secondary credential levels from documents of completion to applied baccalaureate degrees.

#### Admissions

4. Kwantlen University College welcomes all students, but reserves the right to place students in courses or programs, according to reasonable, fair and appropriate guidelines, or criteria linked to the initial performance expectations of the course or program. We recognize that learning may be acquired by both formal and informal means. Some students may need upgrading before or concurrent with their course or program in order to ensure success and progress.
5. Admission criteria to programs will be to ensure that students have a reasonable chance of success. Students meeting these threshold criteria will be admitted to the program based on their dates of application.

#### Diversity

6. We recognize the diversity of the communities we serve and the advantages this diversity provides. We will treat all applicants, students, employees, external advisors and board members as equally valued members of our Kwantlen Community and we will provide equal access to education, employment and service opportunities.



[Return to Bylaws & Policies Homepage](#)

[Return to Kwantlen's Home Page](#)

MEETING DATE: *September 14, 1998*  
AGENDA NO: 7

PRESENTED BY: *Jim Gunson*

## EDUCATION COUNCIL

### **BACKGROUND:**

The Executive was assigned the task of investigating the Student Applicant Eligibility Committee's problems and reporting to Council. As there is currently no member-at-large, this report comes from discussions between the Council chair and vice-chair.

The Student Applicant Eligibility Committee, in various forms, has been around for a number of years, with a mandate to recommend policy with regard to the testing of prospective students. A major issue has been the testing of students for English language skills. When Derek Nanson resigned as chair almost two years ago, Margaret Beresford and Rhondda Porter assumed the duties as co-chairs. A year ago, after Jacqie Thachuk's departure, Skip Triplett and Derek Francis became members of the Committee. This roughly coincided with the completion of consultations with curriculum committees, which Education Council had requested.

The Draft Policy (*see attached*), which had the support of curriculum committees, came to Council, but was "postponed" until the completion of a research project to determine the relationship between English skills and performance in Kwantlen courses. This action was felt by some members of the Committee to negate its work and leave it without a mandate.

In the course of considering entrance requirements for degree programs, Council found itself grappling with some of the same issues and had on its agenda a reconsideration of the parts of the Draft Policy not directly related to English language testing. Unfortunately, at this time, the co-chairs convened a meeting of part of the Committee, excluding those considered opposed to the Policy. From this meeting came another report to Council. As it appeared that the Committee was now dysfunctional, the

STUDENT APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE

Report to Council: September 14, 1998

Page 2

---

reconsideration of the report was removed from the agenda to allow things to cool and hopefully to permit steps to be taken to make the Committee functional.

The work of the Committee is important; the members have done valuable work and have expertise. It is therefore important to attempt to restore its functionality. To disband the Committee at this stage would lead to long-lasting negative feelings.

To this end, the following is proposed:

1. That Council reconsider the Committee's Draft Policy with a view to approving it, with the exception of #1, under the heading "Policy", which mandates English language testing.
2. That Council review the mandate of the Student Applicant Eligibility Committee (*see attached*).
3. That Council appoint a new committee chair with the mandate of attempting to restore its functionality. If this fails, the new chair is to report back to Council.



## DRAFT POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT ELIGIBILITY

### **POLICY**

In order to maximize community access and student success through effective use of its resources, Kwantlen University College will ensure applicants admitted to programs and courses have the potential to succeed in those programs and courses.

To this end, the University College has established program entry requirements, course prerequisites and corequisites and assessment practices to evaluate the knowledge, skills and preparedness of applicants to the University College, its programs and its courses. The University College recognizes that applicants have life and work experience and the University College will, upon request, assess, and, if appropriate, formally recognize such prior learning.

The following principles will apply to all assessments:

1. As English is the language of instruction at Kwantlen University College all applicants, regardless of country of origin or of citizenship status, will be required to provide evidence of their competence in the English language. It is the responsibility of the department, discipline, school or program to recommend specific levels of competence in the English language for specific programs and courses.
2. In order to ensure applicant assessment meets with commonly accepted standards and complies with relevant legislation, assessment tools used by the University College must be of demonstrable reliability, validity and relevance. This includes non-standardized assessment tools administered by departments, disciplines, schools or programs. The criteria for non-standardized assessments must be clearly stated and demonstrably linked to student success in the course or program to which the non-standardized assessments apply.
3. Where appropriate, assessment tools should be standardized across disciplines, programs and courses.
4. The University College will inform applicants of assessment results by a date specified in advance. Kwantlen University College will endeavour to provide advice and outline options for applicants who do not meet program entrance requirements. The University College will endeavor to provide programs and courses which will assist applicants in meeting those entrance requirements.

### **PROCEDURES**

1. Entrance requirements for specific programs will be included in the University College calendar, program information, brochures, etc. Prerequisites and corequisites for individual courses will be specified in the course outlines and in the course description included in the calendar.
2. Under the direction of the Dean, entrance requirements for programs and courses will be recommended, reviewed and, when necessary, revised by ~~Departmental~~ <sup>Disciplinary</sup> Curriculum Committees through the curriculum review process. *The Dept. C.C. will recommend requirements to ed council*
3. Program entrance requirements and the assessment tools used to ensure those requirements are met will be reviewed, and, if required, revised during the program review process in consultation with an individual with expertise in assessment from outside the department. *division*

## DEFINITIONS

Entrance requirement (for a program): the minimum skills, knowledge and preparedness necessary for success in a program of studies. These may be defined in terms of standardized test scores, prior course work, prior work experience, high school grades, a non-standardized assessment (e.g. interview, role-play, portfolio review), etc.

Assessment: the process by which the College determines student knowledge, skills and preparedness in relation to established and documented entrance requirements.

Non-standardized Assessment: informal assessments of knowledge, skills and preparedness administered on a non-uniform basis. These could include personal interviews, letters of interest, prior work experience, etc.

Standardized Assessment: assessments of knowledge, skills and preparedness administered in a uniform way to allow comparisons within a large group over a period of time.

Corequisite: course or set of courses which are taken along with another course.

Prerequisite (for a course): lower level or related course or set of courses in which the student must have performed adequately in order to be permitted to register in the given course.

Relevance: the degree to which the attributes and characteristics being assessed are linked in practice to student success in particular programs or courses.

Reliability: the degree to which an assessment instrument provides consistent measures over time.

Validity: the degree to which an assessment instrument/practice measures what it is purported to measure.

*Make sure  
10 on 10 on  
10 on 10 on  
10 on 10 on*



**KWANTLEN**  
**University College**

*Vice-President, Education*

**Memorandum**

*Tel: 599-2145*

*Fax: 599-2235*

---

**To:** All Faculty  
**From:** Jacqie Thachuk  
**Date:** January 6, 1997  
**Subject:** Standing Committee on Student Eligibility

---

The Standing Committee on Student Eligibility (formerly known as the Standing Committee on Student Assessment), are reconvening in the new year.

This is a sub-committee of Education Council with a mandate as follows:

1. To review and evaluate, as appropriate, all assessment methods presently in use and any new assessment procedures proposed by departments. This review will involve preparing a report describing assessment methods and recommending any changes necessary. The process will be done in full consultation with all those involved in the process.
2. To institute ongoing evaluation of the validity of tests and assessment methods.
3. To provide advice and assistance to individuals and departments seeking help in the assessment area.
4. To develop College policy, procedures and guidelines in the area of assessment.

Margaret Beresford and Rhonda Porter will co-chair the committee. Cliff Falk will provide administrative support.

The first objective will be to move the draft policy on assessment through the final approval stages.

The committee will then establish a work plan to address assessment issues relating to language requirements for academic courses and validation of admission requirements.

New members are required to support this important work.

**If you have an interest and wish to devote some of your accountable time to this committee, please contact one of the following:**

Margaret Beresford  
Rhonda Porter  
Jacqie Thachuk

Extension 2507/Voice Mail 9505  
Extension 2693/Voice Mail 9986  
Extension 2145

Thank you.

copies: Deans, J. Patterson, C. Falk

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON STUDENT ASSESSMENT  
A SUBCOMMITTEE OF KEAC**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. To review and evaluate, as appropriate, all assessment methods presently in use and any new assessment procedures proposed by departments. This review will involve preparing a report describing assessment methods and recommending any changes necessary. The process will be done in full consultation with all those involved in the process.
2. To institute ongoing evaluation of the validity of tests and assessment methods.
3. To provide advice and assistance to individuals and departments seeking help in the assessment area.
4. To develop College policy, procedures and guidelines in the area of assessment.

**Further Work With The Measurement Tool:**

1) A faculty member with expertise in English Language Testing should be given partial work release time to evaluate relevant measurement tools (i.e. LPI, Kwantlen's English Placement Test etc.) If necessary, new tools may need to be evaluated.

2) The sample should be divided into at least three groups from the following areas:

- Career and Technical Programs
- Academic Programs
- Vocational Programs

Each of these areas have different English language requirements and should therefore be handled separately. Faculty/consultants may need to work with the above mentioned areas to define their English language needs and ensure that the chosen testing tool is sensitive to their needs.

**Sampling Issues:**

The overall sample will be defined as all new students entering Kwantlen University College in the fall of 1998. The overall sample will be made up of three subsamples consisting of students entering one of the three above mentioned areas. In total, a maximum of 600 students will be tested. The samples will be stratified based on gender and possibly age.

**Summary of Expenses:**

1. Work release time for faculty
2. Auxillary time to arrange testing appointments with students
3. Auxillary time to help with testing of students
4. Testing fees

**Proposed Time Line**

Week	Date Range	Activity
1	May 25-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Get Faculty/consultants together to examine testing tool (Faculty begins work release time)</li></ul>
2,3,4 & 5	June 1 - 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Faculty/consultants decide on test and begin working with the different areas to establish general English language requirements</li><li>• Determine the complete subsample definitions</li></ul>
6	June 29- July 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Complete the survey portion of the test. i.e. Demographic questions</li></ul>
7 & 8	July 6 - July 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Arrange testing time blocks with Derek Nanson and Iris Goodlet</li><li>• Determine the final cost estimate for auxiliary help required for additional testing</li></ul>
9	July 20 - 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Complete the database required for entering test score data.</li><li>• Train Iris Goodlet on the new database</li><li>• If necessary, arrange for faculty to mark tests in September</li></ul>
10	July 27 - Aug. 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Work with IET to prepare the necessary data extraction programs required for sampling purposes</li></ul>
11, 12 & 13	Aug. 10 -28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Time to review procedures and address any items that may be behind schedule</li><li>• Prepare letters to go out to all Faculty teaching in the Fall semester This letter will inform them of the testing and may request that all instructors briefly discuss the testing procedure with their classes.</li></ul>
14	Aug. 31 -Sept. 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conduct sampling procedure and prepare phone lists.</li><li>• Send out a letter to all students that have been selected for the study explaining the testing procedures</li></ul>
15 & 16	Sept. 7 - 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Auxiliary staff call students to arrange testing appointments</li></ul>
17, 18 & 19	Sept. 21 - Oct. 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Student Testing</li></ul>



**KWANTLEN**  
University College

## Inter Office Memo

**Memo To:** Skip Triplett and Derek Francis  
**From:** Adrienne Olnick (Planning Assistant) (#3256)  
**Subject:** English Language Testing for Kwantlen Students  
**Date:** May 14, 1998

---

**Research Question:** What is the English skill level of new students entering Kwantlen University College?

**Method of Measurement:** After preliminary research on English Language Tests, I have decided to focus my attention on testing tools that are currently available at Kwantlen. My reasons for this decision are as follows:

- 1) Cost
- 2) Kwantlen's in house expertise
- 3) Degree of knowledge required to interpret related literature

If Kwantlen decides to use a test that it does not currently own, an initial (and quite often substantial) start-up fee will be incurred with the purchase of a new testing tool. This start-up fee will be in addition to the marking and administrative costs associated with testing students. Alternatively, by using a test that Kwantlen already owns, the start up fee can be avoided. Secondly, by using a test that is currently available at Kwantlen, we can rely on in house expertise for marking and interpretation skills. In addition, we have test score data from previous years that can be analyzed to allow the new results to be better interpreted in Kwantlen's educational environment. Finally, although I was able to identify new tests that may be useful for this research project, a thorough understanding of language testing is required to examine the appropriateness of these new tests.

(The section titled "Further Work With The Measurement Tool" addresses the issue of identifying the best test for this research project)

### Tests Currently Used at Kwantlen:

**Kwantlen's English Placement Test:** Provides placement information for students planning to take an English course. Based on the test results, students are placed in either English 0099 or a 100 level English course. If the test scores are really low, students are advised to take additional ABE/ESL testing. The placement test was developed at Kwantlen by the English Department and is marked in house. Concerns have been expressed about the test being susceptible to subjective marking as it is only marked by one faculty member. If marking followed a similar structure to the LPI method of marking where each test is assigned two markers, some of these concerns may be alleviated. Currently, the fee for taking Kwantlen's English Placement Test is \$30.00 per student, with \$10.00 going to the marker and \$20.00 going to cover the costs of administration.

**LPI:** The LPI test provides placement information for students planning to take an English course. Based on the test results, students are placed in either English 0099 or a 100 level English course. If the test scores are really low, students are advised to take additional ABE/ESL testing. The test was developed at UBC and is used by many colleges in the province. Every test is marked by two markers and if two different grades are given, a team of markers in a group setting decide on an appropriate score together. Currently, the fee to take the LPI is \$40.00 per student and all tests are sent to UBC for marking.

**Slep:** The Slep was designed to be used on the ESL population and is not suitable for native speakers.

**Toefl:** The Toefl was designed to be used on the ESL population and is not suitable for native speakers.

✓

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**  
**Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes**  
Friday, June 19, 1998, 12:30-2:15 p.m.  
Room 2550A, Richmond Campus

---

<b>Attending:</b>	Attridge, Bob Ingre, David Morris, Susan Smith, Barb	Bollo, Priscilla ( <i>Chairperson</i> ) Ling, Arthur Smolkin, Doran Talbot, Ann
<b>Absent:</b>	Ramirez, Patricio	Vernon, Roger
<b>Guest:</b>	Nishizawa, Sumiko Langley, Moira	Tritchew, Panteli
<b>Copies to Chairs:</b>	Rhonda Porter, Panteli Tritchew, Christiane Richards, Bill Barthelemy, Dana Cserepes, Moira de Silva, English Chair	

---

David Wiens will replace David Ingre as representative from Applied Communications in September. The Chair thanked David for his contribution to this committee.

**1. Approval of Agenda of June 19 and Minutes from May 15, 1998**

Addition to Agenda

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 4 a) Changing prerequisites for UT classes                       | Bob       |
| 4 b) Executive Summary – Bachelor of Applied Design & Technology | Priscilla |

**2. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

a) INFO3110, ENTR3550

These courses were put forward by Business, discussed and approved at the June Ed Council meeting. Questions were raised regarding consultation with the department, the abbreviation for the courses, course funding and staffing.

Bob Attridge moved and Ann Talbot seconded that this committee voice its concern to Ed Council with copies to Dean, KCFA and Human Resources that we need official clarification and guidance on courses developed intradepartmentally. Of concern are the staffing ramifications of courses such as INFO3110 and ENTR 3550, which are offered and funded by Business but developed and staffed by CMNS:

Action: Priscilla

b) New Course Outline Manual

An email response from Jim Gunson was distributed (attached).

c) ENLT full-time outlines – followup

The full-time outlines were not approved, as Ed Council did not see sufficient difference from the part-time outlines. Ed Council questioned accessibility and recommended withdrawal of the full-time courses. Commencing Fall 1998, part-time semester based courses will be offered in Richmond and continuous intake courses at Newton.

d) CMNS1105 – followup

A memo from Jim Gunson was distributed (attached). There were suggestions as to how the outline should be worded. The committee felt that Ed Council is not expected to grasp the jargon and the depth of what's in all programs and course outlines. There should be respect for decisions reached at individual Curriculum Committees. It was suggested that Jim Gunson be invited to clarify how the role of Ed Council differs from those of the Curriculum Committees. Priscilla will send a memo on behalf of the committee with the following:

“We have seen the outline that was sent back for changes and appreciate an opportunity to dialogue with you re what the Course Outline Sub-Committee is looking for and its role.”

Action: Priscilla

- e) PLA procedure  
CRWR and FINA have not nominated their PLA representatives to date. In addition, it was not sure if CRWR wants to send a representative to Curriculum Committee meetings. Priscilla will find out.

Action: Priscilla

3. COURSE OUTLINES – NEW

ENGL0098

The profile for ESL students has changed and students are failing ENGL0099. This course is designed to target reading, comprehension, summarizing, and paraphrasing with emphasis on written English. It will replace ENGL0099. The English Department, at their May 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, moved to 1) accept ENGL0098 and 2) set the prerequisites for ENGL 0098 and 0099 to 'C' and raise that of ENGL1100, 1110 from 'C' to 'B' or placement test. This is part of an attempt to smooth transition. Statistics show that those coming in with 'C' and 'C+' do not do well. Priscilla commented that a 2-year lead-in time would be required so that high schools are notified of changes. A Prerequisite 'C' is needed to accommodate program entries. It was suggested that 'C-' be used initially, to be changed to 'C' later, pending changes to ENGL1100 and 1110. Priscilla will advise Counseling and Advising re the forthcoming changes. Due to shortage of time, this outline will be revisited in September. It was suggested that ENGL0099, 1100 and 1110 be included for discussion.

Action: Priscilla/Moira/Bob/Celia

COURSE OUTLINES – REVISIONS

None

4. NEW BUSINESS

- a) Changing prerequisites for UT classes

See Course outlines – New above.

- b) Executive Summary – Bachelor of Applied Design & Technology

Priscilla

Postponed to next meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m., followed by the Human Rights presentation by Liz McKinlay and Derek Francis in Room 2550B. The next meeting will be held from 10:00 a.m. on Friday, September 18, 1998 at Richmond.

*what will happen to 0099 - for non-native speakers*