

EDUCATION COUNCIL

October 1, 2001 - 4:15 p.m.
Surrey Campus Boardroom (G2110)

A G E N D A

1. Confirmation of Agenda ! *Ask Barbara about alternate date - as we may need this - Sept 18*
2. Approval of Minutes *(September 17, 2001)*
3. Chair's Report
4. Committee Reports
 - 4.1 Degree Proposal Assessment Committee
(Dana Goedbloed - Chair)
 - 4.2 Curriculum Approval
~~EASL 0085 - English for Academic Purposes - Level 4~~
 - 4.3 Grant Applications Panel
(Jack Finnbogason - Chair)
 - 4.4 Liberal Education Curriculum Committee
(Roger Elmes - Chair)
 - 4.5 International Education Committee
(Derek Francis - Chair)
 - 4.6 Intake Testing and Assessment Committee
(Robin Russell - Chair)
5. Appeals Process Review *(Jody Gordon)*
6. Appeals Review Sub-committee
7. Establishing Minimum Level English Competency
 - Intake Testing and Assessment Committee Report *(att'd.)*
 - Corresponding Tables *(att'd.)*
8. Education Council - June Retreat *(previously distributed - please bring forward) defer*
9. Education Council Marketing and Communication *defer*
10. Statement Regarding Academic Freedom *(att'd.) defer*
11. Admission Point System in the Collaborative Nursing Program *(to be distributed)*
12. Next Meeting: November 5, 2001 - 4:15 p.m. - Surrey Campus Boardroom (G2110)
13. Adjournment



MEETING DATE: *October 1, 2001*

AGENDA #: *2*

PREPARED BY: *Barbara Melnyk*

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE: **Approval of Education Council Minutes**

ACTION: **THAT the Minutes of the September 17, 2001 Education Council meeting be approved.**



EDUCATION COUNCIL

September 17, 2001 – 4:15 p.m.
Surrey Campus Boardroom (G2110)

MINUTES

<u>Present:</u>	Larry Anderson Gary Arneja Roni Clubb Derek Francis Charlotte Graham Charon Graham Steven Lee Jack Finnbogason Karin Green	Jack Finnbogason Karin Green Gary Jones Judith McGillivray Barbara Melnyk (Recorder) Susan Morris Maxine Mott Ihor Pona Robin Russell (Chair)
<u>Absent:</u>	Jeremy Baker Linda Condell Carolyn Granholm	Graham Rankin Newton Wainman Skip Triplett
<u>Guests:</u>	Jody Gordon Tom Radesh	

1. **Confirmation of Agenda**

The Agenda of September 17, 2001 was confirmed by consensus.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

The Minutes of May 28, 2001 were approved by consensus.

3. **Chair's Report**

- The Chair met with the Council Executive on July 17th, to plan agenda items for the 2001/2002 academic year. These items were largely identified in the Meta Evaluation. Council's immediate goal will be to formalize the Strategic Plan and to review the issues documented at the June 4th Council Retreat.
- The Chair stated that she is the Council of Education Council representative on SCOEA. The Core Review document was reviewed at the last SCOEA Meeting, and it is very clear that 'performance' words are beginning to creep into educational agendas. British Columbia has looked at performance indicators for a number of years. A reference to Education Council is now included in the Core Review document. The Chair is booked into a conference in Victoria on Key Performance Indicators.

EDUCATION COUNCIL MINUTES

September 17, 2001

Page 2

- The Chair reminded Council members that the Intake Testing and Assessment Committee Report would be on the October agenda, and that feedback from their constituents is important. **ACTION:** The Recorder will e-mail the Report to Council members.

4. Committee Reports

4.2 Curriculum Approval

ACCT 3380 – Managerial Finance

CSWC 1276 – Professional Practice II

CSWC 1375 – Professional Practice III

JRNL 2350 – Directed Study

Discontinued Courses

FREN 0099 – Conversational French for Beginners

NRSG 1110 – Health 1: Health Styles

NRSG 1120 – Professional Growth 1: Nurses' Work

Moved by R. Clubb, seconded by K. Green,

THAT Council approved the above new and discontinued courses.

(MOTION CARRIED)

4.3 Grant Applications Panel

Jack Finnbogason has asked those groups who received partial funds for GAP grants to report on how they would be scaling back their proposals. A final report will be sent to Council after March 31, 2002.

4.4 Liberal Education Curriculum Committee

No report

4.5 International Education Committee

No report

4.6 Intake Testing and Assessment Committee

No report

5. New Education Council Sub-committee

The Chair stated that the current standing committees no longer represent the whole spectrum of work that is being done or needs to be done if Education Council is to meet its mandate. She suggested that three areas stand out:

- (i) The Language Competency Liaison Committee is an on-going, ad hoc group that has been very active in looking at cross-discipline English language issues. They have asked to be made a standing committee.

Moved by J. Finnbogason, seconded by I. Pona,

THAT Council accept the Language Competency Liaison Committee's application to become a standing committee of the Education Council.

(MOTION CARRIED)

EDUCATION COUNCIL MINUTES

September 17, 2001

Page 3

- (ii) The Chair stated that a Degree and Program Evaluation Committee is required to undertake systematic reviews of the more than 90 degrees and programs currently offered at Kwantlen. She suggested that the current model of the Degree Proposal Assessment Committee should be the basis for this complementary evaluation committee.

**Moved by J. McGillivray, seconded by R. Clubb,
THAT Council establish a Degree and Program Evaluation Committee as a standing committee of Education Council and that this committee be modeled on the current Degree Proposal Assessment Committee.**

Council expressed concern regarding the name of the committee and the fact that it would be modeled on the Degree Proposal Assessment Committee given that evaluation is quite different than initiation. Council agreed that a formal program evaluation process should include representation from a broadly based constituency. It was suggested that the committee's job would have an evaluation and a monitoring aspect. The Vice President, Education would like to create a 25% Time Release (effective January 2002) for the Chair of the committee.

**Moved by M. Mott, seconded by I. Pona,
THAT the previous motion be amended as follows:
THAT Council establish a standing committee to establish a program evaluation process and that it have representation from across the divisions.
(MOTION CARRIED)**

- (iii) The Chair would like to see a limited-time committee put in place to review the current status of Kwantlen's educational policies and to make recommendations to Council on any serious gaps in renewal and review with respect to policy maintenance. The role of the committee would be to review the policies and their current implementation/interpretation within a set period of time.

**Moved by Charon Graham, seconded by S. Lee,
THAT Council establish a Policy Review Committee with a mandate to review all policies that fall within the powers or the advisory role of the Education Council, as stated in the Act.
(MOTION CARRIED)**

Ihor Pona and Derek Francis offered to sit on the Policy Review Committee. The Chair asked for other volunteers from Council membership, and suggested that membership can be drawn also from other areas in the university college.

6. Discussion: A Timely Approach to Course Changes

The Language Competency Liaison Committee forwarded their recommendation to use the on-line calendar as the definitive calendar and to establish yearly deadlines for implementation of changes. Given that Kwantlen will be switching entirely to on-line registration, the Chair opened the floor for discussion.

**Moved by Charlotte Graham, seconded by S. Lee,
THAT Kwantlen University College establish three deadlines a year (September 1, January 1 and May 1) for course changes to be accepted and implemented for the following semester and that these changes be implemented through the on-line calendar.**

Derek Francis stated that numerous institutions are struggling with this. The printed calendar is regarded as the legal contract between the institution and the students. There is a legal issue with respect to making the on-line calendar the definitive calendar. Kwantlen is waiting for clarification from UBC given that they are currently seeking a legal opinion on this matter.

The Chair stated that Council is not in a position to vote on this motion as yet, and suggested that the motion be postponed and that the Curriculum Approval Sub-committee be asked to review the principles used for changes in course implementation. Council members agreed.

7. Policy Additions: Degree Completion

In April 2001, Education Council approved a motion to harmonize completion timelines in Policies C.13, C.14 and C.15. While this action addresses requirements for completion of Citations, Certificates, and Diplomas, there appears to be no policy covering degree programs. The Calendar states on page 38 that Bachelor Degrees must be completed within 20 years; however, a search of the on-line policy manual revealed no policy basis for this statement.

ACTION: Derek Francis will ask Jody Gordon to review timelines for Kwantlen's Associate Degrees, and will follow-up with respect to harmonizing the completion timelines in Policies C.13, C.14, and C.15.

8. Discussion: Admission Requirement for International United States Students

**Moved by D. Francis, seconded by K. Green,
THAT Kwantlen University College amend its admission requirement for international United States of America students as follows: "International students from the United States of America will only be admitted to the University College if they have graduated from high school, obtained their GED, or passed a U.S. government approved exam that is deemed equivalent to high school".
(MOTION CARRIED)**

Derek Francis stated that we currently have six U.S. students attending Kwantlen. Also, we are engaged in an activity in Seattle where we are attempting to open up more connections with American institutions (particularly in Washington). We also hope that we will not lose our federal loans certification.

The Chair noted that at the present time, a student must be a U.S. citizen to apply for the loan program. This may be reversed in a year.

EDUCATION COUNCIL MINUTES

September 17, 2001

Page 5

9. Discussion: Education Council June Retreat – Deferred to October 1, 2001 meeting.

10. Joint Education Council / Board of Governors

Moved by S. Lee, seconded by Charon Graham,
THAT Council appoint interested members to serve on the Joint Council.
(MOTION CARRIED)

At the Education Council Retreat in June, Council members noted that the relations between the Board and Council were uncertain. When this was raised at the Joint Council meeting on June 19th, Board members present expressed support for holding information sessions. The initial focus would be to share views and develop mutual knowledge on topics such as program changes, success and access, and accountability and monitoring.

The Chair invited Council members (according to their expertise) to attend Joint Education Council/Board of Governors meetings on an ad hoc basis. Council members requested that the Chair provide a context for future Joint Council meetings.

11. Education Council Marketing and Communication – Deferred to October 1, 2001 meeting.

12. Next Meeting: October 1, 2001 – 4:15 p.m. – Surrey Campus Boardroom (G2110)

13. Adjournment

Moved by R. Clubb, seconded by S. Lee,
That Council adjourn its meeting at 6:20 p.m.
(MOTION CARRIED)



MEETING DATE: *October 1, 2001*

AGENDA #: 4.2

PREPARED BY: Barbara Melnyk

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE: Curriculum Approval

ACTION: THAT Council approve the following course outline,
subject to revisions:

EASL 0085 – English for Academic Purposes – Lev.4



MEETING DATE: October 1, 2001

AGENDA #: 5

PREPARED BY: Jody Gordon

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE: Appeals Process Review



MEETING DATE: October 1, 2001

AGENDA #: 6

PREPARED BY: Robin Russell

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE: Appeals Policy Review Sub-committee

ACTION: THAT Education Council establish an Appeals Policy Review Sub-committee with a mandate to review policy and implementation and to make recommendations to Council regarding updating or renewal.



MEETING DATE: October 1, 2001

AGENDA #: 7

PREPARED BY: Robin Russell

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE:

Establishing Minimum Level English Competency

- **Intake Testing and Assessment Committee Report**
- **Corresponding Tables**



**INTAKE TESTING AND ASSESSMENT SUB-COMMITTEE
REPORT TO EDUCATION COUNCIL
MAY 2001**

The Intake Testing and Assessment Committee submits this report in response to the Education Council Motion passed in March 2001, which gave the committee the task of gathering information in support of establishing minimum threshold requirements for English language competency.

BACKGROUND

Over a period of 15 years, the Greater Vancouver Region of British Columbia has received in excess of 300,000 new immigrants, most of whom have arrived from Asia or South Asia. (Lee Gunderson in his address to British Columbia Teachers of English as an Additional Language, February 24, 2001) The influx of non-native speakers of English into the communities and schools has brought increased diversity to the Kwantlen catchment areas. With diversity has come an increased awareness of the needs of the recently arrived non-native English speaking students who are seeking educational opportunities but who lack some of the skills necessary to be successful. In addition to dealing with the influx of new immigrants, secondary schools in British Columbia have made a concerted effort to keep more students in school and to have more students complete grade twelve. Indeed, more students are completing grade twelve and these students are expecting to continue their education in a post-secondary institution. Among this larger group of completing students there are a number of underprepared students who, like their non-native speaking counterparts, require special attention.

CURRENT KWANTLEN POLICY

Kwantlen has adhered very closely to the goal of open admission and minimally restricted access with respect to academic courses. Nevertheless, Kwantlen's policy governing English language competency sets out the right to establish enforceable standards.

All applicants to Kwantlen University College, regardless of country of origin or citizenship status, must be able to undertake studies in the English language. Any applicant may be required to produce evidence of competency to undertake studies in the English language. An applicant may be required to take a test of facility in the English language before admission to a program. (Kwantlen University College Calendar 2001-2002, p. 7)

In addition to this statement of policy in the Calendar, Policy C1, Assessment of Student Eligibility, states, "Admission criteria to programs will be to ensure that students have a reasonable chance of success". The policy, however clear, does not spell out the exact nature of the English language competency needed to undertake a course of study with a reasonable degree of success.

CURRENT PRACTICE AND CONCERNS

With the exception of university transfer (UT) English, most university transfer courses and many courses within career/professional programs have not established threshold English competency requirements. Most programs set entry standards but do not enforce them via their courses. This practice is in direct contrast to the practices of most trades and vocational programs, which routinely set English language reading competency requirements. Faculty members teaching the unregulated, mostly academic courses have expressed concern over the low rates of success and retention in introductory courses. Furthermore, a review of the 2000 Key Student Outcomes Indicators shows that only 38% of the students surveyed completed the requirements for a program credential.

At Kwantlen's institutional retreat at Coyote Creek in 1999, one of the most cited concerns was the number of underprepared students being admitted to Kwantlen. At an even earlier date, this concern was noted in the Kwantlen Strategic Framework, Spring 1997. Here the concern was identified as an external condition in which increasing numbers of people without good English language skills would have an impact on Kwantlen operations. Most recently, this same concern has been restated in the May 2001 report on the College Preparatory Division Initiative.

THE YEAR 2000/2001 PROJECT

In September 2000, the Intake Testing and Assessment Committee examined Grade Point Distribution reports from Spring 1999 to Spring 2000. Noting that many courses demonstrated serious retention and success problems, the committee set up a series of discussions to examine courses in six disciplines: Accounting, Biology, Chemistry, Criminology, Mathematics, and Philosophy. Representatives from each discipline were invited to bring information and expertise to meetings with the committee. During each meeting, problems were identified and suggestions for further study were collected. Four areas – Accounting, Philosophy, Criminology, and Biology – cited English language competency as key concerns. Both Philosophy and Criminology had already undertaken tracking studies that compared the grade twelve English final mark with the mark achieved in an introductory course within each discipline. Intake Testing and Assessment commissioned additional studies of a similar nature for Accounting and Biology. In all four areas, English language competency, as measured by grade twelve English marks, were shown to be correlated with success in introductory courses. In all four areas, success and retention was particularly problematic for students who entered with a grade 12 English mark of 'D' or who entered with no demonstrated level of English competency.

THE TRACKING

Table #1: This table aggregates the results of four of the studies examined by the committee. The results from grade 12 entrance data show a clear relationship between English language competency, as measured by grade 12 performance, and success and retention in academic courses. English 12 results were available for around 90% of the students who were in the 'has data' group; LPI or EPT scores were available for the rest of this group. The other measures of English language competence, the Language Proficiency Index (LPI) and the English Placement Test (EPT) appear to be less easily interpreted. These alternative measures, however, accounted for a very small percentage of the student sample.

Table #2: This table indicates that students for whom no placement data from English 12, EPT or LPI was available, show the same profile with respect to success and retention as the 'has data' group. This 'no data' group appears to include students who completed grade twelve using Communications 12 rather than English 12, students who have entered as mature students, students whose registration information fell outside the date parameters of the study, and students who may have had English language competency testing via other tests or courses.

Table #3: This table aggregates the number of high-risk students that Kwantlen would potentially encounter over a four-year or nine-semester period of time. This table makes the assumption that the 'no data' group as a whole constitutes a high-risk group. Using these figures, it would appear that around 600 spaces would potentially go unfilled each semester in the courses used in the study if half of the students identified as at risk failed to demonstrate the minimum level of English language competency recommended.

2000 KEY STUDENT OUTCOMES DATA

Examination of this information shows that Kwantlen rates consistently lower than the other university colleges and is comparable but still lower in comparison with other Lower Mainland colleges in all of the categories presented.

PRELIMINARY STUDY ON LATE STUDENT APPLICANTS

The Assistant Registrar briefly reviewed the data on 2,327 late applicants from the period of May to August 2000. Approximately 70% or 1,745 of these students, who form the group most likely to be denied access to courses and programs, possessed the minimum level of English language proficiency outlined in our recommendations. Using this number multiplied by the average course load of 3, we estimate that more than 5000 course seats per semester could be well used by this group alone.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Kwantlen University College establish a minimum threshold for English language competency for all university transfer and career/professional courses.

THAT the minimum threshold should be as broadly defined as possible by including achievement, placement, and enrolment criteria:

- 1) 'C' in English 12 or 'C' in Communications 12 or (213 CBTOEFL with Writing Band 4), or**
- 2) Placement in English 0099 or ACPE 0081 or ACPE 0091, or**
- 3) Enrolment in EASL 0075 or ACPE 0070**

RATIONALE

The information supplied in these tables supports quantitatively the anecdotal evidence supplied by instructors, which has been expressed in a variety of venues over the last several years. From a qualitative viewpoint, this report supports the view that students are not receiving adequate guidance from Kwantlen.

Two key rationales have been identified:

- 1) This recommendation is an essential part of assuming a more ethical level of guidance for underprepared students. By not establishing minimum English language standards for academic courses, we have given students the erroneous impression that academic courses require no skill in English usage. Establishing the very modest level of competency recommended as a threshold to academic and career/professional courses would help us to avoid setting students up for failure.**
- 2) Kwantlen will not be able to increase access for the next several years. The resources that are currently expended on students who are very clearly lacking in the skills needed for success could be redirected. Following this recommendation would allow access to students who have the minimum level of language competency needed to have even a 50% chance of success. Furthermore, as the preliminary results from the Assistant Registrar's survey indicate, there are many recent high school graduates and many mature returning students who are waiting for their opportunity to access higher education and who bring the minimum level of English language competency necessary for some reasonable chance of success.**

INFORMATION SOURCES

All information in these aggregate tables can be found in the following research reports prepared by the Kwantlen University College Office of Institutional Research.

1. College Biology Course Outcomes and Selected High School Course Grades. April 18, 2001.
2. High School English 12 Grades/English Placement Scores and Accounting Course Outcomes. April 10, 2001.
3. High School English 12 Grades and Philosophy Course Outcomes. November 14, 2000.
4. The Relationship Between High School Grades and Selected College Course Outcomes: CRIM 1100, 1101, and 1107. Fall 2000.

**THIS REPORT COMPILED BY ROBIN RUSSELL
CHAIR, INTAKE TESTING AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**

(Entry Scores) ↓	Accounting C or higher	Accounting Withdrawal Rate	Philosophy C or higher	Philosophy Withdrawal Rate	Criminol 1100 C or higher	Criminol Withdrawal Rate	Biology C or higher	Biology Withdrawal Rate	
A Grade 12 English	79%	10.3%	88.2%	8.7%	89.5%	3.5%	87%	7.2%	
B Grade 12 English	61%	12.3%	71.5%	12.9%	77.8%	9.5%	78%	7.7%	
C Grade 12 English	48%	15.5%	58.2%	16.6%	52.3%	15.5%	57%	12%	
D Grade 12 English	36%	15.8%	48.5%	20.7%	27.1%	20.7%	34%	24.5%	
EPT 100+	55%	10.4%	61.1%	16.5%	56.5%	23.2%	N/A	N/A	
EPT 99-	53%	12.2%	62%	17.2%	35.2%	28.2%	N/A	N/A	
LPI 25+	60%	10.9%	67.6%	14.2%	74%	9.7%	N/A	N/A	
LPI 25-	48%	17.5%	63.4%	18.3%	44%	28%	N/A	N/A	
Totals	T=4,450 W/D/F= 2,180 (49%)		T=3,059 W/D/F= 1,101 (37%)		T=2,504 W/D/F= 1,147 (46%)		T=1,274 W/D/F= 421 (33%)		Grand Total T=11,287 W/D/F= 4,849 (40%)

Table 1: Tracking Success via English Entry Scores

Note:

Accounting, Criminology and Philosophy data from Spring 1996-Spring 2000

Biology data from Spring 1999-Spring 2000

Table 2: Data vs No Data
Spring 1996-Spring 2000

	No English Data	D/W/F	Has English Data	D/W/F
Accounting (1110, 1130, 1160 and 1293)	2248	48%	4450	49%
Criminology (1100, 1101 and 1107)	2145	49%	5156	41%
Philosophy (1100, 1110, 1120, 1145 and 1150)	1353	39%	3059	37%

Table 3: Number of students affected over 4 years (approximately 9 semesters)
Spring 1996-Spring 2000

	No data	Grade 12 D	EPT 99 or lower	LPI 25 or lower	Total
Accounting (1110, 1130, 1160 and 1293)	2248	748	328	295	3619
Criminology (1100, 1101 and 1107)	2145	1169	122	247	3683
Philosophy (1100, 1110, 1120, 1145 and 1150)	1353	449	180	486	2468



MEETING DATE: October 1, 2001

AGENDA #: 8

PREPARED BY: Robin Russell

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE: Education Council – June Retreat

DISCUSSION: Implications for the current strategic framework.

Note: Please bring forward the previously distributed documents from your September 17th agenda package.

Education Council Executive Meeting July 2001

<p>September 17</p> <p>Discuss policy review</p> <p>Policy additions: - degree completion (similar to B 14-16)</p> <p>Education Council marketing and communication</p> <p>LCLC proposal re On-line calendar</p> <p>Review '96 EdCo Strategic Framework and Present 2001 SF</p>	<p>October 1</p> <p>Intake Testing and Assessment Committee Recommendation</p> <p>Appeals process review (consult Jody and ask for outline of current process)</p> <p>Review committee membership, mandate and reporting</p>	<p>November 5</p> <p>Discussion: The effect of on-line instruction and 3 hour classes on standards</p> <p>Review of student withdrawal (consult with Zoe Johnston and Dave Wolley)</p>	<p>December 3</p>	<p>January 7</p> <p>Discuss CE programs and access to resources</p>
<p>February 4</p> <p>Review KPI 2001 and compare with earlier</p>	<p>March 4</p>	<p>April 1</p>	<p>May 6</p>	<p>June 3</p>



MEETING DATE: *October 1, 2001*

AGENDA #: 9

PREPARED BY: Robin Russell

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE: Education Council Marketing and Communications



MEETING DATE: October 1, 2001

AGENDA #: 10

PREPARED BY: Robin Russell

EDUCATION COUNCIL

ISSUE: Statement Regarding Academic Freedom

Caroline
Roni
Jack
Derek
Markus
Larry
Robert
Jack
Markus
Larry



Kwantlen
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

STATEMENT REGARDING ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Kwantlen University College (Kwantlen) believes in the value to society and to the University College of the search for knowledge, and of rigorous and collegial debate.

Academic freedom at Kwantlen includes the freedom to carry out research and to publish the results, freedom to teach and to engage in critical discourse, and freedom to challenge theories, propositions and methodologies.

Kwantlen's commitment to academic freedom recognizes and is based on:

1. Respect for the value of independent research, intellectual integrity, freedom of enquiry and rational discussion;
2. Respect for and the protection of individual human rights and the principles of equity and justice;
3. The value of collegiality and respect amongst instructors and members of Kwantlen; and
4. Fiscal responsibility.

Conflict of interest



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Policies and Procedures

SUBJECT: CODE OF FACULTY ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A 30.01

I. FACULTY MEMBERS AS TEACHERS

1. The first responsibility of university teachers is the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and understanding through teaching and research. They must devote their energies conscientiously to develop their scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers.
2. They must be conscientious in the preparation and organization of their subject matter and should revise this periodically in the light of developments in their fields.
3. They must conscientiously strive to improve the methods of presentation of their subjects to their students.
4. They must encourage the free exchange of ideas between themselves and their students.
5. They must always be fair to their students. It is unethical for them to exploit students for their private advantage. It is unethical for them to utilize the work of students in a publication without appropriate attribution.
6. They are guilty of unethical conduct if they act so as to prevent the fulfillment of these responsibilities by themselves or by other members of the academic community.
7. They must keep in confidence all privileged information gained about a student, whether concerning academic progress, personal life or political and religious views. Nevertheless, they may reveal information about the academic standing of students in response to a request from a reputable source; they may refer to the student's character only insofar as this is relevant. When acting as referees, they must strive to be fair and objective.

II. FACULTY MEMBERS AS SCHOLARS

1. All scholarly activity conducted within the University must have as its primary objectives:
 - the increase of knowledge and understanding;
 - i. the improvement of the scholarly competence of the teacher, and
 - ii. insofar as possible, the initiation of students into the academic disciplines.

In view of the first objective, it is essential that faculty members be free to disseminate the results of their research through publication, lectures and other appropriate means.

2. It is unethical for faculty members to enter into any agreement that infringes their freedom to

publish the results of research conducted within the University precincts or under University auspices. Notwithstanding this, faculty members may agree to delay, for a specific period of time, publication of the results of sponsored or contract research, provided that this condition is agreed to by the University.

III. FACULTY MEMBERS AS COLLEAGUES

1. They have the obligation to defend the right of their colleagues to academic freedom. It is unethical to act so as deliberately to infringe that freedom.
2. They should refrain from denigration of the character and competence of their colleagues. When presenting a professional judgment on a colleague at the request of an appropriate university committee or authority (e.g. a committee dealing with appointments, tenure, dismissal or research grants), or in any other forum, they have the obligation both to the colleague and to the University to be fair and objective.
3. It is unethical to fail to respect the confidentiality of information about a colleague gained during participation in the work of committees such as those described in Section IV.1.
4. They have the responsibility to acknowledge in their scholarly lectures and publications, academic debts to colleagues and students.
5. It is unethical for them to exploit the unpaid work of colleagues for personal gain.

IV. FACULTY MEMBERS AND THE UNIVERSITY

1. In accepting a University appointment, faculty members assume obligations to the University in addition to their primary duties as teachers and scholars. They have the responsibility to participate in the life of the University, in its governance and administration through membership on committees and organizations at Board, Senate, Faculty and Department levels, provided that this participation is consistent with the discharge of their primary responsibilities and with their own abilities.
2. It is unethical for them to accept an appointment to an administrative position (e.g. Department Chair, Dean, President) unless satisfied that adequate consultative procedures have been employed in filling the post.
3. They have a responsibility to abide by the rules and regulations established for the orderly conduct of the affairs of the University, provided that these rules and regulations do not infringe the academic freedom of faculty and students or the principles of ethical conduct as set forth in this policy. At the same time, they have a responsibility to seek reforms which would, in their judgment, improve the University.
4. It is unethical to fail to give proper notice of resignation of a faculty appointment, in accordance with the appropriate university regulations, or to accept another position involving conflicting obligations for a period covered under the terms of an existing appointment.
5. Simon Fraser University endeavours to provide a working and learning environment that is supportive of scholarship and research and the fair treatment of all members of the University

community. The basis for interaction among all members of the University is mutual respect, co-operation and understanding. Harassment of any kind violates fundamental rights, personal dignity and personal integrity. The University considers harassment to be a serious offence which is subject to a range of disciplinary measures up to and including dismissal or expulsion.

V. FACULTY MEMBERS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

1. Faculty members should avoid the following potential conflicts of interest unless, after full consultation, they have the approval of the university officer to whom they are responsible:
 - a. Authorize the purchase by the University of equipment, supplies or services from a source in which they or their families have a substantial interest;
 - b. Hire any member of their immediate family as an employee or consultant for any project supported by funds administered through the University;
 - c. Be associated with the management of any undertaking which hires or proposes to hire University personnel.

VI. VI. FACULTY MEMBERS AND THE COMMUNITY AT LARGE

1. In statements outside the University, they retain the responsibility of seeking the truth and of stating it as they see it. However, they should make clear that except when specifically authorized to do so, they are acting in their own names and not in the name of the University.
2. Secondary income: The time involved in any consulting or related work and the nature of such work, involving payment to the faculty member by any person or organization other than the University must be disclosed to the appropriate university authorities in accordance with existing university policies (see Policy A 30.04).
3. When they enter into a special relationship with some sector of the community at large, as when they are engaged as consultants or when they conduct research under contract, they have a responsibility to ensure that these duties are consistent with their primary obligation to the University and in no way deleteriously affect their duties within the University.

October 1, 1992



List of services...  



Go back to

- [◀ Chapters](#)
- [◀ Academic Regulations](#)
- [◀ Academic Freedom](#)

In this section

- [Introduction ▶](#)
- [Freedom from Harassment and Discrimination ▶](#)



[Welcome](#) [Academic Year](#) [Course Planning](#) [Registration](#) [Search](#)

IV ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

Academic Freedom ▶ Introduction

The members of the university enjoy certain rights and privileges essential to the fulfillment of its primary functions: instruction and the pursuit of knowledge. Central among these rights is the freedom, within the law, to pursue what seem to them fruitful avenues of inquiry, to teach and to learn unhindered by external or nonacademic constraints, to engage in full and unrestricted consideration of any opinion. This freedom extends not only to the regular members of the university but to all who are invited to participate in its forum. Suppression of this freedom, whether by institutions of the state, the officers of the university or the actions of private individuals, would prevent the university carrying out its primary functions. All members of the university must recognize this fundamental principle and must share responsibility for supporting, safeguarding and preserving this central freedom. Behaviour which obstructs free and full discussion, not only of ideas which are safe and accepted but of those which may be unpopular or even abhorrent, vitally threatens the integrity of the university's forum. Such behaviour cannot be tolerated.

Please send questions or comments to student.information@ubc.ca.
 This page was generated on 24 Sep 2001 at 10:15 AM.
 Copyright © 1998-2001 **The University of British Columbia**.

COLLABORATIVE NURSING PROGRAM

ADMISSION POINT SYSTEM

Starting in the year 2002 The Collaborative Nursing Program can admit 32 students into each of the Fall and Winter semesters respectively. The expectation is that applicants will far exceed the number of available seats in each semester. In anticipation of large numbers of applicants the CNP is proposing a new approach to the admission process. As a result, applicants will be sorted and classified for the two intakes differently depending upon the semester requested for admission. The proposed mix of the two intakes is listed below as we anticipate the applicants for the two intakes to be quite varied. As well a point system has been devised to allow for priority admission for a select few.

FALL INTAKE

32 seats to be distributed as followed:

- 8 seats dedicated to high school applicants who will enter through random selection
- 8 seats drawn through random selection
- 16 seats assigned to those students with the highest points calculated from the following criteria:
 1. Geographical location 1 point
 - * geographical location is defined as those applicants who reside within the Kwantlen catchment region.
 2. Relevant education experience 6 points

6 points to be calculated from:

Biology 1160	1 point
Biology 1260	1 point
English 1100 level	1 point
English 1200 level	1 point
Elective	1 point
Elective	1 point
 3. Persistent interest in the program 2 points

1 point allotted for each previous unsuccessful admission attempt
 4. Aboriginal applicant 1 point

TOTAL

10 POINTS

JANUARY INTAKE

The 32 seats are to be distributed as follows:

- 16 students through random selection
- 16 students with the highest points as outlined above

Chair's Report Sept 2001

Key Items : { Begin to formalize our Strategic Plan
Goals { Committee Mandates + Goals

Concerns { Performance Indicators / Service
Indicators - SCOSA Meeting
CORR Review - Draft Copies for
The UC NOW include a Reference
to Educator Council

Reminder { Reminder to Consult w/ faculty
re the Change in Admissions

Plan: { Sept 10 SCOSA
Sept 28-29 to Kamloops - CoESCO

Oct 29-30 - PNARP



The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data.

In the second section, the author details the various methods used to collect and analyze the data. This includes both manual and automated processes. The goal is to ensure that the information is both reliable and up-to-date.

The third part of the document focuses on the results of the analysis. It shows that there has been a significant increase in sales over the period covered. This is attributed to several factors, including improved marketing strategies and better customer service.

Finally, the document concludes with a series of recommendations for future actions. These include continuing to invest in marketing, maintaining high standards of customer service, and regularly reviewing financial performance to identify areas for improvement.

