

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NORTH ISLAND COLLEGE EDUCATION COUNCIL  
HELD AT THE COMOX VALLEY CAMPUS & ON TEAMS ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2026**

**APPROVED**

- 
- PRESENT:** Aisling Brady, Faculty, Comox Valley, *Chair*  
Alex Blair, Faculty, Comox Valley  
Alexia Birosh, Student, Comox Valley  
Brooke McIntosh, Support Staff, Campbell River  
Ethan Olson, Student, Comox Valley  
Jennifer Fallis Starhunter, Faculty, Campbell River, *Chair, Curriculum & Fast Track*  
Judith Marriott, Faculty, Comox Valley, *Chair, Planning & Standards*  
Julia Baratto, Faculty, Port Alberni  
Katherine Carpenter, Faculty, Comox Valley  
Meghan Sheehan, Student, Comox Valley  
Michael Androschuk, Faculty, Campbell River  
Michelle Badger, Administration  
Neil Cruickshank, Administration, Comox Valley  
Paris Gaudet, Support Staff, Comox Valley/Campbell River  
Rebecca Mackenzie, Faculty, Port Hardy  
Sandra Milligan, Faculty, Campbell River  
Tony Bellavia, Administration, Comox Valley  
Roger Kishi, Board of Governors (BOG) Representative  
Lisa Domae, President (Ex-Officio)  
*Kara Foreman, Recording Secretary (RS)*
- REGRETS:** Jocelyn Moreau, Faculty, Campbell River  
Rahul Kuma, Student, Comox Valley

**1. Indigenous Acknowledgment**

**Declaration of Quorum:** A. Brady declared quorum at 1:01pm.

**2. Adoption of Agenda**

Moved by M. Badger / Seconded by M. Androschuk **TO ADOPT THE AGENDA FOR JANUARY 16, 2026.**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. CONSENT AGENDA**

Moved by A. Blair / Seconded by K. Carpenter **TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.**

**3.1 MINUTES** of the meeting on December 12, 2025

**3.2 Curriculum Proposal**

3.2.1 New Course – ENG 191 Writing with GenAI

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**4. Business Arising - None**

**5. Committee Reports**

**5.1 Education Council Chair Update**

*Tasks:*

- Discussion with Curriculum Committee chair and Recording Secretary to finalize dates for next year's schedule
- Responding to request from the Board of Governor chair

**5.2 Planning and Standards Committee**

*Chair Report (Verbal)*

- The Program Advisory Committee policy has been approved and is in the process of being finalized.
- The Program Review policy will soon be ready for community feedback.
- The committee is waiting to receive the Credential policy.

- The Code of Conduct policy is still being developed and the committee hopes to see it in March.

No Meeting

### 5.3 Curriculum Committee

*Chair Report (Verbal)*

The academic calendar deadline was in December. Everything approved at the December EdCo meeting is going to appear in the academic calendar. There are a limited number of fields that can be changed after this deadline. Today we are looking at these limited course revisions, including course description, course content, course learning outcomes, evaluation of student learning and additional evaluation of student learning, and the instructor qualifications.

Feedback on the other fields are taken as advice but can't be altered for fall 2026. Proponents are advised to bring these revisions back in the future.

MINUTES of December 5, 2025

#### 5.3.1 Course Revision – CHE 051 College Preparatory Chemistry I

Moved by J. Fallis Starhunter / Seconded by J. Marriott **TO APPROVE THE COURSE REVISION.**

**EFFECTIVE/START DATE: FA 2026**

**Discussion:**

Comments regarding changes were addressed by the proponent before the meeting.

**No Revisions**

**Fields Revised:**

- Course Content
- Course Learning Outcomes

**MOTION CARRIED.**

#### 5.3.2 Course Revision – NUR 204 Nursing Practice III: Promoting Health and Healing

Moved by J. Fallis Starhunter / Seconded by M. Androschuk **TO APPROVE THE COURSE REVISION.**

**EFFECTIVE/START DATE: FA 2026**

**Discussion:**

*Prerequisite:* is successful completion of year one adequate? Yes, it's a cohort program.

*Course Description:* there was concern that the course hours were not being appropriately communicated to students. Course hours fall within a range which can't be changed at this time. Each offering falls within this range and the number of hours are provided to the students on the course outline which is distributed on the first day of class. Tracking ensures they meet with obligations to our external partners but the course description is not the appropriate place to provide the range of hours.

*Learning Outcomes:* this language cannot be altered due the requirement of its consistency with VIU. It has been approved by their external accreditor and this accreditation is reflective of the current process.

*Course Content:* First sentence is awkward. Rewrite was suggested and accepted.

*Additional Evaluation:* This is specifically addressed in the program's curriculum guide and aligned with VIU.

**Revisions**

*Course Content:* 1<sup>st</sup> sentence rewrite

**Fields Revised:**

- Course Description
- Course Learning Outcomes
- Textbooks (as required for transfer articulation)

**MOTION CARRIED.**

#### 5.3.3 Course Revision – NUR 214 Nursing Practice IV: Promoting Health and Healing

Moved by J. Fallis Starhunter / Seconded by J. Marriott **TO APPROVE THE COURSE REVISION.**

**EFFECTIVE/START DATE: FA 2026**

**Discussion:**

*Course Description:* identical to NUR 204. Curriculum shared with VIU so changes cannot be made without collaboration with them. Comprehensive changes to all of these courses will be brought forward in the future.

*Prerequisite:* language preference is term over year.

*Noted:* this is a limited revision to these courses and a more fulsome review of revisions are forthcoming. Advice from Council can be shared with the proponent for consideration.

**Revisions**

*Course Description:* remove “in this semester”

*Course Content:* 1<sup>st</sup> sentence rewrite

*Course Content:* “health promotion and *disease* prevention”

Minor grammatical fixes

**Fields Revised:**

- Course Description
- Course Learning Outcomes
- Evaluation of Student Learning

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**5.3.4 Course Revision – NUR 217 Health and Healing IV: Health Challenges/Healing Initiatives**

Moved by J. Fallis Starhunter / Seconded by A. Blair **TO APPROVE THE COURSE REVISION.**

**EFFECTIVE/START DATE: FA 2026**

**Discussion:**

*Learning Outcomes:* align location of “ends in view” with other courses and remove extra “and” in list

**Revisions**

*Learning Outcomes:* move “ends in view”

Minor grammatical edits

**Fields Revised:**

- Course Description
- Course Learning Outcomes
- Evaluation of Student Learning

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**5.3.5 Course Revision – NUR 276 Consolidated Practice Experience II**

Moved by J. Fallis Starhunter / Seconded by J. Marriott **TO APPROVE THE COURSE REVISION.**

**EFFECTIVE/START DATE: FA 2026**

**Discussion:**

None

**Revisions**

Minor grammatical edits

Spell out abbreviations (e.g. BSN)

**Fields Revised:**

- Course Description
- Course Learning Outcomes
- Evaluation of Student Learning

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**5.3.6 Course Revision – NUR 304 Nursing Practice V: Promoting Health and Healing**

Moved by J. Fallis Starhunter / Seconded by A. Blair **TO APPROVE THE COURSE REVISION.**

**EFFECTIVE/START DATE: FA 2026**

**Discussion:**

None

**Revisions**

Minor grammatical edits

**Fields Revised:**

- Course Description
- Course Learning Outcomes
- Evaluation of Student Learning

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**5.3.7 Course Revision – NUR 318 Health and Healing VI: Global Health Issues**

Moved by J. Fallis Starhunter / Seconded by B. McIntosh **TO APPROVE THE COURSE REVISION.**

**EFFECTIVE/START DATE: FA 2026**

**Discussion:**

None.

**Revisions**

Minor formatting changes done.

**Fields Revised:**

- Course Learning Outcomes

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**6. New Business****6.1 Clarification of Agenda for Special Meeting on January 23, 2026****Background:**

On January 12<sup>th</sup> the chair received a letter from the Board of Governors (BOG) requesting advice from Education Council on a without prejudice and without precedent basis regarding a list of programs being recommended for suspension as a result of the Expedited Program Impact Assessment (EPIA). EdCo was given 10 days to provide this advice. As there was minimal guidance on what specific advice the BOG was requesting, the chair reviewed Policy 3-20 Suspension, Relocation or Cancellation of Academic Credentialed Programs but found no advisory role for EdCo with regard to program suspension. They are the purview of the VP Academic (VPA). She also found no such advisory role in the BC College & Institute Act (the Act) with regard to program suspensions. In a letter to the BOG chair, she asked the BOG to provide clarification on the scope and nature of the advice they wanted, i.e. advice on each individual program, or the overall process and principles applied during the EPIA, academic considerations, policy compliance, or broader institutional or provincial considerations. The BOG chair responded that because the Act is unclear as to EdCo's role in program suspensions, the BOG was inviting EdCo to provide any advice it considers appropriate within the scope of its responsibilities and limitations under the Act. The EdCo chair has called a special meeting on January 23<sup>rd</sup> and this agenda item was added so members could discuss the agenda for that meeting and the nature of the advice it will provide to the BOG.

**Discussion:**

**Submission:** to look at these programs in a group by group basis because they are so varied and important factors may be missed if they are taken as a lump.

**Question:** Did the BOG provide any parameters or metrics they've used or summary reports from the deans?

**Answer:** The only information provided was the EPIA summary documents that the VPA shared with the program areas and the BOG. This is a new process for the BOG. Previously suspension were the purview of the VPA alone. This change gives the BOG the authority to approve program suspensions. Now the BOG is requesting advice from EdCo before making this decision.

**Submission:** EdCo should provide advice on whether we agree with both the process and the outcome of the process on each individual program based on the expertise that members bring to the table. Then the BOG can decide if it agrees or not.

**Submission:** EdCo should advise the BOG whether or not we feel the process used was sufficient and involved all the necessary parties and that each program being reviewed individually as they are so different. EdCo's responsible for the quality and accessibility of academics at NIC and it's important that members are able to share their concerns about the impacts of these suspensions.

**Submission:** EdCo should provide evidence-based advice and in order to do that, members need to see the metrics that administrators used to make these decisions and hear from faculty on each of these programs. In the absence of this data, EdCo is unable to make an evidence-based decision so should by default advise against these suspensions.

**Submission:** Although discussions of this process started in August 2025, EdCo still has no information with which to formulate their advice.

**Submission:** It's important not to conflate advice for decision or recommendation. The decision for suspension lies with the VPA according to policy. Adjudicating the process or rationale is not in EdCo's purview. It can provide advice on a college wide basis to make sure we're not forgetting about programs that require electives but not to re-adjudicate and decide on the merits.

**Submission:** The advice may be, does the BOG have all the information they need to make their decision? Is there key information that should be considered before a decision is made considering all aspects of academic governance?

**Submission:** With this crunch timeline, what use is advice when it is uninformed? How do we formulate it properly when it feels very rushed with very little information?

**Submission:** Policy 3-20, an EdCo approved policy, provides authority for suspension to the office of the VPA. Programs approved for suspension will be reviewed within two academic years. In response to two factors. First, the Ministry mandate letter issued in June 2025 states the organization is to review all existing programs to ensure they are relevant, efficient, sustainable, grow the economy and advance reconciliation. Second, to support the institution deficit management plan. It is the institution's legislative responsibility to balance our budget. The VPA's office developed the EPIA to review programs at the college. This process was approved by the BOG. The EPIA was initiated in September 2025 and EdCo was informed of this process in November 2025. It was also shared with faculty and departments college wide. Department meetings and college conversations were held to provide opportunities for feedback on the process. The EPIA ran from September to December. Decisions on recommendations were announced to the relevant departments in January 2026. So the suggestion is that the advice from Council should be, did the EPIA process align with Policy 3-20? As the VPA is the decision maker, there is an apparent conflict of interest with his office, however the process was articulated to EdCo and approved by the BOG.

**Submission:** The BOG's purpose in requesting advice from EdCo was to be as transparent as possible while addressing the deficit that NIC will face over the next 2-3 years. Thus the BOG is looking at a broader picture than just curricular or academic matters, but also its fiduciary responsibilities and the overall sustainability of the college. The current situation is impacting the whole organization as it faces a multimillion dollar deficit. The faculty at TRU recently brought a case against the university regarding program cancellations so there is now case law stating that the responsibility for such decisions resides with the BOG. The Act, while not entirely clear, confirms this.

**Submission:** Our bylaws don't say anything about closed or in camera meetings, while some other Councils in the province do. Currently our bylaws state that our meetings are open to the college and the public. It was noted that the bylaws don't require a formal meeting to provide advice.

**Submission:** While EdCo has known about the EPIA process, there was nothing to suggest that EdCo would have any involvement in the decision regarding program suspensions. (i.e. providing advice to the BOG). Had EdCo known, members would need to see the metrics and hear from faculty involved with the programs. With regard to financial challenges, it would appear that the only cost saving measures EdCo is hearing about are program suspensions. At previous meetings we heard that work was being done to determine a cost per student per program to have a better idea of the cost of student services. Seeing the metrics would be needed to make an informed decision. If we're doing these things because of financial pressures, we need information that indicates there will be a positive financial outcome, along with the lost revenue resulting from these suspension. In the absence of relevant data, the only advice EdCo could give is to not suspend these programs.

**Submission:** For clarification, based on Policy 3-20, the VPA has no obligation to share the process regarding decisions on program suspensions with EdCo. The policy give full authority on suspensions to the VPA. The VPA can choose to bring them to EdCo for information.

**Submission:** For clarification, EdCo is not being asked to decide if these programs should be suspended. We are being asked for advice from an academic governance perspective. The BOG oversees the financial perspective.

**Submission:** EdCo members are often reminded that delivery, operations and financial considerations are not their purview so it's unclear how we might provide advice on the EPIA process as it's operational. If we are to give advice on whether the policy was followed, we're already hearing that the policy needs to be fixed because of these other legal precedents. The policy as currently written is no longer appropriate as it's at odds with someone's interpretation of the Act. In the BOG's letter it "seeks the advice of Education Council on with without prejudice, without precedent basis regarding the following programs being recommended for suspension." Financial and operational aspects are not our purview. When asked to provide advice on program cancellations in the fall, we considered the educational merits of each program and whether the program was beneficial to students. These are the things that EdCo can and should be considering. So perhaps it's appropriate for EdCo to provide advice on whether there is educational support for these programs being considered for suspension.

**Submission:** Programs begin with a concept, we get letters from industry, we look at the budget, then after significant analysis by the dean and VPA, eventually it goes through the Curriculum/EdCo approval process. If we reverse that model, the advice from EdCo should be about what's being taught; not the financials.

**Question:** Is EdCo voting on whether we give advice or what that advice will be?

**Answer:** EdCo doesn't need to vote as advice. It can come in the form of summaries, or an overview of discussion. In the TRU case, the Senate provided letters supported documentation and the judge ruled that was appropriate. There is no statutory requirement to provide advice in a specific form.

**Submission:** Given the issues under discussion are complicated, have huge impacts and elicit strong feelings, it's impossible for us to be unbiased. Our role is to comment on procedure and policy for further review. One recommendation is that the BOG receive advice from the parties involved. EdCo's role is about policy.

**Submission:** This was BCIT's approach. They looked at whether policy was followed with regard to program suspensions and cancellations.

**Submission:** Perhaps the advice could be to ask the BOG, what in current policy should be revised in order to make the difficult process ahead better, more transparent given the new case law.

**Submission:** There is a broader consultation process with program cancellations that includes department chairs, faculty, students and staff.

**Submission:** Suspensions do not stop programs being operational, they suspend intakes for two years.

**Submission:** Per policy, it is the responsibility of the VPA's office to review suspended programs and determine if they will be brought back in their current iteration, or modified into a new iteration, or cancelled altogether. The policy also states that students have the right to complete their programs and the Registrar and the Deans will work with students individually to ensure they can.

**Submission:** Aside from the policy and the recent court decision, the ACT is unclear. The ACT can be changed by going through the Legislature but the process is challenging. With the provincial review of post-secondary institutions, we're operating under a new process that hasn't had a development phase. The college has a responsibility to the Ministry to present a deficit plan and this is driving the urgency as this plan needs to take effect in fall of 2026. It will likely take 2-3 years to mitigate the current deficit. It's not a given that these 15 recommended program suspensions will fix the fiscal situation. Part of the problem over the last year is that the IRCC kept changing the rules making it challenging for international students to come to Canada. Other factors in our current economy also impact program costs and thus decision making.

**Submission:** Just as with EdCo's review of curriculum, the advice should be from an educational perspective, from faculty and students, do we agree with these suspensions or not, or do we not have enough information to decide. Then the final decision is up to the BOG.

**Submission:** This is hard decision for the BOG. They have received operational/financial advice from the administration on these programs. EdCo can provide curricular/academic advice that could help with their decision on each program. Specific feedback will be more valuable than generic feedback and better to err by giving them too much information rather than not enough.

**Submission:** The nature of the advice should reflect the constituents of EdCo: faculty, students, staff, administrators, and include any considerations beyond operational, such as impacts to other areas of the college (e.g. advising, registration, Indigenous Education). EdCo has an obligation collectively but members also bring something individually to Council.

**Submission:** With regard to what entails advice vs a recommendation: The BOG has requested advice, not a recommendation from EdCo. To vote on a recommendation is a very different process than a request for advice.

**Submission:** Agree that any advice given by EdCo should be on the basis of curriculum as it is not EdCo's responsibility to look at financial matters.

**Submission:** Most institution make a distinction between suspension and cancellation. A suspension allows you to stop doing intakes because when you're doing intakes, you're increasing your legal expectation to complete a student. By suspending intakes you have time to do a complete review of the program.

**Submission:** There is an obligation through the VPA office under suspension to pause the program and do a thorough review within 2 years. EdCo can give advice on the expectation that this occurs in that 2 year period with regard to curriculum. It would be very difficult for EdCo to give advice on curriculum within the 10 day time frame provided in the BOG's request. The obligation to complete this work rests with the VPA. The dean's office will initiate meetings with department chairs and faculty to ensure that work happens. Part of EdCo's advice to the BOG could be that EdCo will hold the VPA's office accountable to make sure the process unfolds.

**Question:** Admissions opened in October 2025. Have students been applying to these programs? Are these suspensions schedule for this fall (2026) or next year's intake since we're in the middle of the year?

**Answer:** They are scheduled for fall 2026. We can close an intake up to 10 weeks prior to the start of term. The Registrar's office is communicating with anyone applying now and redirecting them to other programs and advisors. The sooner a decision is made, the better.

**Question:** How many programs that were previously suspended were either brought back or cancelled?

**Answer:** Recently we had two suspensions; Criminology and Computer Information Systems (CIS). Criminology was brought back its current iteration after one year and the CIS was cancelled.

**Submission:** A number of programs were cancelled without first being suspended. The VPA's office needs to review all of these suspensions and there's concern this won't happen.

**Submission:** The VPA's office is accountable to ensure these meetings occur and a review will take place as noted in policy. After review, some of these programs may be recommended for cancellation and the Act states that decisions on cancellation falls to the BOG.

**Submission:** Normally EdCo has time to review the contents of their agenda package. In this case, we don't have 10 days as we still don't have the necessary information to make an informed opinion. Many members wear multiple hats so giving them five days to review the material is a very tight timeline.

**Question:** If it would be difficult for EdCo to provide advice on curriculum in 10 days, and curriculum is EdCo's purview, why is the BOG asking for us for advice within 10 days?

**Answer:** The reference to EdCo providing curricular advice was regarding the review process.

**Submission:** Given that EdCo can't provide any curricular advice to the BOG with limited information and a short timeline, and assuming this was discussed at the BOG before the request was sent to EdCo, what other advice could EdCo provide? It's clear that members are struggling with what type of advice they can come up with within the next week. While EdCo appreciates the BOG asking for advice, members have no information with which to give advice on, curricular or otherwise. Without information to make an evidenced-based decision, our advice would be to not suspend these programs.

**Submission:** It's important to draw a clear distinction between suspensions and cancellations. They require very different processes as outlined in Policy 3-20.

**Submission:** The advice being sought by the BOG is outside the Act and Policy 3-20 and was requested on a without prejudice, without precedence basis as these are unusual times.

**Submission:** We're talking about suspensions of a credential, not about not offering courses in that discipline. The VPA has assessed these credentials for their impact based on the expedited process relative to the college's current situation. The Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) process has program impact assessment as an annual process. It looks at our credentials based on a number of criteria. It is a commitment to ongoing review, ongoing quality assurance. It doesn't necessarily mean an end to programming or even an end to a credential. The EPIA process is more married to the college's financial situation than hoped when we started the SEM process.

**Question:** When a program is suspended, does the college have a duty to keep the capital investments that are program-related intact?

**Answer:** While it's not an obligation, it's part of the consideration when working with deans and department chairs to review any significant capital investments and determine if they can be used in some form.

**Submission:** We're in uncharted territory. The BOG realized they were legally held to the same language for suspensions as cancellations. In a special meeting in September 2025 EdCo reviewed and gave recommendations on 10 program cancellations, which are more significant decisions than suspensions, with only 5 business days to review the material. We have a process in place for recommending cancellations. While it's not optimal, it's not outside the scope of possibility that EdCo can give advice on the 15 program suspensions with the information that's been provided in this short timeframe.

**Submission:** As there isn't time for EdCo to look at the curricular aspects of these programs, their advice might be what does the next step look like in the two year period before consideration for cancellation. Perhaps we are looking for a commitment to further involvement in reviewing and providing curricular advice prior to cancellation.

**Question:** How long does it take to unsuspend a program if, after the review, it's still deemed viable?

**Answer:** This depends on various factors and would be determined on a case by case basis. The timeline would include the reimagining and rearticulation of the program, curriculum/EdCo approval, registration processes, determining the best time to offer the program (e.g. fall, winter, spring). Generally it could take six to nine months.

**Submission:** If there are no changes to the program then it needs to go through marketing, registration etc. If there are changes, it needs to go through the curriculum/EdCo approval process. Program revisions and new programs have different processes and timelines.

**Submission:** In some cases of suspended programs, if community requests it and we secure one time funding, the program can be delivered in a matter of weeks.

**Submission:** During suspension, programs are still in the calendar with a note that it is under suspension. There is just no open intake. Nothing happens on the system until cancellation.

**Submission:** We still don't have the scope of what our advice would be. We have the option to not hold a meeting next Friday, or to create a subcommittee to draft the advice.

**Submission:** There are a lot of people whose jobs hinge on the BOG's decision on February 5<sup>th</sup> so not having a meeting is not an option. Regardless of the gravity our advice actually has, we can set aside a Friday to do it.

**Submission:** We have good policies and our policy clearly states that suspensions are the purview of the VPA. EdCo has input into cancellations, not suspensions. We need to avoid spiraling down a negative path. Suspensions are a good thing. They give us the opportunity to talk to students and take a step back to review our programs. The BOG has asked for EdCo's advice so that it can make a good decision which is a positive thing.

**Submission:** The BOG's request for advice on these suspensions isn't aligned with current policy so we're not encroaching on policy in providing advice. It's fair to give air time to things that are really important. Suspensions may be seen as a good thing for some members of the college, but not for others. How many people can sustain mortgages and bills on employment insurance for two years while they wait to see if they still have a job here.

**Submission:** A pause on bringing new students into a program that the VPA has deemed in need of review is positive in that it allows us to reflect on the program. Courses are still being taught while the program is suspended.

**Submission:** If it's a two year program, you have some time to adjust and plan. If it's a foundation program, you only have a couple of months.

**Submission:** While the college acknowledges that there will be impact on our colleagues, that is not the purview of EdCo.

**Submission:** While our policies are great, they are not exhaustive or we wouldn't be having a three hour meeting on the scope of what to do here. If our scope is curriculum and the decision is driven by financials and the financial decisions aren't going to have a net positive impact for a while because of the teach out, it makes it very confusing for Council. Based on my understanding of the EPIA, the decisions were going to be potentially cancellations, suspensions or reimagining which would eventually come through EdCo. But we've only seen these suspensions. We're being asked for advice

on a decision that is driven by financials when our scope is curriculum. We haven't seen anything to indicate there is anything fundamentally wrong with the curriculum. It's just that the programs don't have as many students as we'd like them to have.

**Submission:** Regarding holding the meeting on January 23<sup>rd</sup>, we have quorum and should hold the meeting, accepting the fact that the advice provided may be that we met, we tried to provide but we had limited information and our hands were tied.

**Submission:** We should have the meeting and start with stating the boundaries of what we can and cannot do. Based on the documents provided, the decision to suspend these programs is strongly financial as opposed to a need to revisit and redo the curriculum.

**Submission:** It's surprising and impressive what gets caught at this table because of the diverse perspectives of its members from different divisions. While the VPA has a broader view, he can't catch everything. As faculty representatives, we've all been contacted by people who want to be heard. It would be helpful to provide the BOG with information not included in the document that people feel it's important for them to have.

**Submission:** The BOG's letter references an attachment which EdCo has not received. The BOG should know that members did not have 10 days to review the material. This should have been sent to members upon receipt.

**Submission:** The chair chose not to send all the information without having any direction for Council regarding the discussion as it might be overwhelming, especially for student members, to receive it. She sent it during the meeting. There is still no scope or guidance on how to proceed. Council agreed to hold the special meeting. Whether or not they come up with clear advice will be determined. Council will consider everyone's perspective and what's under its purview. Perhaps the advice provided can be a summary on each program and what additional information the BOG should have.

**Submission:** Members could reach out to their colleagues to see if they have different information than what's been provided so that EdCo has a fulsome view of the situation for next week.

The chair drafted a template to organize discussion points and what additional information the BOG should consider apart from the EPIA documents.

She proposed sending a cover sheet with the meeting package outlining areas of discussion for the meeting within the purview of academic governance.

There have been several requests from departments to present at EdCo. The chair also drafted an outline of how the presentations would be handled.

There is a process available for people to present their feedback to the BOG on February 5<sup>th</sup>.

The chair had sent a questionnaire to department chairs of the proposed suspensions to gather any information not included in the EPIA, but was advised that it was not EdCo's purview to create a new process for gathering this information. The process of determining proposed program suspensions is under the VPA per Policy 3-20.

**Submission:** The chair's email is triaging emails with reams of information being sent to faculty representatives by those who want their voices heard. Members still don't feel they have enough information to give useful advice.

**Submission:** For procedural fairness, because EdCo represents the entire college, any request for information should be sent to the whole community not just a single constituency.

**Submission:** There is concern about requesting input and information when we are not making a decision, we are providing advice. The BOG needs to hear from these delegations.

**Submission:** With the retraction, EdCo should include an apology to those who have been putting time and effort into gathering the information regarding their programs.

**Submission:** The only information EdCo has received is from administration. As faculty representatives we should be hearing from faculty in order to make an evidence-based decision on what advice to give the BOG. Staff representatives could request information from staff and student representatives could go through NISU to gather information.

**Submission:** The chair is not just a faculty representative. She represents all of EdCo.

**Submission:** It's unfortunate that there is such a tight timeline to provide this advice. It might be challenging for administrators to get more information that doesn't support your proposal to suspend

these programs, but it is more transparent and the college community might feel better about the final decision if they have input.

**Submission:** Administration has no concerns about delegations bringing their feedback to the BOG. The concern is about protecting EdCo and the chair in regards to the invitation only going to faculty. **It was agreed** that the chair would send an email to retract the request for information as it was not sent on behalf of EdCo and wasn't sent to the wider college community.

The chair still doesn't have a clear idea of how to structure the special meeting on January 23<sup>rd</sup> in order to provide useful advice to the BOG.

**Submission:** Perhaps we could form a working group of EdCo members to help you establish parameters or a framework for that meeting.

**It was agreed** that an email will be sent to all members requesting volunteers, preferably from all constituent groups with potential meeting times.

7. **Information / Correspondence - None**
8. **Meeting Evaluation – Roundtable Discussion - None**
9. **Next Meeting – Special Meeting January 23, 2026**
10. **ADJOURNED AT 4:51pm**