



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council

Thursday, February 11, 2016

1:30 – 4:00 pm

533 A Education South

Minutes

Present: W Dunn (Chair for C Hickson), H Kennedy-Plant (Administrator)

J da Costa (for B Stelmach), T Dust, W Lam, J Leighton (for L Daniels), J McFeetors, L McGarvey, J Pegg, B Smilanich, J Sousa, A Wolfe, C Weber-Pillwax

Regrets: D Chorney, C Christianson, L Daniels, M Gravel, B Hanson, C Hickson, L Shultz, B Stelmach

Guest: G Schreiber (ATA for M Gravel)

1. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

- W Dunn announced that he is serving as Chair for the meeting, in C Hickson's absence. Dr. Gaylene Schreiber, was welcomed back as a guest and introduced as representing the ATA in M Gravel's absence.

2. Approval of the Agenda

MOTION (B Smilanich): To approve the agenda, as circulated.

Seconded by: L McGarvey

4 Abstained, Carried

- Procedural process questions were raised about the addition of the EPS motion to withdraw and the idea that the motion to withdraw is not a motion category. Questioned if motion to table should have been considered instead
- W Dunn provided the rationale for including the EPS motion and for the order of the agenda, noting that considerable thought and consultation was done prior to sending out the agenda with the motion from EPS. Governance procedures do not include a motion to withdraw and it was decided to treat it as any other motion. Regarding the motion to table, since the motion came in advance of the meeting and in consideration of transparency of process and concerns raised by a department, it was decided to include it on the agenda
- J da Costa explained that the motion passed at EPS Department Council and expressed that he would be happy to second the motion and asked if another member would consider presenting the motion
- It was explained that a Faculty level motion can be challenged at Faculty Council
- Further questions were raised about the order of agenda
- It was pointed out that the motion on the table contained 2 motions – one to withdraw and one for wider consultation
- C Weber-Pillwax stated that the intention of the EPS motion was to communicate the discussion occurring in the department surrounding the topic of the Education Electives Motion. The intent of the EPS motion was to let it be known that there is concern that there was not enough information provided for the rationale in terms of figuring out the future direction of electives and although there was lots of discussion it did not involve many people. Work was well done but arguments were not convincing and there is need to go through and do the alignment to the Curriculum Components which is the basis for the EPS motion asking for a wider process. Overriding the motion will not keep EPS from having questions and discussion because the department believes there are still valid questions remaining. C Weber-Pillwax reminded members that she withdrew her name from the electives working group documents due to not being able to attend the working group meetings.
- W Dunn mentioned that any motion can be brought forward anytime and a motion to rescind or to reconsider could be brought forward. The authority to set the agenda resides with the Chair but the Chair is subject to challenge, in which case the matter is settled by a majority vote
- Ongoing discussion on the order of agenda and the motion occurred around the table
- W Dunn stated that after much consideration and in prior consultation with C Hickson (UAAC regular Chair), his decision as Chair was to keep the order of the agenda as presented unless challenged

- W Dunn notified members of the Debate Procedures in the Education Faculty Council (EFC) Terms of Reference about Challenging the Chair (8.6.3) and stated that any member can challenge the chair and should the ruling of the chair be sustained then the issue is put to a vote
- W Dunn entertained requests to change the order of the agenda and spoke to the reasons that the Motion to Withdraw was added to the agenda and why it was ordered in advance of the Education Electives motion. The request to add a motion by members of Educational Policy Studies, as outlined below, was circulated in advance of the meeting and as it directly related to the Education Electives motion on the agenda. Therefore the item was included on the agenda
- W Dunn called for a vote to approve the agenda

3. Approval of the Minutes of January 14, 2016 (attached)
MOTION (L McGarvey): To approve the agenda, as circulated.
 Seconded by: J McFeetors
3 Abstained, Carried

4. Items for Discussion

- **Program Renewal Work**

- **MOTION (C Weber-Pillwax):** Members of Educational Policy Studies request that UAAC withdraw the Electives motion and institute a wider process of consultation.

Seconded: J da Costa

1 Abstained, 7 Opposed, Not Carried

- J da Costa shared that his understanding of the work of the electives working group was to ensure that students know which courses they can complete for education electives courses in a timely fashion and to not have to seek course exceptions to meet this program requirement. He also stated that many of the elective courses offered in EPS were not taught by faculty members but by sessionals and graduate students and was uncertain why faculty are not invested in teaching the courses
- Questions were raised concerning the EPS motion around the impact and issues experienced by students
- L McGarvey shared that D Kapoor had provided information from EPS departmental discussions which was helpful. L McGarvey responded on the topic of wider consultation. The electives working group used the Curriculum Framework as a basis for decisions but it seemed that the wider consultation that was being asked for was on the Curriculum Framework itself and not on the electives and L McGarvey asked members for clarification if the request for wider consultation was for the framework, or on something different and who should have been consulted given there was quite strong representation from across the faculty
- J Sousa spoke on behalf of EPS noting that electives were a thread in the department's minutes. He questioned whether representation and consultation is the same thing and the assumption was that the representation ensured that there was consultation and there is not agreement that was the case. It was not questioning the individuals on the working group but the process and that it wasn't as inclusive and broad as many would have preferred
- C Weber-Pillwax mentioned that the basis, as she recalled the discussion was that when looking at the analysis of the Curriculum Framework components and the courses used, the analysis of the content did not necessarily align. While there is some claim to objectivity of the analysis it is not sufficient or convincing enough. Points about social justice and foundations and those aspects of what was missing in the undergrad program that became clear in the principles document, the Curriculum Framework outlined those but the review of existing courses does not align with what is contained in the framework and a basis of concern was if those values are not reflected in courses. Hearing arguments around timetabling and scheduling were not convincing arguments to drive decision making. C Weber-Pillwax mentioned that EPS discussions expressed the hope that by taking EPS courses students would orient towards courses that, without being mandated, students may not select. She questioned whether students would take courses with controversial content voluntarily. C Weber-Pillwax stated in conclusion that we haven't had time to talk amongst ourselves and everyone in the faculty in a way since the Curriculum Framework discussions 10 years ago
- W Lam mentioned that he sat on the electives working group and looked through course enrolment and rationale as to how many students are enrolled within courses in each department and there seems to be healthy enrolment within EPS courses. W Lam shared that he did not believe it fair to generalize that students won't take something controversial or in that subject area. Having the elective be any 300 or 400-level courses does allow students to have choice of courses that do fit a course within their schedule to meet their needs and allow students to finish on time

- **Education Electives Working Group**

- **MOTION (L McGarvey):** Members of the Education Electives Working Group move that the Education Elective requirement be fulfilled by any 300 or 400-level course in the Faculty of Education

- **Seconded: T Dust**

- **1 Abstained, 1 Opposed, Carried**

- J Sousa stated that he did not want to devalue the work of the working group in any way but questioned whether the outcome could be divisive and problematic because it might pit departments against each other just in terms of the process. Data are interesting but based on limited information, over a short time. The issue has been talked about for years but departmental concerns will continue to exist and he believed a vote for this motion would be counterproductive
- C Weber-Pillwax indicated that she would repeat what she had stated for the last motion for this motion as well and wished it could have proceeded in a more collaborative way
- J da Costa stated that he thinks that students will take courses that are challenging and students should be given credit for not shying away from topics that are controversial and our responsibility as faculty and instructors is to help students to understand the importance of those concepts and how they fit within the courses that we teach and students will come to good courses if given the opportunity
- J Sousa discussed concerns around entrepreneurialism and having to 'sell' courses and stated this may not be a problem now but it is a potent issue. He raised the topic of adding a timeline of 3 years for the motion at which time it could be looked at again
- L McGarvey responded to the issue of data collection and how the elective component of the program has evolved by reminding the membership that the origins of electives were passed at July 2013 Faculty Council for implementation in 2014. The working group did consider data from 2013 education options as well. It wasn't until a closed door meeting where it was insisted that an elective be included in the program. The faculty had agreed to an education option that all departments could contribute to. However, there was no consultation on the elective and that unfortunately is what has become quite divisive
- In terms of the elective being any 300-400 level course that turns returns it to the broad consultations in 2005-2008 when development of new program was being done. L McGarvey believed that this was actually in part why the process was consultative and inclusive of all departments. The electives working group was responsible for going back to their department and bringing feedback back to the working group and EPS had group members from the department who brought voices back to the working group and they were listened to and agreed with the analysis that was done by the working group
- C Weber-Pillwax stated EPS department representatives did report back to department and discuss at council meeting and they did know what was going on
- J Sousa stated that there were discussions but questioned whether it was consultation. He inquired what a course like EDPS 360 was referred to before it was referred to as an elective prior to 2014 and L McGarvey stated that they were education options
- J da Costa asked for clarification about when electives entered the program if they did away with education options and if options were limited in the same way as electives were or if they were available from throughout the faculty in the manner that the motion was proposing
- L McGarvey spoke further on the background and shared that prior to 2013 the education option from Secondary was any education course and the education option in Elementary said any 300 or 400 level education course and there were no restrictions on what that was until in 2014 where it became an elective to be selected from a group of courses which were to be determined
- J Pegg clarified that the motion voted on in 2013 implemented in 2014 was that the education electives were a group of courses to be determined in consultation with all departments
- L McGarvey confirmed that this was voted on at Faculty Council in 2013 and implemented in 2014 and the revision introduced the education elective which was described as a course selected from an approved list of education courses. The list of courses to be determined by a cross-department consultation process to determine which electives will be offered each year. There was nowhere that it said that it was to be offered by EPS or any other department. L McGarvey stated that it was supposed to be a narrow list of courses and part of that was due to budget considerations at the time
- J Sousa mentioned that prior to 2014 there was more space in the program for options courses and it made sense that courses were offered by every department prior to 2014 but with the new program there was reduced space and that is a concern and is related to the concerns of the department

- L McGarvey mentioned that part of the budget cuts meant a cut to the number of required education credits but as part of that there were two education option courses for both Elementary and Secondary prior to 2014 and when the budget cuts were made one of the education options changed to an education elective and the other education option course changed to an open option where a student can take an education or non-education course, meaning it is hard to say if students are going to take more education options or less education options and we only have one year of data to be able to make that decision and that data is not very accessible but we could look at that but it is not as straight forward as we might like
 - W Dunn asked if there were further comments and with none the discussion moved to the vote
 - After the vote carried W Dunn mentioned that this was certainly something that a lot of time has been spent on and he provided members with a reminder that members can bring motions at any time. Our program is always a work in progress, it's always evolving and it is not expected that this is settled forever but quite a while has been spent working on this
 - L McGarvey shared that at the bottom of D Kapoor's feedback on education electives comments he proposed another motion that was regard to open options but this was not passed at the department council
 - J da Costa ongoing discussions will occur back at the department
- **MOTION: (T Dust):** To suspend the BSc in Human Ecology / BEd (Secondary) combined degree program from July 1, 2016 until June 30, 2024.
Rationale: This program is run jointly by the Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences (ALES) and the Faculty of Education. ALES has initiated a request for the program to be suspended. Enrolment numbers in the program are low, but more importantly; it is difficult for students to navigate through the program. One reason for this difficulty is that ALES accepts transfer credit that the Faculty of Education cannot due to the requirements of Teacher Qualification Services. Students who are currently in the program will be allowed to finish. In the future, students with an interest in this area can pursue a regular BEd program with the corresponding major in CTS: Human Sciences or they can complete a BSc in Human Ecology followed by a BEd After Degree.
Seconded: L McGarvey

5. Calendar Change Documents (attached)

- Editorial Calendar Changes:
 - Education Students' Association: Calendar change to update contact information
Motion: W Lam, **Seconded:** B Smilanich, **Carried**
 - Educational Policy Studies: Course Description Calendar changes resulting from departments review of course descriptions. Updated course descriptions and justifications is attached for EDPS 311, 341, 360, 425, 432, 456, and 474
Motion: J da Costa, **Seconded:** J Sousa, **Carried**
 - Editorial changes came out of working group looking closely at courses descriptions
- Other Calendar Changes:
 - None

6. Update Items from the Council membership

- Member updates
 - G Schreiber provided an update on behalf of the ATA, sharing that the ATA Specialist Council invited students to attend the Pre-Service Carousel in January and it was a success and congratulations to the proficiency of our student local was provided to the ESA
 - W Lam will introduce the ESA UAAC member to H Kennedy-Plant via email, as he is heading out to his placement. W Lam was thanked for his contributions to UAAC
 - J Pegg reported that subject area chairs in the Department of Elementary Education recently met to look at gaps identified from the electives working group report, to start coordinating and building upon what is occurring across the courses

7. Reminder of Agreed Upon Future Agenda Items

- Potential presentation: Office of Student Conduct and Accountability

Adjournment: B Smilanich moved to adjourn the February 11, 2016 meeting of Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council.
 Adjourned at 2:38 pm