Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

- Regrets were shared. Greg Thomas was welcomed as the alternate for Tom Dust and Gaylene Schreiber for Monique Gavel (ATA). Around the table introductions occurred.

Approval of the Agenda
MOTION (J Thibaudeau): To approve the agenda, as circulated
Seconded by: J McFeetors
Carried

Approval of the Minutes of September 28, 2017
MOTION (C Christianson): To approve the UAAC minutes of September 28, 2017
Seconded by: S Carr-Stewart
1 Abstention; Carried

C Hickson reminded council members that the September and October UAAC meetings primarily focus on Calendar changes to meet University Governance circulation timelines for inclusion of changes into the 2018-2019 Calendar. Changes will be compiled and moved to University Governance on Monday.

Calendar Change Documents

- Editorial Calendar Changes:
  - Secondary Education
    - BEd (After Degree) Secondary Education Route Program Requirements and Faculty Regulations sections changes required to adapt Calendar for inclusion of new After Degree only minor - Interdisciplinary Studies: Social Sciences (approved at April 27, 2017 UAAC meeting)
      - Motion: G Thomas, Seconded: L Sulz
      - Carried
        - G Thomas shared that the motion is to optimize how the new (already passed) minor has to be addressed in the Calendar.
        - C Hickson explained further the placement of After Degree admission requirements living on the Faculty website, and not in the Calendar. The Calendar will now include a listing of all Majors and Minors within the After-Degree section of the Calendar. Calendar changes will need to be prepared to outline the After-Degree admission/program requirements in the Calendar going forward.

- Education Chart 1 changes to ENLA Major to clarify which courses on the requirement list should be senior level, and to allow EDSE 429 to be part of program requirement list (an English Language Arts courses that is offered by the Department of Secondary Education).
Motion: G Thomas, Seconded: J Thibaudeau
1 Opposed, Carried

- Education Chart 2 changes to ENLA Minor to allow EDSE 429 to be part of program requirement list (an English Language Arts courses that is offered by the Department of Secondary Education).
  Motion: G Thomas, Seconded: J Thibaudeau
  1 Opposed, Carried

- EDSE 429 update of course title and description, as current listing contains outdated language
  Motion: G Thomas, Seconded: J Thibaudeau,
  9 in favour, 3 Opposed, Carried
  o Concerns were discussed about the changes to the course description possibly resulting in an entire new course.
  o The language was updated to be more aligned with what is occurring in schools.
  o If trying to appeal to junior high courses, the course description may not be understandable and there seems to be great difference in theories.
  o It was asked if the final sentence in the course description could be removed (Students will engage in multiple opportunities for text creation across sign systems and forms of representation (including comics, film, audio and digital texts, etc.)
  o The level of understanding of the course description was questioned and it was suggested that it should be able to be understood by students.

- Other Calendar Changes:
  o MOTION (L Daniels): New Course, EDPY 197 Selected Topics in Educational Psychology, New Course, EDPY 297 Selected Topics in Educational Psychology
    Seconded: S Carr-Stewart
    8 In Favour, 6 Opposed: Carried
    l Daniels clarified there is no use of faculty resources beyond what is already in place because already offer 497 courses and the department would like to instead switch to offering 197 or 297, in place of current 497 offerings.
    The courses can fulfill Open Options to strengthen the Education courses recommended in Elementary and Secondary Open Options where either non-education or education courses can fulfill this requirement.
    It was asked if offering additional 100-level courses might cause concern for meeting any minimum senior level requirements and confirmed that this had been consulted upon and there is not an issue.
    There is not a need for the 100 level or 200 level courses to serve as prerequisites. They are intended to be able to reach students with Education courses that may appeal in their early years of their program.
    A comment was made that the upcoming new budget model may require us to offer more education courses, as part of the undergraduate program.
    The lower level courses would provide access and exposure to faculty members earlier in students’ programs and will be taught in the faculty by faculty members.
    When asked if these courses would be offered by colleges the response was that the short answer is no, as these courses will be variable courses. However, after a variable course is taught for 3 or 4 years and is deemed successful, it would be moved to a permanent course number and then if wanted to be taken up by colleges they could apply through the transfer credit process to match our course.
    No prerequisites mean the courses could be taken before or concurrently with EDU 100.
    The courses will be stand-alone courses.
    Omnibus course numbers exist in each department to host variable content courses
    Feedback from members on behalf of departments was shared and included:
      o Concern with going forward and listing with years one and two education courses, given that EDU courses are intended to be cross-departmental and governed by the faculty as a whole, with input and review from all departments and they are also intended to provide groundwork for further Education courses.
      o Concern with only one department having 100-200 level courses and not having them for all departments.
- As omnibus/variable content courses do not require course outlines there is no opportunity for review and vetting across the faculty and there may be overlapping of other education course content.
- Often seminar courses contain more specialization and if they are occurring earlier it was questioned how the content then connects to later courses. It was suggested that students have a better ability to consider and take courses later in their program.
- Underlying concerns that this may be a band aid solution to a staffing issue instead of driven by student need and it was asked if students were consulted.
- Program renewal never had 100-200 level before maybe the timing is not right or need larger conversations at the program level before moving ahead.
- Resources from department perspective are not required as the courses will be using current resources.
- It was asked if there would be faculty resource implications when sessionals are still being hired.

- There was discussion from some members that there is not opposition and they are on board with 100-200 level education course need and wanted to know if all other departments can create 100-200 level omnibus variable content courses. It was suggested in the discussion that possible program implications would need to be considered and it will be important to not take a free for all approach and consider what is driving the decisions around adopting this approach because of the significance to undergraduate programming.
- We have students coming from direct entry now and having 300-400 level and not having 100-200 level, has these students not engaging with the education faculty members early in their program.
- The developmental model of the program was brought up as a question. Have we been intentional about designing a program in years one and two? We have to question if we have been intentional in doing that when *51 credits is completed with other courses from outside of the faculty. We do not have a curriculum map and we have been intending to do that for the education courses. Having more education courses and opportunity to focus on education could be a positive, as well as having faculty teach our students instead of having students taught outside of our faculty.
- There are increasing numbers of high school/direct entry students and some spaces for education courses to be taken for open options early in the program would be beneficial for students.
- Timing in relation to program review and renewal was mentioned, as was the changing budget model and a sense of there being many unknowns.
- Resourcing disparity between how departments contribute to meeting Faculty course offerings
- The department can staff the offerings and it does not minimize a need to think of faculty representation and faculty teaching required courses first.
- It was asked if all departments can come up with 100-200 level courses if they have resourcing and faculty to teach and there was affirmation that this is possible.
- A motivating factor for these courses could be the opportunity to take courses inside our faculty rather than from outside faculties.
- There are currently no prerequisites for EDPY 497 and they can be taken by all students but for students early in their program it can be overwhelming to take a 400-level course.
- It was asked what students take as open options now and what will they not be taking in other departments. The aim is for a zero-sum game with 197-297 replacing 497 sections but as 497 can be used as an education elective it could free up more opportunity for students to take 300-400 courses from any department for their electives. There is not an accounting of what students are currently taking for open options, and to meet this requirement they can take education or non-education courses.
- C Weber-Pillwax shared concerns that students will not choose to take difficult content and it is the responsibility of the faculty to make course and program decisions and consider the impacts on teacher education in the undergraduate program and what students gain within their degree. We must use caution in developing course content and have an accountability to make decisions that are not ad-hoc but set the foundation in all courses and not have the mandatory faculty courses standing alone in this endeavor. There is a need for 100-200 level but what topics and content are needed, needs to be part of the work done for developing the courses that students should be able to choose from. All departments could have something to offer in the discussion of what is needed for 100-200 level courses.
- L Daniels commented that the way the program is designed the changes to 100-200 level instead of 400 level is about creating courses that can fit into an open option and that allow access at a
different point in the program and not about trying to create new content for the program but changing when students have access to education courses and enabling this to occur at an earlier point.

- J McFeetors shared that Elementary Education colleagues felt like the change was a structural change to the program.
- L Daniels responded that the open option in Elementary is listed in year four and the open options in Secondary are listed in years one, two and three and they are components of the program already in existence and they note that education coursework is recommended.
- C Christianson noted that open options do not require students to take education courses but instead any course offered by another faculty can be used for the requirement and therefore it does not seem like a structural change but instead an opportunity to take more education courses which may help students who feel disconnected from the faculty in the early parts of their program by having access to more education courses.
- There is need look at overall concerns of program content and structure as part of the review and renewal project, as the program has evolved.
- Feedback from the profession is pragmatic and encouraging and should also be considered during the review.
- L Daniels stated that it can be looked at as a trial and once approved it would still be easy to remove in the future.
- C Hickson asked if registration could be limited to not offer more courses than were offered as 497 and L Daniels expressed agreement.

**Discussion items**

- **Update and discussion on undergraduate program review announcement (W Dunn)**
  - Process for renewal and review is developing and faculty members were sent a call of interest for review and study our program.
  - University is looking at a new budget model for next year and the strategic plan for the faculty is being completed over the next year and information is being collected now to bring together the strategic plan and program renewal.
  - Work that has normally come to UAAC will remain coming to UAAC.
  - Decisions that usually are made within departments, such as staffing, will continue to remain with department chairs.
  - What do we think as a faculty and do we think the content should be that we want students to be able to choose from in their programs.
  - Committee that is going to do the work is not structured like the faculty, as it is formed from the call for interest but there will be various avenues for consultation around what questions need to be asked during the review.
  - DAC has been working on the first stages and researchers will gather information and reach out to faculty, students, school district personnel, graduates, etc. and will are begin with the first stage being data collection and the next stage of renewal will require more representation.
  - In response to a question about UAAC having a place in the setting up of the research, it was mentioned that the idea is that we need to consult broadly across the faculty as to the questions that need to be asked.
  - It will be strategic to have members consult department councils about the questions they would like to put forward and to them back to the council.
  - A discussion also occurred on seeking input into who needs to be consulted beyond the faculty, for instance, what do MTs think about our IFX/AFX and about our students and needs of the field. Stakeholders could also include the ATA and practicing teachers.
  - Asked if stakeholders would include parents and parent groups it was mentioned that they are not usually asked but this may well need to be considered.

- **Plan for “Items for Future Discussion” at upcoming 2017-2018 UAAC Meetings**
  - C Hickson shared that at the April 2017 UAAC meeting members identified the following topics and issues for areas of focus for UAAC to consider undertaking during the 2017 – 2018 academic year at the November 30, January 25, March 22, and April 26 meetings.
  - Discussion occurred on the areas of focus and it was decided that at the November 30th meeting preliminary questions to guide program review would be brought to council. Members are to take to department councils and this will be used as a base for discussion on the phase one discussions on data collection for program renewal. It was also agreed that November's meeting would include a discussion on the topic of the Teaching Quality Standards.
For the January 25th meeting it was decided that the knowledgeability of Indigenous/Aboriginal education would be a discussion topic, along with a discussion on EDU 211 and bringing forward comments from EDU 211.

Topics will still need to be decided upon for the March 22 and April 26 meetings.

Update Items from the Council membership

- C Weber-Pillwax alerted members about threatening and worrisome posters and postcards that were distributed and left around the faculty that compared Alberta Education to Nazis and inferred our faculty is indoctrinating and not educating our students. From the Edmonton Sun article, [http://edmontonsun.com/2017/09/29/posters-comparing-alberta-education-to-nazis-taken-down-at-university-of-alberta/wcm/ad658f61-5ef6-4e68-8d2f-fb404d69e9a9](http://edmontonsun.com/2017/09/29/posters-comparing-alberta-education-to-nazis-taken-down-at-university-of-alberta/wcm/ad658f61-5ef6-4e68-8d2f-fb404d69e9a9). For council membership, information excerpted from this article suggests:
  - “Posters comparing Alberta Education to Nazis with drawings of swastikas have been removed by the University of Alberta.”
  - “The university received several complaints about the posters, put up without authorization and that violated the institution’s policies and procedures on posting announcements, notices and banners, university spokesman Bryan Alary said in an e-mail Friday.”
  - “The university’s Protective Services was investigating, Alary said.”
  - “The posters accused the provincial education department of censoring opposing views, indoctrinating students into government ideologies, encouraging irrational thinking and forcing conformity…”

- The ESA shared that the annual Education Week events will take place the third week of January and there will be multiple professional development events offered.

- G Schreiber shared updates on behalf of the ATA. The Student Local will be receiving memos for pre-service Edmonton carousels that will take place January 20th where students can learn about the 21 specialist councils and it will be hosted at Concordia’s campus. There are multiple staffing changes at the ATA including, Dennis Theobald will move into the role of Executive Secretary, Brian Andrais will hold the Associate Executive Secretary position and Joni Turville will be the Assistant Executive Secretary. Dr. Mark Swanson will be the Coordinator, PD beginning December 1st, as Dr. Mark Yurick retires as of November 30th.

- C Hickson asked that G Schrieber please share back to Dr. Mark Yurick that his extensive contributions to the faculty were of the highest quality and appreciated, and he was well respected during his tenure, and will be missed.

Motion to Adjourn: G Thomas, 3:59 p.m.