

**UA Teacher Education Council
Friday, October 12, 2018**

Meeting Minutes

Present: Steve Atwater, Virgil Fredenberg, Katy Spangler, Cathy Coulter, Claudia Dybdahl, Paul Ongtooguk, Amy Vinlove, Ernestine Hayes, Diane Kardash, Sean Topkok

Absent: Jonathan Bartels, Doug Cost

1. Welcome/UPDATE: EPP Activity:
 - a. Agenda/Minutes were sent by Steve; agenda will be a working, live document. People were invited to share if there was anything that occurred at their EPP that they would like to share.
 - b. UAA: Nothing
 - c. UAF: CAEP Commissioners meet on the 20th. They may take up to 30 days to issue a decision.
 - d. UAS: CAEP Consultant came during the first week of October; helpful for self-study work. Lots of business and supervision travel.
2. 9/7 and 9/28 Minutes:
 - a. Minutes were posted, feedback has been incorporated. Diane took the lead on a lot of organizational material—including whiteboard screenshots from 9/7/18.
 - b. There were no objections to the adoption of the 9/7/18 minutes as they stand. They are approved.
 - c. Looking to approve the meeting minutes from 9/28/18. Objection to adopting them as presented?
 - i. Yes, there was curiosity about bullet point 3; statement about taking things back to the greater faculty will slow things down. Did we all agree on this?
 - ii. Some seemed to think there was a brief discussion, but others went back to watch the video—not any decisions made.
 - iii. The 9/28/2018 minutes were edited to say that Steve stated that, and that there was no agreement.
 - iv. There was a question by Amy as to agreement, for whether we represented larger bodies. It was stated that no agreement was made that we represent larger bodies.
 - v. There was a request by Amy that Steve revisit the issue of the TEC Representation.
 - d. After the above changes, there were no objections for approving the meeting minutes for 9/29. The minutes are approved and will be posted to the public.
3. UA TEC CHARGE: NEXT STEPS:
 - a. It was discussed that members are participating online in this document, but there has been has not been enough activity to bring forward to the full group a proposal.
 - b. It was acknowledged that the charge may take longer to create than priorities, but also be guided by priorities.

4. PRIORITIZING TEC ACTIVITY:

a. PROCESS FOR PRIORITIZATION DISCUSSION:

- i. When the priority list is achieved, there would be an activity tied to any of the priorities. The TEC would work toward achieving that priority..
- ii. It was agreed the priorities should come first and the charge, second. This decision was opened up to the group. UAS and UAA faculty both made verbal affirmations while acknowledging the importance of coming with a charge. UAF had no verbalized objections.
- iii. It was discussed that everyone needs to have the same information, and that the UA TEC should be consistent in the information that it distributes.
- iv. It was discussed that some wrestled with the document. There was an expectation that Alaska Native student success would be embedded in all the priorities, and as a result, Steve stated that he didn't believe that it would be necessary to single it out and put it into a separate priority. Most of the priorities and tasks that are listed don't include this. It was suggested to embed the Indigenous interests in each priority.
- v. It was asked of the group whether these meet the criteria for system-wide priorities. It was noted that if we proceed with priorities before establishing a set of processes and procedures, that it will slow the effectiveness of the TEC.
- vi. Steve suggested that a working group be created to establish some "rules of engagement" and bring them back to the group. There were no questions or comments from the group on this, when prompted.

b. Professional development as a priority is sponsored by Steve & Diane; Diane created a link to the rationale. Amy provided comments. It was discussed that school districts are interested in UA supporting activity not necessarily tied to degree programs—looking for smaller chunks of professional development. How do we determine whether that's feasible? Could we establish a more methodic relationship to school districts?

- i. Establishing a working group for this priority was discussed.
- ii. The working group would look at how to gather information about the school districts and whether the UA system had the capacity to address goals: data, finances, etc.
- iii. It was discussed that school district requests may not make sense for system-level coordination—a comment was provided, citing the costs and 500-level course development.
 1. 500-level courses have adjustable tuition.
 2. It was mentioned that it's more about the process and whether K-12 need this kind of interaction.
- iv. It was mentioned that there is likely a need, but we need to gather evidence of that need. We need to be strategic, perhaps survey districts, how much their current professional development costs them, etc.
- v. It was agreed that evidence is needed to back up the claims of the school districts and the capacity of UA to fill a need.
- vi. Claudia mentioned that UAA's PACE Office is very active; how is this different from what PACE is doing now?

1. Steve stated that PACE is more passive, reactive—it waits for external initiation before brokering the course. The UA system could be more assertive with this. The broader conversation supports endorsement-level activity, rather than a short-sequence of courses.
- vii. It was agreed to explore the Professional Development idea to see if it makes feasible sense.
- c. Secondary Faculty have gathered at UAS from across the system to share expertise and courses. Does this level of collaboration need further guidance?
 - i. It was suggested by Steve that this is not quite a TEC “system-level” yet, but it might be at some point.
 - ii. The secondary meeting cross-institution collaboration should have an agenda and some goals in mind. What’s their purpose? It was noted that the Steve created a summary-type sheet for cross-unit collaboration activity, so they could report-out. It can be submitted to the TEC, who can catalog the activity.
 - iii. It was discussed whether the secondary group would run this by the TEC; suggested that this become folded into the “rules of engagement” for the TEC. Amy offered that if a group of faculty wants to come together for a collaborative meeting, they have to submit a brief proposal to the TEC to include the items listed above (goals, agenda, etc.).
 - iv. It was asked if TEC has funds that allow the group to meet: TEC does have the funds, through AKCOE; about \$50k allotted for this year.
- d. Strengthening of teaching reading education in Alaska is a priority sponsored by Diane & Cathy. This would be a new group, which would make an application to the TEC before forming. I think that there are more faculty that wish to participate in cross-institution collaboration—teaching of reading has been such an item.
 - i. A concern was raised by Diane that the legislature is engaged in a task force for reading proficiency and dyslexia, and that we don’t have a seat in that task force. One of the current members, is open to collaborating with us.
 - ii. Cathy has asked to speak to them on November 2—specifically about the NCTQ rating. Diane noted that NCTQ scores have been raised after changing 1 text. There is concern that UA is being left out of the Task Force conversation; there is a narrative that UA is to blame for the lower test scores, and that is something UA should address.
 - iii. Virgil agrees that the narrative needs to be addressed. Additionally, culture needs to stay at the forefront of the discussion. Virgil said that we are teaching students who can’t read and don’t speak English. These students do struggle, and are simply not going to perform quite as well—they’re starting in a different position that needs to be considered.
 - iv. Diane informed that PEAK scores don’t demonstrate a “growth over time”, it’s just a “one-time assessment.” Growth over-time scores need to be how we measure Alaskan students. How can we show this, and disseminate the information?

- v. Ernestine drew attention to the previous comment about the significant score change, from changing 1 text. Text choice can have a huge impact on Alaska Native and English language learners.
- vi. Claudia agrees that it is a critical issue to connect with the Alaskan education system on reading, and advocates for collaboration with the initiative of the legislature.
- vii. This may not be a TEC decision, but if a system-wide group were created, it could apply to the TEC. Steve advocates for this being a TEC issue.
- viii. Diane states that Posie Boggs has been a good contact on this. There is a member list of the legislative group. UA had a seat on this legislative team at one time, but was removed when the legislature narrowed their focus.
- e. PRAXIS is sponsored by Katy. We all have students who are unable to pass the PRAXIS, and therefore, these people are unable to become teachers. Is there an alternative?
 - i. Virgil suggests the TEC can promote that every branch campus be able to offer the test. It would increase accessibility for students in the interior—but doesn't fix all accessibility issues.
 - ii. Amy offered that she was on a national committee this summer that surveyed teachers about the PRAXIS and whether the content was valid for entry into teaching programs. The group addressed the math portion of the test, and subsequently recommended "lowering the bar."
- f. ATP recruitment is sponsored by Katy. ATP recruitment is less-effective, and I'm not sure if the TEC could or should take action.
 - i. Steve indicates that ATP Recruitment is not a TEC function.
 - ii. Virgil noted that UA needs to look at how we can help paraprofessional educators become both teachers and/or stronger paraprofessionals. Considering courses that are tailored specifically for paraprofessionals, as many of them do not wish to become educators. Special education uses a lot of paraprofessionals.
 - iii. This was suggested to be moved to Professional Development item.
- g. Indigenous Education and Authority is sponsored by Ernestine. There is a tremendous opportunity to change the Alaskan educational system; everyone should be taking steps to acknowledge Indigenous authority and sovereignty on every level. We do not want these to be overlooked.
 - i. The task of the working group would be to integrate these concerns into each priority. Separating this into its own priority would not properly facilitate the interests.
 - ii. There could be a standing working group to answer questions, or act as a reference.
 - iii. Claudia notes that this will be a paradigm shift—Indigenous knowledge, authority and sovereignty is a core value, and should be integrated into everything we do. Too often this takes the form of an "addition" to check a box, when it should be represented and integrated with the values of our education programs.

- iv. Amy suggests that in the operations of the TEC should incorporate a mandatory, high-level requirement to specifically and directly consider indigenous knowledge and sovereignty into all proposals and conversations. It should be a standing order for TEC working groups, and those who wish to make system-wide collaborative groups.
- v. Cathy suggests that this is something to consider when working to promote a system-wide ELL. We have been able to map-out programs, and have a very diverse state—ELL populations are quite large, so it makes sense to prioritize.
- vi. Amy notes that ELL and reading issues in the same group deserve their own attention.
- vii. Virgil notes that as we're looking at the top 4 priorities, we should not organize this priority in such a way that it disappears from the top of the list. There is some worry about losing one or the other—we don't necessarily need to tie them together, but we don't wish to lose either priority.
- viii. Paul notes there's some overlap at the non-specifics of language learning—village English is part of the home environment of many ELLs, which is overlooked or dismissed. When students come to us with English-dialect from the villages, they aren't recognized as ELLs in schools.
- ix. These are a series of items without rationale—jointly tied to operations and recruitment of Indigenous Education Professionals. As we look through everything through a cultural lens, it will be part of everything we do.

5. PROCESS FOR PRIORITY WORK:

- a. AKCOE is hiring a system-wide recruiter for all education programs; there is no MAU focus. The position should be publicly advertised, next week.
 - i. A major focus of this position will be to recruit Alaska Natives.
 - ii. TEC will be involved in shaping recruitment; need TEC members for the hiring group.
 - 1. Claudia and Amy have volunteered.

6. IDENTIFY TEAMS FOR EACH PRIORITY:

- a. TEC needs to identify issues that rise to the top so we can begin work on these issues. Steve will put together next steps in terms of prioritizing before the next meeting.
- b. Leaders will be created for each of the working groups, and all of us will be giving about 2 hours a week outside this meeting.

7. REVIEW MEETING SCHEDULE:

- a. We have a schedule of meetings every other week.
- b. Meeting on 10/26, November 02 will be cancelled (addition after the fact).
- c. Meeting location for Anchorage has been changed to EIB217 for the remaining meetings of 2018.

8. TEC INPUT ON NEXT AGENDA:

- a. Please email any desired additions to Steve.

- b. No further comments from group members, meeting is adjourned.