UA TEC MEETING MINUTES 10/26/2018

UA Teacher Education Council
Friday, October 26, 2018

Meeting Notes

Present: Steve Atwater, Virgil Fredenberg, Ernestine Hayes, Katy Spangler, Cathy Coulter, Claudia Dybdahl, Paul Ongtooguk, Diane Kardash, Sean Topkok, Jonathan Bartels, and Douglas Cost

Absent: Amy Vinlove

1. EPP UPDATE:
   a. UAF: Diane reported that UAF called into the accreditation council board meeting; and CAEP had no outstanding questions for one UAF. The lead CAEP reviewer for UAF said that UAF did a great job! The CAEP newsletter came out, and President said in the newsletter that they would inform schools next month of their decision.
   b. UAA: Claudia reported that their CAEP interview was a little different than UAF's. UAA congratulates UAF with their CAEP workload success. The UAA interview with CAEP went on for 35 minutes—no indication as to what to make of the UAA situation as of yet. Claudia said that CAEP asked about things that were provided in the report, and we weren't sure what to make of it.

2. MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING:
   a. Steve asked the group if there were any comments about the minutes from last meeting. Virgil noted they were detailed. No other comments. No objection to approving the meeting minutes as-is—minutes were approved.

3. DECISION-MAKING:
   a. Steve asked the group if the proposed decision-making process was acceptable.
   b. Katy noted that if this group is going to be voting and majority rules, that this group should consider the repercussions of the minority. If someone cannot attend, are they allowed to send a substitute in their place to vote? Katy noted that to have the best work, each campus should be fully represented by the three representatives.
   c. Claudia noted that if you look at an items 1 and 2, there is clearly a distinction in the of impact. For items that require a vote, or readings, then that's when we should have a proxy, or full representation.
   d. Diane agreed with Claudia, and noted that it depends on the item. If the item has greater impact, there should be a proxy. A bigger item seems like it would be run by the whole faculty, too. I don't know if a proxy is needed to make that decision. For Diane, it makes sense that the impact of the item would determine this. If we didn't know whether or not it was a big item, then we probably shouldn't be voting on it anyways.
   e. Steve noted that we could maintain an online voting system, so that all TEC members could read initiatives and vote on them there. This way, full participation of the council is achieved, and a series of items would be available to vote for online. The person who is voting, may not be present for the discussion or debate, and there will be times when members aren't present and it's standard to move ahead. Not unusual to have less than

100% of members here, each meeting. Does the lack of a quorum misrepresent the University system? Steve indicated that he would hate to see this committee need a 100% of the vote to progress—at what point would an item warrant 100% attendance? Steve indicated that he was brainstorming, but that if this committee is at a point where decision is significant enough to warrant a deeper level of consideration, then someone should move to defer it to that point. For example, if I had a request to vote on an item, someone else would say that they "vote to amend the motion to defer it to a full vote of the committee." At that point, the motion would stall and be subject to a full vote. This is an important hurdle to cover.

f. Katy indicated that the group is discussing Robert's rules of orders—but consensus is what we've been doing. There's a bigger question here about how we operate and consensus..

g. Steve noted that how we operate has never been defined, so the committee is deciding that now. A simple decision-making process needs to be established.

h. Claudia mentioned that she likes the idea of a proxy, and noted that it's important to have representation. She is in support of further discussion.

i. Steve asked the group if they were comfortable with members being a proxy for an absent member.

j. Virgil asked if there is a need for the whole group to vote on something, would these be the items that we will have taken back to the faculty?

k. All answered affirmatively.

l. Virgil then noted that a proxy makes sense.

m. Steve then confirmed that there will be a simple majority for single items, and when items need full faculty consideration, that a proxy would be allowed. Are there any objections?

n. Claudia drew attention back to the simple majority solution, and noted that in a way, all these decisions would be made by consensus; even a simple majority is needed to confirm the meeting minutes.

o. Steve asked the group if we need to distinguish between the simple majority and full faculty consideration, or if that should be deferred to full faculty until it arises. We will inevitably reach a point where the group will indicate that they wish to "refer it back to the faculty," but this group is empowered to represent the faculty—part of what you are doing is maintaining a communication with the faculty, and what's happening; this is why the faculty chose you.

p. Virgil indicated that during the discussion, we can decide as a committee whether we need faculty input; we don't need the 2nd way because it's all one process. Once it goes to faculty, it goes, and then it comes back.

q. Diane states that this is a decision we can make without involving the faculty; their representative should be honest about whether something is working for everyone—don't be shy to say that it affects you or someone you represent.

r. Virgil asks that this group represents the faculty, how do the Deans fit in? The Deans are administrators, so in the vote is it the faculty, or all 12?

s. Steve answers that all 12 are equal members of the committee.

t. Cathy indicated that she was uncomfortable with "we represent the faculty and therefore have decision-making abilities" and that we aren't making time to run things past faculty. Cathy thinks that was more an issue in the beginning—in the name of efficiency, we're bowling over shared-governance. Over time, it will be easier to solicit input from each of the faculties, but she is a little bit uncomfortable that we're making decisions that need to be vetted. If this group feels compelled to make pretty rash decisions, in the name of decisions, we're bowling over shared-governance and we need to keep a cautious eye to that, and make sure that it's inclusive of all of our colleagues.

u. Virgil noted that because it's built into our decision-process, we can take things back. If someone feels that strongly about an item, it's already built into the suggested process.

v. Claudia added that if the feeling is that if a person needs to, they can request an item be taken back for discussion.

w. Ernestine asked the group if there is a phrase that the group can add that makes decisions subject to individual members request to delay it until they consult with their faculty--If they make a special request to that effect.

x. Steve noted that there is no intent to railroad things through.

y. Cathy indicates that this quiets her concerns a bit, about governance.

z. Doug noted that as we make decisions, we can adjust accordingly. The bigger the decisions, and what we know, then we can make a better-informed rule. Rather than just hypotheticals.

aa. Paul noted that we're using the term faculty, and we have a broader group to consider.

bb. Steve points out that Ernestine is the only non-education faculty; both she and Paul have more to consider.

cc. Virgil added that he suggested that not only if a faculty input is needed that we can send it for feedback, but for example, we talked about the reading initiative—we have a language arts professor here. If the committee feels that we need additional input, can we bring them to the meeting?

dd. Steve indicated he appreciated the question, and if the committee decides they need more info that can be allowed.

4. TEC CHARGE:
    a. Steve informed the group that President Johnson has asked us to think about what our charge is. We want to see if any of these resonate for the mission of the TEC.
    b. Paul said that Amy's amendment to Paul's suggestion is fine; option #3.
    c. Steve asked the group if any of these captured what members feel the charge of the committee is?
    d. Claudia indicated that she and Katy like the last paragraph of Paul's option (2nd paragraph). It's succinct and gets to the heart of the TEC.
    e. Diane notes that the very first sentence attracted her; simplicity is good and there are basically 2 ways of saying the same types of things.
    f. Jonathan notes that he likes language that empowers faculty to have authority over what happens with their programs; he understands faculty concerns about the TEC.
    g. Katy indicates she also likes the language.

h. Virgil said that assisting education programs needs to be specified, but he likes it too. It captures what we're trying to do here.
i. Sean stated that this group need to add "all faculty input", because we're talking about the voting process.
j. Steve noted that it does say that, at the membership piece at the top, which captures what the TEC is trying to include. Either way, it can be captured. Steve asked the group if it made sense to have a preamble or a membership statement at the top.
k. Claudia answered that it's also important to define the members of this council.
l. Sean answered that it should be in the "change" portion, versus the membership portion.
m. Steve stated the purpose of the TEC members are to represent all faculty. He invited Sean to insert language to the correct portion.
n. Virgil noted that he prefers the word "assist" better, or to include "assist and support." The TEC should want both, because we have resources that we want to assist with, to help faculty to do their jobs better. If they're looking at leadership programs, then we can assist them in addressing that need. That way, we would encourage faculty members in the other units. Not to only support, but also help them.
o. Steve voiced his caution about the role of assisting—no member of the TEC has the capacity to offer abject assistance; we aren't a resource center. I'm ok with the verb assist, but have concerns that we'll be seen as a resource. The TEC is a body that needs to provide guidance and direction—by and large it's come together to provide a vision and guidance of what's to come. Given workloads, I don't know if we can get into the practice of assistance.
p. Ernestine agrees.
q. Claudia mentioned that if the TEC is going to support and assist education programs, that more clarification is needed.
r. Paul mentioned that we are assisting education programs.
s. Claudia voiced reservations about putting in "with input from all education faculty", because once you state that, and an individual feels that they've not had input, that we're in violation of our charge.
t. Ernestine pointed out that it was not "education faculty" who made the difference in indigenous representation on this committee.
u. Katy added that we don't need the word "faculty" because it doesn't define the current membership.
v. Claudia stated that she doesn't think the word is quite accurate; Alaska Native studies council has a place at this table, and "education faculty" only represents a portion.
w. Ernestine stated that if we include the membership, then I would suggest that the AK Native study council representatives be included and that these members are as essential as the first main group. As long as it's equal.
x. Sean and Cathy agree that Ernestine addressed the equality well.
y. Steve noted that the edits have slowed now, so the document will be left open a vote will be proposed at a later date.

5. WORKING GROUP UPDATES:
   a. Cathy, Katy and Diane mentioned that they put up a link to the collaborative meeting report form. This is live for us; we are making updates to this document as we work. Our most recent meeting was yesterday; I mentioned the 3 of us (Lisa Richardson too), I likened it to our CAEP Process—we helped each other to learn more about one another's programs across the system. This helps us to prepare for the task force involvement with legislature.

   Additionally, the 11/2 meeting with the legislature has been bumped. It gives us more time; 50 minutes which includes Q&A. With this time, we cannot be all-inclusive, but we can open doors for future conversations.

   Cathy is able to attend all the meetings so far, and Lisa was able to call-in as well. Diane and Katy will as they are able; appreciation for Cathy who has been able to go there in person, which impacted a committee member to be less negative about UA. The committee members was Posie Boggs, who included slides that were very unfair to Alaska teacher educators; we spent time talking about this.

   Diane reached out to Posie Boggs to discuss the slides later that evening; the discussion centered on the information presented—specifically what was presented and how. The information she shared painted the UA system with a broad brush, and perpetuated negative perceptions. Linked low PEAK scores with UA educators, etc. This style sets up animosity and closes the door to collaboration. Diane spoke to her again this morning, and Posie Boggs is interested in working with us—she's not adversarial. There was no apology presented, but she did provide a recording from 10/22—the link to that recording is available. Posie Boggs felt that once UA listened to the recording, they would have a different opinion. Diane emphasized she did not speak on behalf of anyone in the TEC, but she did tell Posee Boggs what she felt based on the slides and recording—Diane wishes to address the walls that have been built up; it's hard to scapegoat people that you know. Everyone is trying to make things better for kids in Alaska, so how can we come together to help make Alaskan kids better readers and writers? Posee agreed with this.

   The new meeting has been scheduled for 11/26, and Diane will convey a collaborative spirit— that UA is willing to help and offer resources, and that we want to participate in this task force. I'm hoping to present to the TEC what I might say, and receive feedback.

   Cathy noted that Diane did an awesome job talking about the work done so far, but also conveyed concern about the narrative that is being presented to the task force. First, scapegoating of the Colleges of Education, and also the narrative that directed programs and scripted programs are being put forward and are the "best thing"—which is very problematic.

   b. Claudia and Steve both thanked Diane, Cathy and Katy for the important work. Lisa was also recognized.

   c. Steve reminded everyone that this is supporting programs, not in the most obvious definition, but this is still support. Gratitude was given to Diane for taking the lead on this. This is strong example of the TEC responding to a need. This was shared with the UA Summit Team (leadership from UA), that the TEC is taking action and actively engaging.

UA TEC MEETING MINUTES 10/26/2018

INDIGENOUS LENS:

    a. Steve wished to speak about the indigenous lens brought up last meeting—it's broader than just the initiative. Ernestine drafted some language about this, and it's on the agenda. This is a chance to comment; it's an important item and needs to be a driving piece behind the work of the TEC. Steve asked the group for comments or thoughts.

    b. Ernestine voiced that she was not completely happy with her word choices, for example "means" and "meaningful", so perhaps the committee could suggest another word such as "method, practice or approach", or chime in if it is acceptable as it is.

    c. Claudia asked Ernestine whether she intended for this to be added to the charge.

    d. Ernestine replied that it might; then intention was to offer the committee to place it where they best thought it fit.

    e. Diane said that she would like to see it as part of the charge; the language is very nice and it's a good reminder to have it front and center.

    f. Doug, seconded this.

    g. Steve called for any objections—there were none, so the motion to add the language was approved.

    h. Sean voiced his support as well as a special gratitude towards Ernestine.

AKCOE WEBSITE: UA TEC LANGUAGE:

    a. Steve introduced the AKCOE website language; Diane has also offered some additional comments. Diane said that whatever the language will be, it needs to reflect the will of the TEC. This conversation and suggestions both are ongoing. Please look at the edits that Steve provided, and provide feedback.

    b. Virgil says that he supports Steve's edits.

    c. Cathy voiced confusion about what the AKCOE is in relation to UAS.

    d. Steve clarified that the TEC is different than the AKCOE, and that you cannot have one without the other. Currently, we are looking at a function of the TEC, how it can support the system and what language to use.

    e. Claudia noted that saying the TEC was created at the direction of President Johnson is direct and truthful.

    f. Katy added that the charge was just discussed, and the second part of this edit is similar to the charge. One the TEC has settled on what the charge is, it is her opinion that's what belongs on the website.

    g. Diane mentioned that one of UAF's faculty was on a plane yesterday, and a fellow traveler inquired of that faculty member how to apply to the SOE, now that there is only a COE. UAA/UAF should be advertised too. The changes with the graphic are fine, but all the logos need to be included—it needs to be equal.

    h. Doug pointed out that there are 2 mentions of UAS and no mentions of UAA/UAF—this should be rephrased.

    i. Claudia seconded.

    j. Cathy stated that she attended the principals' conference and while UAA/UAF had SOE banners, the banner from UAS was the AKCOE banner.

    k. Steve clarifies that the TEC page would be to advise the system. The language is critical.

l.   Diane says this website is more than just the TEC—it's the face to the public. It is not just about us in-house, it's public. Equal representation is important, and having all of the images there, does make a difference.

m. Steve asked the group to look at the website, go to the TEC tab. He stated his preference for not having AKCOE in front of the TEC label -it doesn't advise the EPP's function of the AKCOE—Steve said this template with AKCOE is set for now for whole website.

n.   Diane agrees that full representation is important; we have a big whale tail on top of that page, but the TEC represents all 3! We have a graphic that has all 3 of us, to insert.

6. NOTES:

a.   Steve encouraged members to be active offline, and expressed his gratitude for giving the committee time and attention. Regarding the proposed meeting in December, Steve couldn't get more than 75% of the TEC together, so he will propose an alternative date for early January.

b.   Steve notes that there is a brainstorming document (linked to the agenda) for discussing issues—it is important to map out activities. Are there closing comments?

c.   Doug wished to note that UAF needs website updates.

d.   Sean emphasized how important having full representation on the TEC website is.

e.   Diane, Virgil and Claudia all expressed gratitude.

f.   Steve reminded everyone the next meeting is 11/16; items will be sent for committee consideration. There will be a lot of reading outside of the meetings, which is important to do. While Steve is not at liberty to enforce it, he would like to maximize the time together.

The meeting is adjourned at 11:54am.