UA Teacher Education Council
Friday, September 28, 2018
MEETING NOTES

Members Present: **Steve Atwater (chair)**, Amy Vinlove, Cathy Coulter, Claudia Dybdahl, Douglas Cost, Jonathan Bartels, Katy Spangler, Paul Ongtooguk, and Virgil Fredenberg

Absent:
Ernestine Hayes, Sean Topkok

Meeting Notes taken by Kayti Coonjohn, Assistant to the Executive Dean for the AKCOE:

1. Welcome/Review of Agenda/Update on EPP Activity: LINK TO AGENDA
    a. Executive Dean Atwater reviewed the agenda, welcomed members. He reminded everyone that the rooms we've selected going forward may change for UAA/UAF. Calendar invitations will also be sent for the remaining meetings.
    b. Dean Atwater asked for a brief update from each of the MAU's education departments (below):
        i. **UAA:** Hoping for a 2YR Accreditation approval from CAEP; both secondary and teaching & learning enrollments are up.
        ii. **UAF:** ELL endorsement approved by the State for Language & Literacy Endorsement.
        iii. **UAS:** CAEP Self-Study report due in February; hired a CAEP Consultant This will be the main focus for the next 5 months. HR Activities are taking precedent, as UAS AKCOE has five vacancies.

2. Discuss Meeting Minutes from 9/7: LINK TO MINUTES
    a. Meeting minutes from 9/7 were discussed. Overall, there was an agreement that the minutes were shorter than expected. Steve offered that TEC members could add information that would be considered as a part of the approval process.
    b. It was a group decision to accept the minutes from 9/7 as they are at this point. Several TEC members have screenshots of the whiteboard. Please send these to Kayti, so she can put them into the minutes from 9/7.
    c. People have inquired as to when the meeting minutes will be public. It was decided that group consensus/approval was not needed, in efforts to publish these more quickly.
    d. A new website is being created for the UA TEC, and it will be live starting the week of 10/8/18 (this was not discussed at the meeting, but has been corrected

in the minutes).

3. TEC Members/Representation:
   a. The TEC discussed the role of representing other faculty and the need to have faculty weigh in on key decisions. Atwater stated that taking back lesser information from the UA TEC to the greater faculty prior to making decisions would slow down the decision-making process, and defeats the purpose of being an empowered, elected representative. More significant decisions would delay by a meeting to allow full faculty feedback.

4. TEC Charge: LINK TO CHARGE
   a. President's Memo and the charge (Collaboratively develop system-wide plans for how the three universities will grow in meeting our goals for education) was discussed; is it a suitable charge? There were concerns about vagueness and scope of the charge as well as a question on the goal(s).
   b. The Alaska Native Studies Council's purpose was mentioned as a model to work from.
      i. *"The purpose of the Alaska Natives Studies Council is to mentor, support, and increase exchange of indigenous knowledge and Alaska Native ways of knowing. The mission of the organizations is to identify, develop, and implement Native-focused curricula, to promote and publish Alaska Native-related research and pedagogical strategies."* and was posted on the charge form- TEC members were invited to comment, offer suggestions for a TEC charge.
      c. There was some discussion to clarify the intent of the TEC to guide the charge. This was followed by a discussion wherein it was acknowledged that there was NOT a clear definition of what a local level concern was and what a system level concern was.
      d. There was continued discussion about the limitations of the reorganization. Atwater stated that while the reorganization may be limiting, the TEC is not the venue to criticize the reorganization (this is done through Provost Chancellor channels). The directive given from the UA President was for the TEC to collaborate on the prioritization and analysis of system-level priorities and sustainable solutions.
      e. It was discussed that UA TEC has a great opportunity to work collaboratively, although historically the MAUs have worked competitively, as driven by enrollment numbers. Although we are still separately accredited, we have system-wide priorities that need to be addressed—these priorities are at the system-level, and as such should benefit each of the MAUs.

5. Prioritizing TEC Activity: LINK TO TEC PRIORITIES

a. This committee should be part of conversations revolving around system-wide changes; local-level changes such as curriculum changes at an MAU should be kept at the local-level and not involve the UA TEC. Members need more clarification on what constitutes a system level change.

b. It was decided that representatives would bring forward system-level concerns and priorities from their respective MAUs. They were to put them into a Google Document (link above), with their names and a brief explanation about why it's important.

c. It was discussed that the UA TEC should be empowered to participate, edit, and intervene in system-wide decisions. There was no consensus as to what the role of the UATEC is in system-wide decisions.

6. Identify Teams for Each Priority:
   a. Pushed to next meeting.

7. Review Meeting Schedule: LINK TO MEETING SCHEDULE
   a. Some members are not able to make all the meetings. Recordings and agendas will be circulated to the group, and posted to the new website when it's up. Thanks to Diane for creating links on the meeting schedule page TEC Meeting Schedule - these will be also be posted on the webpage.

8. TEC Input on Next Agenda:
   a. System-level priorities and processes will be discussed at next meeting.