

Department of Educational Studies
Department Meeting MINUTES
Thursday, January 17, 2019 12:30 to 2:45 pm

Present: Mona Gleason (chair), Garnet Grosjean, Ebru Ozturk, Maria Angelica Guerrero Quintana, Mary Kostandy, Michael Marker, Wendy Poole, Kapil Regmi, Sam Rocha, Shermila Salgadoe, Tom Sork, Michelle Stack, Alison Taylor, Petra Mikulan, Wendy Trass, Jonathan Turcotte-Summers, Jude Walker, Pierre Walter, Fei Wang, Taylor Webb, Jason Ellis, Carolina Palacios, Zuzana Jackuliakova, André Mazawi, Vanessa Andreotti, Rob Vanwynserghe, Sharon Stein, Cash Ahenakew

Regrets: Amy Metcalfe, Gerald Fallon, Bathseba Opini

Absent: Leslie Roman, Claudia Ruitenber

Announcement before agenda

The Department head invited everyone to attend a panel presented by Jan Hare's office of Indigenous education, which is happening on February 15th. This presentation, which answers to *Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Call to action 65*, is going to talk about what it means to do Indigenous research and teaching in context of higher education and how that work can be incorporated into processes like tenure and promotion, etc. This can help us to understand indigenous way of knowing as being integral to our work and not outside of the work.

1. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved with one change to move UBC Emeritus College update by Don Fisher forward before the Head's report.

2. Approval of minutes (meeting of November 15, 2018)

The minutes were approved. There was a question regarding lack of details in the minutes from the discussion that occurred at the last department meeting about Safety/Security topic. Shermila explained that she took detailed notes of those discussions and presented to the Security Personnel during the meeting that she and Mona had with the Campus Security. The minutes normally record the outcome of the decision and not so much of the details of the discussion.

3. Library report (Wendy Traas)

Wendy introduced the app BrowZine, which is a very useful app to organize your content and access and browse e-journals and articles from different publishers in one simple interface.

Since it is the end of the Library's fiscal year for collection spending, Wendy also reminded everyone to send recommendations for new books or journal subscriptions by January 31.

Library report also includes a nice handout on publishing, which might be particularly useful for graduate students, who are about to get published.

Discussion

Is BrowZine connected to UBC library? Wendy agreed that it is. It's an app that you can access with your CWL. You can create a bookshelf with your favourite journals and articles.

4. Emeritus college (Don Fisher)- Don provided handouts

The proposal to establish an Emeritus college was approved by Senate last May and subsequently by the Board of Governors in June, the college became a formal entity on October 17th. It is a first Emeritus college in Canada, so in that sense we are breaking new grounds. This major initiative is fully supported by UBC and Professor Ono; and provides intellectual pathway to retirement while maintaining a close connection to the university and academia. Essentially, the emeritus college provides opportunity to remain as part of the university's intellectual life after retirement. We work in these 3 areas: (1) Academic program, where we continue to provide series of lectures, seminars and major events. We are hosting the Symposium in May to celebrate the foundation of the emeritus college. We will be also sponsoring the visiting emeritus scholars and hosting visiting lectures. (2) Support scholarship and reimbursing colleagues for scholarly activities. In last year, 5 of our colleagues received reimbursements. (3) Benefits and transition- we worked closely with HR and Faculty relations to promote smooth transition for scholars. Particularly important part of this are medical and travel benefits, which thanks to our activity can be now provided by supplementary programs. The coverage the retirees now get is almost equal to what we had before. We expect the cooperation between department and college to be closer, more clear and active.

Topics for discussion/decision

a. Head's report (Mona)

Mona welcomed and introduced new faculty member Dr. Sharon Stein. Further, Mona acknowledged Jo-ann Archibald and Shauna Butterwick for receiving such an important recognition of their work. Jo-ann Archibald was named an Officer of the Order of Canada and Shauna Butterwick was inducted into the IACE Hall of Fame.

Faculty hiring- EDAL program

A faculty member asked about hiring issue with EDAL. Mona confirmed that we suspended admission to EDAL program for 2019/20 because of reduced capacity in the program area. When discussing the hiring last year, Mona pointed out that the Department made hiring asks in our hiring plan that were forwarded to the faculty. She confirmed that the department requests regarding hiring last year did not include hiring in EDAL for future. There were 3 other tenure track positions - TT Instructor in Teacher Education, Higher Education and a position in Indigenous education. After successful development in first two, the priority at the moment was given to the position in Indigenous education. Also, within the department, the self-study process is very critical for us. We need to decide as a department how to move forward and this will absolutely have an impact on the hiring landscape going forward. We will continue to make hiring asks, but it is important to have certain things and processes in place before we can make certain asks.

A faculty member disagreed, even though there were no formal asks, there were 3 searches last year and 1 search in the year before for the position in EDAL. Maybe there was nothing formally written down, but there was an informal understanding between the department and the dean's office that there was a great need in EDAL. After the searches were not successful in Spring they thought that they would

continue with searches again in the Fall. They were shocked when that was not the case and would like to have some explanation. Moreover, students who were supposed to start the program this year are very disappointed, because they were told that they could not start the program this year and have to reapply for next year. In entire EDAL program, there will be no more than 8 students coming into the program and it is shocking as we have a lot of students interested. The Department Head is very supportive of EDAL program but does not think it is a good time to bring a new faculty member into the program. A faculty member is concerned that program might die if we wait. The Head admitted that we might have to face this as a department. It is not good enough to have only a need in field, there must be a solid support within the department for members who teach in that area, for supervision in the program area and for course structure. There must be a support for existing members in research and other activities they would like to do. Before these things get into place, it would be irresponsible to bring in more faculty members. Searches were not successful for specific reasons and we have to face it.

Another faculty member thought that we also need to think about faculty members and not just a program itself. We need to put attention to their workload and their well-being. We care about EDAL, but EDAL is not a healthy environment at the moment; not for faculty members and not for students. It is not responsible to bring in a new faculty member here until we figure out these issues.

Another faculty member is deeply concerned about the program. It is a program with long tradition and they are worried that if the program is neglected, then it will disappear. This would be a very poor strategic decision on our part. They would like to see concerted effort to bring the program back to what it should be and therefore it needs a new hire. The Head said that we should bring all this passion to more discussion about EDAL program.

A faculty member stressed that no one is supporting shutting down the hiring in EDAL. The only question to be determined is when. To say that if we don't hire, it would cancel the EDAL program is a different concern. The desire for program and capacity for the program alone is not sufficient enough to go forward with hiring. If you look into hiring criteria, it is not even listed in the form.

The Head stressed the importance to work together and to have wider conversations. We should think strategically about the department and about students' needs in our department. We need to see all our challenges as department wide challenges and that is how we should approach it.

Teaching Assistantships (TA)

Alison explained more about TAs. One area in strategic planning of TAs is around the community engagement. There is some additional work when setting up the course with community engagement learning component. The amount of work that might be required in doing community engaged courses could be equivalent of teaching the large course. Alison also summed this up in the letter, which she could make available. As a department we will have to decide on the fair process for allocating TAs.

Tenure track hire in Indigenous education

A department member thinks that department is lacking Indigenous teachers and knowledge, which is recognized as an important contribution to education and knowledge. It is great that department is recognizing this lack and this department member thinks that hire in Indigenous education should be a priority, because in comparison to some other programs it has been historically absent.

Another department member invited everyone to attend the candidate presentation for the Chair in Special Education taking place the next day. They encouraged everyone to come, because it would be great to see if the candidate can contribute beyond the field of special education. Can this candidate work in interdisciplinary fashion? With the work we do here, will they work with the whole faculty or they will stay only in special education, which is a very close field. The idea is that we talk together and create new things out of our diversity. If we bring an indigenous scholar, it will open new conversation and ideas and raise questions beyond the Indigenous education. It would serve as a catalyst for new synergy that can reinvigorate the department.

Another department member suggested to look at the reason why this search was unsuccessful before, because it could be very important in moving forward. We should work from original document and edit it. Another department member thinks that it is very important and an urgent hire, because looking at the applications, it is obvious that a lot of students are interested and we need Indigenous supervision.

Another department member echoed full support for this position and added that if we can do one single thing in this department, it should be to focus on truth and reconciliation. If we are not doing it, who else will? We have only two faculty members who are dealing with indigenous students and we are in a real need of more, because these two faculty members do not even have capacity to deal with all the Indigenous students and not to mention with non-Indigenous students interested in subject.

The Head promised to work on what a description for this position might consist of and try to circulate in for our February meeting. In the meantime, Mona can talk to Jan Hare and take her advice and ideas.

A department member suggested to look at what Indigenous scholars, particularly recent graduates have been producing in terms of research and look at trends in indigenous education. We should draft the description on what is out there and respect the work which had been done by recent graduates.

b. Graduate advisor report (Alison)

Alison has been meeting with GAAs about the Research day. She encouraged everyone to think about panels, particularly about joint student and faculty collaborations around panels within different areas.

There has been a lot of admission activity and committee meetings, so Alison thanked everyone for all their work required in adjudicating the files.

Pierre explained that the department received 83 applications for the PhD program and we can only accept around 5, therefore, if any faculty member has a student they would like to support and work with, they should let the committee know. There was a question from the faculty member about how the 5 admissions number was determined. Alison explained that the number is based on the allocation of graduate funding and we have to follow certain rules (PhD:MA= 70:30) within the department. We are trying to engage in thoughtful planning and think about what is sustainable for the future. In addition to our funding, we have also special funding for Indigenous people. Another question was about this new model of funding- grants and Indigenous funding. Do we need to look into more discussion about new model? Do we need some kind of support to help us understand how this model works since it is quite different from previous model? Yes, the conversation is welcome. Another question was what if faculty member is willing to sponsor/give funding to student? Where does it place that student versus the other

student in the applicant pool without the support? That is one of the policies which could arrive under the new model. And another question coming from this, if a professor gives funding to student for 4 years, but this professor leaves the faculty after 2 years, who is responsible for the remaining 2 years? Some questions are answered in booklet, but not all of them. Alison mentioned that in Education we tend not to have money for this kind of funding. One faculty member highlighted that some faculty members do not have problems supporting students through the new funding model. We need to ask what kind of economics and politics are at work in those faculties and departments that find it easy to fund PhD students through the new model.

Another issue that came up in GPACC was what changes are needed to inform students about the proper application processes.

One department member mentioned that when looking at application and all the criteria there was one asking if the person contacted any member who is going to supervise them and this is pretty relevant for the funding. Funding through supervision is important to talk about.

Alison mentioned a few things that are important for this conversation. (1) Is minimum funding a bad idea from student perspective? No, the issue is who is paying for these students and we do not have that kind of control we would like to have over this decision. (2) Issues with capacity for supervision and we need to ensure that graduate students are getting supervision and mentorship they expect. (3) Concerns with equity.

One department member stressed that funding policy is what it is, we can strategize about it, but it is given. We should strategically think about PhD recruitment in terms what we are trying to achieve with that PhD. Following the criteria, it is more likely that certain some people would be getting in more than others. We should discuss more deeply the identity of the PhD program, do we want to tie the specific research to specific terms, themes and areas? We need to think about equity in student and faculty recruitment as priorities in admission and hiring. We can't change the funding policies at university level, so we need to think about the synergies across the department.

Another department member added that we cannot have discussions about supervision without clarifying who we are as department.

Online course proposal

Alison encouraged everyone to provide ideas about what courses we might want to redesign as online. We should look at gaps in programs and equitable access to courses as well as interest on the part of faculty and think what to bring.

Regarding the online courses, one department member suggested that it would be a good idea to organize department workshops on how to proceed with this. Alison assured that it would be part of it.

One department member provided the observation that the needs of PhD program should shape hiring.

Motion for a category change- EDST 553

Alison brought a motion forward for category change for EDAL- EDST 553, addition of a prerequisite: EDST 501. The main rational is to formalize what is already in practice. The motion was brought forward by Wendy, seconded by Pierre.

Discussion

One department member asked that if this practice is already in use, why there is a need for regulation. And if we add a rule, what happens if we can't follow the rule, then we need to make room for the exceptions. We shouldn't create more regulations, than we need. Wendy answered that this rule should solve more problems than it would create. There is always the options for advisors to substitute the course. However, there is a reason why these 2 courses should go together. The proposal prepared in EDST 501 is the basis for the culminating research report produced in EDST 553. In essence, EDST 501 and EDST 553 are a research course sequence. We encountered the problem because there are constantly new people asked to be program advisors and take care of the program. Sometimes, they do not understand the rules and without the knowledge they could be advising students what is not in their best interest.

A faculty member agreed that it makes sense for off campus students. However, for the on campus students, it is not always flexible, especially for working students. They asked if there is any way to give them more flexibility. Wendy thought that on campus student have more flexibility, they have more options about which courses to take. However, you cannot do group projects unless you work with the group before on the proposal.

The department member mentioned that we do not have options to do course-based work, but Wendy said that it is clear in the program description that group paper is required. Another department member disagreed with this option. We can either make EDST 553 more widely open to students and do individual or group projects or get rid of 501 and 553 all together and have a course-based (or do the option for 500 and graduating paper). But if we want to keep these courses, we should have some flexibility where it could be more than 10 students.

Wendy added that there are lot of options on campus, but if students want to do EDST 553 and expect to do a group project, then they should take course 501, which prepare one to do the project. It is not fair to students who are working on the project to be with students who did not do the work and prepare before.

Another faculty member stressed that even though the 500 course and graduating paper is an option, these are not quite an equivalent.

Another department member mentioned that more regulation will make the course more rigid. There are two big concerns: (1) If we tie these courses together without flexibility, it might result in more issues. What are they going to be doing in 501, preparing their proposal or doing research methods? Because it is quite different.

(2) How do we define status of course across the department? No program owns anything and we want to open some opportunities up for elective students. If we are tying the courses together that means unequitable and unfair situation for some students.

Alison suggested to table the topic for now before initializing the change. It seems, that we need to have more conversation because at this moment it does not seem to have all the necessary support.

Motion to table the topic – Michelle; seconded-Jude and Sam- all in favour, opposed one.

c. Operations report (Shermila)

Mona and Shermila had a meeting with the Operation Manager for Campus Security and provided a brief report and description of what took place in PCOH, and also raised concerns discussed at the department level. The Campus Security personnel agreed to come to provide a presentation to the department.

Discussion

There was a question regarding the budget for the May Symposium. Shermila explained that the revenue was split into two fiscal years, therefore the expenses seem higher in one fiscal year.

d. GAA report (Maria & Mary)

This month we canceled our vision board because of lack of registration. We are supporting our Friday seminar series and Maria invited everyone to attend. There was also a feedback form included in the current GAA newsletter, which will hopefully give us some feedback from the students. We will learn more how to better represent the students and believe that the feedback will be helpful for the self-study.

Maria also mentioned preparation for the Research day and encouraged the faculty to remind students to apply. The deadline is February 18th.

Mary introduced Ebru Ozturk, new rep for SCPE for the second term.

5. Peer Review of Teaching document (Tom & Jason)

Tom brought the motion that department adopt the new Peer Review of Teaching document, seconded by Sam.

Tom provided some background - Last year, Tom and Jason were responsible for carrying out the peer reviews and there were a lot of questions raised, so both wanted to clarify the expectation about procedure for peer review. They started gathering information, reviewed the existing procedures from other departments and they put together the procedure which is most consistent with the Collective Agreement. There was an arbitration ruling that said we cannot exclusively rely on students' evaluation of teaching to judge faculty member's teaching skills. However, for decision making around rehiring and for tenure and promotion, we need clear guidance regarding PRT. We consulted with UPACC and GPACC and collected a lot of feedback and recommendations that was incorporated to the final document. This document can provide a guidance to peer reviews while we await a Faculty- wide process in plan.

Discussion

Has it gone through the Faculty Association? Have you had it reviewed by them? Tom responded, that there is nothing in the Collective Agreement that stipulates that it should go to Faculty Association. If someone has a problem, they can take it to the Faculty Association.

A questions was raised if the Sessionals are subject to this review could they be members of the Peer Review committees? Yes, they can be, but not in every case - for other sessionals only and not for reviews of tenure stream of faculty. Another question was asked - could a doctoral student be part of the membership? Doctoral students cannot be members of the Peer Review committee. However, if a PhD student is a sessional lecturer nothing precludes them from acting as a Peer review committee member during the time of their appointment.

The Voting on adopting peer review of teaching procedure - all in favour: 15; abstention 2; and opposed 3. The motion was passed.

6. Update on search for Instructor (Tenure Track) in Teacher Education (Michelle Stack)

The Search committee- Michelle, Jason, Annette, Sam and Claudia Diaz (student) met last week. Based on our search criteria, Dr. Bathseba Opini was shortlisted for the position. Our plan is to organize the presentation and interview on February 5th. Everyone is invited to attend the presentation.

7. Department Forum Discussion (we ran out of meeting time)

8. Announcements

Please come out for third Friday Seminar Series will take place on Friday, January 18th. Later today, January 17th at 4:00pm to 6:00pm there is a presentation by Alexis Shotwell, from Carleton University, entitled "Against purity and for a politics of responsibility."

Meeting adjourned at 2:40pm.