PEC Minutes
April 21, 2016
Wyatt Room, Steen Library

The Professional Educator’s Council (PEC) met Thursday, April 21, 2016, at 1:00 pm in the Student Center Regents Suite A.

In attendance: Dr. Judy Abbott, Dr. Adam Akerson, Dr. Susan Casey, Ms. Carrie Durrett, Ms. Francheska Fernandez, Dr. Brandon Fox, Dr. Christina Sinclair (for Mr. David Goodman), Dr. Jeanie Gresham, Dr. Paula Griffin, Ms. Karla Hamilton, Dr. Stacy Hendricks, Dr. Lesa Beverly (for Dr. Tom Judson), Dr. Lynda Martin, Dr. Paige Mask, Ms. Heather Munro, Dr. Michael Munro, Dr. Jannah Nerren, Dr. Bill Nieberding, Dr. Heather Olson-Beal, Dr. Dale Perritt, Dr. Amanda Rudolph, Dr. Chris Sams, Ms. Heather Samuelson, Dr. Nancy Shepherd, Dr. Kathleen Sheriff, Ms. Katie Snyder, Dr. Le’Ann Solmonson, Dr. Elizabeth Spradley, Ms. Lisa Stone, Dr. Janet Tareilo, Dr. Josephine Taylor, Dr. Liz Vaughan, Dr. Kimberly Welsh, Dr. Claudia Whitley, Dr. Michelle Williams, Ms. Carrie Williams, Dr. Carol Wright, and Mr. Chaz Zemanek.

Not in attendance: Ms. Haley Jameson, Ms. Lindsey Kennon, Dr. Glen McCuller, Ms. Melissa McMillian-Cunningham, Dr. Lisa Mize, Dr. Frank Mullins, Dr. Carla Murgia, Dr. Phoebe Okungu, Ms. Maggie Patterson, Dr. Gabriela Recinos, Dr. Jose Neftali Recinos, Dr. Pauline Sampson, Dr. Paul Sandul, Dr. Robbie Steward, Dr. Mark Turner, and Dr. Scott Whitney.

Dr. Nerren called the meeting to order:

- She asked the group if they had reviewed the minutes and asked if any changes were needed
- Dr. Wright and Dr. Shepherd both said they were in attendance February 11.
- Dr. Nerren did mention that the latest version of the February 11 minutes emailed to the council did include a change already suggested by Dr. Mask.
- Dr. Fox made a motion to accept the minutes with the above amendments.
- Dr. Casey seconded the motion.
- All were in favor, none were opposed, and there were no abstentions.
- Dr. Nerren then asked new PEC member, Karla Hamilton, to introduce herself.

The first reports came from the Office of Assessment and Accountability:

Update on Unit Assessments:
- Dr. Nerren spoke about the implementation of T-TESS this fall and stated that Drs. Scott Bailey and George Willey were both developing training modules for it.
- She added both will attend the August student teacher and field supervisor orientation.
- She also said that the CAEP Unit Assessment Committee will meet next on April 28 and will focus on work samples.
• She announced that changes had been submitted to TEA regarding the agriculture 6-12 certification and the business and finance grades 6-12 certification (to make it PBIC-only) but that TEA had not yet responded to the submissions.

Dates and Deadlines:
• Dr. Nerren emphasized that August 25 was the admission deadline into EPP for the fall semester. However, some flexibility will be used in this first deadline.
• She promoted the Partners in Educator Preparation event on May 26 and described how it would recognize field supervisors and cooperating teachers of student teachers for the 15-16 academic year.
• She did point out that all PEC members are invited, told the group some about the speaker, Dr. Kandi Hill-Clarke, and said to email Carrie Williams to RSVP.
• Dr. Solmonson expressed a desire to invite some of her counselors to the event.
• Dr. Olson-Beal suggested inviting the mentors of the PBIC interns.
• Dr. Hendricks asked if the student teachers were invited to which Dr. Nerren replied they were not.
• It was suggested that superintendents also be invited to the same event in May of 2017.
• Dr. Nerren expressed concern over inviting too many people thus exceeding the capacity of the Twilight Ballroom.

Ms. Snyder gave updates from the April SBEC meeting. There were various items in the discussion stage including, but not limited to, the following:
• Each EPP possibly must have a calendar of events
• The number of field-based hours prior to clinical teaching may increase from 30 to 40.
• PBIC interns may go from being observed three to five times per academic year.

Next were reports from Dr. Tareilo from the Office of Student Services and Advising:
• She said that SFA was in process of aligning standards for teachers and principals with the commissioner’s standards for both.
• She added that she will be happy to send the standards to anyone who asks for them.
• Dr. Vaughan mentioned that Dr. Gresham had brought up that there were new technology standards.
• Dr. Tareilo replied that she had not heard of them but would obtain a copy.
• Dr. Gresham then remarked that she didn’t know if the new technology standards were complete or not.

Discussion Items:

a. 2nd reading: Appeals for Certification Testing/Student Teaching:
• Dr. Sams expressed concern about students who test on the December 15 deadline not getting their results until after the deadline if they wanted to student teach the following spring semester.
• Dr. Sams also mentioned something about “no lower than on standard error of measure for that exam”
• Dr. Vaughan pointed out that standard deviations will vary.
• Dr. Nerren did say that the student must attempt the exam at least once prior to making an appeal.
• Mr. Zemanek made reference to the previous meeting in which it was suggested that the appeal form have a place for the program coordinator to sign.
• Dr. Sams made a motion to accept the appeals process.
• Dr. Williams seconded the motion.
• All were in favor, none were opposed, and there were no abstentions.
• Dr. Nerren told the group the process would take effect Fall 2016.
• Dr. Mask asked if the student teachers’ cooperating teachers and district administrators were being sent materials on this process.
• Dr. Sinclair inquired if the program coordinator’s signature on the form meant that the coordinator approved.
• Ms. Fernandez suggested the form should include a statement in which the coordinator could oppose the appeal.
• Dr. Gresham felt that it was not wise to include the coordinator’s signature and that the department chair should decide.
• Dr. Welsh suggested that, as the form goes from one level to the next, it could be denied at any level.
• It was also brought up that the appeal be made prior to the first day of student teaching.
• Dr. Williams asked about acknowledgements.
• Dr. Rudolph stated that the form should only require three signatures from the following: the program coordinator, department chair, and associate dean. She added that fewer people to approve the form would improve the process and that she trusted the associate dean.
• Dr. Fox questioned why the appeals process was continuing to be discussed after a motion had been made and seconded and then a vote had been taken.
• Dr. Mask remarked that SFA is stricter than TEA on this issue but that it is a good idea for the educator preparation program at SFA to cover itself.
• Dr. Nerren stated that the process will be piloted as is and, if changes are needed, the council will revisit those later.
• Dr. Abbott concluded the discussion by saying that less than 5% of students even encounter a need to appeal to student teach if they have late content exam scores.

b. 2nd reading: GPA Requirements for Admission vs. Continuance:
• Dr. Nerren began this discussion by reminding the group that, to be admitted to the Educator Preparation Program:
  o Students prior to Fall 2013 were required to have overall and teaching field GPAs of 2.5.
  o Students admitted during/after Fall 2013 were required to have overall and teaching field GPAs of 2.75.
• She added, however, that there is no record of a PEC vote requiring students to maintain these GPAs while in the EPP.
• Dr. Sheriff expressed concern with students being able to go through the program merely with a C average.
• Dr. Vaughan also was concerned about no mandate to maintain the GPAs.
• Dr. Nieberding questioned the credit hours being taken into consideration to which Dr. Nerren replied that TEA wants the transfer hours calculated into the GPAs.
• Dr. Vaughan suggested using the overall GPA at SFA for maintenance purposes.
• Ms. Snyder asked if this issue regarded maintaining the overall GPA or just the GPA on the last 60 hours to which Dr. Nerren replied it could be one, the other, or both.
• Dr. Nieberding said that a last 60-hour GPA is a rolling GPA and that, if a student had a difficult semester, the GPA could drop below the maintenance level (provided the council decided to use only the last 60 hours in the maintenance GPA).
• Dr. Rudolph asked if data could be made available to make this decision.
• Dr. Nerren said this issue would affect less than 10 students.
• She then approached the PEC to see if it would like to consider a third and final reading at the first fall meeting for 2016-17.
• Dr. Abbott advocated voting at the final meeting for 2015-16 so that 2016-17 could begin with a fresh start.
• Dr. Sheriff asked what happens to the 10 or so students whose GPAs fall below the minimum.
• Dr. Vaughan made a motion to require students to maintain a 2.75 (or 2.5 if admitted to the EPP before Fall 2013) either on their overall or last 60 hours while in the EPP.
• Dr. Gresham seconded the motion.
• All were in favor, none were opposed, and there were no abstentions.

c. 1st reading: PBIC Mentor Stipends:
• Dr. Nerren began the discussion by reviewing with them that mentor teachers of PBIC interns are paid $300/intern/semester but that cooperating teachers of student teachers are not compensated at all.
• She proposed reducing the $300 payment made to mentors and begin paying cooperating teachers a small fee.
• She added that cooperating teachers really do more work than the mentors.
• She asked the group to think about the issue for a fall vote.
• Dr. Akerson alluded to an experience he had at Northside ISD in which student teachers could substitute for up to five days but not get paid for two.
• Dr. Abbott said she would have to check on this but was concerned about student teachers substituting without any substitute training because they would be the teacher of record and, therefore, liable for what goes on in the classroom.
• Dr. Welsh questioned if this was a school district or university decision.
• Dr. Solmonson said there are presently people supervising graduate students who do not get compensation and are not involved in teacher preparation.
• Dr. Fox inquired about the $100 that remains after decreasing a mentor’s pay and increasing a cooperating teacher’s pay.
• Dr. Nerren replied that the course fees would be reduced.
• Dr. Olson-Beal remarked that PBIC interns currently pay a $750 course fee each semester of their internship.
• Dr. Abbott broke down the $750 fee as follows: $300 in mentor pay, $300 in field supervisor pay, and $150 for field supervisor travel.
Dr. Vaughan questioned paying mentors from the cooperating teachers’ fund (or vice versa).
Dr. Nerren again approached the group about reducing the payment made to mentors and begin compensating cooperating teachers with a small fee.
Dr. Mask asked when this new compensation plan would be implemented.
Dr. Abbott replied Fall 2017.
Dr. Nerren encouraged the council to vote on it in the first PEC meeting for 2016-17 before the October deadline for curriculum changes.
Dr. Abbott informed everyone that student teachers already pay a $100 fee to cover their field supervisors’ travel.
Ms. Snyder brought up the problems with getting mentors to submit their assignments and/or payment paperwork.
Dr. Nerren said that, when mentors don’t get paid for one or both of those reasons, the course fee is not being used as intended.
Mr. Zemanek asked what PBIC meant, and he was told it stood for Post Baccalaureate Initial Certification.
Dr. Sheriff inquired if cooperating teachers were asking for compensation, and she was told that they indeed were.
Dr. Abbott stressed that some institutions offer compensation in the form of tuition assistance, use of the university’s recreation center, etc.
Dr. Vaughan questioned EC-6 split assignments and if, in those cases, would the two cooperating teachers each receive half the normal compensation in a given semester.
Dr. Martin suggested forming a subcommittee to see what the trends are in compensation.
Dr. Nerren readily told her that CSOTTE has already done the research and some universities compensate and some do not.

Interview (or Other Admission Screening) Instrument Update:
Dr. Sams mentioned three of his students were in SED 370 but still had no idea that an interview (or other admission screening) was required for EPP admission.
Dr. Vaughan admitted to some glitches in the interview (or other admission screening) process.
Dr. Nerren advocated increased communication.
Dr. Sheriff asked if special education students were doing their interviews (or other admission screenings) through Secondary Education.
Dr. Rudolph replied that Dr. Sheriff was correct.

Dr. Abbott asked for items from the floor:
Dr. Rudolph announced that she had copies of material to help departments align their content.

Adjournment:
Dr. Nieberding made a motion to adjourn.
Dr. Hendricks seconded the motion at 2:30 pm.