PEC Minutes
February 4, 2015

The Professional Educator’s Council (PEC) met Wednesday, February 4, at 1:30 pm in the Steen Library’s Wyatt Room.

Members attending:
Dr. Adam Akerson, Dr. Carla Murgia, Ms. Carrie Durrett, Ms. Carrie Williams, Dr. Chris Sams, Dr. Claudia Whitley, Mr. David Goodman, Dr. Elizabeth Vaughan, Dr. Heather Olson Beal, Dr. Jannah Nerren, Dr. Jeanie Gresham, Mr. Joe Strahl, Dr. Jose Neftali Recinos, Dr. Josephine Taylor, Dr. Judy Abbott, Ms. Julie Stadler, Dr. Kathleen Sheriff, Ms. Katie Snyder, Ms. Libby Rhodes, Ms. Lisa Stone, Dr. Lynda Martin, Dr. Mark Turner, Ms. Melissa McMillian-Cunningham, Dr. Michelle Williams, Dr. Nancy Shepherd, Dr. Paige Mask, Dr. Paula Griffin, Dr. Robbie Steward, Ms. Shelia Dyer, Dr. Ali Hachem for Dr. Stacy Hendricks, Dr. Susan Casey, Dr. Tom Judson, and Dr. Tracey Hasbun.

Not attending: Dr. Dale Perritt, Ms. Elizabeth Spradley, Dr. Glen McCuller, Ms. Hayley Gillen, Dr. Janet Tareilo, Dr. Jay Thornton, Dr. Joyce Johnston, Dr. Kimberly Welsh, Dr. Le’Ann Solmonson, Ms. Lindsey Kennon, Dr. Manny Brand, Dr. Michael Munro, Dr. Mike Martin, Dr. Neill Armstrong, Dr. Paul Sandul, Dr. Pauline Sampson, Dr. Scott Slough, Dr. Scott Whitney, Dr. Stacy Hendricks, Mr. Stan Bobo, and Dr. William Nieberding.

Dr. Abbott called the meeting to order and then asked for introductions.

The minutes from October 30 were reviewed:

- Dr. Vaughan made a motion to accept.
- Dr. Murgia seconded.
- All voted to approve the minutes.

Dr. Nerren gave an update on the transition from NCATE to CAEP:

- She said that the CAEP Unit Assessment Committee had been looking at assessments and began by drafting a dispositions statement by using a model from the University of Houston-Clear Lake. The draft emphasizes the six core values of the Perkins COE.
- Dr. Nerren stressed that dealing with dispositions is difficult and subjective.
- Dr. Murgia suggested taking out “culturally” before “diverse people” to make the language more inclusive.
- Dr. Abbott mentioned the shift in emphasis from teacher preparation to educator preparation.
- Some members suggested that “professional education candidates” replace “teacher candidates.”
• One member asked if the assessment adequately checks for a candidate’s curiosity for his/her content area.
• Dr. Vaughan brought up lifelong learning.
• Dr. Abbott commented that advanced certification candidates should document continuous learning whereas initial certification candidates should demonstrate joining professional organizations and learning communities as well as reading professional journals.
• There was also discussion on in-service versus professional development.
• Dr. Turner said that professional development is too often seen as a once per year necessity.
• Dr. Vaughan agreed that it should be viewed as ongoing.
• Dr. Judson mentioned that professional development varies in quality, is sometimes a waste of time, and that teachers are aware.
• Dr. Goodman asked if the candidates actually fill out the questions on the draft and added that a checklist should contain statements not questions.
• Dr. Nerren replied that it was merely a document for candidates to read to preliminarily assess themselves and that the actual assessment instrument was not developed yet.
• Dr. Abbott stressed that the document can be modified as needed.
• Using a Likert scale was brought up.
• Dr. Nerren said that the professional dispositions statement will likely be posted on the PCOE website.
• Dr. Sams suggested changing “on time” to “on time regularly” and “participate” to “actively participate.”
• Dr. Abbott emphasized again that the statement with descriptors under the core beliefs is not the instrument.
• Dr. Nerren suggested that, by the end of next week, committee members send potential revisions via email.
• Dr. Abbott proposed voting at the April PEC meeting while Dr. Nerren suggested an email vote at the end of next week.
• Dr. Abbott added the possible use of a Qualtrex survey for an email vote.

Dr. Hasbun gave an update on SPA reports:

• She announced that Kimberly Welsh was the new writer for the Role 6 Reading Specialist report.
• She added that Susan Casey would be writing the new report for the Master of Education in Early Childhood. There will be a meeting February 10 to go over the report and that it would be submitted in Fall 2015 or even maybe Spring 2016.
• It was brought up that the Educational Diagnostician report will be resubmitted in March 2015. Dr. Hasbun agreed to help Dr. Mask clarify the basis for the resubmission.
• A member asked if a new submission was in addition to the three maximum resubmissions.
• Dr. Abbott reassured the group that Dr. Hasbun will be working with the SPA writers outside the PCOE if their program is recognized with conditions and a resubmission is due in September 2015.

The next item concerned student teaching:

• Ms. Durrett reported that Spring 2015 began with 240 student teachers but that number had been reduced to 207 because of some not passing TExES exams. She added that the student teachers are dispersed among 42 school districts.
• Dr. Nerren emphasized important dates for Fall 2015, especially the student teaching application deadline of February 15.
• Ms. Snyder reminded the group that remote supervision of initial certification candidates is going away in Fall 2015.
• Dr. Nerren shared with everyone that Assessment and Accountability has drafted a grievance policy which would be covered later in discussion items.

Ms. Stone and Dr. Abbott spoke about the Student Success Initiative:

• 168 candidates had gone through the initiative.
• The success rate was 90%.
• It is mainly for freshmen and sophomores on probation or suspension.
• The candidates meet every month through May with their advisor.
• The results have been good.
• Retention is the purpose of the initiative
• The advisor’s role was being transformed.

Next there was discussion regarding curriculum:

• Ms. Stone mentioned that there’s a new online university approval system for curriculum changes and that Kimberly Welsh is over it.
• Dr. Vaughan said that the PEC should be more involved in this approval system.
• Dr. Abbott stated she realized how everyone is concerned about how curriculum changes will affect their individual departments, prerequisites and credit hours.
• Dr. Abbott suggested a summary table linked to the curriculum document but that such a link cannot be done in one week.
• To firm up the table listing with descriptors, Dr. Abbott asked everyone to think of their degree plans and to email for deeper information regarding the vote system.
• Dr. Martin stressed rationale.
• Dr. Abbott said to consider it done.

Discussion item 1-Proposed “C” rule:
• Dr. Vaughan proposed that the PEC not take action at this time because a blanket approach is not a good one.
• Some members felt that the increased GPA requirement will take care of the “C” issue.
• Many agreed that a department-by-department approach is better.
• Concern was expressed over how the “C” rule would affect transfer candidates.
• Other questions arose about how the rule would be monitored and enforced.
• Dr. Abbott said that “too much trouble” was not a good reason to not monitor grades and that maybe Webfocus rather than a “hand/eye” technique could be used for grade monitoring.
• Dr. Judson said it is not within his department’s power to enforce the “C” rule.
• Dr. Sheriff suggested quick monitoring and a forced drop date.
• Dr. Turner brought up issues concerning excessive hours and monetary issues for candidates.
• Dr. Abbott made a motion to accept the recommendations of the subcommittee or deny them.
• Dr. Turner moved to accept the motion to not require a “C” in designated courses as a whole. Instead, keep it a departmental decision in departments granting degrees.
• Dr. Gresham seconded the motion.
• Dr. Olson Beal said that the official wording should not be for just degrees.
• Dr. Abbott asked if the original motion should be amended to include departments and programs.
• Dr. Akerson seconded the motion.
• All voted to approve.

Discussion item 2-Proposed TEA Grievance Policy:

• Dr. Nerren reviewed with everyone what the draft said.
• Dr. Vaughan stressed that it should specify academic, not grade, appeals.
• Dr. Vaughan reinforced that, because of university policy A-2, the grievance order should be faculty-chair-dean-committee.
• It was agreed that the final paragraph is the heart of what TEA wants in the policy.
• Dr. Steward suggested that “Educator Preparation” be added to the title.
• Ms. McMillian-Cunningham noted that the final paragraph switches between the second and third person.

Discussion item 3-Student Teaching Placement

Dr. Nerren announced:

• There is a new Field Experience and Clinical Practice Committee.
• There are many online student teachers who are not near partner school districts.
• The placement of these student teachers needs to accommodate both the student teachers and the field supervisors.
• Online student teachers would have to agree to student teach in a school district no greater than 45 miles from home.
• The current practice requires at least four student teachers per site.

Other comments on discussion item 3:

• Dr. Martin suggested changing “up to” to “no greater than.”
• Others asked why not change 45 to 60 miles.
• Dr. Judson suggested basing the maximum on hours rather than miles. Some members pointed out that one hour traveling in a metropolitan area generally results in less distance covered than in a rural area.
• Dr. Nerren replied that 45 miles was simply what the committee came up with as a starting point.
• Dr. Mask proposed hyphenating and/or giving requirements a range.
• Dr. Williams stressed “don’t ask for what you don’t need.”
• Dr. Nerren brought up charging remote student teachers a course fee to cover field supervisor travel.
• Ms. McMillian-Cunningham asked about using alumni to supervise remote sites.
• Dr. Abbott asked the group to move on to the next item since the second reading for student teaching placement would be in April.

Discussion item 4-Remote Supervision

It was agreed that this item would be covered in its second reading at the April meeting.

Discussion item 5-Proposed Process and Limitations for Certification Testing:

• Dr. said that, if a candidate fails a certification test five times, it becomes public record. She asked what does the committee want to do about it?
• A committee member asked who locks candidates out of testing. Ms. Stadler replies that she does.
• The group agreed that the procedure needs to be “up front.”
• Dr. Abbott reinforced with everyone that candidates will still complain even if there is a policy and they have access to it.
• She added that 20% at most may be affected by this procedure and that 500 candidates per semester are recommended.
• Certification testing was likened to the bar exam.
• Dr. Abbott asked the committee if it was right to stop candidates if they cannot pass the PPR or content exams.
• Dr. Nerren suggested waiting to cap in the April meeting.
• A motion was made by Dr. Casey to accept the clearance procedure.
• Ms. McMillian-Cunningham seconded the motion.
• All voted to approve.
Discussion item 6-Proposed Process for PBIC Admissions

- Dr. Nerren said the proposed process would streamline the PBIC admissions and use less paper.
- Ms. Snyder stated that she would be the central receiving person and would make the program more in line with TEA requirements.
- Dr. Mask asked for more than one box for two certifications.
- Dr. Murgia made a motion to accept the process.
- Dr. Griffin seconded the motion.
- All voted to approve.

There were no items from the floor. Dr. Abbott emphasized that this is the first year to have three meetings which allows for flexibility for two readings of discussion items.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm. The next meeting will be April 23 from 1-2:30 pm.