

**Professional Education Council**

**Minutes**

**September 26, 2019**

**McKee 282; 4:00-5:30 PM**

Present: Jason Robinson, Jennifer Krause, Jennifer Parrish, Jaimie McMullen, Charlie Warren, Mark Montemayor, Kim Mahovsky, Donna Goodwin, Victoria Terranova, Jackie Davis, Ginny Huang, Stan Trembach, Kim Creasy, Maggie Berg

Absent: Jeri Kraver, Wes Tuttle, Brian Rose (proxy Jaimie)

Guests: Meagan Crews, Michelle Heiny

1. **Welcome: Donna Goodwin, Chair**
	* Donna asked for everyone to introduce themselves.
2. **Curriculum Review**
	* New electronic curriculum submission process was reviewed with Meagan Crews. See PowerPoint for more details. A few processing notes:
		+ Login through Ursa, under Employee tab there is a link in the General Information area of the Employee Tools section for Curriculum Workflow
		+ Once curriculum is ready for PEC review, everyone will receive an email when curriculum is ready for review. You can click link from email or login through Ursa to review. Until the curriculum has been reviewed and a decision submitted, everyone on PEC will receive an email each evening (M.W.F) notifying you of curriculum in your queue.
		+ After council reviews and approves, Administrative support (Cheryl) serves as proxy and will approve/deny on council’s behalf.
		+ If council notes “minor” (i.e. spelling), errors they can edit if they choose to through chair proxy.
		+ If you click on the compare versions button, you can see what has been changed. Anything changed is in red.
		+ Any questions let Meagan know and if she gets the questions multiple times, they may make changes.
3. **Old Business**
	* Curriculum review process for PEC:
		+ Brian brought up thoughts on how we should review curriculum through PEC. Donna asked if there was a motion to discuss.
			1. Maggie moved to discuss
		+ Brian is suggesting we identify 2 possible areas of concern/review for PEC. What is our job and what are we looking for? Suggestions are:
			1. Compliance to standards
			2. Impact on programs
		+ Jaimie – it would be great to decide what we should be looking at. We are not content experts in what we are reviewing. Compliance to standards and impact on other programs is something we can objectively look at. Defining what we look at may help streamline the process and make it easier.
		+ Mark – what standards are we reviewing
			1. ILO – institutional learning outcomes
				1. UNC assessment office run by the Provost. New Provost is insisting that all areas align with the ILO’s.
				2. Donna will have Cheryl send link to committee on what the standards are and what areas need to be met. Not every area will meet every standard.
				3. Maggie: What are the benefits:

Unsure what the benefit is, they already exist, not sure PEC has any say to it.

Mark: maybe the ILO’s is for another body to monitor those standards, not PEC? Perhaps it’s not appropriate for PEC to review.

The state won’t require the ILO’s are met for licensure.

Agreed.

Based on the by-laws we could or could not require them. PEC’s interpretation.

* + - * 1. PEC agreed that ILO standards should not be reviewed by the council.
			1. TQS – teacher quality standards
			2. Content standards from CDE
			3. ELL – English language learners standards
			4. SPA standards are up to the content areas
		- Kim M. – when we are presented curriculum will we see the impact statements?
			1. Yes, they are provided.
		- Donna is suggesting we consider telling those submitting curriculum that they must provide the matrices showing where the changes apply. PEC review would then check for:
			1. How does the matrix play into syllabi?
			2. Are there impact statements?
		- Jaimie – programs should go beyond just including the impact statement and provide the resolution to the impact.
			1. Kim C. – sometimes it won’t be resolved
				1. PEC then determines how they would proceed if that was the case.

Does PEC move it forward and let the Dean make the decision.

Kim C. - Maybe utilize the consulting option in the current by-laws to consult with those submitting the curriculum. This may not result in a resolution. But the effort can at least be made and then PEC determines next steps in the review process.

* + - 1. Jaimie – is it our business if the impact on a program is for our approval.
				1. Donna – PEC could pass it on. PEC can make a recommendation and let the CEBS Dean make the decision.
		- It was also suggested that in reviewing the standards, maybe divide into sub-committees and give them a specific set of standards or everyone reviews all standards?
			1. Or we could divide based on what curriculum is received.
			2. Jaimie – always looking at the same standards I would get good at them after reviewing them.
		- Mark – can we provide what our expectations are for PEC.
			1. PEC can come up with something and give to CEBS Dean to review and send to all college Dean’s
		- Do we want to develop some guidelines?
			1. Jaimie - We need a process in place. It doesn’t seem a good use of our time to continue as we have been.
			2. ELL and TQS will be the same across programs
			3. Content standards will take longer for everyone to look at.
			4. Splitting may not work based on what curriculum is received.
			5. Jaimie – proposes that curriculum is divided amongst small groups based on what is received for each meeting.
			6. Jackie – what if those left for voting (due to proxy) didn’t review any of the curriculum being voted on.
			7. Kim. M. – could review be rotated.
		- Donna asked everyone to think on it and we can review.
			1. Kim M. motioned to table for next meeting. Jennifer K seconded.
	+ Donna provided an update on the by-law changes submitted to Faculty Senate.
		- It is currently being reviewed. The most recent update of the by-laws will be sent to the council.
1. **New Business:**
* PEC meeting time – Donna
	+ Does the council want to vote on alternate time for the meeting?
		- Mark thinks it needs to stay at it is
		- Kim C is okay with how it is now.
		- Jackie suggests we send a doodle poll. Jason agrees with doodle poll.
			* Jackie motions to create doodle poll. Maggie seconds. Poll will be sent by Cheryl
* New checkpoint meeting for licensure students - Ginny
	+ Currently CASPA reps are invited to the initial meeting, EDFE 110.
	+ Input from prior attendees states we squeeze a lot of information into the initial meeting and some of it is too early.
	+ For the EDFE 120/Full Admission to PTEP, this is when most teacher candidates are being placed for practicum. Would our students benefit if we had a mandatory meeting for EDFE 120/Full Admission to PTEP?
	+ Ginny wants to know what PEC and the programs think.
		- Jaimie asked if we could create online modules?
			* We currently record the sessions and ask them specific questions to the recording if a student does not attend.
			* Based on feedback a face-to-face meeting gives them more understanding of the seriousness of what is being presented.
			* Meeting with CASPA reps is very powerful and the students really appreciate it.
	+ Ginny asked if everyone would take back to their programs and then we could discuss it again at the next PEC meeting.
	+ Charlie supports the notion of the EDFE 120 meeting. It is important that they get the information just in time. Telling them too early leads to issues. They need the information a little closer to when it is relevant.
* District interview as licensure program requirement – Ginny asked that we table this until there is more definitive information to share.
1. **Reports:**
	* From voting members:
		+ Mark – can we discuss the new checkpoint canvas shells.
			1. Hearing about students who are improperly enrolled in shells
			2. Donna suggested we table this to the next meeting
	* From advisory members:
* Victoria – Undergraduate Council – we are updating by-laws and aligning them with the board policy. Sub-committee formed to review how moving forward we can improve on program success and evaluation.
* Stan – Library – semester off to good start. Beginning their 4th dissertation writing and report workshop. Looking to offer twice a year at end of November and then end of February/early March.
* Charlie – Licensure – fingerprinting process has been rough. Most of our students are clearing fine, but we have had a few with troubles. Charlie is working through the issues with various law enforcement agencies to iron out the issues.
	+ If there is a student in your area with an issue, send them to Charlie for review.
	+ School districts cannot fingerprint one of our candidates and make them pay for it. This is against the law.
* Charlie is developing a Canvas catalog shell specifically for Licensure. Charlie still must figure out how to get it to the appropriate students.
* Leadership/Mentorship certificate is being offered from CDE – this allows practicing teachers to earn leadership and mentorship specific training.
* PRAXIS has separated the tests for Principals, Superintendents and Directors of Special Education. Direct questions to Charlie.
1. **PEC Vacancies:**
	* We still have these vacancies:
	* Secondary Partner School – Wes Tuttle could still attend if a member wants to recommend him for another term.
	* Elementary Partner School
	* Undergraduate Student Representative
	* Graduate Student Representative

Jaimie motioned to adjourn, Jackie seconded. Meeting adjourned

*Minutes submitted by Cheryl Sparks*