

**Professional Education Council**

**Minutes**

**April 25, 2019**

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

Present: Brian Rose, Donna Goodwin, Jason Robinson, Jackie Davis, Michelle Heiny, Ginny Huang, Stan Trembach, Collin Brooks, Jaimie McMullen, Charlie Warren, Teresa Higgins (Zoom), Jennifer Krause (Zoom), Maggie Berg (Zoom)

Absent: Wes Tuttle, Val Middleton, Courtney Luce, Kim Mahovsky (proxy to Donna Goodwin), Scott Franklin

Guests: Mark Montemayor, Nancy Glen, Yolanda Chatwood

1. **Welcome: Brian Rose, Chair**
2. **Approval of 2.28.19 and 3.28.19 Minutes**
   * Jackie motioned to approve 2.28.19 minutes, Jason seconded. All in favor with correction of the spelling of Jaimie’s last name. Approved.
   * Jason motioned to approve 3.28.19 minutes, Teresa seconded. All in favor. Approved.
3. **Curriculum Review**
   * Music Education: Proposing to add a new course, modeled after current EDSE 433 course. All standards are aligned and met in the new course. New course would be MUS 433. Program updates would require either of the 433 courses.
     + Donna motioned to consider curriculum change, Jaimie seconded.
     + Discussion:
       1. Ginny: Students could take either course? What is the difference?
          1. The MUS section is the same directives as the current EDSE course but applied more specifically to a music classroom.
          2. The rule at UNC is to not create a new course if one already exists. Also, for any program that creates a course, availability for faculty resource needs to be considered. What if the availability no longer exists?
       2. Jackie - What is the impact to SPED?
          1. Per the Director the impact should be minimal with one fewer section per semester.
       3. Ginny – You are creating a new course to help MUS students graduate on time. You are not reducing credits, just creating a new course to better benefit the students.
          1. Yes.
       4. Jaimie – she sees the concern Ginny brought up because creating a similar course would be setting a precedence for other programs to request their own section.
          1. Mark suggests that having a more program specific course makes the education more involved for the students.
          2. Ginny agrees philosophically, but as an institution there were decisions made long ago about how to proceed. She is unsure of the current context.
       5. Jennifer – this course is different enough because the content is specific to music and wouldn’t violate the rules. She did not compare the class objectives to each other. They have a course in a similar field as EDSE 433 but decided to keep both courses because the students should have more than 1 course in SPED. She is in support of the course because students in other programs don’t always see how some courses apply to their program. Students struggle to see the crossover.
          1. Mark sees an opportunity for the instructor to offer something specific to their program.
          2. Yolanda states that some of what she is currently teaching is not offered in the regular course, but music students benefit from.
       6. The course is similar as they must meet the same standards.
       7. Who is responsible for deciding if a course is similar?
          1. Michelle states it is part of the last line of approval.
          2. Michelle – can the students take both courses? Are you comfortable with having the students get credit for taking both? Are the courses different enough to get credit for both?
       8. Donna – the courses are not cross-listed? No, they could take both.
          1. What is in place to ensure the same syllabi is used if the instructor was to change in the future. They approve the syllabi and expect it to be taught that way.
     + Donna motions to approve the course as presented and the program changes to include the new course, Jaimie seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.
4. **Old Business**
   * By-law review
     + Brian asked everyone to review the by-laws. Brian has worked closely with Eugene on the by-laws and they drafted some language.
       1. First note was answering the question of who do we recommend to?
          1. We recommend to any licensure program. The language Eugene and Brian came up with is in blue in the document provided.
     + Teresa asked how this works.
       1. Brian says that it is for recommendations that PEC wishes to make to all licensure programs, but is specific to Article II, Section 2 of the by-laws.
     + Ginny remembers that PEC has the responsibility to ensure standards are followed.
     + Brian and Eugene discussed rules vs. by-laws. For example, the syllabi guideline is a rule that was adopted, but is not a by-law. We can use this new by-law update to “remind” everyone of changes and their need to align to the changes.
     + Jaimie motions to approve Article II, Section 2, Subsection a as written in highlighted blue on newest version of by-laws, Jason seconded. All in favor. Approved.
     + All by-law changes go to Faculty Senate for final approval. Donna will present them on behalf of PEC.
5. **New Business**
   * Vice Chair:
     + Donna nominated Jaimie.
     + Will send out another request for nominations, confirm with nominees and then vote next week.
   * Curriculum review process for PEC:
     + Jaimie has a concern about PEC needing to know what all the applicable standards are (2nd to last sentence in document provided). It was agreed that PEC could not sustain that.
     + Brian - going through our recent reauthorization it was found that most areas did not have the standards set-up.
     + Ginny – programs were using standards that were not all current. Many content areas have standards that are changed. Your programs must match the current standards.
     + Jackie – maybe re-wording to state that anything presented to us be accurate.
     + Brian – we could add responsibilities of the presenters.
     + We can table this document for now.
   * Teacher Quality Standard alignment
     + We don’t need to discuss but need to be aware that the teacher quality standards have been revised. Areas should be notified to ensure their programs are meeting the revised standards.
   * Other items from membership
     + Jaimie – I have questions from students about the new required background check:
       1. If students have been checked through a certain district, they still must do this check? Yes, they do, new law is for CDE to get the check and distribute to districts.
       2. A student did a background check with a checkpoint does that count?
          1. Not unless it was this exact process that just passed legislature.
       3. If they have fingerprints on file with local police, they still must do it?
          1. Yes.
       4. If they are already on file with CDE, they don’t have to do it?
          1. Correct
       5. How long does it last?
          1. Lifetime.
          2. A note from Charlie: CDE will not vet the background checks until an application is submitted. Districts are struggling because the state will get updates, but not the districts. Some districts want to do their own background check, so they get flagged with updates. Cherry Creek and Academy 20 are currently requesting another background check and Poudre is inquiring about doing it also.
       6. As instructors with field experience, do we have any responsibility to ensure the student has done the background check or review those who are flagged with a criminal instance?
          1. No.
          2. Charlie will review those who have completed the check and review for convictions. If they have convictions, he will require those students to make appointments to review with Charlie.
          3. Do programs need to be flagged for positive checks?

They would be notified if it impacts a student’s ability to complete the program. Any other communication is a violation of FERPA rules.

* + - * 1. Do I as an instructor have to do anything if a student registered in my course ends up with a criminal record?

No.

1. R**eports:**

* Charlie –
  + new background check process is going pretty good right now. The time of year is helping allow students to go home and get the checks done.
* Ginny –
  + ELL support team sent out another notification. Canvas will be ready May 1st and notice will go to coordinators. Encourage them to upload the documents. It needs to be done by June 1st.
* Stan –
  + Nothing to report

1. **PEC Vacancies:**

* Let’s start this during the new year.

Jaimie motioned. Jacki seconded. Meeting adjourned

*Minutes submitted by Cheryl Sparks*