

**Minutes of the  
Licensure Subcommittee of the NC  
Professional Educator Preparation and  
Standards Commission Meeting (Virtual)**

301 N. Wilmington Street  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601  
March 31, 2022

**The Licensure Subcommittee of the North Carolina Professional Educator Preparation and Standards Commission (PEPSC) met and the following members and staff were present:**

Dr. Ann Bullock	Dr. Alvera Lesane
Dr. Christopher Blanton	Dr. Amanda Bullard Maxwell
Ms. Megan Boren	Dr. Bradley Smith
Ms. Jill Camnitz	Ms. Lori Stacey
Dr. Vivian Covington	Ms. Maureen Stover
Dr. Kimberly Creamer	Ms. Melissa Tooley
Mr. Robert Ellyson	Dr. Tom Tomberlin
Dr. Chris Godwin	Dr. Kim Evans
Ms. Virginia Gutierrez	Ms. Maya Kaul
Ms. Sarah Greer Koenig	

**Licensure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**

The link to the recorded subcommittee meeting is  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZSpJexilnyc>.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Bullock thanked everyone for their attendance and started the subcommittee meeting. The purpose of today's meeting is to discuss the updated model shared by DPI. We shared DPI's presentation to PEPSC via email. The model in discussion is a *starting point*, not a final point.

**I. Discussions of Updated Model**

- Co-Chair Bullock begins by opening up the floor for clarifying questions of the model.
  - Mr. Ellyson asks about the compensation at each level. Is this the state rate, not including any district supplements?
    - Dr. Tomberlin confirms this is correct.
  - Ms. Koenig asks if this model goes away with the current pay scale?
    - Dr. Tomberlin notes this is correct. The only place in this model where years come into play is in the renewal cycle for the License IV teacher, where a successful 5-year renewal comes with a \$5,000 bump in salary.

- Dr. Lesane asks in chat: So based on the explanation, a teacher could basically advance to the next level with \$5k increases in two renewal cycles? (I apologize but my microphone is not working so I will be using the chat.)
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that this is kind of the case. But the advanced teacher roles are conducting their renewals in a similar way. Presumably if Advanced Teacher renewals have a successful renewal, then their base salary would go up at the same rate as all other License IV. Nobody would be stagnating.
  - Dr. Lesane responds in chat: I understand that ... I am just concerned about comparable jobs in the district. Support roles .... I like the model, I am just trying to address all considerations. I think this will make us more competitive but will require ensuring our field understands the levels.
- Co-Chair Bullock asks the group to share things in the model that they liked.
  - Mr. Ellyson shares that he likes that there are multiple levels that someone is able to transition to different licenses throughout their career and make more money. The more professional development they demonstrate, they can progress in the profession.
  - Ms. Stover shares that she likes that this model enables experienced teachers to support earlier career teachers. I also appreciate that there are opportunities for advancement within teaching that do not require leaving teaching for administration.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that she agrees that a highlight of the model is that teachers can stay in the model and grow, and be valued for that.
  - Ms. Gutierrez appreciates the Apprentice teacher role – it could be a potential recruitment strategy to bring in new teachers.
  - Ms. Tooley notes in chat: +1 to the apprentice teacher role. I also like that DPI thought through some of the nitty gritty details that they detailed in the full presentation
  - Dr. Covington shares in chat: I like the starting salary for new teachers.
- Co-Chair Bullock asks the group to share feedback they have on the model.
  - Dr. Godwin shares that he is concerned with a potential overreliance on microcredentials. Several PSUs I work with have shared concerns about how this would be managed by DPI. We need to make sure we are all held accountable in a comparable way.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that she and Co-Chair Wood shares concerns that the proposed model is overly-complicated and could be streamlined.
  - Dr. Covington shares her concern that this could de-incentivize the traditional program – perhaps this is what it is designed to do. If I am a parent, my kid could go to community college and do some microcredentials to go to License I. Then, they would receive an advancement account to get to License II. By the time I get to License III, I

will be vested in the state of North Carolina. Whereas, if I go to a 4-year program and incur debt, I'll make less money and receive less total funding from a professional advancement account. Another concern is that we have declining enrollments in EPPs. I could change all of my programs to B.A.s. For these teachers, I wouldn't have to do the regular reporting. We know that EPP graduates are the most effective and stay in the field.

- Dr. Lesane responds in chat: Excellent point
- Dr. Godwin notes in chat: Excellent Vivian
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that it's not clear what the role of EPPs are in this model.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes that he somewhat objects to the way that this was presented. There was no intent. If we could agree as a group to have intellectually honest comments about this, that would be helpful. In this model, Dr. Covington referenced either meeting content or pedagogy – that was the old display. That doesn't reflect what's been updated in this model. The idea that microcredentials drive the whole model is nowhere in this model. I'm happy to talk through the merits of this model and how it could work. I don't understand taking it all out of context. Anyone going through the EPP system can come out making \$45,000 today in the current model.
- Dr. Godwin notes in chat: This is too harsh. I do not think that is what Vivian stated...
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that she isn't clear what the role of EPPs is in this model.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes that, at each stage, it says that the routing of this person has to be done in conjunction with the sponsorship of an EPP or PSU. In those articulations of those supports, it says as directed by the MOU between the EPP and PSU. If the subcommittee wants to clarify the absolute role of the EPP, we can do that.
- Ms. Tooley notes that part of the issue here might be that we're focusing too much on the summary slides. I think these details come through the detailed slides.
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that we can do that, but the summary slide graphic is what comes up online—e.g., on social media. I think a fair next step is to make it more clear on the graphic.
- Dr. Covington notes that she is making an intellectually sound argument. The model still has content/pedagogy under License II and III.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes in chat: I did not mean to be harsh, I am simply pointing out that there is a lot of insinuation that the

model is designed to the detriment of EPPs. I don't believe such comments are productive. He adds that suggesting that the goal of this model is to eliminate EPPs is not a productive line of discussion.

- Co-Chair Bullock reminds everyone that her question to the group was if anyone had any concerns. I did not know what concerns people would share in anticipation of the meeting. We need people to have a safe space to share any concerns they have.
- Ms. Camnitz notes that, as a member of the Roundtable, that there was no intention to disincentivize EPPs. Rather, we saw this as incentivizing EPPs.
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that maybe it is a marketing issue, rather than a model issue.
- Ms. Tooley notes in chat: Agreed, Ann.
- Dr. Godwin notes that we could make the columns more narrow in the graphic. This may help clarify some things for people. One of the problems people are having is that people are seeing 3 columns before the EPP role.
- Ms. Camnitz notes in chat: That's a great idea!
- Ms. Koenig notes in chat: I Agree with Chris.
- Dr. Covington notes in chat: Thank you Jill. Currently there are way more people coming in Lic I and II (Residency) at ECU than traditional routes. It's not clear to me that \$10,000/year will change that.
  - Dr. Smith notes in chat: Agreed, Vivian. We are seeing similar trends at UNC Charlotte. Enrollment in our residency licensure programs is growing much faster than enrollment in our traditional programs.
- Ms. Tooley notes that, when people see the graphic, a lot of people think you have to start at the beginning and work through the full model. We could clarify that candidates can enter at Licensure III.
- Dr. Camnitz notes in chat: I hear you. They still need what EPPs have to offer.
- Ms. Stover notes that she appreciates that the Apprentice teacher level allows folks to get paid while getting experience. In the current model, the unpaid internship is a barrier to entering teaching.
  - Dr. Gutierrez notes in chat: I agree with Ms. Stover.
- Ms. Tooley notes that a registered apprenticeship is a very technical role, prescribed by federal legislation. If we are thinking of this operating as a true registered apprenticeship, I think it's okay to use this language. We should be careful with our language if this is not the case though.

- Dr. Tomberlin notes that we have been having conversations with Kathryn Castelloes about potentially pursuing the registered apprenticeship route.
- Dr. Covington clarifies what the role of License IV teachers is in supporting Apprentice teachers.
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that this would be very similar to our TA role, but it is licensed/indicated that this person is not planning on staying in the classified role. The apprentice teacher would be working under the direct supervision of a License IV+ teacher.
  - Dr. Covington notes that this is important because, when people hear this, they think it will help with the shortage. However, this will be two people in one classroom.
- Dr. Bullard-Maxwell asks in chat: Has the compensation for the Licensure IV teacher supervisor been fleshed out? Will there be compensation?
- Mr. Ellyson asks if apprentice teachers must have an A.A. or higher? Are there credit hour requirements? Are these general credit hours, or are they in a specific are? When we created the mentor teacher roles, there were instances where we didn't have candidates for those roles so we had to create workarounds. My concern is that we may have schools that don't have teachers eligible for Advanced teacher roles, which could create equity gaps between schools.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that she's not sure if these requirements are "or" (i.e., you need one or more on the list) or "and" (i.e., you need them all). For example, do Apprentice teachers need an A.A. AND 60 credit hours towards a baccalaureate degree?
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that these are "or."
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that this should be a clarification in our model.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes that he would be concerned about being overly restricted in this area. Once it's in policy, we are going to get a million calls from a million LEAs arguing that they have good candidates who do not exactly meet these requirements (e.g., specific credit hours). The restrictive nature is going to be problematic because we will find great people who don't have the exact right configuration and then we'd have to say no to that person.
- Ms. Tooley notes that it's a hard needle to thread. On the one hand, you don't want to leave out good candidates. On the other hand, you want to make sure the candidate is on their way to achieving a B.A. and can actually complete the requirements before the end of their Apprentice teacher period. My sense is that this is why these requirements are more stringent than a regular TA position.
- Ms. Camnitz enters in chat (in response to earlier questions from Dr. Smith and Dr. Covington): Brad and Vivian, do we have any

understanding of why that shift is occurring? If fewer traditional college students are choosing education, would this new system attract more of them?

- Dr. Covington notes that they are discussing how more of their candidates are entering teaching through non-traditional pathways.
- Dr. Smith notes that he thinks it's a hiring issue. Schools are needing to hire more and more folks.
- Mr. Ellyson notes that 53% of our beginning teachers come through alternative pathways.
- Dr. Lesane notes in chat: We experience similar patterns in Durham Public Schools.
- Dr. Godwin notes in chat: Amazing...Same at Campbell, larger Residency...
- Dr. Bullard-Maxwell notes in chat: Same for UMO....currently 107 in Residency
- Dr. Covington notes that when the cut-off was coming for no health care and retirement, we had a huge rush of students coming in for summer courses before that deadline. Folks are savvy. When we get later down in the model, I have a question what folks who don't want to become mentor teachers do if they want to make more money. We could have other incentives here – e.g., graduates of EPPs could have no additional requirements (tests or microcredentials). Right now, it's out there that, if you don't take the test in the first year and pass it in the third year, you aren't eligible for a license. We have a lot of folks who don't even attempt it in the first year and we don't do anything to them. If they don't pass it by the third year, we get them a limited license. Somewhere in my mind, we have to have the stomach to say yes or no so that it doesn't fall on a single person. I think this warrants a lot of conversation in terms of this model.
- Ms. Tooley notes in chat (in response to Dr. Covington's question): Those are salary minimums in the licensure framework, so they would still get experience salary bumps, right?
  - Ms. Boren notes in chat: The license IV slide says that a teacher would make \$56k when licensed and can get a \$5k bump at each 5 year license renewal.
  - Dr. Tomberlin responds in chat: Just to clarify, License IV is \$56K
  - Ms. Boren notes in chat: \$45k is the salary for a license III teacher, which is not a professional teacher yet - that looks like an initial license, correct?

- Dr. Covington notes in chat: Yes, I was talking about staying at Lic 3.
- Dr. Tomberlin responds in chat: One could not stay at a License III in this model
  - Ms. Tooley clarifies, asking if Dr. Covington's question was about Level IV Expert category? Is the concern because they would have a supervisory role?
- Dr. Covington notes that she wonders if the supervisory piece is required. We have other staff roles that support this. We have a lot of good teachers who are not good at working with other adults. Do I have to mentor at License IV? While I'm helping others, if I don't meet my own renewal standards, then I fall back in the model.
- Ms. Tooley thanks Dr. Covington for the clarification. She notes that she sees the Apprentice role as a TA role, where it's additional help in the classroom for teachers. I was thinking this as something as teachers would want, but I'd be curious for others' thoughts on this.
- Ms. Camnitz enters in chat: I don't know the question of requiring mentorship has been discussed, if not, we should put that on the list.
  - Dr. Bullard responds in chat: That is my question - Will those who supervise Apprentice Teachers be compensated?
- Ms. Stover notes that she agrees with Ms. Tooley. As a teacher, I see this as an opportunity to both support teachers in their early years and provide more classroom support in the classroom. When I look at the advanced roles, I see them more as an opportunity for teachers to grow. In the current model, those roles are not being compensated/structured. They are taking that work on and finding ways to weave it into their workday. This updated model provides a way to actually compensate this labor and build it into to teachers' workdays. As a teacher who mentors younger teachers, I don't have an opportunity to do this doing the day, so we have to find times outside of our regular workdays. This is a way to redefine the way education is happening in North Carolina. This is a way, as teachers, we can lean in and be part of the solution, per Leandro.
  - Dr. Covington responds in chat: I agree Maureen, but this model says a teacher has to.
- Dr. Godwin notes that it depends on the Apprentice teacher and License IV teacher. We have some teachers who are more than willing to host student teachers. Then we also have some.
- Ms. Tooley proposes considering requiring some in-school support role experience prior to becoming an Apprentice teacher, to distinguish them from those with no school experience.
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for feedback on License I.
  - Mr. Ellyson enters in chat: I think we revisit putting an amount of time someone can hold a particular license. This complicates tracking and

impacts non-renewal of contracts. I believe that teachers that are not motivated to make more money will take themselves out of the situation and principals will be motivated to remove them from their schools.

- Dr. Smith notes we need to be clear with our language around “affiliated with an EPP or an employer that guides routing.”
- Mr. Ellyson note that he would advocate for not using something that we’re using right now with the residency. They enter the profession and they don’t move to the next level until they *complete* a program— whether that’s residency or a traditional program. I know that districts hardly have any staff to try to track that. I would suggest taking out the language “affiliation” and use the language of “program completion” at higher licensure levels so that it’s more matter of fact.
  - Dr. Godwin notes in chat: Great point Rob
  - Dr. Gutierrez notes in chat: Rob, That is a very good idea, as it is extremely challenging to manage these.
- Ms. Tooley asks for clarification for what “an employer that guides routing” means.
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that this is definitely a point that needs to be worked out by the subcommittee. We decided that subcommittees should determine if EPP affiliation is required in our model.
- Dr. Covington enters in chat: 60+ EPPs in NC
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that Dr. Tomberlin’s comment is very different from what was said before. This will be under our next step to determine who should determine the routing for Licensure I. I will put this under next steps.
- Dr. Covington asks where the 18 hour requirement comes from, given that we are operating with 24 hours in the current model.
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that we provide the opportunity to hold an emergency permit to teach with 18 hours until they reach the 24 hours for residency. That is where the 18 hours come from. This is just something for you to react to though – we hope that you will edit these things as you see appropriate.
  - Dr. Covington notes that currently folks need credit hours. In the current model, could teachers get microcredential credit?
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that this is not correct. Microcredentials are merely included in the model as an alternative to the licensure exam testing.
  - Dr. Godwin responds in chat: That is a helpful description of the usage of microcredentials. Thank you.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that she noted the 18 vs. 24 hour requirement as something for us to return to as a subcommittee.

- Dr. Tomberlin notes that the 18 hour goes back into the Apprentice as what's required for the A.A.
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for feedback on License II.
  - Co-Chair Bullocks asks how microcredentials would be equivalent to content. It's more clear how they're clear to pedagogy.
    - Dr. Tomberlin notes that microcredentials would need to be created to measure content.
  - Co-Chair Bullock asks for clarification around cut scores.
    - Dr. Tomberlin notes that, if individuals choose the testing route, they would have to meet the SBE-approved cut score.
  - Dr. Lesane asks in chat: Specifically, on this slide for License II, what is the asterick by MCs referencing?
  - Dr. Godwin asks who would develop microcredentials and how?
    - Dr. Tomberlin says no, not at this time. This would be the work of the agency to develop those if we move forward with microcredentials in the model.
  - Co-Chair Bullock asks how we would ensure inter-rater reliability with PEER.
    - Dr. Tomberlin notes that we currently do not with principal observations. One of the ways to build reliability is through multiple, independent observers. That's the approach we've taken with PEER. This is hypothetical currently. We don't have good data on peer observations because we don't collect this data as a state.
  - Dr. Gutierrez asks in chat: Does the pedagogy exam include edTPA/PPAT or is it Praxis Principles of Teaching and Learning?
    - Dr. Evans responds in chat: edTPA/PPAT are pedagogy exams
  - Dr. Godwin notes that Standard III isn't currently in observations for teachers. Would this require a change?
    - Dr. Tomberlin notes that this could be changed because it's under the purview of the SBE – not statute.
    - Dr. Godwin notes that we would need to know that from the principal perspective.
    - Dr. Tomberlin notes that we would need to change the abbreviated to reflect III and IV, rather than I and IV. The goal here is to not make you do something else. We would align our standard expectations with what principals are already doing.
  - Dr. Covington asks in chat: Do PSUs have concerns about making those decisions that will involve a teacher's salary?
  - Ms. Tooley asks if student surveys include questions about surveys. I wonder about how well students can assess that aspect of their classroom experience.

- Dr. Godwin enters in chat: I am still concerned about these surveys.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes we have piloted two student surveys in North Carolina, but don't currently use surveys across the state, including Ron Ferguson's. These surveys were predictive of how teachers performed on the growth measure. We found that students below Grade 3 were not able to give really good feedback.
- Ms. Tooley enters in chat: Ron Ferguson's is Tripod, has great data/research behind it
- Dr. Godwin notes in chat: I thought this committee was not very supportive of using these surveys?
- Ms. Tooley notes that she isn't questioning the use of student surveys. It was more about whether they could measure content and pedagogy separately.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes that there are questions that get at both content and pedagogy that could be analyzed separately.
- Mr. Ellyson notes in chat: I would not support student surveys at this time.
- Ms. Koenig enters in chat: Chris, that was my understanding as well that the majority of us did not support the idea of student surveys.
- Dr. Bullard-Maxwell enters in chat: I do not support student surveys.
- Ms. Boren notes in chat: There was another committee - the Advancement committee I think - that recommended the student surveys
- Dr. Godwin enters in chat: Ann, you may want to put discussion of student surveys back on the burner. sounds like we are not all on board with that idea.
- Ms. Stover enters in chat: For the record, as a practicing classroom teacher, I do support the use of student surveys. There is robust research and data that correlates student outcomes with student survey results and the surveys can help teachers identify areas where they can improve their teaching practice as part of their reflection
- Mr. Ellyson notes in chat: It could be a menu item as an "or" but not a requirement.
- Dr. Godwin enters in chat: Maureen, that is why we need to discuss again, I think from all our perspectives, we all have experiences that may or may not support student surveys.

- Ms. Stover enters in chat: Agreed Chris, but since others were weighing in, I wanted to make sure it was recorded that some of us do support the use of surveys
  - Dr. Godwin notes in chat: Agreed Maureen, that is why we more than likely need to just have a robust discussion. Thanks.
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for feedback on License III.
  - Mr. Ellyson asks if candidates goes through a traditional path through an EPP, would they still have to take the tests? Or, would graduation and program requirements be submitted in place of the test? Also, what do we do with out-of-state people? If they've already taken tests, does this prevent them from having to do additional things?
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that we may want to recommend alternatives for EPP completers.
  - Dr. Covington asks for clarification on what the pedagogy exam includes.
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that the PLT is only evaluable where there is not edTPA/PPAT. There are a couple CTE courses where there is not a pedagogy exam, so we allow the PLT to function in that case. That's the only case.
  - Dr. Sioberg notes that CTE is getting its only licensed test moving forward. My guess is that the one-off we've been doing will be shored up as of this fall.
  - Dr. Evans returns to the point around student surveys. When we voted, it was not unanimous, but the majority voted in favor of them.
  - Ms. Tooley notes in chat: I personally don't think using qualitative assessments for licensure is a good idea b/c it opens up too much subjectivity into the process. That includes a PEER process as well as any IHE-specific performance assessment process. To Ann's point, rater training and interrater reliability is an issue. I would strongly recommend against those types of measures.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that the measures we use as EPPs are state-measures, rather than EPP-measures.
  - Ms. Tooley notes that it's not about the measures themselves, but the rates. Unless the state is doing training of the raters, then it's a subjective process.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that we regularly do inter-rater reliability training within our EPP.
  - Ms. Tooley notes that this is the problem. We would need the training to be state-level.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that they bring in someone from the state to conduct the training. I'm not saying that's what's done everywhere.
  - Ms. Tooley notes that it becomes harder to have standardized trainings the more people we bring in.

- Dr. Covington notes that, for CFAST, folks have to retrain on the observation tool at least one a year. We could show that this is happening within EPPs. We are already doing this work for our accreditors.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes that we get hundreds of requests per year from LEAs to get good teachers through the system. The purpose of PEER is to provide LEAs with an opportunity to display their teachers' competence. This is a signal that they are also experts of what great teaching is. To the point of inter-rater reliability, this is only have the problem. We also need to ensure predictive validity. The question is: are those rating associated with better student outcomes? That's the question we don't have the answer to at this point.
  - Mr. Tooley responds in chat: True, Tom...great point
  - Co-Chair Bullock asks if NCEES has predictive validity
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that it does not. The goal is that PEER would have someone working closely with the teacher make evaluations.
- Dr. Covington asks for clarification around the \$5,000 salary bump.
  - Ms. Stover notes that this is for Level IV.
- Ms. Stover notes that what's powerful about this model is that it gives teachers the ability to display their competency in different ways. One of our goals entering this work was to remove barriers into the profession. This gives those teachers the opportunity to remain in the classroom. It's scary because it's a paradigm shift, but we need to be open to change.
- Ms. Tooley enters in chat: I'll say again that DPI did a great job trying to flesh out this model further. It's nearly impossible work given the hundred varying perspectives and input, but you did a really nice job.
- Co-Chair Stover notes that nobody disagrees with options. We just need to ensure the options are of quality.

### III. Adjournment

Co-Chair Bullock thanked subcommittee members for sharing their opinions. We appreciate every viewpoint that is brought forward. We appreciate and value your expertise and where you're bringing that from. This is emotionally-charged change. Thank you for your comments and your honesty. Please know that you can reach out to Dr. Wood or me if you want to have any one-on-one conversations.

Dr. Evans notes that the next meeting is May 2, 2022 from 1-3pm.

*Upon motion made by Dr. Vivian Covington and seconded by Ms. Sarah Greer Koenig, Commission members voted unanimously to adjourn the March 31, 2022 meeting of the Licensure Subcommittee.*