

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

301 N. Wilmington Street  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601  
November 19, 2021

---

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

---

Dr. Ann Bullock  
Dr. Westley Wood  
Ms. Jill Camnitz  
Ms. Kathryn Castelloes  
Mr. Geoff Coltrane  
Dr. Vivian Covington  
Dr. Kimberly Creamer  
Mr. Robert Ellyson  
Ms. Virginia Gutierrez  
Ms. Deborah Hoffman  
Ms. Tamika Walker Kelly

Ms. Sarah Greer Koenig  
Dr. Connie Locklear  
Dr. Amanda Bullard Maxwell  
Ms. Lee O'Neal  
Ms. Susan Ruiz  
Dr. Bradley Smith  
Ms. Lori Stacey  
Ms. Maureen Stover  
Dr. Kim Evans  
Dr. Andrew Sioberg  
Dr. Tom Tomberlin

**Licensure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**

The link to the recorded subcommittee meeting is  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hoctigvwc24>.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Westley Wood thanked everyone for their attendance and started the subcommittee meeting.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

As the first order of business, Co-Chair Wood requested a motion for approval of the agenda.

*Upon motion made by Dr. Vivian Covington, and seconded by Ms. Sarah Koenig, the Subcommittee voted unanimously to approve the Licensure Subcommittee meeting agenda for November 19, 2021.*

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Co-Chair Wood asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 20, 2021 Commission meeting.

*Upon motion made by Dr. Connie Locklear, and seconded by Dr. Amanda Maxwell, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the Licensure Subcommittee meeting minutes for October 20, 2021.*

Co-Chair Wood shares that the goal today is to vote on each of the sub-measures to identify which of the measures we will recommend for the North Carolina Pathways to Excellence for Teaching Professionals model as a sub-committee. Moving forward, our understanding is that the co-chairs of each subcommittee will take the data from their sub-committees and begin to put a draft together of our recommended pathways model. Our work will be particularly important to the Advancement & Development sub-committee.

Co-Chair Wood stated that Dr. Tom Tomberlin would review the current licensure model and then provide a deeper review of the new licensure framework from the Human Capital Roundtable. Finally, they will discuss the role and focus of the Licensure Subcommittee.

Co-Chair Wood introduces Dr. Tom Tomberlin.

### I. Voting on Measures

- Dr. Evans shares that we will vote through polling, one measure at a time. We will discuss each measure and then there will be a poll for the measure. For each measure, everyone will have 3 minutes to vote *yes (with considerations)* or *no*.
- Co-Chair Wood remind everyone that Dr. Evans emailed out summaries of each of the measures, based on previous sub-committee meetings. He reminds everyone that we are not recommending how to include each measure in the model—just if we think the measure is appropriate to be included in the model at all. The Advancement & Development committee will place the measures appropriately within the model.
- Co-Chair Bullock begins the voting process. She shares that measures we will vote on today include: student surveys, microcredentials, licensure exams (content), observational measures, measures of student learning, and portfolios/performance tests. We might additionally discuss Master’s degrees at the end.
- Dr. Evans brings up a word document which synthesizes all of the Pros, Cons, and Questions for Consideration the sub-committee has discussed for each of the measures.
  - Co-Chair Bullock asks if there are any clarifying questions or if anyone would like to make addition to the document.

- Dr. Covington asks for clarification about licensure exams. Do we consider edTPA a performance exam or a licensure exam (content)? If it is under performance, that needs to be flushed out more.
- Co-Chair Bullock says that she will take note of this when we are voting on those measures.
- C
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for any comments on **student surveys**.
  - Dr. Camnitz notes, in reference to where it says that surveys are challenging to employ for teachers of very young or non-verbal students in the document, we do have other data for those grade levels. A pro of the surveys are that they could be used for middle/high school teachers, where we otherwise have less data. Additionally, another con is the current climate around student surveys.
  - Dr. Tomberlin asks if we can say “secondary” instead of “middle/high.”
  - Co-Chair Bullock asks Dr. Tomberlin to clarify what he defines as “secondary.”
  - Dr. Tomberlin says that typically Elementary is K-5 and Secondary is 6-12. We can define that in our notes if we want to.
  - Dr. Creamer shares that we live in a world of student evaluations each semester. A big piece of those reflections at the higher ed. level is reflecting on oneself. Not sure if that will be/should be a piece of this in our model?
  - Co-Chair Bullock recommends we add this point as a Question for Consideration as a potential recommendation in our model.
  - Dr. Tomberlin asks if the vote here is whether we would include it as an option for a teacher—not the single option, correct?
  - Co-Chair Bullock says we are not even doing that yet. We are just saying that these are potential measures that could be considered. We are voting to say that student surveys, for example, is something we want to take forward in consideration in this model in some way and that we would approve it being used in the model with our stated parameters. It might be a choice or the only option – that will be decided down the line.
  - Dr. Locklear shares that she was also trying to get clarify on what we were voting on. Going back to student surveys, going down to the recommendations it states that it should not be considered for content. My question is that, when we are looking at licensure, you’re just saying that this is something we *may* consider—not where it sits in the mode at this point?
  - **Co-Chair Bullock clarifies that this is correct and solicits a vote.**
    - **Vote: Yes, with considerations – 8 votes; No -7 votes**
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that not everyone voted, in part because DPI staff abstained from voting.

- Ms. Castelloes notes that she abstained as well because she works with Apprenticeship.
  - Ms. Koenig asks why DPI and others refrained from voting.
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that DPI staff sees themselves as administrative support on sub-committees and not voting members.
  - Ms. O’Neal notes in chat: I voted! I am with DPI. Can we cancel my vote? Sorry I didn’t know!
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that Ms. O’Neal is able to/should vote because she just happens to be affiliated with DPI but is on the subcommittee as a subject-matter expert. This is distinct from the staff working for Educator Recruitment and Support.
  - Ms. Kelly shares that she has concerns about this process. A majority of the people who are typically part of this sub-committee are not present and many of those present are not voting.
  - Co-Chair Bullock asks what the total number of voting members of this subcommittee is.
  - Dr. Evans estimates that there would be about 30 voting members.
  - Ms. Koenig notes that we all knew that this meeting was coming up and had the agenda and knew the importance of this meeting. I understand the concerns with some people not being present. I personally had another meeting and cleared it because I understood the importance of this meeting.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that we have not asked for quorum for any other votes as a sub-committee.
  - Ms. Kelly notes that it still is not appropriate to take a vote with people missing.
  - Ms. Koenig notes that all other sub-committee members’ thoughts are reflected in the document with pros, cons, and recommendations.
  - Co-Chair Bullock agrees that this is correct. There were also opportunities for individual members to submit comments on all this work.
  - Dr. Evans shares that there are 32 voting members total on the sub-committee.
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that 14 are present today.
  - Co-Chair Wood suggests continuing with the voting and then discuss how to handle the missing members afterwards.
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for any comments on **microcredentials**.
    - Ms. Gutierrez shares that microcredentials would be a very helpful tool especially for initially licensed teachers. Some are unable to pass their content test by 1-2 points but are doing a really great job—particularly at our high priority schools. This measure would be very helpful with this.

- Co-Chair Bullock adds “Could micro-credentials be used for candidates ‘close to passing the licensure tests’ to make up the difference” to the Questions for Consideration.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes that he is concerned with framing it that way. Then you’re creating a situation where you see the standardized test as the gold standard, and this is slightly less high-quality. Our goal here should be to develop an equivalent set of options for teachers, so that there is no perception that some teachers are “less than” other teachers. I am not objecting to the fact that we need options for folks for whom the licensure exam is not a good indicator of their ability. I’m suggesting we are careful in how we frame the various pathways so that one is not seen as lesser.
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that we have talked about this before as a viability. I do think that this is real, and I know it’s real for my colleagues and personnel. I don’t think it’s as lesser as much as an alternative.
- Dr. Tomberlin clarifies: it is an alternative if the licensure exam is attempted? Is the intent of this group to say that “this is the way everyone has to go through licensure? Only if you fail that route are you able to avail alternatives?”
- Co-Chair Bullock says that we are suggesting this is one way to use microcredentials—not the only way.
- Ms. Gutierrez says that in earlier sessions, there were presentations about microcredentials being used in this way in other states and it gave me a lot of hope. It’s not instead of the test—only if teachers are missing it by 1 or 2 points.
- Ms. Koenig asks if it is noted that the state would need to review microcredentials against criteria?
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that we did discuss this. We have noted this as a recommendation in our document.
- Dr. Covington notes that she thinks this needs to be clarified under the con where it says, “wide range of microcredentials available.” Are we talking about a wide range of *quality* of microcredentials available?
- Ms. Koenig notes that we discussed the concern of educators cherry-picking certain ones.
- Co-Chair Wood notes that the issue is around the range in quality.
- Mr. Coltrane shares that we don’t yet have a set of microcredentials that could be applied for early career teachers (licensure levels 1-3). This feels like an extremely new, promising area. To me, this feels like this is something that is promising but not necessarily something that we should hang our hat on. Should think about microcredentials as a way to display particular competencies / specific skills – not necessarily the broad range of skills we expect beginning teachers to have.

- Co-Chair Bullock asks if we need to add anything to the document to reflect these concerns?
  - Mr. Coltrane notes that we should add under cons: do we have micro credentials available to measure the skills we care about?
  - Ms. Camnitz says that the work we are doing here is going to play out over an extended time. If the work on microcredentials continues, can we still have in our minds the possibility that at some point in time that microcredentials may be available in a systematic way? I could also see them being used for Licensure Level 4.
  - Mr. Coltrane says that he thinks that we could, but we aren't there yet. Other sub-committees are thinking about the NCEES rubric, etc. so these things may be coming.
  - Ms. Camnitz suggests that we could also develop specific credentials in areas to math things up. We could be very targeted and get that work done.
  - Co-Chair Bullock shares that there is no way that anyone could create the hundreds and thousands of specific skill microcredentials that we would need that would be equivalent to an EPP. We could choose some that are tangible and palatable.
  - Co-Chair Wood notes that a lot of work must be done to clarify where microcredentials go in the model.
  - Ms. Camnitz notes that we have talked about the development of specific microcredentials as an opening the meeting we are going to have in December will help us dig a little harder on microcredentials and learn more, which may be helpful.
  - Co-Chair Bullock says that what she is hearing is that micro credentialing could be something we see as a possibility, but 1) we don't have it yet, 2) it would have to be developed.
  - Dr. Creamer notes that, if she votes yes today, she sees it as wanting microcredentials to stay on the list for consideration for us to home in and further develop. If I say no, it means I want it off the list and do not want to consider it at all.
  - **Co-Chair Bullock clarifies that this is correct and solicits a vote.**
    - **Vote: Yes, with considerations – 16 votes; No – 0 votes**
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for any comments on **licensure exams**.
    - Dr. Covington asks if this is not going to include edTPA, then that needs to be clear. Where does the edTPA fall? We can make it clear that it is included under portfolio/performance tests. If so, I would like to make it noted that edTPA is not included under licensure exams.
    - Mr. Coltrane clarifies whether or not edTPA shows up in a later measure? To clarify, licensure exams include traditional licensure exams like PRAXIS.

- Co-Chair Bullock recommends adding a recommendation accordingly. Also, the high-level title for Licensure Exams is qualified with “(Content, not edTPA/PPAT)”
- Dr. Covington notes we have not noted costs as a pro/con. Is this understood? There are costs associated with each of these measures.
- Co-Chair Bullock recommends adding a note to the top of the document about costs.
- Ms. Koenig agrees and says it is important to take note of costs at the top of the document.
- Co-Chair Wood agrees and notes that anything that goes into this model must be sustainable. Any measures must be guaranteed to be funded.
- Dr. Locklear notes that we need to keep it on the list. We are not trying to do away with the test – the goal is just to consider alternatives to the test in addition.
- Ms. Hoffman asks about the cut scores for the PRAXIS – can we add a consideration related to that?
- Dr. Bullock notes that we can add a consideration. There’s a whole process around cut scores.
- Dr. Tomberlin notes that cut scores are largely derived from the vendor, who uses a national norming process.
- **Co-Chair Bullock solicits a vote.**
  - Dr. Evans shares that some people had to leave the meeting, so they shared their votes directly with her.
  - **Vote: Yes, with considerations – 15 votes; No – 1 vote**
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for any comments on **observational measures.**
  - Ms. Koenig notes that one of the challenges listed is that it requires significant training for observers, which often does not occur.
  - Co-Chair Wood agrees and notes that, like microcredentials, further development of the measure would be necessary before implementing a new model.
  - Dr. Creamers asks, does this include the LEA/IHE form that is filled out for initial licensure for teachers?
  - Dr. Covington responds, do you mean the certification of teaching capacity form? We still use this, but it doesn’t go anywhere. It comes from 4 or more individual observations, so it’s not a one-time thing.
  - Co-Chair Wood notes that something like that could be considered.
  - Dr. Covington shares that they use this for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and final observation at East Carolina as well as a few other IHEs. You have to be trained once a year to continue using it so it’s pretty rigorous and easy to do.
  - Dr. Locklear asks where are we going to get the individual to do this training? In some districts, we are scrapped to get individuals to cover

- classes. In the direction we are going now, we don't have the capacity in many districts to do this.
- Dr. Locklear notes that we should note both monetary and human costs at the top of the document.
  - Co-Chair Bullock says that she hears this concern and notes that we also have coaches in all these schools. It could potentially improve learning for children if we trained everyone.
  - Dr. Locklear agrees that it is a tool that we could use. Thinking about the climate that we are in right now; do we have the capacity to support this? Will we be able to support everyone across the state with the same training?
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that this would be a big lift. We have added language to the document to reflect this. This could be a long play, rather than a short play.
  - Ms. Koenig notes that there is a lot of lack of trust in the ratings in terms of durability and cultural norms. Should something like that be included as a notation?
  - Co-Chair Bullock notes that we can add this to recommendations.
  - Dr. Tomberlin notes that this is a real issue. We do not necessarily need to provide a rationale for why this is happening. It's enough that this exists.
  - **Co-Chair Bullock solicits a vote.**
    - **Vote: Yes, with considerations – 14 votes; No – 2 votes**
- Co-Chair Bullock asks for any comments on **measures of student growth.**
    - Dr. Covington asks to clarify if this is code for EVAAS?
    - Co-Chair Wood notes that it could include EVAAS, but for teachers who do not have EVAAS, it could be another achievement measure.
    - Dr. Covington notes that some of this could be formative, so may be worth clarifying in the document.
    - Co-Chair Bullock suggests that we add something around the measure needing to be reliable and valid. Someone could suggest looking at quarterly district tests. If they have reliability and validity, could those be used?
    - **Co-Chair Bullock solicits a vote.**
      - **Vote: Yes, with considerations – 14 votes; No – 1 vote**
  - Co-Chair Bullock asks for any comments on **portfolios/performance assessments.**
    - Co-Chair Bullock suggests using the term "performance assessments" rather than "performance tests" in the document. Where it refers to edTPA, she suggests saying "edTPA/PPAT"

- Dr. Covington suggests adding more under the pros. It's not just about collecting artifacts – it also allows teachers to demonstrate competency
- **Co-Chair Bullock solicits a vote.**
  - **Vote: Yes, with considerations – 15 votes; No – 1 vote**
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that an additional measure we've discussed is master's degrees. When one has a master's degree, there are particular degree/course outcomes that are met through things like performance assessments that are reliable and valid. This isn't true for all master's degrees, but many of them. Where would those fit into our measures?
  - Dr. Locklear adds that we also discussed candidates with high GPAs in their content area, in addition to the role of master's degrees.
  - Co-Chair Bullock suggests that we have an additional brainstorm list of potential measures that we present.
  - Ms. Kelly agrees that we have an additional list of things to consider. I would also note that a master's or advanced degree would maybe fit well in a total portfolio because there could be coursework that they may want to include.
  - Co-Chair Bullock recommends we take note of all these things because they may come up in other committees as well.
  - Dr. Creamer notes that there needs to be a date on credentials—e.g., when did one receive the master's degree? We may want to include this as a consideration.
  - Ms. Hoffman suggests that we add a consideration for out-of-state teachers. I have one teacher licensed in two other states who is really struggling to pass the PRAXIS.
  - Dr. Camnitz notes that this is a problem we are trying to solve with this system, so it's important.
- Co-Chair Bullock notes that, in the past, we have always report what happened in the meeting today and give all committee members an opportunity to react. This would give those who did not get a chance to vote during the session a chance to respond
  - Ms. Kelly says this is a good idea and suggests polling the missing members.
  - Co-Chair Bullock says that we could formally solicit their feedback. After providing a chance for comment, we will share out the final recommendations with the sub-committee.
  - Co-Chair Wood notes that this vote is important, but our working document is the most important thing. It summarizes the past few months of conversation.

### III. Adjourment

Co-Chair Wood thanked subcommittee members for their preparation and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Co-Chair Wood reminded members that the next standing meeting is Wednesday, December 15, starting at 2PM.

*Upon motion made by Dr. Connie Locklear and seconded by Ms. Sarah Koenig, Commission members voted unanimously to adjourn the November 19, 2021 meeting of the Licensure Subcommittee.*