

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sat, 17 Jul 2021 22:42:12 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: [External] Draft text  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED]

I appreciate the positive points with regards to opportunities with the new model. I empathize (because I've lived it) the constant change related to licensure. Bottom line though....So....what are they asking for? Are they seeking for us to object, advocate, or just understand?

TBH...I'm not seeing where the money is going to come from to pay for the larger salaries and PD accounts. The "coalition" conversation is ridiculous...they want former Govs Hunt and Martin to be honorary chairs and are seeking out Erskine Bowles and a slew of others to participate. It's not realistic. Hell, we spent an hour and half deciding a name. The PEPSC subcommittees are moving better with some real dollar amounts being fleshed out, but they are no where near ready to make the model a reality. It's tricky for us because there is talk of tossing licensure exams which would be fine for EPPs but then there is no measure of effectiveness designed yet. I feel certain our board or the legislature isn't going to be down with reducing rigor which is what could be perceived as happening if exams are tossed. This hasn't even been pitched to NCAE, NCAFT, PENC, PANC....broad population of educators and personnel administrators. They think there is resistance from EPPs? They don't know what's going to hit them with those groups. Checking in with TOYs is convenient but isn't enough to capture the workforce. A lot of who participated were alternatively prepared so they don't capture the full scope of a typical teacher.

I think we will need to craft some sort of position maybe or a response at the least...we probably need to circle up with some of our govt relations folks again. Lotta cooks in the kitchen and the dish right now is a undercooked goulash.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]