

NCPFP Commission Meeting

February 25, 2021

9:00 - 12:00 pm

Attendees:

Eddie Price, Tony Stewart, Brenda Berg, Richard Cornette, Chris Godwin, Marcie Holland, Olivia Oxendine, Shirley Prince, Mike Ray, Melba Spooner, Mamie Sutphin, Jim Watson, Victor Cadilla

Welcome/Housekeeping:

- Dr. Price greets all Commission members. He reads the conflict of interest statement, and no commissioners report conflicts of interest.
- Dr. Price makes commissioners aware that this meeting will be operating under the open meeting act and the amendments that allow government bodies to meet during emergencies.
- Dr. Price calls for a vote on the meeting minutes from the previous Commission meeting on October 29, 2020. Meeting minutes approved by all present commissioners.

Action Items for Discussion and Vote:

- RFP Update (Tony Stewart):
 - Dr. Stewart reviews the changes made to the previous RFP by the RFP sub-committee.
 - First piece addresses the issue of odd-year cohorts the Commission has previously discussed. The language will encourage programs to increase the number of cohorts.
 - Ms. Berg asks if the intention is to increase the size of cohorts? Also expresses concern about programs splintering their cohorts for the sake of securing the RFP.
 - Dr. Price answers that the goal would be to have cohorts follow an annual cohort model similar to UNCC. This is to make sure demand is met.
 - Dr. Prince asks if money from the trust fund money could be used strategically to get some of these programs to start an odd-year cohort?
 - Dr. Price responds that the Commission would need to discuss that topic if it wanted to proceed. The departments of education at participating universities are setting benchmarks that would prevent programs from splintering.
 - Ms. Berg asks if it is a possibility for them to add a year onto their contract with grant funds?
 - Dr. Price responds that it may be possible and asks for Dr. Stewart to follow up with Michelle Hemmer (SEAA) about this possibility. The issue is unclear, because rollovers were not permitted in the past.

- Ms. Berg asks if the Commission is trying to increase cohort sizes?
 - Dr. Price responds that NCPFP/TP3 is trying to create a benchmark for program enrollment. Based on the goal of producing 80% of administrators, we can estimate how many candidates programs should have.
- Dr. Stewart discusses the second update to the RFP regarding equity coaching. NCPFP/TP3 is asking applicants to address and commit to equity coaching.
 - Mr. Ray asks if there are any percentages of diversity participation in the program that would give applicants a competitive advantage in the RFP?
 - Dr. Price agrees with Mr. Ray's sentiment about increasing diversity of candidates. There have been conversations about this in the past, but there is no language about competitive advantage in the RFP. Believes there could be if others wanted to include it.
 - Dr. Prince agrees with the importance of increasing diversity candidate pool. Notes experience of trying to hold programs accountable without commitment in writing. Supports adding language that would hold programs more accountable.
 - Dr. Price notes that it could be part of the formative check. If programs aren't meeting their agreement the Commission would need to vote to defund that program. Elaborates that this is why data collection is necessary for the future.
 - Dr. Holland notes that the Commission should identify a specific percentage of "grace" for programs that do not meet these stipulations but are actively trying to recruit a diverse group of candidates.
 - Dr. Oxendine asks if the Commission plans on defining "candidates of color". She notes that it could differ greatly by region. Dr. Spooner and Dr. Price agree.
- Dr. Stewart discusses the last RFP change dealing with evaluation and grant renewal. It includes formative and summative evaluations. Notes that he and Dr. Price will provide assistance to applicants if it is needed.
- Dr. Price mentions that it could be important to add "and any data requested by the commission" to the RFP. Dr. Stewart agrees to include it.
- Dr. Stewart asks Dr. Price if it would be okay to allow a motion to approve the RFP with the caveat that minor modifications will be made regarding what was discussed here.
- Dr. Price responds that he would like to craft the language based on what was discussed first, then send it to the Commission for any additional input before approval. Commission members agree.
- NCPFP/TP3 Policy Manual Updates (Eddie Price):
 - Dr. Price discusses the goal of creating a new policy manual for NCPFP/TP3. He hopes it would have information about the policies and processes regarding

activities of students. He also mentions that the unique scenarios encountered in the recent past are being included in the manual. He describes the first on the agenda: a policy to prevent the hiring of candidates prior to completion of their 10 month internship.

- Ms. Sutphin described experience with this situation and agreed with Dr. Price.
 - Dr. Prince also described experience with this situation and agreed with Dr. Price. She asks if Dr. Holland has any insight?
 - Dr. Holland responds that this situation has happened before in Wake County Public Schools. Logistically it is a challenge for LEAs right now due to state licensure issues. The state licensure office doesn't guarantee a licensure is applied after 4/15 - it is still possible but they do not guarantee it will arrive. Ideally district leaders want them to finish, but in certain instances there are pressures that prevent that possibility.
 - Ms. Berg and Dr. Holland discussed the possibility of changing this issue in the legislative session.
 - Dr. Stewart asks if there is a motion to include this item in the policy manual.
 - Motion is called and is carried.
- Dr. Price discusses the second scenario to include in the policy manual. There have been changes with Sandhills-RESA partners. Since, HPU, Sandhills, and UNCG are not currently under purview of this Commission, this would be for the future. Sandhills currently has a grant with TP3. They are partnering now with 2 universities and this program is only allowed to have 8 grant recipients. Proposes that if this situation were to happen in the future, a RESA would need to ask permission from the Commission.
- Dr. Prince expresses concern about not allowing programs to make necessary changes with partners.
 - Dr. Price explains that RESAs and programs would be allowed to make changes as long as the Commission approves them.
 - Dr. Godwin agrees with Dr. Prince. He notes that the wording appears to prevent changes from being considered and suggests the wording be redone.
 - Dr. Holland suggests "With Commission approval, partners may be considered for addition to a program."
 - Dr. Godwin suggests broadening the language beyond the specific situation described.
 - Dr. Oxendine agrees the Commission should be consulted on changes. She discusses the possibility of including more in the policy manual regarding which changes the Commission will approve.
 - Dr. Prince describes the process used for these changes. Programs had to show how their changes met the criteria of the legislation. Dr. Oxendine agrees with using this standard.

- Dr. Price mentions there is clarity in the legislation. He discusses the idea of programs explaining their rationalization for making changes. When changes came up in the past, they have been addressed similarly to this proposal. There may be a need to craft language about programs coming to the Commission for approval as a general statement to include the manual in addition to this specific situation.
- Dr. Stewart asks if there is a motion to include this language?
 - Motion carried unanimously.

Information Items for Review and Discussion:

- SBE TP3 Presentation Overview (Shirley Prince):
 - Dr. Prince gives condensed form of what will be presented to the SBE. She discusses the rationale behind the 7 recommendations she will be making. She mentions that she will also be sharing data with the Board of Education, which this body has seen in previous meetings.
 - 1st recommendation - Use TP3 and MSA funds to cover the full cost of everything involved in the principal preparation program to attract best candidates.
 - 2nd recommendation - Work with grantees to redesign programs to include current TP3 enhancement activities, which would save substantial TP3 funds.
 - 3rd recommendations - Establish a cap on grant funds that can go to personnel; gradually reduce personnel salary, except for coaching; redefine "high needs school" to have a more targeted impact.
 - 4th recommendation - Expand TP3 grant awards beyond 8 currently allowed to scale the transformation of principal programs.
 - 5th recommendation - Give particular consideration to minority-serving institutions of higher education.
 - 6th recommendation - Promote school district-driven principal pipelines that encourage authentic district involvement.
 - 7th recommendation - Promote best practices across the state by continuing a professional learning network for providers, provide individualized technical assistance, and implement program evaluation.
 - Dr. Oxendine asks if Dr. Prince has a specific definition for a "high needs school"?
 - Dr. Prince answers that it would be best for SBE to make that designation. It could be to identify a specific percentage of low-income students.
 - Dr. Oxendine identifies certain people who could get the SBE to assist on this issue.
- Commission's Response to Recommendations (Eddie Price):
 - Dr. Price discusses his presentation to the SBE, including responses to recommendations, how the merger will impact this program, and recent Commission changes regarding hold harmless. Dr. Price discusses individual items in the presentation:

- Provide the programs with a metric for individual program components and our enhancements.
- Incorporate minimum enrollment and/or funding range in the next RFP
- Establish definitions of institutional costs if there is a cap put in place.
- New RFP includes competitive preference priority for annual enrollment.
- New RFP includes comp pref priority for annual production i/o 2-year cohort models.
- There is a need to create a specific formula to designate a school/LEA that needs transformative leadership
 - Dr. Holland asks if that is a place to incorporate the diversity goals discussed earlier.
 - Dr. Price responds that it is very possible to do that. It might not be a specific descriptor, but it is part of the current designation for “at-risk”. There may be a need to merge current formulas.
 - Dr. Oxendine suggests capturing what is already out there in DPI and identify managers who handle such issues. The Commission can then ask those individuals to come to the table to help us craft those definitions.
- EPIC Contract for Program Evaluation (Tony Stewart):
 - Dr. Stewart updates the Commission on the contract with EPIC for program evaluation. EPIC has had a long relationship with the Principal Fellows program as it relates to data collection and evaluation purposes. They have an understanding of the Program’s history. The Program was provided with guidance that an RFP is not necessary to contract with EPIC. The current plan is to use annual operating funds or funds after they are returned to the trust fund to pay for this contract. There will be budgeting on an annual basis for this additional cost.

Adjournment:

- Vote to adjourn
 - Motion carries and the meeting is adjourned

Capture of votes:

Commission Member	Vote 1 – Approval of minutes for October 29 minutes	Vote 2 - Approval of including candidate hiring limitations in policy manual	Vote 3 - Approval of including changes to RESA partnerships in policy manual	Vote 4 - Adjournment
Brenda Berg	y	y	y	y
Leah Carper	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Richard Cornette	y	y	y	y
Chris Godwin	y	y	y	y
Marcie Holland	N/A	N/A	y	N/A
Reginald Holley	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ethan Lenker	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Olivia Oxendine	y	y	y	y
Eddie Price	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shirley Prince	y	y	y	y
Mike Ray	y	y	y	N/A
Jim Roberts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mamie Sutphin	y	y	y	y
Melba Spooner	y	y	y	y
Jim Watson	y	y	y	y