

Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

Agenda

Monday December 16, 2002, 8:30 a.m.

Room 421, Legislative Office Building

Via Teleconference

Senator Walter Dalton, Chairing

Community College System Study

Kristine Leggett
Fiscal Research Division

DPI's Textbook Study

Jim Newlin
Fiscal Research Division

Continuing Certification Interim Requirements

Jim Newlin
Fiscal Research Division

Senator Howard Lee

Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

Agenda

Monday December 16, 2002, 8:30 a.m.

Room 421, Legislative Office Building

Via Teleconference

Senator Walter Dalton, Chairing

Community College System Study

Kristine Leggett
Fiscal Research Division

DPI's Textbook Study

Jim Newlin
Fiscal Research Division

Continuing Certification Interim Requirements

Jim Newlin
Fiscal Research Division

Chapter 126 of the 2002 Session Laws (SB 1115)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM STUDY

SECTION 8.7.(a) The Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee, in conjunction with the State Board of Community Colleges, shall hire an outside consultant to consider:

- (1) The organization and structure of the Community College System, the number of colleges within the System, the location and size of the colleges, and whether the State could realize any administrative savings from the consolidation of some colleges or programs;
- (2) The formula used to fund administration at the colleges, appropriate funding levels for administration of the various colleges, and the appropriate number of administrative staff members for colleges of different sizes; and
- (3) The funding of multicampus colleges and off-campus centers, including the appropriate number of administrative staff members, and an appropriate funding mechanism for administration and for other purposes.

Chapter 126 of the 2002 Session Laws (SB 1115)

STUDY OF THE TEXTBOOK DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

SECTION 7.17.(c) Study of the Textbook Distribution System. - Section 28.24 of S.L. 2001-424 reads as rewritten: "**SECTION 28.24.** The State Board of Education shall contract for an analysis of the best and most efficient method to manage textbook distribution to the local schools. The Board shall prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) outlining the scope of the analysis required and select a private consultant to perform the analysis. The analysis shall include such issues as timely delivery, total costs to the local school systems in providing textbooks to school buildings, use of currently available technology in the process, pricing practices among the textbook publishing industry, and other issues the Board considers relevant to a comprehensive review of the system. Prior to award of a contract, the State Board shall present the Request for Proposals to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee for comment. The State Board shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on the results of the consultant's analysis, including the Board's recommendations for changes in the current system. The Board shall make its final report to the Committee by ~~April 1, 2002.~~February 1, 2003."

Interim Requirements for Continuing Certification

Session Law 2002-126 Section 7.18 (a) suspends the portfolio requirement for continuing licensure and directs that prior to the implementation of interim requirements the State Board of Education report proposed requirements to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee. A copy of this section of the law is included as Appendix A.

Input on possible interim requirements was solicited from a variety of stakeholders including teachers, school administrators, Initial Licensure Program Coordinators, central office administrators, and superintendents. Eight regional meetings were held in November. Participants in the meetings and the summaries of those meetings are included as Appendix B. On December 3, 2002 a ninth meeting was held with representative stakeholders to review the input provided through the regional meetings. Participants in the December 3 meeting are included as Appendix C. On December 12, 2002, the State Board of Education approved the following interim requirements for continuing certification:

1. The Beginning Teacher Individualized Growth Plan (IGP) be utilized to document professional growth and development focused on the INTASC Standards. The completed IGPs and the required observations and annual summative TPAI-R evaluations will be submitted with a statement from the LEA indicating whether or not the beginning teacher has adequately demonstrated competency with all INTASC Standards. (Note: Beginning teachers are currently required to complete an IGP annually and are observed four times and evaluated annually using the TPAI-R.)
2. Beginning teachers be required to participate in professional development activities which are focused on the INTASC Standards and reflect IGP formative assessments. The activities are to be documented.
3. Beginning teachers, along with their mentors, be required to participate in regular meetings within their school/LEA communities for focused discussion of and reflection on the INTASC Standards. They are also to have individual conferences focused on the needs of the beginning teacher. These group meetings and individual conferences are to be documented.
4. While there was not consensus on the use of videos, the majority of participants in the December 3rd meeting favored the use of videos for self-reflection at the local level.
5. The IGPs, the TPAI-R observations and evaluations submitted with the statement from the LEA, documentation of the professional development activities completed by the beginning teacher, and documentation of the beginning teacher/mentor meetings will be reviewed by trained assessors. The results of the reviews will be reported to the State Board.

A copy of the Beginning Teacher Individualized Growth Plan and the TPAI-R are included as Appendix D.

APPENDIX A

Session Law 2002-126

PERFORMANCE-BASED LICENSURE PROGRAM/SUSPENSION OF PORTFOLIO REQUIREMENT AND STUDY

SECTION 7.18.(a) The State Board of Education, in consultation with the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina and the Education Cabinet, shall review teacher preparation programs and the continuing certification process to determine how these programs can be modified to enhance the continuing teacher certification process and to reduce the burden the continuing certification process places on newly certified teachers. This evaluation shall consider strategies for streamlining the current continuing certification process and reducing the amount of documentation required in the applicant's portfolio.

The State Board of Education shall suspend the portfolio requirement for all teachers who are required, under the current law, to submit portfolios from August 1, 2002, through June 30, 2004. Teachers who are not required to submit portfolios during the period the portfolio requirement is suspended shall be subject to interim requirements adopted by the State Board and shall complete the interim requirements. The State Board of Education shall make every effort to insure that any interim requirements do not require significant and unnecessary paperwork, effort, and administrative burden. Prior to implementation of the interim requirements, the State Board of Education shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on the proposed requirements.

APPENDIX B

Summaries of Regional Meetings

Central Region Group 1	Central Group 2
<p>Group preferences that showed up in each group discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide options for teachers to select from. Once option is selected the teachers remains in that track. 2. Use a combination of IGP, TPAI and reflection from teacher, mentor and principal. 3. All testing or options should be at no cost to teacher. 4. Collaboration with IHE to develop the quality of teachers and provide credit for staff development for all years of ILT program. Bank CEUs—both coursework toward Masters and local CEUs. 5. More mentor training and release time for mentors and ILTs to conference. <p>Feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use IGP, show evidences, signatures of 3 individuals and reflection on what ILT needs to focus on as well as a growth reflection paired with TPAI-R. 2. Peer teacher review process (as in SERVE model)—3 mentor teachers 3. Reflection practice process is important 4. Options package that is fair—monitor how options work 5. Provide incentives to complete in 2003—since only 5 months left—2 bonus leave days or banked CEUs 6. Test (TTK?)—teacher should not have to pay 7. Performance documentation—video, TPAI and Summative 8. Staff development hours banked (3 CEUs to carry over to continuing license) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement a statewide timeline for ILTs and Mentors to document work that focuses on INTASC—may require mentor re-training and at least three district wide meetings to support timelines 2. ILTs with Masters degrees should get a professional continuing license. 3. Video to show INTASC standards being met 4. Concern about any tests that might be offered—are they an authentic assessment? 5. Evaluation instrument based on INTASC to be preformed by administrators (in addition to those currently being given) 6. Video assessment with lesson plans, reflection and self-assessment 7. TTK—test—state should pay 8. Offer PBLP as an option with modifications because of short time frame 9. Staff Development credits re-instated focus on INTASC 10. IGP and Evaluations to be tied 11. Evidence(proof) of each INTASC standard in evaluation process 12. Local assessments—teachers assessing teachers with state approved assessors 13. Unannounced observations with outside assessors 14. Interviews to express knowledge of INTASC 15. Teach a lesson with another component (?) 16. Video (1 hour long) with INTASC demonstrated. 17. Documentation of monthly meetings with mentors and ILTs <p>Additional Concerns/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should pay the cost for any requirement (as they did with product). • Move the product requirement to year 3. • Don't forget that teachers will begin EOC/EOG testing in March--whatever takes place of product should not interrupt this class time needed for preparing for testing with students. • Compensation such as extra annual leave days should be awarded for completion of process. • Place more responsibility on universities not ILTs. • It is important that the "practice of teaching" is OJT and should be demonstrated there. • Any requirement should reflect INTASC as that is what previous focus has been.

Northeast Group 1	Northeast Group 2	Northeast Group 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations and IGP • INTASC with checklist of behaviors/evidences (they are not collected) • Video <p>"Interactive Assessment" -video, panel review (reflection piece-interview, discussion) observations/IGP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video - 20-minute lesson (can be edited)/lesson plan included • Guided Question Interview Video <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -standard questions based upon INTASC standards (Post-conference formal interview) -Reflective thinking • Required IGP • Observations (2nd year) / Summative (1st year) <p>*All four elements would be required. Rubrics must be developed for each segment.</p>	<p>3 15-minute unedited video tape sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning • Middle • End of Year <p>Reflective Questions on classroom management and planning/instruction would show mastery of INTASC standards</p> <p>PROS: Questions already developed Assessors already trained (state) Video gives visual to support reflective questions No unnecessary paperwork or administrative burden</p>
Northeast Group 4	Northeast Group 5	Northeast Group 6
<p>"ILT Package" Options</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IGP - submit with evidence of completed goals State assessors review (Year 1 and 2) LEA - sign off on evidence Principal/central office 2. Video - Reflective of IGP 3. Reflection - Video/IGP/ (self analysis) (3 typed pages maximum) This is where I've been This is where I am This is where I'm going +/- + tied to what ILT is doing + INTASC connection + Performance Based <p>Clear - convincing- consistent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing Teacher Knowledge by NES (connected to INTASC standards) State should cover cost of test. • Use IGP and Evaluations Have assessors to evaluate these two documents • Video testing INTASC standards knowledge Reflection/analyze standard knowledge in video tape • Provide teachers with options <p>Use the above bullets as options</p> <p>Teacher chooses and pass <u>only one</u> of the above options</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations (Reported to State) linked to INTASC standards checklist *Administration *Teacher • Test plus Observations (TTK) • Video tape (more than once) • Quality IGPs (planning and implementation/summation) (useable strategies)
Northeast Group 7	Northeast Group 8	Northeast Group 9
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outside observers 2. Videotaping and interviewing by assessors 3. Regional oral interviews on INTASC standards 4. NO ADDITIONAL TESTING 5. More Training for Legislators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Videotaping a lesson/unit *Oral interview concerning lesson/unit based on the INTASC standards *Summative Evaluation 	<p>Growth Plan (IGP) Video/Oral Narrative Evaluations (Satisfactory or Above) Possible Oral Exam (Locally)</p>

Northeast Group 10	Northwest Group 1	Northwest Group 2
<p>Paced Timeline of Professional Growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video of different lessons throughout the year (math, communications, cooperative groups, giving tests, review lessons) • IGP • Professional Readings with Response (written assessment) • Standardized Test at the end of Year 2 (TTK) standardized assessment • Reflective Practices <p>Video lessons, student growth, professional development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of summative evaluation • Monthly Mentor/ILT conferences • Log as an expansion to the 3rd page IGP, plus delta sheet • All evaluations, conferences and IGP based on INTASC Standards at no additional cost 	<p>A “statement of assurance” checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentor/Mentee regular meetings • System-wide staff development/support meetings with focus on • INTASC Standards • Regular review of IGP • Documentation of scheduled observations • Written reflection in two INTASC areas • Final verification and signatures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal • Mentor • Mentee/ILT • ILT Coordinator/Central Office Rep.
Northwest Group 3	Northwest Group 4	Northwest Group 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required monthly meetings on INTASC Standards • Required skill building on INTASC Standards – Coach 2 Coach Modes • Required designated time weekly/monthly for Mentor/ILT meetings • Expand observation data - add lesson plans and student work for each observation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present pre-conference form with data relating directly to ITASC Standards as does the ILT’s IGP • add a two page reflection for each year of how ILT grew professionally as a teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Menu: choices of test, video, etc. • Video and documentation • Monthly meetings Mentee/ILT Coordinator • Banking of CEUs • Graduated annual leave credits (ILT 1-1 day, ILT 2-2days) • Submission of a monthly journal of reflections (based on INTASC Standards) and a video 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue Mentor/Mentee meetings – ILT 1,2, and 3s (goal/objectives & coordinated) • LEA wide Mentor/Mentee meetings based on needed areas of improvement • Professional journal – reflections: weekly, bi-monthly, monthly?? • Additional observations of master/superior teachers and reflect • Video – reflection with mentor +/- based on INTASC Standards • Graduate work = some interim requirements/ additional certification • Staff development

Sandhills Proposal 1	Sandhills Proposal 2	Sandhills Proposal 3
<p>Year 1—Evaluation with feedback by Mentors and Principal. Meet educational requirements. Spend this year getting to know curriculum, etc.</p> <p>Year 2 – Create a rubric to determine who would need to do “interim” requirements(such as a product) using IGP, TPAI-R, etc. Have the designated individuals do the interim requirements.</p> <p>Year 3—Streamline and customize any revisions on interim product or requirement. Demonstrate through observation ability to overcome weaknesses identified in year 2.</p>	<p>Incorporate true coaching model and build it into the daily schedule.</p> <p>Use the IGP to develop reflections for year 2.</p> <p>Oral assessment with state providing questions prior to assessment.</p>	<p>Want choices/options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA taught courses (use Coach2Coach modules) on INTASC. Provide evidences each month of attending sessions AND implementing the strategies in classroom. • Test (TTK???) • Masters degree in Education # hours per year(?)
Sandhills Proposal 4	Sandhills Proposal 5	
<p>Options/Choices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate credit/Masters of Education • TPAI-R • Written reflection on chosen part of IGP related to INTASC • Monthly Meetings with ILTs/Mentors 	<p>No TEST</p> <p>Reinstate staff development credit and require ILTs and Mentors to meet monthly for focused discussion on the INTASC standards.</p>	

Southeast Group 1	Southeast Group 2	Southeast Group 3
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ILT will demonstrate competency of INTASC standards by the development of a video. 2. The ILT will use a variety of methods/strategies to show mastery. <p style="text-align: center;">Options</p> <p>As an incentive for this year's ILT-2's to complete the video, the length and number of INTASC standards would be reduced.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>NO</u> to the student performance as measurement 2. Choice of more in depth IGP (Regional review board) or TTK 3. Larger role for mentor (ex. Release time for frequent observations from mentor, time for feedback) 	<p>OPTIONS- Differentiated Licensure Process*--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TTK – Verbal linguistic, analytical • Video and form (NES) * - (Kinesthetic, art/visual, naturalist • EOC/G growth – (Analytical, interpersonal) • Documented Mentor/Mentee observations & meetings based on INTASC (interpersonal, intrapersonal) <p>This process treats teachers in the manner in which we expect teachers to treat students.</p>
Southeast Group 4	Southeast Group 5	Southeast Group 6
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Choice of assessments (test, video, observations, reflective writing) 2. Personal Inquiry Project (evidence to support standards picked in IGP) Cape Fear Center for Inquiry 3. Redirect State Funding to the School Level Focus more on mentor and administrative observations; bring trained assessors to the classroom 4. Observations with reflection and meet with Mentor (interdistrict as well as intradistrict observations) (focus on one standard per month) 5. Spread amount of work equally over 3 years. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. True implementation of BTIGP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INTASC Standards • Documented evidence of completion • Targeted Staff Development 2. Menu of Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video Lesson with reflection on INTASC standards • Test of Teaching Knowledge (TTK) • Documentation of implementation of INTASC standards 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Video with questions (looking for lesson plan, behavior, unique learners) 2. Accept work already done by present ILT-2s 3. Assessors to come into the classrooms 4. Conversational reflection is important (journal with mentor) 5. <u>ALL</u> NC colleges and universities should prepare teachers with INTASC standards (ECU model) 6. Video (with no edits) and narrative, with evidence of understanding of INTASC standards. 7. Option of test (state paid) or “whatever” is decided upon. 8. Give additional incentive for ILTs to complete the requirement this year. (Additional annual leave days.) 9. More staff development on curriculum strategies, technology, and classroom management. 10. State assessors from neighboring counties with pre-conference. 11. *This year, change requirement from year 2 to year 3. (Dec.-May is too short a time frame) 12. Begin in year 2004 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 1 – plan with mentor (unit) Year 2 – implement/reflect Year 3 – compile and assess 13. Different process for ILTs and Lateral Entry.

Southwest Region

All groups supported the proposal presented by the SW Region Personnel Directors (attached)

Reasons:

Meets both letter and spirit of the legislation, do-able, already in place, acceptability is there, accountability is there (ILT, Mentor, and Principal).

Should include an appeal process and review process from local group of teachers, mentors, etc. State teams could go and observe this process if this is a state decision.

Fine tune the IGP to show proof of learning INTASC and include reflections on the INTASC standards related to the IGP.

Focus the TPAI-R pre-conference on the INTASC standards as well as classroom observations. Merge the INTASC standards and observation questions.

If there are inequities across the state with IGP and TPAI-R process—could DPI address these differences as a part of the “interim” requirement?

Use forms, Standards, processes already in place.

1. Staff Development Units should be reinstated: gives the ILT documentation and is an incentive. Monthly meetings with Mentor and ILT documented by sign-in sheets(provide time for Mentor/ILT meetings within the day). Must be related to INTASC. Give schools the opportunity to tie in School Improvement, Technology, SACS, Safe Schools, etc.
2. IHEs should be required to introduce INTASC standards. Make known differences in portfolio at IHE level and at other levels...should be different than any required of teachers. Need to think about a year long internship, thus justifying the increased pay upon graduation.
3. There should be different requirements for Lateral Entry teachers. Pay for teachers who graduated from Teacher Education institutions should be a pay grade higher than lateral entry.
4. Require ILTs to observe designated Master Teachers in the LEA. Provide two half days of release time for this.
5. Unannounced Observations by a Professional Observer—Whole day, Based on INTASC, planning period to review and give feedback.
6. More rigorous accountability for Mentors.
7. No additional tests of any kind.

West Group 1	West Group 2	West Group 3
<p>1) Continue monthly meetings with ILTs and mentors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on IGP and these INTASC Standards: content pedagogy, motivation and management, and planning. • ILT2s will be assessed via TPAI-R (or other model) with all functions rated “at standard” or above. <p>2) Long-term proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILT3s in their 1st semester produce a 20-minute video and written reflections, assessed by a trained mentor/assessor in concert with principal’s recommendation. 	<p>Menu option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot test National Education Services test on INTASC Standards. • Require mentor/mentee meetings with evidence of INTASC to be assessed within the region but outside the LEA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If deemed “below standard,” ILT must go to a 2-day intensive training. The intense 2-day retreat will be for ILTs who need further professional development. High quality teachers who demonstrate INTASC Standards and help ILTs pull together evidence of INTASC Standards will provide this training. ILTs will earn CEUs for participation. <p>Also noted: PBL Product requirement would move to a part of student teaching</p>	<p>Four options as numbered:</p> <p>1) Licensure decision based on results of interviews and conferences between ILT and site administrator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubric on INTASC Standards • LEA makes recommendation for licensure. <p>2) Two full lessons on videotape with supporting evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILT reflects orally, on tape, or written • Based on INTASC • Evaluated by trained assessors. <p>3) Menu (No more than three)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PBL Portfolio • Videotaped lessons with assessment • Test (State pays, not ILT or State reimburses upon successful completion). <p>4) Continuing Education Credits to document learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banked during ILT process • Formula for how many count toward continuing license. <p>Also noted: Tough calls make it difficult for licensure decisions to be done locally</p>
West Group 4	West Group 5	West Group 6
<p>1) Expand and clearly define the role of mentor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better documentation of meetings • Implement reflective practices with mentor • Give mentor more authority • Better match of certification areas • Give mentor more training and more time with mentee <p>2) Shrink Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions need to be more succinct • Lengthen the time frame to complete the product • ILT2 process <p>Also noted: No more out of pocket expenses for teachers No video</p>	<p>Show INTASC implementation in classroom with more support for ILT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings with ILTs and mentors. Possibly structured activities or action plans. Mentor should provide informal observations for ILT. Support system. Let ILTs see good teachers in action. • Focused staff development with timeline. Provide professional development day on a monthly basis. • Follow-up is important. Support throughout the entire year. • Promotional incentives for ILTs such as renewal credit or annual leave days. <p>Also noted: Products should be implemented during college or student teaching to standardize requirements. No Test</p>	<p>1) Options for different learning styles, but build reflective process into all components</p> <p>2) Provide strong support base in individual schools/school systems with a cyclical approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network of ILTs so that they have a structure for addressing real problems • Input from experienced teachers • Practical application • Review and reflect with groups. • Staff development model that includes regular meetings focused on real classroom issues with input from experienced teachers. Practical professional development in which participants try ideas, discuss, revise, etc. <p>Also noted: There should be ongoing communication with colleges and universities to incorporate PBL Components and requirements into student teaching experience.</p>

West Group 7	West Group 8
<p>Suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money that has been set aside for PBL assessment be given to local systems to hire master teachers who provide assistance to first year and second year teachers • Local control • Time provided for comprehensive program • Video/discussion of INTASC Standards 	<p>Menu option of four items; keep the rigor; system chooses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test • Interview • Portfolio – may be modified • Growth standard (not a one time, one test situation) Have a school level discussion with ILT2s as a part of the process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPAI with monthly reflection • Principal or committee recommendation. • Cover INTASC over three years and give options when standards are covered. <p>Also noted: Reflective process is good Beginning teacher pay does not match expectations Improve student teaching Hire full time mentors</p>

Additional Comments/Notes

1. Individuals who need to resubmit

From the Southeast Regional Meeting: *WE ARE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT RESUBMISSIONS!!!! (Can we let them redo??? Since we want “Interim” requirements to be well-developed and not rushed?)

2. \$500 stipend from the state for teachers completing requirements in lieu of assessment fees (Sandhills)
3. Expand probationary license to 3 years (Sandhills)
4. More uniform standards at IHEs (Sandhills)
5. Want flexible options with balance (Sandhills)
6. Retrain Mentors on current material (Sandhills)
7. **VERY IMPORTANT:** Teachers should not pay for any interim requirement since the product did not have a fee to assess paid by teachers. (Southwest)
8. DO NOT make this in addition to what teachers are already doing. (Southwest)
9. Let the decision making be at the local level. (Southwest)
10. There needs to be stronger accountability for Principals/Administrators. (Southwest)
11. Options (a menus of two of three items to clear ILT) should be allowed with parameters. (Southwest)
12. DO NOT give options(differing view was would this be defensible in court?). (Southwest)
13. Move the product to year 4. (Southwest)
14. Teachers are not returning because of the product.
15. Continue full funding for a Mentor Program.

From Brenda Dail, Perquimans County

I have just recently finished going through the NC Teaching Fellows process with our top-notch students. I was so impressed with them and the entire process. It is a wonderful, challenging and valid process (much research and documentation to support program). I was thinking this process might be a good fill-in until another process could be approved. It is a very structured and rigorous process. Naturally, we could take it to a higher level and incorporate the INTASC standards.

Writing Assessment:

I suggest that we keep the writing assessment like they do for the teaching fellows. All LEAs will receive a sealed envelope including two writing prompts. During a certain time frame all local coordinators (or designees) will be responsible for administering a 60-minute writing assignment to their local ILTs - year 2 (or people needing to meet this licensure requirement). It would be nice to have it done on computers (like we do our comps for our masters degrees). Use a website, disk or paper - I would prefer them to demonstrate technology skills. Each ILT will select one prompt to write about defending their answer or reflecting on an experience. I will fax you a copy of the Teaching Fellows writing assignment and directions for you to review. The writing assignment can be printed out, saved on a disk or sent as an attachment to our Regional ILT Coordinator. Our Regional Coordinator will get our already trained PBL assessors to meet in June to read these papers and evaluate them based on a standard four-scale rubric. This will demonstrate technology skills, reflective writing and thinking skills, etc. I don't think this is too much to ask of our ILTs. The writing assessment can be done during the month of April.

Interview Assessment:

During the months of May and June, all ILTs will schedule a 20-minute interview with three trained PBL assessors (arranged by Regional and Local ILT Coordinators). The assessors will be given a set of 5 - 8 questions designed by DPI State ILT Coordinator and team. Again, received in a sealed envelope and all will be alike and follow their directions. (I will fax you a copy of this, too). Each ILT will be asked the same questions across the state. The interview session can be judged like the Teaching Fellows interview. I will send you a copy of the scoring sheet. Each PBL assessor will give a certain score for five areas. A minimum score will be set for the interview and all writing assignments must meet "At Standard" ranking.

I realized a lot of people suggested a video taping yesterday, but a writing assessment and interview may be more valid and practical while wait for the study to be completed. Many schools do not have proper video equipment and could cause a real hardship here at the last minute. I know our school system is poor and we don't have a lot of cameras. Also, teachers sometime record the same lesson over and over again until they get it perfect and this takes away from true instructional time and true learning. Plus, getting someone to record a quality video is often difficult. You get motion sickness watching some of these amateur videos. I don't think a 15-minute video allows enough time for a person to evaluate another person's teaching abilities. Based on the TPAI training, a true evaluation should last at least 45 to 50 minutes. Snapshots alone are not very valid documentation. Plus, getting people together to view videos could cost the state more money and more trouble. Is there validity in video watching?

Hopefully, IGP, INTASC standards and evaluations could be a part of the interview questions and/or writing assessments. (They are all very important components for an ILT to be successful).

November 22, 2002

Ms. Gayenell Campbell Gull
Mr. V. Brock Murray
Dr. Kathy Sullivan
Dr. Zoe Locklear

Greetings:

At a meeting on November 14, 2002, the personnel administrators of the Southwest Educational Alliance agreed on a recommendation to make to you regarding the interim Performance-Based Licensure requirements. We appreciate very much the opportunity to provide this input.

We want to emphasize that we are fully supportive of high standards for continuing licensure. Furthermore, we feel strongly that continuing licenses should be issued based on quality performance. In addition, one of the goals of the State Board of Education and all of our local school systems involves the recruitment and retention of **quality** teachers. These are some of the guiding principles behind our proposal.

As you know, the Initial Licensure Process that is in place now is already more rigorous than it was when the Excellent Schools Act was passed. This additional rigor is due to the alignment of the Beginning Teachers' Individual Growth Plan with the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument—Revised, the Pre-Conference Questions, and the rubrics that have been developed. In addition, these documents have also been correlated to the INTASC Standards, the State Board's standards, and the NBPTS Core Propositions. With these alignments, we feel strongly that the continuing licensure program for Initially Licensed Teachers must be based on the INTASC standards and the teacher's growth within these ten standards. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the Beginning Teacher Individualized Growth Plan be the **primary** document used for determining continuing licensure, along with the other TPAI-R documents. On the following page is the analysis behind this recommendation.

A further recommendation is that the General Assembly provide a fully-funded mentor program. If the new teacher is classified as an ILT, then a state-paid mentor should be provided until the new teacher qualifies for a continuing license.

Again, we appreciate this opportunity for input. Please let us know if you would like additional information.

Sincerely,

Personnel Administrators
Southwest Educational Alliance

Analysis of the Recommendation to use

THE BEGINNING TEACHER'S INDIVIDUAL GROWTH PLAN FOR CONTINUING LICENSURE

+	σ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Since 2000, administrators, mentors, and ILTs have been trained and/or re-trained in the use of this instrument. + The BT-IGP focuses on the ten INTASC Standards, which address the main things that a teacher needs to know and be able to do. + The legislation requires “that any interim requirements do not require significant and unnecessary paperwork, effort, and administrative burden.” Since these documents and processes are already in place, this recommendation meets that requirement of the legislation. + With the additional focus on the BT-IGP, it becomes a more rigorous process. + It focuses on the GROWTH of the ILT. Certainly that should be the focus of any effective and productive recruitment, induction, retention, and licensing program. + The IGP is reviewed three times per year. The school-based administrators and the mentor and/or other peers are involved in that review. As part of the review, the ILT provides documentation / evidence related to or addressing each of the INTASC standards. Over a three-year period, a minimum of nine reviews occur. A form is already provided to document these reviews. + Part of the BT-IGP documentation would be verification of completion of professional development sessions related to each of the INTASC standards (for example, a minimum of 60 hours = 20 hours per year for each of the three years in the ILT program). These would not be renewal credits, but would be professional growth directly related to the Beginning Teacher Process and the INTASC Standards. + One of the INTASC Standards addresses Motivation and Management of Students, one of the most common growth areas for ILTs. + The Key Indicators for the INTASC Standards provide a ready-made rubric for the IGP (copy attached). + This recommendation is aligned with what beginning teachers already are doing, with the addition of specified professional growth and documentation related to the INTASC standards. Perhaps one additional page would have to be added: a sign-off sheet for the school-based administrator, the mentor, and the central office regarding the ILTs readiness for a continuing license. + This proposal does not require additional DPI staffing or major effort at DPI. In a year, when the state agency has already lost 30-40 positions and most departments are stressed, this is an important consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> σ The State Board and/or Legislative Oversight Committee may not be aware of the BT-IGP and the revised TPAI, including the excellent Pre-Observation Questions and Rubric, as they were not in place when the Excellent Schools Act was passed. The monitoring process and evaluation system for beginning teachers are now more rigorous than when the PBL process began. σ With the added focus on the BT-IGP, school systems may need to concentrate a little additional in-service time on this instrument, as well as on how to analyze one's strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the BT-IGP. σ Many school systems have used the Pre-Observation Conference questions with our Initially Licensed Teachers on a trial basis (these questions were originally developed for experienced teachers). Those trials have been very successful, and we recommend that the Pre-Conference Questions and Rubric be used at least one time per year with the ILTs (not more than once because their use requires an announced observation). These questions need to be incorporated into the local performance appraisal training for ILTs. σ Someone (preferably DPI) should further develop the INTASC Key Indicators Rubric, listing suggested activities / strategies for each of the Key Indicators as well as the resources (people, funds, materials, or time) needed to accomplish each activity/strategy. This sample prescriptive growth document should be shared with all NC school systems.

Participants in the Regional Meetings

Individual	Position	LEA
Linda Loy	Coordinator for Personnel Development	Alamance-Burlington
Sheryl Steele	Mentor Teacher	Alamance-Burlington
Rachel Walker	ILT 2	Alamance-Burlington
Liz Cronan	ILT2	Alexander County
Elizabeth Curry	Principal	Alexander County
Lynn Grogan	EC Lead Teacher	Alexander County
Barry Redmond	Associate Superintendent	Alexander County
Tanya Carmichael	ILT2	Alleghany County
Phil Howell	Principal	Alleghany County
Leann Joines	ILT1	Alleghany County
Carol Porter	Mentor Teacher	Alleghany County
Gary West	Principal	Alleghany County
Maxter Allen		Anson County
Betsy Ammons		Anson County
Melissa Edwards		Anson County
Eileen Churchill	ILT Coordinator	Arapahoe Charter
Ina Cox	Personnel Director	Ashe County
Elizabeth Cuildus		Asheboro City
Jennifer Lake		Asheboro City
Barbara Skelly		Asheboro City
Jennifer Smith		Asheboro City
Cindy Byron	Teacher	Asheville City
Vicki Dineen	Principal	Asheville City
Nancy Reid	ILT Coordinator	Asheville City/McDowell County
Greg Townsend	Mentor Teacher	Asheville City
Rachel Hollman	Director of Personnel	Avery County
Diane Jaynes	Principal	Avery County

Individual	Position	LEA
Wendi Reed	ILT 1	Baker Charter
Marti Wilson	Principal	Baker Charter
Susan Legg	Teacher	Beauford County
Nicole Howard	Principal	Beauford County
Carolyn Satchell	Human Resources	Beauford County
Sandra Hardy	Assistant Principal	Bertie County
Brenda Pollard	Teacher	Bertie County
Connie Richardson	Director	Bertie County
John Bettarto	Principal	Bethel Hill Charter
Gail Collie	Teacher	Bethel Hill Charter
Sandra Snead	Teacher	Bethel Hill Charter
Sandy Jones		Bladen County
Pat Holden	Director-ILT Coordinator	Brunswick County
Susan Piland	Mentor Teacher	Buncombe County
Margaret Hyatt	Principal	Buncombe County
Don Icenhour	Principal	Buncombe County
Donna James	ILT Coordinator	Buncombe County
Cassie Ostertag	ILT	Buncombe County
Steve Demiter	Director of Personnel/ILT Coordinator	Burke County
Penny Jenkins	Mentor	Burke County
Julia Knight-Pittman	Assistant Principal	Burke County
Shanda McFarlin	Principal	Burke County
Erin Wall	ILT2	Burke County
Teresa Abernathy		Cabarrus County
Marion Bish		Cabarrus County
Vickie Honeycutt		Cabarrus County
Jonathan Newton		Cabarrus County
Colleen Sain		Cabarrus County
Paula Mickey	Personnel Director/ILT Coordinator	Camden County

Individual	Position	LEA
Mary Beth Poole	Teacher	Camp Lejeune
Tom King	Personnel Administrator	Camp Lejeune
Janet Kinney	Principal	Camp Lejeune
Lisa Griffin	Director	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Sarah McCorcle	Teacher	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Valarie Simmons	Teacher	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Lisa Sullivan	Teacher	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Barbara Brown	Licensure Specialist	Carteret County
Donna Kimbro	ILT Coordinator	Caswell
Shelba Barrett	ILT Coordinator	Catawba County
Ashley Dozier	Teacher	Chapel Hill-Carrboro City
Mary Gundeson	ILT Coordinator	Chapel Hill-Carrboro City
Helen Maxwell	Teacher	Chapel Hill-Carrboro City
Mollie Henderson		Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Elaine Miller		Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Teresa Shipman	Human Resources	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Valerie Williams		Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Dale Bunch	Teacher	Chatham Charter School
John Cazzinni	Principal	Chatham Charter School
Judy Morris	Teacher	Chatham County
Crystal Perry	Teacher	Chatham Charter School
Rhonda Underwood	ILT Coordinator/Licensure Specialist	Chatham County
John Arnold	ILT Coordinator	Cherokee Central Schools
Wanda Arrowood	Principal	Cherokee County Schools
Tim Coffey	Director of Instruction	Cherokee County Schools
Linda Crowe	Principal	Cherokee Central Schools
Clara Gustason	Mentor Teacher	Cherokee County Schools
Arlene Huskey	Teacher	Cherokee Central Schools
Teresa Mosteller	Teacher	Cherokee County Schools

Individual	Position	LEA
David Newsome	Principal	Cherokee County Schools
Laura Hastings	Association President	CLDS
Christine Moye	ILT	CLDS
Joe Bowen		Cleveland County
Cathy Mason	Assistant Principal	Clinton City
Mary Nell Darden	Assistant Principal	Clinton City
Faye McManus	Principal	Clover Garden Charter
Charity Saunders	Teacher	Clover Garden Charter
Camille Thomas	Teacher	Clover Garden Charter
Kathryn Faulk		Columbus County
Roy Mayo		Columbus County
Amy Powell		Columbus County
Georgia Spaulding		Columbus County
Barbara Yates		Columbus County
Marnie Halvorson		Covenant Day School
Betty Blythe	Personnel Director	Craven County
Shirley Dawson	Assistant Superintendent	Craven County
Cindy Johnston	Teacher/Mentor	Craven County
Jennie Oakley	Principal	Craven County
Jewel Smith	Teacher/Mentor	Craven County
Cindy McCormic		Cumberland County
Theresa Rovry		Cumberland County
Dale Williams		Cumberland County
Anne Mackin	Personnel Director	Currituck County
Margie Parker		Dare County
Jules Crowell	Principal	Davidson County
Annette Kruse		Davidson County
Melissa MacDermid		Davidson County
Evan Myers		Davidson County

Individual	Position	LEA
Faye Patterson	ILT Coordinator	Davidson County
Amy Durso	Resource Coordinator	DHHS
Michael Viar	Licensure/Support Services Coordinator	DHHS
Carole Breerwood		Diocese of Charlotte
Rosalie Innacelli	ILT Coordinator	Diocese of Raleigh
Jennifer Haygood	Teacher Support Coordinator	DJJDP
Vicki Alabaster	ILT Coordinator	Duplin County
Minnie Bryant	Human Resource Director	Duplin County
Marian Chavious	Lateral Entry Coordinator	Duplin County
Alice Hagaman	PBL Coordinator	Durham Public
Sheila Washington-Callis	Mentor Coordinator	Durham Public
Jennifer Bellizza	Teacher	East Wake Academy
Kelly Maxson	ILT Coordinator	East Wake Academy
Michelle Alexander	HR Director	Edenton-Chowan
Debbie Burrough	ILT 2 Coach	Edenton-Chowan
Debora Lightfoot	ILT Coordinator	Edgecombe County
Joyce Harris	ILT Coordinator	Elizabeth City/Pasquotank
Victor Vance		Fort Bragg Schools
Quincy Etheridge		Gaston County
Jennifer Fannin		Gaston County
Marcia Hunter		Gaston County
Penny Powell		Gaston County
Linda Rader		Gaston County
Nina Yeargin	Director of Human Resources	Graham County Schools
Dave Bennett	HR Director	Granville County
Mekeisha Williams	Professional Development Coordinator	Granville County
Mary Beth Riddick	Teacher	Greene County
Gwen Smith	ILT Coordinator	Greene County
Raymond Smith	Director, Human Resources	Greene County

Individual	Position	LEA
Erica Summerlin	Teacher	Greene County
Sonja Fischer		Guilford County
Doris Henderson	ILT Coordinator	Guilford County
Martha Snavely		Guilford County
Audrey Young	Teacher	Guilford County
Selma Allen	Personnel Director	Halifax County
Vivian Branch	Principal	Halifax County
Chastity Kinsey	Teacher	Halifax County
Jeffrey McCain	Principal	Halifax County
Claudia Sikes	Literacy Specialist	Halifax County
Betty Ann Bowen		Harnett County
Carla Crenshaw		Harnett County
Cecilia Gregory		Harnett County
Linda Turlington Herring		Harnett County
Rebecca Caldwell	Mentor Teacher	Haywood County Schools
Kadie Franklin	ILT	Haywood County Schools
Regina Lambert	Principal	Haywood County Schools
Terry McCracken	Director of Human Resources	Haywood County Schools
Bill Nolte	Principal	Haywood County Schools
David Jones	Sr. Director of Personnel Services	Henderson County
Gailoe Johnson	Teacher	Hertford County
Betty Pyl	ILT Coordinator	Hertford County
Ric Vandett	Assistant Superintendent	Hickory City
Linda McLaughlin		Hoke County
Diantha Coley	Administrative Assistant	Hyde County
Charles Delforge	Principal	Hyde County
Bertha Valentine-Thorpe	Principal	Hyde County
Susan Norman	Lead Teacher	Jackson County
Carol Burchette	Mentor Teacher	Johnston County

Individual	Position	LEA
Kirk Denning	Principal	Johnston County
Robin Little	ILT Coordinator	Johnston County
Holly Price	ILT 2	Johnston County
Valeria Barrow	Personnel Officer	Jones County
Jerry Meaney	Teacher	Jones County
Donna Morton	Teacher	Jones County
Jo Stone	Principal	Jones County
Sherry Winn	ILT 2	Jones County
Chip Buckwell		Kannapolis City
Judy Dayroult		Kannapolis City
Judy Goodnight		Kannapolis City
Annie Pickett	Personnel Director	Kannapolis City
Kristi Stubbs		Kannapolis City
Ronnie Wilson		Kings Mountain
Lou Coggins		Lee County
Amy Thomas		Lee County
Robert Melton	ILT Coordinator	Lenoir County
Ashley Hinson		Lexington City
Melissa Pfeffer		Lexington City
Susan Vivacoua		Lexington City
Vicky Ratchford		Lincoln County
Phyllis Talbert		Lincoln County
Richard Baldwin	Director of Personnel	Macon County
Terry Bell	Principal	Macon County
Tammy Tisdale	Principal	Macon County
Theresa Banks	Associate Superintendent	Madison County
Susanne DuVall	Teacher	Madison County
Shannon Ramsey	Teacher	Madison County
Lisa Snelson	Teacher	Madison County

Individual	Position	LEA
Candi McPherson	Principal	McDowell County
Sarah Pratt	Personnel Services	McDowell County
Sandra Queen	Mentor	McDowell County
Robyn Wall	Teacher	McDowell County
Jim Washburn	Principal	McDowell County
Aimee Auman		Montgomery County
Bob Gilman		Montgomery County
Ralph Johnson		Montgomery County
Sue Long		Montgomery County
Stella Farrow		Moore County
Donna Thomas		Moore County
Carmen Vaughan		Moore County
Elizabeth Sadler		Mooresville City
Denny Barr	Assistant Principal	Mt. Airy
Gloria Best	Mentor	Mt. Airy
Whitney Blackwell	ILT2	Mt. Airy
Roberta Ackley		New Century Charter
Amy Conklin	Teacher	New Hanover County
Cary Sink	Teacher	New Hanover County
Olga Wheatley	ILT Coordinator	New Hanover County
Michael Zentwerger	Principal	New Hanover County
Larry Harris		Newton-Conover
Beckie Collins	Personnel Director	Onslow County
Cindy Paredes	ILT 3	Onslow County
Deborah Rose	Site Coordinator	Onslow County
Sue Florence	ILT Coordinator	Orange County
Judy Pounds	Teacher	Orange County
Patricia Temple	Principal	Orange County
Margaret Vaughn	Teacher	Orange County

Individual	Position	LEA
Wanda Dawson	Assistant Superintendent	Pamlico County
Deloris Rhodes	Director of Personnel	Pender County
Brenda Dail	Personnel Director	Perquimans County
Jennifer Kiesicki	Teacher	Perquimans County
Judith Hunley	Teacher	Person County
Donna Jerry	Assistant Director/Personnel	Person County
Kim Kauffman	Mentor Teacher	Person County
Chera Cayton	Teacher	Pitt County
Walter Claybrook	Assistant Principal	Pitt County
Sheridan Holstein	ILT Coordinator	Pitt County
Virginia Simmons	Assistant Principal	Pitt County
Margaret Wirth	Teacher	Pitt County
Cathy Childress	Principal	Polk County
Rick Howell	Principal	Polk County
Mary Margaret Ingle	Associate Superintendent	Polk County
Stephanie Bridges	Assistant Principal	Randolph County
Nancy Cross	Instructional Lead Teacher	Randolph County
Judi Moffitt	Coordinator for Personnel Support	Randolph County
Kelli Vann	Teacher	Randolph County
K. Luann Greene		Richmond County
Lane Street		Richmond County
Martha Webb		Richmond County
Linda Humble	ILT Coordinator/Principal	River Mill Academy
Mildred Hurteau	Teacher	River Mill Academy
Joan Love	Teacher	River Mill Academy
Joyce Kennedy	Personnel Director	Roanoke Rapids
Gene Freeman		Robeson County
Vicki Gibson		Robeson County
Melinda Powers		Robeson County

Individual	Position	LEA
Jay Jones	ILT Coordinator	Rockingham County
Delores Morris		Rowan Salisbury
Jean Kennedy		Rowan-Salisbury
Sandra Rogers		Rowan-Salisbury
Mandi Sweet		Rowan-Salisbury
Donna Wiseman		Rowan-Salisbury
Steven Helton	Assistant Principal	Rutherford County
Marty Hopper	Principal	Rutherford County
Diann Johnson	Assistant Principal	Sampson County
Rhonda Spell	Assistant Principal	Sampson County
Elizabeth Wheeler	Teacher	Sampson County
Ellen Jones		Scotland County
Leslie Knauss		Scotland County
Patricia McLean		Scotland County
Any Sloop		Scotland County
Donna Suttle		Shelby City
Peggy Furr		Stanly County
Terry Griffin		Stanly County
Debby Johnston		Stanly County
Angela Mills		Stanly County
Susan Shields		Stanly County
Melisa Jessup	Human Resources	Stokes County
Jennifer Scott	Director of Professional Development	Surry County
Bill Hester	ILT	Swain County
Bobby Marr	Associate Superintendent	Swain County
Jody Marr	Mentor Teacher	Swain County
Sam Pattillo	Principal	Swain County
Os Waters	Principal	Swain County
Barbara Armstrong		Thomasville City

Individual	Position	LEA
Elizabeth Ballard	ILT	Transylvania County
Amy Schoenacher	Mentor	Transylvania County
Betty Scruggs	Assistant Principal	Transylvania County
James Cahoon	Assistant Superintendent/ILT Coord.	Tyrrell County
Pearl Ogletree	Director, C&I	Tyrrell County
Joanne Smith	Teacher	Tyrrell County
Patty Spencer	Support Teacher	Tyrrell County
Terri Cooper		Union County
Sarah Bristow	Teacher	Vance Charter School
Vivian Bullock	ILT Coordinator	Vance County
Carolyn Powell	Principal	Vance Charter School
S. Wall		Vance Charter School
Gail Washington	Teacher	Vance Charter School
Anne Hudson	Elementary ILP Coordinator	Wake County
Luana McCamy	Teacher/ILP Coordinator	Wake County
Mary Page	Principal	Wake County
Judy Stines	Secondary ILP Coordinator	Wake County
Wendy Thomas	Administrator	Wake County
Lisa Woodside	ILT 3	Wake County
Princine Jefferies	Assistant Superintendent	Warren County
Chelsa Jennings	Teacher	Warren County
Joyce Long	Principal	Warren County
Willistine Williams	Teacher	Warren County
Gail Ford	K-8 ILT Coordinator	Watauga County
Phyllis Garr	Mentor Teacher	Watauga County
Clarissa Schanal	HS ILT Coordinator	Watauga County
Angela Watson	Teacher/Mentee	Watauga County
Carla Anderson	Teacher	Wayne County
Debbie Durham	ILT Coordinator	Wayne County

Individual	Position	LEA
Teresa Simmons	Mentor Teacher	Wayne County
Diane Watts	Assistant Principal	Wayne County
Jenny Whitfield	Principal	Wayne County
Donna Draper	Teacher/Support Coach	Weldon City
Betty Hanks	Counselor/Support Coach	Weldon City
Roger Metcalf	Director	Western-RESA
Milton Frink		Whiteville City
Chinaki Jal		Whiteville City
Katie McLam		Whiteville City
Deanna Sherman		Whiteville City
Jerry Barlett	Principal	Wilkes County
Deborah Elleridge	ILT Coordinator	Wilkes County
Bob Hobert	Principal	Wilkes County
Charles Davis	Principal	Winston-Salem Forsyth
James Lucas	ILT Coordinator	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Fran Oates	Dir. of Staff Development/ILT Coor.	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Suzanne Sarfert	ILT2	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Jane Thomas	Mentor Teacher	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Ann Marie Wasson	ILT3	Yadkin County
Karen Matthew	ILT Coordinator	Yadkin County
Brenda Perdue	Mentor	Yadkin County
James Sheek	Principal	Yadkin County

APPENDIX C

Participants

December 3, 2002 Meeting

Individual	LEA Affiliation
Barbara Armstrong	Thomasville City
Cecil Banks	NCPTSC
Velma Barnes	Wilson County
Valeria Barrow	Jones County
Becky Blomgren	Greensboro College
Betty Blythe	Craven County
Chip Buckwell	Kannapolis City
Vivian Bullock	Vance County
Angela Farthing	NCAE
Alice Hagaman	Durham County
Larry Harris	Newton-Conover
Dorsey Harris	NCAE
Susan Harrison	Wake County
Parmalee Hawk	East Carolina University
Doris Henderson	Guilford County
Ashley Hinson	Lexington City
Vickie Honeycutt	Cabarrus County
Anne Hudson	Wake County
Gary Jarrett	DPI
Melisa Jessup	Stokes County
Jay Jones	Rockingham County
Jean Kennedy	Rowan-Salisbury
Debora Lightfoot	Edgecombe County
Robin Little	Johnston County
Zoe Locklear	DPI

Individual	LEA Affiliation
Penny Maguire	DPI
Karen Matthews	Yadkin County
Robert Melton	Lenoir County
Delores Morris	Rowan-Salisbury
Brock Murray	DPI
Bennett Myers	Craven County
Jane Norwood	SBE
Faye Patterson	Davidson County
Philip Price	DPI
Vicki Rivenbark	Onslow County
Sandra Rogers	Rowan-Salisbury
Tony Romano	Charlotte-Mecklenburg
Susan Simpson	PENC
Judy Stines	Wake County
Linda Suggs	DPI
Joyce Wade	Johnston County
Olga Wheatley	New Hanover County
Claire White	NCPTA
Devon White	PENC
Margaret Wirth	Pitt County

APPENDIX D
INDIVIDUALIZED GROWTH PLAN AND TPAI-R

DIRECTIONS FOR THE USE OF THE BEGINNING TEACHER'S INDIVIDUALIZED GROWTH PLAN (IGP)

1. Fill in identifying data on the beginning teacher and the mentor teacher. Specify the school year and indicate (by circling 1, 2, or 3) if the beginning teacher is in the first, second, or third year of the Initial Licensure Program.
2. Review the 10 INTASC Standards for Beginning Teachers. Using the attached form, assess the beginning teacher's standing relative to each of the standards.
3. Based on the review of the INTASC standards, identify the standard(s) on which the beginning teacher will focus for the IGP year.
4. Identify the Key Indicators on which the beginning teacher will focus during the IGP year.
5. Identify the Activities/Strategies the beginning teacher will use to focus on the targeted Key Indicators during the IGP year.
6. Identify the Resources (people, funds, materials, or time) need to accomplish each activity/strategy.
7. Identify a target date for each activity/strategy.
8. Record the completion date for each activity/strategy.
9. Identify evidence of completion of each activity/strategy.
10. Near the end of the school year, the beginning teacher, the mentor teacher, and the supervisor should each assess the progress of the beginning teacher in realizing the targeted Key Indicators. Each should sign and date the comments.
11. Throughout the year, periodic conferences should be conducted to assess the beginning teacher's progress in realizing the targeted Key Indicators. Summaries of these conferences should be recorded on the Assessment Conferences sheet. Additional copies of this sheet should be made as needed.

BEGINNING TEACHER INDIVIDUALIZED GROWTH PLAN

School Year: _____ ILP Year: 1 2 3 (Circle)

Name: _____ Position/Subject Area: _____ School: _____

Mentor: _____ Position/Subject Area: _____ School: _____

INTASC Standards for Beginning Teachers 1. Content Pedagogy 2. Student Development 3. Diverse Learners 4. Multiple Instructional Strategies 5. Motivation and Management			6. Communication and Technology 7. Planning 8. Assessment 9. Reflective Practice: Professional Growth 10. School and Community Involvement			Focus Standards: 		
Key Indicators	Activities (Strategies)	Resources	Target Date	Completion Date	Evidence of Completion			
Beginning Teacher's Summative Assessment <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> Signature: _____ Date: _____ </div>								
Mentor's Summative Assessment <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> Signature: _____ Date: _____ </div>								
Supervisor's Summative Assessment <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> Signature: _____ Date: _____ </div>								

ASSESSMENT CONFERENCES

Date	Beginning Teacher's Assessment/Comments	Mentor's/Principal's Assessment/Comments
	<p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Signature: _____</p>
	<p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Signature: _____</p>
	<p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Signature: _____</p>

INTASC STANDARDS ASSESSMENT

1: Content Pedagogy	2: Student Development	3: Diverse Learners	4: Multiple Instructional Strategies	5: Motivation and Management
+	+	+	+	+
>	>	>	>	>
6: Communication/Technology	7: Planning	8: Assessment	9: Reflective Practice	10: School/Community Involvement
+	+	+	+	+
>	>	>	>	>

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

**NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM STUDY**

November 14, 2002
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

North Carolina Community College System Study

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Section 8.7(a) of Chapter 126 of the 2002 Session Laws, the North Carolina Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee (Committee), in conjunction with the North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges (State Board), is seeking a qualified vendor with expertise in education policy and finance to conduct a study of and make recommendations regarding the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) (See Appendix A, NCCCS Study). The study should be an analysis of the organization and structure of the NCCCS, the number of colleges within the NCCCS, the location and size of the colleges, and the effects of consolidating some of the colleges and programs. The study should also analyze the formula used to fund administration at the colleges; appropriate funding levels for administration of the various colleges, and the appropriate number of administrative staff members for colleges of different sizes. Finally, the study should consider how multi-campus colleges and off-campus centers are funded including the appropriate number of administrative staff members for these entities and the appropriate funding mechanisms for administration and other purposes.

BACKGROUND

Organization and Structure of the NCCCS

The NCCCS offers a comprehensive range of educational programs to meet the needs of local communities for workforce preparedness and higher academic education, basic educational skills, job retraining, personal growth and development, and community and economic development. Fifty-eight colleges and the Center for Applied Textile Technology make up the NCCCS. A complete list of the colleges and their locations can be found in Appendix B.

The State of North Carolina has assigned the fifty-eight colleges and the Center for Applied Textile Technology to the State Board. The State Board consists of 21 members selected by the Governor and the General Assembly, and has full authority to adopt all policies, regulations, and standards it may deem necessary for the operation of the NCCCS. The NCCCS Office, headed by the NCCCS President, provides State-level administration and leadership of the NCCCS under the direction of the State Board.

Each individual college is governed by a local board of trustees composed of a minimum of twelve citizens from the service area in which the college is located. The local board of trustees sets local policy. The local board of trustees elects and the State Board approves the selection of the president of each college. All personnel employed at the colleges are employees of the college and not the State of North Carolina.

Administrative Funding Formula

The Community College Budget. The NCCCS operates on funds from four sources: State, local, federal, and tuition and fees. The majority of funding for the NCCCS comes from the State and is used for administration and instruction. (Maintenance of plant and capital costs are generally the purview of the counties in which the colleges are located.) Funds are distributed to the colleges primarily through two funding formulas: the instructional formula and the administrative formula. In FY01-02, the total General Fund operating budget for the NCCCS was \$650,888,736. Of that, 59% (\$381 million) was used for the instructional formula; 27% (\$179 million) for administration; 4% for the NCCCS Office; and the remaining 10% for equipment and books and other miscellaneous programs.

Although funds are provided to the colleges for specific purposes, the presidents and the local board of trustees of each individual college have the flexibility to manage their funds in a manner appropriate for their college. The only limitation on this flexibility is a 2% transfer restriction on faculty salary funds. The colleges may not move more than 2% from faculty salaries to other areas within the budget (i.e. administration, equipment, etc.)

The Administrative Formula. This study will focus only on the administrative formula, and not on instruction, equipment, or categorical funding. Administration at each college usually consists of the president, senior administrators, guidance counselors, financial aid officers, registrars, librarians, and other non-instructional staff. State funds may be used to pay for all non-instructional staff except maintenance personnel. The current administrative formula provides a base allotment of \$1.61 million (based on the cost of 31 positions). Enrollment funding is provided at a rate of \$1,103 per full-time equivalent student (FTE) for every FTE over 750. The president's salary is based on a salary scale that has recently been revised by the State Board; that salary is not included in the administrative formula. The adjusted average administrative allotment for FY01-02 was \$3.9 million.

Multi-Campus Colleges and Off-Campus Center Funding

Multi-Campus Colleges (MCCs). MCCs are essentially self-contained satellites of existing colleges. In order to be categorized as a MCC by the State Board, the college must offer at least one Associate degree obtainable entirely at the campus, and have an enrollment of at least 300 full-time equivalent students (FTE). MCCs offer all student services – financial aid, registration, guidance counselors, and libraries.

Current Funding for MCCs. Currently there are 12 colleges with a total of 17 campuses designated as MCCs. A listing of all MCCs can be found in Appendix C. Each college receives \$92,093 per campus to supplement the administrative formula allotment. (MCCs and off-campus centers do not require additional instructional funding. Costs associated with instruction are covered by the regular instructional formula allotment.)

Off-Campus Centers. Off-campus centers are convenience locations that provide appropriate population and geographic access for community outreach, faculty and staff office space, literacy, continuing education, and curriculum instruction. Students may complete certificates or diplomas. Generally, only limited services are provided at off-campus centers. Colleges usually employ at least one person to oversee scheduling and operations; other staff may include counselors, financial aid officers, or librarians. Currently, forty-six colleges have an off-campus center. A complete list of all off-campus centers can be found in Appendix D. No additional funding is provided for the operation of the off-campus centers.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE

In gathering the necessary data, the consultant is encouraged to meet with staff from the Fiscal Research Division of the North Carolina General Assembly, the Business and Finance Division of NCCCS, representatives from the State Board, representatives from individual community colleges in North Carolina, and other appropriate individuals. The consultant may obtain and review information from other states' community college systems as part of this project.

The project shall include consideration, analysis, and assessment of the following:

1. The organization and structure of the NCCCS including recommendations regarding organization and structure.
2. The size (full-time equivalent students and headcount) and number of colleges, (including campuses and off-campus centers) within the NCCCS; their proximity to one another; and whether or not the consolidation of two or more colleges or the administrations of two or more colleges, is feasible.
3. The basic elements of administration required to effectively operate a college or a subset of colleges:
 - a. Direct and indirect costs;
 - b. Staffing requirements; and
 - c. Appropriate levels of funding for administration at a college.

The consultant may categorize colleges according to similar relevant characteristics which affect administrative needs, and may sample different types of colleges to determine the basic elements of administration required for each category.

4. The current administrative formula:
 - a. Whether the current formula adequately provides for administration at each college;
 - b. Whether the current formula should be revised to reflect enrollment differences; and
 - c. Whether other factors should be considered in the current administrative formula to reflect administrative requirements at different colleges; and
 - d. Recommendations for other changes needed in the administrative formula.

5. MCCs and Off-Campus Centers:

- a. Whether MCCs have special administrative funding requirements and if so, recommendations as to appropriate funding mechanisms to address those special requirements; and
- b. Whether there are additional costs associated with the operation of off-campus centers and if so, recommendations as to appropriate funding mechanisms to address those additional costs.

The vendor will be expected to present interim and final reports to the Committee and the State Board. The interim report should at least include the analysis of the organization and structure of NCCCS and the analysis of the basic elements of administration required to effectively operate a community college. Following the submission of the final report, the vendor will be expected to make a presentation to the House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees on Education during the 2003 General Assembly Legislative Session; the date and time to be determined by the Committee. The vendor will also be expected to make a presentation to the State Board; the date and time to be determined by the State Board.

PROJECT TIMEFRAME

Key dates and deadlines associated with this study are listed below:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Projected Completion Date</u>
Issue RFP	November 14, 2002
Proposal Deadline	December 9, 2002
Award Contract	December 20, 2002
Interim Progress Report	March 15, 2003
Final Report	June 1, 2003

PROPOSAL FORMAT

The proposals for this project must be submitted in two separate sealed envelopes, one containing the technical proposal and the other containing the cost proposal. Requirements for each of these items are described below.

Technical Proposal Content

The technical proposal shall consist of the following sections:

- 1. Executive Summary:** The executive summary shall consist of a brief summary of the contents of the proposal.
- 2. Corporate Background and Experience:** This section shall include background information on the organization and details of experiences with similar projects. In addition, a list of at least three references, including contacts and telephone numbers

for whom similar work has been performed should be included. (References may not include current project stakeholders.) Samples of work projects should be provided.

3. Project Staffing and Organization: This section shall include a description of proposed staffing, deployment and organization of personnel to be assigned to the project. The vendor shall also include the resumes of key personnel who will actually be assigned to the project, describing experience with similar projects and the responsibilities to be assigned to each person. In addition, the section shall include a detailed description of how the study will be planned, organized, and executed.

4. Task Description and Schedule: This section shall include, in narrative, outline, or graph form, the vendor's approach to accomplishing the tasks outlined in the projects description section of this RFP. A description of each task and the schedule for accomplishing each shall be included.

In summary, vendors must demonstrate clearly and succinctly that they have the necessary experience, qualifications, and proven track record to complete the project successfully, on time, and within budget. Elaborate, verbose technical proposal documentation is neither wanted nor required to establish fitness or credentials for accomplishing this work.

Cost Proposal Content

The cost proposal shall include:

1. Personnel-related costs including hourly rate and number of hours;
2. Anticipated travel and subsistence expenses;
3. Office space, telephone, and other support needs, if any, anticipated from the Committee or State Board;
4. Subcontractor costs (if any);
5. Other costs;
6. Total proposed cost of the project (see page 6);
7. Rates for additional analyses requested during the project period; and
8. A current balance sheet, a certified financial statement or equivalent information that indicates the financial stability of the vendor.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL PROCESS

1. Two original and ten copies of both the technical proposal and cost proposal, in separate sealed packages.
2. Each original shall be signed and dated by an official authorized to bind the vendor.
3. Other guidelines for the submission of proposals and questions concerning the RFP are addressed on Page 1.

COST PROPOSAL/EXECUTION OF PROPOSAL

By submitting this proposal, the potential vendor certifies the following:

- _____ This proposal is signed by an authorized representative of the vendor.
- _____ The vendor can obtain insurance certificates as required within 10 calendar days after notice of award.
- _____ The cost and availability of all equipment, materials, and supplies associated with performing the services described herein have been determined and included in the proposed cost.
- _____ All labor costs, direct and indirect, have been determined and included in the proposed cost.
- _____ The potential vendor has read and understands the conditions set forth in this RFP and agrees to them with no exceptions.
- _____ The vendor is registered in NC E-Procurement @ Your Service or agrees to register within two days after notification of contract award.

Therefore, in compliance with this Request for Proposals, and subject to all conditions herein, the undersigned offers and agrees, if this proposal is accepted within thirty (30) days from the date of the opening, to furnish the subject services for a TOTAL COST not to exceed \$ _____

Vendor: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Telephone: _____ FAX: _____

Federal Employer Identification Number: _____

E-Mail: _____

By: _____ Title: _____ Date: _____
(Signature)

(Typed or printed name)

ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL

By: _____ Title: _____ Date: _____

THIS PAGE MUST BE SIGNED AND INCLUDED IN YOUR PROPOSAL.
Unsigned proposals will not be considered.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluation Process Explanation

- Technical proposals will be evaluated first.
- The Committee and the State Board may request oral presentations from, or discussions with, any or all vendors for the purpose of clarifying or amplifying the material presented in any part of the proposals. However, vendors are advised that this provision is not mandatory; therefore, all proposals, both cost and technical, should be complete, concise, and reflect the most favorable terms available from the bidders. Vendors may be required to provide copies of reports and other pertinent documentation they have completed for similar projects, especially in the public sector.
- Proposals will be evaluated according to the criteria listed below under "Evaluation Criteria." The award of the contract to one vendor does not mean that the other proposals lacked merit, but with all factors considered, **THE SELECTED PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED TO PROVIDE THE BEST COMBINATION OF TECHNICAL AND COST VALUES TO THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.**
- Vendors are cautioned that this is a request for proposals, not a request to contract, and the Committee and the State Board reserve the unqualified right to reject any or all offers for any contract when such rejection is deemed to be in the best interest of the State of North Carolina.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Understanding the key objectives of the study.
2. Approach to the completion of the study including methodology to be employed, work plan to be followed, concepts to be emphasized, issues to be addressed, and resources to be used.
3. Staffing resources assigned to the study, including:
 - a. Experience levels and areas of expertise;
 - b. Use of unique resources for specific areas, organizations, and disciplines involved;
 - c. Adequate time commitment of senior management and technical and education specialists;
4. Capability, including proven track record, to ensure the successful completion of the study; and
5. Cost.

GENERAL CONDITIONS FOR SUBMITTAL OF PROPOSALS

All proposals are subject to the terms and conditions outlined herein. All responses shall be controlled by such terms and conditions and the submission of other terms

and conditions, price lists, catalogs, and/or other documents as part of a vendor's response will be waived and have no effect either on this Request for Proposals or on any contract that may be awarded resulting from this solicitation. The Vendor specifically agrees to the conditions set forth in the above paragraph by signature to the proposal.

Competitive Offer

Pursuant to the provision of G.S. 143-54, and under penalty of perjury, the signer of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP thereby certifies that this proposal has not been arrived at collusively or otherwise in violation of either Federal or North Carolina antitrust laws.

Right to Enter Negotiations

The Committee and the State Board reserve the right to enter into negotiations over the cost of the contract with the selected vendor, prior to acceptance, if the vendor's cost proposal is not within the funds available to the Committee or the State Board for the purpose set forth in this RFP.

Right to Reject

The Committee and State Board reserve the unqualified right to reject any and all proposals when such rejection is deemed to be in the best interest of the State of North Carolina.

Time for Acceptance

Each proposal shall state that it is a firm offer that may be accepted within a period of ninety (90) days from the date of submission.

Unsolicited Proposal Changes

Any unsolicited change to a proposal that is received after the closing date of this RFP will be rejected.

Responsibility to Make Timely Submission

The vendor is responsible for assuring the timely delivery of a proposal. Late proposals will be rejected without review.

Cost for Proposal Preparation

Any costs incurred by vendors in preparing or submitting offers are the vendor's sole responsibility; the Committee and the State Board will not reimburse any vendor for any costs incurred prior to award.

Oral Explanations

The Committee and the State Board shall not be bound by oral explanations or instructions given at any time during the competitive process or after award.

Reference to Other Data

Only information which is received in response to this RFP will be evaluated; reference to information previously submitted shall not be evaluated.

Elaborate Proposals

Elaborate proposals in the form of brochures or other presentations beyond that necessary to present a complete and effective proposal are not desired.

In an effort to support the sustainability efforts of the State of North Carolina we solicit your cooperation in this effort.

It is desirable that all responses meet the following requirements:

- All copies are printed **double sided**.
- All submittals and copies are printed on **recycled paper with a minimum post-consumer content of 30%** and indicate this information accordingly on the response.
- Unless absolutely necessary, all proposals and copies should **minimize or eliminate use of non-recyclable or non re-usable materials** such as plastic report covers, plastic dividers, vinyl sleeves, and GBC binding. Three-ringed binders, glued materials, paper clips, and staples are acceptable.
- Materials should be submitted in a format which allows for **easy removal and recycling** of paper materials.

Titles

Titles and headings in this RFP and any subsequent contract are for convenience only and shall have no binding force or effect.

Confidentiality of Proposals

In submitting its proposal the vendor agrees not to discuss or otherwise reveal the contents of the proposal to any source outside of the Committee, State Board or the Legislative Services Office staff until after the award of the contract.

Right to Submitted Materials

All responses, inquiries, or correspondence relating to or in reference to this RFP, and all other reports, charts, displays, schedules, exhibits, and other documentation submitted by the vendors shall become the property of the State of North Carolina when received.

Form of Proposal

Proposals shall be submitted in a form that, in the opinion of the Committee and State Board, may be incorporated verbatim into a contract.

Exception to Terms

Any exception, interpretation, or suggestion for clarification by the vendor to any of the terms and conditions of this RFP must be clearly stated by the vendor.

Vendor's Representative

Each vendor shall submit with its proposal the name, address, and telephone number of the person(s) with authority to bind the firm and answer questions or provide clarification concerning the vendor's proposal.

Proprietary Information

All vendor information submitted in the proposal has the potential to become public information. Vendors are cautioned that any proprietary information contained in the proposal may not be protected as confidential and should not be submitted in response to this RFP.

Historically Underutilized Businesses

Pursuant to General Statute 143-48 and Executive Order #150, the State invites and encourages participation in this procurement process by businesses owned by minorities, women, disabled, disabled business enterprises and non-profit work centers for the blind and severely disabled.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF RESULTING CONTRACT

The following terms and conditions will be included in the contract for conducting the project. Other terms and conditions may be added prior to the signing of the contract.

Contractor

The contract is between the Committee and the State Board (subject to the approval of the Legislative Services Commission) and the selected vendor (hereinafter referred to as "Contractor").

Governing Law

This contract is made under and shall be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of North Carolina.

Situs

The place of this contract, its situs and forum, shall be Raleigh, North Carolina, where all matters, whether sounding in contract or tort, relating to its validity, construction, interpretation and enforcement shall be determined.

Contract Period

The terms of the contract shall begin at its signing and shall end on or before June 1, 2003, unless extended or terminated as provided in this document.

Termination

Upon mutual written agreement of the Committee and the State Board and the Contractor, the contract may be terminated at any time. Failure to perform by the Contractor may result in termination by the Committee and the State Board. In addition, the Committee and the State Board have the right to terminate the contract at their discretion with 10 days written notice. In the event of such termination, the Contractor will be paid an amount commensurate with work completed.

Independent Contractor

The Contractor shall be considered to be an independent contractor and as such shall be wholly responsible for the work to be performed and for the supervision of its employees.

The Contractor represents that it has, or will secure at its own expense, all personnel required in performing the services under this agreement. Such employees shall not be employees of, or have any individual contractual relationship with the Legislative Services Office, the NCCCS, the Committee, the State Board, or any North Carolina Community College.

Conflict of Interest

The Contractor shall inform the Committee and the State Board in writing of any contracts for consulting services entered into by the Contractor with clients who may have a financial interest in the decisions and recommendations of the Committee, the State Board, any local board of trustees, or any combination of the three. Failure to disclose the names of such clients may result in the termination of this contract by the Committee and the State Board for cause.

Key Personnel

The Contractor shall not substitute key personnel assigned to the performance of this contract without prior written approval by the Committee and the State Board. The individuals designated as key personnel for purposes of this contract are those specified in the Contractor's proposal.

Subcontracting

Work proposed to be performed under this contract by the Contractor or its employees shall not be subcontracted without prior written approval of the Committee and the State Board.

Performance and Default

If, through any cause, the Contractor shall fail to fulfill in timely and proper manner the obligations under this agreement, the Committee and the State Board shall thereupon have the right to terminate this contract by giving written notice to the Contractor and specifying the effective date thereof. In that event, all finished or unfinished deliverable items under this contract prepared by the Contractor shall, at the option of the Committee and the State Board, become the property of the Committee and the State Board, and the Contractor shall be entitled to receive just and equitable compensation for any satisfactory work completed on such materials. Notwithstanding, the Contractor shall not be relieved of liability to the Committee and the State Board for damages sustained by the Committee and the State Board by virtue of any breach of this agreement, and the Committee and the State Board may withhold any payment due the Contractor for the purpose of setoff until such time as the exact amount of damages due the Committee and the State Board from such breach can be determined. In case of default by the Contractor, the Committee and the State Board may procure the services from other sources and hold the Contractor responsible for any excess cost occasioned thereby. Neither party shall be deemed to be in default of its obligations hereunder if and so long as it is prevented from performing such obligations by any act of war, hostile foreign action, nuclear explosion, riot, strikes, civil insurrection, earthquake, hurricane, tornado, or other catastrophic natural event or act of God.

Bankruptcy

Upon the filing for bankruptcy of insolvency by or against the Contractor, the Committee and the State Board may terminate this contract, and the provisions of the paragraph entitled "Performance and Default" shall apply.

Performance Bond

The Committee and the State Board may require either a performance bond up to the full amount of the contract or another performance guarantee.

Availability of Funds

Any and all payments to the Contractor are dependent upon and subject to the availability of funds to the Legislative Services Office, the State Board, or both, for the purpose set forth in this agreement.

Confidentiality

The Contractor agrees to protect the confidentiality of any files, data, or other materials provided by the Committee and the State Board and to restrict their use to the purpose of performing the contract. The contractor shall comply with the provisions of Article 17 of Chapter 120 of the North Carolina General Statutes regarding confidentiality between the contractor and members of the General Assembly.

Care of Property

The Contractor agrees that it shall be responsible for the proper custody and care of any property furnished to it by the Committee and the State Board for use in connection with the performance of this contract or purchased by it for this contract and will reimburse the Committee and the State Board for loss of damage of such property.

Copyright

No deliverable items produced in whole or in part under this agreement shall be the subject of an application for copyright by or on behalf of the Contractor.

Access to Persons and Records

The State Auditor shall have access to persons and records as a result of all contracts or grants entered into by State agencies or political subdivisions in accordance with General Statute 147-64.7. The Contractor shall retain all records for a period of three years following completion of the contract.

Transfer of Assignment

The contract shall not be transferred or assigned to a third party.

Compliance with Laws

The Contractor shall comply with all laws, ordinances, codes, rules, regulations, and licensing requirements that are applicable to the conduct of its business, including those of federal, state, and local agencies having jurisdiction or authority, or both jurisdiction and authority.

Equal Opportunity Statement

The nondiscrimination clause contained in Section 202 Executive Order 11245, as amended by Executive Order 11375, relative to equal employment opportunity for all persons without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, or national origin, and the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor of the United States, are incorporated herein. The program for Employment of the Handicapped (Affirmative Action) Regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor of the United States in Title 20, Part 741, Chapter VI, Subchapter "C" of the Code of Federal Regulations, pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 11758 and Section 503 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, are incorporated herein.

Insurance

The Contractor shall obtain, pay for, and keep in force, for the duration of the contract, worker's compensation insurance, as required by the laws of North Carolina, covering all of the Contractor's employees engaged in any work on the project in the State.

Additional Contract Expenses

The contract for the project is not a time and materials agreement. Any expenses of the contractor in addition to those contracted for, or above the contract amount, are the sole responsibilities of the Contractor.

Advertising

The Contractor agrees not to use the results or existence of the contract, or the products produced pursuant to the contract as a part of any news release or commercial advertising without the prior written approval of the Committee and the State Board.

General Indemnity

The Contractor shall hold and save the State of North Carolina, its officers, agents, and employees, and the local boards of trustees, their officers, agents, and employees, harmless from liability of any kind, including all claims and losses, with the exception of consequential damages, accruing or resulting to any other person, firm, or corporation furnishing or supplying work, services, materials, or supplies in connection with the performance of this contract, and from any and all claims and losses accruing or resulting to any person, firm, or corporation that may be injured or damaged by the contractor in the performance of this contract and that are attributable to the negligence or intentionally tortuous acts of the Contractor provided that the Contractor is notified in writing within 30 days that the State and/or the local boards of trustees have knowledge of such claims. The Contractor represents and warrants that it shall make no claim of any kind or nature against the State's agents and/or the local boards of trustees' agents who are involved in the delivery or processing of the Contractor's goods to the State. The representation and warranty in the preceding sentence shall survive the termination or expiration of this contract.

