

Minutes of the CAEP Board of Directors Meeting

August 29-30, 2013

The Fairfax at Embassy Row -2100 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.

Those in attendance and constituting a quorum were:

Members present: Mary Brabeck, Barbara Cambridge, James Cibulka, Francis "Skip" Fennell, Rick Ginsberg, Deborah Gist, Randy Hitz, Mary Kenfield, Arthur Levine, Christopher Koch, Frank Murray, Candy Olson, Janice Poda, Cheryl Redfield, and Blake West.

Members present via WebEx: Marquita Grenot-Scheyer and Lori Ward.

Non-Voting Designees Present: Marjorie Brown (representing Randi Weingarten on Thursday), Segun Eubanks (representing Dennis Van Roekel), and Marla Ucelli-Kashyap (representing Randi Weingarten on Friday).

Guests present: Camilla Benbow (Vanderbilt University/CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting Co-Chair), Ronald Colbert (Fitchburg University/COPPE/CAEP Advisory Nominating Committee), Susan Eads Role (CAEP Parliamentarian), Mary Harrill McClellan (AACTE), Steve Heuer (New York University), Mark Johnson-Lewis (AACTE), Sarah Pinsky (AACTE), Shep Ranbom (CAEP consultant), Stephen Sawchuck (Education Week), and Mark Toner (CAEP consultant).

Guests present via WebEx: Jim Kohlmoos, member of CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting (Thursday only).

Staff present: Mishaela Durán, Emerson Elliot, Mark LaCelle-Peterson, Deborah Eldridge, Donald Feuerstein, Angela Garcia, Patty Garvin, Donna Gollnick, Christine Carrino Gorowara, Lynette Jackson, Kaaryn Keller, Nate Thomas, Thanh Tran, Stacey Trey, and Elizabeth Vilky.

Call to Order

Chair Frank Murray called the Board of Directors meeting to order at 9:15 am on August 29th, 2013.

Election of new board chair

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg nominated Mary Brabeck for board chair. The motion was seconded by Barbara Cambridge. No further nominations were put forth. The motion was adopted.

Approval of June minutes

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg moved approval of the June minutes and Blake West seconded. The motion was adopted.

Approval of agenda

MOTION: Barbara Cambridge moved and Janice Poda seconded approval of the agenda with noted minor edits. The motion was adopted.

Advisory Nominating Committee Report

Janice Poda and Ronald Colbert provided comments about the process and structure of the nominating committee work. The nominating committee included applicants from all three sectors required by the bylaws; post-secondary, practitioners/policy members/employers, and the public at large. The charge for the committee was to implement an inclusive and transparent process shifting from a designation model. The call for service yielded over 600 applications and 40% of applicants were new to accreditation. A rubric and scoring guide were used to evaluate all applicants. The terms of office were randomly assigned via a computer-generated algorithm. The committee provided a number of recommendations including revision to the rubric to include norming the rating process, implementing a formal orientation and training for all governance volunteers, and a formal committee manual. Additional recommendations include bylaw changes such as including providing a range of number of members rather than a finite number, not allowing alternates, and streamlining structure taking the Commission representatives off of the committees. In addition, it would be helpful for the president and board chair discuss recruiting and organizational needs with the nominating committee.

Six committee slates of nominees were offered for consideration (included in board materials). The chair asked for any further nominations. There were none. The nominations were closed. The slate of nominees was deemed accepted.

Elections

Board of Directors

MOTION: Janice Poda nominated Deborah Gist for the board of directors. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Janice Poda nominated Lori Ward for the board of directors. The motion was adopted.

Officers and accreditation co-chairs committee liaisons

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg nominated Christopher Koch for the office of vice-char. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg nominated Mary Kenfield for the office of secretary. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg nominated Denis Van Roekel for the office of treasurer. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg nominated Francis Skip Fennell for the office of chair of the nominating committee. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg nominated Barbara Cambridge for the office of accreditation council co-chair. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Rick Ginsberg nominated Blake West for the office of accreditation council co-chair. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Blake West moved to approve the following committee liaisons: Rick Ginsberg and Mary Kenfield, nominating committee; Candy Olson and Janice Poda, state partnerships and content area committee; Arthur Levine, standards committee; and Cheryl Redfield, International committee. The motion was adopted.

NCATE and TEAC boards

James Cibulka offered prefacing comments prior to the election of NCATE and TEAC board. These two boards will need to remain active until CAEP completes one accreditation cycle.

MOTION: Janice Poda nominated James Cibulka, Deborah Eldridge, and Mark LaCelle-Peterson to the NCATE and TEAC boards of directors. The motion was adopted.

Future board meeting dates and participation

The next meeting will be Dec. 12-13th, 2013 and the second meeting will be June 5-6th, 2014 in Washington, DC.

The chair informed the board that representatives participating on behalf of board members may participate in discussion but may not vote. Additionally, the use of staggered terms for board members was explained. An algorithm was utilized to randomly assign terms and board members can be nominated for a second term if they wish.

CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting Presentation and Discussion

James Cibulka provided comments regarding the charge to the commission and co-chair Camilla Benbow provided the report to the board. James explained that CAEP is coming into existence at a pivotal time in education, with an increasingly diverse K-12 population and higher expectations for all students. Concurrently, there are stronger demands for accountability for both P-12 and teacher education. There are new providers in both arenas that bring new innovation, variations in quality, and sometimes different business models. There is new disruptive technologies that bring both opportunities and challenges. We have a new focus on human capital and the availability of new data to judge effectiveness of our teacher training programs. The NCATE-TEAC design team believed that we needed to transform rather than tinker with teacher education in this nation. The central elements of accreditation are quality assurance and program improvement. Accreditation is independent of the government; peer driven; and largely in the field of education, a voluntary enterprise.

Camilla Benbow discussed the importance of the commission's work and stressed the thoughtful and deliberate work conducted by the group over one year. The structure of the Commission was organized by content and pedagogy, clinical practice and partnerships, quality and selectivity of candidates, quality and continuous improvement, and accreditation/public accountability/transparency. Diversity and technology cut across the five working groups. The commission worked under an aggressive timeline, developing standards over a year, with opportunity for stakeholder feedback. The entire process was transparent – over 500 organizations or individuals provided feedback and it was analyzed independently, summarized, and reported back to the stakeholders.

The commission focused on evidence-informed accreditation, including the use of multiple measures, impact on student learning, validity and reliability of evidence in meeting standards, and continuous improvement. The Commission's Data taskforce was formed with diverse experts responsible for providing direction to CAEP as the organization implements new evidence and reporting requirements.

Each of the five standards were presented by former Commission members and/or current board leaders and there was a period of discussion after each standard was presented.

Camilla Benbow presented the following recommendations on behalf of the commission:

1. Build partnerships and strong clinical experiences;
2. Raise and assure candidate quality;
3. Include all providers; and
4. Insist that preparation be judged by outcomes and impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Chair Brabeck asked the board to adjust the agenda to allow for a vote on the standards prior to a discussion of implementation. Prior to that, questions from the board were entertained. Support for the process of the commission coupled with the ability to continue to shape the document after adoption was discussed.

MOTION: Christopher Koch moved the adoption of the accreditation standards and recommendation proposed by the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Implementation Plan for Standards

James Cibulka discussed the implementation plans for both the short and long-term. Short-term implementation includes the release of the standards and the long-term includes ongoing monitoring and course corrections as needed. Implementation of the standards will be stewarded by the board. Information and resources needed by the field was discussed. A key element of implementation will be transparency and annual reporting. CAEP will use feedback from the stakeholders to make ongoing improvements and to initiate areas of work needed to build capacity. Electronic media will be an increasing part of the communication strategy.

The release of the new standards to EPPs and the public will occur January 2014. A progress report will be provided at the December board meeting. A study of the impact of the new CAEP standards will be part of the implementation plan. It was suggested that two pieces of communications be posted on the website: 1) links to various standards (e.g. College and Career Readiness Standards, InTASC, NCTM, NCTE, and Social Studies) and 2) various exemplary programs that help the public see how this is being done successfully and to act as peer coaches. At the Spring CAEP conference there will be opportunities for institutions to learn more about how they might meet the new standards. It was suggested that a document about "lessons learned from early adopters" be developed.

MOTION: Blake West moved that the CAEP standards implementation guidelines and decision rules will include an ongoing formal feedback loop (for both initial procedures and ongoing changes) to ensure opportunities for stakeholder groups to provide input and guidance for the continued development of those processes. CAEP staff

will share progress on the process for such stakeholder engagement for the Board of Directors to review. The motion was seconded and discussion ensued. A reasonable balance between informing the board of the progress and moving forward on accreditation decisions was raised as a concern. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Blake West moved that the CAEP Board of Directors shall direct the Research Committee to incorporate into their ongoing review of the implementation of accreditation standards, processes, and decision rules a regular review and reporting of crucial information from the field including, but not limited to:

- The extent to which up-to-date research on the use of data in accreditation decisions is being utilized in the field by both state agencies and educator preparation providers.
- Evidence that tracks the usefulness of various common measures of candidate readiness for admission (e.g. GPA, standardized test performance) in predicting future success in program completion and career readiness as well as examining how or if these measures significantly affect the demographic diversity of teacher preparation candidates.
- The use and potential misapplication of data by third parties outside of CAEP that is collected and reported through the CAEP accreditation process.
- Monitoring the impact of CAEP standards and processes on various dimensions of diversity (e.g. candidate admission, characteristics of placements and field experiences, faculty demographics.)

This data will be tracked and monitored to the extent feasible and additional funding will be sought for more comprehensive analysis.

The motion was seconded and discussion ensued. A friendly amendment was offered to add local school districts after state agency in the first bullet, and eliminating “both”. The scope of the research needed pursuant to this amendment was noted as a concern for several board members. Concern was also expressed about legal and ethical use of any data that is collected for this purpose.

Discussion of the motion was postponed to allow various board members to make revisions.

Overview of Tripod Initiative

Mark LaCelle-Peterson provided an overview of the Tripod Initiative, a new Gates Foundation supported project being led by CAEP and Cambridge Education, an organization led by Dr. Ronald Ferguson of Harvard University. One element of CAEP’s strategic plan is to advance research and innovation and this initiative is aligned to that goal. Additionally, there is a recurring emphasis in the new standards on emerging and needed data for continuous improvement. One data element not often collected is K-12 student survey data as one of multiple measures in data collection. The Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, demonstrated that there was a high correlation between P-12 student survey data and other measures of teacher effectiveness. The Tripod survey assessments will capture key dimensions of classroom life and teaching practice from a student’s perspective. Included in the survey are student perceptions of teaching effectiveness, student engagement, student satisfaction, and whole-school climate. The Tripod project will be piloted among 8-9 EPP campuses with a mix of public and private schools. The goal is to demonstrate that student surveys are a viable activity in an EPP context (proof of concept) and that the data be useful for continuous improvement. Potentially, a larger project could follow. Concerns were expressed about various aspects of the project, particular how this might interplay with teacher evaluations. It was suggested that this student survey data would be useful for both the teaching candidates and programs. The Tripod project data would only be used for program improvement purposes.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

Chair Mary Brabeck called the Board of Directors meeting to order at 9:09 am on August 30th, 2013.

Staff introductions were made.

Reconsideration of Motion

MOTION: Blake West moved to substitute the postponed motion with the following substitute motion.

CAEP Research Committee shall incorporate into their ongoing review of the implementation of accreditation standards, processes, and decision rules a regular review and reporting of crucial information from the field including, but not limited to:

- Evidence that tracks the usefulness of various common measures of candidate readiness for admission (e.g. GPA, standardized test performance) in predicting future success in program completion and career readiness as well as examining how or if these measures significantly affect the demographic diversity of teacher preparation candidates).
- An examination of candidate success with program completion and career readiness for those who do not meet common measures of readiness (e.g., candidates who are admitted with lower GPA or standardized test performance outside of benchmarked goals).
- Monitoring the impact of CAEP standards and processes on various dimensions of diversity (e.g. candidate admission, characteristics of placements and field experiences, faculty demographics).
- Identification and study of programs which has been successful at maintaining and increasing diversity.

Within the limitations of financial and human resources available for research and the necessity to adhere to appropriate legal and ethical standards for conducting research and use of data, the Research Committee should also give consideration to such issues as:

- How is data from the accreditation decision-making process being utilized in the field by state agencies, school district and educator preparation providers?
- How are third parties outside of CAEP utilizing data that is collected and reported through the accreditation process?
- Additional funding should be sought to increase CAEP's capacity to accomplish this challenging agenda of research and analysis.

The motion to make the substitute motion was adopted. The motion to adopt the revised motion was adopted.

CAEP Strategic Plan and Organizational Chart

Blake West, Jim Cibulka, and Mishaela Duran presented the strategic plan to the board of directors. The process was very inclusive with over 900 stakeholders providing feedback to the staff-board strategic planning committee. The whole CAEP interim board was interviewed and staff also participated in focus groups, surveys, and presentations of the draft goals.

Blake West highlighted CAEP's six strategic goals, referencing the strategic plan and memo in the board materials:

1. To raise the bar in educator preparation (though high standards based on evidence)
2. To promote continuous improvement (among EPPs)
3. To advance research and innovation
4. To increase accreditation's value
5. To be a model accrediting body
6. To be a model learning organization

Mishaela Duran informed the board that staff are working to implement the strategic plan, developing objectives and metrics that will roll up into an organizational dashboard for use at board meetings. The strategic plan will be aligned to all operations, including budget development, communications, performance evaluations, and other organization-wide initiatives. Additionally, the CAEP staff organizational chart was presented to the board, highlighting the new functions including Member Engagement, Research and Development, Event Planning, and Human Resources.

Transition Activities in Operations and Communications

Thanh Tran presented the CAEP FY 14 budget overview and finance policies. The revenue structure was discussed in depth, including EPP annual fees, organizational membership dues, accreditation site visits and more. Additionally, there are in-kind services donated from volunteers (about \$3.5 million to CAEP last year, as calculated during recent audit.) A new line item, strategic reserve fund, was created for financial stability of the organization. Discussion was held about how to reach out to states in the next couple of years to possibly mitigate decreased accreditation activity. A discussion of accreditation fees ensued and the board discussed the need to increase the R&D budget to support this new function in the organization. Blake West recommended aligning the budget to the strategic plan, as part of the budget development process. At the June 2014 board meeting, the board will review the annual audit report. CAEP's grant writing plan was also discussed. There may be some fiscal recommendations and bylaws changes for consideration at the December board meeting. Presentation continued after the presentation on CCSSO-CAEP Partnership.

CCSSO-CAEP Partnership to Transform Teacher Preparation

Janice Poda shared the work of CCSSO to look at areas that they have responsibility for and settled on three areas to focus: licensure, program approval and data collection/analysis/reporting. They then looked at recommendations to make for themselves and decided on ten focus/recommendation areas. The report was issued in Dec. of 2012. A group of national partners was created and CAEP is one of those key partners. CCSSO will now begin implementing those recommendations in collaboration with seven states. This issue of sharing teacher data across state lines was discussed.

Transition Activities in Operations and Communications - Continued

Thanh Tran discussed the document, *Finance and Investment Policies to be Considered by the Board of Directors – August 2013*. Topics highlighted included risk management, financial audits, records retention and CAEP investment policies. One suggestion was submitted – add “for the board of director’s approval” to bullet 1 under Annual Budget section on page 2. The second bullet may also need some revision – to add approval by executive committee and the board of directors.

Mark LaCelle-Peterson provided the board with an update regarding Communications, Research and Development, and Member Relations. There will be a new website that will be more extensive than just merging the two existing websites. There will be an electronic bi-weekly CAEP Update disseminated to all stakeholders as part of CAEP's communication strategy. CAEP has been working with *Communications Works* to build a coordinated strategy to communicate the work about the new standards. CAEP has been engaged in a number of initiatives to support its communication plan, including mobilizing partners, developing a set of materials that are easily understood by the public, delivering presentations to support peer-to-peer communications across the country, communication with members/institutions/providers, state outreach to encourage chiefs and state policymakers to use accreditation, and a continued focus on media relations. The goal is to show CAEP's commitment to the larger agenda (research, for example) and to continuously communicate what the changes mean and why it's important. A more formal communications plan will be presented at a future board meeting. Member engagement activities, including state partnerships agreements and the alliance on clinical practice as

were discussed. Mark also provided a brief update on the new research and development function, reporting that there will be a study of the impacts of the new standards, similar to ABET's (engineering accreditor) study after it implemented its new standards. CAEP is recruiting for a number of new positions in the R&D, Member Relations, and Communications areas to build capacity to support these new functions.

Deborah Eldridge shared information regarding Accreditation Update and Policies. Several revisions to the underlying policies were discussed. The focus of these revisions relate to adverse actions.

Mishaela Duran provided an overview of the Whistleblower Policy.

MOTION: Blake West moved adoption of the proposed changes under the section, "Policy VII Adverse Actions." The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Blake West moved adoption of the proposed change under the section, "Policy VIII Complaints against CAEP- accreditation EPPS or against CAEP. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Blake West moved adoption of changes to the finance and investment policies as presented. The motion was adopted.

MOTION: Deborah Gist moved adoption of the travel reimbursement policies as presented. The motion was adopted. The chair suggested development of guidelines for the board related to IRS requirements related to reimbursements.

MOTION: Skip Fennell moved adoption of the whistle blower policies as presented. The motion was adopted. The executive committee will appoint a compliance officer at their next meeting.

Board members were asked to share their next steps for communicating the new standards.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm.