

**Minutes for CAEP Board Meeting
Dupont Hotel, Washington, DC
May 1-3, 2011**

Sunday, May 1, 2011, 3:00 p.m.

Present: Jim Anderton, Rachelle Bruno, Barbara Cambridge, Jim Cibulka, Sandra Cohen, Jillian Kinzie, Arthur Levine, Frank Murray, Janice Poda, Rick Ginsberg, Blake West

Absent: Tom Bordenkircher, Barbara Brittingham, Calvin Johnson

Staff Present: Don Feuerstein, Donna Gollnick, Nancy Groth, Mark LaCelle-Peterson, Frank Huang, Diana Rigden

Frank Murray called the meeting to order, each member introduced him/herself and Jim Cibulka reviewed the topics of the agenda, which were taken up in the order below:

TOPIC 1: Approval of minutes

After some minor corrections to the distributed draft minutes, the minutes from December 13-14, 2010 meeting were approved unanimously for posting on the CAEP website (moved by Cambridge and seconded by Cohen).

CAEP is maintaining two records of its meetings – formal minutes for posting to give the members confidence that issues of concern to them were adequately discussed and a near transcript version of the meeting in notes taken by Diana Rigden.

TOPIC 2: Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting

Murray reminded the Board that it has an obligation in its bylaws to create a standing committee on standards. This proposed Commission and the draft given to the Board will become the basis to begin an effort to get some funding for the Commission's work.

Cibulka reported he has vetted the idea for a Commission with a number of groups and it has been received well. The goal is to have a major initiative proposed at the beginning of CAEP. The plan is to develop performance measures to attach to the standards; develop a lexicon and taxonomy of common program characteristics; and develop consensus of how assessment is going to be done. One additional task of the Commission, besides standard setting and performance indicators, would be to create an annual reporting process that would give (1) status measures and growth measures, (2) longitudinal measures to show how institutions are performing and improving in the aggregate, (3) benchmarking measures against peers. The annual reporting system would not include data at the individual institutional and program levels, but it would be a report to the public as well as to CAEP on the annual quality of educator preparation. Cibulka pointed out the need to involve the field more broadly, not only in the development of CAEP standards, but in carrying out important related work.

The discussion centered on how the proposed Commission fits into the CAEP organizational chart, to whom does it report, what would be its relation with the board's standing committee on standards and also its standing committee on research, the potential for confusion with the two other CAEP Commissions, the urgency for CAEP to show it is more than a business as usual agency, the need to provide a credible alternative to the NCTQ-type initiatives, and most importantly to build renewed confidence in accreditation itself.

Cibulka argued that the Commission needs to have a higher profile than a standing committee and needs to have a number of influential people in the field serve on it. He felt it might have its first meeting August or early September so that its work could influence CAEP's eventual submissions to USDE and CHEA. He thought it would work for 18-24 months and after CAEP goes live, it may work with CAEP for 6 months or so. It would then morph into the standing committee on standards, perhaps by having some members of the Commission accept appointments to the committee.

The discussion also considered how this Commission would relate to other standard setting initiatives in the country – e.g., the new InTASC standards and the PARCC and Smarter Balance Consortia common core curricular standards and assessments. There was also some caution expressed that CAEP not overpromise the outcome of the Commission's work insofar as the nation's desire for quick action may outstrip the true accomplishments of the field with regard to assessment, interpretation of results, and available data and standard setting. It may be that the Commission would be able to do little more than think hard about the topic of raising standards.

It would be helpful to have some concrete examples to give the Commissioners on what CAEP envisions as a successful outcome for the Commission, being mindful of Campbell's law (the increased risk in high stakes assessment is that they get corrupted and the purpose for which they were created is also corrupted). It would also be helpful to have the Commission's advice on what visiting teams need to examine and what can be handled offsite.

Finally, there was discussion on how the Commission's work would lead to improvements in CAEP's processes and how the performance indicators could be used to improve programs and support the eventual or possible requirement of certain program features and inputs.

The board unanimously authorized the president to establish the Commission, informed by the discussion above, (moved by West and seconded by Poda)

It was understood that this Commission satisfies the board's bylaws' requirement for a standing committee on standards.

TOPIC 3: How the two Commissions will work

Murray reviewed three items on the agenda:

- (1) How much work can be done collaboratively – scheduling, training, information sharing, etc.?
- (2) How will each Commission employ CAEP standards?

(3) How will CAEP achieve consistency across eligibility, accreditation decisions, etc.?

The staff reported that common workshops and orientations have been scheduled, that plans for a consolidated AIMS database are progressing and that the TEAC and NCATE staffs will be trained on each other's accreditation processes.

It was proposed that CAEP develop a common survey of students, faculty and cooperating teachers as one way to investigate the comparability between the Commissions.

Most of the discussion centered on the second question: how will each Commission employ CAEP standards. Given that the two Commissions have different views of standards, Cibulka wanted to be assured that he would be accurate as CAEP's president to say that all institutions meet CAEP standards and demonstrate that they meet CAEP standards. The board gave that assurance.

However, there was a wide-ranging discussion of the differences between the two Commissions in how they would make the accreditation determination and on what basis. The discussion revealed that some board members were still unsure how one unified system could tolerate this kind of flexibility. TEAC affords flexibility in the language programs may use to interpret a standard and allows variations in evidence that programs may cite and rely on in showing how a standard was met. Some board members felt there was no need for this flexibility and that all institutions should just use the literal CAEP standards and that certain evidence should be required as the way to satisfy a standard. Others felt that if a state, for example, had adopted the new InTASC standards, the institution should be free to make its case in terms of them and show the alignment between them and the CAEP standards. Similarly, some institutions would rely on course grades or other assessments while others would not and so forth. These institutions and programs would provide a roadmap that shows how they are faithful to the CAEP standards and why the evidence they cited was valid. One suggested way would be to have a list of exhibits organized by CAEP standards that would show comparability.

There was also a discussion of how the two commissions will work together, including

- a. How much can be done collaboratively—scheduling, training, information sharing, etc.?
- b. How will they employ the CAEP standards?
- c. Have we achieved appropriate consistency across commissions in eligibility, accreditation decisions, etc.? (Can we anticipate what CHEA and USDE expectations will be in these regards?)

The discussion expanded to the relationship between TEAC, NCATE, and CAEP initiatives and when future public initiatives will be represented as exclusively CAEP initiatives. The matter is complicated by the president of one organization being the president of the other but it was felt that the sooner we create a CAEP public agenda, the better. The Board added a "d" to the list so that all initiatives are styled as CAEP initiatives, not as NCATE or TEAC initiatives. Cohen asked about how these initiatives will be vetted by the two staffs – she thought we need to make it public how the vetting is done – because the field still sees these as coming only from the NCATE office, and we need to publicly acknowledge that any new initiative will be common.

MONDAY, MAY 2, 2011, 9:00 A.M.

Present: Jim Anderton, Tom Bordenkircher, Rachelle Bruno, Barbara Cambridge, Jim Cibulka, Sandra Cohen, Calvin Johnson, Jillian Kinzie, Arthur Levine, Frank Murray, Janice Poda, Rick Ginsberg, Blake West

Absent: Barbara Brittingham

Staff Present: Margie Crutchfield, Shari Francis, Don Feuerstein, Donna Gollnick, Nancy Groth, Mark LaCelle-Peterson, Diana Rigden

TOPIC 3: How the two Commissions will work, continued

Murray opened the meeting with a brief wrap-up of Sunday afternoon's discussion on how the two Commissions will work. He worried that CAEP will have a difficult time explaining, not only the two Commissions, but the three to four options within CAEP for accreditation. The problem is that the options on their face do not look comparable. The ensuing discussion settled on the desirability of having a common floor that all institutions meet, but after that there could be a number of ways in which institutions and programs could be accredited provided they met the common floor of plausible rigor. The common floor or threshold standard means that those who fail to meet it should not be in the business of preparing educators.

On this line of thinking some felt that all CAEP needs to say is that it has determined by various internal methods, appropriate to each case, that the standards have been met. The public is relatively unconcerned about how CAEP makes the determination. We could publicly blur the distinction between the Commissions and simply say that CAEP has two options: a research option (which is either by the transformative initiative or the IB) and a continuous improvement option (move to target or investigate a quality control system) – these are the ways institutions and programs get beyond the threshold.

There was also concern that the argument to the public and to CAEP's members has to be the same and that one can't simply gloss over the NCATE and TEAC options with the labels of *research* and *continuous improvement*.

The discussion also turned to how CAEP could broaden the base for accreditation. One is working with the states; the other is the unaccredited institutions and how CAEP might encourage them to seek accreditation. It's unlikely that we can get more states to mandate accreditation, but is it likely that the vision of CAEP will bring in high quality unaccredited institutions?

Levine reported that he is talking with deans at 10 unaccredited institutions about their experiences with accreditation and what would it take for them to join CAEP in the future. The preliminary result from some is that they already go through the process with the state and from others that there are institutions that are accredited that are not good and with which they would not want to be associated. Others reported that the process is too broad, takes too long, and isn't worth it. Most won't do it unless their state requires it.

Poda argued that at the end of the day, while money is a factor, the real bottom line is the quality of the teacher in the classroom. CAEP needs to make the case that accreditation improves teaching quality. Cibulka agreed that CAEP needs to pay close attention to the State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness (SCEE) initiative of CCSSO – he thought that what seemed to resonate with the teacher education strand was that CAEP would help prepare teachers who are effective. West cautioned that Kansas is just one election away from rejecting the common core because of evolution, the issue being one of local control. This aspect of the discussion concluded with the sentiment that CAEP needed to be aware of, and sensitive to, the various national standard-setting initiatives, but also not get mired in state politics, but instead chart its own distinctive national course.

Feuerstein argued that if accreditors continue to accredit 98% of the programs and institutions, accreditation will be seen as not doing its job. Others felt that CAEP could somehow be more rigorous and also make every program a success, but all more or less agreed that time is running out for accreditation to show its rigor.

Bruno argued that as we talk about new initiatives, we have to make sure the charge to the Commission is carefully worded – and the piece of that could impact the future research committee. The annual report needs to be how the institution is responding to the standards.

TOPIC 4: CAEP Option #2

Cambridge reviewed the status of work conducted by the Committee on Program Review and State Partnerships: the stakeholder meeting on March 18 was successful and led to the draft document describing Option 2 and the development of the proposed timeline handed out at the meeting.

The two introductory paragraphs are proposed as something to be included in every CAEP document describing program review. Cambridge quickly walked the board through the document, described the Q&A, and immediate financial and personnel needs for implementing Option 2. She indicated that the committee will be conducting some simulation in the fall and proposed that an outside group evaluate them.

A discussion centered on when the program review takes place in relation to the accreditation review and the inter-relation of program review and accreditation, the nature of the committee that would evaluate Option 2, whether they needed to be “top flight” or those who are willing to do the “nitty gritty work.” Some thought that research 1 faculty could be interested in the data that would be generated.

Crutchfield said that in the fall the committee planned to work with materials submitted by TEAC and NCATE institutions to create the tables, review the documentation, and determine whether feedback could be provided. These would be simulations with no stakes attached to them. The information from these simulations would be used to build real guidelines and work with a few institutions to have them pilot the process in fall 2012 and be ready to roll out by spring 2013.

The discussion was mostly about the meaning of the text in the committee's report. The following issues were expressed:

1. Option 2 must align with CAEP standards
2. Option 2 must give the state what it needs to satisfy the state's legal process to approve the program.
3. Because CAEP is using the state program approval standards as a CAEP eligibility criterion, CAEP has an interest in the quality of these state standards.
4. The review team should be able to consult with the SPAs through CAEP staff.
5. Investments in reviewer training are critical.
6. If the document is to be made public it has to be precise.
7. The P-12 arena needs to be involved.

In the end the Committee agreed that it will do some word-smithing.

TOPIC 5: CAEP/State Partnership Program Framework

Mark LaCelle-Peterson reviewed the processes by which staff from NCATE and TEAC worked through the details of the existing state partnership agreements between the accreditors and the states, including the decision to question each aspect to develop a streamlined new version.

Shari Francis began a discussion of a draft document on state partnership frameworks, explaining that the desire for a partnership with a state often influences how many details are included in the partnership agreement. The protocol clarifies logistics and policies – both CAEP and state – and offers a roadmap to the process.

A protracted discussion ensued and in the end there was consensus that the Board would allow the staff to handle the process unless there is a problem in which case the president will deal with it and/or bring it to the board. The staff was advised to start with the 13 states with joint agreements, wordsmith the draft document, and attempt to leverage state standards up so that the states will get out of this what they need.

TOPIC 6: Review of operational issues

Jim Cibulka and Nancy Groth discussed the operational issues. Anderton has agreed to serve on an Operations Planning Committee of the CAEP Interim Board that would provide some guidance to the president. The committee plans to begin working on a CAEP Policy Manual this summer, based on the NCATE employee handbook and the accreditation policy manual.

Committee members will include: Jim Anderton, Blake West, Janice Poda and Barbara Brittingham (pending acceptance).

TOPIC 7: Status report on USDE and CHEA

Murray described the meeting that he and Jim had with USDE staff who run the recognition process. They appeared to have no way to deal with the unification of two agencies other than CAEP providing an application and going through a review as a new agency, even though NCATE and TEAC would have gone through the process a year or two earlier and that the only

new thing is the process of the Board making the final decision. They agreed to extend recognition for TEAC and NCATE – but with no timelines.

The issues are complicated -- when do NCATE and TEAC disappear, and If CAEP is not recognized at that moment, what will the institutions' accreditation status be? On the other hand if we perpetuate NCATE and TEAC well into the creation of CAEP, it will send the wrong message to our members. There are also the financial ramifications of running three accrediting agencies.

The Department's position is that they will extend the recognition of both entities until they produce a full proposal for CAEP's recognition. If CAEP is considered a new agency, then at the minimum it will have to show that its process works for at least three cases. It remains problematic for USDE to give the current TEAC and NCATE accredited institutions an accreditation status within CAEP since they didn't submit to the CAEP standards and process.

The discussion ranged from the consequences of withdrawing from the recognition process as ABET did, to practical strategies to have CAEP recognized in a timely and 'under-the-radar' manner, to getting waivers from the Secretary to grandfather CAEP on the strength of the prior recognition of NCATE and TEAC.

There was concern that if CAEP simply accepted cases from TEAC and NCATE in its petition, it would undercut the message that CAEP is new and different. On the other hand TEAC and NCATE standards and processes are all that exist at the moment.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2011, 8:45 A.M.

Present: Tom Bordenkircher, Rachele Bruno, Barbara Cambridge, Jim Cibulka, Sandra Cohen, Calvin Johnson, Jillian Kinzie, Arthur Levine, Frank Murray, Janice Poda, Rick Ginsberg, Blake West

Absent: Jim Anderton, Barbara Brittingham

Staff Present: Don Feuerstein, Donna Gollnick, Nancy Groth, Mark LaCelle-Peterson, Diana Rigden

TOPIC 7: Status report on USDE and CHEA, continued

Murray recapped yesterday afternoon's plan that Jim and Frank (or his successor) will talk with USDE staff again and possibly meet with Martha Kantor. The likelihood is that we will put forward a CAEP petition.

It is unprecedented to have two accrediting agencies come together and the USDE staff does not have a way to think about this. We have to prove out the system to demonstrate that the CAEP system will work. We're saying that each system will run its accreditation process as approved,

and the board will confirm the decisions coming from the two Commissions. Under the best of circumstances there will be a USDE staff person present to make sure we follow our procedures.

One additional problem is that NACIQI is a newly configured and the USDE has added many new and controversial regulations. The conversation with USDE was friendly but they are perplexed about how to move forward. They want CAEP to exist and want to be helpful, but they can't figure out how to do it.

TOPIC 8: Transition Planning

The discussion revolved around the common standards CAEP must have – are these the aligned current TEAC and NCATE standards, the standards the Design Team worked out, or new standards coming from the new Commission? At what point does CAEP stop offering the choice of the current models given the requirements of fairness and due notice to those accredited and seeking re-accreditation and also given the time needed to develop and pilot new assessments for the new standards?

The consensus was to seek a waiver from the Secretary for the USDE common standard requirement and if the request is denied, then we would proceed with the draft standards in the upcoming petition and follow that with a pilot of institutions using the standards crafted by the Commission.

There was further discussion on the critical difference between getting CAEP recognized with the draft standards and subsequently having CAEP seen as a new and more rigorous accreditor based on the Commission's accomplishments.

Kinzie was persuaded that USDE recognition is not the big deal and that we stick with what we can get approved. The main story will be with the innovations of the six or so institutions who pilot the new standards – that's the strategy we need.

The discussion turned to the accreditation terms that will be used by CAEP. Gollnick reported that NCATE used to use 5 year terms, but saw that other accrediting agencies were using 7-8 year terms with many moving down from 10 saying it's too long.

The Board unanimously adopted a 7-year term for CAEP accreditation (moved by Cambridge, seconded by Kinzie)

TOPIC 9: Communications Plan

Cibulka noted that the reality is that there is no extra staffing to make CAEP operational; it's coming out of the hides of existing staff. He has two full-time jobs at the moment. There are no additional resources to hire new staff.

There was some discussion about securing resources for public relations and a communications plan and expediting the transition.

TOPIC 9: Research Plan

The question of the discussion was whether we are going to let people conduct research with CAEP's data for their own purposes. There may be problems because we have not received permission from the institutions on sharing their data. And there may be some research issues CAEP would like to commission – for example, looking at the survey data – and we would hire someone who would like to advance their career.

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous agreement.

Minutes submitted by the Secretary of the Board, Frank Murray, from extensive notes of the meeting compiled by Diana Rigden.

Tasks Identified at the May 2011 Meeting of the Interim CAEP Board for Which Action Was Required

Tasks Identified in Board Minutes	Action Taken
1. Common TEAC and NCATE workshops should be scheduled.	A number of shared meetings have occurred since the last board meeting. See Agenda Item V.A.
2. New initiatives should be styled as CAEP initiatives, not NCATE or TEAC.	The public annual report is a joint NCATE/TEAC/CAEP report. It is described in Agenda Item V.C.
3. Develop consolidated AIMS database.	The TEAC data on institutions has been incorporated into the AIMS database. TEAC staff is now able to access the data, and institutions will be able to use AIMS early in 2012.
4. TEAC and NCATE staffs should be trained in each other's accreditation processes.	The August joint staff meeting was designed to become aware of the two organization's accreditation processes.
5. CAEP should develop a common survey of students, faculty, and cooperating teachers.	This task has not occurred, but will be developed for the pilot testing of the CAEP system.
6. An external group should review the simulations on Program Review for Feedback (formerly Option 2), which are scheduled for fall 2011.	The simulations have been completed, but an external group has not reviewed the work. Monique Lynch will discuss the simulations in her presentation for Agenda Item XI.B.
7. Pilot tests of the Program Review for Feedback option should begin in fall 2012 with the roll out scheduled for spring 2013. Paper on Program Review for Feedback needs further editing..	The pilot testing of the Program Review for Feedback option will begin with submissions of programs in spring 2013. A timeline and discussion of the pilot testing can be found in Agenda Item XI.B.
8. Pilot tests of the CAEP state partnerships should begin with 13 states with both NCATE and TEAC agreements. CAEP should attempt to leverage state standards so that states will get out of this what they want. The framework paper needs further editing.	The pilot testing of the CAEP state partnerships will begin this winter as described in Agenda Item XI.A.
9. A CAEP policy manual for operations should be developed over the summer. It should be based on NCATE employee handbook and TEAC accreditation policy manual.	The Operations Planning Committee and staff will be developing this manual as part of its work this winter/spring.

10. Jim and Frank will talk further with the US Department of Education staff and possibly Martha Kantor about the CAEP petition.	Jim and Mark met with the NAICQI staff after the board meeting and continue to consult with Department staff about CAEP's petition.
11. Seven-year accreditation cycle was adopted by the Interim CAEP Board. ¹	The 7-year cycle will be included in the appropriate CAEP policies that are being compiled this spring.
12. An Operations Planning Committee should be created and begin meeting over the summer.	This Committee has been appointed and has had several electronic meetings. The chair, Jim Anderton, has met with Jim Cibulka and Nancy Groth to initiate the necessary transition work.

¹ Both TEAC and NCATE have also adopted a 7-year cycle.