

CAEP¹ Interim Board Meeting

December 12-13, 2010

One Dupont Circle, Suite, 320, Washington, DC

Members present:

CAEP currently has two members: NCATE and TEAC, represented by their respective presidents, who under the articles of incorporation, were authorized to, and did, name the following eight persons as members of the CAEP Interim Board before the meeting was called to order:

Jim Anderton, Barbara Cambridge, Jim Cibulka, Sandi Cohen, Rick Ginsberg, Jillian Kinzie, Frank Murray and Janice Poda

Staff present:

In addition to the above individuals, who were present, the following staff members of NCATE and TEAC were present: Don Feuerstein, Donna Gollnick, Mark LaCelle-Peterson, Rebecca Pelton and Diana Rigden

Board chair Frank Murray greeted members of the appointed interim board and called the meeting to order at 8:30 am and turned to President Jim Cibulka, who began the meeting with a review of the following agenda which was acceptable to all directors by consensus.

Agenda:

- A. Affiliation Agreement, Consolidation Agreement, and Design Team Report.
(Board members received a copy of the Design Team Report prior to the meeting.)
- B. Organization of CAEP.
- C. Legal work on 501(c)(3) status
- D. Recognition by USDE and CHEA and relationship to TEAC and NCATE continuing recognition

Organization of CAEP

There was a brief discussion the Organization of CAEP (item B) and a handout, "Tentative Organizational Framework for CAEP" (attached). The discussion centered on the figure's schematic and what the arrows and their directions meant. Direct reporting lines are represented by solid arrows and indirect by dotted lines.

¹ Patricia E Grays, Superintendent of Corporation, Corporations Division, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Government of the District of Columbia issued a certificate of incorporation to The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, Incorporated on October 21, 2010.

USDE and CHEA Recognition of CAEP

Chair Murray and President Cibulka reported on their various discussions with the staff of U.S. Department of Education and CHEA regarding recognition of CAEP. The board discussion focused on next steps that would need to be taken owing to the fact that TEAC is being considered in June 2011 for USDE approval and in September 2011 for CHEA approval, with NCATE scheduled a year later and with CAEP fully functioning at the beginning of 2013. Whatever the schedule of events, there was consensus that it must insure an unbroken chain of accreditation for all those accredited by NCATE and TEAC by a recognized accreditor until CAEP is recognized as an accreditor that can replace TEAC and NCATE.

There was also consensus that the most desirable outcome would be for CAEP to be “automatically” recognized based on the prior, and now presumably current, recognitions of TEAC and NCATE. It was agreed that the two presidents would seek a meeting with appropriate USDE staff to provide them with a roadmap for recognizing CAEP without any additional submissions while preserving USDE process and standards. The two options within North Central with its common standards for PEAK and AQIP were thought to provide a relevant precedent and roadmap for the department.

There was a brief discussion of whether CAEP could pilot its system with four cases, two from TEAC and two from NCATE, this year to prove to USDE and CHEA that CAEP in fact had a workable system of accreditation. While there was considerable enthusiasm from some for proving out the system sooner rather than later, others thought the members might balk, that CAEP could end up looking like a rubber stamp for TEAC and NCATE because the “higher” CAEP standards had not yet been vetted. The group was unable to decide whether it wanted to make a continuity argument, which would be needed for CAEP’s recognition on strength of the prior recognition of NCATE and TEAC, or an innovation argument, which is needed to satisfy the promises in the Design Team report. There was no consensus for piloting CAEP’s system in 2011 and the idea was dropped.

NCATE Updates:

President Cibulka reported on two reports NCATE has recently released and suggested that these be considered in terms of CAEP:

- Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning
- Report of the National Expert Panel on Increasing the Application of Knowledge about Child and Adolescent Development and Learning in Educator Preparation Programs

There was a brief discussion about what was actually new in the reports, the praise the BRP received from the Secretary of Education and others, the antidote its insistence on integrating clinical preparation into teacher preparation and developing partnerships with school districts might provide to Kate Walsh's expected critique of the clinical component of teacher education, the role of CAEP in setting an intellectual agenda for education, CAEP's role as a convener linked to AACTE/ATE in raising the level of the debate in the field, or as being its own agent of reform. There was consensus that CAEP should seek to implement the recommendations in the BRP, although some were unsure they knew what they were at a level of detail that could be helpful to accreditation. Some also expressed caution that CAEP, as an accreditor, not overstep its role and not be seen as preempting others' agendas.

Lunch break

After the board and staff returned from their lunch, they were joined by Margie Crutchfield, Shari Francis, and Nancy Groth from the NCATE staff.

TEAC Updates

President Murray briefly described the results from the surveys of students, cooperating teachers and faculty TEAC conducts in conjunction with each every audit. There are close to 3000 surveys and there was a very brief discussion of how such evidence could be used in the field.

Process for developing new Option #2 under specialty program review

Barbara Cambridge opened the afternoon discussion by reviewing the proposed Option #2, reporting that there were still aspects of the proposal that needed clarification and development. President Cibulka noted that he had the support of the NCATE board for this option because he had promised an inclusive process that would have to precede any state partnership agreements. There was consensus that the subcommittee would meet to make the needed clarifications and additions and then President Cibulka would send the proposal to the Board and to a larger group that would include SPAs, states and institutions within the next six to nine months.

Process for developing state partnership agreements

Shari Francis distributed a sample NCATE partnership protocol and a sample state partnership agreement, acknowledging that she understood the TEAC protocols were different. There was some discussion about the differences between the TEAC and NCATE style of agreements, noting that TEAC's were much briefer because they didn't cover the logistics of accreditation visits, report writing, voting and respective responsibilities. There was consensus that we should develop a CAEP model agreement and protocol to be used in all the states. President Cibulka said he will ask the staff to come up with a proposed template for an agreement and a protocol, possibly the same document, and a process for involving stakeholders by March 1st.

Finance/business management infrastructure

Nancy Groth alerted the board to issues in securing 501(c)3 status for CAEP, common billing cycles, vendors for payroll, benefits, personnel manuals, changes in the law requiring more than just the choice of TIAA-CREF, and so forth. The discussion took up the question of whether CAEP needed to hire a consultant to advise on Nancy Groth's list of tasks. While some were in favor, others noted that one consultant could not do it all anyway. Jim Anderton who has experience in these matters offered to consult with President Cibulka and his offer was gratefully accepted.

CAEP Banner for the AACTE meetings

There was consensus that the banner would have the NCATE logo with the "Standard of Excellence" tag line, TEAC logo with the "Accreditation through the audit of evidence of student achievement," tag line and both flowing into "Becoming CAEP."

Process for further developing standards and vetting them

Unlike CAEP's other standing committees which are appointed at the time of consolidation, Article III, section 3.16(E) of the CAEP bylaws requires the board to appoint a Standards Committee "*after the date of adoption of these bylaws and until the date of consolidation*" of 8 individuals, four named by NCATE and four named by TEAC. After consolidation equal numbers of commissioners are appointed.

There was some discussion about the role of the committee now, whether its members could be staff, whether the members should be deans, whether it would simply bless or tweak the Design Team standards, whether it would tackle creating truly "higher" standards, and so forth. The Design Team report promises that the committee will "*bring to the Interim Board as promptly and expeditiously as possible evidence that the CAEP accreditation standards contribute substantively to high quality educator preparation and their recommendations regarding those standards*" and this charge might require some members who are researchers in this field.

The consensus was that we needed to calibrate the level of committee expertise and then Presidents Cibulka and Murray will make the appointments.

Marketing CAEP to institutions and to organizations (possible affiliate memberships)

There was a brief discussion of expanding the number of stakeholder members who could not afford the regular stakeholder fees. The points in the discussion were the gaps in representation if the PTA were not part of CAEP, for example, the motives organizations would have for affiliation even with modest fees, the effect of modest

fees would have on the regular stakeholders, conflicts of interest for some types of members (ETS, Pearson, Live-Text), going beyond the SPAs to the primary discipline organizations, CIC, and so forth.

Appointment of additional members to the Interim Board

The interim board appointed the following additional members to the board to be effective at the end of this meeting:

Tom Bordenkircher, Barbara Brittingham, Rachelle Bruno, Calvin Johnson, Arthur Levine, and Blake West

Barbara Cambridge moved; Jillian Kinzie seconded. The vote was unanimous.

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

1/27/11

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Topics not covered:

- A. Communications plan (e.g., presentations, website, etc.)
- B. AIMS and other IT integration
- C. Research plan
- D. Rewriting organizational manuals

Budget Issues

- A. Management of transition costs
- B. Strategy for developing long-term staffing plan

Draft Organizational Framework for CAEP

