|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MEAC Board of Directors Meeting** | **Date:**March 11, 2013 |
| **Time: Convened**12:00 EDT**Adjourned**1:40 EDT |
| **Type of Meeting:**Conference call |
| **Attendees:** | Board members: Heidi Fillmore, Mary Yglesia, Henci Goer, Kristi Ridd-Young, Andrea Ferroni, Nichole Reding, Jeanne Madrid, Kathryn MontgomeryStaff: Sandra Bitonti Stewart; Karin Borgerson |
| **Absent:** | Sheila Simms-Watson |
| **Notes taken by:** | Karin Borgerson |
| ***Minutes*** |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Minutes from 2/11/2013 | **Presenter:**  | Kristi Ridd-Young |
| **Documents:** | 2a 2013-02-11\_Board Meeting Minutes.docx |
| **Discussion:**  | Kristi presented minutes.  |
| **Conclusions:** | Motion to accept minutes: Heidi Fillmore. Second: Mary Yglesia. Opposed: None. Abstaining: Nichole Reding. Motion passes. |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
|  |  |  |
| Change to P+P ? | Change to Handbook? | Notify public or schools? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Minutes from special board meeting, 2/25/2013 | **Presenter:**  | Kristi Ridd-Young |
| **Documents:** | 2b 2013-02-25 Special Standards Meeting Minutes.docx |
| **Discussion:**  | Kristi presented minutes.  |
| **Conclusions:** | Motion to accept minutes: Andrea Ferroni. Second: Henci Goer. Opposed: none. Abstaining: None. Motion passes. |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
|  |  |  |
| Change to P+P ? | Change to Handbook? | Notify public or schools? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Standards revision: approve implementation timeline | **Presenter:**  | Sandra Bitonti Stewart |
| **Documents:** | 3 Draft Implementation Timetable\_2013\_02.docx3 Standards Implementation Timeline\_by school v.2.xls |
| **Discussion:**  | In earlier rounds of standards revisions, MEAC has exceeded USDE regulations by requiring demonstration of compliance within two years of adoption, rather than as part of next regular accreditation review. Staff proposes implementation plan that would require schools to submit a plan for coming into compliance by June 2014, and then attest to full compliance by June 2015. MEAC would confirm compliance through review of the annual reports and then verify compliance through site visits during next reaccreditation cycle. Board discussed concern that MEAC would not be able to verify compliance with a few schools until 2019. Suggestion offered to host meetings for member schools to learn from each other and share strategies for compliance with new standards. Suggestion that progress reports could be required with each annual report until schools complete their next accreditation cycle, rather than just through 2015. Strong support for setting a 2-year “deadline” for compliance by June 2015.  |
| **Conclusions:** | Motion: Mary: I move to approve timeline with addition of the language about regular reports through next accreditation cycle. Second: Kathryn. Abstentions: none: Opposed: none. Motion passes. |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Edit plan to add row for reports due after 2015
 | Sandra  | 3/11/2013 |
| Change to P+P ? | Change to Handbook? | Notify public or schools? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | AMO/US-MERA meetings: Strategy and goals | **Presenter:**  | Kristi |
| **Documents:** | 4a Collaboration Next Steps for Board\_2013\_02.docx |
| **Discussion:**  | In preparation for the two meetings in April, 2013, the Executive Committee sent out a survey to each board member requesting thoughts on several questions related to goals and strategy for MEAC in the two meetings. Board asked to complete the survey by Thursday, March 14 so that the Executive Committee will have an opportunity to review. If it becomes clear that there are differences of opinion, Kristi recommended the possibility of a special board meeting before the AMO meeting.  |
| **Conclusions:** | Board members will complete survey by Thursday midnight. |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Sandra will re-send survey link and a reminder
* Board members will complete survey
* Executive Committee will review the survey responses in preparation for AMO meeting
 | Sandra Bitonti StewartBoard members | 3/12/20133/14/2013 |
| Change to P+P ? | Change to Handbook? | Notify public or schools? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Review and approve drafts of ICM Comparison documents | **Presenter:**  | Sandra |
| **Documents:** | 4b(1) Education Standards Assessment - Comparison of ICM and MEAC Standards Feb 15 2013.doc4b(2) Comparison of ICM and MEAC Curriculum Checklist\_2013\_03.docx4b(3) ICM Global Standards for Midwifery Education and Certified Professional Midwives\_2013\_02\_Jo Anne.docx |
| **Discussion:**  | Three documents have been prepared by staff as MEAC’s formal “gap analysis” with the ICM education standards and competencies. These documents will be shared with the allied midwifery organizations and the CNM organizations participating in the US-MERA meeting. Each of these organizations are also working on their own interpretation of gap analyses. Henci noticed that a few edits needed to be made to the ICM Global Standards comparison document to reflect edits that the MEAC Board made to the proposed 2013 standards. (II.3.e, IV.4) Sandra will make these edits. Several questions and concerns were raised in regard to our ICM gap analysis: * concerns about the different curriculum requirements for MEAC school students and PEP students;
* questions about how NARM Form 201 is developed and how often it is updated – job analysis process/how is this different than development of core competencies
* what are the purposes of core competencies vs. skills list for credentialing/testing agency?
* being in alignment with international standards is an important goal;
* how these issues will affect schools, students and prospective students, sister organizations.
* concerns about preserving access to multiple pathways for midwifery education
* fundamental differences between the “bottom up” approach of the job analysis that NARM does and the “top down” approach that MEAC is embracing by adopting the ICM standards and competencies.
* Less about the PEP educational pathway and more about the administration of the pathway and the assessments used to determine competency. This is the issue and will become increasingly so as we come under the attention of a larger audience including the federal government/Medicaid etc.
* Concern expressed that MEAC representatives to the upcoming AMO and US-MERA meetings need clarity on these issues – where does MEAC stand? Does our philosophy statement need to be reviewed again in terms of our commitment to multiple pathways?

Suggestion was made to schedule a special board meeting to discuss the results of the survey that come in before the Executive Committee leaves for Scottsdale.  |
| **Conclusions:** | 4b(1): Move to approve-Henci moves for approval with corrections as discussed. Second: Andrea. Abstention: none Opposed: none. Approved.(2): Motion: Mary moves to approve curriculum checklist comparison. Kristi: second. No abstain, no opposed. Accepted. After survey is completed—perhaps be prepared to have a special board meeting where we might set aside time to have the larger philosophical discussion. Be thoughtful about the survey.(3): Motion to accept this overview: Henci I move that we accept this overview by Jo Anne. Second: Andrea. Abstain: none. Opposed: none. |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Edits comparison documents
 | Sandra  | 3/11/2013 |
| Change to P+P ? | Change to Handbook? | Notify public or schools? |