

<b>MEAC Board of Directors Meeting</b>	<b>Date: October 30, 2017</b>						
	<b>Time Convened 8:05am</b>						
	<b>Time Adjourned 8:30pm</b>						
<b>Type of Meeting: In Person</b>							
<b>Attendees (Present Yes/No):</b>							
<b>Board Members</b>							
Abigail Aiyepola	No	Karen Ehrlich	Yes	Courtney Everson	Yes	Heidi Fillmore	Yes
Henci Goer	Yes	Rachel Hargy	Yes	Cassandra Jah	Yes	Safiya McCarter	Yes
Kristi Ridd-Young	Yes	Ana Vollmar	No				
<b>Administrative Staff</b>							
Rachael Bommarito	Yes	Amari Fauna	Yes	Trixi Packmohr	No	Timberly Robinson	Yes
<b>Guests:</b> Joseph Vibert, ASPA (present 2017-10-30 7am-10am), Dolly Browder (present 2017-10-30 10am-10:45am)							
<b>Notes taken by:</b> Rachael Bommarito and Amari Fauna							

### *Minutes*

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Keynote speaker	<b>Presenter:</b>	Joseph Vibert, ASPA
<b>Documents:</b>	Mr. Vibert provided a PowerPoint presentation		
<b>Discussion:</b>	Overview of ASPA and higher education “triad” (federal, state, accreditors)		
<b>Conclusions:</b>	MEAC Board and Staff have an increased understanding of ASPA, its role, its members, and the services it provides.		
<b>Action Items</b>		<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ none			
Change to P+P ? No	Change to Handbook? No	Notify public or schools? No	

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Consent Agenda	<b>Presenter:</b>	Kristi Ridd-Young
<b>Documents:</b>	Budget Vs Actual Oct FY 2017-18, Cashflow Statements 2016-2018		
<b>Discussion:</b>	none		
<b>Conclusions:</b>	Cassandra Jah moves to accept the consent agenda. Second: Rachael Hargy Abstain: none. Oppose: none		
<b>Action Items</b>		<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ none			
Change to P+P ? No	Change to Handbook? No	Notify public or schools? No	

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Nizhoni Reaccreditation	<b>Presenter:</b>	Kristi Ridd-Young, Amari Fauna
<b>Documents:</b>	NIZ RA IBR vs ARC V.2, Nizhoni Reaccreditation Visual Timeline		
<b>Discussion:</b>	Amari discusses timeline for Nizhoni reaccreditation review, starting in 2014 and ending in 2017.		

**ARC recommendation** - Guest: Dolly Browder, NIZ ARC member, joins via telephone to discuss benchmarks for which there is a discrepancy between the ARC and IBR recommendations. Dolly provides rationale for ARC recommendations on Benchmarks I.C5, III.A5, III.B1, IV.B3, and V.C3. Dolly departs call.

**IBR recommendation** – Accept ARC report with changes. IBR discusses the following benchmarks: I.B1, I.C5, II.D1, II.D2, III.A5, III.B1, III.B2, III.B4, III.C2, IV.B3, IV.D2, IV.D6, V.C3, V.C4, V.D3, VI.A1.

**Board discussion** –

Topic 1: When do findings of Met-1 need monitoring reports? How does MEAC want to use monitoring reports? BOD refers to standard MEAC language for benchmark scoring and monitoring reporting to inform its decision.

Topic 2: Scores for benchmarks listed in IBR recommendation above.

**Board decision** - Accept ARC report with changes listed below

- I.B1: Met-1, no monitoring report
- I.C5: Met-1, monitoring report, due 6 months from notification
- II.D1: Met-1, no monitoring report
- II.D2: Met-1, no monitoring report
- III.A5: Met-1, monitoring report, due 6 months from notification
- III.B1: Met-1, no monitoring report
- III.B2: Met-2, no reporting
- III.B4: Met-1, no monitoring report
- III.C2: Met-1, no monitoring report
- IV.B3: Met-1, no monitoring report
- IV.D2: Met-1, no monitoring report
- IV.D6: Not met, ECD 6 months from notification, monitoring report due three months from notification, compliance report due 30 days after ECD.
- V.C3: Met-1, monitoring report, due 6 months from notification
- V.C4: Met-1, no monitoring report
- V.D3: Met-2, no reporting
- VI.A1: Met-2, no reporting

I.C1 and I.C2 left unscored.

**Conclusions:** Reaccreditation decision will occur after discussion of benchmarks I.C1 and I.C2 with 2016 Annual Reports on 10/31/2017.

<b>Action Items</b>		<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ none			
Change to P+P ?	Change to Handbook?	Notify public or schools?	

<b>Agenda Item:</b> Our Needs – MEAC Board of Directors	<b>Presenter:</b> Dr. Timberly Robinson
---	---

<b>Documents:</b>	MEAC Board Expertise Matrix
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>Timberly discusses expertise present on the Board. Categories of expertise: current midwifery educator, current midwifery program/institution administrator, practicing midwife, public member.</p> <p><b>Questions and topics of conversation:</b>  Does MEAC need more candidates for the Board? We currently have 5 candidates.  Should MEAC engage in active recruitment from member schools?  MEAC’s definition of “peer” for “peer reviewer”: midwifery educator, higher education administrator, other.  MEAC definition of public member.  Board cultivation.  Who has terms expiring in 2017 and what are their plans for renewal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristi Ridd-Young – plans to renew, but would rather not serve 3 more years</li> <li>• Heidi Fillmore – interested in renewing year to year, if possible</li> <li>• Courtney Everson– plans to renew</li> </ul> <p>Noted from Bylaws that Board terms are for three years and there must be three cohorts of Board members. With Kristi, Heidi, and Courtney renewing they would be part of the cohort that have terms ending in 2020. This means there would be a 2018 expiring cohort, and a 2020 expiring cohort but no 2019 as that cohort have all previously resigned. Decided that we could appoint Board members to fill that cohort, but that it is confusing to have the appointments made later and at the same time as regular elections.</p> <p>Cassandra leads a consensus process on what an ideal Board would look like.</p>
<b>Conclusions:</b>	MEAC Board will continue this discussion 10/31/2017.

<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ none		
Change to P+P ?	Change to Handbook?	Notify public or schools?

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Our Needs: IT System	<b>Presenter:</b>	Dr. Timberly Robinson
<b>Documents:</b>			
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>Vendor: Social solutions: Apricot Essentials</p> <p>Autumn gives a walkthrough of their systems and cost estimate. Board asks questions.</p>		
<b>Conclusions:</b>	<p>Agreed that a more centralized system for retaining information and compiling data would be beneficial. ED will form a workgroup between staff and a couple Board members to look into more options, including accreditation-specific software, with the goal of making a recommendation to</p>		

the Board.		
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ Form workgroup to consider options and make recommendation.	Timberly Robinson	
Change to P+P ? No	Change to Handbook? No	Notify public or schools? No

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	NCM 2017-06-30 CR	<b>Presenter:</b>	Heidi Fillmore, Rachael Bommarito
<b>Documents:</b>	NCM 2017-06-31 CR IBR Report, NCM 2017-06-31 CR ARC Report, NCM Overview Presentation.ppt		
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>Rachael introduces the accreditation decisions being reviewed as well as background.</p> <p>Heidi introduces Benchmarks under review.</p> <p>II.B2- ARC and IBR recommendation Met-1 with no follow-up. Board discusses.</p> <p>II.B5- ARC and IBR recommend Met-2 with no follow-up. No Board discussion.</p> <p>II.C1- ARC and IBR recommend Met-1. Board discusses if documentation is Met-1 or Not Met. Several members posit that documentation is less thorough than it could have been, but it does demonstrate that assessment of competencies is happening. Board suggests Monitoring Report due within two weeks of notification to complete Demo II.C1.3, Competencies Spreadsheet, to identify specific method used to complete final summative assessment for each individual competency.</p> <p>II.D1- ARC and IBR recommend Met-1. IBR recommends a Monitoring Report. Board discusses and strikes requirement for Monitoring Report.</p> <p>II.D2- ARC and IBR recommend Met-1. Board discusses.</p> <p>II.D3- ARC recommends Met-2. IBR recommends Met-1 with a Monitoring Report. Board discusses and accepts IBR recommendation for scoring but strikes requirement for Monitoring Report.</p>		
<b>Conclusions:</b>	Karen Ehrlich moves to accept IBR recommendation with changes proposed by Board. Kristi Ridd-Young seconds. Absent: Abigail Aiyepola. Recused: Cassandra Jah. Abstains:1. In favor: 6. Opposes: none. Motion carries.		
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	
✓ Send notification of Board decision.	Rachael Bommarito	11/16/17	
Change to P+P ? No.	Change to Handbook? No.	Notify public or schools? NCM	

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	NCM Substantive Change	<b>Presenter:</b>	Rachael Bommarito
<b>Documents:</b>	None.		
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>Rachael introduces history of processing this substantive change. Report is not ready for Board decision. Staff, ARC, and IBR are recommending that decision be deferred to allow time to request additional information and complete a review.</p> <p>Board discusses. Formal deferral not needed at this point. Will issue an Additional Information Request and continue to process as per usual.</p>		
<b>Conclusions:</b>			
<b>Action Items</b>		<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ Draft and send AIR.		Rachael Bommarito	
Change to P+P ? No.	Change to Handbook? No.	Notify public or schools? NCM.	

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	NACIQI Update	<b>Presenter:</b>	Courtney Everson
<b>Documents:</b>	Powerpoint		
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>Courtney reviews MEAC status with NACIQI. Board discusses and assigns staff task to map MEAC policy to CFR 602 with related policy updates as needed.</p>		
<b>Conclusions:</b>			
<b>Action Items</b>		<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ Create plan for PnP mapping and revision.		Timberly Robinson, Amari Fauna	
Change to P+P ? Yes	Change to Handbook?	Notify public or schools?	