|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MEAC Board of Directors** **Annual Meeting** | **Date:10/21/2013** |
| **Time convened** 8:30 am PDT**Time adjourned:**5:50 pm PDT |
| **Type of Meeting:** In Person |
| **Attendees:** | Board members: Nichole Reading, Kathryn Montgomery, Henci Goer, Mary Yglesia, Heidi Fillmore, Kristi Ridd-YoungStaff: Sandra Bitonti Stewart, Anana Integre, Jo Anne Myers-Ciecko, Karin Borgerson, Trixi Packmohr, Jessica Kelly-Shaieb |
| **Absent:**  | Sheila Simms-Watson, Jeanne Madrid, Andrea Ferroni |
| **Notes taken by:** | Karin Borgerson, Jessica Kelly-Shaieb |
| ***Minutes*** |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Reathorization of Higher Ed Act & ASPA update | **Presenter:**  | Joseph Vibert, ASPA Executive Director  |
| **Documents:** |  |
| **Discussion:**  | Joseph Vibert gave presentation and fielded questions.  |
| **Conclusions:** |  |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Joseph will provide examples of CHEA-required public reporting. (Karin will request.)
 | Karin Borgerson |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Consent Agenda | **Presenter:**  | Kristi Ridd-Young |
| **Documents:**  | 2013\_09\_30 Minutes; USMERA Update on Consensus Statements; Report on MAMA Campaign; ACCAHC Report to MEAC; Report on MEAC Website; School Status Report as of October 10, 2013; ASPA Fall 2013 Conference Report;  |
| **Discussion:**  | Board discussed the process of using a consent agenda. No items were extracted from the consent agenda. |
| **Conclusions:** | Kathryn moved to approve consent agenda. Heidi seconded. Motion carries unanimously. |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Direct assessment, Competency-based education & MEAC | **Presenter:**  | Heidi Fillmore |
| **Documents:** |  |
| **Discussion:**  | Heidi presented. Discussion ensued. |
| **Conclusions:** | Form a workgroup to review MEAC standards, policies and procedures in relation to the possibility of an application from a direct assessment program. Also carefully consider the ways that MEAC can support the schools in their work to develop assessment plans for the 2013 standards. Henci agreed to participate in the workgroup with Heidi.  |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Set up meeting of workgroup
 | Heidi, Sandra  | January 2014  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | CEUs | **Presenter:**  | Anana Integre |
| **Documents:** |  |
| **Discussion:**  | Anana presented. 2011-2012 was a high-revenue year because of conferences (MANA regionals, etc.). 2012-2013 Anana did outreach for applicants. Volume up, but mostly short workshops (low-revenue). Reduction in conferences, apps from single people, app fees reduced.2013-2014 YTD: Revenue is low, and small relative to number of applications. (Effort:$ ratio has declined).Recruiting and retaining reviewers is an issue.We require faculty to do professional development—is this a good opportunity? Can we grant CEUs for reviewing CEU applications?Can we grant CEUs for precepting? ACNM does.New combined forms have generated some confusion.Could we develop rubrics for reviewers? |
| **Conclusions:** |  |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Further form revisions
* New standing committee (if formed) could propose ways to make life easier for reviewers
* Advertise in AME newsletter
* Make requests to schools for reviewers
 | Anana & Henci |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Reduced rate for AME CEUs | **Presenter:**  | Anana Integre |
| **Documents:** |  |
| **Discussion:**  | Mary Yglesia recused herself.AME has requested reduced rate.History & context:4 years ago: review of NARM rate & equity vs. MANA rate—how applications are broken down. Conclusion then: for-profit, non-profit, member schools, NARM price structure.MANA has subsequently asked for a reduction for MANA regionals—request was denied, and we no longer get applications.Our overall pricing structure may need to be revised. |
| **Conclusions:** | Fee structure (based on market analysis) referred to committee, who will bring a recommendation to the board.AME will be permitted to defer payment until after session.Henci moves that we will not make an exception for AME because we are re-examining overall fee structure and eliminating all exceptions, but we will permit AME to pay after each workshop rather than upon application through June 30, 2014. Kathryn seconds.Mary abstains. Motion passes. |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Notify AME of our response to their request for reduced fees
 | Sandra  | November, 2014  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Analysis of Annual Report Data | **Presenter:**  | Karin Borgerson |
| **Documents:** | 2012 Annual Report Summary for MEAC Board PPT |
| **Discussion:**  | Karin presents a PowerPoint presentation reviewing the 2012 Annual Report data. Reviews the key indicators for compliance with MEAC Standards and highlights findings. Notes that several areas lacked information to form a full analysis.Motion to adopt staff recommendations to:1. For items that BOD does not intend to refer to the ARC, MEAC staff recommends the board take a specific action at this meeting.
2. For those items that the BOD would like to refer to the ARCs, MEAC staff recommends a blanket motion to refer the issues to the ARCs.

Nichole. Second: Mary. Abstain: None. Opposed: None. |
| **Conclusions:** |  |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Refer issues to appropriate ARCs
 | Karin, Jessica  | December, 2013  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Implementation of 2013 Standards: Process and Timelines | **Presenter:**  | Sandra Bitonti Stewart |
| **Documents:** | Standards Implementation Workgroup Rec to MEAC Board |
| **Discussion:**  | Sandra presents recommendations from the Implementation Workgroup that all schools would be able to demonstrate compliance with 2013 Standards by the next time they apply for reaccreditation, in keeping with USDE regulations. In the interim, all schools will develop and follow a plan to come into compliance. A method of “compassionate accountability.”Board raises concern that this plan includes additional complex reports that will require staff and ARC analysis. Staff believes that this will be easier on staff than the method used in past years, which included full SER reporting for every school within two years of the adoption of standards.Board raises concern over unfairness in implementation deadlines.Board suggests Standard-by-Standard tutorials available to Member Schools online.Motion to approve the implementation plan as it is presented in the Workgroup Recommendations: Nichole. Second: Kathryn. Abstain: None. Opposed: None. |
| **Conclusions:** |  |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| * Develop tools and standardized forms for implementation
 | Staff |  |
| * Inform schools of expectations and provide training
 | Staff | November 2013  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item:**  | Board Training and Professional Development | **Presenter:**  | Jo Anne Myers-Ciecko |
| **Documents:** |  |
| **Discussion:**  | Jo Anne presents a PowerPoint presentation about the Allied Midwifery Organizations (AMO) history and context in preparation for upcoming collaboration meeting. |
| **Conclusions:** |  |
| **Action Items** | **Person Responsible** | **Deadline** |
|  |  |  |