Meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Members present:
Commissioner Chris Nicastro, Commissioner David Russell, Chad Bass, Cathy Cartier, Erin Cary, Kathryn Chval, Glenn Coltharp, Alexander Cuenca, Kathryn Garber-Miller, David Hough, Linda Kaiser, Paul Katnik, Kristen Merrell, and Rusty Monhollon

Members absent:
Gena McCluskey and Mike Ponder

Introductions were provided by MABEP members. Dr. Nicastro and Dr. Russell gave opening remarks that included:

- The need for the Advisory Board
- Emphasis on the importance of the work to be accomplished
- Appreciation to MABEP members for their willingness to serve

1. SB 492 and 5 CSR 20-400.450 are scheduled to become official in August 2014. The statute and companion rule specify the composition of members, duties, responsibilities and meeting logistics of MABEP.
   a. MABEP meeting logistics
      i. Frequency of MABEP meetings
         1. MABEP will meet at least two times annually as required by rule with other meetings scheduled as deemed necessary.
         2. It was agreed that more frequent meetings will be needed until the redesign of teacher education requirements, assessments, and procedures is complete due to concerns that need to be collaboratively discussed.
      ii. Setting the agenda
          1. The designees and/or Commissioners of Higher Education and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education will set basic agenda items.
          2. Board members will be invited to add items to the agenda.
          3. The proposed agenda will be sent to MABEP members at least one business week prior to the meeting date to allow everyone adequate preparation time.
      iii. Advisory Board minutes
          1. Minutes will be kept by DESE at each meeting and are sent to MABEP members for their review within one week following the meeting.
2. MABEP members review the minutes and have opportunity to submit corrections, additions or clarifications.
3. MABEP minutes are approved by the board at the beginning of the next meeting.
4. Minutes sent to MABEP members may be shared with constituents immediately upon receipt with the understanding that the minutes are unofficial until approved at the next meeting of the board.
5. A complete set of minutes from MABEP meetings will be maintained and hosted on the respective websites of the Departments with mutual links.
6. An e-mail address for each board member shall be included on the MABEP webpage to allow those outside of the board a mechanism for providing input, feedback and comments regarding board business directly to MABEP members.

iv. Operational procedures of MABEP
1. Parliamentary procedures will be followed for MABEP meetings.
2. The Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Commissioner of Higher Education (or designees) shall chair each meeting on a rotating basis.
   a. Both Commissioners were present and co-chaired the initial meeting.
   b. As a part of the public comment period for 5 CSR 20-400.450, the State Board of Education rule for MABEP, it is proposed that the rule be adjusted to indicate that MABEP be chaired on alternate meetings by the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education (or designee) and the Commissioner of Higher Education (or designee).
3. No MABEP member, other than the Commissioners of each Department, shall send a designee or appointee in his or her place.
4. MABEP members may participate via teleconference when necessary and available.
5. Written comments may be submitted by MABEP members prior to meetings for those members unable to attend.
6. MABEP meetings may include presentations or reports from an external source
   a. Those reporting at MABEP meetings will be approved by MABEP members in advance of the meeting.
   b. Approval may be granted via teleconference or email exchange.
   c. Members who do not respond in the indicated time frame will be counted as an “aye” vote.
b. MABEP duties and responsibilities
   i. Duties and responsibilities as listed in 5 CSR 20-400.450 were reviewed and are as follows:
      1. Meet with the commissioners of elementary and secondary education and higher education to discuss policy issues and proposed changes to standards and practices related to educator preparation programs;
      2. Make recommendations to the commissioners of elementary and secondary education and higher education regarding the criteria and procedures for evaluation and approval of educator degree programs and educator preparation programs within the state;
      3. Facilitate communication by inviting subject matter and educator preparation experts and constituencies with an interest in developing highly effective educators to meet with the MABEP for the purpose of identifying, reviewing and promoting best practices and standards in educator preparation and professional development (See item 1.a.iv.5 a-c);
      4. Present annually to the State Board of Education (SBE) and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) to discuss matters of mutual interest in the area of educator preparation as presented by the rotating chairs of MABEP; and
         a. First joint meeting will occur July 29 at approximately 1:30 p.m. at the Holiday Executive Center in Columbia, MO
      5. Maintain a record of deliberations for the purpose of keeping constituent groups with an interest in the maintenance of quality education preparation programs informed of issues and recommendations (See item 1.a.iii)

2. Structure for authentic collaboration and clear communications
   a. Common goals and objectives
      i. The goal is to improve educator effectiveness in a spirit of collaboration.
   b. General discussion
      i. Each member will maintain contact with respective constituents to gather input and relay information.
      ii. How do we ensure MABEP has a voice in the process?
      iii. MABEP can be an additional vehicle for ensuring accurate and current information is disseminated.
   c. Achieving genuine collaboration
      i. A complete set of minutes from MABEP meetings will be maintained and hosted on the respective websites of the Departments with mutual links.
      ii. Contact information for each board member shall be included on the MABEP webpage to allow those outside of MABEP a mechanism for providing input, feedback and comments regarding board business.
iii. Each MABEP member will identify constituencies from whom they will seek input and will regularly seek such input and represent the interests of those respective constituencies at each meeting. It was suggested the student representative could garner feedback from teacher candidates beyond her own institution.

3. Issues of MoSPE/MEGA
   a. Missouri General Education Assessment (MoGEA) framework revision
      i. MABEP members reviewed the June 2014 – July 2015 schedule for the revision of the framework
      ii. General discussion
         1. There is content on the general education test (MoGEA) to which some students may never have been exposed (i.e., economics content).
         2. There is a difference between the definition of general education in higher education and the definition being established by DESE through the assessment; this could be problematic because the test has questions on content that may not be provided in practice in institutions of higher education.
         3. Students will often not have enough content knowledge to pass some very content specific tests by the second year of undergraduate work.
         4. Much of the content knowledge required depends on the quality of high school the student attended.
         5. If we continue discussing issues we never move forward. Some students will get caught in that process so on the K-12 side of it; we are working to fill the gaps.
         6. It is important to review the existing framework in regards to the aforementioned questions, feedback, and input; completely starting over could be problematic as some institutions have already adjusted to the new content.
         7. It was suggested that current entry assessments being used by various institutions be explored.
   b. Missouri Content Assessment implementation beginning in Fall 2014
      i. Brief review of the June 9 memo
      ii. General discussion
         1. Many students are being encouraged to take the Praxis II before it is discontinued at the end of August. Will there be a large enough “N” size on the new content assessments to provide adequate impact data?
         2. There is concern that test takers currently in the pipeline would not have adequate time to prepare for first launch of test.
         3. General concern about the timeline of implementation.
   c. Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA) delay in launch
i. Distributed and reviewed June 3 memo

ii. General discussion
   1. The year delay will be spent trying to determine how to offer a video and non-video component to Task 4.
   2. There is some confusion regarding the “qualifications” of cooperating teachers and field-based host teachers. The lack of consistent terminology between K-12 and higher education is problematic.
   3. Is the problem with implementing the MoPTA fixable?
   4. There is some confusion regarding the “effectiveness” of cooperating teachers and the lack of a consistent definition between K-12 and higher education.

d. Annual Performance Report (APR)
   i. Distributed and reviewed sample APR.
   ii. Noted that current metrics include GPA, content assessment pass rate, first year teacher survey, and principal survey.
   iii. Performance assessment metric is yet to be phased in.

4. Final MABEP business
   a. Joint meeting of the CBHE and SBE will be on the afternoon of July 29th at approximately 1:30 p.m. at the Holiday Inn Executive Center in Columbia. MABEP members are encouraged to attend.
   b. Next meeting: Rusty Monhollon with DHE will create a poll to determine best dates/times to meet during the week of July 21.
   c. Subsequent dates will also be explored for follow-up meetings in Fall and Spring.

5. Comments for the Good of the Order
   a. Is it within the purview of MABEP to explore issues like ABCTE? It will be necessary to link issues discussed to established MABEP duties and responsibilities (See item 1.b).

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.
Unfortunately, a meeting scheduled for 10:00-2:00 was only conducted from 10:00-12:40 in spite of having an agenda worthy of the entire time. This left insufficient time to get to the problem-solving stage regarding issues of MoSPE/MEGA.