TF began meeting with a recap of what defines a quality educator preparation program. The TF voted on how they would like future votes to be determined. The decision was made that a super majority would be used with a quorum of at least 12 members present. The MAPA timeline was discussed. It takes 3 meetings to push recommendations to BOPE, then another 3 meetings for BOPE to move recommendations from TF to next steps.

TF discussed if current process of sub chapter 1 fits the needs of the current educational landscape. TF feels they need to make sure the process focuses on the constitution of the state and that it meets the needs of every student. What is OPI doing well and no well in the accreditation process? Is seven years a good timeline? Discussion moves to other conversation around the accreditation process. Should the TF incorporate CAEP as a requirement in the process?

Discussion around 10.58.103. What language needs to be changed within this section? The process is long and stressful. What could the TF change to make it better? Would language stronger than “encouraged” help? The support from additional institutional levels could be helpful. Discussion redirected to 10.58.102, subsection B. “The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall conduct workshops that prepare educators to serve as team members of site reviews”. Maybe language should be included to give a timeline for the OP to conduct these workshops. Would it be helpful for the CAEP and OPI to be on the same page through a joint group? TF feels that more time is spent on paperwork than talking with faculty during the accreditation process. They would prefer that they spend an equal amount of time on paperwork and interaction with the applicant.