



Chapter 55 School Quality Task Force Meeting Minutes Tuesday, March 8, 2022 10:00 AM – 5:00 PM

Meeting Start Time: 10:00 AM

Roll Call

Task Force Members

Daniel Lee
Emily Dean
Heather Hoyer
Heather Jarrett
Janelle Beers
Tony Warren

BPE Representation

McCall Flynn

Facilitators

Julie Murgel
Erich Stiefvater
Tristen Loveridge

OPI Representation

Nathan Miller

Welcome and Overview

1. Julie Murgel reviews:
 - a. Meeting outcomes and agenda
 - b. Taskforce norms and consensus definition
 - c. Taskforce purpose and deliverables
 - i. Emily Dean: Asks if the areas that are completed tomorrow, the TF will have an opportunity to revisit them? Asks for the timeline to be explained.
 1. Julie Murgel: They are the initial recommendations to the Negotiated Rule-Making Committee (NRMC). The NRMC can decide to work with the recommendation or send it back to the TF. These are our initial recommendations, but more information can be flowed to the NRMC.
 - d. Taskforce timeline
 - e. NMRC timeline and members
2. TF members take turns reviewing summaries of meetings done so far.
3. TF participate in "Save the Last Word for ME" protocol. Thoughts/topics shared:
 - a. Dan Lee: This is a unit of analysis problem. Districts are the right level to be accredited rather than individual schools. Districts have the power to shift resources to areas that the district serves to better serve children. Thinking more broadly rather than singularly with an individual school.
 - b. Heather Jarrett: Keeps hanging on to competency-based education frameworks and if we are really doing right by our students by requiring them to be in 4th grade when

they're 10. Does this serve any purpose, or should we be thinking of a total restructure of the system, so our students are valued learners?

- c. Heather Hoyer: Concurrs with both members in her group (Dan Lee and Heather Jarrett). Looking at district level accreditation allows for systemic change. If we keep accrediting schools the way we do, we always have we will keep getting what we have always gotten. [District level accreditation] would allow for systemic change. Second, looking at proficiency-based education and looking at it differently as we prepare students for a future we do not know about.
 - d. Tony Warren: The value that peer reviews from neighboring districts could bring to your district in the accreditation process. If you have administrators from nearby districts that understand what you are doing, they could bring value to the process.
 - e. Emily Dean: Drawn to pieces that we are setting the baseline but also encouraging actual support to districts and solving actual problems. This comes back to personnel and having levers to support districts in reaching their goals. Having a flexible system to support a district in the way they need support rather than a one size fits all model.
 - f. Nathan Miller: As an employee of OPI, it was interesting to hear the perspectives of the different accreditation models and school improvement plans. It would be good to find a strategy with OPI, how we can help schools more with the material they put into a school improvement plan and how can we help them reach those goals. Perhaps through onsite visits or with peer reviews. We collect a lot of data and look at it but how do we help schools achieve their goals?
 - g. McCall Flynn: Surprised how many states use Cognia as their primary accreditor. There are some amazing benefits by going through Cognia accreditation, but on the other side of that, ensuring schools have the resources to use it fully. Thinking through how we can implement the outcomes and strategies you can get through a company like Cognia without going through their accreditation process.
 - h. Janelle Beers: Looking to find a system that has some flexibility and innovation but also meets the minimum standards. That's the Catch-22.
4. Julie Murgel: Reviews the four areas of the accreditation framework, accreditation process, response to accreditation, and school improvement.

Sample Content Memorandum – Conceptual Changes

1. Julie Murgel: Reviews and explains the sample Conceptual Memorandum document.
2. Emily Dean: One of the things that MTSBA has discussed going into Ch55 is to use the notice to provide the red lines [proposed changes to ARMs] to the Superintendent. The memorandum was confusing for Ch57, and the content had to be explained to members of MTSBA. If there needs to be a subsequent narrative, that would be appropriate, but just from the process MTSBA experienced in Ch57 the chart was too difficult to follow and understand. Having one red line document would be a more clear and expedient way to provide the recommendation to the Superintendent.
 - a. Julie Murgel: This is something to think about. Something we must complete in the group is the Conceptual Memorandum. It is important to include the conceptual changes, the rationale, and the redline. When it comes to public notice, perhaps we can

take the extra step, but it is important to share the rationale and conceptual changes and where they live in ARM.

- b. Emily: Will have to see what it looks like playing out. Still a bit confused because the Ch57 chart is what was given to the public when it was moved forward. The chart was very confusing.
- c. Julie: What we are working towards now is getting the conceptual memorandum to the NRMC and Superintendent. They will work off our conceptual changes and the rationale for why so they can begin to negotiate. The memorandum format is not new. The OPI did not develop the format for Ch 57 but has been used in the past for ARM Chapter review. The OPI did complete a synthesized summary of the work for the public, so it was not so difficult to follow.
- d. Emily: The concern is that when the TF recommendation goes to the Superintendent and NRMC, we don't want a difference in opinion on a specific change to be based on the conceptual conversation of the TF rather the actual language in Rule says. What matters is what is in the actual Rule. Wants to ensure that if there is some sort or disagreement, it is not based on the rationale or discussion but the language in the Rule.
- e. Julie: Would like to summarize this quickly and wants to ensure that we are clear.
- f. Emily: Advocates that a redline is given to the notice to proposed Rule so that decisions are generated based on the language in rule rather than the rationale and discussion of the TF.
- g. Julie: This will be an important piece. Perhaps we need to be clear on the recommended Rule change in the comments.
- h. Emily: it is difficult to run the TF and NRMC concurrently because conceptual changes are different than actual changes. What matters is what is in the final rule not a concept someone would like in the rule.
- i. Julie: When we think about final Rule, we do not want to wordsmith in Rule. If we are making recommendations to changes in Rule there needs to be a reason behind it.

Review Preliminary Survey Results

1. Julie Murgel: Reviewed progress on survey results and data.

Working Copy of Conceptual Memorandum

1. Erich Stiefvater: Reviews the accreditation framework, key questions, conceptual changes chart, and overviews the work to be done today and tomorrow. He reviews topics already discussed by the TF.
 - a. Flexibility versus accountability; variation by school size and local context
 - b. Accreditation data collection period
 - c. Recruitment and retention of quality educators
 - d. Post-secondary preparation outcomes
 - e. Incorporate Student Grown measures
 - f. Role of SEL in education
 - g. School climate and culture
 - h. Shared vision with all stakeholders
 - i. Parents families and communities
 - j. Student satisfaction

2. Heather Hoyer: Asks if it would be possible to run through an example that is not overly complex to see the process.
3. McCall Flynn: the areas that are added on the chart are from the spreadsheet the TF put rules in. Where does that fit in here?
 - a. Erich: Yes. Perhaps we should pull it up and double check all areas are included.
4. Student Satisfaction: Practice discussion
 - a. Julie Murgel: Student satisfaction, what do we mean by this? What is the concept behind it? Then we can discuss the rationale why we would consider this in rule and where it would live.
 - b. Dan Lee: In his head he would go through each section of ARM and working it. In thinking about student satisfaction, where does it exist in ARM currently? We're not going to write new Rule we're going to look at what we already have. We were talking before lunch about the overall view of accreditation and now were talking about a specific item in accreditation. Unless we understand the former, we cannot do the later. What is our overall view of accreditation and how do we begin to address it?
 - i. Julie Murgel: When we say student satisfaction, where does this live in the framework? It's not part of the accreditation process, not part of a response of accreditation process, but it is a characteristic/standard ("the what"). Do we want to include that student satisfaction is an element of the basic standards of a school? Where does this live right now and if it doesn't where should it live? Perhaps 10.55.801 (School climate)?
 - c. Heather Hoyer: When looking at 801 it is speaking to parents, guardians, educators, and members of the community. It does not speak to students or student voice. Is this on the right track? She is trying to get an idea how do we navigate this specifically.
 - d. Erich: As Julie has identified, Student satisfaction probably falls under the essential elements of school quality.
 - e. Dan Lee: Still trying to get his head around what the function of the state is in accrediting schools and how involved the state should be in the rule process. Is student satisfaction a necessary item for the state to involve itself in in the quality of schools? His belief system is to create less rules than more rules if possible. It is tough for people in the field to comply with the rules we already have.
 - f. Julie: Do we believe that student satisfaction is a necessary element to be measured as a minimum standard for a school? If so, then we will discuss how to potentially measure it.
 - g. Janelle: In thinking about the student satisfaction piece, the end would be to include "student" in 10.55.801 (g) or (h). She wants to ensure she is on the right track.
 - h. Julie: yes, she thinks Janelle is on the right track. Do we think student satisfaction should be included as a minimum standard for accreditation?
 - i. Dan: This is not to say that student satisfaction is not an important quality in school climate. Is this an element that is so demanding that every school must have measure of some sort of student satisfaction?
 - j. Emily: Thinking back to conversations from this morning, seeing examples from around the country there could be flexible ways to address these topics. It might already be

- happening in districts but are being done in different ways. Every district may do this a little differently, so it is important to ensure a flexible system is in place is important.
- k. Dan: 10.55.801 (f) It isn't like the ARM currently ignores students because it does address students.
 - l. Julie: So how does this currently exist in Rule? What does it mean that "School board trustees shall..."?
 - m. Dan: Sometimes it might be MTSBA sends a template policy for school boards to adopt. So perhaps it is already being done. If we're currently already doing something close to this, do we need to add more to it?
 - n. Heather H: If we feel that it is adequately addressed then we put that it is adequately addressed as written?
 - o. Julie: Is this really a change? What we're saying then that the local board will help determine how student satisfaction happens.
 - p. Erich: so maybe this is not a high lever topic. He discusses how to proceed.
 - q. Tony: Does not see this as a high-level change and doesn't need to be addressed. 10.55.801 (a) there are policies that districts develop and 10.55.801 (f) says to take responsibility for their stuff and don't be a "jerk."
 - r. Julie: Suggests we take it off our table for how. Asks the TF if there is a high-level conceptual change they would like to think about.
5. Heather Hoyer: We only discussed student satisfaction in the context of school climate. Her group discussed credits in flexibility and credits in individualized learning and plans for students. This is also student satisfaction. Maybe it lives somewhere else in ARM besides climate that was missed.
 - a. Julie: Yes, it does.
 - b. Heather J: Could also be included in 10.55.803 Learner Access?
 - c. Julie: 10.55.803: 2(a) Learner access "in implementing curriculum in all program areas, the local board of trustees shall: provide all learning experiences matched to students' interests, readiness, and learning styles."
 - d. Heather H: Yes, believes it is reflected there.
 - e. Julie: Also, as you look at 10.55.803 (d) & (e). Asks Heather H if she would like to continue discussing this or if she feels it is already included in ARM.
 - f. Heather H: Thinks it already lives here. The Chapter is huge and needed help finding where it would have lived already. She wants to ensure that something is not missed.
 - g. Dan Lee: 10.55.803 2(a) is interesting. "Learning styles" is kind of an 80's thing but it says a "trustee shall" not "may". How do we know every single district is providing "learning experiences matched to students' interests, readiness, and learning styles"? The use of the word is nice and kind of fluffy, but we are making a law here. How do we know they're doing it and if they know they're doing it?
 6. Heather Jarrett: How are we currently measuring 10.55.801 and 10.55.803 in accreditation procedures?
 - a. Nathan Miller: When it comes to various board of trustee policies, there is a policy screen in TEAMS where they must put in that information. This is an opportunity to not only look at how we are currently measuring, but we are also discussing if the TF feels something should be done differently.

- b. Dan Lee: As a Superintendent, he would bring policies to the board because he had to and needed to check off that it was done. It's an exercise. We adopt it and put it in the policy book, but it does not mean it is paid attention too much. Are we making law that doesn't really make a difference for children?
 - c. Nathan: There is local control element with how policies are implemented. That is the opportunity of those on the TF to decide if maybe it's not working the way it currently is. We can look at the process and decide if it is OK or not the way it is.
7. Julie Murgel: Asks TF how they would like to proceed.
- a. Erich: Feels that there is space already carved out in ARM for measures for student satisfaction and there is already space carved out for personalized learning programs. These are already supported in ARM and so TF may not need to consider changes.
8. Janelle Beers: We have talked about seat minutes that don't give the flexibility students need that could fall under student satisfaction.
9. Julie Murgel: The TF has talked a lot about measuring growth in student performance. In ARM, 10.55.602 Definitions (43) "'Student performance standards' means minimum standards of a quality education, which measures student performance on annual state level summative assessments and graduation rates used to determine the accreditation status of a school." Julie describes the chart that reviewed variance and student standards.
- a. McCall: If changes are made to this in Ch 55 would this impact assessments as well?
 - i. Julie: Assessments already measure growth. There could be implications if we decided to measure growth in grades we do not already or in other ways.
 - b. Dan: The problem is that growth is only measured in one place. Student growth is measured through testing. Do we have the wherewithal to expand testing? If we did in the secondary level, growth does not matter under current law, because it's all about the accumulation of credits.
 - c. McCall: Surprised to see on the preliminary results of the survey with student growth ranked second to last.
10. Tony Warren: How much weight should we put on the survey?
- a. Julie: There are not very many responses to make any assumptions.
11. Julie Murgel: When we talk about growth, the survey does inform us so some extent.
- a. Erich: Discussions have also included flexibility for schools as well. If a school is demonstrating progress in achieving student growth. Hold them to high standards but give them flexibility and show good faith in progress.
 - b. Dan: It would be unlikely at the high school level the way things are right now. You have to be able to check off the boxes for credits. It doesn't leave much room for anything else like CTE and internships.
 - c. Heather H: Does the credit have to be a traditional class, or could it be delivered through a CTE class? There are different levels of flexibility.
 - d. Dan: Would the teacher need an English endorsement?
 - e. McCall: There are some flexibilities that allow for boards of trustees to waive courses based on unique situations.
 - f. Emily: A board can waive any course.
 - g. Heather J: Looking at school quality informal interview responses, there were about 20 responses that included growth, and this was one of the measures when determining a

successful school. For her, they look at growth from K-11th grade. As they progress through high school they are tested less depending on their situation. We can look at the difference between formative assessments and summative assessments. When we are talking about instruction, learners, and providing a quality education, for her it is centered around growth. This is not to discount the data that we get from a summative assessment, but as an educator, growth is what should be considered when looking at a quality school.

- h. Julie: Do we think this should be left on as an emerging concept to be considered?
 - i. Dan: Heather's school district finds a way to measure formative growth in a productive way. To say that all districts must have a plan to measure and document student growth (could be MAPPS, other testing, or embedded in courses). But to say the state of Montana considers it important that schools are accredited based on student growth is a good thing. But allow local districts to make some decisions.
 - j. Erich: It seems that there is energy around this...
 - k. Julie: We can note the 10.55.603 Curriculum and Assessment. Begins talking about assessments around multiple measures and methods. Not sure if it measures growth but there are components, and this could be a potential area where this lives.
 - l. Heather H: Is student growth only tied to achievement? In looking at some of these we have talked about attendance as well. Are there other things that are tied to student growth that we may not have considered yet?
 - m. Nathan: Another area, 10.55.601 in the continuous school improvement plan, could also be an area to include growth.
 - n. Julie: This is a topic the group would like to pursue deeper.
12. McCall Flynn: Staffing ratios (library media specialists, counselors, etc.)
- a. Dan: Staffing ratios should be included to the extent that they can be substantiated in the literature. We know there is a lot of literature about class size, so it makes sense there is a range in class size. He is unfamiliar with other staffing ratios. Perhaps in MT the school counselor association could give us literature on it. It is hard for him to say that there needs to be X ratio because he is unfamiliar those areas.
 - b. McCall: one of the things McCall brought forward one of the first times the TF met was from a conversation she had with the variance to standards board chair. The ability for them to weigh in on the "grey areas" that continuously get brought forward to the variance to standard board. She is not pushing to change the ratios around teachers to students, but she was looking to the library media and areas under the variance to standards.
 - c. Heather H: We also spoke to flexibility for both library media specialists and counselors. As we are looking at SEL and mental health for students, talking about the flexibility for schools to fill those positions with the resources in communities. It can be difficult for districts to fill those positions.
 - d. Nathan: We currently have 35 variances to standards in place, all but one is for library FTE. This is an area schools are struggling currently, [with the requirements in] 10.55.709.
 - e. Dan: Is it possible for us to have a better breakdown? Based on district size? His guess is that it is smaller districts that can't get an endorsed library media specialist.

- f. Nathan: Will get that data for the group. A lot of times in a school system, the middle school will require that they have a library .001 FTE, but if the elementary and high school both require a .5 FTE, the likelihood of the system to hire another individual to fill the .001 FTE is unlikely. In larger schools, when it jumps from needing 1.0 FTE to 1.5-2 FTE it may catch schools that anticipated less or more. OPI does work with schools in these situations. With the rule as is, it jumps .5 FTE making it difficult for schools to find another librarian. Its not just a smaller school issue.
- g. Julie: Lists the schools with this variance to standard.
- h. Dan: No one is debating that library media specialists should be available for students. We're just looking at the difficult cut offs.
- i. Janelle: For small schools this an important topic. Everyone agrees that there should be a cut off and you should have licensed people, but people can jump in and out of the standards quickly and then find yourself in a variance. Perhaps we can have a three-to-five-year range for compliance.
- j. Nathan: Adds that variance to standards process is not a process to keep from getting a deviation, but a way for schools to show that they are meeting the standards. We have seen that the variances are coming in because of the need to find a librarian but unable to find one for partial FTE.
- k. Heather J: is there any history for how these ratios and numbers came to be? It was obviously put in for a reason.
- l. Nathan: That was "pre-Nathan". A committee was formed with different stakeholders and agencies. He is unsure why the ratios were put in place.
- m. Heather J: Would also be interested in seeing a 10–15-year lookback on how close schools are to not having those variances. It would be beneficial to see what is happening in the field so we can make changes based on the needs.
- n. Nathan: This is what he was talking to in the variance to standard process. It is not to be an FTE variance. It is meant for schools to show that they are meeting the needs of their schools by utilizing a para or other resources. If we look at the current rule and the numbers, we will see where the breakout is. Nathan gives an example in 10.55.709.
- o. Janelle: Would like us to look more at the post-secondary schools are doing for training counselors. If they can even meet the demand.
- p. Heather H: The high school in Great Falls has 5 advisement counselors. It is difficult to find licensed counselors to come to the Great Falls district. Would it be possible to have a blend of each? A certain percentage of advisement counselors and CPC so they can focus on either academics or mental health rather than both in schools that are large enough.
- q. McCall: Would this impact how they are licensed to be a counselor?
 - i. Julie: They are both licensed but they are licensed in different systems. The OPI licenses guidance counselors but not the others.
- r. Heather J: Is this an appropriate place to consider SEL? The premise of a school counselor is to teach those skills. Is this where the conversation needs to begin when we talk about that piece? We have talked about the mental health of our students.
- s. Heather J: There are a lot of resources for schools in SEL. In some schools it may be a flexibility to provide PD to staff at all grade levels to infuse it in the classroom. She

doesn't want to add yet another thing to a classroom teacher, however it may be a conversation how to address the SEL for students with the lack of counselors available.

- t. Heather H: Because of their advanced degrees [counselors] are expensive. Schools have to make a choice between [advisors or counselors] because they can't afford to do both.

13. Post-secondary readiness

- a. Heather H: Historically we have defined post-secondary readiness as college readiness. This is one of the things we need to re-consider. The way we assess, is to assess the ACT but we don't give credit for the AFC or other national assessments.
- b. Dan: This is a great point because we talk about the secondary curriculum. The Board of Trustees doesn't have the authority to say they are going to restructure the high school curriculum to eliminate the 20-credit requirement. Not sure if the group is ready to have this conversation but it would be wrong if we did not have it. If we don't, for 10 years we won't have the opportunity. We have to remember that this high school curriculum was put in by the "Committee of 12" in 1892. It wasn't based on anything, yet we've used it ever since.

14. Accreditation Process

- a. Heather J: Discussed accreditation at a district level and systemic change. When we are trying to move a large system that is trying to improve, it is a broader view.
- b. Dan: We can ask ourselves if accreditation is a compliance activity that the state requires or if it is a means of growth, renewal, and review. If it's a compliance activity, he has it all worked out already that looks like a two-tiered system.
- c. Heather H: A conversation we have also had already is the timeframe. Do we really need to be accredited every year or could it be done every 3 or 5 years? Would like to hear Nathan's opinion on this idea.
 - i. Nathan: There are probably pros and cons with both. The longer the window, there will be more fluctuation year by year and impact other areas like teacher credentials. A longer window could benefit schools with resources, onsite visits, staffing and may give schools time to develop and put into place improvement plans to find solutions. The current model allows schools to see where they need to improve in because they can see their deviations. Data collection would need to be considered in this idea. We have data on teachers that can be used on critical shortage reports that are taken to the BPE and legislature. This is something we might not have on a five-year cycle. It's all based on how it would be set up.
- d. Julie: There is a range of thoughts that we can think about. There are options that have been put out there that we can think about both ways. Right now, there is data that provides information, but it is based on the assurance standards.
- e. Dan: There are some things that need to be done every year. The notion of accreditation could be done on a five-year cycle. A portion of the state would be going through the accreditation process while the other is preparing for it. This could be more beneficial for students and less onerous for districts.
- f. Nathan: Notes MCA 20-7-102 Accreditation of Schools.
- g. Heather H: When thinking about a multiyear accreditation process, she thinks of the possibility of multiple graduating classes leaving the school system and not being

recovered if there were an issue. She does see that small schools could accommodate bubbles of kids that they may need to provide in terms of accreditation.

15. Heather H: Is recruitment and retention addressed in ARM? This has come up several times in both the informal interviews that were conducted and the TF meetings.
 - a. Julie: When we think about this, where does it live? How do you see it in accreditation? As an essential standard or a characteristic? We can possibly include it in the internship section of ARM. 10.55.607. We see districts using internships for administrators, superintendents, and special education.
 - b. Heather H: This might not be the place for recruitment and retention, but she knows it is a big conversation that comes up often.
16. Heather J: Are we going to crosswalk the current working copy with the guided questions working document?
 - a. Julie: Is there something specific? Currently we're trying to get the group to identify high lever topics that we will dive deeper into. Perhaps it would be beneficial to look at the guided framework.

Guided Questions Working Doc

1. Erich: Explains the topics identified and reviews the assignment to the group now.
2. TF identifies missing topics that should be included for consideration.
3. TF discusses what items to focus on for tomorrow's work.

Public Comment

1. Dennis Parmin, Executive Director, Montana Rural Education Association: Has had a lot of thoughts listening to the TF. He and Patty Meyers led this discussion ten years ago with 50 people on the TF. He thinks it took about nine months to get through all of it. There were questions around staffing ratios and where those numbers came from. In 2013, those ratios were not changed and that was because of the potential fiscal impact on districts and the potential of an unfunded mandate. There is a very organized librarian contingency and that is why the ratios are the way they are. Graduation requirements is something that was talked about for a long time. If there is someone who has data around what High Schools require three credits, it would be Sharon Carroll, past BPE chair, is where he would suggest looking. When thinking about staffing ratios, think about recruitment difficulties as well. Jim Germann, Superintendent in Glendive, made a profound statement: if we didn't have these ratios and standards to guide us, he doesn't know if we would know what to do. It was a guideline for budgeting, to talk to taxpayers, and building programs. This was thought about for a long time. Accrediting schools vs districts and the term of an accreditation cycle. The process has nothing to do with the physical structures or even how it is mapped out on paper. He has been a proponent to making changes to this, but it wouldn't be a simple thing. Something that drives and creates tension at the local level is that no district wants to face the public and say they don't have an accredited school. Within this, the school is not accredited because it is divided into units. At the end of the process as it is today, the Superintendent of OPI can recommend to the BPE that funding be withheld because they have come to the end of the line to meet requirements. Student growth at the state level is tricky. Julie has done a good job of identifying where some of the difficulties may come with this. This is something that is easier to discuss at

the local level. Balance, balance, balance. There is a reporting burden on the local district. Take a look at that. Will something be added to that, taken away, or other. Nathan will be a great resource for this. The processing burden at the state level is very large. Site visits are essentially a desk audit. The TF discussed if a school district has a certain policy in place. The policy is a check mark, but there is value if a policy isn't in place the public can push for the district to put it in place. The TF is in a good place with state control and local control. He does not think it need to be a competing situation. Both the BPE and locally elected trustees have constitutional authority but neither have absolute authority. Finding the balance is important. He sits on the committee for Cognia and wants to make the TF aware of that. Thanks, the TF for the work. He has an appreciation for how hard and how big the work is and the ripple effect it can have throughout the state.

2. Diane Fladmo, Director of Policy, Montana Federation for Public Employees: Would like to thank the TF. To think that there were 50 members of this TF last time and it took a long time to make these important decisions. Offers that this is a challenging time. Not only there are fewer in the TF and a shorter timeline, but we're coming out of a pandemic. Today we are thinking about what it takes to accredit a school in Montana. The Montana constitution's goal is to meet the full educational potential of every person. Those decisions should be based on research. What does it take to build the full potential of each child? What is the structure that needs to be in place to ensure this happens in Montana? Be very careful in what we are doing. We do know some things based on research. We know that a quality school needs to be staffed with quality staff. She would not make changes based on a pipeline that is not adequate. There are many reasons why that pipeline isn't good enough that is out of the control of the TF. One of those reasons are inadequate wages. When she was graduating from high school, many women were prescribed careers in nursing, education, and secretarial work. The world is now wide open for women. Educators aren't paid enough. They're not paid enough to pay off their student debts, healthcare, and housing. Many of the beautiful places Montanans want to work are too expensive to live. There are so many issues that affect the pipeline of quality educators have. What this TF is can do is to protect the quality of education for students. She wouldn't recommend the TF make changes without research to back up the decisions. Would encourage TF to understand that accreditation is what determines what the measures of quality are. Schools typically, in MT, has worked with school districts to meet accreditation standards. She heard discussion on the accreditation cycle. Three years is really a long time in the world of a K-12 student. Think about what we might do to keep and recruit teachers. She has not heard of a mentoring and induction program yet. Perhaps we need to mentor educators in a school district that allows educators to grow and do the job they want to be doing.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:49 PM