



Chapter 55 School Quality Task Force Meeting Minutes Tuesday, March 22, 2022 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Meeting Start Time: 11:00 AM

Roll Call

Task Force Members

Billi Taylor
Daniel Lee
Emily Dean
Heather Hoyer
Heather Jarrett
Janelle Beers
Jon Konen

Facilitators

Julie Murgel
Jacob Williams

Executive Support

Joan Franke

BPE Representation

McCall Flynn

Welcome and Review

1. Julie Murgel: Reviews
 - a. Meeting outcomes
 - b. Meeting agenda
 - c. Group Norms and Working Agreements
 - d. Taskforce (TF) Consensus Definition
 - e. TF Purpose
 - f. Key deliverables
 - g. TF Timeline
 - i. Zoom on April 5th
 - ii. In Person April 14th and 15th
2. Julie Murgel: Recaps Negotiated Rule Making Committee (NRM) In person meetings March 17th and 18th
 - a. NRM agendas
 - b. Notes from Conceptual Memorandum
 - c. Discussion on 10.55.602 definitions

Review Survey Results

1. Julie Murgel: Reviews results from survey

2. Julie Murgel: Asks TF if they would like a deeper analysis of current data responses or if they would like more responses.
 - a. Jon Konen: More responses from more organizations to get more data is essential. More than just 54 responses.
 - b. Heather Jarrett: seconds Jon’s suggestion to get more data
3. Heather Hoyer: Asks Emily Dean if this was pushed out once on the daily dispatch for all admin and school board members. Could it be pushed out again?
 - a. Emily Dean: yes, it could be included in the monthly communication that goes out this week.

Working Plan

1. Jacob Williams: Reviews the developed plan to complete conceptual changes:
 - a. Finalize areas for conceptual change/topics – March 22nd
 - b. Collect all input on “discussion of change” and “rationale” – comments completed by April 5th and review on April 5th (completed as homework)
 - c. Agency team draft redlines – completed by April 12th
 - d. Finalize recommendations/redlines – April 14th and 15th
 - i. Dan Lee: Is this compressed format hard and fast? Some of the discussions we have may be difficult to complete in this timeframe. He is wondering if it is possible to push the timeline back a month or so?
 1. Julie Murgel: The notion is to find how to support the TF thinking and then write draft red line versions that can be brought back to the TF to ensure the ideas were captured within the recommended redline changes. It will have to be up to the TF if they want more time on particular conceptual changes. There are pieces that could be brought forward first and recommended to the Superintendent which do not. The agency staff want to provide support to the task force to get rules on pen and paper
 2. Jacob Williams: We want to make as much progress as we can by the 14th and 15th. We can reassess where we are when that time comes.
 3. Dan Lee: He understands the complexity of all the moving pieces.
 - ii. Emily Dean: Will the TF have the data we discussed? Like the impact on librarians with the proposed changes? Is it possible to see a first draft of redlines at the April 5th meeting?
 1. Julie: The data is a critical piece. She wants to get an idea what data the TF would really like to see so it can be gathered and brought to the group. It will be a push to have the redlines ready by the 12th. Some could be ready by the 5th but not all of the chapter.
 - iii. Jacob Williams: To help inform the TF for homework, there is some questions in the chart for Nathan around library media specialist data. Can we get that data to the TF in time for the homework?
 1. Julie: They will be meeting to review all of the data that is needed. Nathan is a ware of the data.

Working Copy – Conceptual Memorandum

1. Jacob Williams: Reviews the work completed so far on conceptual memorandum.
2. McCall Flynn: Asks if mentorship and induction should be included? It hasn’t been talked about yet in Ch55 but was discussed in Ch57.
 - a. Julie: We probably should include it
 - b. Jon Konen: agrees
 - c. Julie: Asks if we’re looking at just teacher mentorship or if we’re looking at other roles as well. Decides it will be broader to start then TF will go from there.

3. Jacob Williams: Assigning topics to TF members for homework to continue discussion on rationale and proposed changes

Essential Elements of Quality Schools	Meaningful Accreditation Process	Response to Accreditation	School Improvement
What	How	So What	Now What
Student growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Billi Taylor • Heather Jarrett Staffing ratios for library media specialists <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heather Jarrett • Nathan Miller Graduation requirements and high school credits and Post-secondary readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heather Hoyer • Daniel Lee Basic Education Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heather Jarrett • Julie Murgel Program delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julie will ask for OPI program staff to review? Staffing ratios for school counselors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janelle Beers SEL and Mental well-being <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jon Konen School climate/Family and community engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jon Konen Paraprofessional and substitute requirement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony Warren Mentorship and Induction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McCall Flynn • Julie Murgel 	Accreditation process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heather Hoyer • Daniel Lee • Billi Taylor Accreditation categories <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heather Hoyer • Daniel Lee • Bill Taylor Local control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emily Dean 	ARM flexibility Variance to standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacob Williams • Julie Murgel 	Continuous school improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacob Williams • Julie Murgel

Discussion of current proposals

1. Meaningful accreditation process – Tiered system
 - a. Heather Hoyer: The current system we have in place is an approval system rather than an accreditation system. A true accreditation system requires self-evaluation and reflection at your practice, not just the checkbox system used now.
 - i. Dan Lee: Agrees. You can't accredit yourself every year. A district should reflect, check how they stand compared to state and federal standards, and have some goal setting.
 - ii. Jon Konen: What Dan has said sounds like what Cognia provides.
 - iii. Dan: Likes Cognia but the question is if all districts can afford it.
 - iv. Jon: Right, it is also a state decision as well.
 - v. Billi Taylor: Cost for small schools is a big barrier in using Cognia. We need to consider the capacity of small schools. If there is added preparation for Cognia to come in, small schools only have one person to do those tasks rather than a team.
 - b. Jacob Williams: When we talk about a tiered system, are we talking about it in terms of how much support the state may need to look into a school based on performance?
 - i. McCall Flynn: Discussed a tiered system as the cycle of accreditation. Schools that are consistently in regular status could be in a three- or five-year cycle and schools that need more assistance in a one- or two-year status.

- ii. Dan Lee: agrees with McCall. He asks if a district finds that they need assistance in an area, will the OPI have the capacity to support the district? He is concerned that a district would struggle finding help.
 - iii. Jon Konen: There is a piece of what the state would need to provide to support districts. He suggests a multi-tiered system of support.
 - iv. Janelle Beers: We need to keep in mind that small schools would not be able to meet an unfunded mandate.
 - v. Jacob Williams: If the term multi-tiered system of support is utilized it is a way to allocate resources starting with screening data.
2. Julie Murgel: There is a data request on the Library Media Specialist ratios. She thinks we need to pull data on the counselor data. Is there other data the TF would like?
 - a. Emily Dean: Any place we're considering changing ratios, data would be helpful in making those decisions.

Wrap-up and Next Steps

1. Julie Murgel: reviews work done in today's meeting and next steps

Public Comment

1. Dennis Parman, Executive Director, Montana Rural Education Association:
 - a. Wants to thank everyone for the work today. He enjoyed the discussion and the productive work today. He looks forward to what is coming out.
2. Diane Fladmo, Director of Policy, Montana Federation for Public Employees:
 - a. Thanks everyone for the work today and the interesting discussions. Feels encouraged the group will look at mentoring more. It is an important issue in providing support to educators. A lot of the changes that are considered are sweeping. She heard a concern about the capacity we have for providing support needed for a tiered accreditation system. The capacity that OPI has with current vacancies would be a real consideration as well as the cost for OPI and school districts. She would like to hear more about moving to a system like Cognia. She appreciates the discussion on the data that is needed. She appreciates the discussion on support for school districts is important, yet we need the capacity to know how districts. She suggests not moving away from a process that gathers information on districts, licensed staff, and class sizes. Think about prioritizing sweeping changes and have a timeline for future changes.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:00 PM