

## Chapter 58 Research and Review Task Force Meeting

Thursday, June 17, 2021

8:00 AM – 9:30 PM

[Zoom Webinar Link](#)

### Purpose:

The purpose of this task force is to make recommendations of Chapter 58 revisions to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

### Resources:

[Chapter 58 Google Site Link](#)

[Chapter 58 Link](#)

### Roll Call:

Karie Orendorff  
Kieran O'mara  
Kirk J Miller  
Zach Hawkins  
Barbara frank  
Mary DuCharme

McCall Flynn  
Curtis Smeby  
Susan Gregory  
Lisa Schmidt  
Lora Poser-Brown  
Emily Dean

Nishala Silva  
Gary Lusin  
Kimberly Barnes  
Zach Hawkins  
Tristen Belnap

### Welcome (Kimberly- 5 minutes)

- 1) What makes a really great quality educator prep program?
  - a. How can we make the best ARM for CH58?
- 2) Reminder that we are voices for the Task force but there are many wonderful voices to learn.
- 3) Agenda overview

### Recap what defines a quality educator preparation program (Sharyl- 10 minutes)

- 4) Ability to identify relationships.
  - a. Teachers into the field
  - b. Technology
  - c. Teacher readiness
- 5) There needs to be an understanding of rural vs les rural schools

- 6) Teachers need to be able to keep up in technology.
- 7) Value add in quality?
- 8) What makes a quality Educator Prep Program?
  - a. Can get copies of these studies? Also on Google Sites
  - b. EPP are keeping up with changes that are occurring in classrooms
- 9) Clarify Value add
  - a. Example, value added could be from day one. Students in EPP could be sent to the field a little later than they are currently.
  - b. Systems that encourage individuals in those skill developments. Ex. Elementary Education components have studies that found the science behind reading is not totally understood by teachers.
  - c. Value added in EPP in Mathematics (Spoke with Conrad Wolfram)
- 10) We all understand the EFFECTIVENESS and QUALITY of the teacher is the beginning of the outcome for students.

#### **Norms of Behavior for Task Force (Jacqueline- 15 minutes)**

- 1) How do we want to work together?
  - a. Be Aware!
    - i. If you're talking or not talking
    - ii. How long you're talking
    - iii. Being engaged
    - iv. Asking questions
- 2) How to we want to communicate?
  - a. Zoom via
    - i. Chat
    - ii. Having cameras on
- 3) Moving the Process forward
  - a. Having conversations
  - b. Making decisions
    - i. Possibly do a work group outside of Webinar?
    - ii. Everything must be in a public forum
  - c. Reach Consensus
    - i. Simple Majority (>50%)
    - ii. Super Majority (>60%)
    - iii. Only One Dissenter
    - iv. Only Two Dissenters
  - d. Will the vote allow for discussion after the vote is made if there are dissenters?
    - i. Thought: Discussion should be done before the vote is called
      1. Will ensure TF Members are comfortable with moving forward with vote.

- e. How many people are voting on each issue? What if someone isn't here for the day?
  - i. Must be present?
  - ii. By Proxi allowed?
    - 1. People need to be present. Shouldn't be able to just read and send their vote in.
    - 2. There may be legitimate reason why someone wouldn't be able to attend. Is it fair to not allow them to participate in the vote?
    - 3. Vote by email or google forms?
      - a. Because all meetings must be public forum. This may not be the best option.
    - 4. Work and travel may make it difficult to attend but doesn't mean they are not present in the situation and understanding of concepts.
  - f. TF Members on which style of vote to use.
    - i. Majority of TF voted to use Super Majority.
      - 1. With Suggestion for Quorum of at least 12

**MAPA Timeline (Sharyl- 5 minutes)**

- 11) Will take TF 3 meeting to push recommendation to BOPE
- 12) September will be the first month to have Recommendations for BOPE
- 13) September November January are the months TF will most likely send recommendations to BOPE
- 14) Takes 3 meetings of BOPE to move recommendations from TF to next steps

**Work through ARM regarding quality EPP language, subject PEPP standards, and potential revisions (Co-Facilitators- 50 minutes)**

- 15) Overview of ARM Chapters
  - a. Subchapters 1 and 3
    - i. Next week subchapter 5
  - b. Overarching facilitating questions from Zach
  - c. Kimberly will take care of more specific verbiage that may need changed
- 16) Sub-Chapter One
  - a. Procedural Standard
    - i. How do we do the process of reviewing accreditation Chapters
      - 1. Every 7 Years
      - 2. Roles
      - 3. TF Selection
      - 4. Guiding Principals

- ii. End Goal is to create quality educators that are knowledgeable and proficient practitioners in the current educational landscape.
- b. Does the current process fit the needs of the educational landscape?
  - i. Focusing on the constitution of the state
  - ii. Focus on effort being made to meet the needs of every student.
    - 1. Not sure if this is a conversation for Sub-Chapter 1.
    - 2. May be more Sub-Chapter 3
      - a. Or maybe we want to include an overview now.
        - i. Outline purpose of work
        - ii. Goal
    - 3. Ch1 talks about process of accreditation.
      - a. Task of making revisions.
        - i. What does OPI do well with accreditation?
          - 1. Going to the Universities?
        - ii. What isn't going well?
      - b. Think of the Roles of OPI
        - i. K-12 System
        - ii. Setting standards for Post-Secondary institutions and Board of Regents
      - iii. Is 7 years a good timeline?
        - 1. Is there something that necessitates the 7 yr timeline?
          - a. Lot of work put into the process.
          - b. Organizational decision to reduce stress on reviewers.
          - c. Staffing required is intense.
          - d. BOPE needs to be able to review.
      - iv. Ways OPI put together the Task Force?
        - 1. Good representation?
          - a. Need more diversity?
- iii. Smaller school chose not to due to cost and challenges with that. OPI accreditation through EPP and follow same standards as CAEP.
  - 1. CAEP Accredited larger
  - 2. Smaller are often not participating in CAEP
    - a. We should make CAEP happen
      - i. In a structural and supportive way
    - b. We have plenty of students graduating in MT but they aren't going to rural MT
- 3. CAEP language Discussion
  - a. Do we include language to have CAEP required?

4. 10.58.103
  - a. Result to cooperate with EPP.
  - b. Ability to not double down the EPP that needs to go through the process.
5. Is everyone happy with the current language?
  - a. Or do we need to strengthen it?
    - i. Process was not pleasant was stressful.
      1. Drags on and is a challenging process.
      2. WHAT WOULD MAKE IT BETTER
6. What do we want to do with this?
  - a. Do we need stronger language than “encouraged”?
  - b. Encouragement and stronger language would be helpful
    - i. Continuously working on accreditation
    - ii. Support from different institutional levels could be helpful.
      1. Not necessarily directed from OPI
    - iii. Supt had expressed interest from moving accreditation from OPI to commissioner.
      1. No one has told Zach that is Supts desire.
      2. Philosophical question about.
        - a. Engineering faculty, content in k12... Big picture philosophical question.
7. 10.58.102
  - a. Subsection B
    - i. (b) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall conduct workshops that prepare educators to serve as team members of site reviews.
      1. Some kind of timeline for the OPI, yearly basis or regularly
      2. Joint Group (CAEP, OPI)
        - a. Not everyone is always on the same page
      3. Knowing the standards
      4. Being able to write to the standards after review
      5. Size of the institution
        - a. Small going to large and vice versa
        - b. Difficult to get examiners

- b. Seems that they spend more time on paperwork than talking with faculty.
  - i. Would prefer that they spend equal amt of time on paperwork and interaction.
- c. Special Education.

**Next Steps (Kimberly- 5 minutes)**

- c. What we do until next week
  - i. Will look at topics that have come up and will be able to look at them deeper before next meeting.
    - 1. 7 years
    - 2. Process
    - 3. Size of institution
  - ii. Will send them out so you can look specifically what can be revised.