

Chapter 57 Feedback Group Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 20, 2021

10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

Meeting Start Time: 9:34

Roll Call

Task Force Members

Katie McCrea
Kristine Steinberg
Scott Kinney
Shay Kidd
Shelly Weight
Tim Norbeck

Facilitators

Jacob Williams
Dr. Julie Murgel
Crystal Andrews

Executive Support

Erich Stiefvater
Virginia Díaz

Welcome and Introductions

1. Facilitators welcomed Feedback Group and provided an overview of the meeting.

Overview of Task Force meetings

1. Facilitators reviewed with participants important topics that have been discussed in the Chapter 57 Task Force meetings.
2. ARMs Subchapter 6 recommended changes: [10.57.600 Revisions](#)
 - 601(2)
 - i. No comments from feedback group
 - 601(xii)(a) change was from the OPI Legal team to ensure ARM is in-line with recent Montana law changes on the legalization of marijuana
 - i. No comments from feedback group
 - 601B
 - i. No comment from feedback group
 - 607(2)
 - i. No comment from feedback group
3. ARMS Subchapter 4, Facilitators opened and walked through chart summarizing high-level proposed changes for Subchapter 4 that have been under discussion at the Task Force meetings. The chart was developed with the focus of helping teachers obtain a license, keep a license, and advance a license. Progression could potentially look like
 - Open discussion as follows:
 - i. Shay Kidd expressed concern about language about “successful” teaching experience, i.e., as currently proposed a teacher could not be on an improvement plan but also not be an effective teacher.

1. Jacob Williams pointed out the language “w/o being placed on improvement plan, onus on local district”
 - ii. Kristine Steinberg expressed concern about teachers with expired licenses but with experience being required to teach three years on a provisional license. Seems very limiting and seems to penalize people who have taken a break from teaching.
 1. Julie Murgel clarified that a provisional license is given to anyone applying for a Class 1 or Class 2 license who has an expired license.
 2. Kristine Steinberg reiterated concern that a person with teaching experience would have to teach three more years before getting a Class 2 (standard) or Class 1 (license).
 3. Julie Murgel floated possibility of having a 5B license (similar to 5A used when an applicant meets all requirements but passing the Praxis) in which an applicant meets all requirements except recency requirements.
 - iii. Shay Kidd asked about how the Praxis score recalibration factors into licensure.
 1. Julie Murgel noted that applicants with scores prior to the recalibration were grandfathered in.
- Provisional license – regarding proposed new language “Montana approved” regarding internships in the provisional licensure pathway and asked participants for comment. Noted that the language would seem to prevent applicants pursuing preparation through flexible programs offered by non-Montana programs such as those offered by Western Governors University (WGU).
 - i. Scott Kinney noted that he has supervised over 12 student teachers pursuing preparation through WGU. Stated WGU has 400-500 MT students enrolled who are pursuing education degrees/studies. He likes WGU’s student teaching module. Discussed example of challenges faced by Spanish teacher who wanted to teach math. Couldn’t find courses she wanted over the summer from a Montana college or university, so took courses at WGU and negotiated an internship through MSU. Eventually the teacher took a job at Kalispell where she could earn more money.
 - ii. Jacob Williams noted absence of flexible learning options at Montana educator preparation programs.
 - iii. Kristine Weinberg acknowledged lack of flexible options and that “Montana approved” language is problematic but noted importance of providing a measure of assurance and protection to candidates that if they complete an internship they will be qualified for licensure and employment in Montana.
 - iv. Shelly Weight suggested replacing “Montana approved” with “OPI approved.”
 - v. Jacob Williams noted that addressing the wording would have to be tackled in Subchapter 1, where definitions are provided. He noted that will be part of the Task Force’s discussion as it looks at Subchapter 4
 - Jacob Williams highlighted in chart proposed language about requiring completion of a Montana teacher mentoring program at a school for a licensure holder to move out of a first (initial) tier of licensure and asked for comments.

- i. Kristine Weinberg requested clarification around the proposed first and second tiers; what is their intent.
- ii. Jacob Williams noted the proposed first and second tiers is to find a home for the proposed requirements for licensure holders to complete a Montana teacher internship program.
- iii. Shelly Weight asked what the incentive would be for a person to move between the first and second tier.
- iv. Julie Murgel described the tiers as an attempt to allow for the inclusion of a mentoring program. She added that as currently under discussion at the Task Force this mentorship completion would be required of everyone; any provisional or initial licensure applicant would need to complete a mentorship program before earning a standard or professional license; all license applicants would stay in the first tier until they complete the mentorship program.
- v. Kristine Weinberg asked about the incentive for educators to move between the first and second tiers and noted that without a time limit and making the first tier non-renewable, people could just stick with the first tier and then work towards the third tier, bypassing the second tier (and the mentorship requirement). Pointed out that this is setting up barriers for applicants; suggested there may be other ways to structure a mentorship program tied to licensure to help retain teachers.
- vi. Julie Murgel posed question to Feedback Group members about if mentorship could/should live in Chapter 57? Noted it currently lives in Chapter 55 (school accreditation). Asked what the group thinks of also making it a component of Chapter 57.
 - 1. Shelly Weight said it would be a barrier to licensure. Mentorship should be at the school level; doesn't belong in Chapter 57.
 - 2. Scott Kinney agreed; feels like requiring the internship would be a mandate to districts, many of which already have mentoring programs.
 - 3. Shay Kidd expressed concerns about what mentorship would look like in rural districts with few teachers. Would OPI provide resources when there are no senior teachers around to provide mentorship?
- vii. Jacob Williams added language to chart to say that first-tier license would be for two years and non-renewable.
 - 1. Kristine Weinberg commented that this change would address the issue, although she does not necessarily agree that it should be done.
- viii. Jacob Williams relayed to group conversation from last Task Force meeting about if requiring the internship for licensure puts a burden on the licensure applicant that he/she has no control over (i.e., what happens if their employing district doesn't offer a mentoring program?).
- Jacob Williams noted that in the proposed changes to Subchapter 4 anyone from out of state with a valid, current license would get a Montana license.
 - i. Scott Kinney expressed support for this.
- Kristine Weinberg pointed out that changing language away from "Montana approved" to "state approved" program would require looking at definitions in Subchapter 1.

- Jacob pointed out that in proposed third of licensure an applicant could earn National Board Certification in lieu of a master’s degree.
- Shay Kidd noted need to adjust language between the three tiers to clarify the three years of experience.
 - i. Jacob Williams adjusted wording on chart to match suggestion.
- Jacob Williams summarized proposed changes for teachers to add endorsements and asked Feedback Group participants for their responses.
 - i. Kristine Weinberg noted changing thoughts from Task Force about the Praxis; sometimes people seem to want to keep it and other times they want to get rid of it. Does not think it should be applied across the board; may need to vary by endorsement area. Gave examples of a high-school science teacher wanting to add a math endorsement versus wanting to add an elementary education endorsement; seems too fundamental of a switch to just allow them to earn the elementary endorsement simply by taking the Praxis.
 - ii. Julie Murgel concurred that some deeper thinking would be needed on this point; some requests to add endorsements are more a stretch than others and simply requiring the Praxis may not be adequate.
- Kristine Weinberg asked about the proposed 60 professional development credits as an alternative for recency requirements. How would they be offered and approved? Would they align with renewal credit requirements?
 - i. Shay Kidd also expressed concern about the 60 hours of approved PD and said it needs further definition. Are there state-provided PD units that would suffice?
- Shay Kidd asked about the language of a teacher requiring to complete “full-time” teaching in a subject to earn an endorsement.
 - i. Julie Murgel clarified that “full-time” is defined in Subchapter 1; a teacher could potentially earn experience towards an endorsement by teaching in the desired endorsement area while still meeting other teaching responsibilities.
- Kristine Weinberg noted potential for districts to keep rotating non-endorsed staff through a position to avoid an accreditation ding. Does this set up a diversion for districts? Issue of teachers teaching out of endorsement areas now often resolved with provisional licenses and internships. Would districts abuse this new option and/or not support educators to acquire experience to earn an endorsement?
 - i. Shay Kidd noted experience option could move a district towards the “bad list” of accreditation but that it also provides a pathway away from the bad list.
 - ii. Julie Murgel noted that revisions to Chapter 55 (school accreditation) could be made to react and respond to changes made in Chapter 57 regarding teachers teaching out of endorsement areas.
- Kristine Weinberg expressed concern about defining success in terms of teaching experience and the Praxis, and noted difficulty of determining if and how a teacher is successful. For example, completing three years of teaching in an endorsement area doesn’t necessarily mean the teacher is good at it.
 - i. Shay Kidd suggested there be some measure of growth; e.g., offering a pre- and post-test to teachers teaching out of endorsement areas to make sure they are showing progress in teaching the content of the endorsement area.

- ii. Jacob Williams acknowledged there is an assumption of good faith on the part of school leaders in the proposed revision such that the leaders won't simply sign off on an unendorsed teacher to earn the endorsement without being good at teaching it and then letting it be someone else's problem.
 1. Kristine Weinberg asked if there would be any sort of documentation to show that the teacher knows what they are doing, besides relying on an assumption that a hiring district can and will attest to teacher effectiveness.
 2. Jacob Williams proposed language such as "with district recommendation" be added.
- iii. Kristine Weinberg reiterated concern about using 60 approved PD units to count for qualifying for an endorsement and how they would be defined and approved.

Closing

1. Facilitators reviewed the timeline of the Chapter 57 Task Force (two meetings left in September) and asked if there was anything else the Feedback Group members would like brought back to the Task Force.
 - a. Kristine Weinberg asked if the redlines for proposed changes the Task Force is considering are accessible to Feedback Group participants.
 - i. Crystal Andrews and Julie Murgel indicated they were and will make sure the link to them [Redline Recommendations](#) is sent out with the Feedback Group meeting notes. Virginia Diaz also noted the meeting agendas have links to the online document repository.

Meeting Adjourned: 11:54