

Chapter 57 Research and Review Task Force Meeting Minutes

Thursday, October 7, 2021

1:00 PM – 3:30 PM

Roll Call

Task Force Members

Angela McLean
Diane Fladmo
Heather Jarret
John Melick
McCall Flynn
Sharon Carroll
Shaun Scott
Sue Corrigan
Jule Walker
Valerie Fowler

Facilitators

Jacob Williams
Eric Stiefvater

OPI Representation

Julie Murgel

Executive Support

Tristen Belnap

9 TF members present

Meeting start time: 1:04 pm

ARM Subchapter Redline Discussions

1. Review of [Mentorship Basic Certification Chart](#)
 - a. Scenarios of licensure
 - i. Diane Fladmo makes comment about mentorship being a requirement of licensure.
 1. Jacob Williams explains scenario of unemployment and licensure.
 - b. Kentucky example
 - i. Julie Murgel explains that with the 2A the applicant would still need to complete mentorship to receive a 2B license.
 - c. Jacob Williams poses the question if the TF wants out of state applicants with experience, but less than three years of experience to be required to complete a mentorship program.
 - i. Christine Eggar makes comment that she does not believe it would be necessary. If it was needed, the district should be able to identify that.
 - ii. John Melick makes comment that rule should be equitable for in state and out of state licensure requirements. Not requiring mentorship for out of state would make the weight of licensure heavier for in state applicants.
 1. Also makes comment that good mentorship is useful no matter the experience level.
 2. Angela McLean concurs
 3. Diane Fladmo concurs

- iii. Shaun Scott makes comment that mentorship for out of state applicants does make sense as they acclimate to Montana. He is unsure though, how long the mentorship would be?
 - iv. Dennis Parman, an attendee, asks “could someone speak to why licensure rules would require something that is already required in Chapter 55?”
 - 1. Jule Walker makes comment that it is not being done in an effective manner through ch55. The TF voted and it passed that the group felt it should be included in licensure rule. Intent is that mentorship occurs and is effective in the retention of teachers.
 - 2. Shaun Scott responds that if mentorship is an important process of licensure, it should be included.
 - d. John asks question about presented scenario if it may be easier for an applicant to transfer a license from out of state than apply for initial license from out of state.
 - e. Couple of notes if this moves forward.
 - i. Unrestricted license needs to be defined
 - ii. May need to define mentorship
 - 1. Julie Murgel makes comment that she actually likes the idea of leaving it undefined and more open.
- 2. Julie Murgel explains [ARM suggested language 10.57.410 Class 2A License](#)
 - a. Angela McLean asks if there was a recommendation for a definition of the coursework GPA requirement.
 - b. Diane Fladmo asks what is the difference between a 3.25 or a 3.0
 - i. Sharon concurs and asks if GPA is accessible for coursework through transcripts?
 - 1. Julie Murgel responds that it may be required that the EPP verify the coursework.
 - 2. John Melick comments that MSU does this currently for students applying for licenses out of state. MSU only submits content courses that are a part of the program. He makes comment that the way he reads the suggested ARM, it would allow out of state applicants more flexibility in GPA than in state. He makes comment that 3.25 is a part of the if/or requirements.
 - 3. Jacob Williams makes comment that 3.25 is also a checkpoint for quality candidates.
 - 4. Christine Eggar makes comment about mentoring student that struggled learning math but was a wonderful math teacher because he understood how difficult math could be. The GPA is not always a fool proof determination of quality teacher.
 - c. Angela McLean makes a motion that GPA of 3.0 replaces 3.25
 - i. Diane Fladmo Yes
 - ii. Shaun Scott Yes
 - iii. Angela McLean Yes
 - iv. Sharon Carrol Yes
 - v. Heather Jarrott Yes
 - vi. Jule Walker Yes
 - vii. McCall Flynn Yes
 - viii. Valerie Fowler Yes
 - ix. John Melick Yes
 - x. Christine Eggar Yes
 - 1. Vote passes unanimously

3. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for 10.57.410 2B License
 - a. Jule Walker asks if mentorship needs to be defined?
 - i. Julie Murgel pulls up subchapter 1 10.57.102 (12) where mentorship is defined.
 1. Sharon Carroll asks if initial license means an initial Montana license or if the intent is different.
 2. Julie Murgel suggests removing Initial license from the section.
 - b. Christine Eggar asks to discuss the PRAXIS again. Gives example of Alaska requirement options.
 - i. Jacob Williams asks if there is a need to include other states if the language already allows licenses from another state be a reciprocal move.
 - ii. Christine responds that she agrees but there may be other options that could be included.
 - iii. Erich Stiefvater suggests creating an and/or option which leaves the door open to future assessments other than the PRAXIS.
 - iv. McCall Flynn asks if anyone knows if the exams used in Alaska are the equivalent to the PRAXIS?
 - v. Jule Walker responds that a test approved by the BOPE may allow a way to do an and/or option. The PRAXIS is a national test and hold more validity than other state specific tests.
 - vi. Sharron Carroll expresses she is in favor of leaving the language as is.
 - c. Julie Murgel moves to vote: Does the TF want to leave as is concerning the PRAXIS?

i. Angela McLean Yes	iv. Christine Eggar No
ii. Jule Walker Yes	v. Valerie Fowler Yes
iii. Diane Fladmo Yes	vi. Heather Jarrott Yes

 1. TF reaches consensus with 5 Yes and 1 No vote
4. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for 10.57.411 Professional License
5. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for 10.57.412 Endorsements
 - a. Sharon Carroll asks question about 60 professional development units or six semester credits. Is the and/or enough to clarify the intent?
 - i. Julie Murgel explains in subchapter 2 uses language such as “equivalent”
 1. Could use language such as “by earning 60 professional development units as defined in ARM 10.57.215(4)”
 - ii. Jule Walker asks if this is changed would it be clear that it can be a combination? The goal is to make it easily understood.
 - iii. Jacob Williams makes the comment that Julies suggestion would clarify the requirements
 - b. TF thinks giving options in (7) would
 - c. Julie Murgel makes motion to vote on approval of 10.57.410, 411, and 412

i. Sharon Carroll Yes	v. Diane Fladmo Yes
ii. McCall Flynn Yes	vi. Heather Jarrett Yes
iii. Angela McLean Yes	vii. Valerie Fowler Yes
iv. Christine Eggar Yes	

 1. Vote passes unanimously, recommendations will proceed to the Superintendent.

6. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for 10.57.414 Administrative License
 - a. Sharon Carroll asks if in order to be a Superintendent, does the applicant have to have a principals endorsement?
 - i. Julie Murgel explains that yes, in current rule but is unclear about actual practice. In general, the principalship is given in P-12 to allow the individual to advance to superintendency.
 - ii. Christine Eggar makes comment. Individuals coming from out of state may have different requirements. Suggests giving reciprocity for out of state superintendent licenses.
 - iii. Julie Murgel explains unusual case with out of state superintendent
 - iv. Jule Walker makes comment about personal experience coming back to Montana after being out of state and the endorsements she needed with the duties she had. Suggests this section needs more thought and discussion.
 1. Sharon Carroll concurs and explains further.
 - v. Will hold this section for now
 - b. Julie Murgel explains the addition of IEFA to this section.
7. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for the condensing of 10.57.415-417
 - a. McCall Flynn asks it is not changing rule but removing repetition.
 - b. Sharon Carroll asks that there is not different requirements in the sections for endorsement codes
8. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for supervisor endorsement and special education
9. Julie Murgel suggests the TF move on and she will wok on the couple of to do's
 - a. Double check on k-12 superintendency
 - b. Alignment to chapter 55
10. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for 10.57.420 – 10.57.421
 - a. McCall Flynn clarifies that 2000 came from the hours used in the Montana registered program.
 - b. Jule Walker makes comment that while OSHA does pertain to many CTE courses, it does not pertain to all of them.
 - i. Julie Murgel asks if perhaps the addition of OSHA limits applicants options.
 - ii. Jule Walker makes suggestion to replace “must include” with “could include”
 - iii. Julie also suggests in OPI processing, OSHA 10 could be given as and example to satisfy that requirement rather than include it in ARM
 - c. TF discusses the requirement of 5000
 - i. Jacob Williams shares [chart with comparison of other state requirements](#).
 1. Angela McLean points out ID requirement of recency of experience. She suggests this is something the TF should discuss further and possibly reduce the requirement even less than 5000.
 - ii. Julie Murgel proposes to table for now until next week.
11. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for 10.57.424 Provisional License
 - a. TF decides to wait before voting on this section till next week.
12. Julie Murgel explains ARM language suggestions for Class 6, Class 7, and Class 8

- a. Diane Fladmo makes comment that the process for class 8 may be an issue. Suggestion to look further if there could be changes made to make process easier.
 - i. McCall Flynn asks what part of the process is difficult?
 - ii. Julie Murgel makes comment that class 8 is done all on paper and must be handwritten then submitted. Asks if maybe this is what could be difficult.
 - iii. Diane follows up and says the requirements may also be too difficult to meet as well.
- b. Julie Murgel makes suggestion to take a vote of the addition of IEFA to sections 6, 7 and 8 of Class 8 license
 - i. There is no TF member opposed to the addition. Recommendation will move forward.

Timeline and Next Steps

1. Recommended to move on to the Superintendent:
 - a. 10.57.410 - 412
 - b. 10.57.433 - 438
2. Come back to next week prepared to vote on:
 - a. 10.57.413 – 419
 - i. Principalship for superintendency
 - ii. Leave 415 separated or ok to condense?
 - b. 10.57.420 - 421
 - i. Class 4 - hours of experience at 2000 or 5000 and addition of apprentice
 - c. 10.57.424 - 432
 - i. Class 5 – look through
3. Additional items to be discussed:
 - a. Subchapter 1 – Definitions
 - b. Subchapter 2 – Professional Development, Military reciprocity, Foreign Transcript Evaluation, EPP Verification
 - c. Subchapter 3 – Endorsements
 - i. What could you do to add an endorsement without going back to school?
 - d. Emergency authorizations
4. Next week's meeting 1:00-3:30

Meeting adjourned: 3:42 pm