

# Chapter 57 Research and Review Task Force Meeting Minutes

## Tuesday, November 30, 2021

### 2:30 PM – 4:30 PM

#### Roll Call

##### Task Force Members

Angela McLean  
Dan Schmidt  
Dean Jardee  
Diane Fladmo  
Erica Allen  
Heather Jarrett  
John Melick  
Jule Walker  
McCall Flynn  
Mike Perry  
Nick Schumacher  
Sharon Carroll  
Sue Corrigan  
Val Fowler

##### Facilitators

Jacob Williams  
Erich Stiefvater  
Crystal Andrews

##### OPI Representation

Julie Murgel

##### Executive Support

Tristen Loveridge

#### Welcome and Review

1. Sharon Carroll asks if a final version can be shared with the TF
  - a. Julie Murgel responds that the information will be available on the ARM Tracker
2. Diane Fladmo asks if there will be tracking of the recommendations when the TF completed their work and the Superintendents changes. So it is easy to follow what has happened.
  - a. Julie Murgel makes note of this

#### State Analysis of Adding an Endorsement

1. Julie Murgel shares [document with comparison of states](#).
2. Sharon Carroll asks if this was something she missed.
  - a. Julie Murgel responds that no, this document was created yesterday.

#### Remaining Areas of ARM

1. 10.57.410 [Red Line Document](#)
  - a. Julie Murgel explains the document
  - b. Jule Walker asks if her suggestion to reduce the years of experience required to 1 year.
    - i. Julie Murgel responds that yes, she could bring this to the group.
    - ii. Jule makes a comment that she is suggesting it is reduced to 1 FTE.
    - iii. Julie Murgel explains the definition of a year of experience.
  - c. Mike Perry asks if Jule could suggest 2 years if the definition does not align.
    - i. Jule responds that she feels when an applicant is looking at the requirements it seems confusing. She says she thinks 1 should = 1
  - d. Diane asks if 1 year would be required from 1 year from any EPP or just Accredited.

- i. Julie Murgel explains that this is referring to alternative programs
  - e. Sharon Carroll asks where the definition of a year is a half year is located? She would like some background
    - i. Julie Murgel shares that in definitions 10.57.102
      - 1. (13) is the Year of Administrative Experience
      - 2. (14) is the year of teaching experience.
        - a. (14) "Year of teaching experience" means employment as a licensed teacher at any level within a state accredited P-12 school system, or in an educational institution specified in 20-9-707, MCA, for the equivalent of at least .5 FTE for a school year comparable to a 180 day school year. Experience gained prior to initial licensure is not considered.
  - f. Jule Walker makes a motion 10.57.410 (c) "...a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license, and one year of successful teaching experience..."
    - i. Nick seconds the motion
    - g. Diane Fladmo comments that she would not be in favor of this motion. She feels the quality suffers by lowering the requirement.
    - h. Sharon Carrol makes comment. She asks if OPI was currently operating with an "or" at the end of (b)
- 2. TF votes on Jule's motion 10.57.410 (c) "...a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license, and one year of successful teaching experience..."
  - a. Sharon Carroll No
  - b. Mike Perry Yes
  - c. Diane Fladmo No
  - d. Erica Allen Yes
  - e. Nick Schumacher Yes
  - f. Angela McLean No
  - g. Dan Schmidt Yes
    - i. Yes: 8
    - ii. No: 5
      - 1. Motion fails
    - iii. In reviewing the recording and minutes, it was discovered Jule Walker's vote was not recorded as she made the motion. With Jule's yes vote for one year of successful teaching experience, the motion passes with 61%. The recommendation from the task force will move forward to the superintendent and all votes regarding the years of experience will be explained.
- 3. Sharon Carroll Moves to change the requirement to three years 10.57.410 (c) "...a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license, and three years of successful teaching experience"
  - a. Dean Jardee seconds the motion
  - b. Erica Allen makes comment that she feels the Superintendents fear is losing the opportunity to recruit out of state by the third year due to tenure

- c. Sharon Carroll shares her concern of the half year of experience. She worries about individuals jumping from district to district. She says it should not be easy to get a license in MT
    - i. Jacob Williams clarifies a full year of half time
    - ii. Sharon Carroll responds that she is speaking about successful teaching experience. Half time does not allow for a highly qualified teacher to come to MT
  - d. Dan Schmidt makes comment that he would vote yes for zero years. And feels that many rural areas of the state would also vote this way. Why should MT be a hard place to get a license? Eastern Montana is seeing a lot of hardship. We don't need barriers that have no barring on bringing in a qualified teacher.
  - e. Erica Allen makes a comment that 1, 3, 5 years of experience does not necessarily show qualification. It is up to local control to review applications.
  - f. Val Fowler makes comment that she agrees with Erica and Dan. Local control will prevent unqualified teachers being employed. Years of experience does not guarantee a good teacher.
  - g. Mike Perry makes comment that we have lost more opportunity to have teachers come in due to the requirements vs the bad teachers that would have come in if the requirement was less.
  - h. Diane Fladmo makes comment that approved does not mean accredited. Approved is approved by another state.
    - i. Julie Murgel makes comment that Accredited and Approved do not mean the same thing. Alternative Preparation Programs are not accredited but are approved. She wants to point out that approved programs mean they lead to licensure in a state. Accredited programs can also be approved. MT ARM requires
  - i. Sharon Carroll makes comment that she is from Eastern Montana. The smallest schools need a lot of support for individuals, yet there is often not enough staff to properly staff. It should be required to vet applicants properly before they come to the state.
  - j. Val Fowler responds that she felt Sharon's comment was negative in a Superintendents responsibility. She feels that it is possible to have a lot of
    - i. Julie Murgel responds that there is a difference between being certified and getting a job. Being certified does not guarantee a job.
    - ii. Crystal Andrews makes a comment about emergency authorizations. They are due tomorrow and has received another stack today that will put her over 200 this year. This will continue to increase without being addressed.
  - k. Angela McLean makes a comment that we would be remiss that it is high licensure standards that there is an increase in emergency authorizations. High standards to teach MT students should not be equivocated to making licensure difficult. She has no apologies for having high standards for teaching MT students.
4. TF Votes on Sharon's motion for three years 10.57.410 (c) "...a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license, and three years of successful teaching experience... that 1 year of teaching experience"
- a. Angela McLean Yes
  - b. Sharon Carroll Yes

- c. Dean Jardee Yes
- d. Jule Walker No
- e. Erica Allen No
- f. Nick Schumacher No
- g. Mike Perry Yes
- h. Shaun Scott --
  - i. Yes: 6
  - ii. No: 6
  - iii. Abstain: 1
- i. Dan Schmidt No
- j. Diane Fladmo Yes
- k. McCall Flynn Yes
- l. Val Fowler No
- m. Sue Corrigan No

1. Motion Fails

5. Jule Walker makes a motion for 2 years' experience 10.57.410 (c) "...a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license, and three years of successful teaching experience... that two years of teaching experience"

- a. Shaun Scott seconds the motion

6. TF Votes on Jule's motion for three years 10.57.410 (c) "...a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license, and three years of successful teaching experience... that two years of teaching experience"

- a. Nick Schumacher Yes
- b. Erica Allen Yes
- c. Sharon Carroll Yes
- d. Mike Perry Yes
- e. Dean Jardee Yes
- f. Diane Fladmo No
- g. McCall Flynn No
  - i. Yes: 9
  - ii. No: 4
- h. Val Fowler Yes
- i. Sue Corrigan Yes
- j. Angela McLean No
- k. Dan Schmidt No
- l. Shaun Scott Yes
- m. Jule Walker Yes

1. Motion passes

7. ARM 10.57.424 after mentorship and induction is removed
- a. Julie Murgel explains the changes to language
  - b. Dan Schmidt asks if the 5C would apply to those with an international degree.
    - i. Julie Murgel responds that if their license was expired and did not have current professional development in the last 5 years they would get a 5c.
    - ii. Dan expands his question around a J1Visa.
    - iii. Julie responds that this gets tricky. She feels we are better off with it included. And provides an example.
  - c. Julie Murgel asks if the TF would like to leave 10.57.424 (a) one year now that it does not have mentorship.
    - i. TF agrees
  - d. Shaun Scott asks who is going to make the call that an applicant can get a 5C license based on where they are from.
    - i. Julie Murgel explains that there is already a process.
  - e. Jacob Williams asks if any member of the TF is opposed to the current language of 10.57.424.

- f. Dan Schmidt asks what happens if something comes up the OPI cannot process a 5A license.
  - i. Julie Murgel explains that BPE was able to grant extensions based on circumstances
- 8. State Analysis of Adding an Endorsement
  - a. Julie Murgel explains the findings from other states.
  - b. Julie Murgel shares red line document for subchapter 3
  - c. Does the TF want to add a pathway for another endorsement?
  - d. Shaun Scott asks if there a need to do this? If so, how big of a need is it? What kind of solution might be recommended that would provide quality but minimize barriers?
    - i. Julie Murgel comments that currently, the only way to add an endorsement is to go back to school and complete an EPP.
  - e. Sharon Carroll makes a comment she remembers that CSPAC is interested in another pathway to endorsement. Sharon asks if any of these models may be something CSPAC would be interested in?
    - i. McCall Flynn responds that they were very interested in a pathway to endorsement but there was no feedback given on one of these models.
  - f. Diane Fladmo makes a comment that perhaps a PRAXIS plus a recommendation could be given. This would put more weight on the EPP program but something that might help with this.
  - g. Erica Allen makes a comment that it would be nice to have some sort of pathway to prove proficiency without having to complete a college course.
  - h. Jule Walker agrees that there needs to be a pathway. It is difficult to be presented a document and decide on the spot.
  - i. Diane Fladmo makes comment that EPPs could be involved in the process to provide a recommendation.
  - j. Dan Schmidt makes a comment around PRAXIS. If the PRAXIS is going to be a choice, then make it THE choice. Perhaps make the passing score higher to become endorsed. He feels that by taking this content test, we would find if they had the ability to teach.
  - k. Sharon Carroll makes comment. Currently there is not a process in place to make a recommendation.
    - i. Angela McLean responds that an EPP would be put in an unusual spot. After reaching out to individuals in EPPs, there is a desire to include “and” rather than “or”. Ideally would like to see the PRAXIS and the other pieces.
  - l. Julie Murgel makes comment that if “and” is in place it would require the PRAXIS. It would be an add on.
  - m. Does the TF want to recommend a pathway to add an endorsement? Or leave it as it is.
- 9. Nick Schumacher makes a motion to approve the first draft as presented.
  - a. Dan Schmidt seconds the motion
- 10. TF votes on Nick’s motion
 

a. Shaun Scott yes	e. Erica Allen Yes
b. Dan Schmidt Yes	f. Angela McLean No
c. Val Fowler Yes	g. Dean Jardee No
d. Nick Schumacher Yes	h. Mike Perry Yes

- i. Sharon Carroll No
- j. Jule Walker Yes
- k. Diane Fladmo No

- l. McCall Flynn No
- m. Sue Corrigan Yes
- n. John Melick No

i. Yes: 8

ii. No: 6

1. Motion fails

11. Jacob Williams asks if the TF would like to put forward a recommendation without specifics, but to consider a pathway for endorsements.
  - a. Julie Murgel responds that yes, the TF could vote to have the superintendent consider a pathway.
12. Sharon Carroll shares that since this is the second time the group has talked about this. But since CSPAC has already expressed interest in an alternative pathway it would be good to allow them to look at it.
  - a. Julie Murgel responds that this language will go to the Superintendent and then her recommendation will be taken to CSPAC. Is the TF voting to not have another pathway?
  - b. Val Fowler responds that is not what she took away. She felt it was a vote that the group did not want to move the language from the first draft forward.
  - c. Sharon Carroll makes comment that putting forth an open ended recommendation is not necessarily what this TF is trying to do. She is not comfortable to make open ended recommendations.
13. McCall Flynn makes a comment that her no vote is not against alternative pathways. It was against the language in the first draft. Based on the presentation to CSPAC the first time they gave feedback that an alternate pathway for endorsements would be a good thing. She thinks CSPAC would be willing to help sort out the best option with the Superintendent.
14. Shaun Scott echoes. He would like to multiple pathways but was unsure about the language specifically.
15. Val Fowler asks if CSPAC would be ok with the TF leaving this as it is. If they would like to see a pathway and the TF says to leave it as is, that seems conflicting.
  - a. Julie Murgel makes a comment that the TF is recommending to the Superintendent, and she is taking her recommendation to CSPAC.
  - b. Val asks if it is possible to recommend to the Superintendent the TF is in agreement, we would like to see pathways. We'd like you to take a look into it.
  - c. Julie responds that yes, this is an option.
16. Diane Fladmo makes a comment that she agrees that CSPAC and the Superintendent would be able to work to find the best option.
17. Jule Walker makes a motion to remove credible source from 10.57.601 to end "from a local school district board of trustees."
  - a. Sharon Carroll seconds the motion
18. TF votes on Jule's motion to remove language of a credible source from 10.57.601 to end "from a local school district board of trustees."
  - a. Erica Allen yes
  - b. Angela McLean Yes
  - c. Sharon Carroll Yes
  - d. Mike Perry Yes
  - e. Dean Jardee Yes
  - f. Shaun Scott Yes
  - g. Nick Schumacher Yes
  - h. Jule Walker Yes

- i. Diane Fladmo Yes
- j. McCall Flynn Yes
  - i. Yes: 12
  - ii. No: 0
  - 1. Motion passes
- k. Val Fowler Yes
- l. John Melick Yes

19. 10.57.102 [Red Line Document](#)

- a. Julie Murgel explains the document
- b. Julie Murgel explains that CSPAC requested definitions for terms of coursework GPA and student teaching portfolio.
- c. John Melick makes comment that right now we are looking at content of coursework. So it would allow programs to make a recommendation based on the coursework completed by the individual.
  - i. How does this relate to out of state candidates? Would they be required to submit a course book.
    - 1. Julie Murgel makes comment that the EPP would need to verify the work.
  - ii. John mentions he feels the Portfolio would need to be specified and how the EPP is to be put together.
    - 1. Julie Murgel responds that if the program doesn't offer this than it would not be an option for them.
    - 2. John responds that it would be helpful to have guidance what is acceptable in a portfolio. It would be good to identify key artifacts.

20. Military spouses and dependents

- a. Julie Murgel explains the CSPAC feedback to remove dependents from the definition.
- b. Val Fowler explains that she is a dependent and her daughter is a dependent. Then explains some of her experience and opinion.
- c. Angela McLean shares that she is in support of dependents being included in language. She wants to include whatever supports and is most inclusive the most to military men and women.
- d. McCall Flynn makes comment about the CSPAC discussion.

21. Closing

- a. The changes will be included in the ARM tracker.
- b. Final copy will be sent to the TF with recommendations that are going to the Superintendent.