

Chapter 57 Research and Review Task Force Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 16, 2021
4:00 PM – 5:30 PM

Meeting Start Time: 4:02 PM

Roll Call

Task Force

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

Facilitators

Crystal Andrews
Erich Stiefvater

OPI Representation

Julie Murgel

Executive Support

Tristen Loveridge

Quorum is met with 13 TF members

Debrief of CSPAC Feedback and Questions

1. Mike Perry asks if the notes from CSPAC. Are these comments from the members of CSPAC?
 - a. Yes, Notes were not taken on the public comment portion of the meeting. All notes in the document are from CSPAC members.

Areas of ARM Discussion

1. 10.57.109
 - a. Crystal Andrews explains the CSPAC discussion around this section.
 - b. Sharon Carroll asks if there has been a proposal to replace the word “allegation” in ARM
 - c. McCall Flynn clarifies that there was a proposal to remove this section referring to hearing all together. The steps in the type of hearing for an usual case vs a suspension or revocation of a license. The processes for these types of hearing’s are very different.
2. 10.57.434
 - a. Crystal Andrews explains that this proposal was brought forward in a discussion with school psychologists from the University of Montana.
 - b. Language for school psychologists, line 483 in spreadsheet, (a) and (b).
 - i. Recommended from a school psychologist to include “or” in the language.
 - ii. Jule Walker asks where the notes in the CSPAC document mentions this recommendation.
 1. Julie Murgel responds that the recommendation came from a conversation with school psychologists from UM.

- iii. Sharon Carroll clarifies that this section has been treated as an “or” anyway.
 - 1. Julie Murgel replies that yes, this is how it is done already.
- c. Jule Walker makes a motion to accept this recommendation.
 - i. Diane Fladmo seconds the motion.
 - ii. There is no opposition in the TF and the motion passes

10.57.434 CLASS 6 SPECIALIST LICENSE - SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST	(1) To obtain a Class 6 specialist license with a school psychologist endorsement an applicant must provide verification of:
	(a) current credentials as a nationally certified school psychologist (NCSP) from the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP); or
	(b) completion of a specialist level degree from a NASP accredited school psychologist program which included a 1200-hour internship, of which 600 hours were in a school setting; or
	(c) for those applicants who did not earn at least a specialist level school psychology degree from a NASP accredited program:
	(i) a master's degree or higher in school psychology or a related field from a regionally accredited college or university; and
	(ii) recommendation from a NASP accredited specialist program defined in ARM 10.57.102, attesting to the applicant's qualifications being equivalent to NASP training standards, which included a 1200-hour internship experience of which 600 hours were in a school setting.

- d. Jule Walker asks question clarifying consensus. Required 60% to meet consensus, is this of those present or of the Task Force as a whole? Where are we with members?
 - i. 13 TF members present today.
 - e. Val Fowler states that she did watch the CSPAC meeting. Asks question about if there is a way (electronically or email) to utilize a survey to get the full task force’s recommendation. Not just those that are present.
 - f. Sharon Carroll makes a comment that while voting, it would be difficult to wait for votes after the meeting, although she sees the benefit in hearing from all the Task Force. She also asks what is a quorum for the group?
 - i. Julie Murgel responds that votes have been taken with 12 members present. With 13 present, it would be fine to vote.
 - g. TF discusses how many members are part of the group.
 - i. 18 TF members part of the group
 - h. Diane Fladmo makes comment that MFPE has reviewed the recommendations in the CSPAC meeting and will have comments to make throughout this review.
 - i. Jule Walker makes comment that MTSBA has also reviewed and will make comments throughout the document.
3. 10.57.102
- a. Julie Murgel explains the discussion and questions around “and/or” and what is meant by Accredited Preparation Program. Line 8 in the tracker. Is there a difference between being approved and being accredited?
 - i. Sharon Carroll wants to clarify why this is being rediscussed if it was voted on. Thought it was voted on and TF voted on “and”. She asks why this is being revisited?
 - 1. Putting in “or” means that the door is opened to other licensure programs that should not be considered in MT. Sharon is in favor of the word “and”
 - ii. Diane Fladmo makes comment that she agrees that she would like “and” and MFPE also agrees. She has language she can send for the TF to consider.
 - iii. Shaun Scott makes comment that class 2 A license speaking to the definition in 10.57.102 2 (a) or (b). 2(a) does not allow for an out of state individual with a license from an alternative pathway. How can this be sorted out? The intent of the section is to allow the pathway and allow OPI to conduct quality control.

1. Julie Murgel responds that when you look at all the states. How they list out approved programs from state boards, they all use the word approved not accredited. Approved means that they have met the basic requirements to licensure established by a state. Accreditation is a threshold of quality. Many states distinguish between out of state and in state processes or alternative and traditional pathways. Some states have 2, 3 years of experience or the requirement of a passed PRAXIS test.
 2. Shaun responds that, given the intent, the definition is correct, but we need to work on the way to achieve the intent.
 3. Julie responds that ensuring quality program is where Sharon is held up in insuring quality of an alternative vs accredited program.
 - iv. Julie Walker makes comment. In 10.57.410 language may need to circle back and have additional discussion around this.
 1. Julie Murgel asks if “Alternative” is where this language would apply?
 2. Julie will make a motion that has to do with the elimination of mentorship and induction to live in Ch 55.
 - v. Julie Murgel asks if the group how they would like to word this section knowing what other states do.
 1. Sharon asks if the language was not functional before?
 2. Julie responds that yes, the language was functional.
 3. Was there a reason for the change before? Do alternative pathways fit with the original language?
 - a. Julie responds that currently traditional and alternative are distinguished. And will not work here. Addressing the issue with alternative programs, then some sort of indicator needs to be included. Which is how the language is currently by including “and”.
 - b. Sharon asks if none of you are there at the OPI, will the current process be clear enough?
 - c. Julie proposes to leave the language with approved or accredited. Then, define the other assurances.
 - d. Sharon Carroll suggests that we come back to this conversation at another time.
 - vi. Angela McLean makes comment that the notion that out of state providers are held to the same standard of in state EPPs which are all accredited.
 1. Supports Jules suggestion of removing mentorship and induction from Chapter 57.
 - b. Julie Walker explains the language she would like to bring forward to the group around Mentorship and Induction.
 - i. Julie Murgel presents situational example with the current language.
 1. Julie clarifies what Julie is suggesting.
 - a. Remove mentorship requirement and have only a standard 2
 - b. A standard teaching license requirements for traditional license remains the same
 - i. Student teaching
 - ii. Accredited EPP
 - c. If an alternative program
 - i. Current unrestricted standard license
 - ii. And one year of teaching at a K-12 accredited school
 1. This is different due to the one-year vs five years of experience
4. Julie Walker moves to remove the Mentorship and Induction portions in Chapter 57 with an emphasis in chapter 55 to address these programs in the state to better support recruitment and retention.
 - a. Diane Fladmo seconds the motion

- b. Shaun Scott makes comment that mentorship is a good onboarding practice. And helps new hires be successful. He asks what is being proposed, is to take a more in-depth discussion of mentorship in Chapter 55.
 - c. Diane Fladmo makes comment that she was a big advocator of mentorship in Chapter 57. She sees the danger in putting this forward before ensuring there is quality in the programs. She offers to be a part of a sub committee to recommend to the Chapter 55 task force a quality mentoring program.
 - d. Angela McLean adds that she has had many discussions around this topic and the language can be done better than what is there now.
 - e. Sharon Carroll makes comment that this is what happens when the work is reopened after public comment is given. She feels there is confusion based on the recommendation to resend the previously made recommendation.
 - i. Julie Murgel responds that the suggestion was brought to give the TF a chance to review before sending to the Superintendent.
 - f. TF votes on the motion to remove the Mentorship and Induction portions in Chapter 57 with an emphasis in chapter 55 to address these programs in the state to better support recruitment and retention.
 - i. Sharon Carroll Yes
 - ii. Shaun Scott Yes
 - iii. Angela McLean Yes
 - iv. McCall Flynn Yes
 - v. Erica Allen Yes
 - vi. Jule Walker Yes
 - vii. Diane Fladmo Yes
 - viii. Val Fowler Yes
 - ix. Heather Jarrett Yes
 - x. Dean Jardee Yes
 - xi. John Melick Yes
 - g. Vote is unanimous, motion passes
5. Jule Walker presents the language “a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license and at least one year of experience in an accredited K-12 school district.”
- a. Diane Fladmo asks if one year of experience is .5 FTE?
 - i. Jule Walker responds that she would like a full FTE. The definition would need to be changed if language is passed in vote.
 - b. Julie Murgel discusses where this language lives in ARM.
 - c. Keep traditional c but to change 10.57.410 from 5 years to 1 year.
 - d. Diane Fladmo makes comment that she will be voting against this motion based on the original motion. She would like to see 3 years of experience in a K-12 school with an alternative pathway.
 - e. Shaun Scott asks if by removing mentorship, 2A is gone.
 - f. Shaun comments that his understanding, out of state teachers are teaching while getting their license. Thinking about years of experience. What kind of experience are the students gaining while going through an alternative program?
 - i. Julie Murgel explains that many alt programs require the individual to be contracted.
 - ii. Shaun asks if this is the case, what is the difference between 0 years and 1 years.
 - iii. Julie comments that this would depend on the alternative program and the state. It may take different amounts of time based on factors it could be several years.
 - iv. In many places, to receive a current standard, unrestricted out-of-state educator license, most likely would have had to complete your program.
 - v. Shaun asks why not zero then if this is the case?
 - g. Sharon Carroll asks what in the language allows an alternative pathway?

- i. Julie responds that there is not language that specifies accredited pathway.
- h. Shaun comments he is feeling hesitant about this language, and it seems muddy.
- i. McCall Flynn asks if the Superintendent is waiting on this group to make her recommendation?
 - 1. Julie Murgel responds that yes, she is waiting on the TF to ensure the group is where they would like to be, but there is not a ton of time to do so.

Next Steps

1. Suggestion to reconvene the week of November 29th for a meeting to finalize language.
2. TF discusses what should be on the "To do's" for next meeting:
 - a. Definition of EPP
 - b. Successful year of teaching experience
 - c. Definition for Portfolio
 - d. EPP courses
 - e. Additional endorsements
3. Shaun Scott makes comment that definition and alternative route pathways needs to be clarified with the large portion of language that was removed today.
4. Jule Walker makes comment that she was asked to address the fact the group does not have a quorum anymore in the meeting and therefore the full group should be able to give their input.
 - a. TF discusses steps going forward.