Chapter 58 Research and Review Task Force Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 19, 2021
8:00 AM – 9:30 AM

Roll Call

Task Force Members
Curtis Smeby
Stevie Schmitz
Kirk Miller
McCall Flynn
Alison Harmon
Karie Orendorff
Emily Dean
Gail Staffanson
Gary Lusin
Susan Gregory

Facilitators
Tracy Moseman
Jacqueline Raphael

OPI Representation
Sharyl Allen

Executive Support
Tristen Belnap

Visiting Expert
Ann Ewbank (Visitor for EPP Accreditation)

Task Force Members Present: 10 – Quorum is not reached

Recap of August 12th meeting

1. Discussed and decided not to form subcommittees at this time.
2. Discussed issues related to broad recommendations to investigate increased access of pre-service teachers to be paid for on-site residencies; decided more information was needed
3. Reviewed proposed language changes for 10.58.312 regarding year-long residencies and consolidation of language related to initial vs. advanced programs; objections were raised, and no vote was taken at this time
4. Reviewed remaining lever topics; no specific proposed changes were raised.

Progress, Timeline and Procedures

1. Input information, and/or data from the field experts, e.g., field placement coordinators
   a. It would be appropriate to have experts join the Task Force around specific questions and a revision the TF is considering
   b. Would not be open to adding new individuals to the TF before going to the FBG.
      i. There are individuals in the FBG that are qualified and may be willing to joint he TF long term if that is needed.
   c. When it comes to drafting recommendations, it would be difficult to do so without the expertise in the TF
      i. The OPI Communications and Legal team will be responsible for drafting language.
      ii. Adding endorsements is a process far greater than just adding language.
2. Agency’s vision for how state standards align with national, e.g., CAEP
a. EPP Accreditation standards can be provided.
   i. MOU with CAEP has been implemented and approved
      1. CISPAC has been involved
   ii. BOPE has taken a look at the July meeting
      1. Vote will be taken in the August meeting
   iii. Important to note that CAEP is involved in the site review process

3. Is the agency exploring a year-long residency already?
   a. There is a lot of difficulty in districts to recruit and retain teachers
      i. MT is short 57 Special education teachers in the K-12 system currently.
   b. The OPI has been considering the idea of a Pilot in the Fall of 2022
      i. Visiting with entities that could potentially provide funding
      ii. Collaborating with legislators
         1. Possibly the legislature could fund the program??
      iii. Cost for the Pilot includes the cost to pay student teachers.
   iv. 

4. Recommending development of new endorsements – is this a broad recommendation we can make?

5. Timeline/process for deliverables
   a. The goal is to have recommended changes implemented by July 1, 2022
   b. Are there interim deadlines to propose changes?
      i. If the TF is not ready to propose changes until October will that be ok?
         1. Yes, the OPI will adapt with the TF as needed and will work with the BOPE as needed

6. How many of the TF members are still active?
   a. Is the TF still able to meet quorum?
   b. With the size of this task, is it feasible to continue as is or can we get members to become active again?

7. Is the TF tasked with reviewing each subchapter of Ch58?
   a. Yes, it would be helpful to the OPI if the TF could.
   b. Come up with a timeline of priorities to discuss for remaining meetings?

8. Communications and legal department looking at drafts
   a. Recommendations and changes to ARM wont conflict with each other.
   b. To avoid problems occurring with conflicts that are not the intent

**Check-in on initial and advanced program and CAEP standards**

1. Visitor Ann Ewbank shares presentation on EPP Accreditation
2. Principles
   a. Montana BPE accreditation is required.
      i. Allows the EPP to issue Institutional Recommendations for licensure in Montana and other states.
   b. Most Montana EPP completers work in public schools in Montana
   b. CAEP accreditation is optional (5/10 Montana EPPs participate), and CAEP accreditation signifies high quality teacher preparation nationally.
i. This may assist students in obtaining licensure and positions in states other than Montana and attract out of state students to our programs.

ii. The other National accreditor is AAQEP
   1. Emerged after MT EPP did significant work to align with CAEP

iii. Why would some EPPs consider applying for national accreditation
   1. Gives visibility and attracts out of state applicants

   c. Accreditation provides us with the language and the framework from which to continuously improve.
      i. Not about compliance, difficult process, or bureaucratic futility

   d. Continuous improvement is just that – continuous. When needs, conditions, resources, and processes can’t, we are nimble and adaptable.
      i. To continuously evaluate areas that need to be improved and areas that are being done well

   e. The ten Montana EPPs work collaboratively through the Montana Council of Deans of Education.
      i. This includes our approach to Standard 4 (Program Impact).
         1. Each EPP is required to demonstrate how the completers efforts impact K-12 students
            a. Many other states use a Value-Added model or a Statistical model
            b. Because MT does not use a statistical measure, gives the opportunity to look at MT landscape
               i. Each EPP can complete a case study to find what needs to be improved

   f. MT BPE and CAEP accreditation standards are parallel.
      i. Site visits and accreditation have a heavy price tag
         1. Paying the Dues
         2. The site visit itself is an upwards of $20,000
         3. Large human resource impact

   g. An effective EPP has program learning outcomes reflected in every course and field experience.
      i. In our case, these are chapter 58 standards.
      ii. Many EPPs follow ARM plus some
         1. The field moves faster than administration can advise

3. Ch. 58 PEPPS/ INTASC Comparison
   a. Individuals applying for initial licensure must demonstrate all criteria in 10.58.501
   b. The INTASC structure was developed in 2013
      i. There are similarities
      ii. There are some differences because MT is unique

4. Endorsements and National standards
   a. There are national standards in content areas that have superseded what is currently in Ch 58

5. Ch 58 PEPPS/ PSEL Comparison
   a. Chapter 58 standards are based on a superseded version of ISLLC standards
1. Created by the council of chief state school officers
2. EPPs the have administrator prep programs are using the PSEL standards
   1. PSEL goes beyond and prepares MT schools even better.

6. Initial Standards (Class 1 and 2 licenses)
   a. There is intentional alignment between the National standards and Chapter 58
   b. CAEP added 2 additional standards.
      i. Standard 6 Fiscal and Administrative Capacity
         1. Is a concern since the educational leadership faculty have 70 students per 2 faculty.
      ii. Standard 7 Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act
         1. Title IV is about student loans, default rates, and student aid

7. Advanced Standards (*Class 3 and 6 licenses)
   a. Class 3
      i. Superintendent
      ii. Principal
      iii. Curriculum Directors
   b. Class 6
      i. School counselors
         1. Are sometimes done through an external program called CACREP

8. Takeaways
   a. Alignment across EPPs in MT to pursue both accreditations
      i. Joint site reviews save lots of money
   b. Endorsements are constructed by
      i. Experienced faculty and experts
         1. Look at and recommend what skills and knowledge educators need
   c. Smaller EPPs cannot complete all the work on their own
      i. Statewide agreements allow the state to succeed
         1. This is not a common thing in the U.S.

9. Not every EPP has an advanced program
   a. Having defined differences between the two helps smaller EPP be successful

10. The big picture is about the students being prepared to be teachers
    a. Grounded in what is in common

11. The quality of education in MT rests largely upon the licensure of the teacher
    a. Is the deciding factor of the quality of education provided to children in the state.

12. Why does Ch 58 ARM exist vs the national?
    a. Why do we need state and National?
       i. 10th Amendment to the constitution
          1. Education is the State’s responsibility
          2. The State standards are required, but CAEP is optional
             a. Term “superseded” is used because standards development tend to move more quickly than the standards of administrative rule
       b. Article 10 of the Montana constitution
          i. General supervision of a system of public education in Montana
1. Foundation of being able to implement all standards

13. Even though half of the EPPs are CAEP & State accredited
   a. It is important for smaller EPPs and tribal schools to be able to have CAEP standards through ARM

14. Teacher training is only one part of the process
   a. Implementation is the other half and is so important

Priority setting for remaining meetings

1. 6 meetings in August and September
   a. TF is responsible to review all subchapters of 58.

2. TF needs to make sure to align Ch 58 with CAEP alignment
   a. Would be very beneficial for EPPs
   b. There may be some language problems that need to be corrected in ARM.
      i. Specific items to be addressed will be collected also can review the initial research to find the areas that aren't already aligned

3. Endorsement areas need to be reviewed
   a. Would be opportunities to have experts come to the TF to speak on the possible endorsements.
      i. Slide that highlighted the endorsements based on Ann Ewbank’s presentation.

4. TF to generate a list of priorities to make a timeline to discuss all important topics for the remaining topics.
   a. Readdress the previous suggestions from the TF in next meeting.
   b. 9 subchapters in Ch 58
      i. With 3 subchapters that have been removed.
      ii. Facilitators will work to create the schedule to review all subchapters