

# 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 12<sup>th</sup> 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 join the 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.
    - ii. 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

- i. Created by the council of chief state school officers
  - ii. 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. 10<sup>th</sup> 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