

# Chapter 58 Research and Review Task Force Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 1, 2021

8:00 AM – 9:30 AM

## Welcome and Roll Call

Gail Staffanson  
Curtis Smeby  
Emily Dean  
Gary Lusin  
Lora Poser-Brown  
McCall Flynn  
Stevie Schmitz

Karie Orendorff  
Kirk Miller  
Susan Gregory  
Nishala Silva  
Mary DuCharme  
Lisa Schmidt  
Jonathan Eagleman

## Recap from Last week

1. Lever Topics identified
  - a. Potential areas we may want revisions.
    - i. Pedagogy – not what to teach but how to teach. Moving from content to facilitating learning. How to differentiate the learning experience. Equality of educational opportunities. More active learning, personalized/individualized learning
  - b. Real-world experiences – year-long residency would provide hands-on experience in diverse settings.
  - c. More robust observations and mentorship (extending time)
  - d. Continuous improvement and desire for life-long learning. Accountability to outcomes
  - e. Relationships – ability to develop relationships with student, parents, and the community at large.
    - i. Came through strongly in focus group.
  - f. Appropriate technical skills and knowledge.
2. Additional topics to consider
  - a. 1D – 3D Science Initiative
    - i. Critical thinking
    - ii. Look at this in relationship to Pedagogy.
  - b. Is there a reason for us to define the terms we use?
    - i. Differentiated learning
    - ii. Personalized learning
    - iii. Individualized learning
    - iv. Equality of educational opportunities
      1. What do these terms mean?
      2. Are they the same or different?
  - a. As we discuss these lever topics we will need to define and clarify what we mean by the terms.

1. How do we complete verbiage change recommendations?
  - a. Sub-Committees assigned to certain sections.
    - i. Not a popular option in the Task Force
  - b. Scribe works on language with task force input.
    - i. Collectively talk through the changes as a group.
      1. Can make changes via zoom until a consensus is made.
  - c. Task force members submit language change proposals for discussion.
    - i. Individually submit and propose change then discussed and voted on.
2. Recommendations made by OCHE that have already been made to the OPI.
  - a. Those recommendations should be brought forward for the TF to contemplate.
  - b. TF could consider those as well as developing their own recommendations.
3. Would sub committees be assigned other sections of Ch. 58?
  - a. Subcommittee work
    - i. Big picture conversations are happening.
      1. When specific language is identified a sub committee would be assigned to focus on those.
        - a. Helps divide the work that may be easier than a large group.
  - b. How do we help make sure the TF stays on course with just ch58?
    - i. Facilitators can help ensure ARM is front and center as we move through topics.
      1. To help keep TF on track and comfortable with changes.
    - ii. Establish what we want to see what TF wants to see first.
      1. Then find a way to get it to fit in the rules and regulations.
  - c. Should help make sure group is on the
4. Start by looking at big picture.
  - a. Set a time frame to be done looking at the big picture.
  - b. After the big picture is addressed then dive into changes and that

**Discussion: Hands-on experiences through a residence and mentorship**

5. Guiding Questions
  - a. What did the articles make you think about?
  - b. What partnerships or programs are working for other states?
  - c. How might a year-long residency in Montana work best?
  - d. What do we want to include/revise in 58 to ensure a hands-on experience in diverse settings for candidates?
  - e. How can we extend and enhance observations and mentoring in 58?
6. Article had brought up Financial burden on students.
  - a. Gave example of residence working in schools for years was given a stipend of \$2000/yr.
  - b. Teachers in residency in Boston were given \$12000 a year but through private funding.
    - i. MSUB students
      1. Many on financial aid
        - a. May not be able to afford a yearlong unpaid residence.
  - c. Mentoring
    - i. Challenges in finding mentors.

1. Louisiana Teachers were going to be mentors in schools would have to go through a training program.
    - a. Do they get credits for that?
  2. MSUB students
    - a. Difficulty finding room in schools for student teachers.
      - i. Bozeman has the same difficulty.
  3. Is MT thinking about funding residency?
  4. If it is already difficult to find placement for students, how will adding another requirement make the process harder?
7. Louisiana started the program and are continuing to gather data from the program.
    - i. How to expand classroom training
    - ii. Data gathering is critical to see.
    - iii. Is there good data within MT to see how expanding classroom training might affect our population?
  8. Data on effectiveness
    - a. The effectiveness on programs currently
      - i. Data that is consolidated and available.
    - b. There is not anything that prevents the development of this type of program right now.
      - i. Important to remember standards are the level of entry not the exemplar.
  9. In rural MT
    - a. 3 years for supervising teachers is difficult to find.
      - i. This challenge is not going away any time soon.
        1. Will most likely only increase.
  10. Would the internship replace student teaching?
    - a. When student teaching, you do not get paid.
      - i. If we ask people to take a year
        1. What is the year? School year vs. calendar year?
          - a. Student teachers already give 3 months without any stipend.
        2. Piolet program is crucial.
      - ii. Requirements for base line expectations
        1. MT has more untraditional students
          - a. Older than 18 – 20 and unattached
      - iii. How would requiring a year long internship affect a later in life credential?
      - iv. Funding in terms of mentors.
        1. Accountability to mentors.
          - a. Class c school mentors
            - i. Tend to be overworked.
              1. Assigned mentor but in title only.
            - ii. Making sure the credential is in the same area.
              1. Example: Do not want a math teacher mentoring an English teacher.
    11. 20 yrs. ago on a Task Force on billings school board
      - a. TF conducted research on yearlong student teaching.

- i. As a member, the committee thought a yearlong student teaching experience was a very desirable thing to implement.
  - 1. Over time, obstacles were more difficult than originally thought.
    - a. Lack of mentors
    - b. Elongating teacher preparation
      - i. We need teachers now not 5 years from now.
    - c. Money
      - i. The lack of money for student teachers to teach.
      - ii. \$12,000 stipend is probably not enough to keep a student going during that time.
      - iii. Mentors are also not being compensated.
  - ii. The experience helped teachers be more prepared.
    - 1. But the obstacles were significant.
  - iii. Would be difficult for School districts to fund a program like this for a year.
    - 1. The costs would likely flow back to students.
      - a. Causing more debt.
  - iv. Having two different tracs for opportunities may also not be what we think it would be.
    - 1. May not result in the quality outcome MT is looking for.
  - v. EPP needs to make sure to give Students real student time in classrooms.
    - 1. There is no simulation or replacement for real classroom time.
    - 2. But it will be difficult to achieve even more than what is happening already.

## 12. Academic side of teacher preparation

- a. New teachers coming in with a better background in:
  - i. Science of reading
  - ii. Trauma Informed Practices
  - iii. Social Emotional Learning
- b. If residency has too many barriers,
  - i. Are there things we can look at in EPP that could be instituted academically for new teachers.
    - 1. Louisiana wanted all standards to be consistent across all EPP in their State.
      - a. Is this feasible in MT?

## 13. Rule Making process

- a. Accreditation standards are what rules are based on.
  - i. Entry level important to keep in mind.
- b. Quality and state of the art recommendations that could be included.
  - i. Rule making process needs to be where other ideas can be used to be built.
    - 1. Any change to legislative rule
      - a. Has a substantial impact from the rule?
        - i. If somehow a yearlong internship program could be right

- 1. Would have a significant impact on EPP and student teachers.
          - a. Would likely result in legislature to develop revenue and appropriate funding.
  - c. A Pilot is being prepared of a portion of residency through mentorship with an advanced student teaching model.
    - i. Part of the Grow your own initiative.
      - 1. How can a paid student teaching experience?
        - a. With district cooperation
    - ii. Concepts are being thought about.
      - 1. Piolets need to be considered before changing the rules.
14. MSUB pilot of a group of students
- a. During Junior field experience then continuing with the same teacher for a year
    - i. Then continue to do their student teaching in the spring with the same teacher.
      - 1. Challenge that arose.
        - a. Many of those students were getting endorsements in other areas as well.
          - i. Students that are doing endorsements are required to student teach.
      - 2. If we are requiring a year long residency
        - a. Just for getting general education.
          - i. Would they be expected to do additional time in the school for endorsements?
15. The Goal is for students to learn.
- a. Curriculum could be changed.
  - b. Difficulties requiring seat time.
  - c. ARM Rules
    - i. How do we integrate all our tools to allow students to be prepared?
16. What is the definition of hands-on diverse experience?
- a. Helena is 90% Caucasian at Carrol College
    - i. Difficult to get diverse experience.
      - 1. Perhaps digital classrooms could be allowed?
  - b. Could an online platform increase:
    - i. Diversity
    - ii. A larger pool
  - c. We would not want to lose anything we learned from COVID.
    - i. Technology is now in schools.
    - ii. Building capacity needs to be available.
      - 1. Teachers need to understand how to use it
        - a. Universal Design
17. In rural school setting there is an opportunity to address the bulk of issues
- a. Rule making process.
    - i. Rural communities

1. New questions that have recently been brought up.
    - a. Institutional system is changing.
  - ii. Local school districts now have the burden.
    1. No music teacher
    2. Important English language learners to teach language in schools.
    3. Tribal culture now has burden of if they want to save their language.
      - a. Every effort was made to make impact in local system.
      - b. School boards have yet to be brought together.
        - i. So local control can have a positive impact on
  - iii. This process is not clear cut.
18. How can this group help effect change?
  - a. More aware and prepared to be a better implementor if IEFA.
    - i. Better practitioners
    - ii. Better serve those students
19. Two bullet point on ARM
  - a. IEFA constitutionally mandated in MT constitution.
    - i. Many MT schools are noncompliance in this.
      1. Discomfort around this topic.
      2. Needs to receive a lot more attention.
        - a. More help and to be comfortable to incorporate IEFA.

#### **Next steps**

1. Timeline to propose going forward.
  - a. Specifics that need to have some word smith suggestions.
2. Look into existing recommendations.
3. More information on Google site for all of members
  - a. Short Bio of each task force member.