CERTIFICATION STANDARDS AND PRACTICES
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

THURSDAY OCTOBER 8, 2020

ZOOM MEETING
Starting at 9:00 A.M.

CALL TO ORDER
A. Call to Order – Mr. Kelly Elder
B. Roll Call
C. Statement of Public Participation
D. Approval of the Agenda
E. Approval of the July 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes

ITEM 1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT – Mr. Kelly Elder
   • Review of By-Laws

ITEM 2 BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORT – Mr. Pete Donovan
   • Review of ECS/National Association of Boards of Education Executive Director Policy Forum

ITEM 3 MSU MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING PROGRAM UPDATE – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, Dr. Ann Ewbank, Dr. Ann Ellsworth

ITEM 4 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE 2013 CAEP STANDARDS FOR EDUCATOR PREPARATION AND IT’S IMPACT ON MONTANA’S CHAPTER 58 PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM STANDARDS (PEPPS) – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, Malina Monaco, VP CAEP, Matt Vanover, Director of External Affairs

ITEM 5 MONTANA MENTORING AND INDUCTION PROJECT WEBPAGE HIGHLIGHTS – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson

ITEM 6 PRAXIS TESTING AT HOME – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, Nick Bellack, ETS

ITEM 7 APPROVE CLASS 8 LICENSE APPLICATIONS – Dr. Julie Murgel

ITEM 8 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURN

Agenda items are handled in the order listed on the approved agenda. Items may be rearranged unless listed “time certain”. Action may be taken by the Council on any item listed on the agenda. Public comment is welcome on all items but time limits on public comment may be set at the Chair’s discretion.

The Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council will make reasonable accommodations for known disabilities that may interfere with an individual’s ability to participate in the meeting. Individuals who require such accommodations should make requests to the Board of Public Education as soon as possible prior to the meeting start date. You may write to: Kris Stockton, PO Box 200601, Helena MT, 59620, email at: kmstockton@mt.gov or phone at 444-0302.
Virtual Joint Meeting CSPAC and MCDE  
Friday, October 8, 2020

12:30 p.m.  Welcome (5 min)  Adrea Lawrence, Alison Harmon & Stevie Schmitz
12:35 p.m.  CSPAC Report: Highlights and Updates from 2019-2020
1 p.m.  MCDE Report: Highlights and Updates from 2019-2020
1:30 p.m.  EPPs Respond to Covid-19: Challenges, Innovations, and Changes
2:15 p.m.  Reflections on Collaboration: How are we doing?
3 p.m.  Adjourn
CALL TO ORDER
MINUTES
CALL TO ORDER
Chair Elder called the meeting to order at 9:09 AM. The Chair welcomed guests and Ms. Stockton read the Statement of Public Participation.

Council members present: Mr. Kelly Elder, Chair; Ms. Barbara Brown; Ms. Theresa Marchant; Dr. Rob Watson; Ms. Ann Wake; Dr. Trent Atkins; Mr. Tom Cubbage. Staff: Mr. Pete Donovan, Executive Director Board of Public Education and CSPAC; Ms. Kris Stockton, Administrative Assistant. Guests: Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, OPI; Ms. Kris Thatcher, OPI; Ms. Tracy Moseman, OPI; Ms. Phoebe Williams, OPI; Mr. Dennis Parman, MREA; Ms. Sharyl Allen, OPI; Ms. Emily Dean, MTSBA.

Approval of Agenda
Ms. Anne Wake moved to approve the agenda as presented. Motion seconded by Mr. Tom Cubbage.

No discussion. Motion passed.

Approval of Minutes
Ms. Anne Wake moved to approve the minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Mr. Tom Cubbage.

No discussion. Motion passed.

ITEM 1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT – Mr. Kelly Elder

• Introduction of New CSPAC Members
  Chair Elder introduced the new members to CSPAC, Ms. Theresa Marchant and Ms. Barbara Brown. Ms. Marchant and Ms. Brown introduced themselves to the Council.

• Election of Officers – Pete Donovan
  Mr. Donovan opened the floor for nominations for Chair.

  Ms. Ann Wake moved to nominate Mr. Kelly Elder for another term as Chair. Motion seconded by Mr. Tom Cubbage

  No discussion. Motion passed.

Mr. Donovan opened the floor for Vice Chair nominations.

Mr. Kelly Elder moved to nominate Ms. Ann Wake as Vice Chair. Dr. Rob Watson seconded the motion.

No discussion. Motion passed.
• Set Yearly Calendar
  The Council set the 2020-2021 Calendar as:

  October 8-9, 2020
  February 10, 2021
  April 14, 2021
  July 14, 2021

  Ms. Ann Wake moved to approve the 2020-2021 CSPAC Meeting Calendar. Motion seconded by Mr. Tom Cubbage.

  No discussion. Motion passed.

• Review of Mission and Goals
  The Council updated the 2019-2020 Goals to read for the 2020-2021 year, and accordingly the dates for the Joint meetings with the Council of Deans and the Board of Public Education.

  Ms. Ann Wake moved to approve the revisions to the CSPAC Mission and Goals as discussed. Motion seconded by Mr. Tom Cubbage.

  No discussion. Motion passed.

• Review CSPAC Annual Report for Presentation to Board at Joint BPE/CSPAC Meeting
  Chair Elder briefly reviewed the CSPAC Annual Report to be presented to the Board of Public Education at the Joint meeting in the afternoon.

ITEM 2 BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORT – Mr. Pete Donovan
Mr. Donovan reviewed the agenda for the Board of Public Education meeting for the following day for the Council and answered questions. The Board will hear reports from the MSDB, the Federal Report, Annual Special Education, Annual HiSET, Content Standards updates, and will hold two hearings on licensure.

ITEM 3 ARM 10.58.604 ADVANCED PROGRAMS DEFINED: WORKING DRAFT AND TIMELINE FOR REVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF CHAPTER 58 ADVANCED PROGRAMS – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, OPI
Dr. Peterson reviewed the Chapter 58 Standards noting the five-year review cycle last done in 2015, so that timeline is now at the current year of 2020. Dr. Peterson discussed the review cycle and timeline for the review and answered questions from the Council members regarding the standards.

ITEM 4 PRAXIS TESTS AT HOME – ETS SOLUTION RESPONSE TO COVID – 19 – Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, OPI
Dr. Peterson gave an update on PRAXIS tests at home due to Covid-19. PRAXIS is used by all the Montana Educator Preparation programs for teacher candidates. ETS closed all its testing centers at the end of March, but later announced an at-home test solution was being devised. The test is available online for at home use. Security measures and proctoring measures are in place for test validity, and each test is monitored while the individual is taking the test.

ITEM 5 APPROVE CLASS 8 LICENSE APPLICATIONS – Kris Thatcher
No Class 8 license applications were received by the OPI for approval by the Council, so Ms. Thatcher reviewed for the new members what the Class 8 license is, discussing the Administrative Rules pertaining to Class 8 and outlining the process. Ms. Thatcher answered Council member questions.
ITEM 6    FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
Update on MSU Master of Teaching program
Update of Chapter 58 Section 6 revisions
CSPAC By-Laws reviewed
Mentorship of New Teachers Presentation
Joint Meeting with Council of Deans

PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURN

Agenda items are handled in the order listed on the approved agenda. Items may be rearranged unless listed “time certain”. Action may be taken by the Council on any item listed on the agenda. Public comment is welcome on all items but time limits on public comment may be set at the Chair’s discretion.

The Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council will make reasonable accommodations for known disabilities that may interfere with an individual’s ability to participate in the meeting. Individuals who require such accommodations should make requests to the Board of Public Education as soon as possible prior to the meeting start date. You may write to: Kris Stockton, PO Box 200601, Helena MT, 59620, email at: kmstockton@mt.gov or phone at 444-0302.
ITEM 1

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

• Review By-laws
MONTANA BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION
CERTIFICATION STANDARDS AND PRACTICES ADVISORY COUNCIL

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I. NAME
The name of the organization shall be the Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council.

ARTICLE II. PURPOSE
The Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council, hereinafter referred to as the Council, has been formed in accordance with 2-15-1522 MCA, and shall have as its purposes:

A. To study and make recommendations to the Board of Public Education in the following areas:

1. Teacher licensure standards, including, but not limited to, prelicensure training and education requirements and licensure renewal requirements and procedures;

2. Administrator licensure standards, including, but not limited to, prelicensure training and education requirements and licensure renewal requirements and procedures;

3. Specialist licensure standards, including, but not limited to, prelicensure training and education requirements and licensure renewal requirements and procedures;

4. Standards of professional practices and ethical conduct;

5. The status and efficacy of approved educator preparation providers in Montana; and

6. Policies related to the denial, suspension, and revocation of educator licensure and the appeals process. For the purpose of preparing recommendations in this area, the Council is authorized to review the individual cases and files that have been submitted to the Board of Public Education.

B. To submit a written report with its recommendations annually and at other
appropriate times to the Board of Public Education.

C. To complete a comprehensive review and adoption of the Professional Educators of Montana Code of Ethics on a five-year cycle beginning January 1, 2012.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

A. Membership. The Council shall consist of seven members appointed by a majority vote of the Board of Public Education. The membership must include:

1. Three teachers engaged in classroom teaching, including:
   a. one who teaches within kindergarten through grade 8;
   b. one who teaches within grade 9 through 12; and
   c. one additional teacher from any category in subsection (2) (a) or (2) (b) of 2-15-1522 MCA.

2. one person employed as a specialist or K-12 specialist;

3. one faculty member from an accredited educator preparation provider;

4. one person employed as an administrator, with the licensure required in 20-4-106 (1) (c); and

5. one school district trustee.

B. Tenure.

1. The term of office of an appointed member is three years. If a vacancy occurs on the Council, the Board of Public Education shall appoint a person from the category of membership in which the vacancy occurred to serve the unexpired term. Regular appointments shall begin June 1, and end May 31, of the third year of the term.

2. Any member desiring to resign from the Council shall submit his/her resignation in writing to the Council and to the office of the Board of Public Education.

C. Compensation. Council members are entitled to travel expenses incurred for each day of attendance at Council meetings or in the performance of any duty or service as a Council member in accordance with 2-18-501 through 2-18-503 MCA. Eligible Council members are also entitled to per diem for each day of attendance at Council meetings, not to exceed eight days per year, in accordance with 2-15-122 MCA.
D. In order to receive reimbursement or compensation for out-of-state activities, the Council member must obtain the approval of the Council Chairperson and the Council Administrator in advance of undertaking the activity.

**ARTICLE IV. MEETINGS**

A. **Meetings.** The Council shall meet quarterly and at other times as may be required for the proper conduct of the business of the Council at the call of the chairperson. Such business may include, but not be limited to:

1. Information, discussion, and action on matters related to the purposes of the Council described in Article II;

2. Election of officers and appointments to committees as described in Article V;

3. Apprising the Board of Public Education of budgetary needs of the Council and making recommendations on a preliminary budget;

4. Reviewing the Council Budget on an ongoing basis for further recommendations to the Board.

B. **Quorum.** A quorum for a meeting shall be not less than four Council members.

Each Council member shall be given written notice of the day, time, and location of any regularly scheduled meeting no less than 48 hours prior to the meeting. Notification of the meeting will be delivered via email.

C. **Absence.** Recognizing the value of his/her contribution to the business of the Council, each Council member shall be responsible to notify the chairperson and the BPE/CSPAC staff in advance of any anticipated absence from a scheduled meeting. If a member is absent from three consecutive scheduled meetings, his/her membership shall be subject to review by the Board of Public Education to determine if the member’s office shall be deemed vacant. If deemed vacant, the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Article III, Section B.

D. **Special Meetings.** Special meetings may be called by the Chairperson of the Council or by a request in writing of two appointed members. When necessary the Council may hold meetings for resolution of specific agenda items either by a meeting in person, by conference call, electronic or digital means, or by any combination of the above. In the case of a special meeting, the Executive Director shall notify each member by email sufficiently in advance of the meeting to allow all Council members to travel to the meeting site from their principal Montana residence.

In the case of a conference call or an electronic or digital format, forty-eight hours
prior to the meeting shall be deemed sufficient notice.

E. Meeting Procedure.

1. Meetings of the Council shall be governed by the following rules:

a. The chair or vice-chair shall preside at all meetings. In their absence, a temporary presiding officer shall be selected by the membership.

b. The presiding officer shall neither introduce nor second a motion.

c. A motion shall require a simple majority of those present to pass.

d. Any motion shall be in order as long as no previous motion is on the floor.

e. Minutes shall be taken at all open sessions of the Council. The minutes shall be made available to the public, subject to reasonable regulation in the time and manner of inspection.


2. The regular order of business shall be as follows:

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the minutes of the preceding meeting
4. Agenda adoption
5. Agenda
6. Date and place of next meeting
7. Adjournment

3. An agenda shall set the structure for meetings of the Council.

a. A list of future agenda items shall be discussed as the last item of business by the Council at each regularly scheduled meeting.

b. The proposed agenda shall be included with the written notice of meeting required in Section C of this article.

c. Persons or organizations desiring to address the Council may make a request using the online Agenda Request process or by notifying
the staff, Chair, or Vice Chair. Requests will be reviewed by the 
Council Chair and Vice Chair and considered for approval.

d. The proposed agenda becomes the approved agenda by a majority 
vote of Council members at the beginning of the meeting.

e. Whenever possible, support materials for the agenda shall be in 
electronic form and readily available to the membership.

ARTICLE V. ORGANIZATION

Section A. Officers

1. The Council shall select, by majority vote, a chair and vice-chair from its 
appointed members annually during the spring meeting of each year.

2. The term of elective office shall be for one year and an officer may not serve 
more than six consecutive years.

3. The chair shall be the presiding officer and shall preside over all regular, special, 
and public meetings of the Council. The vice-chair shall perform the functions of 
the chair in the absence of the chair.

Section B. Committees

1. At the beginning of the chair’s term, and as vacancies occur, the chair shall, with 
concurrence of a majority of the Council, appoint the committee chairs.

   a. The Pre-Professional Preparation and Development Committee 
will initiate studies and recommendations on prelicensure training 
and education requirements for teachers, administrators and specialists.

   b. The Licensure and Endorsement Committee will initiate studies 
and recommendations on types and alignments of licensure and 
endorsements.

   c. The Professional Practices Committee will study and make 
recommendations to the Board of Public Education on policies 
related to denial, suspension, and revocation of educator licensure 
and the appeals process. The Professional Practices Committee 
will oversee the 5-year review cycle of the Professional Educators 
of Montana Code of Ethics
2. The Chair may appoint Special Committees as needed that will allow in-depth study of issues that are the responsibility of the standing committees.

3. The Executive Committee shall consist of the chair, vice-chair, and Executive Director. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for presenting budgeting proposals to the Council and to the Board of Public Education. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for performing other duties as assigned by the chair or Council.

4. The committees will meet at times agreed upon by the majority of the committee. The Council Chair and Executive Director of the Board of Public Education shall be informed of the purpose, time and place of all committee meetings.

**ARTICLE VI. ASSISTANCE**
The Council may request research, administrative and clerical staff assistance from the Board of Public Education.

**ARTICLE VII. COMMUNICATIONS**
These bylaws may be added to or amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the entire Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council provided that the proposed amendment is sent in writing to all members of the Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council at least seven days in advance of the vote to amend the bylaws.
ITEM 2

BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORT

- Review of ECS/National Association of Boards of Education Executive Director Policy Forum

Pete Donovan
Meetings Attended by Peter Donovan

07/16/2020 – 09/10/2020

July

1. BPE Meeting 07/16/2020

2. Education Advocates Meeting 07/21/2020

3. Call w/Chair Schottle 07/22/2020

4. Education Advocates Meeting 07/28/2020

5. Montana Council of Deans of Education Meeting 07/31/2020

6. MT School Safety Advisory Committee Meeting 07/31/2020

August

7. Education Advocates Meeting 08/04/2020

8. State Site Visitor Training for Montana 08/07/2020

9. State Site Visitor Training 08/10/2020

10. Montana Digital Academy Governing Board Call 08/10/2020

11. State Site Visitor Training 08/11/2020

12. Education Advocates Meeting 08/11/2020

13. BPE Special Meeting 08/12/2020

14. MUS 2 Year Study Commission Meeting 08/18/2020

15. Education Advocates Meeting 08/18/2020

16. Education Interim Committee 08/20/2020

17. MSDB Committee Meeting 08/20/2020
18. Education Advocates Meeting 08/25/2020
19. Montana School Safety Advisory Committee Meeting 08/28/2020
20. BPE Agenda Review Meeting w/OPI 08/31/2020

September

21. Content Standards Public Hearing 09/02/2020
22. BPE Meeting 09/10/2020
23. Montana Digital Academy Conference Call 09/14/2020
24. Education Interim Committee 09/14,15/2020
25. Education Advocates Meeting 09/15/2020
26. BPE Executive Committee Call 09/21/2020
27. ECS/NASBE Conference 09/22/2020
28. ECS/NASBE Conference 09/24/2020
29. Call w/McCall Flynn re: Fingerprinting 09/25/2020
30. MUS 2-Year Commission Study Meeting 09/28/2020
31. Call w/OPI 09/29/2020
32. ECS/NASBE Executive Director’s Forum 09/29/2020

October

33. ECS/NASBE Executive Director’s Forum 10/01/2020
34. MACIE Meeting 10/07/2020
Agenda

September 22, 2020
State Responses to COVID-19 and Reopening  1:00 PM-2:30 PM MT

September 24, 2020
Professional Development and Operational Procedures for State Board Executives  1:00 PM-2:30 PM MT

September 29, 2020
Best Practices for State Boards Going Virtual  1:00 PM-2:30 PM MT

October 1, 2020
State Approaches to Equity  1:00 PM-2:30 PM MT
Your Question:
You asked if any states had considered legislation to limit liability for COVID claims against K-12 and/or higher education?

Our Response:

Resources:
- ECS, State Education Policy Tracking, COVID-19
- Education Dive, COVID-19 language in waivers for extracurriculars heighten reopening safety concerns, July 2020

Overview
This issue has been gaining a lot of attention lately with various news outlets reporting on the topic and federal Congressional action. With debate about whether schools should return to in-person instruction this fall, the question of whether schools can be held liable for infections to students or staff is up in the air. Though ECS does not have an existing research brief on this topic, we do track 50-state COVID-19 related legislation in our State Education Policy Tracking webpage. In addition, below are some resources on the Congressional proposals, state legislation limiting liability for schools or school districts, and some of the news that has been swirling around waivers of liability.

Some say that so long as schools, both K-12 and postsecondary, abide by public health guidelines laid out by the states or federal agencies (e.g., CDC), liability may be mitigated. Others indicate that the proof that would be required to show that the school was where the infection took place and was caused by failure to abide by public health and safety guidelines (negligence) on the part of schools is a high hurdle. A recent Education Dive article, Will schools mandate COVID-19 vaccine or face liability? quoted an education attorney, stating: “According to Brian Schwartz, an education lawyer who has served as general counsel for the Illinois Principals Association for 20 years, schools can minimize liability by following local, state and national mandates, especially regarding PPE and social distancing. "Liability might exist if a school requires students and staff to attend in-person and then refuses to follow mandated safety protocols," he said, adding a school district’s insurance carrier might refuse coverage if safety mandates are not in place or are willfully ignored.”

Proponents of limiting liability say it is an incentive for schools (and businesses) to reopen. Opponents say it is a disincentive to parents to send their kids back to school and undermines the notion that schools can reopen safely.

Federal Response
Congress currently has two proposals on the table to provide some protections to essential workers and employers respectively. The HEROES Act, passed by the House, would provide protection for employees from occupational exposure to COVID under the Occupational Safety and Health Act and was passed by the House in May. The SAFE TO WORK Act, part of the Senate’s HEALS Act proposal, would include protection for business, employers and schools if employees or students are exposed to Coronavirus on-site, unless willful misconduct on the part of the employer or school is proven.
At this time, the federal government has not provided guidance regarding liability protections to institutions of higher education. However, some postsecondary institutions and associations have reached out for federal assistance. For example, a letter to the U.S. Congress urges temporary and targeted liability protections to institutions of higher education related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The letter is cosigned by state and national associations for institutions of higher education, including regional compacts:

- Midwestern Higher Education Compact
- New England Board of Higher Education
- Southern Regional Education Board
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

On May 13, 2020, White House officials met with 14 institutions of higher education leaders regarding the COVID-19 pandemic and educational services. This discussion included higher education liability protections. No additional details were provided at this time and no federal or state agency has provided protections to institutions of higher education. The federal government and the Centers for Disease Control provided guidelines for institutions of higher education to follow regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. These guidelines do not include any provisions regarding liability insurance or protections.

### 2020 Legislation Limiting Liability of K-12 Schools Because of COVID Exposure

A handful of states have, or are currently, considering legislation to provide civil liability protections for public schools, both K-12 and postsecondary. **Louisiana (H.B. 59)** is the only state, so far, to enact immunity from civil liability for public school, charter school, and public postsecondary education institutions during states of emergencies or public health emergencies for infectious disease. The legislature in **Arizona (H.B. 2912)** considered legislation limiting enforcement actions and civil liability during a public health emergency to schools, churches and other organizations until April 1, 2021, but the measure failed. **Tennessee legislation (S.B. 2381)** sought to limit the liability of schools from child care through postsecondary due to coronavirus, but the bill did not pass.

**California** A.B. 1384 would exempt a local educational agency, and its officers or employees, that meet these requirements from monetary liability and damages for injury relating to COVID-19 infection, any condition in existence because of the COVID-19 pandemic, or any act or omission by the local educational agency, its officers, or its employees in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. **New Jersey** is currently considering legislation (A.B. 4426) which would grant immunity from liability to school districts, nonpublic schools, and employees for damages resulting from coronavirus disease 2019.

### Waivers from Liability

Several school districts have issued waivers to students, their parents and staff who are participating in voluntary summer programs or extracurricular activities. A waiver from Notus School District in Idaho indicates it applies for all on-campus activities, however, I was unable to find additional information for context.

### Postsecondary Institutions

Changes in postsecondary instruction and services due to the COVID-19 pandemic are prompting discussions at state and federal levels regarding liability matters. At this time, we are not aware of any enacted policies regarding postsecondary institutions in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Some states have liability shields to protect faculty, staff and board members and indemnification policies to protect student financial investments. Below we provide information regarding the federal response to postsecondary liability issues, current state policies and student indemnification.

### Postsecondary Institution Liability
In general, postsecondary liability matters are addressed through state policy. We were unable to find any enacted state action regarding postsecondary institutions’ liability protections related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Current state action related to liability protections are focused on health care providers, volunteers and other essential services.

**California** is considering **A.B. 1759** which would exempt public and independent institutions of higher education, and their officers, employees, and governing bodies from monetary liability and damages for injury relating to COVID-19 infection, any condition in existence because of the COVID-19 pandemic, or any act or omission by those institutions, their officers, their employees, or their governing bodies in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In **Connecticut**, a **subcommittee** on higher education provided a list of **recommendations** to the governor on reopening postsecondary institutions in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The subcommittee argues that students, faculty and staff will contract COVID-19 regardless of the precautions taken. As a result, the subcommittee recommends the state provide liability protections to postsecondary institutions that follow COVID-19 reopening measures.

In **Massachusetts**, a group of public and private postsecondary institutions **requested state action** include liability protections. At this time, no legislation has been introduced regarding state liability protections for postsecondary institutions in Massachusetts. The legislature is also considering **S.N. 2644/H.N. 4659** to provide liability protections to postsecondary institutions that assist the state’s emergency health services during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The **New Jersey** legislature is considering a bill (**A.B. 4408**) that would grant immunity from liability to institutions of higher education and certain employees for damages resulting from novel coronavirus disease.

In addition to COVID-19 response, some states have existing policies related to purchasing liability insurance. For example, **Kentucky state policy** allows postsecondary institution governing boards to purchase liability insurance to protect the institution’s board members, faculty and staff during the duration of their service. State policy does not restrict the type or the amount of liability coverage, allowing each postsecondary institution to determine appropriate coverage.

Education Commission of the States in continuing to **track** state policy responses and other executive actions to the COVID-19 pandemic, including at postsecondary institutions.
Your Question:
You asked for information on metrics that districts or states are using to determine if/when it is safe to return to in-person instruction.

Our Response:
The following state examples were pulled from a review of state school reopening guidance.

State Examples:
- **Arizona**: In conjunction with state superintendent Hoffman, Gov. Ducey directed (see “Arizona: Open for Learning) public health officials to identify metrics to guide school district reopening decisions. The metrics are set to be release August 7. yet to be announced, but expected by end of week.

- **California**: Gov. Newsom laid out his school reopening plan, which includes the strict enforcement of the department of public health’s six metrics for safe school reopening—data that includes the number of new infections per 100,000 residents, the test positivity rate, and the change in hospitalization rate, among others. If a county does not meet these thresholds, they will be placed on the county monitoring list and be unable to open for in-person instruction until they are off the list for 14 days.

- **Iowa**: The state legislature enacted legislation requiring the majority of core classes to be taught in-person. Gov. Reynolds supported this legislation through a proclamation that encouraged in-person learning and allowed for remote learning in limited cases. The proclamation requires schools to receive approval for temporary remote learning from the department of education and department of public health. This FAQ document from the department of education provides additional information on the legislation and proclamation. Guidance from the department of education indicates that remote learning will be allowed if the positivity rate in the county is over 15%.

- **Minnesota**: Gov. Walz issued an executive order requiring schools to utilize public health data in making reopening decisions. The public health data thresholds for reopening are laid out in the state’s safe learning plan (see p. 5-6).

- **New York**: The New York State Education Department reopening guidance requires schools to consider their ability to maintain appropriate social distance, PPE and cloth face mask availability, availability of safe transportation, and local hospital capacity when determining whether it is safe to return to in-person instruction. Gov. Cuomo declared that schools in regions with an infection rate below 5% for at least 14 days may return to in-person instruction. New York City Mayor De Blasio set a 3% threshold for the city’s schools.

- **Oregon**: The state department of education identified three sets of metrics to guide reopening decisions, including:
  - The first set of metrics represents the level of disease circulation that would be required for return to in-person instruction, with limited exceptions. Schools would need to begin transition planning as case rates and test positivity declines in counties in order to prepare the school community for the potential upcoming change.
  - The second set of metrics refers to indicators of increased COVID-19 spread in the community that would indicate the need to plan for transition back to comprehensive distance learning.
  - The third set of metrics indicate disease spread in the community that would prompt initiation of Comprehensive Distance Learning with limited exceptions.

- **Tennessee**: The department of health released a decision protocol to support districts in making determinations in the event of in-school spread. The protocol includes factors such as levels of community spread, among others.
• **Washington:** According to *reopening guidance*, schools are required to receive approval from their local health authority if they are in phase 1 or 1.5 of the *county reopening protocol*. To support districts in making reopening determinations, the department of health released a *report* highlighting the dangers of reopening schools without public health data that supports the decision.
Your Question:

You asked about states not allowing special education students on campus to receive services if their schools are 100% virtual. You also asked about federal government guidance on virtual services for special education students.

Our Response:

Federal Guidance

The U.S. Department of Education has released a number of guidance documents on special education, specifically related to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), during the coronavirus pandemic.

This guidance document from March has information about implementing Part B of the IDEA during the coronavirus pandemic. Examples of questions addressed in the document include:

- Is an LEA required to continue to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities during a school closure caused by a COVID-19 outbreak?
- What services must an LEA provide if a public school for children with disabilities is selectively closed due to the possibility of severe complications from a COVID-19 outbreak?
- May an IEP Team consider a distance learning plan in a child’s IEP as a contingency plan in the event of a COVID-19 outbreak that requires the school’s closure?

Other guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Education includes, but is not limited to:

- Supplemental Fact Sheet (March 21)
- IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution in COVID-19 Environment Q&A Documents (June 22)
- Flexibility in Implementation of IDEA Part B Fiscal Requirements (June 26)
- IDEA Part B Use of Funds in COVID-19 Environment Q&A Documents (June 26)
- IDEA Part B Procedural Safeguards in the COVID-19 environment (June 30)

State Examples

We were unable to find examples of states not allowing special education students on campus in a 100% virtual environment, though we did not complete a comprehensive 50-state scan. Because most states are leaving decisions about the fall semester to localities, that decision is probably being made at the district level in most states. Below are examples of states with guidance specific to special education students in remote settings.

New Mexico: The state public education department released an FAQ document that notes schools are encouraged to allow small groups of students with disabilities to access school buildings in remote or hybrid settings to receive small group or individualized in-person services. The state also has a separate FAQ document specific to special education.

North Dakota: The state department of public instruction released guidance on special education during the COVID-19 pandemic, including School Reentry Considerations for Special Education, Implementation Guidance, Parent Guidance, and other resources. One guiding question provided for consideration is how schools and districts will ensure contingency plans meet students’ needs when instruction takes place through an alternative learning situation.
Vermont: The state education agency has resources dedicated to special education during the coronavirus pandemic. The guidance includes Considerations for IEPs for Fall 2020. Within the guidance, the agency “strongly recommends” that IEPs be amended to detail services and supports that will be provided in the event of remote learning.

Wyoming: The Wyoming Department of Education released Guidelines for Providing Special Education and Related Services during the COVID-19 Pandemic. The guidance includes considerations for addressing the instructional needs of students with disabilities during the pandemic. Among the considerations are strategies for delivering virtual instructional support and general recommendations that suggest localities collaborate with families to develop distance learning plans to support IEP implementation.

Local Examples

Below are examples of localities beginning the fall semester in a remote environment, including any language or guidance the district provides about special education students.

Baltimore City Schools (Maryland) is beginning the fall semester in a 100% virtual environment, but plans to return to in-person learning “as soon as conditions allow.” The district’s reopening plan has a section about supports for special education students that includes supports available in a virtual environment.

Chicago Public Schools (Illinois) will be starting the school year in a remote environment through at least the first quarter. Before the second quarter starts, the district will evaluate whether schools can move to a hybrid model. The district’s FAQ document notes that staff will be asked to prioritize diverse learners for daily in-person instruction in a hybrid environment. The district’s Remote Learning Guidance includes more detailed information about support and considerations for diverse learners.

Denver Public Schools (Colorado) announced that its schools will be 100% virtual through the first quarter. However, the district notes that they are working toward bringing back small groups of students for in-person learning as early as September 8 and will bring back high-priority students first.

Los Angeles Unified School District (California) will begin the fall semester with online instruction. In an FAQ document, the district notes that online instruction will be provided to students with disabilities to address their IEP. The document also mentions that services to students who rely on in-person speech, occupational, physical, or behavioral therapy will not be delivered “as they typically would in a school building.”

Additional Resources

The Center on Reinventing Public Education released a database of state special education guidance. The database indicates whether states advise districts on issues such as IEP meetings and timelines, offering support to families, providing special education curricular resources, and requiring special education to be a component of districts’ remote learning plans.
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**Building a Diverse Teacher Workforce**
This Policy Brief summarizes the benefits of — and state-level action pertaining to — expanding teacher diversity in K-12 classrooms.

**From Data to Action: CA Applies Collective Impact Approach to Track Arts Education and Drive Improvement**
In this case study, California employs data to improve student’s opportunities in arts education.

**Getting to 100 Percent: How NJ Used Data-Driven Strategies to Achieve Universal Access to Arts Education**
This case study spotlights how New Jersey is using data to advance arts education for its students, as highlighted in this case study.

**Mapping the Arts: TX Uses Data to Spotlight Disparities and Drive Equal Access to Arts Education**
Texas used data to expand opportunities in arts education for its students, as highlighted in this case study.

**The Arts Education Data Toolkit**
This toolkit is designed to help leaders manage an arts education data initiative from start to finish.

**Data Lessons and Resources for the Arts Education Field**
This two-page review features lessons that arose from Education Commission of the States’ technical assistance to states and resources that emerged from the State Data Infrastructure Project for Arts Education.

**Prioritizing Equity in Dual Enrollment**
This Policy Brief defines specific barriers to entry for historically underserved student populations, and opportunities for expanded access and equity.

**Policy Solutions That Foster Competency-Based Learning**
This policy product identifies opportunities for states to maximize virtual and hybrid environments to tailor learning and instruction for students.

**Modernizing Math Pathways to Support Student Transitions**
This Policy Brief captures some of the challenges of — and solutions to — math education pathways, in light of the coronavirus pandemic.

**Expanding High-Quality Work-Based Learning**
This resource defines the experiences of and challenges in maintaining quality in work-based learning programs.

**Boosting FAFSA Completion to Increase Student Success**
This Policy Brief identifies barriers to — and ways states can support — completion of the FAFSA for students who are historically underserved.

**Establishing a State-Level Postsecondary Advising Network**
This policy product outlines challenges faced by students — particularly those who are historically underserved — transitioning from high school to college this fall and how recent graduates can help.

**50-State Comparison: Free and Compulsory School Age Requirements**
This updated resource provides a national comparison of school age requirements for both free and compulsory education across all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

---

**Upcoming**

**The Arts in Charter Schools**

**Building a Better K-3 Literacy System**

**Supports for Students in Foster Care**

**50-State Comparison: K-3 Policies**
MUS 2-YEAR COMMISSION: DRAFT
REPORT TO THE 2021 LEGISLATURE

THE COMMISSION'S WORK

The MUS 2-Year Commission was created by House Bill No. 754 (Vinton; 2019) and technically is called the Montana University System 2-Year Restructuring Review Commission. The restructuring refers to the incorporation in 1995 of what were historically known as "vo-tech centers" into the Montana University System (MUS) and are now known by various names as 2-year campuses. See graphic on page 4.

The commission was tasked with reviewing the reasons for the 1995 restructure and considering whether a different structure might strengthen 2-year postsecondary education in Montana and, in particular, career and technical education (CTE).

At the beginning of the 2019-2020 interim, Montana's economy was generally thriving, and unemployment was at a near record low with the main economic concern being a shortage of skilled workers. Strengthening workforce training and better aligning industry and education were central in many policy conversations. While much in our world and economy changed in the Spring of 2020 with COVID-19 and unemployment increased dramatically, in many ways the need for a well aligned and nimble workforce development system is more vital than ever to ensure a strong Montana, and 2-year campuses will certainly play a central role.

The commission held seven meetings over the course of the interim, and heard from representatives of Montana's 2-year campuses as well as from the community and tribal colleges, the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, the Department of Labor and Industry, the Montana Chamber of Commerce, and multiple industry sectors. After reviewing the history of vocational education in Montana and the 1995 restructuring and hearing from 2-year campus leaders, the commission pivoted from considering changes to the governance structure to examining ways to strengthen 2-year programs and especially CTE programs within the current structure. This pivot is reflected in the commission's work and its findings and recommendations on pages 2-3.

This short report will focus on the commission's findings and recommendations; for a full record of the commission's work, including a list of commission members, links to documents and presentations, and meeting minutes and videos, please go to https://leg.mt.gov/committees/other-groups/mus-2-year-commission/.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

When the findings (numbers) and recommendations (letters) below are not directed at a specific entity, the commission intends them to be directed at any and all of the potential policymakers and policy implementers with influence over 2-year postsecondary education in Montana.

1. **Students and 2-year campuses typically do not receive much financial support in pursuing/offering shorter duration and noncredit workforce training programs.**
   
   a. Seek federal financial aid changes to allow Pell Grants and/or other forms of federal financial aid to support shorter duration credentials and noncredit workforce programs
   
   b. Find a way to provide state support for shorter duration credential and noncredit workforce programs; consider restructuring the funding model to incentivize community and 2-year colleges to establish non-credit workforce training programs and acknowledge non-traditional students who attend part time as well as lifelong learners

2. **Postsecondary CTE programs often cost more to start and operate than non-CTE programs.**
   
   a. Encourage investment in providing start-up funds for 2-year campuses for new CTE programs that demonstrate industry need and support
   
   b. Provide more state support for higher-cost CTE programs at 2-year campuses

3. **With a rapidly changing economy and workplace, alignment between education and industry is essential and requires ongoing focus.**
   
   a. Encourage sector partnership/industry alliance approach in aligning workforce and education to develop skilled worker pipeline (like the Montana Photonics Industry Alliance); encourage the Department of Labor and Industry to utilize existing staff to support this effort; support industry recommendations for curriculum at K-12 and 2-year postsecondary programs
   
   b. Promote work-based learning opportunities for students
   
   c. Move to a postsecondary education system that includes and rewards credit and non-credit stackable, industry-recognized and other credentials, certificates, and degrees based on competency or proficiency standards; work-based learning; prior learning assessment; and learning, teaching, and assessment strategies using multiple technologies
   
   d. Encourage the Board of Regents to afford 2-year campuses greater flexibility in terms of program creation and expansion
4. Too few students are aware of or encouraged to pursue postsecondary CTE programs at 2-year campuses.

a. Continue and expand collaborative statewide outreach efforts like the College and Career Readiness Portal to increase postsecondary participation in associates degree programs, nondegree credential programs, and workforce training programs, including apprenticeship and military; focus on the existing 40% that isn't participating in postsecondary at all, rather than competing with 4-year campuses ("grow the pie")

b. Consider the top 4 recommendations from the Montana Chamber of Commerce Workforce Development Survey:
   i. Incentivize school districts to emphasize all career pathways
   ii. Require school districts to incorporate workforce readiness skills into curriculum
   iii. Strengthen career advising in middle school and high school
   iv. Require business and economics education in middle school and high school

c. Request that the Board of Public Education examine the school counselor to pupil ratio

d. Request that the Board of Public Education explore ways in which K-12 career counseling can be strengthened (can the model shared by Billings Public School be replicated in a way that strengthens career counseling while preserving or even enhancing school counselors' ability to provide noncareer counseling services?)

e. Encourage industry to advertise, recruit, and hire graduates from two-year institutions

5. Coordination between K-12 and the MUS could be improved, especially regarding CTE.

a. Strengthen dual enrollment opportunities for high school students pursuing postsecondary CTE programs and certifications

b. Highlight and continue efforts at coordination, especially those like the Perkins V effort led by the Commissioner of Higher Education in partnership with the Office of Public Instruction, the Department of Labor and Industry, the Department of Commerce, and multiple private industry partners

6. Vibrant workforce development programs at 2-year campuses provide a valuable long-term benefit to individuals and the state of Montana as a whole.

a. Encourage appropriators (the Legislature, the Board of Regents, campuses) to view funding for workforce programs as an investment, "spending money to make/save money"
Public Postsecondary Education in Montana: Structure, Relationship, and Governance

Report to the 2021 Legislature

Prepared for the MUS 2-Year Commission by Pad McCracken, Legislative Research Analyst, August 2019 (revised April 2020)

"Flagship" 4-year research university
Independent accreditation and budget

"Embedded" 2-year college
Dependent accreditation and budget
(Bitroot College is in a sense twice-embedded)

4-year regional/specialty university
Independent accreditation and budget
* Northern and Western offer 2-year programs

"Embedded" 2-year college
Dependent accreditation and budget

"Standalone" 2-year college
Independent accreditation and budget

From Section 9 of Article X of the Montana Constitution:
(2) (a) The government and control of the Montana university system is vested in a board of regents of higher education which shall have full power, responsibility, and authority to supervise, coordinate, manage and control the Montana university system and shall supervise and coordinate other public educational institutions assigned by law.

2-year community college
Independent accreditation and budget
Receives state funding outside MUS "lump" Supported by various local levies
Governed by locally elected trustees under supervision and coordination of the regents

2- and 4-year tribally controlled college
Independent accreditation and budget
Receives state funding only through reimbursement for resident nonbeneficiary students pursuant to 20-25-428, MCA

Historic vo-tech centers and statutory 1.5 mill levy on county (5 to state general fund)
ITEM 3

MSU MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING PROGRAM

UPDATE

Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, OPI
Dr. Ann Ewbank, MSU
Dr. Ann Ellsworth, MSU
Master of Arts in Teaching Update

Ann Ellsworth, MAT Program Leader
Ann Ewbank, Education Department Head
October 8, 2020

https://www.montana.edu/education/grad/mat/index.html
The MAT Program

• Designed by MSU and Montana stakeholders to be part of the solution to rural teacher recruitment and retention. **Thanks to BPE approval, the MAT positioned MSU to obtain the largest USDOE grant in MT history.**

• A full-time pathway to initial teacher licensure. Participants study to become a teacher with a cohort in an online, dynamic, and hands-on learning environment.

• Students complete a full-time course of study to complete degree and meet the requirements to earn a recommendation for a Montana Class 2 Teaching License in 15 months (elementary) or 12 months (secondary). The MAT is offered online with one seven-day residency during the summer.
MAT at a Glance

**Elementary**

14 Teacher Residents will graduate in Spring 2021 (9 MRTP with 3-year service commitment in eligible schools).

**Average bachelor’s GPA:** 3.49

**Average Praxis screening test scores**
- ELA: 180 (cut score 157)
- Math: 179 (cut score 157)
- Social Studies: 184 (cut score 184)
- Science: 181 (cut score 159)

*(undergraduate students complete Praxis upon graduation and meet or exceed cut scores consistently)*
MAT at a Glance

**Secondary:**

11 Teacher Residents will graduate in Spring 2021 (8 MRTP with 3-year service commitment in eligible schools).

5 General Science Broadfield
5 Social Studies Broadfield
1 English

**Average Bachelor’s GPA:** 3.54

**Average Praxis screening test scores**
- English: 200 (perfect score, cut score 167)
- Social Studies: 175 (cut score 155)
- Science: 181 (one perfect score, cut score 152)

*(undergraduate students complete Praxis upon graduation and meet or exceed cut scores consistently)*
MAT Teacher Resident Locations

- Troy
- Kalispell
- Columbia Falls
- Whitefish (2)
- Superior
- Plains
- Florence
- Corvallis
- Deer Lodge (2)
- Choteau
- Helena
- Helena
- Bozeman
- Roberts
- Billings
- Gardiner
- Cody, WY
- Terry
- Circle
- Elementary
- Secondary

Montana State University

Mountains & Minds
COVID19 Change: Inclusive Community Camp

By Anne Cantrell, MSU News Service
AUGUST 6, 2020

Jessica Cassel, an elementary education student at Montana State University, leads a cup-stacking activity for Amelia and Sawyer, two children who participated in MSU's new Inclusive Community Camp, Thursday, July 30, 2020, in Bozeman, Mont., as fellow camp guides Elise Reed and Shannah Eichel participate in the activities remotely and are seen through a collaborative mobile device. MSU Photo by Adrian Sanchez-Gonzalez
Montana Rural Teacher Project

Federally-funded program through the USDOE Teacher Quality Partnership

One-Year Teaching Residency in a Rural School

Financial Support through Living-Wage Stipend (USDOE prohibits direct tuition payment)

New Teacher Mentoring and Support during the first two years of teaching

Ongoing opportunities for online and face-to-face professional learning provided by a wide variety of statewide organizations.

Professional development for school leaders about best practices in recruiting and retaining high-quality rural teachers.
Montana Rural Teacher Project Partners

- The Montana Office of Public Instruction is the MRTP designated education authority (LEA).
- Western Montana Professional Learning Collaborative
- OPI’s Teacher Learning Hub
- School Services of Montana
- Montana Small Schools Alliance
- Montana Rural Education Association
- Montana Federation of Public Employees
- SAM
- MASBO
Please Help Us Recruit

Elementary applications open 7/1 – 10/1 (January start).
Secondary applications open 10/1-1/1 (May start).
Contact jocallg@montana.edu

MAT with MRTP

Can you help us identify anyone in your community or region who might want to become a rural teacher?

Requires undergraduate degree that aligns with teaching goal (e.g. an engineering degree for math teaching, a sociology degree for elementary teaching).

Living stipend paid monthly (tuition not allowable expense per USDOE)

3-year commitment to teach in an eligible school

Elementary applications open 7/1 – 10/1 (January start).
Secondary applications open 10/1-1/1 (May start).
Contact jocallg@montana.edu
ITEM 4

UPDATE ON REVISIONS TO ARM TITLE 10, CHAPTER 58, EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM STANDARDS

Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson, OPI
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 21, 2020

CONTACT
Matt Vanover
(217) 341-3849
Matt.Vanover@caepnet.org

CAEP Seeking Public Comment on Updated Standards
Board Maintains Commitment to Review, Improve
Teacher Prep Standards on a Seven-Year Cycle

WASHINGTON – The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) is seeking input on proposed changes to the 2013 CAEP Standards for educator preparation. The CAEP Standards guide the nation’s top schools of education, those that are CAEP accredited, in preparing future K-12 teachers. CAEP is the only accreditor of educator preparation providers recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

“Our education preparation providers are committed to continuous improvement, and so are we. The 2013 CAEP Standards were developed to unify the profession under a single set of standards, with a commitment to ensure they remain rigorous. CAEP set the bar for programs that prepare future educators: They need to demonstrate their graduates are ready to teach on the first day they enter a classroom,” said CAEP President Christopher A. Koch. “Maintaining high quality standards, based on relevant research is costly and time-consuming. More than 30 states partner with us because we are able to tap volunteer experts in the field who committed to excellence and give their time and talents to ensure our standards are rigorous, relevant and a model for successful teaching of our nation’s children and youth.”

The CAEP bylaws require a review of the CAEP Standards every seven years. The CAEP Research Committee was charged in 2018 with updating the research related to the CAEP Standards. The CAEP Board of Directors created a task force at its June 2020, Board meeting, which met over the summer reviewing data and reports from the CAEP Research Committee and the CAEP Equity and Diversity Committee. The task force also reviewed US Department of Education (USDOE) and CHEA guidelines, more than 300 CAEP accreditation decisions, as well as feedback from stakeholders. It was composed of 21 representatives from the field of education, including P-12, higher education, state education departments and non-profit education organizations. The task force focused on reviewing the 2013 standards, specifically seeking to consolidate, clarify and streamline the standards.

“Over the past seven years we have accredited more than 300 educator preparation providers. CAEP accreditation is not a rubber stamp, we have had to revoke, deny and put some institutions on probation,” said Karen Symms Gallagher, Chair, CAEP Board of Directors. “The task force was able to look at the data we have along with the guidance of our experts in the Equity and Diversity and the Research committees. The current recommendations they have put forward will help CAEP providers better address current classroom conditions.”
## CAEP Revised Initial Standards-DRAFT

**Revised Standards to Take Effect Spring 2022**

### Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

**R1.1 The Learner and Learning** The provider ensures candidates demonstrate an understanding and application of the InTASC standards at the appropriate progression levels relating to learner development, learning differences, and the learning environment at the appropriate progression level(s). Providers describe how the learner and learning are integrated into the curricula and developmental experiences and the evidence provided demonstrates a commitment to equity and diversity in preparing candidates to work with diverse P-12 students.

**R1.2 Content** The provider ensures that candidates have appropriate content knowledge and are able to apply the InTASC standards at the appropriate progression levels relating to content knowledge. These outcome assessments can be part of Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs), state approval processes, and/or data linked to national and/or state standards in the content area. Providers describe how content knowledge is integrated into the curricula and developmental experiences and the evidence provided demonstrates a commitment to equity and diversity in preparing candidates to work with diverse P-12 students.

**R1.3 Instructional Practice** The provider ensures that candidates understand and are able to apply the InTASC standards at the appropriate progression levels relating to instructional practices that measure their P-12 students’ progress, plan for instruction, and use a variety of instructional strategies at the appropriate progression level(s). Further, providers ensure that candidates model and apply approved technology standards (e.g., ISTE, state standards) as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning. Providers describe how instructional practices are integrated into the curricula and developmental experiences and the evidence provided demonstrates a commitment to equity and diversity in preparing candidates to work with diverse P-12 students.

**R1.4 Professional Responsibility** The provider ensures that candidates understand and are able to apply the InTASC standards at the appropriate progression levels relating to the expectations of the profession, including professional learning and ethical practice, collaboration and leadership. Providers describe how professional responsibilities are integrated into the curricula and developmental experiences and the evidence provided demonstrates a commitment to equity and diversity in preparing candidates to work with diverse P-12 students.

### Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to demonstrate positive impact on diverse students’ learning and development. High-quality clinical practice offers candidates experiences in different settings and modalities (including online instruction), as well as with diverse P-12 students, school colleagues, and mentors. Partners share responsibility to identify and address real problems of practice that candidates experience in their engagement with P-12 students.

**R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation** Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation.

**R2.2 Clinical Educators** Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, and support high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development.

**R2.3 Clinical Experiences** The provider works with partners to design and implement clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, duration, and modality (including online instruction) to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning and development as presented in Standard 1.

### Standard 3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is continuous and purposeful from recruitment through completion. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation and that EPPs provide supports (such as advising, remediation, and counseling) in all phases of the program so candidates will be successful.

**R3.1 Recruitment** The provider presents goals and progress evidence for recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that align with their mission. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields. The goals and evidence should address progress towards a candidate pool which reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students.

**R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression** The provider establishes criteria for and monitors transition points from admission through completion that indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical skills, critical dispositions and professional responsibilities, and the ability to integrate technology effectively in their practice. The provider ensures that knowledge of and progression through transition points are transparent to candidates. The provider plans and documents the need for candidate support, as identified in disaggregated data by race and ethnicity and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP’s mission, so candidates meet milestones. The provider has a system for effectively maintaining records of candidate complaints, including complaints made to CAEP, and documents the resolution.

**R3.3 Foundational Academic Knowledge of Candidates** The provider identifies a transition point (any point in the program) at which a cohort grade point average of 3.0 is achieved and monitors this data. The provider identifies a transition point at which it ensures candidate academic competency in reading, math, and writing as demonstrated through disaggregated:
- Cohorted averages of national, standardized assessments. The CAEP criteria is meeting the 50th percentile.
- OR measures of candidate criteria tied to outcome performance (connect candidate criteria to completer impact in S4.1). This criteria could include national, standardized assessment data that does not meet the 50th percentile or state required assessments.

The provider plans and documents supports for candidates based on the disaggregated data that demonstrates candidate academic achievement by completion.
### Standard 4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the effectiveness of its completers’ instruction, P-12 student learning and development, and completer and employer satisfaction with the relevance and effectiveness of preparation.

| R4.1 Completer Effectiveness | The provider demonstrates, using multiple sources of evidence, that program completers:  
- effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth  
AND  
- apply in P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.  
In addition, the provider includes a rationale for the data elements provided. |
| R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers | The provider demonstrates that employers are satisfied with the completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. |
| R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers | The provider demonstrates that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that their preparation was effective. |

### Standard 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

The provider maintains a quality assurance system that consists of valid data from multiple measures and supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based. The system is developed and maintained with input from internal and external stakeholders. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements, establish goals for improving fiscal and administrative capacity, and highlight innovations.

| R5.1 Quality Assurance System | The provider has developed, implemented, and modified as needed, a viable and functioning quality assurance system that ensures a process to document operational effectiveness. This system documents how multiple measures enter the system, how the data is used in decision making, and the outcomes of those decisions for programmatic improvement. |
| R5.2 Data Quality | This provider’s quality assurance system from S5.1 relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures to ensure that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. |
| R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement | The provider includes relevant internal (e.g., faculty, staff, candidates, EPP administration) and external (e.g., alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider) stakeholders in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement process. |
| R5.4 Continuous Improvement | The provider regularly, systematically, and continuously assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, documents modifications and the effects of those innovations. |

### Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

The EPP has the fiscal and administrative capacity, faculty, infrastructure (facilities, equipment, and supplies) and other resources as appropriate to the scale of its operations and as necessary for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. **For EPPs whose institution is accredited by an accreditor recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education (e.g., SACSCOC, HLC), such accreditation will be considered sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 6.** If an EPP’s institution is not accredited by an accreditor recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education, the EPP must address each component of ST 6 in narrative supported by evidence.

| R6.1 Fiscal Resources | The EPP has the fiscal capacity as appropriate to the scale of its operations. The budget for curriculum, instruction, faculty, clinical work, scholarship, etc., supports high-quality work within the EPP and its school partners for the preparation of professional educators. |
| R6.2 Administrative Capacity | The EPP has administrative capacity as appropriate to the scale of its operations, including leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study so that their candidates are prepared to meet all standards. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are current, accurate, and transparent. |
| R6.3 Faculty Resources | The EPP has professional education faculty that have earned doctorates or equivalent P-12 teaching experience that qualifies them for their assignments. The EPP provides adequate resources and opportunities for professional development of faculty, including training in the use of technology. |
| R6.4 Infrastructure | The EPP has adequate campus and school facilities, equipment, and supplies to support candidates in meeting standards. The infrastructure supports faculty and candidate use of information technology in instruction. |

**Only For EPPs seeking access to Title IV funds**

### Standard 7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act

Freestanding EPPs relying on CAEP accreditation to access Title IV of the Higher Education Act must demonstrate 100% compliance with their responsibilities under Title IV of the Act, including but not limited to on the basis of student loan default rate data provided by the Secretary, financial and compliance audits, and program reviews conducted by the U.S. Department of Education. Freestanding EPPs will need to provide narrative and evidence for all components of ST 7.
In addition to being recognized by CHEA, CAEP is also seeking recognition by the USDOE. As part of that process, the Standards have been modified to include specific areas of focus required by the Department.

In most cases the Task Force is recommending the consolidation, clarification, and the removal of extraneous language without substantive changes. They are also recommending that specific standards for technology be added, given the increase in online learning. The task force is also recommending each provider be able to demonstrate progress toward recruiting and graduating a candidate pool that reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students, as well as increased flexibility in documenting candidates academic knowledge and their impact on student learning and development.

CAEP is accepting public comments through November 2, 2020. To review the proposed changes and to provide comment, please go to the CAEP Public Comment page. (http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/about-accreditation/public-comment-page) If approved, the revised standards would go into effect during the Spring 2022 semester.

Accreditation is a nongovernmental activity based on peer review that serves the dual functions of assuring quality and promoting improvement. CAEP was created by the consolidation of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council. It is a uniform accreditation system intent on raising the performance of all providers focused on educator preparation.

###

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (www.CAEPnet.org) advances equity and excellence in educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning.
ITEM 5

MONTANA MENTORING AND INDUCTION PROJECT

Dr. Linda Vrooman Peterson
Link to OPI Webpage Montana Mentoring and Induction Project webpage.

Resource: Evidence-based Practice

https://gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/EvidenceBasedPractices_MentoringInduction.pdf
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APPROVE CLASS 8 LICENSE APPLICATIONS

Dr. Julie Murgel, OPI
FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS