

Committee of Practitioners

October 11, 2018 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Utah State Board of Education

Conference Room 241

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CZ3akmmpBlw>

Mediated by Dr. Rebecca Donaldson, ESEA Federal Programs and Related State Initiatives Coordinator

Committee Members present: Dr. Rebecca Donaldson, Leslie Evans, Jeff Ojeda, Dr. Max Lang, Ardy Vallett, Nancy Ward, Trina Valdez, Murray Meszaros, LeAnn Wood, Nancy Kennedy, Dr. Deborah Swensen, Kamille Sheikh, Dr. Christelle Estrada, Sheryl Ellsworth, Dierdre Straight, Dr. Danell Mieure, Barbara Smith, Marianne Rozsahegyi, Joleigh Honey, and Becky Peters.

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1. Welcome and Introductions Review of Minutes Review of Agenda</p> | <p>Rebecca Donaldson</p> | <p>Dr. Donaldson welcomed the group and had everyone introduce himself or herself. The minutes from the June 15, 2018, COP meeting and today's agenda were reviewed.</p> |
| <p>2. School Improvement</p> | <p>Dr. Max Lang Leslie Evans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of schools: CSI and TSI, State Turnaround • Proposed formula to award Title I 1003(a) school improvement funds • Funding/allowable uses of 1003(a) funds | <p>Leslie Evans explained the process for identification of low-performing schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), which identifies the lowest 5% of Title I schools averaged over 3 years and any public high school with a 67% or lower graduation rate over three years. • Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), where any of a school's student group(s) that fall(s) below the percentage of points (cut score) associated with the lowest performing 5 % of schools in the state's accountability system. • Turnaround schools are identified as the lowest 3% of all schools in the State regardless of their Title I status for two consecutive years. <p>School year 2018-19 will be the first year schools will be identified as CSI and TSI. State School Turnaround Cohort 3 Schools will also be</p> |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|------|------------|--|
| | | <p>identified. Identifications will be made in mid-December after the State Accountability Results Data are available. Staff from ESEA Programs have been working with staff from Data and Statistics to ensure schools are not double identified under ESSA and State School Turnaround. Staff will first identify the lowest 3% of all schools in the State and filter out Title I schools, as well as special needs schools, so funding will go to the schools that really need it. CSI schools will be identified after that from the lowest 5% of Title I schools and low-graduation rate high schools.</p> <p>Max Lang reviewed the Title I 1003 School Improvement allocation. The ESSA Statute for School Improvement states that 7% of Title I funds allocated to the state gets set aside for school improvement. 95% of this money is to be awarded to LEAs on behalf of identified low-performing schools. However, there has been a decrease in the overall Title I funding to the State. There is also a hold-harmless calculation for Title I LEA allocations so 7% cannot be reserved for School Improvement. As a result, the money provided to schools needs to be targeted to schools with the greatest needs, capacity, and the greatest commitment to change in order to have the greatest impact. LEAs have to use money based on evidenced-based principles required under the ESSA.</p> <p>In the June 2018 Committee of Practitioners meeting, it was decided to provide funds based on a mixture of a base formula amount and a competitive amount based on a needs assessment and root cause analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need this Committee's guidance on the formula |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|------|------------|---|
| | | <p>amount to start with, and then the competitive amount. In the past, when schools were identified as CSI, they all received the same amount of funds. Since funds are more limited this year, we need to be more careful with how they are distributed to schools. Possible considerations of how funds are distributed could include demographics (such as poverty, number of students, number of teachers, number of EL students, etc.), per pupil allocations, and Title I allocations. Are there other considerations that should be included?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the school was discussed. Urban schools have more access to more support and other outside funds, jobs, or other opportunities than rural schools do. • The size of the district should also be considered. Larger districts have more funds and personnel to address each program. Personnel in smaller districts and charters wear multiple hats, so they might have a larger need for the funds. A concern was expressed regarding whether they had the capacity to utilize the extra funds. This might be a consideration for the competitive grant portion of the process. • EL capacity of the students – how long they have been identified and how much progress they have made. |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|------|------------|---|
| | | <p>Provo has a good model for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of experienced/new teachers. What is the capacity of LEAs to recruit/retain effective teachers? • What is the parent engagement? There are funds set aside for this, but they are supplemental. Can they be included in the grant application? There needs to be parent engagement to help drive school improvement. • The LEA Board needs to have ownership. Make this system-driven rather than personality-driven – so it will be more likely to keep going no matter who (teachers, administrators, etc.) stay or leave. Teachers also need to be involved in the process so they can provide input and have ownership of the improvement process. One district does a formative and summative review of the Superintendent of the LEA every two years. • How is capacity being built within the school? Are pre-K and after-school programs being used? Is information between schools and districts being shared? <p>Consolidated ESSA plan – under previous statute, we were working under the development of a specific process. We had a handbook to delineate the review process. Then the Legislature developed a Turnaround process that required an outside company.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving forward under ESSA, we've updated our handbook |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>based on the 4 Domains of Rapid School Improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs assessment and root cause analysis is now included, and there is a vetted list of outside providers for School Turnaround. • Do we want to provide the option of these outside providers for the CSI? • We have had feedback from schools who have felt cornered into "having" to choose from the list, rather than having expanded options. • If they have others who are experienced, can they use that other group (esp. if they provide validation as to why chosen) • If using a different provider, ensure (provide list) that there is no conflicted of interest. • In the past, the SST people just went in for the beginning needs assessment or review, and then a contracted provider continued the process on their own. Is this still the same practice? |
| <p>3. EL Indicator</p> | <p>Dr. Christelle Estrada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed amendment to ESSA plan | <p>Dr. Estrada provided background on the proposed English Language Proficiency (ELP) amendment to the ESSA plan. Federal and State accountability are now aligned so that all schools in the state with at least 10 English learners are consistent with the state-determined minimum n-size.</p> <p>Students are now moving forward on aligned goals in the domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Goals are personalized to better reflect proficiency levels, related to grade levels, in order to determine the actual quality of school instruction to determine the goals they need to achieve.</p> |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>This is an attempt to redesign the monitoring system to look at classroom instruction – to use data for differentiated individualized instruction. Staff is working with school districts to provide information through the Web site, UEN, ALS meetings. Some of the tools provided include self-assessment tools that demonstrate how resources are actually being used. The new Grants Management system also helps monitor Title III instruction.</p> |
| <p>4. National Distinguished Schools – National Association of ESEA State Program Administrators (NAESPA)</p> | <p>Dr. Rebecca Donaldson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 categories of schools • Identification process • Selection process • Recognition in Kansas City, MO • Proposed funding for schools to attend National NAESPA Conference | <p>Dr. Donaldson advised the Committee that the National Association of ESEA State Program Administrators (NAESPA) is requesting submissions of the 2018 National Distinguished schools. Every year, two schools per state are selected to receive this honor based on criteria from one of three categories: a poverty rate of at least 35% for the selected year, demonstrated high academic achievement for two or more consecutive years, and meeting or exceeding state-determined criteria based on two or more consecutive years of achievement data.</p> <p>This year, the schools must be selected and the NAESPA must be advised by November 30, 2018. However, because of the addition of new science assessments at the middle school level to Utah's tests this year, the results used to determine which schools can be nominated will not be available until mid-December. This means that Utah will either have to sit out this year and not nominate any schools, or nominate schools based on last year's submission information. Dr. Donaldson was able to get some recent information on the schools contained on last year's list of eligible schools, and proposed</p> |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Belknap Elementary from Beaver School District, which has been one of the highest performing Title I schools in Utah. She also proposed Wasatch Elementary from Davis School District for the Closing the Achievement gap award. Wasatch is one of Davis's most highly impacted high-poverty schools, and they have done much to close the achievement gaps between the various groups of students.</p> <p>When the COP group meets again in the spring, Dr. Donaldson would like to discuss the criteria used to nominate Distinguished schools in the future. Because the NAESPA includes more than Title I schools, she would like the group to develop criteria that would help expand which schools are eligible that are doing amazing things in other areas.</p> <p>Barbara Smith moved that these 2 schools be nominated, and Nancy Kennedy seconded the motion. The group voted to sustain this motion.</p> |
| <p>5. Title I Monitoring Processes</p> | <p>Rebecca Donaldson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined monitoring “pilot” | <p>Dr. Rebecca Donaldson provided information on a new pilot for a combined onsite monitoring visit. A combined group of USBE personnel will visit two districts and 1 charter school from Special Ed, Child Nutrition, and ESEA programs. This will include a combination of fiscal and programmatic monitoring. This approach is being piloted because some districts, especially smaller districts and charters, have fewer people to keep up with all of the monitoring visits conducted by the State. This pilot is an attempt to minimize the impact and disruption to the district.</p> <p>When the group has made all three visits, they will review the process to see how it went, gather input for improvements and/or changes, and whether it should continue. Dr.</p> |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|--|-------------------|--|
| | | <p>Donaldson will report to the Committee of Practitioners at the next meeting in February to advise how the visits went.</p> |
| <p>6. Title I-C Response to Federal Desktop Monitoring</p> | <p>Jeff Ojeda</p> | <p>Jeff Ojeda discussed the Title I-C Migrant Education response to the Federal desktop monitoring.</p> <p>There is a national database of migrant data that is used so that, as families move from state to state following agricultural work, students' school records and their coursework – especially in math and language arts – is accessible. This way their coursework and education can be as consistent as possible as they move around.</p> <p>USBE's migrant program was monitored during the spring of 2018, during April/May. During that time, a school district was contacted to ensure what USBE staff had provided in terms of processes and that the data was correct. At the end of August, a report containing the findings was received by USBE. Eight findings were primarily procedural. For instance, none of the procedures were written down, and the policies and procedures were not available on the web.</p> <p>One of the larger problems found had to do with the way our data system coincides with the national data system. The issue has to do with how migrant student data is uploaded. The federal law states that when a student is found to be migrant, their data (including extra information such as test scores, math courses, and language arts courses) has to be uploaded within ten days. Our data system does not actually upload the information until the end of the year. This becomes a problem if a student moves into a district during the year. They are not able to receive</p> |

| Item | Discussion | Follow-up/Motions |
|------|------------|--|
| | | <p>Migrant services until his/her information is uploaded at the end of the year. USBE and district staff had been going off a previous verbal policy that stated information could only be obtained once. It has been verified that that policy is actually no longer the case, so we are now enacting policy and procedures to upload that information within the ten-day period so it will no longer be an issue.</p> <p>Jeff verified that these items would be corrected by November. On November 9th, there will be a meeting with the LEA Migrant directors where they will be advised of this new policy. Jeff also stated that a new Board rule is being created making this a requirement, and Migrant directors will have input on the making of this Board rule. Entering the correct number of students on time is an important issue because funding is based on the numbers, and not entering them correctly will cause students to miss out on the services they need.</p> <p>-</p> |

Dr. Donaldson reminded everyone that the next meeting would be held on Thursday, February 28, 2019, from 10:00 AM – Noon, in the USBE Conference Room 241, with another to be held in June 2019. Both meetings will be live streamed.