

DRAFT
Texas Education Agency
Division of NCLB Program Coordination

Title I Committee of Practitioners
Thursday, September 25, 2008
Minutes

Members Present: Martha Anderson, Tori Austin, Mark, Beaty, Shirley Coleman, Carole, Hagler, Vicki Holland, Belinda Rojas, Margaret Parks Conner, Linda Roper, Victor Forsyth (for Terri Stafford), Jayne Tavenner, Mary Thomas, Michael Turner

Members Absent: Ronaldo Cavazos, Mitzi Doggett, Barbara Martin, Mike McCallum, Margaret McGettrick, Richard Mik

Visitors: Haidee Williams, Mary Garcia, Becky Decker, Kathy Kilcrease, Vickie Luckenbach, Ruth Haynes

TEA Staff Present: Cory Green, Anita Villarreal, Norma Yañez, Mike Poynor, Scott Lewis

SIRC Staff Present: Sally Partridge

The meeting was called to order by Cory Green. He thanked the members present for being there. He welcomed the newest member, Shirley Coleman, to the Committee of Practitioners.

AYP Update

Mr. Green welcomed Shannon Housson and Ester Regalado from Performance Reporting who were present to give an AYP update. Ester Regalado reviewed the important timeline and dates for Federal Accountability AYP.

The August 29, 2008 TEA letter to LEAs discusses how TAKS M and TAKS ALT will be used for AYP.

The September 10, 2008 letter to LEAs on School Leavers states that AYP is not incorporated in High School completion rates.

On October 2, 2008 unmasked AYP releases will be available for districts on TEASE.

On October 8, 2008 The AYP with labels will be publicly released.

Growth model pilot proposals are due to the Department of Education by October 15, 2008 even though your district may be planning to appeal.

Districts can appeal by October 17, 2008.

By Mid December TEA will release the final 2008 AYP masked data tables with final AYP status on its public website.

Mr. Housson discussed the Growth Model Pilot Proposal's deadline was initially August 18, 2008 but USDE extended the deadline to October 15th. He stated that if districts submit it on October 15 they can still add to it.

When will TEA submit the Growth Model to USDE? It will be submitted in November and pending USDE approval in summer will include AYP (if available).

The deadline for reporting returning students has been extended from September 26, 2008 to October 24, 2008 because of the Hurricane crisis. This will apply statewide.

Mr. Hammond stated that because of past history with Hurricane Rita, the state accountability/AYP has had a crisis code built into PEIMS to code students that are displaced by such crises. (Maybe perhaps it will be removed from AYP accountability.)

Vicki Hammond asked, "Do you have a number of LEAs that were impacted by Hurricane Ike?"

Mr. Housson said that it was around 200 school districts.

Ms. Regalado stated that we must re-evaluate how to look at the CAP Preliminary information. It would be interesting to note how the 1% and 2% are impacted.

Mr. Green welcomed Tori Austin from Region 7 to the COP. He also welcomed new staff to NCLB. He acknowledged that Michael Poynor works with the applications unit and that they are 99% finished with the consolidated applications and are waiting on one district that was affected by Hurricane Ike.

The minutes for the June meeting were reviewed. Mr. Green asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. Michael Turner asked that the question regarding if Becca was there to take minutes be deleted. A motion was made and seconded to correct and then accept the minutes. The motion passed.

Migrant Update

Christina Villarreal then reviewed the significant changes to policy guidance related to New Regulations on the Migrant Education Program. She explained that when USDE asked for comments on the new regulations. She requested input from COP, PAC, CAN and other focus groups on the new regulations. She then submitted these comments to USDE. They listened and used this input to make some significant changes.

As a result the PMOL was eliminated.

The following definitions were changed for:

"move or moved" changed from "moved to a new location" to "change of residence due to economic necessity".

"in order to obtain" no definition to "moves to obtain qualifying work".

The state COE will be replaced with a National COE. States will work to make it usable because as it stands now it needs changes. If Districts have already conducted their COEs they do not need to redo them. But if they haven't done them they will have to use the new COE beginning in November.

Re-interviews must be conducted every 3 years. USDE wants Texas to contract with outside groups or with groups outside of the process.

Ms. Villarreal also went over the plan for implementation. She stressed the need for LEAs to comply with the timeline. Also, she asks that the ESCs have a 30 day turnaround on TETN training for their LEAs.

The National ID&R Forum will conduct training for State Directors and this information will be shared at ACET in October.

Vicki Holland asked "I know there was a lot of negative concern about the new regulations. What was so negative?" Ms. Villarreal replied that there was more positive than negative. But she did share that the concerns were about how costly it would be for printing, the timing of the new regulations, and the retraining it would necessitate. There was also the concern of being monitored. Ms. Villarreal recommended that documentation of all activity should take care of that concern.

Skip Forsyth asked what if districts have already done their COE. Do they need to redo them with the new National COE? Ms. Villarreal replied that if they have already been conducted, no. But as of November 17 the National COE must be used. She added that if families did not qualify with the state COE perhaps the new National COE can be used to qualify them.

Title III Update

Mr. Green and Ms. Villarreal will attend the LEP Partnership in Washington, D.C.

Many functions of the Title III were moved to Title I and it seems to be a positive move because there will be better communication between the two programs.

New Initial Compliance Review (ICR) Intervention Document

Mr. Green states that SIP/Migrant Program will have increased monitoring that will be included in the Compliance Review.

He presented the documentation – the Initial Compliance Review Template that will be submitted to TEA as an intervention if the District missed more than 1 indicator. If a district missed only 1 indicator then this documentation will not be required. The District will submit 1 page for each indicator they have missed on the monitoring. Mr. Green asks the committee for feedback on the template.

Martha Anderson raised a concern about small LEAs submitting this type of document. Many small LEAs don't have many personnel knowledgeable in completing this task. Mr. Green asked if the agency could be more flexible. Can an ESC person serve on the committee to help them with completing the intervention template? Mr. Green said yes. Linda Roper stated that teachers should be knowledgeable about the program and should be participants in this committee for a good source of information. Mr. Beaty also stated that Campus decision-making be part of ICR Review.

Another committee member suggested that team members selected should be relevant to the indicator missed.

Ms. Roper asked if when school haven't complied with the Compliance Report what steps it takes. Mr. Green responded with saying he gives them 24 hrs. to comply during the validation.

Ms. Roper asks if the ESCs know head of time when this information goes reported, and Mr. Green stated that the regional reports are made accessible to the ESCs.

Another concern was voiced that some administrators can have problems accessing the appropriate forms to complete the Compliance Report.

Mr. Green then reviewed the ICR Statewide Results for 35 indicators. This was a read only and the actual data will not be available until October. This involved 1219 LEAs. He stated that the submission of the compliance results for these indicators were for the most part good. There were 6 indicators that were of concern to the agency: #6, 18, 21, 22, 24, 32, and 34. Mr. Green then understand the many reasons why districts fail to comply with the report but if they are willing to take the funds, then they are accountable to report.

There was discussion about the LEAs wanting to know how to complete the Compliance reports to avoid being cited. The concern was not about entering data correctly.

Mr. Green raised the question "Should desk audit reviews be made public before ICR? He wanted feedback from the committee on the pros and cons of this idea.

PROS:

This would allow to double check the large amount collected.

It could be used as a checklist for the ESC and LEA personnel.
It provides links to the Needs Assessment and Planning.
It could be used with administrators as a teaching tool.
It enables grantees to "know the game".
It could be used as a learning tool for the LEA with high turnover.

CONS:

It makes sense for true validation- gives credibility (No one knows what you are going to be checked on.)
It is reverting back to the "gotcha". If CRs are not being done it checks that not in compliance.
It puts more frustration and burden on the LEAs.
It affects the morale and the anxiety level.
It promotes the "don't hold me accountable for what I don't know."
It would change our positive and helpful image.

The committee then discussed how to validate those LEAs using the money appropriately. How can this be done? How can we check those districts who are offenders? Mr. Green stated that instead of a random validation would be to go to those districts by first looking at validation history. But this will add frustration and lower the morale.

Suggestions and discussion followed on how would be the best way to validate the submission of CRs.

Random selection as soon as sit gets back, targeted submission as a second validation, and follow up validation, and retro validation?

Also, there is a need to look at all the pieces of the Compliance Report. It would be too much to submit all Compliance Reports. The Hope is that more LEAs will report so it may lead to fewer interventions.

A suggestion was made to make more site visits. Mr. Green stated that USDE does not like the idea of site visits.

Ms. Roper asked if a roving indicator validation is possible. It would keep districts on their toes and ESCs can submit by scanning for their LEAs.

High Qualified Resources Update

The HQT of Sept 22 – gives the annual status report.

Annual status reporting opens on 9/15/08. The status of every teacher as of 9/15 should be reported no later than November 3, 2008. Amendments are possible but there will be a freeze status until November 4, 2008.

Validation of 2008-09 High Qualified Data submitted by Campuses are due by December 15, 2008 will include Teacher Status Validation, Principal's Attestation, and the Parent Notification Validation.

Validations on Teacher status – the number of submissions will be as follows: for large districts – 5, Medium-sized districts – 3 and Small districts 1 or 2.

Parent Notification validations will use last years 07-08.

Consequences for Leas missing HQT targets and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) –

For those Leas that have not reached HQ status by the beginning of the 2008-09 year and have not met AYP for three consecutive years will have to submit additional corrective actions require by statute Section 2141.

LEAS that meet both these criteria will be notified after the November 3, 2008 HQT report deadline. In addition to the campus level participation in the LEA consequences, these campuses in SIP will be required to implement a TEA required administrative mentor. In addition the Title I SIP campuses will be required to submit their HQTICIP to TEA for review. Failure to do so may result in the 2009 NCLB desk audit process score to be elevated. Tea will conduct a review of the plans and provided technical assistance to the campuses and the Leas as needed.

To assist LEAs with submitting required highly Qualified Documentation it will provide HQT worksheets to use as a tool to facilitate the LEAs determining the high qualified status of all core academic subject area teachers. In addition TEA will provide a Course Taxonomy and an Exam Crosswalk that will assist LEAs in determining subject competency.

The changes will be to limit the use of HOUSE to seven areas. There was discussion about giving it more flexibility and breaking down exams for HQ.

Organization Chart

Mr. Green reviewed the reorganization of NCLB division due to losing 3 FTE. He named the new additions to the division as well as new assignments.

Review letter

Mr. Green reviewed the letter mailed out to all LEAs that gives the findings of the USDE monitor visit and the areas of noncompliance. There was discussion on one of the requirements for establishing an In School Support Team that must be available for the campuses. But campuses are not obligated to use it; they can use another provider.

It was decided that ESC personnel can be used to make up a team.

A seven member team can be representative of the HQT area, Principal, teacher, parents, Higher Ed, Regional lab or computer technology, an outside consultant, from the content areas of Math, Science, ELA, and Title 1 Specialist.

Membership requirement must be determined by COP. The top priority for membership must be for the Principal and the Teacher members. Also, someone from pupil services such as counselors, social workers, and psychologists. Other required members should be your Math, Science, ELA, and Title 1 Specialist. All members could be from ESCs except for the Teachers and Principals.

TEA will pay ESCs to be trained and in turn they will provide the training to the campuses. If a campus requests training from the ESCs they will pay the ESCs for this training.

Anyone can request and use this service.

Top priority must go to schools in Stages 3/4, then Stages 1/2.

A motion was made to accept this as minimum standard for the Team. This was seconded.

SES- letter of Guidance from USDE

There was discussion about guidance on parent consultation on student learning plans. Section 1116(e) (3) (A) requires that the parents, the LEA and the provider of choice selected by the parents must consult on the goals for the students to include progress and a timetable. Parents must be active participants.

A Parent Consultation plan was discussed in which the LEA would make 3 contacts by two or more methods (email, sent home, mail) over 3 consecutive days. The parents would be given 1 week to respond. Then a student learning plan would be written and student SES would begin. A signature is not required for this option. If a parent is not happy with provider he can cancel the district plan. A motion was made and seconded to accept this policy for Parent Consultation.

Policy for Removal of SES providers from the State's approved List

The new policy was reviewed by Mr. Green and opportunity for discussion was given. The policy was approved by the Committee.

Loss of a TEA family member

Mr. Green announced the passing of Elvis Shoaf.

Ed Flex Waiver

Scott Lewis presented the committee with an Ed Flex application from North East ISD.

The district was requesting a 2 year extension to get the paraprofessional Highly Qualified on two new campuses not served previously.

There was discussion as to why the district needed two years and whether it could accomplish this in less time. Jayne Tavenner shared that the training need to accomplish this would take 5 days at Region 20. Ms. Hagler moved that the paraprofessionals be Highly Qualified by the beginning of the 2009-2010 school years. Ms. Thomas made a motion that all paraprofessionals be Highly Qualified by last day of the 2008-09 school years. It was seconded by Ms. Holland.

There was a motion to adjourn the meeting.

The next meeting time for the committee will be in November.