



InET Consortium

Minutes of the InET Leadership Team (ILT) Meeting October 31, 2012

Paramount Hotel, Portland, OR

In attendance: Christina Álvarez (ID), Cindy Bartelsmeyer (Fiscal Agent Rep, Fort Scott Community College), Laura Blancas(CO), Frank Contreras (Collaborating Partner, Texas State University), Frank Dávila (InET Coordinator), Susan Durón (InET Evaluator, META), John Farrell (KS), Jonathon Fernow (OR), Sue Henry (NE), Mary Ann Losh (NE), Helen Malagón (WA), Bob Lynch (Coordinating efforts among consortiums on behalf of the SOSOSY Consortium), Antonio Ramos (OR), Noemi Treviño (MN).

Welcome: Mary Ann – She stated that the primary purpose of the Consortium Incentive Grant (CIG) is to work on improving services for our binational students through the use of innovative educational technology. This is one of a few face-to-face meetings. Most meetings will use technology such as Webinars or phone conferences. Frank was introduced and shared a brief overview of his background and experiences. Jonathan welcomed the group to Oregon. A big “Thanks” was given to everyone who helped with the proposal. Those in attendance introduced themselves and Mary Ann asked everyone to contact her at (402) 471-4357 if there are questions or new ideas for enhancing the project. Representatives from six of the eight CIG states were in attendance, plus one of the partner states. She mentioned that information from the meeting (handouts and meeting notes) will be sent to all CIG states, collaborating partner states, and OME.

Overview: Susan reviewed the packet containing the meeting handouts and the objectives for the meeting as: 1) To understanding the goals and objectives of the InET grant; 2) Review all project activities (e.g., build staff capacity to support the objectives of the grant, design materials, and develop state systems to support eligible migrant students who cross the borders between the U.S. and Mexico). She reviewed the agenda and asked participants to share their knowledge of binational systems throughout the meeting and how they have overcome hurdles/barriers to providing appropriate services. With regards to data collection, we are waiting to hear back from OME on the project objectives that we submitted in September before we can put together the data collection tools. At this point we do not know if they have approved the changes requested. Susan mentioned that Oregon and Arizona are two of our InET states that previously had not been involved in CIGs. She noted that we will set dates for the next two years to target the completion of InET’ goals and objectives.

Implementing the Project: An initial review pertained to the six underlying themes of InET designed to support our plan for implementing the project. These include:

- Fostering: awareness among eight CIG states and the collaborating partner states to identify and meet the needs of binational students;

- Imagining, planning, and designing: This is a systems piece that we will be doing in the next two years
- Creating processes and products that result from interstate coordination
- Improving the existing infrastructure, help to share what we know with other states
- Producing solutions to help states overcome barriers in involving binational teachers, helping students to continue the use of appropriate curriculum when they go back to Mexico
- Disseminating effective practices and sustaining their use beyond the two years of full implementation. This will occur through the InET website, pathways that have been established to coordinate with resource partners, materials that have been developed, and professional development

Project Focus

1. Professional development
2. Materials development and dissemination
3. Building systems capacity and support that result in positive student outcomes

Activity/Timeline Chart

In reviewing the Activity/Timeline Chart, the text in red shows the changes to the original proposal that were submitted to OME. The Interim Annual Performance Report (APR) is due in the Spring. This is important because the report determines whether or not the CIGs receive Year 2 funds. This decision is contingent on making substantial progress toward meeting the measurable objectives.

Goal 1: What states are responsible for completing:

1.1 Develop three modules. California developed a module for training binational exchange teachers. This module serves as an example for InET to help in the designing of our three modules. The first module will be completed in year 1. Modules 2 & 3 in will be finalized in Year 2. These materials and other sessions related to the Binational Migrant Education Initiative will be presented at the OME conference on November 13-15) in South Padre Island, Texas. Those from the InET CIG will bring information back to the group. These activities will support the accomplishment of 1.1.

The project year: Award letter states that the project start date is July; however, states were not informed of the grant award until September 10. Funding was received by states around the end of September, so the actual start date for InET would be October 1, 2012 with Year 1 of the project running through September 30, 2013. If Year 2 funds are approved, the project will begin on October 1, 2013 and run through September 30, 2014.

Content: The content for the modules is contingent on ILT decisions based on the identified needs of the BIG states. Increasing the use of the Transfer Document or supporting academic achievement through technology are two possible examples.

1.2 All eight states should pilot at least two of the modules by the end of Year 2. All states are expective to be involved in reviewing and piloting the modules (five staff should pilot the materials, as feasible). The modules would contain a PowerPoint presentation, topic overview sheet, handouts, and resources (similar to the California Teacher Training or the ID&R modules). Development will be completed by the

InET Coordinator and the Cadre of Coaches under the guidance of the Lead State and the ILT. Staff from CIG states with knowledge and experience will be invited to assist in the development of the modules.

1.3 addresses professional development. Staff from the consortium states will participate in the training and others (e.g., collaborating partner state staff) will be invited, as well.

1.4 addresses technical assistance (TA). It is anticipated that states will need technical assistance, based on identified needs. A needs assessment survey will be sent to each state to target needs. For example, questions will address how to increase state efforts to support the achievement of binational children and youth. The TA provider will be determined based on the specific need. For example, for TA on the Apostille, we will seek TA providers that have successfully used the Apostille (e.g., Idaho, Oregon, California).

1.5 Each activity at the end of Objectives 1, 2, and 3 is related to the Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII). Frank and Susan will conduct monthly phone conferences to review each activity to determine status, accomplishments, and what remains to be done. Once the timelines are set, Frank will share that information with member states. He will contact the states before speaking with Susan to gather updates on the goals and activities to complete the FII.

Goal 2: This goal addresses materials development and staff development (e.g., reading, math, out-of-school youth (OSY), early childhood, ID&R, technology).

2.1 Five staff per state will be responsible for piloting the modules and electronic materials in the InET states. We will identify electronic materials (e.g., *Plazas Comunitarias*) and develop materials that will be housed on the InET website. We will cross-reference materials from other CIGS (e.g., SOSOSY materials for OSY; Migrant Literacy CORE materials for reading/literacy development) and from other sources (e.g., Mexico's Secretaría de Educación Pública—SEP).

2.2 Using the materials – The use of materials will be reported in Year 2 of InET.

2.3 Rate the effectiveness of materials – We will use the InET website to list and describe the materials and to seek input on effectiveness.

2.4 Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII) – Again, the Objective 2 activities will be reviewed by the InET Coordinator and the Evaluator, especially the components, the processes, and the outcomes based on each state's responsibilities as proposed.

Goal 3: How states are developing systems to ensure that the needs of binational migrant students are being met:

3.1 This objective calls for a 25% increase in binational students receiving services. The group determined that this pre-measure and a post-measure should be addressing an increase in services, not in the number of binational students as they do not have control over how many binational students arrive in their states. This needs to be modified during our initial call with the CIG project officer, Michelle Moreno.

3.2 There is an expectation that we will see an increase in the percentage of eligible binational migrant students receiving services.

- 3.3 This objective addresses the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA): How many states here today have collected needs assessment data relating to binational students? This is the baseline for 3.3. There was one of the eight InET states that mentions binational students in the CNA (the Lead State of Nebraska). As states update their CNAs, data collection and revision should address the needs of binational students. Currently about four or five of the eight InET states are involved in updating their needs assessment. This information for objective 3.3 will be available on the InET website.
- 3.4 This objective addresses the Service Delivery Plan (SDP): How many states here today have Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) relating to binational students? This is the baseline for 3.3. There were two of the eight InET states that mention binational students in the CNA (the Lead State of Nebraska and Idaho). As states update their SDPs, decisions and revisions should address the services to binational students. Currently about four or five of the eight InET states are involved in updating their SDPs. This information for objective 3.4 will be available on the InET website.
- 3.5 Staff participating in professional development or webinars needs to be recorded. Susan will get a form to states before the OME meeting on how to record PD for your staff.
- 3.6 Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII) – Again, the Objective 2 activities will be reviewed by the InET Coordinator and the Evaluator, especially the components, the processes, and the outcomes based on each state’s responsibilities as proposed.

States should make recommendations to Frank about other resources that may be available to support systems change to benefit binational migrant students that exist outside of the MEP.

Roles and Responsibilities: It is important that InET be clear in the distinction that it is not responsible for the Binational Forum nor other activities beyond the scope of the proposal. States that participate in InET may be involved, but that is through their own initiative. See PowerPoint slide 7 for a description of the various roles of InET, OME, and CME. Jonathan noted that in the past, the binational initiative has relied on states volunteering to participate in activities to support binational migrant students. He remarked that now we have a structure that is formalized which is going to result in additional resources for states in serving their binational students.

As background information, the annual binational forums began in 1998 in Washington. Coordination funds have provided resources such as registration fees for delegates from Mexico (and Mexico covers the fees for U.S. participants when the Forum is in Mexico). The next Forum is tentatively scheduled for March in the DC area.

InET is scheduled to have an ILT planning meeting in conjunction with the ADM/Forum in March. The members agreed that participation is easier for states if it is attached to another meeting that is required. The InET proposal states that there is a fall and a spring required meeting. The Lead State will provide you a letter for the meeting reminding states that participation in the ILT is a requirement.

It was the consensus of the group to hold the InET ILT meeting before the ADM. It could be held on Sunday afternoon, but we need to coordinate it with other groups that may be having meetings. The ADM will be held on Monday, March 4, Binational Forum Wednesday, March 6. It needs to be

determined when the ADM ends. The preference for the meeting is March 3 with flying in on Sunday morning, then meeting in the afternoon. It must be clear that InET is not able to commit resources to activities that are not included in the scope of the work as stated in our proposal.

The ILT members are committed to attend 2 ILT meetings, annually. In addition, states must collect and report data on project effectiveness and outcomes. It was mentioned by one of the ILT members that we need to be careful about the language we use in data collection and reporting to ensure that we are not reporting on immigrant students; rather, on eligible binational students. The definition of a binational student is: ***“A Binational student is an eligible migrant student who has moved between Mexico and the United States with his/her parents or as an emancipated youth at least once in the last 36 months.”*** Mexico does not have the same definition as the U.S. In Mexico the definition is about movement, and not specifically tied to agriculture. All students in Mexico who cross international or Mexican STATE borders are considered “migrant”. Therefore, the binational program is a much larger program in Mexico than in the U.S.

Roles of partner states: The seven states of Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, New Jersey, North Carolina, Utah, and Wisconsin as partner states is to keep them informed, disseminate materials and resources, and ask for their participation in InET, as feasible. It is hoped that in the future, one or more of the partner states will raise their status to CIG state in the next round of competition.

Role of the Cadre of Coaches: A question was raised as to who the coaches will be. This will depend on the identified needs of states, the modules topics, and TA requested. The vision is there will be consulting available as a state needs it. For example, Colorado representatives recently went to Mexico and received guidelines and 2013 requirements for the state describing prescreening for binational teachers. This was sponsored by *Mexico’s Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP)* which is roughly equivalent to the U.S. Department of Education. The SEP emphasizes the Teacher Exchange Program and also has an exchange for administrators and coordinators. Laura, Jonathan, Antonio, Christina, and Frank Contreras contributed to the discussion about partnerships with Mexico.

Role of the InET Coordinator: See slide 13. The Coordinator is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the project. Frank will be working from his home office in Aurora, Colorado and will be requesting support in coordination with the Lead state and the InET fiscal agent. Frank will be conducting a needs assessment of states. As an ongoing activity, John and Susan and will connecting him with the expertise and support systems that already are in place in the member states to identify potential modules and to ask members to share their work and expertise via the Website.

Role of the InET Evaluator: The Evaluator will be in contact weekly, or more frequently with the Coordinator. She will participate in ILP meetings, prepare data collection forms, contact states to collect data, prepare the Interim, Year 1, and Final APRs for review by the states, provide InET data as requested by states and OME, and be in contact monthly with Coordinator to update the FII, and with the Lead State Director, and InET states, as appropriate.

There was discussion that if states currently are not identifying binational students, they need to do this right away. Some states identify binational student status on the COE form that includes any migrant student who crossed the international border with Mexico within the last 36 months. It should be noted that for the binational initiative, we are only looking at students who travel between the U.S. and Mexico. For guidance, see Page 1 of the proposal project narrative. For the next meeting, it was recommended that states bring COEs from their state to see what they are doing and how it could be

modified for binational students. Laura mentioned that InET members could visit the Colorado website at www.cde.state.co.us under Offices/Migrant, to see how their state codes the binational student.

With respect to the various roles, we need teamwork! This teamwork is around our common goals within the InET activities and performance measure to benefit the binational migrant students that we serve in our states.

InEt Budget: Questions included how FSCC will bill the states, how travel funds are handled, and if states want to ban together on insurance for exchange teachers to get a better rate. There was a discussion about the J-1 Visas, SEVIS, finger-printing. It was determined that InET states can increase their resources and knowledge by joining forces. Those in consortium may want to have those conversations before committing funds to Fort Scott. The support could also include accident and medical insurance, J-1 visas, and other responsibilities associated with the Teacher Exchange Program.

Other questions that arose included: How to host a teacher? Step 1, step 2, etc. There is a need to review legal articles (documents) to include teachers in the U.S. going to Mexico. How is this done? We need to identify and share the names and contact information. Regarding insurance questions, Mexico does provide insurance but not at the level required in the U.S. What are the legal documents that are needed to report the number of dates the teachers are staying in Mexico? Look at timelines and the goals and objectives of the visit to stay in compliance. It would be helpful to have this information before the teachers arrive (the documents that have you to report on). For the binational student, could we have a mock document to help us in understanding how to stay in compliance? The report should be the same as last year. We can accomplish this before the teacher arrives.

Contact List for States: Who do you want for your contact person? After lunch, a sheet will be distributed to attain that information.

Data Collection and Reporting: See the PowerPoint, slide 21. The Staff Development form will come to states within a week. The staff materials survey will be available by Survey Monkey. There may be a Focus Group in at the April ILT meeting. The InET reporting requirements are not an unreasonable data burden for the states. META will work with states to ensure the timely and high quality reporting of data.

Regarding student outcome data, Bob Lynch asked about how to monitor and report student data. A: This will be obtained through the Form 1 Coordinators' Survey.

States were asked to turn in surveys by the deadline. If a state is going to be late, let Susan know.

Annual Performance Reporting for Year 1: The Interim Performance Report will be due in April or May. States need to have their survey data submitted in a timely manner. Also, they will need to review the APR—especially the data for your respective state and provide changes/edits to META. Next, help to move the signature page through the state system to get the signature of the Authorized Representative. Return the signed cover sheet to META. The Lead State sends the final version of the InET APR to OME at least two days prior to the due date.

Working Lunch Activity: In preparation for the luncheon activity, participants were asked to think about the top priority of the project. What do you bring to the table that can benefit InET? What ideas do you have about topics for the modules? What is something your state does very well? Is there anything you have seen related to educational uses of technology that you would like InET to explore? During lunch, complete the handout that addresses these questions and turn it in.

Summary of the working lunch activity:

- Through InET we have an opportunity to work together as states to achieve our common goals. Our materials, methods, programs, and practices can be shared.
- Who is a binational migrant student continues to be difficult for states. Schools don't always get it and they think that it goes beyond the MEP to immigrant students. We need to communicate the message about the definition. What are methods, materials, and resources that we can gather to assist us with this task? How can we use the binational agreement between the U.S. and Mexico to help us accomplish this?
- With all of the tools we develop, there has to be something in front of it to show or describe the benefit and the value it brings, something that exposes people to it. Two or three sentences showing the benefit will be important as we develop our products.
- Systems approach. How does information fit together? A dual fidelity of implementation. Could work for non-migrant students as well to establish buy in? We need to identify different stakeholders. What responsibility, if any, is the consortium's responsibility to students who are not binational student? Once tools are developed, anyone will have access to the information.

What does each state bring that would be helpful to other states in InET?

- Colorado and Nebraska have a box on their COEs to check indicating that the student is an eligible binational child/youth. This is transferred to their respective migrant data system and recorded.
- Colorado: Binational migrant brochure in Spanish and English and a binational tool kit for administrators, teachers, students
- Washington: Transfer Document online
- Oregon: Three-week curriculum
- Washington, Oregon, and California: J-1 Visa expertise
- Oregon: Process and experience to process, a calendar for moving through with obtaining the J-1 Visa for exchange teachers. Oregon also has module information and the steps to take for working with exchange teachers. All students in Mexico have a CURP ID. This could be added next to the checkmark on the COE. If a student has their ID, you can get immediate information from Mexico. The U.S. needs to be able to interface with the information.

Reporting Timelines: The green handout containing the timelines will be updated monthly. Due dates for Year 1 of InET are:

- March 10, 2013: Survey data due

- April 20, 2013: Signed Interim APR cover sheet due. All information is pre-populated. States just need to sign the form and date it.
- On or about April 30: Interim APR due to OME by the Lead State
- September 30, 2013: InET Year 1 project year ends
- October 20, 2013: All surveys, data, and forms are due
- November 25, 2013: The review draft of the Year 1 APR is due
- Dec 15, 2013: Signed cover sheets are due
- December 30, 2013: Year 1 APR is due to OME by the Lead State

Meeting Timelines – Year 1

- October 2012: ILT #1 (Portland, OR)
- March 2013: ILT #2 in conjunction with the Annual Directors’ Meeting (DC Area)
- April 2013: ILT #3 in conjunction with the NASDME Conference (Orlando, FL)
- TBA: Conference calls on InET modules
- TBA: Webinars on InET modules

Materials Timeline

- Survey Monkey
- Information from the PowerPoint slide 26

Fidelity of Implementation Index:

During the first monthly coordination call between Susan and Frank, the dates on the FII will be established. The ILT will review the FII and a conference call will follow. The initial FII is for two-years, then it will be split into a Year 1 and Year 2 FII. Frank will put out an agenda for the conference call prior to the meeting. Estimated time needed for the conference call time is 75 minutes. Forms and information will be sent electronically. They will be posted on the website when it is up and running. States will receive an attachment for the conference call. Activities not completed in Year 1 will be moved to the Year 2 FII.

In response to a question on the FII, it was clarified that it contains a rubric ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high) in regard to the implementation level.

General Discussion

What do other states do for teacher exchange? How do individual states pay the honorarium to exchange teachers? In some cases, intermediary units or state migrant education service centers pays for it and then bills the school. We need to know what to do, what the process and the IRS exception under rule 2B is. Exchange teachers are not employees of the district. We need to spell it out for other states and school districts. It seems that the rules change every year. H2A workers have problems now. IRS is not always familiar with their own rules.

Putting FAQs on the InET website would be helpful.

It was recommended that each state do a “show and tell” at the next meeting on the resources and materials that they have that would benefit the other InET states.

Question: How are we protecting our binational kids? A: FERPA. There is a safe way to get information. It was recommended that there be a short training on CURP. Andrea at CME has a presentation on this. She also does a presentation on the differences between the Mexico and U.S. school systems. It was

noted that Mexico experiences the same thing we do with students being behind in school and not speaking the language (there are many limited Spanish speaking students who travel to Mexico after years in the U.S. and do not understand or speak Spanish). For example, Mexico's teachers are not often prepared to teach students using sheltered techniques.

Regarding Activity 3.1.3., we need to collect examples.

Develop a one sentence explanation of acronyms related to the InET acronyms that are provided in the proposal as there are a lot of new terms that states may not be familiar with.

Send all forms out electronically (both handouts and PowerPoint presentations).

As follow-up, we will wait to get feedback from OME on the InET performance measures and share the meeting materials from today with missing states. In closing, we were reminded that three InET activities are key: Implement, coordinate, and evaluate

The next ILT Planning Meeting is scheduled for March. It is expected that it will be held on Sunday, March 3, 2013. After that, the final ILT for Year 1 will be held during the NASDME Conference, perhaps from 5:00 – 6:30p on one of the days. Jonathan suggested that we use Doodle to rank times and top choices.

To close the meeting, participants answered the question, "Did we reach our objectives today?"

Objective 1: All agreed "Yes"

Objective 2: All agreed "Yes"

Objective 3: All agreed "Yes"

.