



Innovative Educational Technologies

InET Leadership Team (ILT) Meeting

Washington, DC (At the ADM)

Monday, March 4, 2013

ILT MEETING NOTES

In attendance: Cindy Bartelsmeyer (Ft. Scott CC), Laura Blancas (CO), Frank Contreras (CME), Frank Dávila (InET), Susan Durón (META), John Farrell (KS), Jonathan Fernow (OR), Mary Ann Losh (NE), Helen Malagón (WA), Carmen Medina (PA), Ralph Romero (AZ), Noemí Treviño (MN)

Unable to attend due to weather: Mary Lou Wells (ID)

- **Welcome and Introductions:** Mary Ann opened the meeting with the welcome and introductions. See the PowerPoint presentation for additional details about the meeting.

Frank D. shared the meeting purpose and outcomes with the group. He stated that he would like to meet in person with binational parents in CIG states. Meeting with staff and parents would provide an opportunity for learning together about initiatives to make InET more robust and relevant based on the criteria set for the states. He is committed to share states' work and comments. One of the design features of InET is to imagine, plan, and design InET to improve programs and services for binational students. Frank stated that during this meeting, we will review the progress made, discuss what has been achieved already and identify what needs to be done (e.g., identify coaches).

Susan Durón noted that this is a brand new consortium; as such, InET has to be clear that the CIG was designed to develop materials, train staff on the delivery of services to binational students, and put state systems in place to identify, serve, and evaluate binational services. This year is focused on developing systems, materials, and professional development around the InET performance measures and the expectations contained in the Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII). InET is about developing processes, procedures, and materials to support binational students; delivering professional development to support those who provide instruction; providing services to eligible binational students; and working collaboratively to operationalize the common definition of eligible binational migrant students among the eight consortium states.

- **InET Performance Measures:** Susan reviewed the InET performance measures.
 1. Develop/pilot/post three electronic modules annually and develop materials
 2. Provide professional development (PD) to support teachers/administrators who work with BN students

3. Institute policies, practices, procedures (i.e., initiate and expand state systems)

The goals and measurable outcomes/timelines were reviewed. Susan stated that there will be an Interim Performance Report for InET that most likely will be due in May or June. Once the modules are developed, states will need to respond with how usable, practical, and useful they are. As states pilot (measure 1.3) the modules, states will then be asked about the extent to which professional development around the material been useful. In measure 1.4 about technical assistance, Frank will work with you in your state. See the FII for a listing of all performance measures.

Goal 2 has four objectives.

- 2.1: Five staff in each state will provide feedback on pilot materials.
- 2.2: States will use three technologies to deliver reading and math instruction to binational students.
- 2.3: Staff will rate services and professional development.
- 2.4: The activities listed in the FII for Goal 2 will be rated.

With respect to Goal 3, the measures are as follows:

- 3.1: There will be a 25% Increase over baseline services. Will be asking states for the numbers of binational students. This will require that states have a way to identify/count their BN students.
- 3.2: There will be a 20% increase above baseline data. Looking for an increase.
- 3.3: States will update their CNA to include data to address the needs of BN students.
- 3.4: States will update their SDP around BN students for program outcomes and activities. Make sure it is on the radar screen for your CNA and SDP update committees.
- 3.5: 90% will report participation in webinars, etc. and show a gain between pre/post on learning.
- 3.6: The activities listed in the FII for Goal 3 will be rated.

Comment (Noemí Treviño, MN) – *“InET states need to be clear and consistent on who is a binational student. Having an identifier is a big concern. In some states, there are no systems in place. With the SDP update coming up next year, in our state we have to figure out a system to identify binational children and youth. Many states have a very small window to identify, capture data, etc. We will make sure that addressing the needs and providing services for binational students is on the agenda with the CNA update committee.”*

Comment (Carmen Medina, PA) – *“States may not be able to show a 25% gain because new people may not be coming in.”* Susan’s response: *“You can show a percent gain in services even though you have fewer students.”*

Regarding eligible binational students, Frank C. stated, *“Many binational students come through Texas. Probe where they were born, where they resided before getting to your state. States will find many binational students based on where they were before during the 3 year window. Find a way to determine their binational status. You may have to communicate with districts in Texas. This is very doable. InET states need to agree on the process and come to a common understanding.”*

Comment (Ralph Romero, AZ): *“We should develop a common definition. Typically, states count numbers differently based on how they understand the definition. All InET states should agree and have the same understanding.”*

Comment (Jonathan Fernow, OR) *“This could be done by simply asking the student ‘Have you been to Mexico in the last 3 years?’ If the answer is ‘yes’, then probe a little further to determine if they made a qualifying move.”*

Comment (Ralph Romero, AZ): *“Some restrict to more movement between Mexico and the U.S. than just the 3 years.”*

Susan responded that if InET is continued for a Year 2, the CIG will document procedural definitions. It is good to be able to work through this and come to consensus with only 8 states.

Frank D. stated that through technology and the use of the InET website, there can be appropriate portals to the various InET states. We can look at school definitions and apply what we learn to how to work with binational students.

Susan continued that the FII is updated monthly and documentation provided on the project progress and the activities. The FII allows the project to stay on schedule, clarify who is responsible, and serve as a tool to communicate outcomes among CIG states.

- **Data Collection Forms:** Susan continued by stating that there are 6 InET forms as listed in the PowerPoint presentation. Form 6 (Needs Assessment Survey) already has been completed by all eight InET states for Year 1 of the Consortium.

FORM 1 – End-of-Year Survey is most important form for this year. Everyone probably is aware that there are new GPRAs. We need clarification as to whether InET will be responding to the old GPRAs (that were in place when the CIG applications were responded to) or the new GPRAs. States will need to compile the data for the APR, which includes both project objectives and GPRAs, and address the questions in Form 1.

Comment (Ralph Romero, AZ): *“In Form 1, you ask for a percentage. As you improve identification, it will be harder to get your percentage. Because numbers and percentages will increase, isn’t it a disincentive to identify students?”* Response: *“For Year 1 and option Year 2, if funded, we will look at percentages. The next funding period, you may want to consider numbers and percentages. But the project is written with outcomes based on percentages similar to how the GPRAs are worded. As we talked about earlier, if the number of students decreases, it’s not reflected in the percentage of services that are provided if you continue to increase the percentage of services. For states just beginning to get their systems for flagging binational students in place, you can estimate, but indicate this by using an asterisk (*).”*

Susan continued by addressing question 5 and the need to put in numbers such as tutoring, lunches, ESL for the baseline, Year 1, and Year 2. The **Interim APR is due soon. For this Year 1 grant and the Option Year two, please be on time with reporting your state’s data.** And remember, this in an implementation grant for which much of the development has already been documented.

Regarding question 7 on Form 1, the InET Leadership Team meetings and workgroup meetings are counted. Later there will be more meetings and professional development that occur (and should be documented) in your states. Consider professional development on binational issues that is provided at NASDME, the Binational Forum, etc. The APR shows all states and all meetings that address the project objectives as professional development.

FORM 2 – Meeting Satisfaction Survey is a SurveyMonkey form that will be emailed to participants during the week following a meeting. Watch for this and respond as quickly as possible. It only takes 3 minutes.

FORM 3 – Instruction Materials, Pilot, and Review Feedback Form is pretty basic. When piloting a module or material, use this form for your feedback.

Comment (Carmen Medina, PA): *“Do the training modules have to go the OME approval process?”*
Response: *“No, this is a state initiative and does not carry the Federal Government approval process or disclaimer; however, as part of the monitoring process, OME may be reviewing the materials produced.”*

FORM 4 – Technology Module/Materials Feedback Form: Once the materials have been piloted, each state will designate five (5) instructors who use the material to respond and provide feedback on the module using Form 4.

FORM 5 – Staff Training and Technical Assistance Survey: This is for you to use in your states. Put the title of the TA session or training on the form and answer the questions.

FORM 6 – Needs Assessment Survey: This form will be used twice during the grant—once each fall. The Year 1 survey already has gone out and you all responded in a timely manner.

What states are responsible for is communicated in the PowerPoint, slide 10. If you have any questions, contact Susan at (303) 550-3333 or duro1@meta1.us

- **InET Website:** Frank introduced the InET website and noted that the domain is registered. Frank asked that each state MEP director send a photo (and a brief bio) to Frank to include on the website. There will be a separate portal for each of the 8 InET states. Frank asked that states provide information for the website using the handout in the folders. While the domain is set, the website is not yet live. The goal is to go live by April 2, 2013.
- **InET Brochure:** Frank reviewed the essential components of brochure. He stated that it will be on the website and you can print out the number that you need. On the back of the brochure, states can add information unique to each state, especially the contact information.
- **Modules:** InET will develop six modules over the two year period of the grant. The first three modules scheduled for Year 1 are on track. An outline and timeline have been established for Year 1. The six module topics were identified through Form 6, the Needs Assessment Survey.

Frank provided a quick review of Module 1 (see the PowerPoint presentation). Frank will be sending out a draft sometime in March and asks that states provide feedback on the draft as soon as possible using Form 3. Once the feedback from Form 3 is received, Frank and the Module 1 team will revise Module 1 and then the module will be posted on the InET website and sent back to states for use in the field. Please ask 5 instructors that use the materials to provide feedback using Form 4.

Strategies to support binational students in language, academics, etc. will be included in the modules. The Teacher Exchange is the focus of module 2 and the original needs assessment had two modules, Teacher Exchange I and Teacher Exchange II. Eventually, Teacher Exchange II will be titled *Teacher Exchange*. It is more detailed than the Teacher Exchange I which will be covered in the Teacher

Exchange Manual that OME currently is revising. Module 3 is almost done and should be completed sometime this month.

- **Cadre of Coaches:** Frank asked, “*Who in your state can deliver training on the modules?*” Coaches are those who will take the modules and do a webinar or state-to-state presentation. For example, a coach from Minnesota could provide a webinar in Arizona. He asked for states to provide a list of names of those who would be good coaches. Presentations could be live or recorded and placed on the website. One idea is to come together and have a big kick off training-of-trainers, then the coach or presenter could be contacted afterwards for clarification, to answer questions, or to provide guidance. Questions could be recorded and made available on the website. Compensation can be provided for someone who is not part of your staff. We are flexible to bring someone in if necessary. Send names to Frank. In the back of the packets are some possible resources .
- **Educational Technology Samples:** Each state will be using two new educational technologies each year as part of the objectives of InET. Ralph mentioned a pilot project that is being done between Arizona and Sonora around the transfer of secondary school records. Carmen mentioned another technology used in Pennsylvania that teaches about poetry. Both of these samples should be added to the list of innovative technologies that Frank has prepared. In order to add to the list, directors should send any information they have to Frank.

Ralph suggested that we change the title from *Educational Technology Examples* to *Educational Technology Samples* to avoid a supplanting issue. Because many of the binational migrant coordinators also have responsibilities for coordinating ESL and migrant programs, these individuals should be documenting that they have used the technology. It should be suggested that sites work with their state MEP director when choosing materials. Frank will add a more detailed disclaimer and add a column for feedback to the *Educational Technology Samples* handout. Frank will contact ILT members for more information.

- **State Reports:**

Jonathan noted that there have been many changes in the State of **Oregon**. The MEP fits in with state goals for early childhood, graduation rates, ESL, HEP/CAMP, and preschool. Materials are now available for parents to collaborate with the schools to help meet the Common Core Standards. They break the curriculum into pieces and provide a 2-step instruction.

Helen (**Washington**) noted that the MEP received an award for services provided. The Dream Act was introduced by the legislature. HEP and CAMP programs are active and do much to support migrant student leadership. The Dare to Dream program is a weeklong academy with career planning, evaluating transcripts, etc. to prepare students to enter the university. They also are looking at math and science with middle School programs focusing on science, math, and writing. The program will serve 500 students. Helen stated that there is a new supervisor at the State who is dedicated to responding to MEP needs.

Carmen stated that In **Pennsylvania**, the administration priorities and cutbacks are causing a large reduction of funds. The First Lady is championing dropout prevention “Opening Doors” to graduation. The MEP already has some efforts in place and the state is coming to MEP for direction. The Wellness Program to improve health is another initiative in which the MEP is taking a leadership role. The MEP has great partnerships in place with higher education. There are MEP weekend (specifically Saturday)

programs in the state. The legislature since 1957 has been funding the MEP as a state initiative. This legislation was in place even before the Federal MEP came into existence. The law is still active.

In **Minnesota**, Noemí shared that the state is focusing on early childhood and the Race to the Top. Applications for programs are going out. Minnesota is updating its CNA and SDP. The CNA is underway in 2012-13 and the SDP will be the focus for 2013-14.

- **Miscellaneous:**

- 1) Regarding the alignment of courses between the U.S. and Mexico, if someone has already done this, please share the information. The National Pass Center has experience with course/credit alignment. Frank noted that alignment information could be shared on the InET website.
- 2) Frank shared some resources that are pertinent to the binational migrant student including *Implementing Effective Instructions for English Language Learners, 12 Key Practices for Administrators, Teachers, and Leadership Teams*, by Suzanne Wagner and Tamara King.

- **Follow-Up**

- 1) As soon as possible, each director should send a photo to Frank (and brief bio) for the state portal of the InET website.
- 2) As soon as Frank sends Module 1 for review, Directors and/or their designees should review the module and provide feedback using InET Form 3.
- 3) It was agreed that a fall ILT meeting is needed and decided that it be attached to the OME meeting in Albuquerque in October. Since the ILT meeting, OME announced at the ADM that there will *not* be an OME meeting in 2013; therefore, the group needs to decide on the date and location of the fall ILT ASAP.
- 4) Directors should send samples of innovative technologies for use with Binational Migrant students to Frank as soon as possible.
- 5) Frank will revise the title of the Educational Technologies handout to read: *Innovative Educational Technologies Samples* and add the technologies suggested by Ralph and Carmen.
- 6) Susan will send out the ILT meeting evaluation form (Form 2) during the week of 3/11/13 to all participants.
- 7) Frank will revise the list of InET contacts and send to all directors/designees.
- 8) Directors should send the names of potential coaches and their areas of expertise to Frank. He will compile the Cadre of Coaches list and post it on the InET website.
- 9) Susan will send out a data request to directors once OME announces the due date for the Interim APR.
- 10) Frank will send out an announcement to InET states when the website is up and running.