



InEt Leadership Meeting

October 22, 2013
Portland, Oregon

In Attendance:

Laura Blancas – CO; Frank Dávila – Coordinator; Susan Durón - META; John Farrell – KS; Jonathon Fernow-OR; Sue Henry – NE; Mary Ann Losh – NE; Bob Lynch, Consultant; Helen Malagón – WA; Carmen Medina – PA; Jennifer Quick – FSCC; Antonio Ramos – OR; Ralph Romero – AZ; Noemí Treviño –MN; Andrea Vázquez – Vázquez Educational Consulting ; Mary Lou Wells – ID

Welcome: Mary Ann

Mary Ann welcomed and thanked everyone for coming to the meeting as an opportunity for interstate coordination around technology and binational migrant students and to discuss where we've been, what we have accomplished, and where we are headed. It is always helpful to have state support. She thanked Jonathan for hosting the InET ILT meeting in Portland, Oregon.

Overview: Frank

Frank reviewed the agenda, documents, and handouts in the folder regarding the review of the first year of the grant. He asked the group to let him know of any state-specific changes to the contract information sheet. Appreciation was expressed to everyone for the work on module development and suggestions for improvement of the work via the piloting. A thank you was expressed to Paige Inman & John Farrell for preparing the materials for the meeting, to Jennifer for organizing the meeting venue, and to Andrea for sharing her experience and insights in reviewing and editing.

Review of Data: Susan

Susan noted that in putting together the annual report, everyone has done so much and it shows in reporting the data. Eight states is a small group to accomplish so many objectives, but it is evident from the data how much has been done. She stressed the importance of documentation. Clearly, the summary of needs assessment data that was completed in fall 2012 evidently drove the work for InET.

- **Review of Year 1 goals and activities (FII)**

There still are some data that need to be submitted. When all data are received, the report will be sent to states by November 1st to review and use for obtaining signatures from their Authorized Representative. For this meeting, Susan put together a preliminary dataset for states to review and discuss during the meeting. Any changes will be reflected in the report sent to states on 11/1/13.

The InET Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII) has been completed for Year 1 with the Performance Measures being met for all three InET FII goals. Susan stated that the Year 1 APR is due to OME by December 30, submitted by the Lead State. Draft Letters for each state were distributed and Susan asked states to look at their respective letter and make sure names and other information are correct. She emphasized that OME requires only items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, and 12 completed and those items are pre-populated on the Cover Sheet. Each state only needs to obtain the signature and date the Cover Sheet. If there are any changes to be made, contact Susan to let her know; otherwise, ILT members were asked to get it signed/dated by Dec. 10th and returned to the address indicated. Carmen asked if states could have an executive summary. Susan stated it will be included in the APR, but also sent as a separate attachment, per her request.

- Review of Year 2 goals and activities (FII)

A big activity for Goal 1 is the development of Modules 4, 5, and 6 (See FII goals 1.1.18 thru 1.1.21). These modules will be finalized in March 2014 to allow use in the regular year programs of Year 2 of InET during May, June, and July as well as during the summer programs. As with Modules 1, 2, and 3, a Survey Monkey form needs to be completed by states for module development as well as forms for the perceived value of professional development.

Measurable outcome 1.4 addresses requests for technical assistance and will continue to be expanded into Year 2. Item 2.1.15 reflects a challenge with respect to support for a binational forum. The operation of a forum is not a function of InET. The project could provide presentations on InET activities at the forum, if invited. If there are program implementation outcomes or changes to state systems that include binational students, this is something we want to document and present these effective practices. Currently, Minnesota, Oregon, and Nebraska are revising their state CNAs and/or SDPs. Several states are in the process of making revisions that may be shared regarding the type of strategy approach in the CNA and SDP. The Administrative Tasks section of the FII (bottom of pg. 9 and 10) found in the Year 1 FII was used to help InET as a new project get started. This section will not be included in the Year 2 FII as the tasks have all been completed.

Frank mentioned that Module 5 addresses the CNA and SDP process and how to make changes to include binational migrant students and the use of technology. If there is information to be shared about these processes in states, please send it to Frank.

- Year 2 Data Collection Forms:

1. Form 1: Directors' end-of-year survey
2. Form 2: ILT meeting satisfaction survey
3. Form 3: Materials and resources review form
4. Form 4: Staff training webinar and technical assistance effectiveness survey

Form 1: Comments

It was noted that there were a number of states whose numbers changed substantially with respect to graduation and dropout rates. A question that emerged was how do states collect information so that they know who binational students are? Some suggestions made and ideas included:

- Through COEs, you can pull data reports for migrant/binational and migrant/non-binational; any services need to be broken out within migrant; break out differences at the front end.
- Data are not always pulled automatically in some of the states.
- We have a separate database for migrant students and a formal agreement to populate migrant and binational. Different states access data in different ways with one goal to build capacity.
- Several years ago, one state did a sample of binational and migrant students. It was a big "aha" moment for the state.
- One way to do it is to write down outcomes and activities as they happen to avoid having to reconstruct the outcomes at the end of the year.

- Lessons Learned:

Form 2: Susan distributed Form 2 and stated that it needs to be filled out and returned as staff development is completed:

Form 3: This is a one-page form for use by anyone in states who review InET pilot materials. It could be the MEP director or anyone from one of the local sites. For example, if you review Module 4, fill out the form. Andrea clarified that this form is replacing the old forms 3 and 5. Each state would complete three of these forms. Remember, September 1, 2014 is the deadline to submit all forms.

Form 4: This is to address technical assistance and training.

All of these forms will be on the web next week. We will remove the old ones.

Question: *Regarding the training Form 4 – Is it from me to my staff or my staff as they go out and do training?*

Response: *It is used for both types of training.*

In response to how many modules we are supposed to pilot, the response is three modules. Three staff from each state that have reviewed and used the modules should complete the forms. Since some modules were received late this first year, this will be commented on in the APR. We need to make sure all 6 modules are covered collectively.

- Suggested Ideas and Thinking for Year 3 (Grant and non-Grant Supported)

- Modify and translate into Spanish all relevant InET documents. For example, when giving information to parent advisory groups or sharing with parent involvement providers. Also, translate the module on the differences between the U.S. and Mexico education systems.
- Provide a training of trainers (TOT). This is a more effective way to reach more people through providing content and developing presentation skills in state trainers and polishing the module implementation. Review how Mexico is supporting the BN program and provide information that can be shared with parent groups.
- Regarding the next Binational 2015 Forum to be held in the U.S., it was reported that every other year the Forum is held in the U.S. During Year 3 of the grant, InET states may consider assisting in the planning of the 2015 meeting agenda in the U.S. The forum requires a great deal of planning and logistics to prepare for this event.
- Should we poll how states want to be active in working on the binational Forum (not through InET, but as states that might work together?) OME is not supporting this through a Contractor/Subject Matter Expert as it has done in the past.
- Planning groups have been tasked to offer ideas on work related to a TOT that would help meet our goals and to review how InET may support the Forum.
- Some states are interested in more innovative technology and the Cadre of Coaches.

- State reports on outcomes:

Arizona – The process for the consortium work is taken very seriously. We are putting greater emphasis on binational students on the Teacher Exchange Program and multi-language resources. We are meeting with representatives on how we can bring some other languages into the process. The state has modified its certification rules to allow teachers to demonstrate qualifications; align the foreign certificate to parallel the J- Visas; and empower the LEAs to find out if certificates are renewed and in hands of the district, not the state. The state will be telling its story on the Annual Performance Report.

Colorado – The state is working on dissemination of information about binational students and the use of technology. At the state conference, we presented two of the InET modules and it went well. The state collaborates routinely with the Mexican Consulate in Denver. What can InET do to help establish good relationships with Consulates? Can we set up a meeting?

Idaho – Early on in the project, she felt disconnected and needed to pull back because of being the only staff member in the State working on migrant education and having to manage multiple priorities. They will be more involved, especially with the data pieces. She learned that coordination with those assigned for the state to the project is essential.

Nebraska – The state collects COE information to identify the needs of binational students. We participated in co-training with teachers from Mexico which gave us a better understanding of the grading system and how schools operate in Mexico. Our Exchange teachers co-presented and were well-received. Eight staff piloted Modules 1, 2, and 3. The timing of materials could have been better as we didn't have a lot of time for implementation after getting the final version of the modules.

Minnesota – Timing was a challenge with respect to implementing the materials. The state started with three sites and communicated with others about the materials. A lesson learned is to rely on colleagues in the consortium for implementing programs. I've learned that if you're not at the table, you get "volun-told" (volunteered-told).

Oregon – The state has learned how to better identify binational students. They are adding binational student markers to the State COE and gathering information systematically. The State is going through reorganization, adding 112 positions to the SEA. Definitions added to COEs have resulted in recruiters asking more questions and focusing more on binational students. Trainings are critical, but this is just the beginning. Training goes along with implementation; staff are knowledgeable about binational students, but school districts need to be made aware of binational documentation and be informed about those who may have dual citizenship.

Pennsylvania: A courtesy communication was requested at the SEA level as LEA/regional staff assigned to a project may not always communicate everything due to being busy. Items need to be developed in a more timely way so that piloting can be scheduled and conducted. Ongoing local TV and media involvement can provide a means for involving more binational families.

Washington – The state has its own migrant database. We need to send/receive information on students coming from other states. We are looking at the field offices since staff don't necessarily have a good understanding of the modules yet, especially the new ones. The training component is important.

- Technology: Ralph, Frank, Andrea:

Ralph discussed the focus on the transfer of documents up to 9th grade, especially with the states that border the U.S. There have been problems in documenting records and not having an appropriate Transfer Document process. For example, it took months to send and receive student records and it happened many times in different states. The issue was raised with the Border governors of 10 states in Mexico and the U.S. Arizona and Sonora were selected to study how to fix the problem. Initially it was fixed by developing a system utilizing paper, pencil, and the telephone—a long process that took months. The alternative and current process was explained via a PowerPoint presentation and handouts (see meeting materials). Ralph will share the model used if other states are interested.

Andrea shared information about Prezi, an alternative to PowerPoint that allows for creative development and then report generation. www.Prezi.com is a web-based presentation tool with a canvas that is limitless. She demonstrated the pro's and con's of Prezi vs. Power Point. She noted that the InET Workgroup at the Denver meeting in September brainstormed their thoughts using Prezi application. She shared a Prezi that included highlights of the past Forum. To conclude this session, Frank demonstrated the InET Website and pointed out the three modules online.

- Budget discussion and handout: Jennifer

Jennifer thanked the group for welcoming her to the group and that she appreciated all the support and positive feedback. The budget was summarized, noting that state billings will be done in the next two weeks. State contribution will be made for supporting Year 2 of InET and if Year 3 is funded, the expectation is that fees will remain the same as Year 2. She explained the regulations regarding food and beverage under grant monies.

- InET's Role in Projected Activities: Mary Ann

Mary Ann asked for recommendations about places where InET can meet in conjunction with an existing meeting. NASDME is scheduled from April 5-9. She asked if we should be submitting a presentation application. Perhaps InET could do a presentation with the InET state directors as Panelists. Could April 5th be the ILT meeting date? Also, she noted that there may be a joint-CIG meeting at the NASDME Conference. We talked about the ongoing activities that are known:

4/5 Saturday, 8:30a-1:00p PASS
4/5 Saturday, 2:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m. InET ILT
4/6 NASDME 8:30 to noon; 4 p.m. opening
4/7 Migrant Literacy CORE 8:00 a.m.-12:00 noon
Migrant Scholarship Auction 4/7 (Monday night) at 7:00 p.m.
4/8 Wednesday 1/2 day

SOSOSY and the Migrant Literacy CORE meetings are scheduled in San Diego during the week of 9/22/14.
9/22 Migrant Literacy CORE will meet on Tuesday, 9/23 in the a.m.
SOSOSY meets beginning on Wednesday afternoon and all day on Thursday, 9/24.
On 9/25, InET could meet all day?

- Update on the Work Plan: Frank

With respect to the Work Plan, we don't need to recreate anything that has been done already. There are lots of good materials that can be accessed from other CIGs. We need to focus on what are best practices for teachers/tutors who work with binational students using technology as a tool. Questions and ideas that emerged as a result of brainstorming include:

- The ELL educators in the field thought about the ELL component and wanted to determine if it is a migrant issue and not an ELL issue. We need to know who the binational students are and plan for their needs.
- When we label more and more, we are getting back into isolation/segregation issues. It is better to integrate skills and differentiate it with students. How can we ensure those characteristics of a binational migrant student are taken into consideration so that teachers know how to meet student needs through technology in the general classroom, in Title programs, and in summer migrant programs? What is the

application for technology pieces? How can we use technology to help binational students? The MEP is supplemental to state and Title funding; we don't need to be re-creating the effective practices that are out there, but tailor them in a supplemental way for binational students.

- Susan reminded the group that our focus is on the three goals that InET is charged with per the proposal and Performance Measures and also consider the use of technology, the unique needs of binational students, and aspects such as the Teacher Exchange Program that support binational students.

- Collaborating across CIGs: Bob

InET and the three other CIGs (Migrant Literacy CORE, Math MATTERS, and SOSOSY) have common themes: serving OSY through content areas, especially reading and math; professional development; interstate coordination and collaboration; and the use of educational technology and technology use for instruction. Examples of points of collaboration are the courses developed called *Math on the Move* and *Math for Living*. These contain mini-lessons and curriculum-embedded pre/post assessments. They are suitable for binational students, OSY, and migrant students in elementary, middle school, and high school. By accessing these materials, there would be no duplication. A CIG master calendar was shared with the group. Bob mentioned that this calendar could be hosted on each of the CIGs' websites. In collaboration, the directors of the four CIGs could add to or change the calendars, as needed.

- Forward thinking: Frank, Andrea, Susan, Mary Ann

Frank invited the group to break into groups to take 10 minutes for discussion on several items that will be coming up during Year 2:

1. Training of Trainers (TOT): Laura, Ralph, Frank, Mary Lou, Carmen, Helen

- a. Purpose: Each state sends two or three individuals. Develop a short application
- b. Process: Talk to Susan Altgelt in Region 20 of Math MATTERS
- c. Timeline: Carmen will meet with Tracie Kalic of SOSOSY and maybe model after the recent SOSOSY TOT. Nov. 6th 4:00 pm EST
- d. The group needs to investigate the cost of a TOT

2. Binational Forum: Susan, Mary Ann, Jonathan, Ralph, Andrea

- a. Purpose: Consider how to best support the U.S. Forum in 2015
- b. Process: Communicate with other states and with Mexico
- c. Timeline: First through webinars, move forward with planning. Consider a November conference call.

3. CIG collaboration: Bob, Noemi, Sue, John Farrell

- a. Purpose: Streamline and avoid duplication of efforts to disseminate and share information across CIGs. Expand networking and knowledge among all projects. Consider a joint-dissemination event.
- b. Process: Talk with other CIG directors. Approach the SOSOSY director to see about doing InET sessions at the SOSOSY Dissemination Event.
- c. Timeline: Contacts made within the next two weeks.
- d. Costs unknown at this time.

- Wrap up: Frank

Frank closed the meeting asking each person for a comment about the meeting. Participants were positive in their feedback, thanking Frank for the clarifications and noting that this meeting was a good learning

experience and opportunity to work together and collaborate across states. There was general agreement that the face-to-face format builds cohesiveness and promotes interstate coordination.