



Meeting Notes

InET Leadership Team (ILT)
Washington, DC – February 10, 2014

Members Present

Doug Boline (Kansas); Frank Dávila (InET); Susan Durón (META); John Farrell (Kansas); Jonathan Fernow (Oregon); Liliana Graham (Colorado); Sue Henry (Nebraska); Mary Ann Losh (Nebraska); Bob Lynch (New York); Helen Malagón (Washington); Carmen Medina (Pennsylvania); Ralph Romero (Arizona); Leigh Schleicher (Minnesota); Unable to Attend: Mary Lou Wells (Idaho)

Welcome and Introductions

Mary Ann welcomed everyone and asked the ILT members and guests to introduce themselves. Frank thanked everyone for making the extra effort to attend this meeting which meant travel on Sunday.

Purpose and Overview of Agenda

Frank discussed the meeting purposes as being to 1) review InET Year 1 Annual Performance Report (APR) and seek ILT thinking and input for Year 2; 2) review and receive updates on InET committee and module work; and 3) look forward and plan for Year 3 which includes the NASME conference, fall ILT meeting, and other activities. He reviewed the meeting agenda.

InET Annual Performance Report Overview

Susan reviewed the APR with the ILT, by project goal and GPRA outcomes (See the copy of the APR contained in the packet). We covered the progress made, by goal, and where we met (and did not meet) our objectives, and how to leverage progress toward the work that needs to be done in Year 2. Next we covered the Year 1 Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII) contained in the APR. Susan noted the importance of getting state outcome data in by the due date since many states require quite a lengthy amount of time to get the required signatures from their chief state school officer or his/her authorized representative.

Brief Update of Committee/Module/Materials Work

Update on Electronic Materials – Frank asked that more states contribute to the e-Zine. He thanked the states that contributed and noted that everyone has been pleased with the articles. During Year 1, e-Zine articles were provided by the states of Colorado, Nebraska, Oregon, and by Andrea Vázquez and Frank Dávila. During Year 2, articles were prepared by Oregon and Bob Lynch of the National PASS Center. For Years 2 and 3, some sample ideas for e-Zine newsletters are: The Apostille, Summary of how technologies were presented in the webinars or professional development; different InET state initiatives and success stories; CIG collaborations, etc.

There are three sets of electronic materials that were identified for development: 1) binational parent/family engagement; 2) lessons for secondary binational students and binational OSY; and 3) lessons for Spanish language development and literacy/math lessons for PK-12.

Parent Survey – First, Frank briefed the ILT on binational parent/family engagement materials developed by the Workgroup including a survey. The ILT had a number of suggestions to improve the parent survey, specifically:

1. State the purpose of the survey at the beginning. It says we will use this information to design and improve our services, but state the specifics of what it will be used for.
2. At the beginning, ask: What are the services you received? (This should be in place of the existing question #1).
3. Use parent-friendly language
4. Reduce the length of the survey
5. Move question #11 to the beginning of the survey and change to: What is the best language for communicating with you?
6. Delete question #12

7. In question #1, separate academic and support services (perhaps into two columns). You could put the form on landscape if that helps. Ask, Do you know what the State's MEP measurable program outcomes (objectives) are? (List the MPOs for the state that is doing the survey). Include pre-K training in the list of types of services. In question #2, add a 5th box after *Somewhat satisfied* stating Satisfied. In question #3, What's the purpose of this question? If it's not clear, delete. In question #4 define support services. In question #6 change Common Core and Keystone to State assessments throughout.

Frank noted that the lessons for secondary binational students and OSY as well as literacy and math lessons for Pre-K through grade 12 will be developed in collaboration with the reading, math, and OSY CIGs. There is no need to re-invent the wheel since some high quality materials already are being developed through the other three consortium efforts. Next, Frank presented an update on the work plan that workgroups will be addressing for Year 2 modules and materials (See the PowerPoint handout in the ILT packet). The three new modules have been developed and are in the review/edit process. The three modules that remain to be completed are Modules 4 (Parent Engagement), Module 5 (OSY/InET Resources), and Module 6 (Mexico/US School System).

Binational Forum – Jonathan presented a proposal to the group for InET to disseminate its materials, in collaboration with the other CIGs, at the binational forums coming up in Mexico in fall 2014 and in the U.S. in fall 2015. He stated that the forums provide a unique opportunity to explore new thinking and review ongoing initiatives, strategies, resources, and materials to support migrant students.

A collaborative effort would help to renew professional connections among educators on both sides of the border to sustain interstate efforts on behalf of shared binational migrant students and take advantage of educational technology initiatives. Ralph will be presenting a one-page handout (See the handout in the ILT packet) at the Annual Directors' Meeting on Tuesday, 2/11/14 to garner support in these efforts.

PowerPoint Presentation on Research-based Resources for Binational Secondary and OSY – Frank introduced a draft PPT and received ILT feedback; specifically:

1. Shorten the presentation—it's too long—and make the focus more on technology. As-is, it appears that the focus is on English learners and bilingualism.
2. Slide #3 should be changed to a brain graphic. The word English and some of the other words stand out making the viewer to think that those languages are more important than the smaller words.
3. Slide #5 should be changed. It looks like the “*mal ojo*” to some of the audience. Check with Minnesota as they have some clips on post-secondary students and parents that could be used instead.
4. Add information on the *Plazas Comunitarias* and some technologies that specifically support binational students.
5. On slide #10 and beyond, expand. This section is what the PPT should be about. Shorten everything prior to #10.
6. Slide #9 – lower case “A” in the word “and.”
7. Slide #18 – Change “ELs” to “Binational” and make the “And” lower case.
8. Slide #27, More Resources: Add HEP and CAMP, the Pennsylvania Diploma Project, and information on the ABCs of Dropout (Researcher: Balfount).
9. Connect this presentation with the InET products that have been developed.
10. Overall, the presentation is too text-intensive. Follow the PowerPoint “Rule of 7” with no more than 7 words per line and no more than 7 lines per slide.

CIG Collaboration – Bob Lynch provided an update on CIG collaboration efforts between InET and Migrant Literacy CORE, Math MATTERS, and SOSOSY. He pointed out that there are a number of points of collaboration that cross consortia including curriculum materials and strategies, joint dissemination of materials, and joint presentations. He shared that the CIGs would be presenting at the ADM tomorrow as well as at the NASDME conference.

Year 3 Forward Thinking

The ILT members shared their ideas for activities for Year 3 of InET. Most importantly, they felt that the InET materials should be made accessible and “friendly” for staff and parents and there be attention given to quality in implementation of InET materials and strategies. This might involve professional development, technical assistance, mentoring, webinars, etc. Other ideas include:

- CIG collaboration: Sue reported that Nebraska did training on Modules 1-3. The exchange teachers from Mexico that came to Nebraska were provided training and community information found the InET materials useful as did the host sites that were coordinating with the visiting teachers. Staff from Nebraska also attended the training-of-trainers for Math MATTERS and they now use this math curriculum. Sue reported that they will be meeting with the director of SOSOSY to see about collaborating on binational OSY. They have gained an arsenal of high quality instructional materials through partnering with other CIGs.

- Curriculum and instruction dashboards: There is information and materials on the use of data for decision making, especially for research-based intervention. Mary Ann has information on how to acquire dashboard templates and procedures. Susan has done some research on the use of dashboards and will provide ideas on how this will apply to InET.
- Time for revision and adjustment: Fine-tuning the implementation of InET strategies, measuring implementation, and using implementation data for improving services is an area of interest.
- Training-of-Trainers (TOT): For each InET module, it was suggested that there be speaking points added to the PPTs and a TOT held. To maximize staff availability and minimize expenses and travel, it was suggested that this occur in Clearwater in September 2015 in coordination with the Binational MEP Forum.
- Joint dissemination with other CIGs: This activity that would feature InET-developed materials could occur at dissemination events, steering team meetings, or technical advisory team meetings of the three other CIGs.
- Expand tools to binational migrant parents: Using the existing InET-developed materials and strategies, this suggestion involves making them parent, student, and OSY-friendly. How can states modify and support this material or strategy to be used at home? How can we make our materials parent friendly? How can we adapt the existing materials for various audiences? (e.g., change the vocabulary, translate the materials into Spanish).
- Provide opportunities to learn new technologies: This suggestion would be supported by technical assistance and training on the various technologies developed and featured by InET.

Upcoming Events

Frank shared several events that are on the horizon.

- NASDME, San Antonio, TX, April 6-9, 2014
- InET ILT Spring Meeting, San Antonio, TX (during NASDME), April 5, 2014, 2:00-5:00 p.m.
- InET ILT Fall Meeting, San Diego, CA, September 24 (pm), 25 (am), 2014 in coordination with the Migrant Literacy CORE steering team meeting.
- OSY Dissemination Event in Clearwater in the fall of 2014. SOSOSY will be focusing on OSY and has invited the other 3 CIGs to present their materials with an emphasis on OSY.
- Online learning collaboration –PASS is working to go online. There is a plan in place to make a smooth transition from paper to online. The paper and pencil version of PASS will be continued, but the online option will soon be available. Bob Lynch reported that work already has been done on this through collaboration between SOSOSY and PASS.

Final Thoughts and Closure

Jonathan asked about ways we could be sharing InET materials with non-CIG states to get their input. Others wondered about contacting and inviting new state directors to be collaborators. It was clarified that since we have a Year 3, we couldn't be inviting new states to participate as part of InET; however, we can disseminate via InET website and contract made during directors' meetings and other events.

Helen asked about what districts use for credit accrual and how do they like what they are using. It was suggested that a list be put together on credit accrual options, cost, and the contact information for someone who is using it. Jonathan stated that Oregon has a list of about 20 sites that they distribute. Ralph noted that there is resurgence in foreign language instruction in his state. The Board of Border Governors has foreign language instruction on their next meeting agenda.

Frank noted that any training-of-trainers event has to be a joint decision. Are modules to train trainers? Or are they to be used *for* training? Carmen said that they asked the SOSOSY director to look at the modules and determine if they are appropriate for a TOT (since SOSOSY has been developing modules for 5 years now). The ILT decided that each state will need to train someone and to appoint that someone to come to the training. How the materials should be focused is a general ILT group decision, not a Workgroup decision. This may be a goal for Year 3.

Leigh noted that it is helpful to states when meetings are connected. Another comment is that while it is true that it is helpful to more than one meeting during a week to save on time and travel, there should be a limit. More than two meetings result in a long week of sitting. One way to make sure meeting planning is efficient is to get the dates out early so that directors and others can plan ahead. This should include an official agenda along with the early invitation.

Liliana reported that for the first time in a while, Colorado is sending eight exchange teachers to Mexico in March 2014. The Deputy Commissioner may be attending, as well.

Jonathan stated that he needs to read through the APR more closely than he did when it was submitted in December. He requested that Susan prepare a checklist planner of data to be reported with timelines as a way to help ensure that states have everything for the APRs on time. He asked that there be a cover page that includes what states need to do. A state-specific checklist would be helpful.

Ralph noted that Arizona is working on the electronic student records exchange with the Mexican State of Sonora. Sonora and Arizona are trying to expand the high school transcript to also include elementary students.

Mary Ann reviewed the follow-up needed and thanked everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.