



Meeting Notes

InET Leadership Team (ILT)
San Diego, CA– September 24-25, 2014

Day 1 – September 24, 2014

Members Present

Mary Ann Losh welcomed the group and asked that the group introduce themselves. The following participants attended: Ralph Romero (AZ), Laura Blancas (CO), John Farrell (KS), Noemi Treviño (MN), Mary Ann Losh (NE), Jonathan Fernow (OR), Antonio Ramos (OR), Damaris Henry (PA), Lupe Ledesma (WA), Frank Dávila (InET), Susan Durón (META), and Andrea Vázquez (META).

Welcome and Introductions

Mary Ann welcomed everyone to San Diego and indicated that we are looking forward to Year 3. She then asked the group to introduce themselves. Frank thanked everyone for attending the meeting and indicated that he appreciated all of their hard work.

Frank Dávila then welcomed the group and introduced and welcomed the new directors – Tomás Mejía from Colorado (represented by Laura Blancas) and Mea Moore from Washington State (represented by Lupe Ledesma). He then introduced Bill Bansberg and Rich Rangel from the Migrant Literacy CORE Consortium Incentive Grant.

Overview: Migrant Literacy CORE

Bill provided the group with a brief history of the Migrant Literacy CORE Consortium. The ML CORE started as a materials' development CIG and has evolved over time. It focuses on literacy and reading. A handout was given to the participants that outlined the mission, current participating states, objectives, etc. Bill shared the website that provides access to thousands of lessons that are available for free to teachers, etc. (www.migrantliteracynet.com).

The ML CORE website has a search feature that helps teachers identify appropriate lessons for their students' specific needs. Bill also shared the Electronic Success Plan which is a plan that can be used to provide students with online tutorials. Information about this was distributed as a handout. The online tutorials are designed to be confidential. Bill and Rich then fielded questions from the group:

Q: What grade ranges do these materials cover?

A: PK-12 and some OSY

Q: Are there any of these materials for which you do not have access if you are not in the CIG?

A: Only the tutorials because of the individual student assessment data; however States can be set up to have this access for a small fee so that administrator privileges can be set up. Contact Bill if you are interested (billbansberg@comcast.net). Susan pointed out that those states that are in

the process of updating the SDP might want to consider these materials as appropriate to the identified State needs to show pre- and post-assessment data.

Q: *Is there a tutorial or someone who can show us how to use the materials?*

A: *Bill indicated that if you send him an e-mail, he will send a PPT of the step-by-step process to use the materials.*

Purpose and Overview

Frank discussed the meeting purposes as being to 1) Review InET Year 2 APR to include piloting Modules 4, 5, and 6; 2) Review and receive updates on InET committee/module work; and 3) Look forward and plan for Year 3. He also reviewed the Intended Outcomes: 1) Identify plans and activities that need ongoing solutions and support; 2) Discuss completing Year 2 goals, and 3) Confirm and prepare plans for Year 3 InET goals and activities. Frank then reviewed the meeting agenda.

Focus on Year 2 Goals and Activities

Frank provided a brief overview of the InET Electronic Materials that were developed and piloted during Year 2 which include Binational Parent/Family Engagement and Lessons for Secondary Binational Students and Binational OSY. The Modules developed and piloted during Year 2 were as follows:

- Module 4: Evaluating Services to BN Migrant Students
- Module 5: Binational Students in CNAs/SDPs
- Module 6: Mexico/US School Systems

Andrea then shared a chart depicting the states that have submitted their Forms for piloting the modules. Nebraska and Oregon received special recognition for being the only states to pilot ALL six modules. Participants were informed that it is not too late to submit their forms. Some participants mentioned that they are in the process of getting the forms ready to send in. Susan noted that some states were not able to get the modules piloted during Year1 because they were received too late and their training sessions were completed. Year 2 shows a much more complete set of pilots that were done by states.

Year 1 InET Modules 1, 2, and 3 Pilot Forms Received								
Module #	AZ	CO	ID	MN	NE	OR	PA	WA
1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2	X				X	X	X	
3		X			X	X	X	
Year 2 InET Modules 4, 5, and 6 Pilot Forms Received								
4	X	X		X	X	X		X
5	X	X			X	X	X	
6	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
TOTALS	5	5	1	2	6	6	5	2

Brief Updates related to Year 2 Activities

Participants were then asked to provide brief updates of Year 2 activities:

- AZ – Conducted a lot of training. MEP staff meet every other month with their recruiter to go through the Modules. Mary Haluska has told Ralph that there has been a lot of interest for more information on the Mexico school system.
- CO – The exchange teachers from Mexico were tasked with piloting Module 6, which was very helpful for the revision of the modules. Laura commented that if there are any other questions regarding the Mexican School System, we can forward them to her and she will get the correct information from the Mexican teachers that Colorado worked with. She added that recruiters and regional directors were trained on all of the modules. She also remarked that the Electronic Materials on Parent Involvement did not really work well for them as a tool to use **with** parents; rather it was better suited for use with *staff*.
- MN – Noemi reported that the weather somewhat hindered their ability to pilot all modules/EMs because their MEP summer program was late and sites had staggered starting dates. They did provide the training to the local coordinators. It was rather overwhelming because they are in three different consortiums. One success discussed was related to the Teacher Exchange Program. This summer they had one teacher who was screened during his visit to Mexico by Antonio Ramos and the teacher that was selected was an excellent match for their program. The teacher participated in a parent group. She stressed the importance of maintaining their native language.
- NE – The summer work with binational teachers was very successful. The teachers from Mexico were able to be with the MEP staff when Module 6 was presented and were very helpful in responding to the NE staff questions. Some participants in the pilot commented that it really helped them think through the stereotypes they had about the Mexico school system. This provided an opportunity to consider how they arrange their services in the State of NE.
- OR – Oregon reported that they have been changing a lot of their trainings to focus on why the data has to be collected, how to use it, and its benefits to better serve binational students. Additional feedback was given on the importance of the binational families' language. The Parent Involvement Electronic Material was presented to the State PAC and it was decided to have a statewide symposium to present this material. The ID&R fall training for ALL staff that work with MEP students was completed that included a parent component and the Binational Transfer Document. There has been a large increase in the number of bilingual programs statewide causing a need to find teachers who are bilingual and bicultural to teach in these positions. There is also a need to provide services to students from other Latin American countries as well as the communities in Mexico (e.g., States of Oaxaca, Michoacán) that speak an indigenous language; so in working with parents, this is not information that is shared with the staff. Oregon has included a question on the COE asking if they speak a language other than Spanish or English. It is very important to continue training staff on the culture of the communities where the students live.

PA – The State of Pennsylvania has had a lot of training for data specialists and others on the Modules. They also piloted the module on the Mexican school system in conjunction with the Binational teachers from Mexico who were participating in the PA MEP.

WA – Washington trained at the regional level using some of the Electronic Materials such as *Teaching Using Digital Story-Telling* which was very successful. Frank asked Lupe if she would submit a draft of an e-Zine article for this project to include on the InET website. Washington also reported to the group that the interstate MEP student has a totally different culture than the Binational MEP student.

Activity - Lessons Learned from InET Work

Andrea led an activity to collect “lessons learned” in the various states on the following four topics:

1) Coordination and Collaboration; 2) Collecting and Reporting Data; 3) Professional Learning and Development, i.e. face-to-face, webinars, technical assistance, materials, etc.; and 4) Materials Development. The lessons learned that participants shared include the following:

Coordination and Collaboration

- *Plan ahead on how to utilize the knowledge of the Binational teachers so they can view and apply the Modules*
- *Providing webinars and meetings helped to collaborate with state directors*
- *Have a joint CIG dissemination activity*
- *Include NASDME, Mexico, CIGs, and IMEC in dissemination events*
- *Terminology; awareness of unique needs of BN students*
- *Trainings; more communication, more coordination with groups named above*
- *Having materials on-line provided access to other entities to help BN migrant students*
- *Provided a platform within the state to train MEP state workers on working with BN students*
- *Challenges included time zones and busy schedules (3 responses)*
- *Must be intentional – invest in creating relationship across CIGs and providing opportunities for brainstorming/networking*
- *I called other states for opinion/perspective on given topics*
- *Not having established an “amistad” face-to-face to facilitate seamless dialogue*
- *Called other states in the development stages*
- *We shared material with state office addressing secondary student needs to reach a broader audience*
- *A challenge was needing to spend time educating other entities about the goals of InET*
- *Collaborating with the MX teachers*

Collecting and Reporting Data

- *Forms provided by CIG, SurveyMonkey*
- *A challenge was timing of evaluation content being made available*
- *Get on the radar early on with requesting the data*
- *Challenge – forgot the pre-score knowledge and post-score knowledge after the training; basically collect the documents immediately after the training*
- *Do not make everything due at the same time and as well as the CSPR*
- *Requested for reports to be run for specific data – mobility report, number of Transfer Documents, etc.*

- *Accessing and filtering down state-level data specific to BN students*
- *We gathered surveys/evaluation forms right after the training*
- *During regional meetings discussions were held*
- *Difficulty identifying Binational students from migrant students in MEP database*
- *State started identifying BN student on the COE*
- *Recommend other states with difficulty in identifying Binational students identify them on the COE*
- *Data collection was done through state data person*
- *Data collection should be done a year behind*

Professional Learning and Development

- *Find specific audience for the materials presented*
- *Do not assume that the staff being trained is familiar with cultural and academic needs of binational students*
- *Trainings (face-to-face)*
- *Lack of knowledge: do a sessions on “Who is the Binational migrant student” before any other training*
- *Not enough time to cover each module sufficiently*
- *The trainer not being totally comfortable or convinced with the content yet needing to train on materials*
- *We had face-to-face training during the summer kick-off*
- *Staff didn’t really identify with particular modules that were required to be piloted*
- *Require that all sites rotate modules over the years so that all get covered over a 3-year span*
- *Combined coordinator, parent, recruiter training into one*
- *Offered one-on-one training and webinars*
- *Had monthly webinars with recruiters and staff*
- *In process of bringing staff in for one-on-one is high therefore the solution is web*
- *Face-to-face, webinars, technical assistance, intra-state collaboration*
- *Time – staff already is overloaded*
- *Having enough resources to add staff and expertise*
- *Use existing networks and proven practices*
- *Create more professional development amongst us as we were not prepared well enough to answer questions*
- *The challenge was that the parent/family engagement materials needed to be focused so that those who are not aware of Binational migrant students don’t get the background information.*

Materials Development

- *Find the right time*
- *Try to think long-term (technology-focused, interactive, current, updated content)*
- *We collaborated with other states in contributing materials for modules*
- *Make sure that strategies/activities are Binational-specific, not just ESL- or migrant-specific*
- *More targeted research/development is needed to focus on binational issues*
- *Our challenge was distance and we overcame this by emailing the PPT in “draft” for back-and-forth discussion until a consensus was reached*
- *We worked with other states on a PPT addressing resources for secondary students*
- *Cross-state collaboration provided a better product and provided for better ideas obtained from several states*

- *The audience for each of the modules is different; therefore care should be taken to ensure the right audience is participating in the module training*
- *Creation of materials is challenging as InET had to “start from scratch” because there was a lack of existing models*
- *Make sure that there is enough resources to do materials and module development as staff already is very busy*
- *Provide more time to disseminate the modules before we have to pilot them*

Year 2 Evaluation Activities

Susan then led a discussion about the Year 2 evaluation activities. She distributed a sample of the ED 524b Cover Sheet and asked participants to review the form to ensure the information in the General Information section is accurate. She congratulated the states that already have submitted the Year 2 data (Form 2): Colorado and Washington. She then shared the sample of the pre-populated Form 1 with a note that all data is due to Andrea by September 30, 2014. Susan reviewed all of the Year 2 Forms which include: 1) Form 1 – InET coordinator End-of-Year Survey; 2) Form 2 – ILT Meeting Satisfaction Survey; 3) Form 3 – Materials and Resources Review Form; and 4) form 4 – Staff Training, Webinar, and Technical Assistance Effectiveness Survey. Also included for the Year 2 reporting is the InET Year 2 Mid-Year Teacher/Administrator Exchange information. The participants were then asked to take a short quiz on Year 2 Evaluation. Next, the Year 2 APR instructions were covered, with emphasis on State directors’ requirement to: 1) review the APR; 2) obtain the signature on the 524b from the authorized representative; 3) return the cover sheet via overnight mail to Andrea by December 12, 2014.

Exploring the InET Website

Frank continued the meeting by walking the participants through some highlights from the InET website. He indicated that he is still accepting contributions from states for the InET Briefs and the InET e-Zine articles. There was a suggestion to add the OSY Dissemination Event on the Calendar of Events, as well as the InET ILT Meeting which will be held prior to the NASDME Conference in Seattle. The ILT Meeting will be held on Saturday, March 21, 2015 from 2p to 5p in a meeting room TBD. Laura shared that whenever she is in Mexico, she shares the InET website with the people in Mexico and they all find it useful. There also was a suggestion to put a link on the InET website to the page on the RESULTS website that links people directly to the US MEP Directory.

InET Budget for Year 3

The discussion on Year 3 budget was moved from the Day 2 agenda to Day 1 and Mary Ann reviewed the Year 3 budget with the group. Ralph asked why we lost a state and Mary Ann responded that the director was involved in another CIG and felt that the commitments were too many. OME allowed this since the initial CIG commitment was a 2-year commitment. Jonathan asked if the group felt that there were enough funds to carry out the tasks since the one state dropped. Frank responded that since Year 3 doesn’t have much materials development, there should be enough funds. Frank asked the group if they agreed with the Year 3 budget and the group unanimously approved the budget.

Summary of Day 1 and Overview of Day 2

Frank thanked the group and indicated that the Day 2 meeting would convene at 8:00 a.m.

Day 2 – September 25, 2014

Welcome and Summary of Day 1

Frank welcomed the group and indicated that a change was going to be made to the agenda in that there would be a small discussion about InET beyond Year 3. Mary Ann indicated that there are three choices that the InET group can make: 1) end InET and go separate ways; 2) join another larger CIG and include BN/technology objectives within another CIG; or 3) go forward and apply as the InET for the new cycle. This will be discussed at a later date.

Focus on Year 3

Participants received a copy of the Year 3 Plan and were asked to participate in the “*What’s New? What’s Different*” activity where participants were given an index card with questions from the Year 3 Plan. After the participants answered the questions, the group reviewed the correct answers and Susan reviewed the components, key features, goals, and objectives of the InET Year 3 Plan. She also reviewed the Outcomes and Performance Measures, Evaluation Activities, and Year 3 Forms. The forms for Year 3 include: 1) InET Coordinator End-of-Year Survey; 2) ILT Meeting Satisfaction Survey; 3) Quality of Strategy Implementation (QSI); and 4) Staff Training, TOT, Webinar, and Technical Assistance Effectiveness Pre/post Survey.

A more-detailed explanation was given about Form 3 – Fidelity of Strategy Implementation (FSI), as this is a new form that is used to determine the fidelity to which the strategies are implemented. One FSI per state will be maintained and completed. Susan clarified that the FSI does not replace the FII and she walked the group through the Year 3 FII, a tool that is used by the evaluator, project coordinator, and the lead State to look at the tasks/activities in light of their level of being completed. The FII was enlarged to be poster-sized and placed on the walls around the room for easy viewing. Susan emphasized Form 4 should be completed each and every time any training or technical assistance is provided (e.g., if Frank travels to a state to meet with the director and provide technical assistance or training, the director completes Form 4; if a director provides training at the local level, they complete Form 4). Jonathan requested that the Form 1 be sent pre-populated by September 1, 2015. Andrea will follow-up on that.

InET Activities and Collaborations During Year 3

1) e-Zine Newsletters, Photos, Ideas

Frank asked if any states would be willing to contribute to the e-Zine Newsletters or provide photos or ideas. The following states reported that they would provide submissions on the topic specified below:

WA – digital story-telling to include photos and video

NE – follow-up article on the BN teacher taking the next steps to allow the teacher to stay for the year

CO – SEP book training, to include photos

PA – La Paloma, overview of the work.

AZ – electronic records

MN – benefits of having a BN teacher in a summer program, from the perspective of a local site (tentative)

OR – Math program coordination with John Hopkins University

2) Educational Technology Resources

Frank asked the group if anyone would be willing to submit information about the educational technology resources they have used. The following two states replied that they will provide submissions on the topics below:

AZ – follow up from Yuma Union Technology from previously submitted

OR – webinars with iLink for binational training purposes

3) Collaborating with the other 3 CIGs

Susan reviewed the collaboration across CIGs that is specified in the Year 3 Plan. She reviewed the other three CIGs (Migrant Literacy CORE, Math MATTERS, and SOSOSY) and then reviewed the specific objectives from InET that indicate the collaboration activities (e.g., website links; joint presentations at the National Migrant Conference, Annual Directors' Meeting, SOSOSY Dissemination Event, etc.; attendance/presentations at other CIGs' steering team meetings). She asked if there were any other ideas and none were noted.

4) Binational Forum

Jonathan provided an update of the Binational Forum Planning, the most recent interaction being a phone conference held on August 21, 2014. The last Binational Forum was held in March 2013 in Washington, DC. To date, the location and/or the date of the next Forum have not been finalized by Mexico and the Forum after that will be held in the US in the fall of 2015. IMEC has been approached to either combine with our meeting and/or the IMEC meeting to facilitate state participation in the Forum. Jonathan, Ralph, and Mary Ann met in June with Francisco García at the IMEC meeting and he was agreeable to pursue this possibility. It is on the IMEC agenda for the October 2014 meeting to see if IMEC is agreeable to have it as part of the IMEC fall 2015 meeting.

A possible venue for the Forum is Clearwater, Florida due to affordable hotels and accessibility for U.S. and Mexico participants. The State MEP director is agreeable and indicated that the Mexican Consulate in Tampa would be a great resource. Jonathan indicated that he will contact Elsa Patricia, the Binational Coordinator for Mexico and Roberto Franco from the SEP to ascertain their plans for hosting a Forum this year.

A discussion ensued about the tentative dates for the Forum when it is held in the U.S. Originally, the third week in September was suggested; however the 22nd and 23rd of September, 2015 already are scheduled by ML CORE which will be having its fall steering team meeting.

Presentation of InET Train-the-Trainer

Frank informed the group that this was originally planned as a webinar; however due to time and schedule constraints it did not happen. Frank walked the group through the Training-of-Trainers presentation and asked if there was any feedback. None was noted.

InET Expert Workgroup (IEW)

Susan drew the participants' attention to the objectives in the Year 3 Plan that include activities involving the InET Expert Workgroup (IEW). Frank reviewed the role of the IEW and Susan and Andrea stressed the importance of these IEW members to be "worker bees". The following nominations were made: Mary Haluska (AZ - if the meeting can be held in Phoenix), Laura Blancas (CO), Antonio Ramos or Jonathan Fernow (OR), Sue Henry (NE), and Damaris Henry (PA – she said she was willing if Carmen

agrees). The group agreed that the meeting can be held in Phoenix with a date TBD. Ralph will look into a venue.

Teamwork Activity on InET Modules and Materials

Andrea led the group in an activity to provide feedback on what needs to be done in Year 3 on the Modules Presenter's Notes, Resources, Updated PPT slides, and Information. Since this includes 6 Modules and 5 Electronic Materials, a debriefing page will be developed for the IEW to use at their next meeting to provide a starting point for the revision and refinement of materials.

Upcoming Events, Follow-up, and Meeting Evaluation

The next meeting will be held on March 21, 2015 from 2p to 5p in Seattle, Washington with the meeting place/room TBD. Additionally, collaboration with other CIGs was encouraged by asking the participants to consider attending the SOSOSY Dissemination Event in November in Clearwater, FL. Susan distributed and asked ILT members to complete a survey received from Migrant Literacy CORE about interstate and inter-CIG collaboration.

Frank asked the group if they had any final comments. Laura gave Frank a video on the Binational Exchange in Colorado and it will be posted on the InET website. Also, CO is hosting a SEP textbook training Oct 20-23. Everyone else thanked the group and expressed appreciation for the work done thus far. Frank thanked the group for their participation, attendance, and hard work and the meeting adjourned at 12 noon.