



InET Consortium

InET Leadership Team

Washington, DC

February 23, 2015

Holiday Inn Capitol Hotel

Senate Room

Work Session Notes

The work session began at 8:30 a.m. with a welcome by Mary Ann Losh, Lead State Director, from Nebraska. She asked all to introduce themselves. Others present included: Mary Haluska (AZ), Noemí Treviño (MN) Julie Chi (MN), Mary Ann Losh (NE), Sue Henry (NE), Jonathan Fernow (OR), Carmen M. Medina (PA), Barbara Patch (CIG Coordination, NH), Susan Durón (META), Frank S. Dávila (InET), Rachel Crawford (OME).

Frank reviewed the agenda and packet of materials and set the expectations of the work session using the PowerPoint presentation.

Quality of Strategy Implementation

Susan reviewed the QSI, data forms, and the specific responsibilities by each state in completing the QSI. Rachel asked how we identify BN migrant students. Susan shared the OME definition of a BN migrant student as being: *A binational student is an eligible migrant student who makes a qualifying move between Mexico and the U.S. with his/her parents or as an emancipated youth at least once in the last 36 months. (Note: this definition is not the same as the definition of a migrant child according to Mexican standards.)*

Jonathan and Carmen indicated they use the COE and State Data to identify and retrieve information related to BN migrant students. Rachel asked if other countries are included in the BN migrant data base. Susan responded that the Consortium was written to include migrant students only from the U.S. and MX based on the definition. Jonathan added that BN migrant students often move from Mexico and are binational but they stop in another state and when asked where they come from, they say the name of a U.S. state. There is an End-of-Year (EOY) verification process for accountability. The ILT requested that Forms 1 and 3 be sent electronically to all members along with a Survey Monkey form for completing Form 1.

InET Expert Workgroup Update

Frank reviewed the work of the InET Expert Workgroup by sharing the rubric used to review the modules and the notes of the IEW work session in AZ. The purpose of the Rubric was explained so that all understood they can use the Rubric with individuals or groups who are reviewing the different modules within their state. The IEW notes were reviewed and the ILT agreed to accept the recommendations of the IEW to reconfigure the sequence of the 6 modules as noted in the IEW notes. Mary Haluska, a member of the IEW, gave a brief review of the work accomplished and the process to review each module individually and then as a group to determine the best results.

Binational Forum

Jonathan provided a brief update of the ongoing developments in staging a BN Forum. He reported that IMEC is not able at this time to commit to taking the lead in hosting the BN Forum. IMEC may consider next year. Their concern is the multiple dates for national conferences and meetings and the short time frame provided by MX in setting a date for the BN forum. With respect to attending the BN Forum in MX, he indicated there are restrictions on the U.S. side from attending. Rachel mentioned that the MOU between the U.S. Department of Education and SEP is still active. A consideration in holding a BN Forum is to schedule it in conjunction with a planned conference/meeting such as NASDME, IMEC, etc. It was suggested that an extra day be added to the existing meeting that could focus on a BN Forum meeting. States will support travel expenditures for directors to travel to NASDME or IMEC (or another meeting) but not to Mexico. Jonathan and Mary Ann will continue the conversation with IMEC and NASDME.

Brief Updates from ILT

One general topic centered on the distinction between a Teacher Exchange and a Visiting Teacher. Jonathan reported that Antonio has designed a comprehensive checklist for the Teacher Exchange Program that is to be used in MX and the U.S. The checklist is a monthly detail of what the organizations need to accomplish with set deadlines so that the sending and receiving country and teachers can be fully prepared to engage in the Teacher Exchange program. Carmen indicated this includes a background check and expectations of the teachers when they arrive in the U.S. MN, PA, NE, and OR are willing to provide added information on the Teacher Exchange Program and to offer more information on the differences between a Teacher Exchange and a Visiting Teacher.

A request was made to use InET as a portal when sending information to MX. Frank will work with the webmaster on this. Frank will send a reminder to the ILT to submit articles for the eZine.

Carmen reported on a Diploma Project and a toolkit that helps BN migrant teachers support students and families in helping students graduate. PA, OR, and NE indicated that they offer Leadership Seminars related to HEP and CAMP to increase the visibility and importance of both programs.

Follow-up/Upcoming Events

Frank reviewed the upcoming events with emphasis on the InET ILT meeting in Seattle. The work session was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.