

DRAFT

Title I Committee of Practitioners

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 31, 2018

9:00 AM

Meeting Locations:

Video Conference

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Department of Education	9890 South Maryland Parkway	Board Room
Department of Education	700 East Fifth Street	Board Room

Call to Order

Ms. Gabby Pingue called to order, from Las Vegas, the meeting of the Title I Committee of Practitioners at 9:04 AM on Thursday, May 31, 2018.

Roll Call

Mindy Montoya, Nevada Department of Education Administrative Assistant, conducted roll call. **Quorum was established (16 members present)**

Committee Members present in Carson City: Sara Jorgensen, Brian Prewett, Valerie Dockery, Holli Kiechler, Karen Barreras, Candi Ruf, Renee Fairless, Mallory Foley, Randi Hunewill, Rich Mares

Committee Members present in Las Vegas: Gabby Pingue, Teresa Stoddard, Somer Rodgers, Kelly-Jo Shebeck, Rhonda Hutchins, Reggie Galloway, Annette Dawson Owens, Melissa Schroeder

Committee Members on Telephone: DeAnna Owens, Teresa Dastrup

Others present: Kristina Cote, Colin Usher, Apryl Black, Greg Kramer, CJ Miller

Introductions

The following people introduced themselves for the record:

Ms. Gabby Pingue, NDE, Title I Program Director and Federal Liaison
Ms. Rhonda Hutchins, NDE, Title I Education Programs Professional
Ms. Somer Rodgers, Parent, Clark County School District
Ms. Teresa Stoddard, Nye County School District Board Member
Ms. Kelly-Jo Shebeck, CCSD Title I Coordinator, McKinney-Vento Liaison.
Ms. Melissa Schroeder, NDE, Equitable Services and Private School Ombudsman
Ms. Renee Fairless, Lead Principal for two Mater Academies located in Clark County
Ms. Sara Jorgenson, NDE, SPSCA Education Program Professional
Ms. Candi Ruf, Carson City School District, District Curriculum Coordinator and CTE
Ms. Valerie Dockery, Director of Grants and Special Projects Carson City School District

Introductions (Continued)

Ms. Mallory Foley, Washoe County School District, CTE Teacher
Ms. Holli Kiechler, Grant Coordinator, Elko County School District
Ms. Kristina Cote, NDE and Title I EPP
Mr. Colin Usher, Carson City Title I Team for Title I, Part D, Foster Care Point-Of-Contact
Ms. Randi Hunewill, NDE Assistant Director of CTE (Health Science & Public Safety)
Ms. Karen Barreras, Superintendent of the Diocese of Reno Catholic Schools
Mr. Richard Mares, Washoe County SD, Title I Accountability & Parent Involvement
Mr. Brian Prewett, Washoe County School District, Title I Director
Ms. DeAnna Owens, Humboldt County School District, Director of Special Programs
Ms. Teresa Dastrup, Elko County School District Board Member & Parent
Mr. Reggie Galloway, Achievement School District Democracy Prep

Nominations and Election for Chair/Vice Chair/Secretary

Ms. Gabby Pingue opened the floor for nominations, but before that, she asked Ms. Rhonda Hutchins to detail the duties and responsibilities of the positions.

Ms. Hutchins said the Chair and the Vice Chair are in charge of facilitating and running the Committee and presenting items for discussion or topics that are presented through the districts that need to be discussed by the Committee. The Secretary is responsible for taking meeting notes.

Ms. Rhonda Hutchins nominated Ms. Valerie Dockery for the position of Chair for the Title I Committee of Practitioners. Ms. Holli Kiechler seconded the nomination. All voted in favor. Ms. Valerie Dockery is the new Chair for the Title I Committee of Practitioners.

Ms. Teresa Stoddard nominated Ms. Rhonda Hutchins for the position of Vice Chair for the Title I Committee of Practitioners. Ms. Valerie Dockery seconded the nomination. All voted in favor. Ms. Rhonda Hutchins is the new Vice Chair for the Title I Committee of Practitioners.

Ms. Renee Fairless nominated Ms. Sara Jorgensen for the position of Secretary for the Title I Committee of Practitioners. Ms. Rhonda Hutchins seconded the nomination. All voted in favor. Ms. Sara Jorgensen is the new Secretary for the Title I Committee of Practitioners.

Public Comments #1

Ms. Gabby Pingue asked if there were any public comments, and there were none. She then moved on to the next agenda item, approval of flexible agenda.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Motion: Ms. Rhonda Hutchins made a motion to approve a flexible agenda, if needed. Ms. Teresa Stoddard seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved.

Statutory Purpose, Members, Terms of Appointment

Ms. Rhonda Hutchins gave a brief overview of this agenda item. The Title I Committee of Practitioners is a requirement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All state agencies that receive Title I funds must have a Title I Committee of Practitioners. The Committee must have representation from an array of Title I people and staff. The Committee meets twice a year. The Committee may provide advice or recommendations for technical assistance, templates or other related items for Title I. The Committee also serves in an advisory role to review proposed or final state rules or regulations pursuant to Title I. An example of a prior Title I Committee of Practitioners action was when the State of Nevada requested a waiver under No Child Left Behind. Ms. Hutchins

completed this overview by telling Members there was a new complete Committee list. She reminded Members the next meeting was a mere six months away.

Statutory Purpose, Members, Terms of Appointment (Continued)

Ms. Rhonda Hutchins moved on to the topic of terms of appointment. She stated that previously, all Members served for three years at a time, and all 26 members have now rotated off, leaving the Committee with no experienced Members. She said she was concerned because this cycle will perpetuate every three years. She proposed that terms be staggered instead. Ms. Hutchins said she would like the Committee to have a discussion on the terms (keep the fixed three year term or stagger appointments) and then make recommendations or suggestions for how to handle the nomination process going forward. Mr. Prewett asked for clarification: is the two or three-term limit per person or per position? Ms. Hutchins said it is per position. A brief discussion ensued about how to determine the two-year people vs. the three-year people.

Ms. Sara Jorgensen suggested that the officer positions be on two-year terms and the general membership positions would be on three. That way, at the two-year mark when all the officers' positions expired, you would have experienced members that could take officer positions and then you'd backfill membership. There was a lengthy discussion after this suggestion about splitting the terms, how to determine the participants, rotating location of officers, and rationale for parents and teachers to get two-year terms.

Ms. Somer Rodgers then recommended that the Committee be split evenly, half with two-year terms and half with three-year terms so the Committee would be switched out evenly every year after the two years. Additionally, she suggested representation by school district, not necessarily a title so that there's equal representation for every school district.

Ms. Valerie Dockery stated she didn't think there was equal representation for every school district, and Ms. Hutchins concurred.

Ms. Teresa Stoddard noted that school board members come up for election every two years so maybe they shouldn't be assigned for three years.

Ms. Holli Kiechler stated she thought the Committee's process was getting over-complicated. She stated with such a large group, they would not be able to find volunteers that would meet all the very specific requirements. She proposed that as peoples' terms expire or they change jobs, they would resign their position on the Board and that vacancy would then open up. And the Committee should not try to customize the terms of service to the very specific person who's sitting in the chair currently.

Ms. Valerie Dockery echoed Ms. Kiechler's views, saying the Committee should keep things as simple as possible because keeping track of membership would be cumbersome. She stated she liked the idea of general membership three years and officers two years and if people have to leave the Board, then they could bring in somebody else to finish that term and then look at that position again.

Ms. Gabby Pingue asked for clarification: as far as the vacancy goes, when somebody leaves, is the vacancy filled with someone who's representative of that position? An unidentified speaker said this was correct.

An unidentified speaker said if the Committee really wanted to have a lot of staggered positions with staggered terms, they would need another position on the Board as a membership officer. There's a real need because the job would be complicated, and membership needs to be tracked carefully.

Statutory Purpose, Members, Terms of Appointment (Continued)

Ms. Gabby Pingue asked if anyone wanted to make a motion regarding this new officer position.

Motion: Ms. Rhonda Hutchins made a motion to approve the addition of a Membership Officer. Ms. Valerie Dockery seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved.

Ms. Gabby Pingue clarified that the duties of the Membership Officer would include handling the membership as far as the nominations, and making sure that implementation of staggered terms (if approved) is a smooth process. Ms. Pingue asked for nominations for the new position. Mr. Prewett nominated Holli Kiechler for the position of Membership Officer for the Title I Committee of Practitioners. Ms. Randi Hunewill seconded the nomination. All voted in favor. Ms. Holli Kiechler is the new Membership Officer for the Title I Committee of Practitioners.

Ms. Gabby Pingue then asked if anyone wanted to make a motion regarding the staggering of terms.

Motion: Ms. Sara Jorgensen made a motion to approve the terms of membership as discussed: for officers to serve a two-year term and other members at large to serve a three-year term. Ms. Valerie Dockery seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved.

Ms. Randi Hunewill expressed a concern about the Committee website. The abbreviation for the Committee is "COP" and she thinks this might be mixed up with the Commission on Professional Standards. She hopes that as items are referenced, they aren't somehow cross-referenced.

Mr. Colin Usher suggested that maybe the abbreviation should have a lower case letter "o." Ms. Rhonda Hutchins said she would address that issue and make changes on the website.

Title I Updates

Ms. Gabby Pingue said members of the Title I team would be giving updates for different parts of the program that Title I oversees.

Brief Overview and Next Steps for State ESSA Evidence Work and Title I 1003 Program

Ms. Gabby Pingue detailed that under ESSA and then for state grants under AB 7; activities, strategies and interventions that LEAs and schools utilize must meet an ESSA Evidence Level 1 through 4. And for Title I 1003(a)'s, the School Improvement activities, strategies and interventions, those can only meet ESSA Evidence Levels 1 through 3.

ESSA really moves towards looking at Evidence levels and really moving away from just looking at research. This helps ensure that liaison schools are implementing intervention strategies and activities that have a strong likelihood of moving student outcomes.

ESSA Evidence Levels 1 through 3, so 1 is strong evidence, 2 is moderate evidence and 3 is promising evidence. And those are prioritized because these are all activities that demonstrate the statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes. Using the research study criteria there, it is based on at least one well-designed and one implemented experimental study for it to meet that strong Evidence level. So, that's like a randomized control study. The moderate Level 2, is evidence decided on at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi experimental study. Level 3, promising evidence, one well-designed and one implemented correlational study of

statistical controls for section bias. And then going to Level 4, demonstrates a rationale. So the writers of ESSA, who kind of wrote this evidence level into law, knew that there were effective interventions at different schools but those schools didn't have the chance to conduct rigorous research studies that would get them into Levels 1, 2 and 3. So they created ESSA Level 4, demonstrates a rationale to kind of help those activity strategies and interventions that didn't yet, again, have those studies, or opportunity to have those studies to meet one of the top three ESSA Evidence Levels, but to then give them some time and some flexibility to then be able to conduct those research studies that will then get those Level 4 interventions up to the top three levels.

Ms. Valerie Dockery asked if this topic could be an agenda item for the next meeting. She said that gathering and citing evidence is a pressing issue for directors all over the state. The focus is on citations. Additionally, not everything falls into Levels 1, 2 and 3, for example Family and Community Engagement. It's very difficult to find evidence in those areas, yet that is a huge part of Title I. There are many areas where that evidence is not under 1, 2 and 3. Ms. Dockery would like the Committee to discuss this issue and see what really works for kids.

Ms. Gabby Pingue said this item would go on the next meeting agenda.

Brief Overview and Next Steps for Title I NDE Guidance and Spending Plan

Ms. Gabby Pingue stated the Title I 1003(a) Program is the School Improvement Grant, which requires seven percent set-aside from the Title I funds that an SEA state education agency receives to support our Comprehensive Support and Improvement, or CSI, and Targeted Support and Improvement Schools. These are basically the new focus and priority schools from NCLB, just labeled differently now as CSI and TSI. So, the CSI schools are on the star-rating system. The one-star schools are schools that are in the bottom five percent of all schools in the state. These are high schools that have a graduation rate of less than 67 percent. And these are the schools that are on the current Rising Stars list. The TSI schools are going to be the schools that have an achievement gap within the certain subgroups.

The Assessment Data Accountability Management Team has been working on the TSI figures, and the list of TSI schools should be out in September. Title I 1003(a) funds can only support schools on the CSI and TSI list, and it's to implement activities, strategies and interventions that will help students meet the challenging academic standards for these schools. Priority is given to LEAs that serve high numbers or high percentages of TSI and CSI schools, demonstrate the greatest need and demonstrate the strongest commitment to using funds that is displayed within their application for these funds. NDA, as an SEA in Nevada, has decided to make these funds competitive. The funds for the school year 18/19 should be around eight and a half million dollars.

The Title I 1003(a) application was completed, reviewed, and preliminary awards will be out to LEAs by June 15th. A statewide forum on ESSA Evidence levels will be conducted over the summer/fall so LEAs and community members can understand where the State is moving in this work, and the rationale behind it. This will ensure that all stakeholders are on the same page and can help support each other in this work.

Ms. Randi Hunewill asked if the Rising Star List was posted on the website and could it be provided to Committee Members. Ms. Pingue responded in the affirmative for both. Ms. Pingue then introduced Ms. Kristina Cote from the NDE .

Brief Overview and Next Steps for Title I NDE Guidance and Spending Plan (Continued)

Ms. Kristina Cote thanked everyone for attending their first COT meeting, and shared some details about the funding cycle with the focus on allocation. There are many funding sources in the state but Title I Big A is the largest funding source in the State besides the Distributed Spending Account that students receive. She went on to give a quick review of their team, along with their responsibilities. *Ms Gabby Pingue* is the Title I Director and also the Federal Liaison for the State of Nevada. She also oversees the state and LEA allocations, along with our Fiscal and Grants Teams. She approves waivers for our school-wide programs, any other type of waivers that you might need, and oversees both Lincoln and Nye School Districts currently. *Ms. Kristina Cote* is the Education Program Professional supporting Washoe, Pershing, Douglas, White Pine, Mineral and Storey Counties. *Mr. Colin Usher* is an Education Program Professional and oversees supports for Carson, Churchill and Lander State Charter Authority and Achievement School District. *Ms. Rhonda Hutchins* is an Education Program Professional and oversees supports for Clark, Lyon and Esmeralda Counties. She also works with Title 5. *Ms. Karen Gordan* [phonetic] is an Education Program Professional and oversees supports for Humboldt and Elko Counties. There is one district in the state, Eureka, who chooses not to receive Title I funding.

The Title I Big A is the large pot of funding that's from USDOE to improve the academic achievement of the disadvantaged, especially meeting the education needs for those high-poverty schools and high-poverty districts to meet the State Achievement Proficiency Standards and a Proficiency test. This is a state-administered program; USDOE grants funds to states based on a complex statutory formula. Then NDE takes that funding and breaks it up based on the other statutory funding, which is happening right now at the NDE. And then, that's provided to Districts based on the statutory formula as well; based on poverty numbers. Districts then allocate the funds to schools based on rank and serving.

Ms. Cote then detailed the allocation part of the process. Preliminary allocations are generally released by USDOE in the early spring because that's when planning happens for the next year. Once the Federal funding comes over to NDE with the preliminaries, the State goes through a process of breaking out state set-asides; one percent that helps pay for NDE salaries, to help pay for the school improvement, the 1003(a) set-side, as well as other set-asides. NDE has a preliminary number that is being broken out into the different districts based on their poverty counts. After a USDOE liaison reviews the allocations, notification will be sent out. The target date for notification is the end of the week or next week. Allocations are based on poverty levels. Services should be based on academic need.

Title I, Part A does have a lot of flexibilities as far as how activities and interventions are chosen. Like 1003(a), the School Improvement set-aside for the most underperforming schools, Title I-A can meet levels 1, 2, 3 or 4. But it should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis, based both at the district level and the school level, and ideally should be aligned to both district priority schools; the school priorities, district's priorities and state priorities. The ultimate goal to have these students achieve on their proficiencies. Once districts determine schools and their poverty levels through rank in serve, they can choose either to operate on a school-wide level (SWP) or a targeted assisted level (TAS).

Brief Overview and Next Steps for Title I NDE Guidance and Spending Plan (Continued)

There are some requirements to operate school-wide versus targeted assistance. Most of the schools in the state operate on school-wide. It's an easier way to manage funds. Everyone gets a benefit of the school-wide funds versus targeted assistance, which would identify particular students who are struggling.

For school-wide programs, for example, you have to be at 40 percent level or higher to operate in school-wide, unless you apply for a waiver. Some districts apply for a waiver because maybe the data was a little off. They might be in the upper 30s and they're anticipating being school-wide next year, for example. If that's the case, then they would apply for a waiver to operate school-wide through the NDE Director, Gabby Pingue. And she will review and approve or give some sort of feedback whether it's been approved or not. Under school-wide, all students can receive the services, like comprehensive school reform. And most at-risk are given the additional assistance.

The Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools, which were identified through the Rising Star list last year, are called CSI schools. The lowest five percent of schools in the state, or under 67 percent graduation rate would be in those CSI schools. The Targeted Support and Improvement Schools will roll out in the fall. The students in CSI and TSI schools tend to be the most needy children. And if they are supported accordingly based on needs assessment, based on the needs of the school, the school and the students should all collectively succeed. Mr. Reggie Galloway asked when in the process is the needs assessment usually conducted? Ms. Cote responded that it varies from school to school and opened the question up to others. Ms. Valerie Dockery stated needs assessments are ongoing throughout the year. It starts at the district level with a district strategic plan. That sets goals and objectives for the district, and then the schools do their own specific needs assessment. Data is collected throughout the year with formative assessments that the teachers are giving; benchmark assessments across the district, math assessments several times of year, plus standardized assessments like the SBAC. Schools that have an SST meet regularly to review needs assessment data and progress towards the interventions and activities that they've set in their school performance plans. So, it really is an ongoing process of looking at the data and reassessing as you go along throughout the year and doing final revisions. Final revisions are usually done in the spring for the following year so that there's a plan going forward.

Ms. Randi Hunewill asked for clarification on Goal 4. Does Goal 4 mean that an LEA can submit to have first-aid and CPR training for their faculty or students?

Ms. Cote responded that it goes back to the needs analysis and then thinking about the purpose of Title I. The purpose of Title I is to help disadvantaged students make the State Proficiency Standards on the assessment material so connecting the request to that is imperative. Ms. Valerie Dockery stated that all funding requests should be tied into the school plan. And your budget and your planning for Title I needs to be supported in that plan. How will the funding request improve growth at your school?

Ms. Cote gave an example of a school buying materials. Materials are not necessarily a direct correlation to the goals. But if it's supporting an intervention that is on the plan to help with the end goal, then that makes sense. You would need those materials, the dependency to be able to support the intervention effectively, and to implement it.

Brief Overview and Next Steps for Title I NDE Guidance and Spending Plan (Continued)

Ms. Holli Kiechler asked how do you show that having a safe and supportive environment where teachers knowing CPR and first aid has an effect on outcomes for students? Evidence for Goals 1 through 4 is hard to gather and schools might not be able to document growth.

Ms. Rhonda Hutchins replied this is where “braided funding” comes in; how are schools using all of the funding that’s available? It’s not just about a specific fund, but it’s about the big picture and all the money that’s on the table. How are schools going to look at all of those pieces in support of kids and what are the parameters of each of those?

Mr. Prewett shared that his team did use the “braided funding” method for determining the best funding sources at schools. They met as a group for the specific schools and looked at how the funds were being leveraged. They discovered that not all funds needed to come from Title I. There are so many funding sources (21st Century Learning, Victory, Nevada Kids Read, Zoom, etc.) that if they are all kept together and put in place, it will be more efficient and address more needs, too.

Before her presentation time was up, Ms. Kristen Cote said she wanted to say a few things about school-wide and targeted private schools. She said that those schools tend to have a big percentage of students that are identified from FRL. Sometimes districts will pool their funding to provide more of a school-wide kind of service rather than specifically providing supports just for those targeted students, which might be more challenging. Ms. Cote stated that this item should be added to a future agenda so everyone understands what the services need to be to private schools and how private schools can utilize the funding that they’re getting, and what that consultation looks like in smaller districts.

Ms. Melissa Schroeder said a lot of private schools actually choose to pool their funding because it makes it a little bit easier to target a larger body of their eligible students that way. She agreed that this should be a future agenda item.

Brief Overview and Next Steps for Title I –D Neglected and Delinquent Program

Mr. Colin Usher introduced himself and stated he was hired as the Title I-D Coordinator for the state, but he often gets wrapped up in the world of Title I-A because that’s a major focus and there’s a lot of moving pieces. Title I, Part D is for neglected and delinquent students, and its focus is to help those students that are incarcerated or in neglected facilities. It’s helping them level the playing field with those students that are in the public schools. That translates to academic supports for those students that are in correctional facilities or in neglected situations. Some are very short-term and some are long-term. There are students in Lovelock Correctional Facility that are doing 10 years for murder. It’s Mr. Usher’s goal to get those students a GED or to graduate from high school and/or find a vocation that they’re excited about so that some day when they are released, they can come back into society and find a job and be productive citizens. The Federal funds are based on yearly neglected and delinquent numbers across the state. Although the program gets only a small portion of Title I funds, it’s really beneficial to those 7000 students that are receiving it. Mr. Usher then added some more details. Subpart I funding is the State agencies, who oversee the programs. Subpart 2 is run through the LEA. They’ve got programs that are directly through school districts. There are six facilities in Subpart I, and six districts in Subpart II. The Feds are really looking at, under ESSA, the transitional services that the state provides both when students transition to a facility and when they transition back to the school district. Mr. Usher said he and many educators across the state created a really solid template to track these students and their progress not only to the facility, but back.

And this will just be for students that are long-term, so within the program for 90 days. It's an innovative way to communicate with these students when they come into the program and they are asked about their academic goals and what they want their future to turn out to, and then through the process, track them and get updates on how that progress is going. One of Mr. Usher's roles is to ensure that the funds that are coming into the state are being used correctly, so he monitors the various programs across the state and studies Federal regulations throughout the year to make sure that things are allowable.

Mr. Usher described some of the programs under the Title I-D umbrella. The Children's Cabinet and Kid's Cottage help supplement educational resources while students are in their care. There are also adolescent treatment centers, juvenile courts, and detention centers that work on the transition of students to high school upon release. And incarcerated students can continue their education through facility programs. And finally, Mr. Usher said he had compiled some data about districts, facilities, and students, and he would be happy to supply that to anyone.

Mr. Reggie Galloway had a question. What about a single student who attended a charter school and somehow ended up incarcerated. How would that student continue their education? Mr. Usher responded that Title I-D funds could be reaching that student and you wouldn't even know it. There are several programs in Clark County that are funded through the district, so it would just be a question of where that student ended up and what their situation is.

Ms. Valerie Dockery said that in Carson City, they have a partnership with their alternative high school and the juvenile detention center and serve students in both facilities in a combination of in-person and online support. Students in the detention center are served by a licensed teacher from Carson City and use online tools to continue their education, and vice-versa. Ms. Dockery thinks their operation is similar to others in the state.

Brief Overview and Next Steps for Equitable Services for Private Schools

Ms. Melissa Schroeder introduced herself and said she is officially part of the Title I team. She works with all of the approximately 200 private schools in seven counties. She oversees private school licensing for the State of Nevada and also helps those schools in providing technical assistance in regards to regulations and compliance issues. She also oversees the Opportunity Scholarship Program, which is a tax credit program that allows families who meet a certain threshold of the poverty level to get funding for their children to go to private school. And finally, she serves as the State Equitable Services Ombudsman. She's the contact for private school questions regarding title funding and all Federal programs that private schools are eligible to participate in. The ESSA Ombudsman role was designated by the SEA, the State Educational Agency, to ensure equity for private school children, teachers and other educational personnel. Ms. Schroeder will be monitoring and enforcing relevant portions of the law for all of the Federal programs.

The ESSA regulation is focused on "timely and meaningful consultation" so that private schools are knowledgeable about the funding that's available to them, and also be invited to participate and utilize funding. Many private schools aren't aware what's out there and available for them in terms of Federal funding. Maybe this topic should be an agenda item for a future meeting?

Ms. Schroeder created an Ombudsman website (on the NDE website) with a lot of information and links to ESSA guidance on equitable services and consultation. All funding amounts allocated will be posted on the website. Her plan for the coming months is to develop and disseminate some guidance on consultation for districts and private schools to make sure that that "meaningful" consultation is happening. She has also created a template complaint form for private schools and she will work with the public schools and the private schools, the districts, to come to an agreement as far as services and funding. Ms. Schroeder asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Karen Barreras asked if there were plans to disseminate the Title I-D PowerPoint to private school people? Ms. Schroeder said she would send it to all the private schools. Ms. Barreras asked if proportionate amount funding would still be allowable as opposed to only free and reduced? And if that is the case, would it be able to be, also, give schools the opportunity to learn how to do that?

Ms. Schroeder said she would check into that before answering.

Ms. Valerie Dockery suggested it might be helpful to have a webinar that both private and public schools could participate in. Problems could be solved before they got to a complaint level. It would be better to be proactive rather than reactive. Whether in person or via webinar, it would be beneficial for all stakeholders to work together.

Ms. Valerie Schroeder agreed whole-heartedly with Ms. Dockery and said she's already in the process of creating a webinar with announcements, suggestions and guidance.

Ms. Gabby Pingue thanked everyone for their informative presentations and then moved on to agenda item 8,

Future Meeting Dates.

Ms. Rhonda Hutchins stated she was hoping they could meet either Thursday November 1st or Thursday November 8th. She asked if one of those dates was agreeable. An unidentified speaker said everyone at her location liked November 1st. Ms. Hutchins asked if 9:00 AM still worked for everyone, and it did. It was established that the next meeting would be Thursday, November 1st at 9:00 AM.

Future Agenda Items

Ms. Rhonda Hutchins said she had been noting suggested agenda items and they included ESSA Evidence Levels, private school's services for school-wide programs and targeted assistance, the meaningful consultations, and funding services. Additionally, a template for DPP and SPP for the district performance plan and school performance plans, and finally McKinney-Vento.

Ms. Valerie Dockery said the Committee needs to be careful about how many items are put on each agenda so that there will be planning and discussion time for each. She suggested that she and Ms. Hutchins review the proposed future agenda items before finalizing the agenda for the next meeting.

Ms. Kristina Cote agreed with Ms. Dockery and suggested that once the topics are set, send out some sort of preliminary questions ahead of time so that it's a more targeted meeting. Ms. Dockery suggested that the Committee could do some pre-reading on the topics if information was sent out beforehand.

Public Comment #2

Ms. Kristina Cote thanked everyone for their engagement at the meeting and said she really appreciated all the subject-matter experts who lent some color to some of these topics that were presented during the meeting.

Adjournment

Ms. Gabby Pingue adjourned the meeting at 10:48 AM.