

Title I Committee of Practitioners

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 11, 2021

9:00-11:00 AM

Meeting Location: Due to the COVID-19 response and in accordance with Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006; Subsection 1, this meeting was conducted via ZOOM.

1. Call to Order; Roll Call

Chair Valerie Dockery called the meeting of the Title I Committee of Practitioners to order at 9:00 AM. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and roll call was conducted. **Quorum was established** (16 members present).

Committee Members Present:

Valerie Dockery
Teresa Stoddard
Teresa Dastrup
Brian Prewett
Karen Holley
Holli Else
Karen Barreras
DeAnna Owens
Candi Ruf
Kelly-Jo Shebeck
Somer Rodgers
Renee Fairless
Sara Jorgensen
Gabby Lamarre
Melissa Schroeder
Randi Hunewill
Mary Stach
Kevin Roukey

Others Present:

Carl Wilson, Ms. Miller, Jill Murdoch, Maria Sauter, Cassandra Stahlke, Silvana Gorton, Rhonda Hutchins, Kristina Cote, Daina Loeffler, Yvonne Morris, Emily Champlin, Chris James, Mark Rich, David Boggoston, Dennis Roy, Megan Peterson, Marko Markovic, Greg Severance, Tina Winqvist.

2. Public Comment #1

There was no public comment.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

3. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for November 5, 2020 (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Chair Dockery asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made on the Minutes. There were none.

Motion: Approve Meeting Minutes for November 5, 2020

By: Sara Jorgenson

Second: Holli Else

Vote: Passed unanimously (or something else)

4. Approval of Flexible Agenda (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Gabby Lamarre requested that items 6 and 7 be combined with item 5 on the agenda as they are quick updates and do not require agenda items of their own.

Motion: Approve Flexible Agenda

By: Randi Hunewill

Second: Sara Jorgensen

Vote: Passed

5. NDE Title I Program Updates/Proposed or final State rules or regulations pursuant to Title I Part A (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Gabby Lamarre, Title I Programs Director & Federal Liaison provided an update regarding COP FRL Rank and Serve. Ms. Lamarre indicated that DOE will be inputting validation numbers. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that there will be an opportunity to make changes as long as DOE is informed, has the correct documentation, and rationale behind the proposed changes.

Chair Dockery asked Gabby Lamarre the validation date and requested that she explain the validation a bit more thoroughly to the Commission.

Gabby Lamarre indicated her understanding is that validation day is October 1st and that conversations with the LEAs occur throughout October and the numbers are finalized at the end of October, beginning of November. Ms. Lamarre explained that the Title I team, the Department of Agriculture and a team from the DOE will be meeting in the upcoming weeks to further discuss the process.

Chair Dockery confirmed that some options from an SLP from 1920 will be used and asked how that would look with the count numbers from the previous fall.

Gabby Lamarre explained that this option was given to districts for within LEA allocations and something that needs to be further discussed but is an option that some districts have requested, and Ms. Lamarre indicated her support for U.S. Ed and U.S. DOA having taking into consideration that for which states were advocating. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that the conversation has not yet taken place and that NDOE is open to new ideas regarding this issue and encouraged the Committee to share any ideas they may have.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Chair Dockery indicated that Carson would like to use the data from the previous year and requested that other Committee members weigh in regarding this option.

An unidentified female speaker from Nye County agreed that Nye would also like to use the data from the previous year.

Brian Prewett indicated that Washoe County School District is moving forward with using this year's numbers and that the option of using the previous year's numbers would not work as Washoe County School District is currently in the process of rezoning and needs to use current numbers.

Chair Dockery questioned how Washoe County was figuring the FRL.

Brian Prewett explained taking a count from October 31st, which was the per-usual information sent to the Department of Agriculture and indicated that the district is aware that numbers are a little bit lower, but with most of the schools being Title-I funded CP schools, the count was fairly accurate.

Chair Dockery indicated her support for everyone having options going forward.

Kristina Cote thanked the districts who contributed to the process. Ms. Cote indicated that the vendor, HMB, is in the process of finalizing some of the system updates and it is anticipated that will be finalized in the coming weeks. Ms. Cote indicated that they will be able to provide information at the NDE Federal Titles meeting in April.

Marko Markovic discussed the federal grant application. Mr. Markovic explained that the vendor is currently finalizing changes to the consolidated application, uploading new documents, and finalizing the structure of the grant. The anticipated completion of this project is projected to be the week following this meeting, thus allowing the consolidated application process to open up no later than March 1st for all districts. Mr. Markovic explained that at the time the process opens, the location can open without actually having the locations, thus allowing districts to begin working on their budgets, begin uploading the program documents, and once the location does become available, the information will be uploaded. Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that starting the application with a \$0 allocation will not prevent districts from doing what they need to do within the system. Mr. Markovic explained that substantial or final approval changes in practice are currently in the works and is expected to be in place at some point in April. Mr. Markovic explained that the process will work as such: districts can submit the completed Title applications while still working on the incomplete ones; the program office will review the application and approve; the completed would then come to the Grants Management Unit for Review; at that point, if all looks good with the budget portion, the application will then move to department approval; once in that stage, districts can expand the funds or the specific Titles, thus eliminating the current wait for all Title grants to be submitted, finalized, and approved for consolidated application before having the ability to expend funds. Mr. Markovic explained that the goal is to have submissions before July 1 so that they can be reviewed and approved by July 1 when the official notice of grant award is received from the federal government.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that approval cannot take place prior to July 1 because funds cannot be allocated until notification is received that the funds are actually available.

Marko Markovic discussed the RFP grant management system. Mr. Markovic indicated that the deadline for Request for Proposals was 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, February 10. The purchasing department received a total of four proposals and the evaluation committee will be meeting on February 16 to review scores and recommend the vendor who would then be awarded the next two years with the option to extend an additional year past that. Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that once the process is finalized and a vendor is selected, the districts will be updated with that information. Mr. Markovic opened up the floor to questions, cautioning the Committee that with respect to the state agreement, he could not disclose any confidential information but could address any technical questions.

Chair Dockery asked the rough timeline for implementing the new system following selection of the vendor.

Marko Markovic responded that the ideal start date would be July 1 as the current contract with the existing vendor expires on June 30. Mr. Markovic explained that part of the technical requirements for the selected vendor would be to implement all the existing grants, transfer all the information into the system, and get everything up and ready, including trainings for NDE and district users so they could continue to work uninterrupted. Mr. Markovic further explained that there are backup plans in place in case the rollover does not go as planned so that districts will continue to be supported.

Chair Dockery confirmed that districts will begin the process in E-Page and then possibly finish in a new system.

Marko Markovic indicated that this was correct. Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that the key requirements outlined for this RFP included ensuring that the system can support everything currently in E-Page, will transfer all of the information smoothly into the system, and will provide full support to NDE and all the LEAs in the use of this new system.

Karen Holley asked if there was a timeline or idea regarding professional development training for the new system.

Marko Markovic explained that a date will be set once the vendor has been selected. Mr. Markovic explained that he is hoping to schedule a couple of virtual sessions for training that will include having the vendor conduct the training with NDE's data.

Brian Prewett asked if HMB submitted a proposal and was assigned the job, would the system still look different.

Marko Markovic indicated that he is not at liberty to disclose who has submitted proposals for the new system so could not answer that question at this time. He did inform the Committee that he would respond back to that question once a vendor was selected and the information could be disclosed.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Chair Dockery asked if it is the intent of DOE to fold all grants into the new system, thus eliminating existing paper grants.

Marko Markovic concurred that the paper grant process is cumbersome for all parties involved and indicated that NDE asked for the capability to move all the grants into the system as well as the ability to add any new grants without having to pay a specific fee to get them into the system and support them.

Greg Kramer asked if there would be a CSV upload with the new system.

Marko Markovic indicated that this is also one of the requested functionalities for the new system.

6. Monitoring: MIDAS (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Gabby Lamarre, Title I Programs Director & Federal Liaison explained that setting this up has been an ongoing internal conversation at the department. Ms. Lamarre reminded the Committee that the purpose of investigating a new desktop monitoring system was to better streamline the process. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that an internal group has been developed for this purpose with representatives from across the agency, including Kristina Cote representing Title I. Ms. Lamarre asked the Commission for continued patience as this is a new process and Ms. Lamarre hopes to be able to share updates in the next few weeks with both the Committee and the LEA stakeholders.

Chair Dockery asked Ms. Lamarre about the timeline for the rollout and the expectation that it will be ready to use for FY '21 monitoring.

Gabby Lamarre indicated that the March deadline has been pushed back as the process is being streamlined across multiple programs, but the expectation is still to use this for FY '21 monitoring.

Chair Dockery asked the other Committee members to comment on their thoughts regarding monitoring, specifically whether they would prefer everything for every program due at the same time or would they prefer a rolling timeline for monitoring.

Holli Else indicated that if possible, it would be easier to upload things to MIDAS as they occurred rather than to try and upload all the information at once at the end of the school year.

Brian Prewett concurred with Holli Else and indicated that it is essential that there is enough time to input all data once everything is open in MIDAS.

Gabby Lamarre indicated that this is part of the ongoing conversation taking place, especially for Title I as Title I has a lot of requirements. Ms. Lamarre indicated that one of the discussions centers on having a fall and spring submission for Title I once the new desktop monitoring system is up and running. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that this is not feasible for FY '21, but that the conversations are taking place regarding this being an option in the future.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Chair Dockery asked for Karen Holley to weigh in regarding small districts and indicated that there are so many grants that more than a month is needed for inputting the data. Chair Dockery discussed the need for an extension the previous year because there were so many things to be done the month timeframe could not be met. Chair Dockery indicated her hope that this was being taken into consideration.

Karen Holley indicated her agreement with Chair Dockery and asked Ms. Lamarre to remain in touch with the Committee regarding this issue. Ms. Holley agreed that everything needs to be uploaded in a timeframe that DOE can use the data, but the timeline also needs to be logical for those uploading the data.

Gabby Lamarre assured the Committee that DOE would keep the Committee updated and continue to solicit feedback and also asked the members of the Committee to provide a general timeframe of how long they felt they would need in order to complete the required upload.

Brian Prewett indicated that two months would be a reasonable timeframe.

Karen Holley indicated that two months would be a reasonable timeframe.

Chair Dockery indicated the need for three months minimum given that session is upcoming, the CARES ESSER is upcoming, and there's more than just the Title I that needs to be done. Chair Dockery indicated that the Title I piece alone was not especially time-consuming, but combined with all the other pieces indicated the need for more time.

Karen Holley indicated that it would be helpful to know what would be needed for ESSER I, ESSER II and so forth for planning purposes.

Chair Dockery agreed that finding out the needed pieces of information at the end of the year rather than at the beginning is much more difficult in terms of planning, preparing, and implementing.

Sara Jorgensen indicated that as much lead time as can be given regarding documents and/or due dates is helpful and appreciated.

7. Risk Assessment (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Gabby Lamarre thanked everyone for their time and patience throughout the process of developing the risk assessment. Ms. Lamarre further informed the Committee that she would like to take questions regarding the risk assessment even though she might not be able to return to the Committee with answers to those questions until the following meeting.

Maria Sauter, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Student and School Support, informed the Committee that the process and procedures used are currently being internally analyzed. All questions and concerns were collected from office hours and the process is now moving forward into year 2, making adjustments that can be done and that can make the process better for both NDE and grants of awardees. Ms. Sauter explained that each individual indicator is being analyzed regarding the implications, the potential barriers, as well as the internal and

Meeting Minutes (continued)

external systems that may affect the indicator. Ms. Sauter explained that now that the year-one pilot has completed, the department is looking into every single indicator for issues of equity. Ms. Sauter further indicated that because of the unprecedented year with the pandemic, indicators that may not be applicable for the '19-20 school year are being studied as there are several indicators that do not currently apply but not have changed such as student achievement and chronic absenteeism. Ms. Sauter indicated that once the discussions and language are finalized around those indicators, the risk assessment will be brought back to stakeholders for feedback. Ms. Sauter reiterated Gabby Lamarre's request for questions to bring back to the team for further discussion prior to providing answers.

Chair Dockery reminded Gabby Lamarre of the email she had sent with questions specific to Title I: comparison of ability audits; equitable services carryover; defining effective interventions that have been implemented and how the NDE is measuring those; equitable distribution of teachers; and knowing which grants were monitored for each district as improvement cannot be made if the district is not aware of which grant is being monitored.

Maria Sauter assured Chair Dockery that she was aware of the email and the questions were currently in discussion with the team working on the risk assessment.

An unidentified female Committee member requested that once Chair Dockery's questions were answered that the responses are sent to everyone on the Committee.

Maria Sauter indicated that the answers would be dispersed to the entire Committee.

Gabby Lamarre reminded the Committee that for the past several months, NDE has been in the process of working with an external partner to redesign the school performance plan, the district performance plan, and the comprehensive needs assessment template. Ms. Lamarre reminded the Committee that there are three different working groups to help facilitate the process: the strategy team, which consists of NDE members and LEA representatives; the design collaborative group, which consists of LEA and SCA members who will be helping with the prototyping; and the core design team, which consists of LEAs and SCAs. Ms. Lamarre indicated that there is currently a pilot phase in place where districts and several schools are going through the continuous improvement process and the school improvement process and are using some of the redesigned tools. Ms. Lamarre indicated that the purpose of this pilot is to get feedback and then make any necessary adjustments prior to rolling out the redesign tool to all schools next school year.

Maria Sauter indicated that the pilot is taking place in six different districts. Ms. Sauter explained that the pilot began February 1 and runs through March 23, and all pilot districts are expected to go through three of the main steps to development of the SPP. Ms. Sauter explained that step 1 is gathering their school improvement team, discussing what the work is, what the understanding of the work is, and establishing a timeline for the work. Step 2 is community outreach, which involves gathering stakeholder feedback on some of the data of the school and some of their thoughts with possible action steps that community members see. Step 3 involves doing a deep dive into the data using root-cause analysis and goal setting which would ultimately culminate in developing action steps that would be monitored throughout the school year. Ms. Sauter indicated that NDE expects to have feedback from this pilot by March 26 and wants to submit it to the state because everyone is currently starting SPP and planning for the next school year, and this will be the template and process moving forward, due

Meeting Minutes (continued)

November 1, 2021. Ms. Sauter explained that she hopes to have the tools in the hands of the Committee by the beginning of April. Ms. Sauter reminded the Committee that if they have already started the process and have goals, those goals merely need to be transferred to the new template.

Gabby Lamarre informed the Committee that there will be a rollout and professional development to talk through these tools, including documentation and likely webinars. The professional development piece is currently being worked out in NDE. Ms. Lamarre asked Maria Sauter and Tina Winquist to inform the Committee of the feedback received thus far from the pilot LEAs in schools going through this process.

Maria Sauter reiterated that detailed, step-by-step guidance with questions has been created to guide teams through the process.

Tina Winquist discussed her excitement that this is one of the first projects she has done that gathers the people that matter to make these decisions. Ms. Winquist explained that this was a great opportunity to work with district partners and people who were most impacted by this work and get feedback.

Maria Sauter informed the Committee that 100 percent of the participants agreed this was a good process during week one, and 83 percent of the school improvement teams felt this was a valuable process and a good use of time when polled in an end survey.

Tina Winquist explained several positive points of the process but her audio was poor and difficult to understand.

Chair Dockery opined that the questions in the template are excellent at providing everything that would possibly need to be done and the template itself is thoughtful regarding walking staff through important questions. Chair Dockery complimented NDE on the fact that the template is thought-provoking and concise and can really help to get down to root causes to help move forward in a succinct manner.

Sara Jorgensen asked if there was going to be a redesign of the CAN and should schools be considering requirements for interventions to match ESSA Level Evidence.

Maria Sauter explained that the ESSA evidence is grant criteria not SPP criteria. Ms. Sauter indicated that the needs assessment is part of this work, but that the SPP template needed to come first in order to put in place a system for the needs assessment. Ms. Sauter indicated that NDE is also working on the DPP and that it will be ready to pilot in the upcoming weeks. Ms. Sauter explained to the Committee that the needs assessment will not be required this summer. Ms. Sauter informed the Committee that they should use their existing system that is in place for needs assessment, and then when a more comprehensive system is built into the template, NDE will again share it, work with the Committee on it, and create guidance around implementation of it.

Gabby Lamarre added that while there are certain evidence-based requirements tied to specific grant funding, the point of advocating for evidence-based interventions is because these interventions have been proven to work and improve student outcomes. Ms. Lamarre encouraged the Committee to think about evaluations for

Meeting Minutes (continued)

interventions that will give an idea whether the activities being implemented are having an effect on student outcomes, which is the ultimate goal.

Chair Dockery requested more resources from NDE regarding evidence-based strategies as the current lists are related to companies and vendors.

Karen Holley concurred with Chair Dockery's request and indicated that some of the websites have erased evidence levels. Ms. Holley further requested that NDE include technical education at the secondary level in the comprehensive needs assessment so that all aspects of schooling were included.

Gabby Lamarre informed the Committee and specifically Karen Holley regarding her question about technical schools that discussions are taking place between NDE and schools and offices.

Candi Ruf indicated that the Perkins Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment collects that same data for CTE as NDE collects and she is in favor of streamlining to have one assessment that incorporates all the information.

Gabby Lamarre reported to the Committee that NDE recently heard from the DAG that Title I CoP is not required to follow open-meeting law because it is a federally required Commission that is not state-funded. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that they will receive an official letter from the DAG's office stating this so that it can be posted online for the public. Ms. Lamarre further indicated that the DAG stated that because the CoP is not required to follow open-meeting law, that the Committee should ensure that their structure does deviate from that so as not to cause any confusion. In addition, Ms. Lamarre indicated that there is talk and legislation in the works to help streamline Commissions that are state-required. Ms. Lamarre explained that NDE does not yet know what exactly all of this means, but gave the example of public comment no longer being a requirement in a non-open-meeting-law meeting. Ms. Lamarre assured the Committee that the integrity of the group will not be compromised and that Committee meetings will continue to remain transparent. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that there will be some adjustments made going forward regarding meetings and used the example of not needing a motion to vote any longer, thus requiring the need to come up with a different process by which decisions will be made.

Chair Dockery indicated that there will be more information at the May meeting and informed the Committee that their expertise and input will be needed regarding some of the changes and the process going forward.

8. Title I CoP Membership (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Holli Else, Title I CoP Membership Officer, informed the Committee that she went through old meeting minutes and the list of officers published on the website to get together a comprehensive and up-to-date list. Ms. Else informed the Committee that the information was compiled in an Excel spreadsheet that contains every member's name, the district they represent, their official position, contact information, the dates they were appointed, and the dates their terms expire. Ms. Else indicated that for the May meeting, 15 representatives will need their appointments renewed: Teresa Stoddard, Nye; Teresa Dastrup, Elko; Brian Prewett, Washoe; Karen Barreras, Diocese of Reno Catholic Schools; Annette Dawson-Owens, Building Excellent Schools; Somer Rodgers; Laura Tibbetts, Lincoln; Deanna Owens, Humboldt; Renee Fairless, Mater Academy; Rich Mares, Washoe; Candi

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Ruf, Carson City; Kelly-Jo Shebeck, Clark; Gabby Lamarre, NDE; Randi Hunewill, NDE; Melissa Schroeder, NDE. These 15 members can either fill out the form to renew their appointment or can pass off their membership to someone else in their district.

Gabby Lamarre indicated that there are certain representatives that are a requirement for the Title I Committee Practitioners per federal law. Ms. Lamarre encouraged the members of the Committee who may not want to remain on the Committee to look for someone who serves in their similar role in order to meet requirements.

Chair Dockery asked Holli Else to send the list of the 15 members to Tracey, who would then forward the list to the members of the Committee. Chair Dockery asked members to reply to the email to let the Committee know if they intended to continue, and if so, to please fill out the form and if not, Ms. Else would have the ability to begin seeking out other people to fill the vacancies.

Gabby Lamarre informed the Committee that Melissa Schroeder did serve as private school Ombudsman but that Karl Wilson now serves in that role.

9. Future Meeting Date and Agenda Items (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Chair Dockery reminded the Commission that there are four quarterly meetings and the final meeting for this school year will take place on May 13, 2021 from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. This meeting will be a Zoom meeting and a calendar invite will be sent out with the appropriate attachments. Chair Dockery asked the Committee to please inform her, Rhonda, and Tracey at least 30 days prior to the next meeting if there were items they wanted added to the agenda.

10. Public Comment #2

Public comment will be taken during this agenda item on any matter within the Title I Committee of Practitioner's jurisdiction, control, or advisory power. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda) as an item on which action may be taken. The secretary of the Title I Committee of Practitioner will impose a time limit of three minutes

There was no public comment.

11. Adjournment (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Motion: Adjourn the Title I Committee of Practitioners August 13th meeting at (FILL IN TIME)

By: Chair Dockery

Second: Karen Holley

Vote: Passed unanimously