

# Title I Committee of Practitioners Meeting Minutes

---

Tuesday November 19, 2019

9:00-11:00 AM

## Meeting Locations:

*Video Conference*

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Las Vegas, NV 89119	Board Room (1st Floor)
Department of Education	700 East Fifth Street Carson City, NV 89512	Board Room

## Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Valerie Dockery called the meeting of the Title I Committee of Practitioners to order at 9:03 AM. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and roll call was conducted. **Quorum was established** (15 members present).

### Committee Members Present:

Valerie Dockery  
Teresa Stoddard  
Teresa Dastrup  
Brian Prewett  
Karen Holley  
Holli Else  
Karen Barreras  
Kelly-Jo Shebeck  
Somer Rodgers  
Renee Fairless  
Rich Mares  
Sara Jorgensen  
Gabby Lamarre  
Melissa Schroeder  
Mary Stach

### Others Present:

Kristina Cote, Colin Usher, Rhonda Hutchins, Cindy Miller, Glenn Meyer, Bobby Beach, Amber Hilberg, Rhonda Hutchins, Tina Winquist, Will Killins, CJ Miller, Cindy Miller

## Public Comment #1

There was no public comment.

## Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for September 19, 2019

There were no changes or corrections made on the Minutes.

**Motion: Approve Meeting Minutes for September 19, 2019**

**By: Karen Holley**

**Second: Sara Jorgensen**

**Vote: Passed unanimously**

### **Approval of Flexible Agenda**

**Motion: Approve Flexible Agenda**

**By: Teresa Dastrup**

**Second: Karen Holley**

**Vote: Passed unanimously**

### **NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates**

Ms. Gabby Lamarre, Title I Programs Director and Federal Liaison, provided the updates for Agenda Item 5:

- FY19 final financial reports were due on Friday, November 15<sup>th</sup> for sub grants ending September 30<sup>th</sup>.
- The McKinney-Vento Education Program Professional position should be filled fairly soon. Final interviews are being conducted at this time.
- The new desktop monitoring system update is getting ready to roll. They have incorporated stakeholder comments and feedback into the request for proposal. The plan is to go through the review process and the contracting process as they are required to do per state purchasing requirements, and then go to the Board of Examiners for approval in February, and then go from there. They are still working on having more details for the transition to ensure as smooth a changeover as possible from eNOTEs to this new tool, and the plan to go to the Board of Examiners' approval in February and have a contract signed by end of February. More details will be forthcoming.
- They have started to work on FY21 ePAGE enhancements, using districts' feedback as a guide. More details will follow.
- The evidence-based provider list review for this year closes December 20<sup>th</sup>. Dr. Tina Winqvist is the person overseeing that. They encourage the different vendor partners to apply to be put on that list. It is optional, but they do encourage it to take the burden off of the districts to have to ask for that research and data and evidence. They hope that this can continue to serve as a resource for districts. Districts can use other vendor partners that aren't on the list as long as they provide the evidence that shows that the vendors meet the requisite level for whatever funding source they might be applying for.

### **NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates**

Chair Dockery thanked Ms. Lamarre for her report and also thanked her for allowing them to get their Title I carryover sooner rather than later. She stated that enabled them to spend those funds down.

Chair Dockery asked what the plan was for this year's desktop monitoring. Ms. Lamarre said those details are still being ironed out. Districts should still be collecting and organizing information as in the past so that whatever tool they do use it will just be an easy upload. More details will follow. They are trying to get a tool that is more helpful and user-friendly than eNOTE, so it should be a pretty smooth process from here on out, but they understand that training will take time, and they're just trying to finalize that timeline and see what makes the most sense for this transition year.

Chair Dockery asked if districts could go into eNOTE and archive documents that are in there and how long will that be available to them so that they can pull out their things that they've put in in the past and be able to keep those records. Ms. Lamarre stated that NDE is working with the eNOTE vendor, West Ed, to determine a transition/migration plan. She will follow up with details as they develop.

Chair Dockery said it is vital to let the districts know what the plan is now. It's almost December, and she thinks in the next newsletter at a minimum or possibly in a separate email they need to have some more information about this going forward so they know how to plan accordingly.

Chair Dockery asked if there were any district Title I Directors involved in the vetting of another possible vendor. Ms. Lamarre stated the point of the survey was to ensure that NDE got districts' feedback and as far as being on a review committee, they can get into tricky waters if not all districts are represented and put the state at risk for legal action, so that's why they utilized the survey to get district feedback.

Chair Dockery said it's very different being an end user of a product when you're looking at what has to be included and what's being provided by a new vendor. They've had processes before where they've had a representative of committees looking at these things, not just completely NDE staff. She asked what her colleagues thought.

Mr. Brian Prewett from Washoe County School District said he would have no problem if they selected some LEA representatives to be on the review committee.

Ms. Karen Holley said it would be a good idea if they could take a look at the eNOTE product before it's released, and the sooner the better.

Chair Dockery agreed and asked Ms. Lamarre if that would be possible. Ms. Lamarre said she would reach out to the fiscal team leading this and inquire about that. As far as Mr. Prewett's comments about review team members, she will bring that topic back up at NDE. And as far as Ms. Holley's comments about looking at the eNOTE product before it's released, she will bring that up too.

Chair Dockery said bringing the new product to the Title I Committee would be very appropriate. It is a representative committee for the state, so any fear of any bias or anything else would be off of the table because it is a representative committee representing Title I across the state. One of the Committee's missions is to review processes and things put into place before they are put into place by the Department of Ed. That's in the statute. Chair Dockery said she would really like to see that being brought to the Committee.

Ms. Lamarre said she would bring it to the fiscal team that is leading this and see what they say. She asked if the Committee is requesting to see what the replacement tool will be before then it is actually implemented.

Chair Dockery responded that she thinks everyone would like to see what the choices are on the table, once the vendors have submitted their applications and have that presented to them and possibly the recommendation from that fiscal team of which one they are going to be leaning towards. Mr. Prewett and Ms. Else said they agreed.

Ms. Else said it was true that the end user experience is often so different than the management piece, and so if the end users had some input before something was implemented, it could probably mitigate some of the issues that they all are experiencing currently with the system that wasn't vetted by any end user.

Chair Dockery asked about the parent engagement handbook they talked about at the last meeting. She said they wanted to have any final updates for this year done by January and stated it's posted now and it still says "draft" on it. She asked will there be more updates or can they use it now. Ms. Lamarre said the parent/family engagement and lead for the state wasn't at the meeting, but she will follow-up with him and ensure that that information is included in the November newsletter.

## **Title 1, Part A, Allocations to Schools Sites**

Ms. Lamarre provided the updates for Agenda Item 6, Title I, Part A, Allocations to School Sites, CEP Provision II. She said the Poverty Percentages and Title IA funding draft document was created in collaboration with the ADAM team and the Nevada Department of Agriculture and the Title I teams at NDE. The objective of the document is to ensure that they, as an SEA, are able to verify and validate that their districts are properly and appropriately ranking and serving schools. Right now there is no consistent way of doing so, and if they had an audit, that would probably be a finding.

To fulfill the objective, they are asking again (in collaboration with NDA and the ADAM Team) to pull the FRPL or the poverty data in April 2020 and then to use that data for school year 2021 within LEA allocations. They did confirm this with the U.S. Department of Education, that the SEAs do have this discretion to implement such a policy. Ms. Lamarre said NDE will be "happy to implement a process for any exceptions that districts may have." They will have a process for that. They do not expect to grant many of these exceptions and that will be a pretty high threshold. But they will be happy to listen.

The Department needs to be able to validate and verify the LEAs are ranking and serving appropriately and they need a "source of truth" for that for within their LEA allocations. They realize that both at the LEA and the state level this may require everyone to change their practices. Changes certainly can be made in the future if they figure out that there are certain things in the process that need to be tweaked. They're happy to do that, but again, NDE does need to have a way of ensuring that LEAs are properly ranking and serving schools. And so that is the purpose for having this.

Chair Dockery asked why they are looking at April as opposed to the October count. Ms. Bobbie Beach from NDA replied they discussed using April as a timeline because that is a timeline that they have for school districts to report their direct certification rates to establish their CEP if they're qualified for CEP. So, everyone is doing that upload to try and maximize those numbers and then it would be consistent across the board.

Chair Dockery asked if a district is applying for CPE in April, would they wait until that process is completed before they would do their rank and serve in the Title I application. She said for example, in Carson they will probably apply for CEP status for several more additional schools and that's usually the end of April, and then this document talks about verifying the numbers periodically through April. She asked if there are schools that are going CEP, will they be doing both of those processes or can they just wait until the end of April if they know they're going to be going for CEP for certain schools.

## **Title 1, Part A, Allocations to Schools Sites (continued)**

Ms. Lamarre said she thinks that they would not have to do two processes and that they could wait until the end of April. They want to have a consistent way, so she doesn't see why they couldn't just wait until end of April to just have that one process instead of having to do it twice.

Chair Dockery asked what the deadline for the CEP applications is. Ms. Beach replied the deadline is June 30<sup>th</sup>. On April 1 they require all the districts to submit their direct certification information just to qualify them for CEP, but they have until June 30<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Dockery said based on this information, they would have to do it before June 30<sup>th</sup>, and if they need to get their rank and serve settled before, they wouldn't be able to wait that long. Ms. Lamarre said she thought they wanted to have some buffer room there, which is why they did not include the June 30<sup>th</sup> date.

Mr. Prewett said what he was hearing was they're pulling this year's Infinite Campus FRL data and they're utilizing next year's CEP data, so there's a conflict in years, and they're using one year for one group and another year for a different group. Ms. Beach said for the CEP, when they pull it on April 1 of 2020, it's setting the CEP for next year, so they would multiply it by the ISPE, which is that 1.6 multiplier to establish the CEP rates.

Mr. Prewett said he understood the process, but wondered about using two different years. He said they're using the FRL for the kids this year and they're using the CEP percentage for the next year, so there's a conflict in years. He said they are not using the CEP percentage for this year, and asked why they aren't using the CEP percentage for this year with the FRL percentage for this year, which means they don't have to do the April 1<sup>st</sup> date.

Ms. Beach said she thought she understood what Mr. Prewett was saying and stated that with the October 1, there's already conflicting years with the Provision II and CEP just because they were established many base years ago. She thinks that is something that they would need to think about.

Chair Dockery asked if it was correct that the CEP percentage for next year is based on this year's count and this year's data. Ms. Beach replied that it depends. She stated that you have the chance to roll it over for three years, so it can be older data, but to establish it for next year, they do release who is eligible and nearly eligible to participate if they want to re-up those percentages if they're higher and change those groupings. She asked if a district could have a combination of existing CEP schools rolling forward and new CEP schools coming on board, and Ms. Beach confirmed yes.

Ms. Holley said her district is 100 percent CEP, so they do use the April 1 report and endearingly refer to it as April Fool's Day report in her district, and that is what they use for the next year.

Ms. Holley asked for more information about the part that says "Districts must then match Department of Family Services and NDE student information for direct certification every two weeks and must match prior to April 1<sup>st</sup> data report from Infinite Campus." She stated they don't change their allocation based on those numbers; this is just a certification that they do every two weeks. Ms. Beach replied they want to see that they're uploading that matched file they're getting, so it's constantly updating those direct certification rates, especially before the April 1 date so that they have the most accurate data and can capture every student that is directly certified.

## **Title 1, Part A, Allocations to Schools Sites (continued)**

Ms. Holley asked if the upload occurs through the Food Service Department and how it works in other districts.

Mr. Glenn Meyer, IT ADAM at NDE, answered they do the documentation every two weeks. It's a file they receive from the Department of Health and Human Services so it's the TANF, SNAP, Medicaid eligibility file. The reason why they encourage and they ask all districts to do that match every two weeks regardless of whether they're fully CEP or not is because the algorithms and campus update that student's eligibility information, so there's a hierarchy, SNAP, then TANF, then Medicaid. He said if the student was eligible in a district because of Medicaid and that's how you counted him and allocated him on October 1<sup>st</sup>, it's very possible that he became eligible for SNAP or TANF later in the year and then you would want that reflected and updated in your Infinite Campus system so that student is identified as being SNAP eligible, not Medicaid eligible, so you know that to apply the correct multiplier for those kids.

Chair Dockery asked should the weekly checks occur prior to April 1 and not in April. She said they should all recur before then. Ms. Beach said the every two weeks when they get that file they should be constantly updating that in Infinite Campus and especially before April 1 because that's going to capture any students prior to the April 1 reporting date, so they can submit accurate information.

Chair Dockery asked if there was a plan to have some training and information sent out to the people who actually do that in the districts and stated that people on the Committee are usually not the people who do that. She asked if there was going to be training and notification to them so that they understand what their role is in this crucial part of Title I. Ms. Lamarre replied they can certainly arrange that. They also believe that that would be helpful, so they can work with NDA and the ADAM Team and put that together.

Mr. Prewett had a question about the grades and age stipulations. In the guidance, it says that the FRL needs to be ages 5 to 17, but when they pull that child nutrition report it actually has Pre-K through fifth year senior. Some Special Ed kids can actually go up to 22 years old. His understanding is one of the reasons why they don't have Pre-K is there's also the Early Childhood set aside. So, he just wants to make sure that they're pulling the kids that are supposed to be pulled.

Mr. Meyer explained the file is ages 3 to 22, so the file they get from DHHS includes all kids ages 3 to 22. They match that against Infinite Campus statewide enrollment and then they provide districts with the matched file and the unmatched file, so the unmatched file will probably contain a lot of those 3 to 5 and 18 to 22-year old kids that districts don't have enrolled. The reason they included 3 to 22 is because that matched project was an NDA funded project, and the purpose from an NDA perspective was to match as many kids as they possibly could that are eligible for the free and reduced lunch program, and since they do have kids ages 3 through 5 and 18 to 22 they wanted to include those kids to match them in the file.

Chair Dockery asked how that aligns with what Mr. Prewett just said if it's 5 to 17.

Ms. Holley said in Nye County, they break them out by age groups at the schools and then just delete the Pre-K and the older kids out.

Chair Dockery said they really need guidance on that because not everybody is going to know what to do and asked if they could get those files without those kids in it to make it easier.

## **Title 1, Part A, Allocations to Schools Sites (continued)**

Mr. Prewett said that is the concern. He said last year they used the numbers that they submitted for Big Horn from the district on October 31 and took that information and extracted those students to make it accurate. He said if they are going with this new system, he doesn't think that's automatically going to be done. He said they're supposed to go by what those numbers have, and if that's the case, he asked how they extract that.

Ms. Cindy Miller said it sounds like there's a disconnect between what ESSA is saying and NDA is saying because their guidance clearly states that you have to do eligibility for 3 through 22. They had a discussion several times about why, but that's what they wanted to fund and that's what they told them to do, so if ESSA says something different maybe they need to look at that.

Ms. Lamarre said their team can certainly go back and look at that and discuss it if they need to clarify it.

Chair Dockery said it is very important that they get this clarification really soon because they need to know going forward where they are in some of those things. The Chair would like to see some of that officially in writing. It has to come not just to the Committee, but to their people who work with Infinite Campus and their people who work in nutrition services so they can help them through this. An awful lot of burden right now is on the districts with not a lot of information. The Chair said she is really concerned about that in going forward that they are able to do this in a manner that's not going to be too burdensome.

Mr. Prewett said he agreed. He said another concern from Washoe County was with this April 1<sup>st</sup> timeline. In Washoe County they start the next year in December, and they have some negotiated agreements. They need to know which schools are Title I serviced and what are their allocations. They go through overage process where if teachers or assistants or deans or APs are not funded for the previous year, they need to be overaged and placed in the site, and if they do not know which schools are ranked and served and with rezoning they have to move students and it's going to look different, so they don't know who's going to be ranked and served.

Mr. Prewett stated they don't know if the PPAs going to be changed. And if they don't have that information, then all of those Title I funded employees will have to be overaged and not have a position until that is figured out which is a major concern and it's not what's best for students and it's not what's best for schools.

Mr. Mares said as a standing principal at a Title II school, he can just foresee the impact this is going to have on hiring and what this will do with displacing good teachers who might get overaged. He would like to make sure that this is addressed, the best possible, so that it doesn't impact schools and students.

Ms. Barreras asked what impact this will have on principally placed students in private schools.

Chair Dockery said that was an excellent question. In her district, they need to know who their Title I schools are early, so they have to send out their information to the private schools asking them if they want to participate, and they usually have that out in December. So, she's assuming that these are Title schools for next year, but if they are not figuring that out till April, then she's got a big problem in figuring out which students are identified, et cetera, and served in their private schools. So, this April date is really late for planning for Title I for next year. That's why in Carson they use the October count even though more families could come onboard. That's the count that they use for their rank and serve.

## **Title 1, Part A, Allocations to Schools Sites (continued)**

Chair Dockery said she was also concerned with that comment regarding properly ranking and serving. She believes that they are allowed to pick a point, a date in time, in the district to rank and serve, and as long as they are using accurate data from that particular date, they are doing it properly. She asked if they are all doing the same date. She thinks they are all doing it properly, and they just may not be picking the same date.

Mr. Prewett said he agreed. And if they chose a date in October, he would have no problem with that, and that's plenty of time. He also pointed out that the LEAs receive funding based on two-year old census data. So, it's not accurate 100 percent to begin with.

Ms. Else said she had to make several points on behalf of small, rural districts. First, she agreed very much with the Chair in regard to the comment that they were doing it "improperly" and the Department needed a way to validate it. In her opinion, the districts are doing it properly based on what they are allowed to do in ESSA and picking that date and moving that and validating it based on the information which the Department requires them to upload in email. That's what monitoring is for. The ability to move that date is critical to small, rural districts that don't have 100 percent CEP where just a few kids make the difference between a school being a Title I school and not being a Title I school, and that number can change from October 1<sup>st</sup> to October 31<sup>st</sup>. That flexibility allows them to make sure that a Title I school that's designated this year can remain designated next year. By setting a firm date and never letting them flex that to keep those numbers stable, it's resulting in schools going in and out of Title I status from year to year. You cannot run stable and effective programs if they're in and out of Title I every other year, so that flexibility is critical, and changing the date to the spring to align for NDE's dates and the AG Department's dates without consideration of any of the LEA dates is irresponsible. They had FEPs done in the fall, so those are all planned on October dates.

Ms. Else said they do private school and travel consultation in January, and again they are going to be doing that without knowing what schools are designated or not, so changing that date to be consistent for two departments, again without respect to any of the issues that causes for end users of that date is very shortsighted. She said it troubled her when Ms. Lamarre announced in this meeting that the Department is going to have a plan for waivers, but they are going to give out very few of them. That is essentially saying they are not going to be giving the waivers. This will be done without consideration for the LEAs or the kids that they are trying to serve and it's just like the Department is not actually considering the input of the Committee. They are dictating a policy and that's unfortunate.

Chair Dockery said she would tend to agree with those comments. Having the flexibility on their end in picking the date is allowed in the federal legislation. She doesn't think anyone has been doing anything improperly; people have been flexing dates to meet their local needs, which is what they're supposed to be doing in their positions as Directors of Title I. It looks very different in Carson City than it looks in Washoe than it looks in Storey County or Nye or any other county. They are charged with trying to take that allocation that comes to their districts and use it in the best possible way for the children that they serve. This proposed plan takes that away from them in terms of having the flexibility. The Chair said if she pulls Title I from one of her lowest performing schools next year, that's going to be a big problem for them even though they're making inroads. Empire Elementary went from a two-star to a three-star school. If she changes that allocation for them, that's not going to help them maintain that three-star rating.



## **Title 1, Part A, Allocations to Schools Sites (continued)**

Mr. Prewett said he agreed with all those statements. In ESSA it does say there is discretion about which sources you even use, and as far as going forward, the LEAs should have some discretion of that, but it has to be consistent. So, if the Department wants them to write up what their process is and make sure it's consistent every year, they are going to have a problem with that. If a district changes and flip-flops around and it's not consistent, that could cause issues. But if you know your process and you can explain your process and you're consistent with that, that should be okay.

Ms. Lamarre said she wanted to put on record that she never said that anybody was doing anything improperly. She said that the Department just needs to be able to verify data, and they trust the districts' processes. What they need is a consistent way at the SEA level to be able to check that. She does appreciate everybody's feedback. It's actually very helpful, and she's glad that they have the three parties that are crucial in having this guidance there in the room. They will certainly take it back and discuss it, because again, they do not want this to be a burden for the districts, but they do want to balance kind of having a consistent process. The group's candid feedback is very helpful. She did hear their concerns.

Mr. Prewett thanked Ms. Lamarre for that, and added that they would like to get that feedback ASAP. In Washoe County, this process normally starts now and they have to, with all of the 20 schools rezoning, they have to move a lot of students to make sure all of their information is accurate, and that is very time consuming. And so, the sooner they can have this addressed, the better.

Chair Dockery said she thought their biggest concern was that April is a little late for them in terms of planning. Districts are doing this properly, but they're not all doing it on the same date with the same information. What NDE is looking for is some consistency that they are using a procedure that's appropriate for when they pick their date and what data they're using. If they could come to some common ground there that would help this quite a bit. They could submit a plan on what their consistent process is and still have some flexibility. The Chair hopes that NDE will consider that rather than a blanket point in time for everyone, which doesn't serve all the districts, especially when it's so late in the year.

## **Equitable Distribution of Teachers (EDT)**

Ms. Lamarre provided the updates for Agenda Item 7. She said at this time, the state does not have a template, so plans will look different. The information is status quo; it remains the same. The Department is collecting the same information as usual when it comes to equitable distribution of teachers. The Department is looking for districts to pull that data for high minority and high poverty schools to compare it to non-high minority and non-high poverty schools, and then have a plan if there is a discrepancy in that data. More information can be found in the state ESSA plan. Title II does have some funds for state activities, and it's Ms. Lamarre's understanding that they are using part of those funds to have a statewide initiative to help ensure that there is no discrepancy in Title I funds and Title IIA funds.

Chair Dockery said there is a real need for that template. It's really important that they get something fairly soon so that they are all consistent. They also need a definition of what is considered high poverty by the state when they're comparing schools and staffing and numbers of teachers. She asked if the definition means CEP schools, 100 percent poverty compared to 50 percent poverty to 20 percent poverty, and are they comparing elementary to elementary, middles to middles, high schools to high schools, et cetera.

Ms. Hutchins said it's her understanding that they rank poverty schools by quartile. That's what they do at the state level, so the top poverty quartile, the top 25 percent and compared to the equity gap to the bottom 25 percent. And yes, they rank elementary schools, middle school and high school separately.

Chair Dockery asked if that is written in the guidance. Ms. Hutchins said it's in the state ESSA plan. It talks about the quartiles so there will be a definition for poverty, minority in the state ESSA plan as well as the definition for inexperienced, out of field, ineffective teachers. In eNOTE they used to upload a template that was just a template that showed the data and then there would be an equity plan that you could upload. There has been some discussion about an equity plan not maybe being a standalone plan, but be part of the STP or DPP, and therefore maybe at the state level be part of the ESSA state plan, but that's under discussion. They would like to see the data analysis, the stakeholders, and the strategies that impact the equitable distribution of teachers.

Chair Dockery said it would be nice if they could get that extrapolated out and provided to them. It's not really clear on the expectations on this and that they need to have more information. Ms. Hutchins said she could pull the data out of there and send it to the team or to the districts; that's not a problem.

### **CSI/TSI/ATSI Support and Alternative Schools**

Dr. Tina Winquist, Office of Student and School Supports, provided an overview of Agenda Item 8. Dr. Winquist said based on the Nevada report card as of October 2019, there are approximately 752 schools in Nevada of which there are about 75 or about 10 percent identified as either alternative, special education and/or correctional. Some of these schools may or may not be part of the alternative performance framework. Of those schools, approximately half of them (37) are designated as CSI, TSI or ATSI. And of those, only 11 of those schools actually receive Title I funding. They really are looking at apples and oranges when they talk about CSI schools, so they will use the term, "nontraditional" for this project in the context of referring to schools that are not traditional, that fall into alternative special education correctional and are part of the performance framework schools as nontraditional schools for this project.

Dr. Winquist hopes to create a work group that is going to specifically develop a template that is an alternative template to the SPP currently being used by all schools that will be targeting measured outcomes for students in nontraditional school settings. This work group will also be tasked with identifying and developing processes to mitigate challenges and promote support for nontraditional schools, and that could include an array of things, starting with the high transiency of schools that go in and out of these nontraditional schools as an example. The purpose of this is really about identifying those instructional efficiencies that are the effects of different instructional conditions associated with the alternative performance schools and the learning that happens and the equitable outcomes, and that will be actually the building blocks to create a template for nontraditional schools in servicing the most marginalized students in the state.

Dr. Winquist is proposing a timeline of projected deliverables: In November they will start their work group. In December the initial meetings will start up with a scope of work designed for task management teams associated with the work group. In January, they'll break out the tasks developing the template with a task team that's going to be identifying those processes in January. In February they are going to be working together as a collective work group to talk about deliverables, and if they are on track to meeting their outcomes for March and May, May will be the time when they circle back with the stakeholder group or Title I Community of

Practitioners with the draft template of what they've been working on up until then. In June of 2020 they will tackle the next steps to actually launch the SPP template for next school year.

Ms. C.J. Miller asked what kind of members they were looking for. Dr. Winquist said they were looking at first, primarily those directors and/or principals that are in the nontraditional schools as the primary audience. District partners and district leaders will be invited to be part of this work group as well.

Chair Dockery asked if these will be a web-based meetings. Dr. Winquist said yes, the meetings will be virtual, using the Lifesize platform to conference throughout the state.

Ms. Fairless said she is representing a state public charter school. They have a data representative, Jessica Barr, who would be a great addition to any committee that is looking at these issues and specifically the impact that they have on schools that are serving in a minority or poverty demographic. Dr. Winquist said she would be welcome.

Chair Dockery asked if there would be representation from the charter schools in this group. Ms. Jorgensen said yes, of course. They would welcome the opportunity to have stakeholders from charter schools represented on that committee.

## **Committee Membership**

Ms. Else detailed Committee membership updates. She reminded everyone that they do have four meetings a year now and attendance is critical at these meetings. If they can't participate in person, Lifesize is a great way to join and be part of the discussions. Ms. Else reported that they had three resignations: CCSD, Hyde Park, Middle School Teacher; Washoe County School District, High School Teacher, and the Elko County School District, Southside Elementary Teacher. Additionally the ASD Charter School Democracy Prep position has been vacated.

If those districts would like to request that someone from their district fill that position, they can just send an email to either Ms. Else or Ms. Hutchins and they'll take care of it from there.

Chair Dockery said she knows it's hard for teachers to join the meetings because they are meeting during school time. She proposed they look at the teachers on special assignment, (TOSAS) to fill those positions. She asked what the Committee thinks about recruiting teachers who are really expert teachers to their group.

Mr. Prewett said he thought that was a great idea. Many of those TOSA teachers work at multiple schools, and so they're going to have a good perspective as well.

Ms. Holley said she liked that idea also. Nye has not been able to fill their coaching positions, but they do have some really young APs that have just moved out of classrooms into some AP positions, so that might be another option as well.

Chair Dockery asked if it would be possible for Nye to see if they could find a representative and Washoe to find a representative and then Carson could see if they could find one as well. Mr. Prewett and Ms. Holley said yes.

Ms. Else said she would email membership forms for that purpose.

Chair Dockery reminded Members that at their March 12, 2020 meeting it will be time to appoint new officers to two-year appointments. Officers can reapply for another term, but they would welcome new Members to join the ranks.

### **Future Meeting Date and Agenda Items**

Chair Dockery said there are four quarterly meetings and the remaining meetings are February 13<sup>th</sup> and May 12<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 a.m. If there are any items for the Committee to put on the agenda, they would like those submitted at least 30 days in advance of the next meeting.

### **Public Comment #2**

There was no public comment.

### **Adjournment**

**Motion:** Adjourn the Title I Committee of Practitioners November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting at 10:45 AM

**By:** Chair Dockery

**Second:** Mary Stach

**Vote:** Passed unanimously