

# Nevada Department of Education

---

## Title I Committee of Practitioners

### Meeting Minutes

Thursday May 9, 2019

9:00-11:00 A.M.

#### Meeting Locations:

##### *Video Conference*

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy Las Vegas, NV 89183	Board Room (2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor)
Department of Education	700 East Fifth Street Carson City, NV 89512	Board Room

#### 1. 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.

##### **Present:**

Valerie Dockery  
Teresa Dastrup  
Brian Prewet  
Holli Kiechler  
Karen Barreras  
Kelly-Jo Shebeck  
Allyson Jamison  
Somer Rodgers  
Mallory Foley  
Rich Mares  
Gabby Lamarre  
Melissa Schroeder  
Randi Hunewill  
Greg Kramer  
Mary Stach  
DeAnna Owens

#### 2. Public Comment #1

There was no public comment.

### 3. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2018

(Information /Discussion/Possible Action)

**Motion:** Approve Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2018

**By:** Annette Dawson Owens

**Second:** Mary Stach

**Vote:** Passed unanimously

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

**Motion:** Approve Flexible Agenda

**By:** Randi Hunewill

**Second:** Gabby Lamarre

**Vote:** Passed unanimously

Before moving on to Agenda Item 5, Chair Dockery reminded everyone what the mission of their group is. The Title I Committee of Practitioners is required to review before publication any proposed or final state rule or regulation pursuant to Title I. The Title I Committee of Practitioners also provides advice and supports the implementation of Title I programs including review of technical assistance documents, templates and other tools that support the quality implementation of Title I in Nevada. She said the committee would like to review, before publication, any new rules and regulations that come forward regarding Title I.

### 5. NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Gabby Lamarre provided the NDE updates for the Committee. They held a combined Titles I, II, and III Directors meeting on Monday and Tuesday. The presentations for those meetings will be available electronically within the next few weeks. They do want to make those publicly available, but first they have to go through the ADA process and so that will take some time. They also did a presentation on the allocation process.

They are still waiting on some of the enhancements to e-page to be pushed through and finalized and they hope to have that very soon. They are thinking about having an initial application due date for mid-June in order to get the July schedule approval.

Chair Dockery expressed concern about a mid-June due date for the Title I, Part A e-page submission with all the other deadlines that they have. Typically, that deadline has been the end of June, and mid-June might be tough. She asked her colleagues their thoughts.

Brian Prewett said if they're talking about the mid-June deadline for e-page for next year's allocation, it's going to depend on when they get the allocation amounts. Chair Dockery said her concern is it's not going to be up there 100% at that point in time. Ms. Lamarre said for the most part, it will be. The vendor who is implementing the Fiscal Year 20 changes said things are pretty much completed right now, so it's just kind of a matter of processes when Title I allocations are sent to districts so that those can be uploaded into e-page. Technically they should be able to roll them out next week.

## 5. NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) (continued)

There might be some additional minute changes, but nothing that would impede the main core function of the application that can be rolled out at a later time.

Ms. Lamarre went on to say their team was thinking that giving districts about a month or so to fill that out would be sufficient, but they could certainly think more about that given the feedback that mid-June would still be difficult to meet. Chair Dockery said that would be great, or at least having a little bit more flexibility in that deadline would be helpful.

Ms. Kiechler agreed and said that having at least a month from when final allocations are out and then revising them multiple times after is a little bit difficult on the smaller districts. She thought at least a month, but then giving some consideration for all of the other NDE grants that are due at the same time. Almost all of the rural districts have a one-person grant department and those grants are no less time consuming to put together. So, there needs to be some consideration and a global view of the NDE grants.

Mr. Prewett clarified: the applications would be loaded in e-page by the end of next week, but the target is still to give them their allocations by tomorrow, correct? Ms. Lamarre confirmed that was correct. And then allocations will be uploaded into e-page by end of next week. But districts will still get their allocations via email from her by the end of day tomorrow.

Chair Dockery pointed out that certainly districts could get their applications in earlier than the deadline and have them reviewed sooner. If they can get them in sooner, then NDE doesn't necessarily have to wait. So one district could turn it in prior to deadline to be reviewed and approved and another might take more time.

Ms. Lamarre confirmed this to be the case; they review on a rolling basis. She clarified once again that these are preliminary allocations. The final won't be until the end of June. She said she understood the revision process is harder on the smaller districts, but they do want to make sure that they get out allocations and that at least they should have an idea of what it will be and, you know, that will likely change again over the course of the year depending on the guidance the Department of Education gives us.

Ms. Karen Gordon gave an **update regarding homeless education**. Nevada was one of only six states to receive funds focused on addressing the needs of 1.3 M homeless students nationally. After NDE received notification of this award, three committees were established, a state leadership team, a liaison leadership team and a homeless education community committee. The three groups are going to work together to improve outcomes for children and youth experiencing homelessness in Nevada. Committees will be reviewing the McKinney-Vento program needs assessment. This is a model assessment located at the National Center for Homeless Education and used quite widely throughout the nation. And during this year's McKinney-Vento monitoring of Nye County, Mineral County and Lyon County, the tool was introduced and being the McKinney-Vento liaison used the tool to look at their program within their district, feedback was given, and it has been overwhelmingly positive. The committees will go through this needs assessment to streamline and shorten the tool possibly and make sure that it is aligned to a new tool that they are creating, a fiscal tool. Second activity for the committees is to look over a fiscal tool that is being used in other states. This tool will help calculate costs from year to year for Title I set aside for

## 5. NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) (continued)

homeless education. This is a requirement in ESSA. It requires that information be included in the Title I Part A plan. And it will help combine programmatic and financial costs for required homeless set aside in the Title I application and help increase effectiveness of past activities. The implementation for this is not until 2021. Ms. Gordon said a letter containing all the specifics would be going out shortly, and additionally, she would be doing a more detailed presentation at the November Title I Committee of Practitioners meeting.

## 6. Equitable Services for Private Schools (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Ms. Melissa Schroeder, the Equitable Services Ombudsman for the Nevada Department of Education, did a presentation about equitable services for private schools in the state. The role of Ombudsman was written into Federal law in 2015. Every state must have an Ombudsman, whose role is basically to serve as a liaison between the LEA and the private schools just to make sure that consultation is ongoing, to check if there are any conflicts to mediate and to see if Federal dollars are being put towards programs and services of value.

Equitable services for a private school student just means that the state is providing eligible students, teachers and their families the opportunity to participate in services or interventions that benefit the child, and in this case, Title I students. The Title programs that require equitable services are Title I, Part A, Part C, Title II, Part A, and so on all the way through Title IV. These programs all have an equitable services requirement meaning that if your district receives these funds that you are required to consult with private schools. Whether or not private schools want to participate is up to them, but if they do choose to participate then you are obligated to provide services and provide consultation with them.

There have been some changes from the No Child Left Behind equitable services statutes. And some of those changes include things like how the proportionate share is calculated for some of the programs. Also, the obligation of funds. So, the U.S. Department of Ed released guidance a couple of years ago that stated that all private school equitable services funds must be obligated in the year in which they were awarded. What that means is that U.S. Ed is expecting us, within the states and at the LEA level, to ensure that equitable service dollars are spent within the fiscal year in which they were awarded.

And so, technically NDE wants to have zero carryover. But a lot of times it's difficult to get private schools to spend down the money. Sometimes there are extenuating circumstances that might prevent the spend down of all the funding, but rarely. Ms. Schroeder said she is working with districts to help them come up with creative ways to spend down their money (other than tutoring and PD) in effective ways that will help their students.

Chair Dockery asked for clarification. When she was at the Title I Conference and went to the U.S. DE workshop, they said carryover for equitable services is allowed. Was this true? Ms. Schroeder said carryover is allowable in the event of "extenuating circumstances" and the U.S. Department of Ed is really leaving the definition of "extenuating circumstances" up to the states. The bottom line is that NDE would like districts to spend that money down.

## 6. Equitable Services for Private Schools (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) (continued)

In addition to her Ombudsman role, Ms. Schroeder is also the Private Schools Education Program Professional, so she does private school compliance and licensing and she also oversees the Nevada Opportunity Scholarship Program. She's written a guidance document that details each of the Federal Title Programs in which equitable service is required.

There are some timeline changes for submitting documentation to the state for monitoring purposes. When NDE does monitoring for different LEAs, the Ombudsman is supposed to be a part of that monitoring, so Ms. Schroeder will be on those teams looking at documentation on consultation and things like that. She doesn't anticipate any complaints, but if there are, she'll be the liaison to resolve equitable services issues at private schools.

She said when it comes to the consultation process, every district does it a little bit differently and that's okay. Every district should work with their private schools in ways that makes sense for them. The goal of consultation is to reach an agreement between the school district and appropriate private school officials on how to provide equitable services and effective programs for eligible private school children. That's the goal is to agree. The consultation should be ongoing; it's not just a one-shot conversation in the spring where you're talking about okay, what are we going to do for next year and then they sign some papers and that's it. You want this to be a continuous cycle of consultation.

You want to make sure that you're also evaluating the effectiveness of the programs that are being implemented at private schools. That's really important because you don't want to implement something that's not working. If it's not working that's ultimately a waste of money. NDE wants to ensure efficient, effective use of funds, and so it is Ms. Schroeder's expectation that the LEAs will institute some form of an evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program from the get-go.

Chair Dockery asked for clarification. Is it the role of the LEA to conduct the evaluation and make the determination or is that a collaborative role with the private school? Ms. Schroeder responded that it should be collaborative. The LEAs should work with the private schools to get the information to get the outcomes. Really working together to figure out how to change, what kinds of changes might be instituted to make the services better.

Some private schools might want to pool their funding and some do. In CCSD the private schools pool their funding. That needs to be discussed too. Do private schools want to pool their funding or do they want funding on a school-by-school basis? So, the reason why the schools in CCSD pool is because it gives them more flexibility with spending the money. It gives them a bigger bang for their buck because they're putting all of their money together.

Ms. Schroeder went on to discuss consultation topics. When you're providing consultation you really want to make sure that you're talking about the services based on needs. And remember you can't use Title I funds to meet the needs of a private school or the general needs of a private school. You must target that assistance to Title I students, teachers and families. No funds go directly to private schools. So that means that no checks ever

## 6. Equitable Services for Private Schools (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) (continued)

get sent to private schools. The LEA is totally in control of the funds at all times. That money never goes to the private school.

So, what's best for those Title I students? How are those students identified, what kind of services do they need? Do the teachers who are teaching these students need professional development around how to better teach these students and meet them where they are and with the needs that they have?

Consultation has to happen before the LEA makes final decisions. You have to provide consultation to your private schools before any decision that affects their opportunities is made. So, if, for instance, an LEA was thinking about transferring funds from one Title program to another, consultation needs to happen regarding that topic with the private schools that could potentially be affected. That doesn't mean you can't transfer funds. It just means you have to let them know and have that conversation, and then whatever pot of money those funds are being transferred into you have to provide equitable services for the private schools through that pot of money. And so, you just want to make sure that you're openly communicating with the private schools regarding any decisions that might affect the opportunities for their students, families and teachers.

The consultation timeline should be continuous. It should be a year-round conversation that you're having starting off with deciding what you're going to do for the upcoming school year, so you're implementing and evaluating and continuously going through that cycle.

Services for private school kids should be starting at the same time services are being held for public school kids. So, if you're starting public school services the second or third week of the school year, then you should be starting those services for the private school kids the second or third week of the school year. Try and maintain that equitable service to those private school kids so that they have the same amount of time for services as the public school kids. Services can be delivered on-site at the private school or they can be delivered on a public school campus.

If private schools having a disagreement over use of funds or contractors, there is a complaint protocol that starts at the school level and if necessary, runs all the way up to the U.S. Department of Education.

NDE does require written affirmation. Affirmation documents for the upcoming school year must be submitted to Ms. Schroeder through e-page for each district that has private schools that are participating in equitable services by May 15<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Schroeder closed by offering her assistance in any capacity as the Ombudsman. She said her number and email were in their packet and she'd be happy to help them anytime.

Chair Dockery reminded everyone that the forms that are due on May 15<sup>th</sup> in e-page should be put into the LEA document library. She thanked Ms. Schroeder for her hard work as Ombudsman and moved on to the next Agenda item.

## 7. ESEA Distinguished School Program (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Ms. Mary Stach from Title I, Washoe County gave the overview of the ESEA Distinguished School Program. This is a pilot year for the Nevada National ESEA Distinguished Schools Program, so there will probably be changes going forward.

The subcommittee decided that it would be best to have an NDE review team as opposed to district representatives on the review team. That review team will be chosen by July 8<sup>th</sup> of 2019. Applications will be anonymous. After the STAR ratings come out, the NDE review team will send out invitations and applications to schools based on the STAR ratings and the criteria.

There are three submission categories: 1) exceptional student performance for two or more consecutive years, 2) closing the achievement gap, and 3) excellence in serving special populations of students. The schools actually have to meet Category 1 or 2 and then the LEA will also be invited to apply for or to nominate a school based on excellence in serving special populations.

The criteria that the subcommittee decided upon in this draft is it has to have been identified as a Title I school. The exceeded expectations for two years for Category 1, yearly for Categories 2 or 3 and then on the third one you'll see demonstrated a high poverty rate which is the top poverty quartile. This does not equate to 75 percent and above FRL or CEP. This actually is all the Title I and CEP schools, and then the top quartile of the schools with a high poverty rate would be in that group. And the reason behind that is that they wanted to focus on schools that had a higher FRL qualification.

**Category 1** which has to be two or more consecutive years would be based on proficiency being in the top ELA, top 15 percent for proficiency in ELA or math or top 15 percent for growth proficiency and ELA and math. So, it is ELA and math, not or math. The Nevada report card STAR rating of 4 or 5, and/or top 15 percent of state total index scores for two consecutive years. That would be based off the ADAM [phonetic] data and the STAR rating.

There are continuing questions on **Category 2** because Category 2 is closing the achievement gap. They started with the top 40 percent for proficiency in ELA and math or top 15 percent for growth proficiency, thinking that would include more schools, however that does not really equate to necessarily closing the achievement gap. They added in including the top 40 percent for proficiency for at least 80 percent of the subpopulations or the student groups to look at closing the achievement gap. And again, this is all figured out through ADAM and the NDE. This would not necessarily be people going through and trying to figure out all that data on their own.

For **Category 3** they're looking at top 40 percent for proficiency in ELA and math for special populations and being nominated by the LEA. So, the NDE review team would be informing LEAs which schools qualify for this, and then the LEA could nominate schools from that. And that's annually based on the current school year. And then the last criteria has to be that the school cannot have been recognized as a National ESEA Distinguished School during the previous two years or a Nevada Distinguished School for the prior year.

## **7. ESEA Distinguished School Program (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) (continued)**

Ms. Stach said their proposed timeline was:

NDE review team would be determined by July 8<sup>th</sup>

STAR ratings are supposed to come out in the beginning of September

Invitation and applications sent out September 18<sup>th</sup>

Nomination process guidance sent out on September 18<sup>th</sup>

Technical assistance webinar for schools runs for month of September

Application is due October 10<sup>th</sup> from the schools

NDE review team will go through the applications from October 11<sup>th</sup> through the 20<sup>th</sup>

Top 5 schools based on review criteria rubric will be invited to interview between November 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>

NDE review team will choose top two schools.

That information will be given to the Nevada National ESEA Distinguished Schools Coordinator.

That information is inputted into the National ESEA Distinguished Schools Program Portal through the Federal Government by November 30<sup>th</sup>

Chair Dockery said that this has been critical that they have a process in place for these schools that NDE can follow so that it's fair and it's equitable for everyone. She thanked Ms. Stach and her team for their hard work.

## **8. CEP, FRL, and Title I (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)**

Ms. Bobbie Davidson from the Department of Agriculture presented the CEP, FRL, and Title I report. She said the Free and Reduced Lunch report that they put together every year is a requirement from USDA. The regulation is very loose, but they just need to capture October data as of October 31<sup>st</sup>. On October 1 of every year they contact all of their sponsors that are operating the National School Lunch Program and they remind them that the October 31<sup>st</sup> date is coming up and to start verifying those students in their various systems to make sure that they are the correct eligibility and it's recording correctly. On October 31 they extract that data and they are to verify it again. They have 10 days to submit that data to the Department of Agriculture and they also have to submit a verification sheet saying that they certify that the numbers are correct.

Once that data is received, a report is generated. It is separated out by district and by school. Once that data is compiled, they go back and edit for special provision sites, such as Provision 2 or the Community Eligibility Provision, the CEP. They go back and enter in their approved claiming percentages because many of those schools are in that four-year cycle and to be most representative of that school site, they go back and enter that claiming percentage because they're no longer collecting those free and reduced lunch applications. That report is posted on the USDA website by December 31<sup>st</sup>.

Chair Dockery asked if Ms. Davidson could explain for the committee, for those that may not know, what is Provision 2 and how it's determined and what is CEP and Community Eligibility Provision and how that's determined?



## 8. CEP, FRL, and Title I (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) (continued)

Ms. Davidson said both Provision 2 and CEP are special provisions outlined by USDA. The intent of the programs is to relieve the administrative burden on school sites and school food authorities of processing all those applications annually. For **Provision 2**, any school can choose to operate Provision 2. There's no minimum free and reduced lunch rate. The school or the school food authority have to assess whether it's financially viable for that school to operate it because they do have to provide lunches to all students for free and they have to subsidize whatever reimbursement they are getting. So, it makes sense for the schools that have a higher Free and Reduced Lunch rate to participate, but there's no minimum percentage. For **CEP** it's a little different. It goes off of their direct certification rate, and direct certification is for all those students that participate in other Federal programs like SNAP, ARTANA, FDPIR. They are automatically certified for free or reduced meals. They do not have to fill out an application. So, for a CEP, a school site has to have a minimum direct certification rate of 40 percent to be able to participate in that program. You are allowed to group schools, and by grouping schools you are averaging that direct certification rate, so there is a chance that a school site, for example, could have a direct certification rate of 15 percent and not be eligible. But when they group with a school site that has a direct certification rate that's much higher and it averages to 40 percent or more, they can participate in that program. And then once the USDA receives that data, collected April 1 of every year from all sponsors and then they give out eligibility letters by April 10<sup>th</sup> of every year outlining what schools are eligible or nearly eligible to participate in CEP. And they have until June 30<sup>th</sup> to let USDA know if they want to participate for the following school year. And then USDA takes that direct certification rate that they gave us on April 1, and then we multiply it by the USE [phonetic] multiplier which is 1.6 which gives them their approved Free and Reduced Lunch claiming rate.

Chair Dockery said when you're completing your Title I application on e-page you are using that CEP rate, the multiplied rate, not the rate prior to the multiplier being applied.

Provision 2 and CEP have four-year cycles, so every four years the School Food Authority has to submit socioeconomic data to prove that there wasn't a significant difference from the last time they collected applications and as long as it's not over a 5 percent difference then they keep it that same rate.

Chair Dockery said it would be helpful if they could get some written guidance along those lines from the Department of Ed as they go into this new application for this year so that everybody is on the same page around this so that they understand it. And it doesn't have to be anything really long -- just some bullet points so that they understand what the guidance is from Department of Ed would be helpful.

Mr. Prewett asked for clarification: the CEP is locked in for four years; however, if it's higher then you can go with the higher number, correct?

Ms. Davidson confirmed that is correct. They collect that data April 1 of every year, and if they're noticing that their direct certification rate is much higher the next year, they can reset that claiming percentage at a higher rate and lock it in for an additional four years.

Ms. Hunewill asked for clarification about the National School Lunch Program. Did they get data from all schools even if they aren't participating in the National School Program

## 8. CEP, FRL, and Title I (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) (continued)

Ms. Davidson said the only October data they're required to collect are any of their schools that are participating in the National School Lunch Program or School Breakfast Program. They do have many schools and charters that submit data that they want to include on the report. So, they put a disclaimer at the top just kind of explaining that they don't go out and verify how they're collecting the information for their Free and Reduced Lunch data, and they do have asterisks by that school name to indicate that they're not participating in this program and this is all self-reported information that we're entering on this report for them.

Mr. Prewett asked a CEP question. In the CEP guidance it gives you three different options for the most part that you can rank and serve. You could take the direct certification, you could take the direct certification with the multiplier for all schools, or you could take kind of like a hybrid where you're using your FRL percentages and only changing the percentages with the multiplier for the CEP schools. What are most districts doing?

Ms. Lamarre said most districts are using the multiplier for the CEP schools.

Chair Dockery thanked Ms. Davidson for her informative report and went on to the next agenda item.

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

Chair Dockery proposed having more frequent meetings, four times a year. What did others think? The others thought this would be wise. They would be better able to stay on top of deadlines and timelines. They could keep the meetings to ninety minutes with one or two meaty topics.

**Motion:** Title I Committee of Practitioners sets a meeting schedule for four meetings a year to take place in September, November, February and May

**By:** Valerie Dockery

**Second:** Mary Stach

**Vote:** Passed unanimously

Chair Dockery said they'll come up with a meeting schedule for those dates and send it out to everyone to make sure that they don't have any big conflicts. They'll come up with some meeting dates for next year as soon as possible.

## 10. Public Comment #2

There was no public comment.

## 11. Adjournment (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

**Motion:** Adjourn the Title I Committee of Practitioners meeting at 10:48 AM

**By:** Valerie Dockery

**Second:** Melissa Schroeder

**Vote:** Passed unanimously