Title I Committee of Practitioners Meeting

December 12, 2013

Call to Order- Karl Koenig

Election of Officers: Theresa Kucsma, Chair for the meeting on December 12-13, 2013

Jill Adams, Secretary

Approval of Agenda

ESEA Waiver Review for New Members from Karl Koenig

**School Improvement Grant (SIG) Update-** Diane Longstreth, Consultant, Office of School Turn-Around (Handout Provided)

Overview of SIG- Federal Grant funded to SEA’s such as ODE. SEA’s have the responsibility to award the dollars to LEA’s through a competitive process. Cohort 1 schools have finished the three years of funding, Cohort 2 schools will finish with their funding this year. New funds will be available in February 2014.

There are 15 Transformation Specialists that are out in the field in the buildings that are supporting the building principal. There are two supported intervention models, Transformation and Turnaround.

Schools will need to include a needs assessment, discreet strategies, and the amount of money needed in the strategies. Schools that have received SIG funding before, are still categorized as Priority Schools, and are not actively receiving SIG funding can reapply.

There will be 9 weeks of time from the release of the application until the time it is due.

154 active priority buildings at this time. They will continue to receive support even if they are not currently receiving funding.

Districts who have a letter of support from their district’s teachers union and board of education will earn extra points on their application.

If districts don’t think they have the capacity to implement the grant they need to know they can be de-funded. If you are de-funded you will have a hearing that may lead to the determination that you will not only stop receiving funding, but also need to return funds already drawn down.

**Questions from the Committee:**

Q:Community Engagement is mentioned in the Transformation Model- this can be difficult to do at the building level because of Title I, SIG and other grant requirements. Can Family/Community Events “count” for multiple grants when we have them? A: yes- we encourage cross funding of events to build capacity.

Q: Does replace 50% of staff mean teaching staff, or building staff as a whole? A: That is a local decision, but most districts replace certified teaching staff.

Q: How many schools have been funded already? A: 40 were awarded in year one.

Q: Is replacing the principal a non-negotiable for receiving the grant? A: Yes. The guidance does allow for a principal replaced during the last two years as an effort to improve the building, to stay.

**ESEA Flexibility Waiver Update-** Tina Thomas-Manning, Associate Superintendent, Division of Accountability and Quality Schools (Power Point Handout Provided)

Timeline for Adequate Yearly Progress

School Improvement Requirements- flexibility from improvement actions for schools

District Improvement Requirements- flexibility for districts identified for improvement or corrective action

Use of Federal Funds- flexibility to use Rural and low-income school program funds

Use of Federal Funds- flexibility to operate a Title I school that does not meet 40% poverty threshold- Priority or Focus

Use of Federal Funds- Priority or Focus Schools, Reward Schools

Teacher improvement Plans- flexibility from HQT improvement plans

Transfer of Certain Funds- flexibility to transfer up to 100 percent of the funds. (Title I Part A)

School Improvement Funds- Flexibility to award available SIG funds

The waiver is good through 2014

Principles of the Waiver

Principle 1- College and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students- Includes the adoption of Ohio’s New Learning Standards, developing and administering high quality assessments.

Principle 2- State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountabilty and Support- Included setting ambitious but achievable AMO’s, providing incentives and recognition, and implementing interventions for low performers.

Principle 3- Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership- Guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation, support systems are consistent with state guidelines.

Ohio’s ESEA Waiver- Ohio was granted the ability to request to extend the current waiver through the 14-15 school year.

To request the waiver ODE will:

Letter requesting extension

Form requesting to amend ESEA flexibility

Evidence of resolution of outstanding issues

Ohio will also ask for flexibility to use ESEA 20% set-asides to support 3rd grade reading guarantee in the February request

Consultation- Engaging with Stakeholders

Updates shared with many groups including this group as outlined in the current waiver

**Questions from the Committee:**

Q: Will there be any restrictions on the use of the 20% set aside? A: The intention would be to not include restrictions if that portion of the waiver is approved.

**21st Century Grant Update-**Jeremy Marks, Director of Federal Programs, Shannon Teague, Associate Director, Office of Federal Programs (Handout Provided)

What is a 21st Century Community Learning Center- Funded under Title IV part B. 37 states are provided 21st Century dollars. These dollars support before and afterschool programming and during the summer. These programs provide supplemental activities that compliment work presented by the teacher during the day. Parent and Family engagement, Reading, Math and Youth Development are the four components. Many times these programs are located in the school, put are funded through grants that have been awarded to community organizations.

The grant targets low preforming, high poverty schools. All programs have a nutrition component.

Ohio gets about 42 million dollars per year for 21st Century Grants and it is awarded competitively. Application opens in February and is due in April.

Three Pathways for Funding:

Expanded learning time (ELT) in addition to out of school programming focused primarily on Pre-K-4 ($500,00)

B/C- Outside the school schedule only. ($200,000) Path B is focused on PreK-4 and path C is focused on literacy, college and career readiness and/or drop-out prevention strategies for middle and high school

Grantees will be subject to a State evaluation to determine future funding.

There will be a more rigorous scoring process than in the past, similar to the Straight A Fund grant funding. It will be weighted for sustainability and creativity, literacy improvement, etc.

Next week a new website will be unveiled to give stakeholders details and the opportunity to offer comments.

**Questions from the Committee:**

Q: Are Focus schools going to receive more points for their applications than other schools? Some schools have been written into grants by outside providers without their consent. A: No. There will need to be sign offs by treasurers and superintendents so schools will not be included without their knowledge.

Q: What percentage of the 42 million dollars will be awarded to Option A schools? A: There isn’t a set percentage. They don’t to limit the possibilities. Each grantee is limited to 3 proposals.

Q: When you say high poverty schools, what do you mean? A: It isn’t necessarily high poverty schools, but the students who come to the program. High poverty students can be identified and targeted to participate in the program services. This can be articulated in the application.

Q: What test will be used to determine growth in reading and math? A: The focus will be mostly literacy. Evaluators who go out to evaluate the program will look at OAA’s.

Q: When you use the term literacy, are you referring to reading literacy? A: Yes

Sharing of changes committee members have seen since NCLB was introduced 10+ years ago:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Positive things about NCLB** | **Challenges from NCLB** |  |
| It forced districts to spend Federal dollars on interventions for students.  | SES- Did not see the gains from the dollars spent. There were many non-educators on the list that made many promises to parents. Schools didn’t have any control over the program. Students not identified as economically disadvantaged were not eligible to participate even though they were academically needy.  |  |
| Report cards made buildings more accountable |  |  |
| Forced schools to look closely at why students were not preforming and what to do to help them improve. |  |  |
| We had to really look at curriculum and what to teach at each grade. |  |  |
| It made schools look at sub-groups.  |  |  |
| Could not hire para-professionals if teachers were not HQT.  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Break for the Day- Assignment for Committee Members- Provide feedback on the provided document regarding the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.