

Advisory Team: Comprehensive School Support and Improvement Advisory Team

MINUTES
JULY 28, 2016

3:30 TO 5:30 PM
ROOM 15/12
LONDERGAN HALL

ADVISORY TEAM LEAD	Dr, Mary Earick (absent)
NOTE TAKER	Deborah Fleurant, Jane Waterhouse, Cynthia Proulx, Richard Feistman
ATTENDEES	Sharon DeVincent, Carrie Charette, Brandie Bolduc , Pat Snow, Jen Sumner, Robin Gregg, Pam Miller, Carrie Portrie and Ethel Gaides
OBSERVERS	Joey Nichol, Richard Feistman, Deb Fleurant, Jane Waterhouse, Peter Durso, and Cynthia Proulx, Lynda Thistle-Elliott , Barbara Patch and Andrea Reade
PRE-READ MATERIALS	Proposed Rules Submitted May 31, 2016 ESSA Section 200.21 to Plan Approval and Monitoring

DISCUSSION
<p>Love the philosophy of innovation. Need strength-based system that accounts for whole child. Need to support the development of effective teachers (in service and pre-service) Need focus on early intervention and preschool. Language is important – need to be inclusive and welcoming Need to explore methods for improving stakeholder engagement and access to school improvement.</p> <p>Great intervention models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems of Practice • Community-based/ Leader in Me • Jenson Poverty Work • Wise Ways <p>The team numbered off into four smaller work groups. Each group was assigned a section of the Proposed rules sections 200.21 to 200.24 to read in a jigsaw activity. The two focus questions:</p> <p>A. Describe state process to include evidence-based interventions B. Describe rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria with-in a State-determined number of years consistent with each section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Act and §200.21(f).</p> <p>These questions guided the discussions during the next hour. The groups reconvened together and shared out their findings and main points from the discussion in the work groups. The major points from each group are listed in the bullets below.</p> <p><i>Focus Question: A. Evidence-Based Interventions: describe state process to include evidence-based interventions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of evidence based interventions, websites. i.e., Sites such as What Works Clearing House • What is the definition of evidence-based?

- Common language for terms can be used and defined on the NH Networks
- Repository for what works with different people/situations
- State Agency look at technical support agencies to help with evidence based strategies (tech assistance center)—look at both state level (NH) and nationally
- Funding to support interventions
- Discussion about the inequities of the resource allocations between Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and between schools
- Attendance and family engagement—keep in school of origin
- Schools need to be committed to the school improvement process
- School Readiness— in order to apply for funding, we need assurances - including from stakeholders - that the school’s improvement plan is comprehensive, and the school is ready to implement their improvement plan.
- Schools need to go through a planning year – School wide or School wide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) model – looking at strengths and weakness of current program
- Accountability – how will the State ensure progress is being made?
- What should State monitoring look like?
- Should not receive funding if implementation is not done with fidelity.
- Contractors - how should the State determine fidelity of implementation with the programs offered by contractors? Recommend that all contractors keep records of success as evidence in order to be considered by Local Education Agencies (LEAs).
- Consider State vetting of programs offered by outside contractors/ bidding process
- How will the extra 5% be used? Where is coming from? Off the top of the grant?
- What does “priority in funding – commitment to family and community engagement” look like?
- Self-selection into program, using neighborhood and health metrics as part of identification.
- Home visiting models
- Initial a study of high performing targeted school and use those schools to mentor others (especially those that are not meeting target after being identified.
- Need to be able to disaggregate the data from Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC).
- Funding for substitutes and other expenses that would allow visitations between school districts to view best practices in other schools
- Provide online courses to the North Country Cohort
- Review the paperwork that is required by state and Federal government to eliminate the redundancy of any requirements or documents.

Focus Question: B. Describe rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria with-in a State-determined number of years consistent with each section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Act and §200.21(f).

- Interventions if closing gap—OK, if not than change interventions
- Everything data driven
- Teacher stability (4 year window), recruit and retain, PD, mentoring
- Transfer students how can process be more streamlined for ease into new district
- Student mobility
- State maintained repository for data (Performance Plus), Digital, just use SASID

- Need continuum of learning
- More student led interventions/choice among students for projects/assessments
- If it is not working, change it
- What are the differences between Comprehensive and Targeted?
- Schools with multiple needs need to narrow down their achievable short-term goals.
- How do schools determine that all the funded initiatives are working? Impact data should accompany school improvement plans in the annual program review process.
- What are we doing about schools not meeting exit criteria? Is this something we should create?
- How will schools understand and be able to choose research-based interventions that are right for them, and that will ensure improvement?
- Should the State have a vetted list, a menu of research-based interventions and programs?
- Continue strength-based and positive connections
- Provide onsite coaches (state sponsored would be ideal)
- Promote further flexibility to explore new options.
- Targeted PD for all staff
- Participatory model
- Support mentor system between model schools and those in need of more support.
- Also need to include higher education and family resource centers into these schools.

The remainder of the meeting was filled with a discussion about the format of the next meeting. Options were proposed about the length of the meeting, maybe 9 to 12, or 1 to 4. We also talked about holding the meetings on different days, in different venues, and locations in different towns. It was decided that a Google.doc will go out to see what is best for the group. It was also suggested that each member in attendance would reach out to another person to bring them to the next meeting.

CONCLUSIONS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strength-based, positive, and flexible system needs to exist for targeted schools. • System should build capacity of students, families, and staff. • Schools that continue to need support should be provided coaches and greater flexibility to explore new options. • One question was still outstanding from the meeting and needs to be addressed. The question is “What are we able to change in the law to make recommendations?” 		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Send out new information about ESSA to Committee members	Joey Nichol	Next meeting
Everyone attending bring a friend to the next meeting	Committee	Next meeting
Send out Google Doc or Survey Monkey to determine next date(s)	Joey Nichol	August 12
Submit notes from each group and post to NHDOE ESSA website	Joey Nichol	ASAP