

Advisory Team: Comprehensive School Support and Improvement

MINUTES

OCTOBER 4, 2016

3:30-5:30PM

PLYMOUTH STATE UNIVERSITY,
CONCORD, NH

ADVISORY TEAM LEAD	Christopher N. Motika
NOTE TAKER	Title I Educational Consultants led small groups and took notes within their groups. Mary Bubnis, Richard Feistman, Deborah Fleurant, Kathryn "Joey" Nichol, and Jane Waterhouse
ATTENDEES	Kathleen Abate – Granite State Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health Kristin Barden – Manchester School District Adrienne Baum – Manchester School District Brandie Bolduc – University of New Hampshire Christine Brennan – Manchester School District Katie Brissett – Spark NH Deb Connell – Fall Mountain School District Bonnie Dunham – Parent Information Center Julie Finley – SAU 18 – Franklin School District Kim Firth – Endowment for Health Ethel Gaides – Pemi-Baker School District Robin Gregg – ConVal Regional School District McKenzie Harrington-Bacote – Laconia School District Mary Heath – NH State Legislation Rachel Hopkins – Library Media Specialist Cara Kuehl – SAU 10 - Derry Pamela Miller – SAU 59 Jeni Mosca – Somersworth School District Eileen Mullen – Department of Health and Human Services Mary Schuh – University of New Hampshire Denise Sharlow - SAU 18 – Franklin School District Lynn Stanley – NH Afterschool Network Kathy Temple – Blake Elementary School – SAU 18 Sheila Wynkoop – Manchester School District Santina Thibedeau – NH Department of Education Mary Steady – NH Department of Education Ashlee Fye – NH Department of Education Lynda Thistle Elliott – NH Department of Education Kathy Vestal – NH Department of Education
OBSERVERS	Joe Trunk – Comprehensive Center
PRE-READ MATERIALS	N/A

DISCUSSION	
<p>Chris Motika opened the meeting by welcoming guests and introducing himself as the new Administrator for the Bureau of Integrated Programs and Title I State Director.</p> <p>Chris thanked the Title I team for agreeing to facilitate small group discussions during the meeting, and he recognized other Department of Education employees and thanked them for joining the Advisory Team.</p> <p>Chris then introduced co-facilitator Andrea Reade from the Comprehensive Center and her colleague, Observer Joe Trunk.</p> <p>Andrea began by reviewing the Meeting Agenda, taking time to note future meetings, as well as the asynchronous meetings that will allow participants to review ESSA indicators and include feedback or advice on addressing the new law. Andrea highlighted the entire Advisory Team schedule and noted our goal of obtaining as much feedback as possible in order to appropriately address the indicators of ESSA.</p> <p>Chris then asked that each of the stakeholders around the room introduce themselves and briefly tell the large group what organization, school, or district they represent. All stakeholders introduced themselves to the large group.</p> <p>Chris then continued and asked how many stakeholders, by a show of hands, were familiar with the new ESSA law. He noted his surprise that a large majority of participants raised their hand. He then spoke about how ESSA is the next authorization of the ESEA law, originally enacted in 1965. Chris highlighted the importance of equity, and that as the breakout groups address the different indicators, they should ensure that equity is at the forefront of their feedback. Chris said that one of the primary purposes to this law is not to ensure that those who already have access to high quality education get more services; but that those who are neediest and have the least access to programs and high quality education receive the services they need to raise them up.</p>	

Andrea then discussed the small group work that would take place, explaining that stakeholders would be broken into groups by counting off, and they would work with a DOE facilitator assigned to that number. She asked all participants to take the time to write their answers addressing questions to each ESSA indicator down so that we could record their answers on a Google Doc, which would then be made available for comment through the asynchronous meeting timeframes. Andrea then asked participants to count off and sort themselves into one of five groups based on their number. She asked facilitators to move to different areas of the room and the group work then began.

After the groups began their work, one stakeholder was concerned that they did not have enough context of the law and the purpose of the work in order to complete the task. Andrea then stopped the group work to provide that context, noting the importance on equity, as well as the need to focus on the specific questions in each standard.

Group work continued and the notes from stakeholders are attached as a document titled: Stakeholder Input ESSA Indicator 4.3.

CONCLUSIONS

Many of the groups struggled to get started, primarily because they did not have the context for the new law or enough knowledge about how the questions pertained to them. Specifically non-school based stakeholders were not aware of how specific aspects of ESSA indicators were relevant to their organizations or perspectives as non-educators.

Building and District based stakeholders, specifically those who work with Title I programs, were able to provide the most feedback as they did understand the context of the law and the questions.

Facilitators received all feedback and debriefed in order to make changes to their approach for the next meeting in order to more appropriately engage all stakeholders.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Create presentation regarding context of ESSA	Chris Motika	10/25/2016
Draft questions for non-school based stakeholders to best receive their input on specific needs of ESSA plan.	Chris Motika	10/25/2016
Draft of ESSA Consolidated Plan for Indicator 4.3 a-e	Chris Motika	10/25/2016
Open Google Doc for comments in asynchronous environment and send to participants	Chris Motika	10/7/2016