NCLB
Committee of Practitioners

Roosevelt Elementary School District Offices
6000 S. 7th Street.
Phoenix, AZ
September 17, 2004

Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES:

COP Members:
Norma Malamud - Co-Chair
Joe O'Reilly – Co-Chair
Julia Ayres
Gerry Baumann
Christine Bejarano
Karen Burns Copley
Harriet Caruso
Steve Chambers
Kaye Dean
Analizabeth Doan
Shery Dorathy
Tanya Ford
Diane Fox
Timothy Frey
Allen Grell
Connie Heath
Armida Hernandez
Maureen Irr
Marion Jewell
Joan Johnson
Mary Anne Kapp
Jean Lewis
Leticia Lujan
Patricia Marsh
Jill Martinez
Mary McIntyre
Lynn Monson
Jacquelyn Power
Amy Scalf
Lynn Thompson
Barbara U'Ren
Charlotte Wing

ADE:
Sherry Barclay
Nancy Konitzer
Lois Kruse
Bobbie Orlando
Tee Lambert
Muriel Rosmann
Erika Wesley

Guests:
Shelly Duran
Carrie Larson
Mary Grace Wendel

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:05. Norma introduced herself and welcomed everyone to the first of the 2004-2005 Committee Of Practitioner meetings. She then had members introduce themselves. Analizabeth Doan, assistant superintendent of Roosevelt District welcomed everyone to her district.

ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS – Maureen Irr & Norma Malamud
Norma explained that the co-chairs for COP serve for two years on an alternating schedule. Maureen had served her two years and she had another year left. Maureen and Norma then asked for nominations from the floor. Joe O'Reilly, Tim Frye, Gerry Baumann and Mary McIntyre were nominated. Joe O'Reilly was elected the new co-chair for the Committee of Practitioners and will serve from 2004-2006. A motion was made that this years nominees would be automatically become nominees for the next year's co-chairs position, not excluding nominations from the floor. There was discussion among members and the motion was withdrawn.

COP GOAL SETTING – Norma Malamud & Joe O'Reilly
Nancy Konitzer stated that she would be asking COP to be working on the Title I Distinguished Schools process. She also spoke about an issue that has been raised at the NCLB Monitoring Training sessions about Time & Effort Logs that auditors are asking LEAs for. Nancy would like COP look at that and provide input on Time & Effort Logs. Nancy expressed that she would like COP to be a working committee working on topics not just listening to presentations. A discussion was held about the purpose of COP. Norma explained Committee Of Practitioners is a group that acts as an advisory committee to ADE. Last year COP provided valuable input on the new 6-year cycle NCLB Monitoring system that was developed.

The committee discussed different issues they would like to focus committee work on. Members wanted to address the concerns and what kind of resources and support that is needed for LEAs and schools are needing trying to meet NCLB requirements and dealing with school and LEA improvement,

The COP members decided on the following committees:

Standing Committees:

- Membership
- Distinguished Schools

Ad Hoc Committees:

- LEA Improvement
- Years 1-3 of School Improvement
  - SI Plan development and implementation
  - Choice
  - Transportation
  - Supplemental services
  - Corrective Action
  - Meaningful parental involvement
- Years 4&5 of School Improvement
  - Meaningful parental involvement
  - Restructure plan development
  - Implementing restructure plan (Alternative Governance)

6-Year NCLB COMPLIANCE MONITORING – Bobbie Orlando
Bobbie explained to members that with COP's input the Monitoring Cycle Development (McD) Team developed the 6-year monitoring system that will help LEAs better understand all the different issues that need to be addressed to be in compliance with NCLB. The 6-year NCLB Self Assessment Compliance Monitoring document is a tool that can be used as a resource for LEAs to evaluate all areas beside the cycle that they are currently in. Bobbie walked members through the monitoring document, explaining how the LEAs will complete the checklists and utilize the worksheets. Bobbie also went over the instruction letter that will be sent with each cycle. She explained that every LEA has been assigned a cycle that aligns with ESS's cycles and the NCLB monitoring packets will be sent out in October. They need to be returned to ADE by February 1st. The monitoring packet and references will soon be on the ADE web site.

6-Year NCLB COMPLIANCE MONITORING cont…
Bobbie updated members about a new combined qualitative monitoring document that has been developed for Exceptional Student Services and No Child Left Behind programs. 3 areas were addressed for the pilot monitoring: Parental Involvement; Professional Development and Instructional Delivery. There were 4 LEAs asked to participate in the pilot monitoring: Fort Huachuca Accommodation District, St. Johns Unified School District, Tanque Verde Unified School District and Humboldt Unified School District.

FUTURE MEETINGS – Norma Malamud
Norma confirmed future COP meeting dates and sites:

Wednesday	November 17, 2004	Mega Conference in Tucson
Friday	January 21, 2005	Agua Fria UHSD
Friday	March 4, 2005	Chandler USD
Friday	May 6, 2005	Mesa USD

COMMITTEE WORK
After lunch members broke up into their committees they signed up for to discuss how they wanted to address each committee's focus.

Membership	Title I Distinguished Schools	LEA Improvement	School Improvement Years 1 - 3	School Improvement Years 4 & 5
Steve Chambers	Kaye Dean	Julia Ayers	Gerry Baumann	Kaye Dean
Allen Grell	Maureen Irr	Steve Chambers	Christine Bejarano	Marion Jewell
Joan Johnson	Mary McIntyre	Karen Copley	Harriet Caruso	Robert Klee
Jill Martinez	Charlotte Wing	Analizabeth Doan	Sherry Dorathy	Norma Malamud
Patricia Marsh		Tonya Ford	Patricia Marsh	Amy Scalf
		Diane Fox	Lynn Monson	Lynn Thompson
		Timothy Frey	Jacquelyn Power	
		Allan Grell		
		Connie Heath		
		Maureen Irr		
		Jean Lewis		
		Leticia Lujan		
		Mary Anne Kapp		
		Jill Martinez		
		Mary McIntyre		
		Barbara U'Ren		

MEGA CONFERENCE – Nancy Konitzer
Nancy let members know that the next COP meeting will be a short 2 hour meeting to be held at Mega Conference on Wednesday, November 17th at 4:30 – 6:30 after Wednesday's regular scheduled sessions. COP will meet at the Radisson City Center in Tucson in the Starlight room. COP will work on the Time and Effort Log issue during this meeting.

The opening General Session at the Mega Conference will feature keynote speaker, Dr. Thomas Guskey. Dr. Guskey is Professor of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation at the University of Kentucky and known by educators around the world for his work in professional development and educational change.

MEGA CONFERENCE cont…
Other featured speakers include Nancy Ichinaga of the Heritage Foundation. When Nancy Ichinaga became principal of Andrew Bennett Elementary in 1974, 95 percent of the children in her school were illiterate. In only four years she raised the school-wide reading performance from the 3rd to the 50th percentile in the state of California. After that achievement kept on climbing and, for 20 years, her school has been one of the highest performers in all of Los Angeles County. A mastery of reading in kindergarten is one of the keys to her success.

Nancy mentioned that if LEAs want to share registration between administrators, Thursday is the day that would benefit principals.

NCLB UPDATE– Nancy Konitzer
Nancy let members know that Arizona Department of Education was going to be audited by the US Department of Education in the spring. They are auditing Title I, Even Start and Neglected or Delinquent. They may want to talk with COP members as well as 2 LEAs to assess how ADE is providing services.

Nancy introduced Ericka Wesley our new Title II coordinator to members. Ericka most recently worked at a Charter school but has worked at the US Department of Education in Title II division.

In the training that is going on in September the focus is on the 6-year self-assessment monitoring for NCLB programs and fiscal applications. There are changes in the application reviews. Nancy encouraged everyone to go back to the directions and look at the application example that was provided. This will help coordinators fill out their applications. The expenditures need to be aligned with the Consolidated Plan and specified if it is a Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide program. Nancy also told members not try to enter student data into SAIS until their application is approved the SAIS system will not accept the data.

Superintendents of LEAs with schools in school improvement will receive a letter summarizing all of their schools that are in school improvement and which year of school improvement that they are in. It will also explain the steps that need to be taken by the schools. Each school principal will also receive a letter.

With LEAs that are in LEA improvement there are three areas of responsibilities that need to happen:

1. The state will notify parents; ADE is currently drafting a parent notification template that the LEA will mail out that ADE will refund the cost of mailing. The requirements that need to be in the letter to parents are: the reason why the LEA was identified as being in LEA Improvement, what parents can do to assist you. The letter will be in Spanish and English.
2. The LEA will develop an improvement plan.
3. The LEA will set aside 10% of their Title I funds for professional development.

Nancy shared with members that Comprehensive School Reform grant money is ending this year. Schools that received funding last year will be funded for all 3 years.

TITLE I DISTINGUISHED SCHOOLS – Sherry Barclay
Sherry is now facilitating Title I Distinguished Schools taking over for Nancy Stahl who has retired. There will be a Title I school chosen based on exhibiting exceptional student performance for 2 or more consecutive years. ADE will research which schools are eligible and notify each school. Once they return their packets, Sherry will gather the Title I Distinguished Schools committee and they will review the applications and choose schools that will have site visits from the members of the committee. Arizona nominees are due to National Association of State Title I Directors (NASTID) by November 17, 2004. The committee hopes to have their selection process done by November 5, 2004.

Before the meeting was adjourned members made a motion and it was passed that they want more information on the duo testing and what that means for AYP and AZLearns labels. A motion was also made and passed to make a recommendation to ADE that they continue to use the scores from 3rd, 5th, 8th and 10th grades for AYP and AZLearns until the duo test has been in place and utilized for a few years before using it as benchmark in assigning labels. COP also recommended that ADE receive input from stakeholders on changing the base line years.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:10 pm.

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners

MEGA Conference
Radisson City Center
Tucson, AZ
November 17, 2004

Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES:

COP Members:
Norma Malamud - Co-Chair
Joe O'Reilly – Co-Chair
Julia Ayres
David Baker
Gerry Baumann
Christine Bejarano
Pamela Bergstrom
Karen Burns Copley
Harriet Caruso
Steve Chambers
Kaye Dean
Tanya Ford
Diane Fox
Timothy Frey
Allen Grell
Connie Heath
Maureen Irr
Maureen Irr
Mary Anne Kapp
Robert Klee
Jean Lewis
Patti Lopez
Leticia Lujan
Patricia Marsh
Mary McIntyre
Ann Peschka
Jacquelyn Power
Kathleen Silvers
Catherine Steele
Julie Thayer
Lynn Thompson
Barbara U'Ren
Charlotte Wing

ADE:
Jill Andrews
Sherry Barclay
Bob Coccagna
Debby Francis
Nancy Konitzer
Tee Lambert
Muriel Rosmann
Janice Smith
Kim Strehlow
Erika Wesley

Guests:
Shelly Duran
Daryl Heinitz
Barbara Kohl
Jill White

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
Joe O'Reilly and Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the November's Committee Of Practitioner meeting. She then had members and guests introduce themselves.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT INFORMATION – Nancy Konitzer
Nancy went over the two handouts on schools in school improvement list. She reminded everyone that there are schools still involved in the appeal process. They will be removed from the list if they win their appeal. The pink copy contains schools in their 1st year of school improvement, which is a warning year. The buff copy contains a list of all schools in school improvement and the year they are in. This copy also indicates schools that are frozen; these are Title I schools that are frozen in the school improvement schedule. When a school in school improvement is frozen it means that they met AYP, they stay at the same level. When they make AYP 2 years in a row they will be removed from the school improvement schedule. If they make AYP 1 year but not the next they will continue on the school improvement schedule. Nancy reminded members that this year the target is higher in making AYP. We have moved from the first plateau to the next for meeting the reading and math targets.

A question was asked about the school improvement money. Nancy explained that NCLB requires set aside for school improvement of the state allocation. It was 2% it is now 4%, $8.9 million that is to be used for schools in school improvement. It cannot be used for LEA improvement, or schools that are in the warning year of school improvement. There is a discussion at ADE on how to prioritize allocation of funds, now that there are schools in the restructuring phase of school improvement.

Nancy informed members that the state is being audited by USDOE in April and they will be looking at Title I, Homeless and Neglected or Delinquent programs. They want to visit districts with schools in school improvement to audit how well ADE supports the districts. ADE is looking for districts that they can visit. If members have a Homeless or N&D program they would like to showcase please contact Bob Coccagna at 542-4564.

On November 8th Nancy attended a National Title I meeting. She shared that they are setting up an assessment piece for the states on compliance with NCLB. It is a peer review. The labeled results are different this time. There will not be any waivers given; there will be different levels of being compliant with the law. Nancy feels that Arizona is in pretty good shape to go through this assessment. All the states are in the same spot on being in compliance with Special Ed with NCLB.

Committee Work on Restructuring – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy went over previous COP input on restructuring on Alternative Governance. Now we have schools in the restructuring phase of school improvement. School Effectiveness Division will work with schools that are in year 1, year 2 and Corrective Action and they will be responsible for school improvement activities with those schools. The schools identified for Restructuring under the federal system and failing under the state system will work with the Intervention Unit, Tommie Miel is the Deputy Associate. Tommie will be directing her staff on working with those schools.

There are 11 or 12 schools that are identified as failing schools and they received site visits to determine if they were to be presented the state board as failing schools under AZLEARNS and they will receive intervention assistance from the intervention team. The intervention team will also be working with the schools that were identified for restructuring because it is a similar process. The failing schools and restructuring schools will be planning for whatever intervention that will be implemented. The options at the state and federal levels are very similar. The schools in restructuring will receive federal support. Nancy wanted the COP to look at what that would like. Tommie Miel asked COP to provide input on:

- The role of an External Facilitator?
- What kind of training at this level would be appropriate for staff, for principal etc.?
- What kind of grants could be used at his point?

Nancy had members break into 3 groups. Program specialists; Debby Francis, Janice Smith, and Kim Strehlow each took one of the questions and facilitated each group's input. They rotated through each group allowing all members to address each question.

See Appendix A for COP member input.

TIME AND EFFORT LOGS
AD-HOC AND STANDING COMMITTEE

These items on the agenda were tabled and will be addressed at a later date.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners

Chandler Unified School District - Offices
1525 W. Frye Road
Chandler, AZ
March. 4, 2005

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

COP Members:
Norma Malamud - Co-Chair
Julia Ayres
Christine Bejarano
Pamela Gergstrom
Karen Burns Copley
Steve Chambers
Kaye Dean
Sherry Dorathy
Tonya Ford
Timothy Frey
Allen Grell
Connie Heath
Marion Jewel
Robert Klee
Jean Lewis
Leticia Lujan
Patricia Marsh
Mary McIntyre
Lynn Monson
Ron Neil
Patricia Osborne
Ann Peschka
Barbara U'Ren

ADE:
Nancy Konitzer
Lois Kruse
Tee Lambert
Kim Strehlow
Regina Molina
Gary Fortney
Cathy Poplin
Robert Franciosi

Guests:
Shelly Duran
Muriel Rosmann

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. COP member Timothy Frey of Chandler Unified School District welcomed COP members and guests to James Perry Administration Center and introduced Susan Eissinger the Associate Superintendent for Instructional Services for Chandler Unified. Ms. Eissinger welcomed everyone to Chandler and expressed her appreciation of all COP members attending and wished everyone a productive day.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY MINUTES

It was motioned and seconded to accept the January COP minutes with an amendment. On the last page of the LEA Improvement Committee it states “The committee feels that the end count should be…” the correction is “end count “should be “N-count”. The motion was passed.

COP OPERATING GUIDELINES – Norma Malamud and Tee Lambert

In preparing to send out applications for COP membership, it was discovered that some of the timelines in the COP Operating Guidelines no longer applied and that the emeritus position was not mentioned. Tee prepared some suggested amendments to the guidelines to include a more flexible timeline, and updated ADE titles. It was recommended that the following procedures on how to handle attendance and position changes would be also be added.

1. “If a member misses more than 2 meetings consecutively a letter or an email is sent to the member asking if they plan on continuing COP. If there is no response a letter

signed by the ADE Deputy Associate Superintendent – Title I and the COP co-chairs to let the member know that their membership with COP is discontinued."

2. "When a member changes a position at their current employer or have gained new employment that would affect their representative position they can continue to the end of their term"

A motion and second to accept the amendments to the COP Operating Guidelines as presented with additional procedures was made. The motion was accepted.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF INCREASING AMOs – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy went over the changes in the benchmarks for meeting AMOs. The benchmark level stayed the same for 2002 - 2004 and has increased for 2005 and will continue to increase annually to reach100% by 2014. It is a concern how this will affect LEAs who have not yet met the benchmarks over the past 3 years and now this year the benchmark has been raised.

There was discussion about what will happen when more grades will be in the calculation of making AYP from the testing of 2006. Student Assessment Group (SAG) is discussing changing the baseline.

This year in the school improvement process there are:

88 schools	Warning year
67 schools	In SI year 1
45 schools	In SI year 2
54 schools	In Corrective Action
12 schools	In Restructure Planning

With the new AMOA benchmark for the 2005 testing, the concern is that the 54 schools in Corrective Action are at risk of moving into Restructure Planning.

Nancy told members who are interested that they should go to the website of the Department of Education Connecticut who just completed a state level cost study of NCLB http://www.state.ct.us/sde/NCLB_Study_2_28_05.pdf . They are part of 12-state consortium that used a standardized methodology developed under the auspices of CCSSO (Council of Chief State School Officers). Connecticut is the first member state to publish its analysis for its state legislature. This first of two parts discusses the costs at the SEA level. A second part related to LEA costs is to be published later.

Nancy talked about receiving an email from Sandy Brown, who does the federal allocations. Sandy mentioned that Arizona has almost doubled in Title I funds over the past 6 years. We received $121 million in 1999 and now we receive $228 mil in 2005. We have been very fortunate, some states are losing money.

IDEAL – Cathy Poplin

Norma introduced Ruth Solomon, ADE Associate Superintendent of Policy. Ruth passed on the Superintendent's appreciation for allowing Cathy Poplin and herself to be at COP to share IDEAL (Integrated Data to Enhance Arizona's Learning). Ideal is a new addition to the State System of Support as stated in NCLB, Sec 1117. It has been built in partnership with ASU and ASSET and ADE.

With this new technology it will learn through your log in, who you are, what kind of computer you are on, whether you are an administrator or a teacher and what grade and subject you teach. Even though you may have had to pay a subscriber fee for ASSET in the past, there is no cost for LEAs, to use IDEAL. Everyone will have access to 70 online professional development courses, 5,000 curriculum based application software tutorials, and more than 3,000 United Streaming video titles. A search can be used for the United Streaming videos using a standards-based search engine. In additions, ASSET provides some great self-assessment tools for teachers. Because of the ability to provide ASSET to all schools in AZ we will be requiring that all LEAs who received one of the Title II-D grants have their teachers take the 360 Technology Assessment at the beginning of the school year and then at the end. ADE hopes to show great gains in the use of technology.

There will be AIMS sample tests that will be online and students will have the ability to take them and then to find out how they did on the sample test. In the future, ADE wants to provide a formative assessment tool that can help teachers determine what their students know and what they need more help with.

IDEAL will be kicked of at the Microcomputer in Education Conference - 2005 March 14-16 at ASU's Main Campus. Superintendent Horne will be there as well as ASSET.

Next year the School improvement Plan will become a web-based form next year on IDEAL which will make updating or changing any portion of it much easier and quicker. There will also be online course work, AP courses. In the future there will be LEA-custom student and teacher ID login. There will be integration of professional development and online teacher certification. ADE will be providing Structured English Immersion (SEI) professional development. IDEAL will also provide resource guides for Reading 1st and Best Practices.

Members expressed excitement about all the possibilities IDEAL will bring. It was also suggested that ADE add curriculum mapping.

RESTRUCTURING – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy updated COP on the results of the training for the 12 schools in Restructure Planning. She shared the Attorney General's findings on the options for restructuring:

1. A school could not be turned over to ADE, and
2. There is nothing in state law that allows an LEA to hire an outside company to come in and run the school, they do not have that level of authority.

The options that are allowable:

1. Replace all/most of the staff
2. "Other" major restructuring
3. Convert to charter

   At the training they did not spend a lot of time discussing converting to a charter. It is a very complex process to do. If a District converted the school to be a charter and then tried to bring it back in, they would have to refund all the start up money and any extra money received as a charter school in one lump sum, it was very punitive and none of the LEAs were interested in that option.

The other two options were focused on. The first 1/3 of the training Nancy went over the history of how their school got to the Restructuring Planning phase of School Improvement explaining that they did not make AYP under IASA or under NCLB. Attendees then went over their own data, Robert Franciosi went over AYP and explained how it is calculated. During the afternoon

of the first day they went over the first 2 options and did role playing of what those would look like. The 1st option discussed was centered on defining what "most of staff" meant. Nancy explained that rather than using a % of the whole staff, schools should use data to make their decision; an example would be that if 3rd grade was the issue then they could consider replacing the 3rd grade staff. They did brainstorming on what are the characteristics of a good staff member. The discussion surrounding the 2nd option was on what did "Other" major restructuring mean. Nancy explained that schools should go back and look at what they had planned in corrective action, and evaluate how it was working. Did it need another year to really show progress, did they need to broaden it, or should they look at another course of action? Each one of the activities was very energizing for the groups.

The second day was to bring them back to earth, Nancy spent time with the schools going over the data, graphing their achievement for two years to help them understand where the gaps were for all the grades the school had. Using this data, they were to establish one priority that was instruction based and another priority that would help them meet the AYP goal. Steve Solomon from the Intervention staff laid out a temporary timeline that showed the steps to develop an action plan by May 15th. In reviewing how the training went Nancy thought parents got lost with all the acronyms and ADE needed to be more cognizant of that with parents being part of the training.

NCLB WORKBOOK CHANGES – Robert Franciosi

Nancy introduced Robert Franciosi, Deputy Associate Supt for the Research and Evaluation Section. Robert updated COP on the amendments that ADE was submitting for the NCLB Workbook to USDE.

1) In the area of the School Improvement Process
   a) Failed to make AYP in the same indicator for two years in a row
      - Grade level, subject
      - Sub-group

2) In the area of the LEA Improvement Process
   a) Failed to make AYP in the same indicator for two years in a row
      - Grade span (3rd-5th; 6th-8th; 9th-12th), subject
      - Sub-group

3) Keep ELL students who become FEP for 2 additional years in this sub-group

4) Raise the N-count to 60. The reasoning is the percent tested if N-count is less could cause them to fail AYP for LEAs and schools.

5) AYP determination for small schools will be average across the years.

6) Change the percentage rate for attendance from 94% to 90%.

7) If AIMS has a negative impact on graduation the graduation rate will be lowered.

ADE asked for changes in the NCLB Workbook that they knew had been accepted in other states.

Robert also reminded members that the new grades being tested this year will not be included as criteria for making AYP this year but will be for ARIZONA LEARNS. They will be in 2006 for

AYP. Robert wanted to warn COP members not to let the legislative action being discussed about AIMS graduation change what they are doing. NCLB still requires testing for 95% of all sub-groups.

ADE is concerned about multiple test days for students; there is a greater likely hood of “did not attempts” or “incompletes” on the test. ADE will have to modify the rules for what counts. The testing count is still using the rule of 1 question in every section of the test. If a student shows up one day and completes one section of the test, but then is sick and doesn’t complete the test that student would not get an AIMS score for having tested. In the past ADE would have included those students that “have not tested”, but this will have to change. Robert also mentioned that members needed to be cognizant of problems of students missing testing due to the rain Arizona had, if you had difficulties getting students to school you can appeal the absences.

A member asked about changing the baseline with adding the new grades being tested to the AMOs. Robert mentioned that they would not be visiting that issue until they see what happens with the new test. There will have to a new baseline with the off grades being tested.

A member asked about using Terra Nova and how that will be used in assessing K-2 schools. Robert stated now that ADE has SAIS IDs attached to the test packets ADE will start judging K-2 schools on their 3rd graders did on their AIMS test as stated in the Arizona NCLB Workbook.

A question was asked about LEAs building new schools and how that will work with the school improvement process. Robert and Nancy explained that if the LEA is opening a new school to change grade configuration by combining schools, or closing older schools, the new school, even if it is given a new CTD number will inherit the school improvement status of the poorest performing school. If a new school is opened because the LEA is growing and building to meet its growth issues, then it will start as new entity and will not inherit a school improvement status.

Norma thanked Robert for coming and updating COP. Norma discussed tabling the committee work for the day. Norma reminded members that the next meeting will be May 6, 2005 and held in Mesa at Mesa Unified. Committee work will be from 9:00 am to 10:00 am and the general meeting will start at 10:00 am. Meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm.

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners

Mesa Unified School District – Student Service Center
1025 N. Country Club Drive
Mesa, AZ

May 6, 2005

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

COP Members:
Norma Malamud - Co-Chair
Joe O'Reilly – Co-Chair
Julia Ayres
David Baker
Christine Bejarano
Karen Burns Copley
Harriet Caruso
Steve Chambers
Kaye Dean
Analizabeth Doan
Sherry Dorathy
Tonya Ford
Diane Fox
Timothy Frey
Allen Grell
Connie Heath
Mary Anne Kapp
Lucille Lang
Jean Lewis
Leticia Lujan
Patricia Marsh
Mary McIntyre
Lynn Monson
Ron Neil
Ann Peschka
Jacquelyn Power
Julie Thayer
Charlotte Wing

ADE:
Nancy Konitzer
Tee Lambert
Kim Strehlow
Gary Fortney

Guests:
Carrie Larson

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Joe O'Reilly, welcomed everyone to the Student Service Center and the Mesa Unified School District. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am for standing committee discussion.

STANDING COMMITTEES AND ROLE OF COP

Norma Malamud opened the discussion on the role of standing committees and COP. There are two standing committees -- the membership committee and recognition committee. The discussion focused on what and where does COP fit in the whole picture with the state. Nancy Konitzer explained that all the responsibility for NCLB no longer lies with just the Academic Achievement Division; there are divisions throughout ADE that deal with NCLB. Superintendent Horne currently has several advisory groups. Nancy is not sure that they are even aware of COP or what COP could provide. ADE is working on building bridges among the

departments dealing with aspects of NCLB. Nancy stated that she will talk with the executive staff about utilizing COP as an advisory committee on:

- Policy, and
- School Support which includes;
    - the IDEAL project,
    - the use of the county offices
        - there are 4 county offices that used to be part of the rural county consortium that receive Title I funds. All of the county offices receive Title IIA money for Math & Science and have Reading 1st money. The county offices want to be more involved in professional development, and
    - the consolidated report.

A member read the definition of the COP role stated in law (P.L. 100-297):

> "…The law requires all major proposed or final rules or regulations issued by the state be reviewed by the Committee of Practitioners."

Members indicated that didn't always happen. It was stated that all ADE departments who deal with NCLB need to understand this portion of the law and involve COP in reviewing and providing input on regulations or final rules before being issued.

Nancy discussed that communication could be increased with COP and ADE by using the listserv instead of waiting for meetings. The frequency of COP meeting dates makes it difficult to gather input before a decision must be made. The listserv could be used to gain input on issues between meeting times. Members feel that there should be a focus for committee meetings and that the issues need to go out ahead of time so members can come prepared. It was expressed that they wanted meaningful work to do not just meet for the sake of meeting.

Joe stated he would create a survey and send it out on the COP listserv to gain members input on the role of COP.

Members wanted to set up a meeting in June for setting a calendar for 05-06 and recommended inviting next year's new members. Harriet Caruso offered to host a meeting June 30th at Career Success at 10:00 am.

Members wanted to invite Superintendent Horne to the first meeting of the year.

TITLE I ALLOCATIONS

Nancy distributed the preliminary 2006 Title I allocations based on federal census and 2004 consolidated report submissions. Under IASA there were only 2 funded parts: the Basic Grant and the Concentration Grant. Under NCLB there are 4 funded parts: Basic, Concentration, Targeted and Education Incentive Grants. Each has their own formula; some districts do not receive all of them because each part has poverty thresholds.

Nancy had just received an email regarding High School money. In FY '07 it shows CTE and CSR and other programs being zeroed out in the federal budget and the funding going to support the High School Renewal Initiative. However, recently Congress passed parts of the CTE bill with funding, so now it is uncertain where the funding will come from for High School Renewal. Nancy will keep members informed when she hears anything.

The total Title I funding for the state is $240 million which is up from $229 million last year. Nancy explained that Richard Valdivia is seeking clarification on if the hold harmless provision is for more than 1 year. If the state funding is adjusted it will have to be adjusted down to the LEAs. Nancy then went over the handout given to members on set-asides. It is a form that provides line items for each set-aside that need to be accounted for. Nancy went over the Professional Development (PD) set-aside. There are 3 PD categories under Title I: A, B, and C. In category A, you need to show up to 5% for programs to meet the Highly Qualified requirements. If less than 5% you need to provide a rationale. Things that could be covered under that line are: tuition reimbursement, direct payment of tuition, payment for testing. It would have to be subject-related professional development.

In category B, LEAs need to show what other set-aside amounts for PD they are utilizing to improve instruction in Title I funded schools such as: conferences, workshops, and stipends for participating in professional development.

In category C, if there are schools in School Improvement there needs to be a 10% set-aside from each school's allocation that provides professional development in addition to what the LEA is doing. Also, under category C, if the LEA is in LEA Improvement there needs to be 10% set aside for professional development. The total can include categories B & C but not A. The set aside budget will be tied into the completion report for 05-06.

A question was raised about how the state is handling SEI certification. Nancy explained that there are two SEI conferences planned in May and August. If a teacher goes to both they would gain their 16 hours needed. In July the IDEAL web site will open and there will be course work online for the 16 hours. SEI certification is not part of the NCLB definition of a highly qualified teacher.

FEDERAL MONITORING

Nancy shared with members the preliminary report from the Federal Monitoring. ADE has not received a final report for the May COP meeting. Nancy discussed the issues that were discussed during the exit review.

ADE received commendations from the monitoring team on:

- SAIS – They were very complimentary on how we use SAIS.
- Service from ADE – During site visits, the monitoring team had received input on how well ADE provides service to our LEAs
- School Improvement Processes – They were impressed how the School Effectiveness, State Intervention and Title I Divisions work with schools.
- Grants Management – They liked the event log and how ADE could track what was going on with grants.
- Neglected and Delinquent and Homeless – They were appreciative that ADE recognized issues that needed attention to those programs and had started to address them.

Nancy mentioned that during the monitoring she worked with Gail Pauley, State Title I Director for Washington State, who was a peer reviewer for the program areas, and it was a great opportunity to talk about what they do in Washington.

Areas of concern were:

- Schoolwide Programs – ADE had already identified this issue. Specialists had discovered through the 6-Year Cycle Monitoring process and during on-site reviews that there is confusion about what is a Schoolwide program. ADE was able to share with the monitoring team that training for Schoolwide was already being developed and will be presented around the state. As School Improvement became a focus, schools started to create School Improvement Plans (SIP). Some schools then adopted their SIP as their Schoolwide Plan; the problem is that a SIP does not contain all the components required in a Schoolwide Plan.

- Parent Notification for Supplemental Services – The notification that they looked at from an LEA did not contain all of the components. Even though ADE supplied LEAs with information containing all components required, it reflected that ADE did not do a complete job of monitoring the Parent Notification letters.

- Set-asides – When the team interviewed LEAs they could not identify the set asides. ADE had identified this issue and Nancy was in the process of changing the completion report and next year's application to list all set asides.

- Tracking – The monitoring team felt that ADE needed to do a better job of tracking and following up on LEAs return of information to be in compliance.

There was also a question on how students were defined for the low SES group for AYP. Robert Franciosi, who is now the director was not part of this process and the original staff that was part of the process are no longer with ADE to answer those questions. There is confusion between identifying schools in schoolwide schools versus identifying kids in a provision 2 or 3 school under the Child Nutrition Program where all the kids are considered Free and Reduced Lunch eligible for accountability purposes. Those schools that are a provision 2 or 3 school do not have to have parents fill out forms every year; the schools establish a base line year and can continue for several years. Because they do not survey parents annually ADE does not have annual information. A directive came from the US Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Department of Education in a joint memo stating that for accountability purposes ADE could say that all of the kids of those schools would belong to that subgroup. The end result would be the aggregate scores of the Title I schools and their low SES subgroup would be the same.

Harriet Caruso spoke about the Federal visit to Career Success Schools as part of the Arizona monitoring. She thought it went well. She and her staff went through the protocol and gathered the documents and had them on hand when they were requested. Career Success Schools went through the same steps as a larger district had to for the monitoring. Harriet was invited to the exit meeting and thought that Arizona was doing well. Nancy mentioned that Harriet and Bob Duffy, who is the charter holder for Career Success Schools, provided the monitoring team a great example of a fiscally as well as academically, successful Arizona charter school. It was the first high school charter that the monitoring team had ever visited.

Nancy thought that the visits also went well at Tucson Unified and at Roosevelt Elementary. She appreciated how hard those districts worked at getting all the materials together for the monitoring visit. They also gathered parents to be interviewed by the monitoring team.

ACCOUNTABILTY WORKBOOK

At the March COP meeting Robert Franciosi came to report the changes in the Accountability Workbook. Since the last meeting there have been 2 conference calls. Most of the changes ADE has proposed will be okay, but there are two issues that haven't been verbally approved:

- Request that not making the AMOs would have to be in the same subject for two years in a row at the same grade level at the school level
    - USED has asked us to consider a grade span of say 3rd – 5th, not same grade. They kept mentioning the Tennessee model.
    - USED felt it would be okay at the district level but not at the school level.
- Request that the N count be changed to 60
    - They sent Robert a chart to do a comparison of the impact.
        - an evaluation showed it would drop 200 schools into the small school categories,
        - with Arizona being so segregated it would drop the African/American sup-group which is at 4% to below a ½%

Since an N-count of 60 was not acceptable, ADE made a counter proposal of an N count of 45.

What was approved so far was a change in attendance to 90% from 94%. For ELL; Arizona schools will be allowed to count students as ELL when they become FEP for 2 years.

UPDATE

- Joe O'Reilly asked to update the members on AIMS testing. He explained that at every grade level the state will bring 144 people together from around the state. On May 9th, 10th and 11th they will get together do to "book marking," assessing test items that range from easy to difficult. They will indicate where they feel students would meet, exceed, approaches and fall far below. The publisher would then do an impact study. Working together they would come to a final recommendation of where the cut points should be set.

- For the 04-05 AYP decisions, the testing of grades 4, 6, & 7 will not be included. They will be included for AZLEARNS.

- Nancy informed members that the State School Board has been expanded and there are 4 new members:
    - Anita Mendoza — Charter School Administrator
    - Nadine Mathis Basha — Public Member
    - Jesse Ary — Public Member
    - Cecilia Owen — County School Superintendent

- The President of the State School Board is Dr. Diethelm. Dr. Diethlem is an engineer and used to work for Intel. JoAnne Hilde is Vice President. Ms Hilde is also a public member but has a strong background in education.

- In September there will a peer review of the accountability system for all states. This review assesses our testing; their validity and reliability, the test development process, and the alignment with Arizona standards.

- Nancy discussed Title I funding for for-profit charters. She explained that there was a published finding from the Office of Inspector General that we can no longer fund for-profit charters. It specifically states in the law that only non-profit charters may receive Title I funding. There are 50 for-profit charter schools, but not all schools accept Title I funding. The charters may choose to change and become a non-profit and keep their funding but this must be initiated by July 1st.

MINUTES

There was a motion and a second to accept the March minutes. The motion passed.

MEMBERSHIP

Steve Chambers presented the recommendations from the membership sub-committee. A motion was made and seconded to accept the resignations of Maxine Roanhorse-Dineyazhe, Ronda Owens, Amy Scalf and William Kelly. The motion passed. Steve then presented a slate of applicants to join COP for members to consider. Steve commented that there was a good response in the amount of applications received. This year, COP had three applicants for the Private School representation and an applicant that could be a non-public school representative. A motion was made and seconded to accept new members recommended from the membership sub-committee. The motion passed.

FUTURE DATES

Norma led the discussion on setting dates for the September and November meetings. It was determined that the 1st meeting of 2005-2006 will be September 16th to be held at Roosevelt and in November it will be November 16th at the Mega Conference in Carefree. The rest of the year will be discussed at the June 30th meeting.

NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT

Nancy mentioned during the Federal Monitoring visit an area that was reviewed was our N & D program. While monitoring N & D and Homeless they met with grantees in the Tucson area for a day and then came to Phoenix and met with some grantees here. Next they came to ADE and reviewed our program. Nancy introduced Bob Coccagna, the Title I-D Neglected or Delinquent program specialist who worked with the Monitoring team. Bob distributed a hand out explaining Title I-D , the results of the Federal Monitoring and responses to the monitoring recommendations. ADE knew that before the monitoring that this was a program that needed to be addressed. Bob had already started to address many of the areas.

There are two subparts:

- Subpart 1 – grants to State Agencies; Department of Corrections , Department of Juvenile Corrections and Arizona Supreme Court

- Subpart 2 – grants to LEAs with a high proportion of youth in local correctional facilities for drop-out prevention programs for at-risk youth.

The confusion lies with who gets the services. What makes it confusing is how the funds are distributed to the state and then to LEAs. In October of each year, the state gets a count from the LEAs of the number of youth in residential programs within their boundaries (not state agencies) that fit in the category of N&D. The LEA then receives federal funding based on those counts. Using this allocation method some of the LEAs would receive such a small amount, they did not even apply, and the funds went unclaimed. Another problem was that LEAs thought the dollars were to go directly to the agency directly serving the youth so the funding became simply a "pass through".

ADE needs to change how we administer Title I-D subpart 2. ADE needs to define what would be considered a "high proportion". Bob discussed some possible solutions such as:

- Change the allocation process to a competitive grants process.
    - Consider a multiple year grant vs. a single grant to develop programs and a system of support.
- Allow LEAs within a given county to apply as a Consortium
    - LEAs by working together could demonstrate a high proportion as a result of the collaboration.
- LEAs must change from the current "pass through" model to a school-based model that supports transition for students returning from correctional facilities and provide services to students determined to be at risk as defined in the law.

Bob mentioned creating a Title I-D sub-grant 2 Focus Group. A form was distributed to see if any members were interested in joining the Task Force.

Members were reminded about the June 30th meeting at Career Success and thanked for coming and participating throughout the year. The Co-Chairs Norma and Joe wished everyone a good summer. Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners

Career Success Schools
3816 N. 27th Ave
Phoenix, AZ

June 30, 2005

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

COP Members:	**New Members:**	**ADE:**	**Guests:**
Norma Malamud - Co-Chair	Linda Denno	Nancy Konitzer	Daryl Heinitz
Joe O'Reilly - Co-Chair	Cecilia Frakes	Tee Lambert	Carrie Larson
Harriet Caruso	Mary Gillespie	Kim Strehlow	
Steve Chambers	Lidell Jacobson		
Timothy Frey	Wendy Miller		
Jean Lewis	Wendy Ong		
Leticia Lujan	Yvonne Watterson		
Mary McIntyre	Deone Wiley		
Ann Peschka			
Charlotte Wing			

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Norma Malamud, opened the meeting at 10:10 am. Norma welcomed everyone, and mentioned that at this meeting we had new members attending that had just been elected. She had members introduce themselves. Nancy Konitzer thanked Harriet Caruso for having Career Success Schools host the COP meeting.

EVALUATIONS

Joe O'Reilly, summarized the comments of the COP evaluation that was sent out to members on the COP list serve. Overall, the responses to the question "What did you like best about COP this year?" indicated that:

- Members liked being on COP,
- they benefit from the meetings,
- members get information that they don't get elsewhere, and
- they like the discussions that take place.

To the question "What was the biggest accomplishment(s) of COP this year?" members felt that:

- they were unsure or stated that they didn't know, or
- that the work that was done at Mega Conference in defining the role of the External Facilitators was the biggest accomplishment.

To the question "Do you think the COP is meeting its role as defined in NCLB?" The most common response was:

- No, COP is not being consulted before the rules and decisions are made but, informed after the fact.

Members said that they do not want to be just informed on issues during the meeting they want to have information before the meeting so members can discussion issues. Members want to work on issues in order to have an impact on decisions being made.

Nancy Konitzer went over the duties of Committee of Practitioners (COP) as stated in Section 1903(b)the NCLB legislation. She shared the history of COP under the requirements of different ESEA legislation. With the enactment of NCLB, ADE has created several divisions to deal with all of the accountability pieces of NCLB and it is no longer under just the Title I Division. During the June ADE monthly Management Meeting Nancy presented what the role of COP is, and how COP is required by law to be involved. They were very receptive and many did not understand the role of COP. Nancy asked that when there are issues that need to be brought before COP to let her know. Nancy will check with the management team monthly to see if there is anything to be placed on the agenda.

Nancy talked about Superintendent Horne's advisory committees. They meet as stakeholder groups; superintendents, teachers, and principals. If there is information that COP thinks might affect these groups we can start a two way communication between those advisory committees and COP.

UPDATES

Nancy informed the group of the following ADE personnel changes:

- Deputy Superintendent, Tacy Ashby has accepted the position of Superintendent at Cave Creek Unified District,
- Associate Superintendent, Margaret Garcia-Dugan has taken the position of Deputy Superintendent, and
- Assessment Director, Donna Lewis has accepted the position of Assistant Superintendent at Phoenix Elementary.
- Sherry Barclay, while still working with Title V, is now the Plans and Systems Manager. She will be monitoring the plans, training staff and working with new LEAs.
- Juana Jose and Rosalio Garcia have retired
- Erika Wesley moved back to Washington DC
- There are 3 other open positions that ADE is looking to fill.

Nancy reported that the Title II funding has come in. ADE is still waiting on Title V. As soon as ADE receives the funding notification and verifies the numbers, the award letters will go out. Nancy also mentioned that ADE has not yet heard back on the Federal Monitoring.

Nancy introduced Mr. Bob Duffy, Superintendent of Career to Success Schools. He welcomed COP members to Career to Success and thanked them for participating in COP. Mr. Duffy mentioned that the communication that is shared with and comes from COP is very important to the schools that deal with NCLB.

GOALS FOR NCLB PROCESS

Last year, Academic Achievement Division's (AAD) goal was to set up and implement the 6 year cycle monitoring process. The first year of the monitoring process went very well with specialists conducting all 78 on-site visits. Out of 420 LEAs participating in the 6 year cycle process, only 15 LEAs were out of compliance for not submitting their assigned Cycle documentation.

This year AAD is focusing on Title I Schoolwide Planning. As specialists have discovered, and the federal monitoring team confirmed, there is a need for training on Schoolwide Programs. In talking to LEAs it was discovered that when some of the schools developed a School Improvement Plan they used it for their Schoolwide Plan. Evaluating the SIP showed that many did not contain all the components required for a Schoolwide Plan. Others did not have any kind of a plan.

Bobby Orlando, the NCLB Monitoring Manager, and members of the Monitoring Cycle Development Team are working on a Schoolwide Plan Training that will be conducted throughout the state starting in July. The goal is to help LEAs understand what a Title I Schoolwide Program is and to help them determine if it is the best program for their school. Schools will also receive training on the Schoolwide Planning Process to use when creating a Schoolwide Plan.

Another issue that AAD is focusing on is the need to work closely with charters that are receiving Title I funding for the first time. To help charter holders understand the requirements of Title I and NCLB, ADE is going to require mandatory training. The training will focus on appropriate Title I programs, the application process, submission of an Interim Plan and guidance on writing their Final Consolidated Plan.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

There have been discussions on the whole system of school support under NCLB and/or AZLEARNS and the need to provide a systematic way to deliver services to these schools. There are Title I schools that are Underperforming but are not in school improvement under NCLB and Title I schools that in are in school improvement under NCLB but are not in school improvement (Underperforming or Failing) under AZLEARNS.

Under AZLEARNS the law requires that schools that were underperforming have solutions teams. These teams would visit the underperforming schools and do an evaluation. There are 4 standards that these schools are evaluated on:

- Leadership,
- Curriculum/instruction/professional development,
- Assessment, and
- Climate/culture/communication.

The solution teams ask the question "Can the school implement the school improvement plan so that student achievement increases?" Using a protocol, the solutions teams document their findings. For AZLEARNS school improvement, the ASSIST Coaches then provide assistance to those schools that were Underperforming.

In wanting to create a single school plan that can be used for a School Improvement Plan, and a Title I Schoolwide Plan, the SIP template was reviewed by the AZLEARNS School Solutions

Division and Nancy has looked at it from a Title I perspective. Recommendations were made to include additional components and reorganize the template so that schools could develop a single school plan. Then the SIP could be used for AZLEARNS, NCLB school improvement, for developing a Title I Schoolwide Plan or by any school that wants to have an improvement process in place. This will help schools so they do not have to have several different plans to increase student achievement and create school reform.

Nancy went over the Title I School Improvement Plan handout provided to members. She pointed out parent and teacher representatives are required on the School Improvement Team. Nancy went over specific questions that will be asked about the percentage of HQ staff, emergency certification and the turnover rate. All of these are indicators of meeting the standards. The goal is to have the demographic data automatically loaded just as it is in the Final Consolidated Plan. This revised SIP template will be accessed through the IDEAL portal. LEAs would answer different questions depending on the type of plan Nancy indicated that the handout was incomplete and stated she would email the full template to members and they could email suggestions back to her. A member made the statement that the process of developing a SIP is as critical as the plan itself.

As part of school support Superintendent Horne asked for $50 million dollars for teacher mentoring from the legislature to be able to help schools. It did not pass in the last legislative session and will be taken back this year In August the SBE will be asked to approve guidelines for the mentoring program.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

Joe led a discussion on future meeting dates after the November meeting at Mega Conference. Members agreed to meet:

- January 27, 2006
- March 31, 2006
- May 19, 2006

The committee will discuss at the September meeting on where those meeting will be held.

There was a discussion on increasing the cost for meals at the meetings. A motion was made and seconded to increase the fee to $15 from the $10. This fee goes towards the cost of brunch, lunch and an afternoon break. The motion passed.

CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION

Nancy spoke about the look of the new consolidated application. The first page is a guide to all the requirements that needs to be addressed as you complete the consolidated application. It also lists steps that need to be done each year for NCLB. There will be an additional option for an update for the Final NCLB Consolidated Plan that has already been approved. The updated plan will have the 04-05 data. Nancy is setting up a NCLB Doc Library on the NCLB page where there will be links to fiscal information, Title I guidance and other useful links for Title I programs. The NCLB Document Library is a tool that can be used while working on the consolidation application. The checklist also describes specific set-asides that must be included and addressed in the consolidated application. Nancy reminded members that program activities and professional development activities are to be supplemental and aligned to the LEA Plan. This checklist will be included with the LEA allocation letter and training will be providing training around the state in July and August.

Nancy encouraged members to go on the Common Logon and fill in the contact information on the LEA Core Data. This will provide ADE an updated email list for NCLB coordinators and other staff members.

Joe and Nancy thanked everyone for coming and wished everyone a good summer. Meeting adjourned at 1:55 pm.