



NATIONAL TITLE I ASSOCIATION

a National Association of State Title I Directors

Advocacy & Reauthorization Committee Meeting October 15, 2013

The Advocacy & Reauthorization Committee call was held on Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at **1:00 PM EDT** (12:00 PM CDT • 11:00 AM MDT • 10:00 AM MST & PDT • 9:00 AM AKDT • 7:00AM HST).

Committee members and individuals participating on the call were: Margo DeLaune (GA); Melina Wright (IL-co-chair); Rachelle Tome (ME); Mike Radke (MI-co-chair); B.J. Granbery (MT-co-chair); Gayle Pauley (WA); Rich Long (EDGR); and Bob Harmon (A+ Events)

Topics discussed:

1. Update on Title I Effectiveness Paper Status/Future Evidence on Title I Success (Mike Radke, Rich Long)

Paper does not make the case that Title I is effective. Consensus is to develop one-pagers which spotlight Title I issues or elements. The papers would provide factual information and advocacy (the “what” and the “why”). B.J. Granbery will find and distribute to Committee members the “hot topics” list from the summer meeting to inform the list of potential topics.

Next steps:

Short-term: Rich will draft the first one-pager, “What Is Title I?” and send to Bob Harmon. Once in good shape, the draft will be shared with the Committee members for review/feedback.

Long-term: Partner with a research entity to provide clear research questions to build the data argument (i.e., Title I Is Effective). Rich offered to talk with Tim Shanahan (directly involved with the Congressionally mandated study) for his advice/direction.

2. Update on America Achieves (Rich Long)

(From Rich Long’s 10-12-2013 email) Discussions have been opened up with America Achieves on several key points. One has to do with the cost of implementing several of the ideas, another with the issue of whose “evidence,” and a third area involves how proposed evaluation compares with ongoing Congressionally mandated evaluation. A final area involves the recommendation changes for programs involving response to intervention and the announcement in August that US ED was making changes to the accounting procedures for supplement/not supplant calculations.

Marcus Cheeks (MS) and Rachelle Tome (ME) were involved in two calls with America Achieves. Gayle Pauley (WA) was also involved, but less so. Prior to the America Achieves letter which sought NASTID’s endorsement, the discussions had been along general themes. The letter was more detailed. Rich has had one discussion with a staffer during which he indicated that NASTID was not necessarily averse to the concepts, but had several



NATIONAL TITLE I ASSOCIATION

a National Association of State Title I Directors

concerns or questions (e.g., how the items would be funded). Rich explained a little bit about the America Achieves organization and B.J. sent committee members their website link (<http://www.americaachieves.org/>).

Next step: Rich is scheduling a follow-up call to share more specifically the concerns expressed in members' emails around the topic.

3. Update on proposed NASDSE-NASTID legislative language (Rich Long)

(From Rich Long's 10-12-2013 email) Language was presented in board meeting as an example, but not really discussed.

Language from August:

"Data submitted by State education agencies under the Consolidated State Performance Report shall be used as the basis of and to prepopulate any other data reports required by the U.S. Department of Education, specifically including data submitted under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 616 as part of the State Performance Plan or Annual Performance Report in order to reduce the data reporting burden and reduce redundancy and duplication of effort."

Under Title I: "If a local education agency has adopted a plan for implementing a multi-tier system of support that (1) is research-based and (2) has clear, outcome based goals and (3) has been submitted to and has been approved by the state education agency, then the local education agency may use up to 25% of its Title I funds to implement such a program without being subject to restrictions in this Act."

New proposal under Title I: "If a local education agency has adopted a plan for implementing a multi-tier system of support that (1) is research-based and (2) has clear, outcome based goals and (3) has been approved by the state education agency, then the local education agency may use its Title I funds to implement such a program *as long as the plan demonstrates how the resources are concentrated on the Title I eligible students.*"

Members agreed that the 25% language went too far, but were okay with the reduction of the burden in data reporting and duplication of effort. Members were generally okay with the new proposal (above), if "targeted assistance programs" language were added. The ensuing discussion, however, raised more questions.

Next step: Table the item for further discussion in Portland.

4. Update on "to do" list as a follow-up to the NASDSE-NASTID joint meeting in DC in August (Rich Long)

(From Rich Long's 10-12-2013 email) Discussions with OSERS have focused on conducting a webinar to present the SWIFT ideas. This was agreed to but not scheduled; before the shutdown.

This item was not discussed further by the Committee due to a lack of time.



NATIONAL TITLE I ASSOCIATION

a National Association of State Title I Directors

5. Federal Register Notice ([Please download and review](#)) - Comments due Oct. 31 on new study of Titles I and II (B.J. Granbery)

If individual state submit comments, share them with other states. It might be more appropriate for states to do so than for the Association. Gayle and B.J. will be meeting with their state counterparts in Title II and will discuss this item with them and report back to the Committee.

Next step: Further discussion in Portland. In the meanwhile, Melina will review the Federal Register Notice and send comments to the Committee for the group's consideration.

Summary prepared by Bob Harmon
Principal Title I Consultant
on behalf of Committee Co-Chairs
National Title I Association