



NATIONAL TITLE I ASSOCIATION

a National Association of State Title I Directors

The **Effective Programs & Quality Outcomes Committee** meeting was held via conference call on **Tuesday, April 25, 2017** at a special time, **11:00AM EDT, 10:00AM CDT, 9:00AM MDT, 8:00AM MST and PDT.**

Participating in the call were: Gayle Pauley (Co-chair—WA); Edmund Moore (AL); Jack O'Connor (MT); Otistene Smith (AR); Jeff Arch (CA—A+ Events); Marcus Cheeks (MS—A+ Events); Jeri Erickson (CA—A+ Events); Bob Harmon (WA—A+ Events); and Dr. Chad Lochmiller — Indiana University.

1. Discuss the research study with Chad Lochmiller, Indiana University. The Board-approved [Agreement to Engage in Research](#) focuses on ESSA resource equity provisions.

Chad described the scope of his research project in broad terms. He appreciates the enthusiastic participation of the Association. Chad has assembled a research team comprised of two doctoral students to provide quantitative and qualitative review of Title I programs. This is a good opportunity to see how resources are being allocated and to see the effectiveness of Title I funds. It is like peeling back the onion to find not only the money being spent but successful interventions needed.

Phase 1: starting on July 1, 2017, this will be a fifty-state policy scan to see how SEA Title I administrators approach new resource equity provisions of ESSA and see how to strengthen provisions per pupil and identify resource inequities.

Comprehensive School Improvement Plans: website review and phone interviews with fifty-state representation of National Title I Association members. Chad has acquired funding for Phase 1 through Indiana University's School of Education.

Between the first of August and the end of September, his team will conduct the first document scan and will begin receiving information regarding participation in the project. They will begin scheduling phone interviews and hope to be completed with the initial interview process by January 2018. Data from the interviews will be pulled by April/May of 2018. Chad will vet findings with the National Title I Association to make sure the language is consistent and correct.

Phase 2: a 2- to 3-year project, this phase of the project will be a deep dive to investigate schools in 5-6 states that are working through the provisions to see what SEAs and LEAs are doing. This part needs funding and Chad has identified a possible source and has sent a letter of inquiry to the William T. Grant Foundation.

After starting phase 2, Chad's team can start phase 3, which he hopes can be funded by The Institute of Education Sciences.

Gayle asked if Chad could tell the committee a little about the focus of Phase 3.

Chad responded that his team will employ a mixed methods approach of gathering and accessing quantitative and qualitative data. The frustration has been that there is no clear guidance structure for interventions or guidance or how to access investment in Title I. How is evidence being used? How are interventions effective?

Gayle remarked that Chad's response is spot on: Washington (state) needs evaluation tools.

Edmund noted that we are moving from research-based to evidence-based evaluations.

Chad responded that this is one of the questions they are hoping to probe – how are evidence-based evaluation changing? Is it just a change in language or completely switching gears? One of the reasons to do a deep dive is that it will allow his team to ask questions about ESSA vs. previous program structures.

Otistene asked if this research would include distinguished schools.

Chad answered that Phase 2 will look at distinguished schools and others schools identified by the National Title I Association.

Bob asked if there will be a role for the Association in the selection of the 5-6 states for the deeper dive.

Chad noted that his team will be using a hierarchical linear growth model after the 5-6 states have been selected and that the Association can help select the states, but not the LEAs.

Bob mentioned that the Association has worked on the Advisory Group with Bob Slavin and Johns Hopkins University's *Evidence for ESSA* website. The website gives folks ideas on how to choose reading and math models and how to judge materials with a rubric.

Chad answered that there are some evaluative components to Phase 3, which should be complimentary to the Johns Hopkins study, but there is little information that looks at effectiveness.

Gayle thanked Chad for his time and all agreed that we are excited to be working together.

2. Continue the discussion and share information about how states can support Distinguished Schools since the set aside for awards is no longer part of the Title I allocation model. (See the link to the survey below.)

Bob started the discussion by mentioning that the survey regarding barriers to DS participation was based on the discussion from the last meeting and includes four questions that should go out to the rest of this committee.

Gayle asked if we could re-work the survey questions to get more beneficial information about funding questions. Should Question #1 be: Did your state name Distinguished Schools (DS) for 2015 and 2016? Yes or No? Should question #3 be: What are the barriers that prevent your state from fully participating in the Distinguished School program at the national conference?

A general discussion about the merits of the DS program followed.

Edmund noted that he would hate to see the DS program go by the wayside.

Gayle mentioned that this is the biggest question – how to adequately fund travel to the conference. Washington (state) used to give small award for travel to the conference.

Edmund said that Alabama stopped funding travel 4 or 5 years ago, but that LEAs have funded.

Gayle replied that in Washington (state) some larger districts could do that, but not the smaller districts and asked the question, “where do we find the funds?” She also stated that we need to think through the effect on state title directors.

Bob asked if we might consider reducing the four questions on the survey to two:

1. Did your state select Distinguished Schools for 2015 and 2016?
2. If no, why not and identify barriers to:
 - a) naming schools
 - b) participating in the 2018 national conference.

Gayle replied that she likes Bob’s pared down questions and would like them to go out to all Active members.

Edmund and Bob agreed that that we need to get the survey out to all 49 states that have Active members (only CA does not).

Jeri confirmed that for the 2017 National Title I Conference, we honored 54 schools from 30 states.

Marcus added that we are going to contact past DS winners (named in 2015 and 2016) to submit speaker proposals for the 2018 conference.

Otistene asked if the DS sessions would be panel type discussions as many school staff are more comfortable with that format rather than a formal lecture.

Edmund noted that he would love to see a Distinguished School Network to share information between schools and LEAs.

Gayle thought it a great tactic at the local level and that we need to add to agenda for future meeting. Gayle also mentioned that a DS from Washington (state) recently presented at the NCTM conference.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 23, 2017 at 2:00PM EDT, 1:00PM CDT, 12:00PM MDT, 11:00AM PDT & MST.

Meeting Schedule (every fourth Tuesday)—Please mark your calendars. May 2017 through December 2017—all meetings will be held 2:00PM ET, 1:00PM CT, 12:00PM MT, 11:00AM PT & MST, 10:00AM AKT

MAY 23 2017		DEC 26 2017	
JUNE 27 2017			
SEP 26 2017			
OCT 24 2017			
NOV 28 2017			