



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, May 23, 2017 at 2:00PM EDT, 1:00PM CDT, 12:00PM MDT, 11:00AM MST and PDT.**

Participating in the call were: Jack O'Connor (MT); Otistene Smith (AR); Betsy Chapman (SD); Sonya Morris (FL); Jeff Arch (CA—A+ Events); Marcus Cheeks (MS—A+ Events); Jeri Erickson (CA—A+ Events); Bob Harmon (WA—A+ Events);

1. Discuss the results of the Barriers to DS Participation Survey.

Bob introduced the results of the survey by discussing the low response rate (only 11 responses) which may have been the result of sending the survey out only to active members, who may or may not have shared the link with their respective staff members. The responses may not have been substantially different, even with more participation, as the most discussed barrier to DS participation is the existing assessment and accountability systems and the delay in getting two years of recent data for analysis.

Other survey responses suggest the loss of academic achievement money is a common concern, as are the different application/identification processes that vary widely from state to state. Common guidelines for state applications and examples of selection criteria that could be shared from state-to-state was brought up, but that could impact the desired flexibility in the selection process.

One suggestion from the survey was to consider aligning with Blue Ribbon Schools or identity what makes them different. Some states are confused about having more than one list to compare.

Other suggestions included identifying successful former Title I students to speak at the national conference, much the way the Association previously ran a Distinguished Graduates Program. The final comment from the survey confirmed the necessity of continuing the Distinguished School program: "...it is something we should continue as it has become something our schools are very excited about."

Betsy stated that South Dakota couldn't complete the survey and asked if it was sent to the wrong people (active members) rather than the EP&QO committee. She also mentioned that adding category 3 to the DS selection criteria gave them greater flexibility and they did not feel pressured to provide test scores and other data. She does not see how the process of aligning DS selection criteria with Blue Ribbon criteria would work. It would make it very difficult for category 3 schools in South Dakota to be recognized.

Jack mentioned that Montana does a straight forward data run, but some states have a more involved and time-consuming process of nominations and site visits. He stressed

his state preference to have a streamlined process.

Bob suggested maximizing state flexibility to allow for more or less complicated processes. He also referred to one of the survey responses that suggested that, in addition to quantitative criteria, it would be useful for the Association to stipulate more qualitative criteria that states could use for identification purposes. He stated that the Association has said states know best and there is no need to have overly prescriptive criteria.

Jack suggested that perhaps we could restructure the selection criteria. Each state would continue to select 2 schools for DS recognition, but the selection criteria would be expanded by allowing states to nominate one school from category 1, one school from category 2, and two schools from category 3. Betsy stated that this would help South Dakota. Otistene said that Arkansas will continue with selecting from categories 1 and 2 using math and literacy scores. Sonya stated that Florida is good either way, but is more inclined to go with Jack's idea of expanding the selection criteria.

Bob asked if the group favored making a recommendation to the Board to expand the criteria as Jack suggested. The committee agreed, stating that anything we can do to help states participate should be encouraged.

Bob suggested that as more states are able to compile two years of data we should have more participation. When the Association expands to include more federal programs that will likely impact what route is followed.

[UPDATE: Any such change is too late for the next cycle and, given the current Association reorganization, it would be best to delay any modifications until later.]

2. Continue the discussion and share information about the Board-approved [Agreement to Engage in Research](#) focuses on ESSA resource equity provisions.

Otistene asked for clarification about how the process works, in particular if State Title I Directors will be contacted to answer questions. She also asked if the research project would be mentioned at the summer meeting.

Jack requested that we make sure that smaller "frontier states" are represented in the study in phase 1 going into phase 2.

Bob affirmed that the Association would open the door for the research team to make it easier to get information and that it would be discussed at the summer meeting. Bob also mentioned that the Association will be involved in making selections.

3. Discuss the possibility of a Distinguished Schools Network

The committee agreed to defer this item to the June meeting since Edmund Moore suggested the idea but was not on the call. All agreed that the committee needs to discuss the purpose of a DS Network, and what it might look like.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 27, 2017 at 2:00PM EDT, 1:00PM CDT, 12:00PM MDT, 11:00AM PDT & MST.

Meeting Schedule (every fourth Tuesday)—Please mark your calendars. June 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

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