



CIMT Meeting Notes (Rosen Centre - Orlando - 5/10/16)

In Attendance:

Lucie Esquivel – PAEC (15 school districts)

Chandra Hayes – State Evaluator

Mary Imig – Palm Beach County

Ray Melecio – ESCORT

Sonya Morris – Chief of Federal Programs

Jay Rembert – Acting MEP State Director

Pamela Wrigley – ESCORT

Courtney Zmach – Collier County

Pam called the meeting to order and went over the agenda and the meeting objectives:

- ❖ Discuss highlights of interviews conducted with district staff on how they use data in creative ways
- ❖ Review and analyze results from a statewide online survey regarding needs assessment and data use practices
- ❖ Review and analyze results of the search to identify preferred service delivery strategies in small, medium and large districts
- ❖ Devise strategies for assisting districts with recommendations on specific ways they can use data to improve their needs assessment and program planning and implementation practices

Everyone greeted the team and were introduced to Chandra Hayes who is a new state level member of the CIMT who specializes in evaluation. All other core CIMT members (except ESCORT's Margot Di Salvo who was on assignment in Denver) were present.

Before going over the composite notes that Pam had disseminated before the meeting, the team wanted to know the criteria that were used to determine the size of an MEP district during our data collection efforts. Here are the funding parameters that were used: **Small: \$0- \$249,000; Medium: \$250,000 - \$749,000; Large: \$750,000 and up**

Pam provided composite notes that were organized by district size. There were three main troves of data to review and analyze: 1) Transcripts of in-depth phone interviews with four select district MEP coordinators, 2) Results from an online survey completed by district MEP coordinators (18 of 29) statewide in April, 2016 and 3) Lists of priority service delivery strategies in each of the six goal areas (School Readiness, Reading/English Language Arts, Mathematics, High School Graduation, Out-of-School Youth and Health) selected by districts in 2013-14 and sorted by district size.

Discussion of District Databases

There were many examples of district databases that were shared during the phone interviews and the online survey (e.g. *Focus*, *Performance Matters*, *Data Warehouse*, etc.). Many of these databases are tailored to flag migrant students and respond to the programmatic and evaluation needs of the district MEP.

Performance Matters is a web-based database (filled out by teachers) that enables monitoring of student progress. This program allows for comparisons of different schools and how they are performing in different categories. This type of data can be very helpful in districts where migrant students are served in many schools.

However, the team said that many districts continue to struggle with integrating migrant students into their district databases.

Carol Mayo (Hillsborough) has overseen the development (with the help of Joe Spencer in the PASS office) of what she calls the Simple Migrant Online Reporting System (SMORS). It is a way of capturing and keeping track of migrant-specific services and schedules in an online database. She is also able to use the system to obtain the latest information on areas of concern. For example, she wanted to focus on school attendance across schools and has been able to adapt the system to give her this data in a timely manner. The SMORS information is pulled from the district main frame. Hillsborough is a data-rich district and its systems include: *Sage Brush*, *Instructional Planning Tool (IPT)*, and *Dashboard*.

Mary Imig asked: how might something like SMORS be adapted for use by smaller programs?

Sonya thinks that we should make more of an effort to determine what the needs of the districts are. Jay thinks there is a particular issue with raising awareness and use of migrant-specific systems such as MSIX. She has frequently seized on opportunities to present on the MSIX system in order to encourage its use. It might be helpful for the state to develop more specific guidance on how MEPs can collaborate with districts to improve the quality of their reporting on migrant students. Sonya also talked about the need to advocate for more inclusion of migrant data at the state level.

Survey 5 seems to be working well. Courtney Zmach talked about how cooperative Collier County has been. *Focus* is a new database that has been particularly user-friendly (some places that have used it successfully include: Madison County - Nick Gonzalez, Suwannee - Juanita, Manatee and PAEC). This program is customizable and allows for exclusive access to migrant students. *Focus* does cost. Lucie Esquivel talked about making sure that MEP staff are maximizing their use of district databases before they consider adopting an entirely new program.

Mary emphasized that summer programs that use I-Ready should be able to document student progress. I-Ready is in wide use in many Florida districts and is capable of tracking student progress in the areas of Reading, Writing and Math. Summer programs may provide the best

opportunity to ascertain the relative effectiveness of migrant-funded services when used with PFS and other targeted at-risk migrant students.

Pam shared a Power Point that focused on what research says about the benefits of supplementary instruction. The research underscores the importance of providing summer educational programs for at-risk students who often suffer from what has been called “summer learning loss”. The Florida MEP has made impressive gains in the provision of summer programming in recent years.

Kate Bloomquist (Manatee) shared an exciting project that she has worked on recently to convert the cumbersome process of handwritten service logs to a more efficient online system (in Excel). She uses a drive that will be common to all of her district MEP service providers. Every staff member logs in and enters his or her services. Kate has access to the logs, carefully monitors them, and makes changes as needed. She has developed a color-coded system to identify students who have moved, are PFS, etc. She can sort by PFS when necessary.

The team discussed what platform might be used for this type of online reporting and one likely tool is Google Docs.

Other highlights from the phone interviews:

The Volusia MEP is very active during the summer. Katie Amaral is particularly proud of their Pre-K – K summer program called “The Home-School Connection”. They hired a teacher who visited families with young children three times a week over a period of three weeks. The Scholastic Early Literacy curriculum was used and they brought portable chairs, a table and an umbrella to each session. This was a clever innovation that increased the comfort level of the families and children.

Carol Mayo (Hillsborough) likes the state-level MPO’s and she says that they “make sense” and help her to keep track and check the status of how her district is performing in each of the goal areas. Beginning in the summer of 2015, she formed committees in each of the SDP goal areas: Reading, Math, HS Graduation, School Readiness, OSY and Health. They meet every other month for one day. At the meetings they look at the latest state-level and district-level data in each of the areas and discuss promising practices, lessons learned and other critical issues.

Fidelity of Implementation (FOI) discussion

Pam was pleased to announce that the CIMT committee fulfilled all of its planned initiatives that were proposed at the September, 2015 CIMT inaugural meeting:

- ****Develop general survey for all districts regarding their needs assessment and data use practices (Student needs v. Program needs) (Completed, Spring – 2016)**
- ****Run data to identify top service delivery strategies in each of the six SDP Focus Areas (School Readiness, Reading/English Language Development, Mathematics, Graduation, Out-of-School Youth, Health) used by small, medium and large districts. (Establish criteria to determine numbers of students that constitute small, medium and large) (Completed, January, 2016)**

- ****Interview people using data in creative ways (e.g. Carol Mayo, Hillsborough County, Katie Amaral, Volusia County, April Young, Lafayette County, Kate Bloomquist, Manatee County) (Completed, December, 2015 – February, 2016)**

One item that was discussed, but put on hold was the issue of what has become known as Fidelity of Implementation (FOI). Since the CIMT is tasked with overseeing the efficacy of the state’s continuous improvement cycle, it stands to reason that they should study the latest thinking on how to use data to measure the quality/intensity of MEP funded and/or sponsored services and the degree to which the services are having the desired impact on student and family outcomes. Here are the suggestions that were made during the 2015 meeting:

- Develop process and field test FOI dimensions
- Develop process and field test FOI rubric

Pam has helped a number of state MEPs with differing levels of SDP Implementation and she shared a format with the CIMT that she has found to be effective with a few states that were willing to try something different from the usual detailed rubric approach to FOI.

The two principal questions that form the foundation of the FOI process are:

- 1) To what extent are programs/strategies being implemented?
- 2) To what extent are programs/strategies for MEP students impacting student outcomes?

Pam made a sample chart that included the top service delivery strategies chosen by a majority of Florida MEPs in each of the six goal areas. (The completed chart with examples is attached to these meeting notes). For example: one of the priority services selected for both reading and math is: “Utilize technology and other tools to promote reading/math skills development and literacy”. The suggested rubric has three categories: 1 = No Implementation Observed, 2 = Some Implementation Observed, 3 = Full Implementation Observed. The novel aspect of this FOI chart is the column that asks for explicit “Evidence of Effects”. Some items that might be placed in this column could include:

- List of all computers and software used and purchased with MEP funds. **(Evidence of quality and relevance of hardware and software)**
- Staff training on use of software and/or technology if new software technology purchased within current fiscal year. **(Evidence of appropriate and adequate PD)**
- Pre/Post mini-assessment data associated with computer-based tutorials. **(Evidence of student learning)**

The CIMT discussed various ways that this process might be phased in and be helpful in asking deep questions about the nature and impact of the services that each district is providing. This is not intended to take the place of the monitoring process that the state engages in. However, the *Monitoring Toolkit* provides many examples of evidence that a district might benefit from considering in detail.

Pam thinks that this FOI process would probably be most helpful if it were incorporated into planning and evaluation at the district level. The first question some CIMT members had was “Who will be responsible for riding herd on this?” With terms such as levels of implementation “observed”; it would probably be best for a district to rate its own level of implementation using available evidence. Pam has received positive feedback from states that she has introduced this process to. It seems to make sense to them once they apply it to their own circumstances.

It will be important to describe these efforts as improvements in the efficacy and efficiency of reporting on SDP implementation measures and in the spirit of making meaningful connections between a type of service provided and proof that it is having the desired impact. It is easy to label a service “high quality” or “research based” without examining the specifics of why it is the best choice for the needs of a district’s migrant students. Every effort should be made to ensure that this evidence-focused FOI process is developed in a meaningful and user-friendly way, and that it not be perceived as an additional data burden.

As with any new process, it might be best for the CIMT to select a limited number of districts that might be ready, willing and able to field test this FOI process. Districts should be encouraged to think beyond test scores when seeking evidence of effects. For example, qualitative evidence such as increased attendance and school engagement could be valid measures that a strategy is having the desired impact. The district coordinator and his or her team will be encouraged to consider all relevant data that a district would present as proof that a service is 1) being implemented adequately (e.g. intensity, target populations, staff qualifications, faithful to research principles) and 2) is producing positive results (e.g. improvements in student performance and/or attitudes, feedback from district MEP and non-MEP staff and feedback from migrant families).

Once the FOI process is field tested, the CIMT will gather the results and obtain feedback from the migrant coordinators who have implemented it. The CIMT will then study the evidence and discuss whether this is a process that might be beneficial to all districts that will encourage them to think more deeply about the nature and frequency of their services as well as whether they are effective with the students they are intended to help (e.g. PFS)

Ray and Pam think that it might be best to ask districts to use this process with a limited set of goal areas. Perhaps, reading and high school graduation would be the best areas to focus on during the initial field testing of the FOI process.

Discussion of Next Steps

Jay informed the team that the next MEP coordinator call will take place at the end of July. She suggested that maybe we should use this as an opportunity to present a CIMT update and to summarize our key findings.

We could add a CIMT feature to the website and put teasers on the website such as: CIMT purpose, meeting timeline, list of members, and how many responded to the data collection

efforts. The website would also be the best place to include the complete transcripts of the interviews that were conducted with migrant coordinators. All CIMT-related news and resources should be readily accessible to all who are interested. An additional benefit to this online feature would be encouraging coordinators to contact each other directly when they have questions about data systems and/or services that they have shared with the CIMT.

The CIMT is meant to be an ongoing deliberative group and everyone agreed that the cycle of holding one fact-to-face meeting in September each year is the best time to convene the team and decide on any new CIMT initiatives. The next CIMT meeting will be scheduled to occur the day before the ISM in Tallahassee in September, 2016.

In the meantime, Pam and the team will work on developing a format and process for field testing the Fidelity of Implementation model that Pam shared. The second of two face-to-face meetings will be held annually in May (during FASFEPa) and provides the team with an opportunity to review data that has been collected, decide on strategic ways to share the information and lessons learned that they have compiled, and begin planning for future projects and focuses of concern for the CIMT.

In addition to the two face-to-face meetings, the CIMT will be convened on an as-needed basis via conference call/webinar to make decisions, mid-course corrections and conduct follow-up tasks.

Other thoughts on possible next steps:

- Shall we begin to pare down the list of service delivery options? (Perhaps based on multiple years of data.) (Are there some SDP strategies that are never and/or rarely selected?)
- Devise a bank of needs assessment questions for districts to choose from (examples of questions for students, staff, parents, partner agencies, etc.) (this was first suggested in September, 2015)
- Have the team consider how systems like SMORS and the online reporting system (developed by Manatee) might be shared with other coordinators

Sample FOI chart with Florida examples:

Florida MEP Program Implementation Results

(1 = No Implementation Observed, 2 = Some Implementation Observed, 3 = Full Implementation Observed)

School Readiness Implementation Activities		Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
1.1	Provide instructional support in the area of emergent literacy		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Assessment log including services

	skills (oral communication, knowledge of print and letters, phonemic and phonological awareness, and vocabulary and comprehension development.		provided, progress notes (see <i>Volusia</i> example; assessment tool (see <i>AMCC and Orange</i> examples; assessment data (see <i>Hendry and AMCC</i> examples) Copy of curriculum/instructional materials used in Title I or MEP funded preschool programs. Evidence of professional development to MEP staff (e.g. meeting agendas, training modules/materials, etc.) related to early childhood literacy skills.
1.2	Offer family outreach, literacy and parent involvement opportunities that focus on early learning.		
1.3(1)	Coordinate with Head Start and other community-based agencies to allow access to education and support services for migrant children and families.		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Evidence of coordination and/or consultation with Head Start and other community-based agencies (e.g. emails, memorandums, letters, meeting minutes, etc.)
1.3(2)	Explore funding and resource collaboration to support full service and Pre-K classes and other options for migrant children.		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> List of agencies serving migrant Pre-K children in the LEA.

Reading/English Language Arts Implementation Activities		Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
2.1	Provide high quality curriculum that is aligned with tools for assessment and progress monitoring to meet individualized student needs.		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Sample of curriculum and/or instructional materials used in any tutorials that includes focuses on vocabulary and fluency development. Evidence of reading certification for MEP and/or non-MEP reading teacher/advocate/specialist.
	Reading/English Language Arts Implementation Activities	Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
2.2	Utilize technology and other tools.		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> List of all computers and software used and purchased with MEP funds.

			<p>Staff training on use of software and/or technology if new software technology purchased within current fiscal year.</p> <p>Pre/Post mini-assessment data associated with computer-based tutorials.</p>
2.3	Provide strategic, content-based tutoring in reading to students identified as PFS.		<p><i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Service log listing at least 10 children, or less for smaller LEAs, that identifies the academic needs and the services provided to meet those needs related to literacy.</p> <p>PFS???</p>

Mathematics Implementation Activities	Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
<p>3.1 Provide high quality curriculum that is aligned with tools for assessment and progress monitoring to meet individualized student needs.</p>		<p><i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Sample of curriculum and/or instructional materials used in any tutorials that includes focuses on rigor, cultural relevance and use of manipulatives.</p> <p>Evidence of mathematics certification for MEP and/or non-MEP mathematics teacher/advocate/specialist.</p>
<p>3.2 Utilize technology and other tools to promote math skills development and literacy.</p>		<p><i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> List of all computers and software used and purchased with MEP funds.</p> <p>Staff training on use of software and/or technology if new software technology purchased within current fiscal year.</p> <p>Pre/Post mini-assessment data associated with computer-based tutorials.</p>
Mathematics Implementation Activities	Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
<p>3.3 Provide strategic, content-based tutoring in math to students identified as PFS.</p>		<p><i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Service log listing at least 10 children, or less for smaller LEAs, that identifies the academic needs and the services</p>

		provided to meet those needs related to mathematics. PFS???	
High School Graduation Implementation Activities		Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
4.1	Provide PASS and Mini-PASS curricula to migrant students who are behind and need to accrue additional credits.		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Evidence of curricula/instructional materials used with secondary students during any tutorials (e.g. prep course materials, sample lessons, PASS materials, etc.)
4.2	Hire qualified secondary-level advocates (grades 6-12) to assist migrant students to access services and programs.		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Evidence of secondary advocate certification for MEP and/or non-MEP secondary advocates.
4.3	Provide strategic, content-based tutoring to secondary students.		<i>Monitoring Toolkit:</i> Services log listing at least 10 children, or less for smaller LEAs, that identifies the academic needs and the services provided and/or facilitated to meet the needs related to graduating.
	Out-of-School Youth Implementation Activities	Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
5.1	Assess individualized needs using the GOSOSY profile instrument when ID & R occurs (if possible) and/or when advocate/tutor follow-up visits take place.		
5.2	Create welcome packages that might include educational, health, and community resources.		
5.3	Develop collaborative partnerships with libraries, churches, universities, community colleges, and other community-based agencies.		
	Health Implementation Activities	Implementation Level	Evidence of Effects
6.1(1)	Build networks with community-based organizations and healthcare		

	providers to help migrant families and OSY access available resources and to share information with providers about the needs of migrant farmworkers (e.g. evening and weekend clinic hours, mobile health units at migrant camps, cultural beliefs, etc.)		
6.1(2)	Provide health-related services to migrant parents (site and home-based programming) on topics such as nutrition, car seat safety, hygiene, home sanitation, preventative care, mental health, etc.		
6.2	Create educational resources related to health and hygiene, in accessible language and using pictures to depict information.		

While developing the description of the FOI process, it might be advisable for Pam, with the help of the CIMT members, to flesh out additional suggestions for the “Evidence of Effects” column of this chart. Once districts are able to see the reasoning behind this approach, they will be better able to field test the process.

The lessons that the district MEPs learn during their field testing will be essential to determining if this is an FOI process that may be worth adopting statewide as a data-focused way to enhance district program improvement efforts.