

**Nonpublic School Advisory Committee Minutes
December 9, 2014**

Attending: Nicole Proesch-Facilitator, Lee Morrison, Julie Delaney, Luvern Gubbels, Janell Brandhorst, Cindy Butler, Isbelia Arzola, Jobi Lawrence, Tom Deeter, Wayne Dykstra, Dan Ryan, Jeff Henderson, Jerry Deegan,

1) English Language Development Assessment/English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (Jobi Lawrence)

- a. Current assessment is I-ELDA but not in compliance with new standards.
- b. New one will be ELPA-21. It is being field tested in the spring 2015.
- c. New assessment will be spring 2016.
- d. Training will be available next year in preparation for spring 2016.

2) Title II Discussion (Isbelia Arzola)

- a. Isbelia received our questions and set out nonpublic school allocations. She is working with public schools and business managers to explain process.
- b. Dan Ryan requested through SLU or other communications about the appropriate timing for the consultation meetings. In the past they were happening in July-September and we want them to be in January-March timeline. The law says the consultation meetings need to take place prior to decisions being made, thus we need sooner consultations.
- c. Title IX checklist and timeline guidelines are what should be used for the consultation timelines (for various programs). Isbelia said the consultations should be starting by February. The agenda, consultation forms, sample plans, and participation forms are in this packet and available on the website.
- d. Dan reiterated the request for the DE to stress the consultation dates.
- e. New for this year, public schools must fill out an online application to request funds, that pre-populates the nonpublic schools allocation and the DE will certify the amount is correct.
- f. In the past proof of meaningful consultation was not verified. Isbelia has begun doing that this year. She has not yet finished reviewing all of the public school applications with consultation meeting verification.
- g. Isbelia said the DE runs the formula for the amount of Title II/Part A funds that are available.
- h. The public schools reduce the amount by using allowable programs (class size reduction, teacher retention, etc.) and thus the nonpublic schools
- i. Isbelia said how funds are used is audited each year. Jeff Berger could be consulted for more information about that process.

- j. In Davenport, the range varies from \$6.00-\$30.00 per student. There are huge swings in amounts per school.
- k. Isbelia explained formula is affected by number of nonpublic schools are within a public district. Nonpublic school representatives asked for additional clarification on formula calculations.
- l. The federal government gives Iowa a total amount of money. The formula is run for public schools. Another formula is run for nonpublic schools.
- m. Isbelia said starting next year, public schools have to show needs assessment and data, as part of application. The public schools could thus take additional dollars from the initial fund (ie: if weak in math, then they need more money for math professional development).
- n. Information on carryover funds from last year is available from AEAs and local public schools. Isbelia recommends nonpublic schools to ask for information and we can copy her on communication.
- o. Jeff asked for clarification on formula since so many schools have amounts that appear they are “rubber-stamped” from last year. There is a minimum dollar amount for nonpublic schools.
- p. Jeff gave an example of a public school that wanted to make a nonpublic school wait until the end of the fiscal year for reimbursement. This is not appropriate and Isbelia can be contacted.
- q. Title II/Part A funds do expire. Next year you have from July to July.
- r. We need to send emails to public schools and cc Isbelia to request carryover fund.
- s. Isbelia recommends a February consultation based on anticipated funds. If the amounts or plans change, you can have another consultation.
- t. Isbelia recommends building relationships with public schools. The amount on spreadsheet is a MINIMUM and if a nonpublic school is allotted \$500 but needs \$1000, it is at the discretion of local public school to give more.
- u. Title IIA guidance on website/ Section G—is specific for nonpublic schools.
- v. Nonpublic schools need to bring the needs assessment (under Title 9-needs assessment form J-8). Isbelia will email it to Nicole who will send it to Jeff to forward to other schools. Public schools also have to bring their needs assessment.
- w. Jerry Deegan emphasized “equitable services” as important concept.
- x. Isbelia will send us carryover information and J-3 to J-11 forms.

3) Tiered Accreditation (Cindy Butler)

- a. Nothing finalized yet, team is looking at all state and federal code and what needs to be monitored. They are aligning on amount of impact on student achievement.
- b. This is being modeling after the MTSS system for students—putting the effort for those that most need assistance right now.

- c. They are preparing a dashboard with data (including healthy indicators) and will be used to determine when a site visit is needed.
- d. The desk audit/collection of data will be completed ANNUALLY (5 year rotation is totally obsolete).
- e. A draft of the dashboard should be available in the spring.
- f. Next year MAY be a pilot year for the visits. There will be a feedback phase at some point.
- g. This new model will pinpoint assistance to be more effective and efficient.
- h. They may be visiting schools that are doing well for information—this would be a visit with a different purpose.
- i. Jeff encouraged DE to be sure to utilize our exemplary schools as well as public schools.
- j. A-Z Index—“Differentiation” is a powerpoint presentation
- k. There are 30 schools that are part of 3rd party accreditation. There are approximately 100-120 private schools in the state.

4) Attendance Center Rankings (Cindy Butler)

- a. Nonpublic schools are **NOT** included in legislation for attendance center rankings.
- b. Three data points: proficiency, growth, and closing gap will be released in January for public schools only—not as ACR but as general data.
- c. Cindy said we could be included with these 3 data points but not on ACR in the future. Nonpublic schools want to hold to see what the information looks like.
- d. The ACR will be released to schools in the fall and then go public in October.
- e. Jeff asked about the elements of the formula. Could it be replicated for nonpublic schools? Cindy said the formula is complicated and the result year-long DE work. Is this formula available to the public? Cindy thinks it would be difficult since it needs student level data. Jeff asked for clarification/asterisk by public school data noting to reader that you can’t compare with schools not listed (ie: they won’t have parent involvement, attendance rates).
- f. Nicole explained public can submit a request for data, but DE won’t have reports on nonpublic schools to give out .
- g. The state does have information on nonpublic schools: Proficiency, Growth, Closing Gap, College Readiness
- h. Cindy said schools won’t be ranked 1-1300, but instead it would be “these 100 schools are exemplary”.

5) Healthy Indicators-Tied with Tiered Accreditation

- a. Healthy Indicators are not legislated but a source of data to decide who gets accreditation visits.

- b. Three Healthy Indicators overlap with ACR: proficiency, growth, and closing gaps.
- c. Others:
 - i. MTSS
 - ii. Universal Screener
 - iii. Progress Monitoring
 - iv. Financial Information (may be different for nonpublic schools)
 - v. Sustainable Leadership Team
- d. They need a nonpublic school representative for their committee. We may need a task person to communicate with where they are at and how that affects nonpublic schools. (Currently 9 people working on data/formulas.)
- e. How do the HI's apply to us when they aren't mandated for us (ie: Universal Screener)?

6) Update on Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium in Regards to the Assessment Task Force (Tom Deeter)

- a. Recommendation is for Iowa schools to use Smarter Balanced for Literacy and Mathematics. A report is currently being written and will go to the legislature approximately January 15th.
- b. Once legislature gets it, we don't know timeline. There are strong lobbyists for ACT and Iowa Testing and by law Smarter Balanced can't have a lobbyist.
- c. Smarter Balanced is an online assessment with adaptive questions whereas Iowa Assessment New Generation is a fixed form test.
- d. Legislature will have to decide how it is funded and to what level.
- e. Technology readiness is a concern. Smarter Balanced has information on their website with a technology readiness calculator (www.smarterbalanced.org) (ie: ipad mini doesn't work and ipad screen is large enough but was not easy to use—keyboard popping up and students have to go back to questions.) They recommend external keyboards but didn't require.)
- f. No science assessment at this time.
- g. Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) will be used for students with significant cognitive learning needs as an alternative assessment-going operational this spring.

7) Iowa Code 299 Requirement (Nicole Proesch)

- a. In 1993, law was passed requiring every public school send a request to nonpublic schools for rosters to check on truancy. Then in early 2000's, law was passed for both publics and nonpublic schools to report truanies to the County Attorney.
- b. It is the current law, but there doesn't appear to have a clear purpose.
- c. Nicole will check with DE policy people on their position on it.
- d. Nicole recommends we draft a proposal.

8) CMA & Clayton Ridge Online Schools

- a. They will continue next year but won't be in existence following that unless there is legislative action.

9) Early Childhood Programs (Mary Delagardelle & Kimberly Villotti, Early Childhood Consultant)

- a. Jeff requested clearer information and webinars.
- b. Mary says it doesn't make sense for DE be monitoring childcare program. Mary said lots of confusion and great opportunity to try to figure this out.
- c. They have requested language to strike this from code and a process for those under DE to transition to DHS. It would eliminate option.
 - i. State would oversee 3 year old PK-if IEPs and 4 year old statewide grant program.
 - ii. Working out language and details. They have requested a code change to not oversee childcare.
 - iii. Re: Transitional Kindergarten/Junior Kindergarten-some are 4 and 5 year olds---they are working on this with a task force.
 - iv. Preschool vs Childcare Language.
 - v. If something is run as a school and not childcare—it's considered an educational program.
 - vi. IE: 3 rooms, 1 with a 3 year old PK, one a daycare (DHS).
 - vii. The DE doesn't currently have authority for 3 year old PK (unless students are on IEP).
 - viii. We recommended the DE and DHS put together a flow chart. DE's dilemma is how far to go until their request is approved.
 - ix. Childcare and preschool are both currently defined in code.
 - x. If language changed—then DE won't monitor child care.
 - xi. 3 Year old PK—is a gray area.
 - xii. Right now—people just get to get under one or the other. The two agencies are trying to work together and have similar guidelines.
 - xiii. If people do desk audit, the DE is adjusting priorities (with emphasis on DHS rules) 1st lense is health and safety.
 - xiv. If a school didn't do a desk audit—can they submit it now? YES-administrators should email Kate Small to let them know that they are starting the process to give the DE a heads up. Health and safety standards will be priority.
 - xv. For current Latch Key programs through DE—a certified teacher or principal need to oversee but not required to be in the room at all times.

10) Policy Legislative Update (Shan Seivert)

- a. Priority is to stay the course and work on implementation.

- b. Submissions to the legislature for this coming year are being drafted but don't anticipate major changes---except DE not to supervise childcare.
- c. Continuing to focus on Iowa Reading Research Center and summer programs.
- d. TLC—Year 2 of implementation for public schools.
- e. Jeff-in September we asked Dr. Buck for an increase in textbook funding for our schools. Shan will look into it. We asked for a quarter million dollar increase.

11) Letter from Brad Buck Regarding Reading Initiative

- a. Went to nonpublic school principals but not superintendents today—we need guidance if letter will be re-written because it would be confusing for our parents as law doesn't apply to us.
- b. Nicole will check on this as soon as possible.
- c. Nonpublic schools think this adds to confusion.
- d. Luvern will send us a revised letter that we could send if we wish.

12) New Administrator Performance Standards

- a. Can we have a representative on this committee?

13) Nonpublic School Representative on BOEE Board

- a. No replacement for Carol Trueg.
- b. Nicole recommended we contact DT Magee on this oversight.