



## Leadership Team Meeting

Alexandria Old Town Hilton  
Alexandria, VA  
January 8 – 9, 2009

### Meeting Notes

*Present: Cindy Bartelsmeyer, Betty Black, Norma Cregan, Susan Durón, John Farrell, Sue Henry, Marty Jacobson, Ron Johnson, Carolyn Matthews, Ray Melecio, Patricia Meyertholen, Michelle Moreno, Mary Mulloy, Barbie Patch, Brenda Pessin, Roberto Reyes, and Alejandra Veléz-Paschko. Not present: Bob Lynch.*

#### *Welcome*

Norma Cregan opened the meeting and welcomed the group to the first OSY Leadership Team Meeting. She asked everyone to introduce themselves and to say a few words regarding their positions in respect to the Migrant Education Program (MEP) and the Opportunities for Success for Out-of-School Youth (OSY) grant in particular. After the introductory remarks, Norma reviewed the objectives for the meeting and the agenda for the two days, and Pat Meyertholen reviewed the meeting packet.

#### *Message from OME*

Alejandra addressed the group saying that OME was excited about this new consortium and the emphasis being placed on out-of-school youth (OSY). She said that Michelle Moreno would be transitioning in as the OME contact because this Consortium Incentive Grant (CIG) dealt with secondary-aged migrant youth, and Michelle would serve as the contact person at OME in all such matters. She indicated that OME expected all consortium member states to participate fully in OSY. (**Note:** OSY in italics designates the grant; in regular font it refers to the out-of-school youth population.)

OME plans to make all the CIGs more visible by posting their products on the Migrant Education Resource Center's (MERC's) website. She also said that Lisa Ramírez would be visiting with the group on Friday in the late morning and would be happy to take any questions. John Farrell asked Alejandra to thank Lisa for finding time in her busy schedule to attend the meeting, especially in light of the fact that just yesterday she was named the OME Director and to tell Lisa "Congratulations" on behalf of the entire OSY Leadership Team.

#### *Putting the Pieces Together – OSY Facts and Foundation Drill*

Susan and Marty handed out a multi-page fill-in-the-blank document designed to familiarize the Team with all aspects of the grant proposal.

#### *Activities and Timelines*

Pat reported on the activities that she has undertaken to date in conjunction with John, Bob Lynch (Leadership Team member for the collaborative partner, the National PASS Center), and Susan Duron, project evaluator. Three products were shared: 1) an OSY PowerPoint presentation; 2) a draft brochure; and 3) a newsletter; all of which were included in the packet. Feedback was very positive, and Pat took note of the group's suggestions for incorporating more information in the brochure about the purpose of the grant and benefits for member and non-member states. The OSY Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) component generated the most discussion. Mary mentioned that she was most concerned about the CNA. She wanted to make clear that the group was interested in the development of an OSY component for states' CNAs and not in the development of an entire CNA, since most states have completed this requirement. In all likelihood, many states probably neglected to include the OSY population in their CNAs and Service Delivery Plans (SDPs), since there was little mention of this sub-population in the MEP Non-Regulatory Guidance.

Mary urged Pat to work with member states to identify and then incorporate, as appropriate, the literature reviews relative to OSY that have already been done. The group discussed a monthly email which Pat would send out to all the steering team members in order to ensure on-going communication and maintain a high interest level among consortium member states. The first email should include a request for the states to send Pat any information they have gathered related to this population.

John spoke to the importance of developing activities and products with which the states can work. The grant should make sure it defines OSY in terms of who the population is, and what products and services may be important for them. Pat should ask each state to define OSY and ask for a description of services now being offered.

Discussion then revolved around communication with the "target" audience. Who is the audience for the website, for the brochure and for the newsletter? The group agreed that the brochure should be distributed at presentations by consortium state members and, for this purpose, should contain general information. Brenda suggested that the language related to the purpose of the project be strengthened. Another section would focus on the characteristics of the OSY population, perhaps presented in bullet format. There may be a need for more than one brochure to be used for different purposes. The Team decided that the newsletter would be disseminated 2 to 4 times per year. Both the brochure and the newsletter should direct readers to the project's website.

Susan summed up that the brochure should:

1. Address what the OSY consortium can do for you;
2. Be able to be customized by states; and
3. Should refer to the website.

Barbie suggested that once discussion about products such as the brochure has taken place and appropriate actions taken, that we should move on and leave finalization to the project director. The group unanimously agreed.

John wanted to make sure that everyone was in agreement that the purpose of the newsletter was to keep all consortium member states involved so they will remain informed and highly involved. Betty suggested that the first issue be sent out to everyone with a key objective of soliciting input. Beginning with the second issue, a deadline for submission of articles and items of interest should be set. It will be important to reflect state-specific news/features as well.

Brenda suggested that Pat establish a regular timeframe for communication. The newsletter could be attached to the first monthly email in which states are asked to submit information for the literature review and send names of experts for the Technical Support Team (TST). Alejandra requested that OME be included in the email list.

When reviewing the draft newsletter, Barbie pointed out that she had inadvertently been left off. Pat will rectify the omission.

#### *Collaborative Partnerships*

The group agreed that all the partners, the National PASS Center, the National Center for Farmworker Health (NCFH) and the National HEP/CAMP Association, need to feel that they are contributing members to the project. The consensus was that these entities should, at the very least, be added to the OSY State Steering Support Team (SSST) list, invited to the upcoming SSST Meeting in San Antonio and also receive the monthly emails. Members voiced a need for an articulation agreement between the OSY grant/lead state of Kansas and each of the partner organizations. The agreement would outline responsibilities and what each organization hoped to accomplish. It was also suggested that the National PASS Center represent the partner organizations at the Leadership Team Meetings. The group agreed that the Leadership Team should stay small. The SSST should be comprised of all the member states, the two partner states, and the collaborative partners. The TST should consist of a core group of members which could be added to whenever the need arose for assistance with the various topical areas/activities undertaken by the project.

Other potential partnerships to investigate are with the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Migrant/Seasonal Farmworker Head Start Program (MSHSP), since these groups are intricately involved with serving OSY. OME should be urged to follow up with Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) at the federal level. Solidifying connections with the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) 167 Adult Farmworker Program and MSHSP at the national level should facilitate the establishment of collaborative partnerships with these entities within states. The Leadership Team would like to review any draft MOU.

#### *Evaluation Activities*

Marty presented a PowerPoint concerning the evaluation component of OSY. He and Susan distributed the GPRA indicators to be used in the Annual Performance Report.

Susan and Marty led discussions concerning the GPRA indicators, the Fidelity Implementation Index (FII) and the data collection forms for OSY which resulted in modifications for all three evaluation instruments. These changes have been implemented and are included as attachments to these minutes.

Brenda suggested that Pat review the New Generation System (NGS) database to advise states that are in both consortia (NGS and OSY) regarding ways in which it may be possible to collect the necessary data. Pat could begin with NGS and then move to

other states' migrant specific databases. The group agreed with Brenda suggestion. Pat will follow up with NGS.

The Day 1 meeting adjourned following the decision to begin ½ hour earlier the next day in order to ensure sufficient time for an intensive discussion on the role and responsibility of the TST.

## **Day 2**

### *Follow-Up with OME*

The group agreed to focus on the following issues in the discussion with Lisa Ramírez later in the morning:

- 1 Data Collection – Data alignment among the National COE, MSIX and the CSPR is critical for addressing the OSY population. Of special concern is OME's intention of merging the grade levels of P0, P1, P2, P3, P4, P5 and OOS into one OSY category on the National COE. Also to be addressed is the question of collection of data related to service delivery for this group.
- 2 Possibility of an MOU at the federal level with the OSY Collaborative Partners – NCFH as well as the Department of Labor (167) and Migrant & Seasonal Head Start.
- 3 Priority for Services (PFS) – OSY should be included in PFS.
- 4 Request an extended lunch hour at the upcoming OME Annual State Directors Meeting in February for purposes of networking. OSY would take advantage of the opportunity to hold a 1 ½ hour lunch meeting for member states to update them on the progress of the project and plans in place.

### *Technical Support Team*

Discussion revolved around the function and membership of the TST. Mary was very concerned that the structure of this group be carefully planned. She has set aside funds for a staff member to participate in the TST. She envisions the group consisting of a core group of members that meets one to three times per year to work on the products for OSY. The Leadership Team agreed that this was a good idea. More members or experts could be added depending upon the areas around which the TST is working. Members should have expertise related to the delivery of services to OSY. The topical areas for the TST should include:

1. ID&R
2. Data Collection
3. Curriculum/Materials Development/Incentive Resources
4. Curriculum and Assessment

Another request for TST Membership should go to the SSST in Pat's email. She should make clear that the TST member did not have to be an expert in all of the above topics. She should also list the benefits of having someone from a consortium state participate on the TST:

1. Possibility of attending the National Conference
2. Coordination with others/consortium states
3. Access to new materials
4. Access to pilots, i.e., I-PODS
5. Ability to share ideas and best practices.

The group discussed the potential benefit of inviting California to participate as a partner state in OSY, since they have identified so many OSY and have a number of products and services for this population.

Also discussed was the importance of sharing meeting minutes with the Leadership Team and all consortium states. There is large commitment to data – timelines must be met and every state has to do its part.

The group emphasized the importance of communication for building trust and ensuring the success of the project. A meeting at the upcoming OME State Directors' Meeting is needed. Due to other meetings scheduled and travel plans, a working lunch on the 25<sup>th</sup> or the 26<sup>th</sup> would be preferable.

Ray Melecio spoke to Florida's efforts to recruit OSY. He explained that the Florida MEP uses the "welcome bag" concept, handing out books, nutrition information, toiletries, jackets, etc. Recruiters are at the market area at 5 a.m. to interview OSY when the agricultural workers arrive looking for work. They use color coded jackets to identify which agricultural workers have been approached previously. If a worker is wearing a turquoise jacket, then the recruiter knows that the worker has been approached by an MEP recruiter. Recruiters also go to this site at night and set up tables. The Florida MEP uses the adult version of Leap Frog to deliver services to the OSY population. Different curricula are loaded on the devices to help OSY learn English. Vocabulary and grammar are related to the work place, school, GED, parenting, etc. When they finish one section, OSY students trade the device in for another loaded with the next section.

Pat and Brenda reviewed materials brought by Bob Lynch who had to leave the previous night due to unforeseen circumstances. The group agreed that the TST needs to review Math on the Move (MOM), Personal Finance, Living in America and other materials to see how they can be adapted for OSY use. Tutors will be needed to pilot the adapted curriculum for use with students, as the materials are designed for semi-independent learning. The development of mini-lessons relevant to OSY instructional and support service needs and interests should be explored. Pilots are necessary to fine tune the lessons.

Living in America was developed for this population but professional development/technical assistance could be a product of OSY. A set costs approximately \$350 and is available from the publisher. Teacher resource guides were shared. The group commented that the TST should have a rubric for use in reviewing and developing any materials that are potential OSY products.

Barbie discussed her experiences with use of I-PODs which were first used for OSY by the Tennessee MEP. Jessica Castañeda developed workbooks for use with the I-POD shuffle. The NH MEP purchases I-PODs, costing \$50, chargers and ear phones for students. Employers are asked to sign a contract specifying the times when the students can use the I-PODs at work. Barbie commented that the assessment component could be strengthened. In her opinion, I-PODs are better suited for language learning, not for math.

A suggestion was made that materials for the I-POD should be made available through the OSY website along with reviews of the materials listing the literacy level. The thought is that using the I-POD as reinforcement to the main lesson taught by a teacher/tutor will

be very popular with OSY students as long as they see the relevance and importance of the information they are learning.

#### *Communication*

Pat shared draft logos for OSY with the group. The consensus was that the green or perhaps the gold background would be best. Pat was advised to work with the designer to come up with a final logo choice; there is no need to come back to the group for a final decision.

The group agreed that the project website should address multiple audiences. Consortium states would have access to particular sections that the general audience would not be able to access. The OSY website should also be used as a listserv, have a calendar of events, showcase and make available the OSY products and evaluation tools, and be used to monitor TST activities. There could be a blog as well. One person from the Leadership Team and one from the SSST should review the materials before they are posted on the OSY website. Brenda will be the Leadership Team representative, and Pat will solicit an individual from the TST through her monthly email.

Pat informed the group that the abstract for a presentation at the National Migrant Education Conference is due on January 16. Pat will submit one on behalf of the OSY Consortium. There was also discussion about whether the TST would meet before the conference in San Antonio, Texas. Ray Melecio extended an invitation to the TST to meet in Florida, perhaps in March, but definitely before the retirement of Earl Wiggins who is based in Immokalee where the highest percentage of OSY for the Florida MEP are identified and recruited.

Mary commented on the need for good communication with the SSST. The Leadership Team will be able to stay abreast of all activities because of the different meetings held during the year. However, the SSST is only scheduled to meet once annually in conjunction with the National MEP Conference. It was decided that the members of the Leadership Team will mentor a consortium state and/or partner state not on the Leadership Team as follows:

Susan – Colorado and Montana

Barbie – New Jersey

Betty – North Carolina

Sue Henry – Pennsylvania

Mary – Tennessee

Pat – Texas

Bob - Georgia

Brenda – Maryland

Communication will occur most often through Pat's monthly email. The email should direct people to the OSY website to read the director's report and the quarterly newsletter.

#### *Group Discussion with Lisa Ramírez*

Data collection was the first item on the agenda. The group expressed its concern that the OSY population at the upper end of the grade spectrum should not be grouped with those not-yet-in-school children at the lower end. Lisa seemed to agree but stated that she would need to speak with staff. Also pointed out were data collection concerns regarding OSY both with respect to the National COE and the Consolidated State

Performance Report (CSPR). Because the OSY population is collected under a district or facility identifier through NCES, LEAs are very hesitant to recruit OSY because of fear that this population, if associated with the district, will affect the district's accountability rating. This alone is a major disincentive for districts to identify and recruit OSY. Lisa agreed that indeed something has to be done, and once again stated that she would look into the matter in more detail.

In terms of the National COE, Lisa stated that OME was leaning towards states deciding what to do with grade levels since grade levels are not related to eligibility. Regarding alignment among EDEN, MSIX and the National COE, Lisa spoke to the different purposes each instrument, stressing that the National COE was not a data collection instrument, but rather a tool to display the eligibility determination made by the state. The National COE is currently being finalized; OME is aware of the issues and concerns brought up by the Leadership Team.

The discussion then turned to collaborating with the DOL and the MSHSP. Lisa explained that staff from OME met with DOL last week to begin to explore ways to collaborate. Just recently, MSFHP invited OME to participate in an Interagency Collaboration Meeting. MSFHP has requested a meeting with OME in February to talk about MSIX and the possibility of using MSIX. Lisa indicated that the concept of completing a MOU on the federal level with these three entities would require more thought and investigation.

Regarding whether OSY can be included as a category in the criteria for Priority for Services (PFS), Lisa said that it was her contention that a child no longer in school definitely meets the definition for PFS. She said that this issue would be addressed in the upcoming new MEP Non-Regulatory Guidance. She indicated that a state should include OSY as a criterion in defining PFS if the state's CNA shows need among this population. Barbie commented that during her recent monitoring visit from OME she was told the exact thing. She said that the OSY population and their needs are part of her state's CNA, but not included in the migrant-specific Service Delivery Plan (SDP). Barbie said that because she was not directed to do so by law or by the existing CNA model adopted by OME, she was very hesitant to make the OME recommended change. Lisa said that this was just one CNA model and that states should use the model that makes most sense for their population.

Mary asked Lisa about defining OSY – is OME referring to Here-to-Work youth, youth not currently enrolled in school, drop out youth, or youth who dropped out the previous school year? If the state CNA defines this population, how does the state set up its priority since this population does not have school interruption? Vermont is using the qualifying arrival date (QAD) as part of the criteria for including OSY in its PFS category. Mary is hopeful that the new NRGs will clarify this point.

Lisa commented that states may decide how OSY is included in the PFS category; there is not one right way to go about doing this. The bottom line is that deciding whether or not OSY should be part of the state's PFS criteria should be based on the state's migrant population. Lisa also pointed out that the state can change both the criteria for PFS and its funding formula to sub-grantees whenever there is a need as long as the state receives approval from OME. The process entails submitting an amendment to the state's Consolidated State Application for Federal Funding to USDE. Lisa said that she has always been of the opinion that the OSY population is the most at risk because

these youth are not at risk of failing--they have already failed. That these youth are high risk and should be considered failing through age 21 will probably appear in the new MEP Non-Regulatory Guidance.

Regarding the PFS count that is due to OME as part of the February submission, Lisa stated that all states have arrived at their total however they see fit. At first, Alex Goniprow told states that OSY could NOT be included in the count submitted to OME; he then he changed his mind and said that they could. Lisa does not know how many states included OSY in their PFS counts.

Lisa commented that much work still needs to be done with the CNA model when it comes to OSY. She reiterated that OSY would be included in the upcoming new NRG document. If the group wanted the law regarding OSY to change, then that, she cautioned, was an issue for Reauthorization.

Finally, the group discussed with Lisa the possibility of OME adjusting the agenda for the upcoming Annual State Directors' Meeting in order to allow for an extended lunch hour one day. This would allow time for the OSY member states to have a working lunch and for other state directors to network with their OME Program Officers. The request is for 1 ½ to 2 hours for this activity. Lisa promised to look at the agenda and to follow up with Pat through Michelle and/or Alejandra. In the event that the working lunch is not possible, OSY will meet Thursday evening for those remaining overnight.

Pat thanked Lisa for taking the time out of her busy day, and, on behalf of the Leadership Team, congratulated her once again for her appointment as Director of OME. Pat commented that the group looked forward to working with Lisa as well as with Alejandra and Michelle as we move forward throughout the two years of the OSY grant. Lisa thanked the group for inviting her to sit in and discuss issues relating to the OSY grant and OSY population because secondary-aged migrant youth was the next initiative to be tackled by OME. It's time to look at what services we are offering our youth, she stated.

Pat thanked the entire Leadership Team for their input and for a productive two days and adjourned the meeting at 12 noon.