



**SOSOSY State Steering Team (SST) Meeting
October 23-24, 2013
Portland, OR**

Day 1 Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions – Doug Boline
- Updates from SOSOSY – Tracie Kalic
 - TST work groups
 - Training Work Group – Emily Hoffman and Sonja Williams
 - Mentoring Work Group –Barbie Patch
 - Curriculum and Materials Work Group–Barbie Patch
 - ID&R Work Group
 - Technology Work Group
 - What’s on the horizon?
- States Updates and Discussion – Susan Durón
 - Lessons learned from SOSOSY Year 1
 - Use of pre/post assessments and process
- OSY Screener – Brenda Pessin
 - Review assessment
 - View video
- SOSOSY Equity Review Process – Susan Durón
 - Review procedures and rubric
 - Nominate Equity Review Process panel
- Panel discussion and focused feedback of strategies and tools to include OSY in State CNA and SDP – Susan Durón
- Mentoring Work Group presentation – Barbie Patch
 - Share state systems for working with OSY
 - Analyze state resources for development of an State OSY Plan

IN ATTENDANCE: Doug Boline-KS; Patrice Boone-MS; Taylor Dearman-MS; Susan Durón-META; John Farrell-KS; Paula Gaddis-TN; Sue Henry-NE; Emily Hoffman-MA; Tracie Kalic-SOSOSY; Bob Lynch-Private Consultant; Mary Ann Losh-NE; Carmen Medina-PA; Tomas Mejía-CO; Ray Melecio-FL; Mary Mulloy-VT; Barbie Patch-NH; Jan Pérez-NJ; Brenda Pessin-IL; Jennifer Quick-Fort Scott Community College; Andrea Vázquez-Vázquez Education Services; Robin Robbins-NY; Myrna Toney-WI; Noemi Treviño-MN; Mary Lou Wells-ID; Sonja Williams-NC **STATES UNABLE TO ATTEND:** AL, KY, SC

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS – DOUG BOLINE

Tracie welcomed the state directors and introduced the new MEP state director for Kansas; Doug Boline. He welcomed the group and provided his background.

UPDATES FROM SOSOSY – TRACIE KALIC

Tracie shared expectations for the meeting with the SST:

- Provide an update to SST about new materials, including ACREs online course and OSY Screener
- Provide information about the work of the TST
- Discuss lessons learned from Year 1 of SOSOSY
- Share how states have integrated OSY into their CNA and SDP process
- Provide feedback on OSY State Plan, SOSOSY Equity Review and CIG Collaboration
- Inform SST about the Mentoring Pilot process and discuss the State Snapshot Tool
- Discuss the future needs of Consortium
- Provide networking opportunities and opportunities for technical assistance

Regarding the TOT update from September 2013 in Clearwater, Tracie thanked Emily, Sonja, and the rest of the training work group for all their hard work in training over 40 trainers. See the SOSOSY website for more on the September TOT.

Training Work Group-Emily Hoffman and Sonja Williams

Posters found around the room were from the trainers attending the TOT held in Clearwater. This event was held in conjunction with the TST meeting in September. The Work Group will be working to support trainers this year. We also will be having conversations about how to make the training more sustainable and how each state could make use of materials and all that is offered.

Mentoring Work Group-Barbie Patch

The Mentoring Work Group received rubrics from all states. From this information, several states were selected to be part of the mentoring pilot. Jessica Castañeda and Barbie Patch also attended the ID&R Forum in Tampa where there was a mentoring session.

Curriculum Work Group-Bob Lynch

All mini lessons now have embedded pre/post assessments. Bob shared information about the joint collaboration to develop an OSY Screener. He noted the importance of moving towards implementation and helping states to utilize all the materials developed by SOSOSY. The Curriculum Work Group will focus its efforts on professional development in order to achieve this.

Identification and Recruitment Work Group-Taylor Dearman

The ID&R work group will create an agricultural map overlay census for each state and a tip sheet for recruiters to use for recruiter knowledge assessment and communicating with states in an effort to combine resources.

Technology Work Group – Kelsey Williams

An update on ACREs Online will be provided along with a hands-on demonstration at tomorrow's meeting. The goal of the Technology Work Group is to encourage the use of technology and the integration of technology into the SOSOSY materials. Each member of the Work Group has been assigned as a tech liaison to one of the other Work Groups.

What is on the horizon?—Tracie Kalic

Tracie outlined the ongoing work of the TST and noted the next meeting dates: January 14-15, 2014 in San Diego. Some of the agenda items include:

- Dissemination Event planning
- Mentoring work
- Trainer support via webinars and other just-in-time professional development
- Integration of technology
- New ID&R tools
- Professional development for instructional support

STATES UPDATES AND DISCUSSION – SUSAN DURÓN

Lessons Learned

Susan asked table groups to respond and share one lesson learned. This information will be incorporated into the Final APR.

Lessons learned reported by states from Year 1 of SOSOSY included:

1. Teachers use materials they helped produce, and are not looking for more tools. They need to focus on *implementation* on how to use all resources that currently exist.

2. It is important for representatives to report and share information after meetings with all personnel including recruiters.
3. We need reminders as to why we are members of consortium and what our roles and the expectations are.
4. We need to remind staff about the OSY student profile sheet and school-based recruiting model; we should discuss ways to improve the model.
5. Pay attention to individuals providing instruction. Consider how we can match OSY with what they need and move forward to deliver these services.
6. A proposal development group should be convened at least 6 months before the next CIG competition.
7. We need to consider way to ensure that an infrastructure for implementing the materials is in place. What happens to the SOSOSY website? How can these structures be sustained after the life of the project?

Pre/post assessments and process

Groups discussed how states implemented the pre/post assessments. It is needs-dependent; not all lessons will be used. Tracie asked table groups to discuss the following:

- What was the response by service providers?
- What suggestions and recommendations do you have? (e.g., ease of administration, data collection)
- How are service providers using the data?

Suggestions:

1. Make certain service providers know the 6th question on the post assessment is not to be scored. Tracie will add an edit check.
2. Provide professional development for new staff on how to use pre/post assessments.

OSY ENGLISH LANGUAGE SCREENER – BRENDA PESSIN

Brenda discussed the screener recently developed by the ALRC including:

- Revised Screening Tool (includes instructions, score sheet, and expanded tool)
 - provides more detailed instructions
 - separates the following components: administration instructions, score sheet, and instrument
 - includes optional screening for higher literacy levels (in English and Spanish)
- Video and Viewer Guide (shows students of various levels being screened for language proficiency)
- Pilot of Tool and Process

She thanked the New York MEP and the Vermont MEP for sharing their assessments that aided in the development of the Screener. The Illinois ALRC also developed a video to go along with the Screener.

The SST viewed the video and made the following suggestions:

- Revise the information shared about the 2nd student's potential needs (perhaps reading comprehension needs addressed)
- Would like to see a small group agree to pilot the Screener to see if there are additional modifications necessary.
- Should there be a Form B? It was noted that since this is just a screener, that a Form B would not be necessary.
- Should we include information about screening results on the OSY Profile?
- States that volunteered to pilot the Screener include NC, KS, MA, NE, NY, and VT.

SOSOSY EQUITY REVIEW PROCESS – SUSAN DURÓN

Susan shared information about the Equity Review process. The group was asked to make revisions on the *Equity Review Rubric*. Volunteers agreeing to serve on the panel include: Paula Gaddis-TN; MaryAnn Losh-NE; and Sonja Williams-NC. Ray Melecio-FL agreed to serve as an alternate.

STATE TRAINING PLANS

Sonja Williams and Emily Hoffman were asked to discuss the creation of State Training Plans based upon what was done at the TOT. There is an entire module on state training plans. Sonja shared the North Carolina OSY State Training Plan. For more detailed information about the North Carolina State Training Plan 2013-2014, see the SST meeting power point.

Emily Hoffman shared the MA state training plan:

- Provide 2 regional trainers and professional development opportunities
- Trainers and Emily Hoffman met after training for de-briefing
- Meet quarterly and focus on permanent staff as well as teachers that are doing direct OSY work
- Provide 2 statewide training workshops
- Have goals & plans
- Key-phrase is: *“doing things with intention”*.

Tracie asked the group to look at page 135, modules 8 and 9 from the TOT manual, as well as pages 159 and 160.

PANEL DISCUSSION AND FOCUSED FEEDBACK OF STRATEGIES AND TOOLS TO INCLUDE OSY IN STATE CNA AND SDP – SUSAN DURÓN, FACILITATOR

Panel Members - Doug Boline-KS; Mary Mulloy-VT; and Brenda Pessin-IL

The panel addressed several questions that were posed by the facilitator in response to one of the objectives of SOSOSY which is to provide **systems and supports** for including OSY as states collect data for their Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). Panelist responded to the questions below.

Question #1: How has your state structured its CNA to include OSY? What specific data on OSY do you collect and report in the CNA?

IL: It has been a process for IL. It didn't happen overnight, but the Consortium has helped us become more aware and include more OSY in CNA and SDP.

KS: Ditto from IL to Kansas. Our state's CNA focuses mostly on OSY and the need to get them to graduate and back in school. We were not systematically looking at needs. This has changed some recently but we still have a ways to go.

VT: Incorporating OSY in the CNA is an evolving story. We had to add addenda to the prior CNA and it has gotten better. We had very limited survey results regarding OSY and have more data now due to more complete profiles. The intentionality is much better based on what we have learned. We have a better body of information. *Question #2: How has your state structured its Service Delivery Plan (SDP) to include OSY? What MPOs and solution strategies does your state have in its SDP that specifically address OSY?*

IL: We are trying to be more specific to OSY, for example, we look at the percentage of OSY who are receiving services.

KS: We are in the process of updating the SDP. We have a difficult time reconciling numbers (quality control). We have close to 3,000 OSY and it's not easy to reconcile the data with other data sources.

VT: Five years ago, we overhauled our system and determined statewide standards for the MEP SDP. It was definitely more difficult for OSY. Planning services requires an emphasis on life skills, but the academic component for OSY has been an uphill struggle.

Question#3: What advice do you have for states that are updating their CNAs and SDPs?

IL: Use the data that is available to you and maximize it. For example, the OSY profile data can be used in many ways. But you have to monitor the data and services. The SDP looks different for all states and OSY in each state. Position yourself for adjustment and structure with flexibility.

KS: The big push again was getting students back in school, so not all of the decisions were needs-based. The lesson is to place the focus what we can do to help and not force OSY back into public schools if that is not what they want to do.

VT: We agree with Brenda on the data and learned that we have to make sure that people who are delivering services have them involved. Accountability is important to make it happen. The group also discussed the issue of Priority of Service and OSY.

MENTORING WORK GROUP PRESENTATION – BARBIE PATCH

The Mentoring Work Group discussed:

- Overview of mentoring and process used to develop the mentoring tools
- Reaction from state pilots
- Snapshot tool

Discussed how one state reacted to the SOSOSY Mentoring process and evaluation information. Barbie Patch, Ray Melecio and John Farrell noted that mentoring has received positive feedback. Mentors will visit another state in November. Mentoring also occurred at the ID&R Forum in Tampa.

State OSY Snapshot Tool

Why was this tool developed? How will information be used? What will be shared with mentoring states and others?

- Way to collect information about what states are doing
- Build models to share how states are supporting OSY
- Connect and network states who may have specific needs
- Refine our technical assistance capabilities
- Build capacity - collective knowledge base

The SST discussed their response and issues with the Snapshot Tool as it is currently written and shared ideas for revision. It was noted that they are not trying to replicate the Profile or compete, but the Snapshot Tool could be a tool for mentors. It has been expanded, and we want a way to network with other states to learn how OSY is handled in all states. We need to make it available for both consortium states as well as non-consortium states. Further comments on the Tool should be sent to Tracie. It was suggested that the group reconvene around the suggestions provided by the SST.

GOAL PLANNING – Susan Durón

Susan shared preliminary Year 1 data and progress toward the SOSOSY goals and objectives:

- SOSOSY is on target with the activities of the CIGs based on the Year 1 Fidelity of Implementation Index.
- The SOSOSY Year 2 activities are specified in the Year 2 FII that was distributed.
- There are data tables to support the Year 1 outcomes that will be included in the Year 1 APR.
- The Year 1 APR will be compiled by 11/2/13 and distributed to SOSOSY states. Please refrain from comparing the data from states as each state context is different with respect to OSY.

- The signed 524b Cover Sheets are due as soon as possible in order to submit the APR at the end of December. Susan asked that each state representative look at their state information on their handout and inform us of any corrections by Friday, 10/28/13, close of business. The due date for returning the signed Cover Sheet is December 10, 2013. The date is early this year to allow us to follow up before the holidays with the due date to OME being 12/30/13.

Dissemination Event Planning – Tracie Kalic

The group was asked for direction in planning the Dissemination Event. There was discussion as to when the event should be held. This will be revisited during Day 2.

Consortium Collaboration – Bob Lynch

Bob discussed a number of items in regard to how the four funded CIGs are working together and how they might work more closely during Year 2 and beyond.

- Use of a portal for *Plazas Comunitarias*
- Creation of CIG master calendar
- Joint migrant health and migrant education projects—Bob asked if the SST wanted the document to be posted on the website that examines six migrant health programs and their ongoing collaboration with migrant education. It was agreed that it would be posted.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.



SOSOSY State Steering Team (SST) Meeting Portland, OR

Day 2 Agenda

- Collaboration/coordination with national, state, and local partners:
how to broker services – Bob Lynch
- Calendar of events
- Survey for Migrant Literacy CORE reading CIG – Susan Durón
- Instructional Technology – Kelsey Williams
 - Talk about lessons learned by states in using educational technology
 - Presentation: Academic and Career Readiness Skills Online Course
- Discussion of Future Needs – Susan Durón and Tracie Kalic
 - Planning for a potential Year 3
 - Discussion of future needs, goals, and objectives
 - Potential Year 3 Budget
- Meeting Planning – Tracie Kalic
 - Select spring meeting date
 - Location and time

SURVEY FOR MIGRANT LITERACY CORE READING CIG – SUSAN DURÓN

Migrant Literacy Core - 14 states; one objective is collaboration of CIGs: Complete the survey; information will be used for our APR

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY -KELSEY WILLIAMS

Kelsey presented on instructional technology and its uses for supporting OSY. If you are interested in her power point, please contact Tracie.

Using tech to support OSY and all kinds of educator-online offers us a different way to educate our students. All students have different needs. How do we get creative to meet educational needs of OSY?

Challenges include:

- Mobility related
- Loss of credits
- Leaving school no transcript
- Lagging behind non-migrant peers
- Excessive absences
- Financial
- Academics
- Personal connection with teachers

Other aspects include

- Flexibility: utilize technology to overcome hurdles & challenges of OSY
- Amazed at how many OSY have smart phones
- Gap is closing but parents aren't aware they can find courses online easily
- YouTube amazing online tool for instructions
- Connecting students and meeting their needs early online resources
- Students usually try 3 times online and may or may not come back
- No one is watching you make attempts
- Ask questions face to face

Kelsey discussed ACReS online course development. She explained that the course will be on www.schoolology.com, a free platform for hosting similar to Facebook so students will have easy access. Course built with KS & PASS and is written at a readability level to cater to lower-reading students in English & Spanish.

Current units include:

1. Read Right Now
2. Two Plus You
3. Reading for Understanding
4. Financial Literacy
5. Life Skills
6. Academic and Career Readiness

ACReS will give an OSY the opportunity to experience success with this course even if they have not been successful with other courses. It may appeal to OSY who aren't looking for HS credit. It can be used by the unit as well.

Tracie will set up master account and send out the access code with instructions. The course will be password protected. It is almost ready to be finalized. Tracie and Kelsey will put together a series of training videos to help states access the materials. All states expressed an interest in piloting the materials. More information will be available in January.

DISCUSSION OF FUTURE NEEDS – SUSAN DURÓN AND TRACIE KALIC

Susan led conversation around future needs of the Consortium. The group discussed what they would like to see in a potential Year 3 or in a new grant proposal. The SST would like to have more time to review any future proposal.

Comments including the following:

- A strong focus on implementation with fidelity.
- Provide more intense professional development.
- Communication with all stakeholders is a priority. (Also include a focus on communicating with non-member states and other national organizations, like NASDME.
- Try to encourage cross-involvement with other consortia
- Continue working with trainers and utilizing Training of Trainers model.
- Focus on assessments, including professional development for service providers
- Helpful in 3rd year to capture the student voice-bring out what has worked and what didn't from student viewpoint; tell a story
- Include a sustainability plan
- Support state planning process

Tracie and Susan asked the group to discuss the following: Who, Where, Pros, Cons, and as we move into Year 3

MEETING PLANNING, BUDGET AND GENERAL INFORMATION – TRACIE KALIC

The Dissemination Event is scheduled for the week of November 17, 2014 in Clearwater, FL. Topics of discussion included:

- Consortium will fund one person from each state for the Dissemination Event
- One or more of the other CIGs may want to present at Dissemination Event
- Many breakouts need to be identified

It was suggested that Tracie ask the other CIGs if they would like to present. The SST also thought having an Academy the day prior to the Dissemination Event would be useful.

The Dissemination Event Committee consists of Patrice Boone, Stephanie Clark; Taylor Dearman; John Farrell, Emily Hoffman, Bob Lynch, Ray Melecio, Barbie Patch, Brenda Pessin, and Sonja Williams. One alternate member is needed.

It was decided that any carryover from Year 1 be put into a line item for the Dissemination Event. There was a consensus that state dues and budget items for SOSOSY for Years 2 and 3 be the same as for Year 1. Jennifer Quick reported that state billings will be completed in the next few weeks. If your state needs specific information, please contact Jennifer as soon as possible.

Future Meeting Date

The next SST meeting will be February 12, 2014 at the Holiday Inn Capitol in Washington D.C.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.