

**ESSA Title IV Part B Work Group
MacKay Building Pierre, SD
January 26, 2017**

The first and only meeting of the Title IV Part B Work Group began at 11:00 a.m. on January 26, 2017, in the MacKay Building, Pierre, South Dakota. The Title IV Part B Work Group was formed to make recommendations to the South Dakota Department of Education pertaining to changes in the statutes in the awarding and managing of 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants in the new reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act known as the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA).

Welcome

The SD Department of Education (DOE) Title Administrator Shannon Malone welcomed the members of the group. Each person in the room introduced him/herself.

Workgroup Membership

Members of the work group present were: Kristie Maher, South Dakota Discovery Center, Pierre; Becky Hubsch, Summit School District; Rose Mary Big, Rosebud Sioux Tribe; Michael Mortland, Sioux Falls School District/Kids Inc.; Jan Johnson, Child Care Services, Department of Social Services; Billie Jo Bakeberg, Kids Club/SoDakSACA/SD Afterschool Network; Louis Canfield, Boys & Girls Club of Watertown; Sandy Stanton, Rapid City YMCA; Desmond Keller, 21st Century Discovery Program, Rapid City; Dale Singer, Spearfish School District; and Rose Ann Hofland, Washington Pavilion of Arts and Science Sioux Falls.

Several SD DOE staff persons were present for all or part of the meeting.

Review of Work Groups and Recommendations to Implement ESSA

Laura Scheibe, SD Department of Education Director of Accountability, reviewed the Every Student Succeeds Act from the signing of the act to the regulations and implementation of the law. Scheibe described how the State Plan under the act must be created, reviewed and input collected from stakeholders, and approved by the Governor. The state plan must be finished and sent to US ED by September 2017. She provided the work group with an explanation of all of the recommendations pertaining to the state's accountability system, English language learners program and accountability, and school improvement designation and requirements.

Scheibe asked the work group to form smaller groups and participate in discussions on accountability, assessment and standards; school improvement and student support; and data and reporting. The groups rotated after a few minutes. The groups provided written comments on their thoughts on each topic to DOE.

Comments made about the members' programs interaction with schools and school improvement.

- No one size fits all process.
- Changes need to come from more of a grassroots level to address the needs of the school.
- Need to empower everyone in the school.
- Look at what the school has done right, not what they have done wrong.
- Asked by the school to work on the math indicator over the summer; the 21st Century program reinforces the school.
- Reaching out from the school to us to work with the “whole” child.
- As school districts are seeking out help in the community, it shows how some schools are missing the connection. We are making the connection and it is leading to career development with our children and staff and also leading to home growing our own teachers.
- When people realize how many hours kids are with us each day, they are realizing that we have kids for as many hours as the school does. This is an eye opener for the parents and the community.
- We see the parents every day and this makes it easier for us to engage the parents. We also have a better idea how the parents are doing and feeling/coping. This helps us help the children.
- We find it hard to find a middle school program that works for that age. We want to keep the kids in our care instead of them going home to an empty house, but we need age appropriate good curriculum/programs.
- We check grades every day and we use successful grades and attendance as a reward system in the programs.
- We need to get career and technical education credits in middle school as high school is already late. We need to make learning and school more relevant earlier.

A working lunch was served.

Sue Burgard announced that the Washington Pavilion was honored at the White House last year as an outstanding 21st Century program. This was the first program from South Dakota to receive the award.

Private School Ombudsman Required Under ESSA

Jordan Dueis, SD DOE Title I, provided information for the group about the ESSA requirement for districts working with private schools. Currently, each district must consult and provide proof of consultation with each accredited private school in their district about the use of several Title federal funds including 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) funds. The consultation must include discussions on the services and/or equitable services. A private school may apply for the Title IV Part B funds directly and alone. Under ESSA, additional requirements have been included in the consultation and each state education department

must designate an ombudsman who will facilitate any differences or conflicts between the school district and the private schools. Dueis will serve as the ombudsman for the SD DOE.

Tribal Consultation Required Under ESSA

Dueis reported that under ESSA each school district that has a student population of at least 50% American Indian or that receives a Title VII Indian Education Grant in the previous year that exceeded \$40,000 must consult with the tribes that are represented by their students. In South Dakota at least 20 school districts received Title VII grants that exceeded \$40,000. SD DOE is working with the nine tribes to establish protocol for consultation to ensure that the tribes are consulted about the education their children will receive in the public schools and about the use of federal funds. Under ESSA, the tribes must elect or appoint persons to specifically be involved in the consultations.

21st Century Community Learning Centers/Title VI Part B Overview

Sue Burgard, SD DOE CCLC program, provided a brief history of the program for the members. Originally, the program started with direct grants to community programs from the federal government. Through reauthorization of the program in 2001 under the No Child Left Behind Act/Elementary and Secondary Education Act each state was awarded funding based on a funding formula tied to the Title I formula used to award funds to the states. The Bureau of Indian Education receives funding in the same fashion as each state and currently has awarded three BIE program grants in South Dakota.

Currently, after meeting eligibility requirements, all grant applications submitted to the SD DOE are equal and do not receive bonus points. A rubric is published with the requests for grants indicating how grants are scored so all applicants have that information from the start. Grants are a minimum of \$50,000 to a maximum of \$150,000 and are awarded for five years with 41 grants in place now. Currently, we fully fund about seven grants each year. The SD DOE receives 20-30 applications each year. Programs may charge a fee, but cannot prohibit a child from attending because they cannot pay. If fees are charged that money must be spent on the program in the current grant year. In South Dakota, over 10,000 children and youth participate in a program with one-half of those children and youth attending regularly.

The main activities of the grantees as outlined in the statute:

- Will reinforce and complement the regular academic programs of the schools attended by the students served.
- Are targeted to the students' academic needs and aligned with the instruction students receive during the school day.
- Offer families of students served opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education including opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

Discussion of changes to Title IV Part B under ESSA

Jill Cotton, SD DOE CCLC program, helped the work group go through a discussion and make recommendations to the department in how to implement the changes to the program as prescribed by the law.

Background: ESEA defined a schoolwide Title I school as a school that is eligible to seek schoolwide status after reaching a 40% Free and Reduced Lunch percentage and completing a school reform process. ESSA removes the requirement of schoolwide programs having to reach 40% before beginning the school reform process. Additionally, CCLC grants are to be awarded to eligible entities that serve students who primarily attend schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities ***and other schools determined by the local education agency to be in need of intervention and support.***

Discussion on the Definition of “Other Schools”

Question before the work group: How will South Dakota define “other schools... in need of intervention and support”?

Brainstorming Ideas of How to Define “Other” Schools

- We will have comprehensive and targeted schools under ESSA that fit the definition and automatically qualify.
- Targeted schools can exit school improvement after one year; does that make them high need? Could schools that were in improvement in the last three years qualify?
- Any high school where the graduation rate dropped below 67% will fall into improvement. What about the schools in danger of dropping below 67%? Do we consider whether the services are available or not available in the school area?
- We could create a watch list of schools going off of the official SD DOE watch list?
- Could we take the parameters from the school report card?
- Could we use language and cultural support and students with limited English as a parameter? Could we use other subgroups like foster children, children without permanent homes; what if the area has a certain percentage of the subgroups? What about three or more targeted subgroups as the basis? Do we want a specific number of groups?
- Should we use data on graduation rate, drop-out rate, well-being of students, recovery programs, sex trafficking, group homes, suicide?
- What about a list of several items and the applicant must have a percentage of each item or they couldn't even apply? How would the SD DOE monitor? How would they locate the students?
- Could county poverty level be used rather than Free and Reduced Lunch?

- What about the changing dynamics of a school because of changing population such as a high poverty school becoming a wealthy school attendance area? The poor families have not exited the area so the need remains, but the poverty rate as dropped.
- How do we consider the quick turnover rate of students? How do we calculate attendance rate with students moving in and out? Some schools have more than a 100% turnover rate each year.
- What about attendance as this would be a great indicator? How does each district calculate attendance?
- Could we use information on our students' grades dropping as a basis of need?
- Should the school district determine what constitutes an "other" attendance center or should the SD DOE make the determination?

Recommendation: The work group recommended that the SD DOE set parameters for grantees that include a definition of "other" schools in need of intervention and support.

Recommendation: The work group recommended that the SD DOE consider an eligible school, including "other schools" as a school in one of four categories: comprehensive improvement, targeted improvement, on the SD DOE watch list of schools in danger of falling into improvement, and Free and Reduced Lunch percentage of at least 40%.

Discussion on Adding Points to Qualifying Applications

Question: After an application meets the basic eligibility standards, should the SD DOE implement an application rating system that awards extra points for certain criteria and what criteria?

The work group made the following observations and comments:

- Setting "need" parameters makes the process easier for the applicants as they understand who would be eligible for the grant and would better be able to make a decision about applying or not.
- The current process works fine. When we give everyone a level playing field, the process itself will "weed out" the applications that are less worthy or less viable.
- The narrative of the application gives the story of why the funding/program is needed. We need to place importance on the narrative.
- Sometimes grants are all about the points and the reviewers become locked in and can't award the truly best applications.
- Some states start with a level basis and then add priority points for certain high needs such as poverty, high school programs, many new teachers in the school, etc. If we don't have parameters built in then we will get so many grants that no grant will stand out as most worthy. Grantees will need to have professional grant writers to create "flashy" applications.
- Some programs can garner all the priority points, but their programs are not academically challenging and will not make a difference for the children's and youth's future.
- Can't we allow the review committee to set their priorities through reading of the applications?

Recommendation: The work group recommended the application review process remain as it is currently operating and that no extra points be awarded to applications during the review by the raters.

Discussion on Prescreening

Question: ESSA requires that each state prescreen external organizations that could provide assistance in carrying out the program activities and to develop and make available to eligible entities a list of external organizations that successfully completed the prescreening process. How should the SD DOE prescreen external organizations? What are the screening criteria? How will the list be made available?

The work group made the following observations and comments:

- The list is intended to be a resource for the districts, not intended to be an exhaustive list of organizations. SD DOE is unclear when US ED will issue guidance, if they will. SD DOE is not required to endorse entities or people; we simply make the list available to the community. In at least one state prescreened entities are allowed to be on the state list for two years.
- Does an entity have to be an organization or can it be an individual? This would only be an organization/entity, not individuals.
- Many of the entities that would be on the list would already be eligible to apply for a 21st CCLC grant themselves.
- What about profit making organizations?
- Is the list a list of entities for programming or for things other than programming, such as training or professional development? The list would be an all-encompassing list; everyone could be on this list including businesses selling items?
- Could we use the list of entities gleaned from the current partners and from current applications?
- The list should be organized by region as a partner in western South Dakota may not become a partner in eastern South Dakota.
- Do we develop an application for these entities to complete including the area they are willing to serve? Should each grant applicant have their partners complete a SD DOE form making referral of partners? This would put the grantees responsible for prescreening as they work directly with the entities and have the most information about how partners follow through. The form would indicate whether the entity wants to be identified as a prescreened entity and be put on a published list. The entity would only need to complete one application though it may be a partner with several grant applicants. Also, the entity could indicate they do not want to be put on the list to be a partner. We will need to require this signed document from all currently operating grantees to cover current partners. The prescreening application needs to include a statement that indicates an entity may be removed at any time by SD DOE.
- How do we handle the requirement through the Department of Social Services Child Care Office that anyone in the care of children must have a background check? Could this be handled at the state level? Currently, the grantees already handle this screening by ensuring all workers and volunteers are persons of good character.
- The statute seems as though it would have been easily implemented if it would have required a list of entities that should not be partners. SD DOE will need to rely on grantees to tell us who should not be on the list.

- What if a partner works well with one organization, but not another one? Do they go off the list or stay on the list? How would we decide? Do they go off the list, but be allowed to reapply in two years?
- We won't be inundated with partners so we will be begging for partners rather than removing them.
- Would we have out-of-state businesses clamoring to get on the list?
- Partners could go to the SD DOE website and fill out the form and list who they are partnering with now including out-of-state entities. We need to be cautious about entities selling products as we don't want product promotion on our website and our grantees don't want it on their websites.
- What makes a partner? Does a field trip to your facility make your facility a partner? No

Recommendation: The work group recommends that the SD DOE develop a document where the partners in good standing of current and future grantees will give information and permission to be considered a partner of other grantees. The SD DOE will post each partner on a list for two years posted on the state website with a notation that the list does not constitute endorsement of the organization or any of their products. No products may be promoted or sold with an implied SD DOE endorsement. The list will be sorted by region.

Adjournment

The work group was thanked for their work and advised that this would be the only meeting of the group as all of the major issues requiring stakeholder input had been addressed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.