



Strategies • Opportunities • Services for Out-of-School Youth

**SOSOSY State Steering Team Meeting
February 23, 2015
Washington, DC**

Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions – Doug Boline
- Updates from SOSOSY – Tracie Kalic and others
- Dissemination Event and Preconference Debrief – Tracie Kalic
- Budget Status– Tracie Kalic
- Quality of Strategy Implementation Training – Susan Durón
- Capacity Building and Planning for the Future– Susan Durón and Tracie Kalic

In attendance: Carol Gagliano (FL), Ray Melecio (FL), Mary Lou Wells (ID), David Gonzalez (IL), Beth Robinson (IL), Brenda Pessin (IL), Doug Boline (KS), John Farrell (KS), Judy Littleton (KY), Heather Rhorer (KY), Emily Hoffman (MA), Noemi Trevino (MN), Julie Chi (MN), Sue Henry (NE), Barbie Patch (NH), Joan Geraci (NJ), Michael Maye (NY), Carmen Medina (PA), Lysandra Alexander (PA), Jennifer Almeda (SC), Janine Whited (TN), Mary Mulloy (VT), Shari Bernstein (WI), Tracie Kalic (SOSOSY), Susan Durón (META), and Rachel Crawford (OME)

Welcome and Introductions

Doug Boline (KS- Lead State) welcomed the SST members to Washington DC, and proceeded with introductions.

Updates from SOSOSY

Tracie Kalic (SOSOSY Director) provided the SST with an update of the progress SOSOSY has made towards its objectives and summarized the latest work, including the following:

- Technical Support Team Workgroups
 - Updates (see below)
 - Goals
- Dissemination Event video
- ID&R Competency Exam
 - will be on the website soon so that users have a choice of format.

- Two presentations will be given at NASDME
 - Goal Setting for OSY
 - Strategies to Work with OSY for Those Not Necessarily Teachers but in the Role of Instructors
- SOSOSY Newsletter, Volume 2-Issue 2 with Dissemination Event highlights
- Year 3 Activities

TST meeting

- The next meeting of the Technical Support Team will be held in Santa Fe in April; please notify Tracie about representation from your state. A draft agenda and the travel information will be sent out in the next two weeks.

Feedback on the Dissemination Event (including Preconference)

Tracie asked the SST members to provide feedback in regard to the Dissemination Event and address the following questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the preconference.

- **Was there enough time?**
- **Coverage of topic**
- Pre-Conference Feedback
 - Plenty of time, Kelsey did a great job and did a thorough job with *Schoolology* as well as discussing how to work with students via online learning, and there was plenty of technical support for those who were not so comfortable with technology and partnering.
 - Kelsey was patient and explained things very well and in a non-demeaning way, very important that there was a tech person at each table.
 - Can Kelsey look at usage via *Schoolology* as to whether it is being used or not- to see if it was effective?
 - There was a New England training- but this is not one-shot deal training because people came out of the training very overwhelmed- it was too much in one day. There needs to be a better implementation plan.
 - There was a help desk for more support on *Schoolology*- should have had a computer lab as opposed to sitting in the hall.
 - There were too many competing meetings that were taking place at the same time as the pre-conference because it was difficult to bounce between the meetings and be able to focus- including SOSOSY and non-SOSOSY events.
 - There has to be more assistance at the state level for how to implement *Schoolology* and how to get everything in place to make a state be able to get up and running with *Schoolology*- to better support the states to be able to provide the support to the instructional folks.
 - Might need to take a step back to make sure that we are using the right platform/modality on technology.
 - Maybe develop a way of a “How To” for the states (like the TOT: how to develop a training plan)

2. What worked well at this year's Dissemination Event?

- **Number and topic of sessions?**
- **Opening Session**
- **Closing Session**
- Dissemination Event
 - More coordination about dates to make sure partners can come.
 - Liked the OSY panel but need to have a guided talk versus everyone answering the same question.
 - Practitioners workshops
 - Technology needs to be beefed up.
 - Like Location
 - Repeat sessions so that we don't have so many.
 - Opening session was wonderful.
 - Closing session was a real treat, more flexible facilitation.
 - People were engaged the whole day, you were not overwhelmed but the day went by quickly.
 - Not a lot of lag time, flow was good.
 - Breakfast should be provided.
 - Maybe a later start time.
 - Number of sessions was adequate.
 - More consortium presenters- that was good.
 - We were larger, but that it was cozy- good break out rooms.
 - More partner participation.
 - OSY panel worked well- but less students need to speak, figure out who are the students who have the best answers to the specific question.
 - Luis Urrea was outstanding.
 - Lisa Ramirez was powerful and meaningful.
 - Which states were actually represented? Let us know.
 - Ray Melecio should be the facilitator to the OSY panel. (Ray has not committed.)
 - Better interpreter
 - Double sessions are hard when there are only four.

3. What would you like to keep?

- Opening session speaker- quality was fantastic- keep it up
- Clearwater as the location, OSY panel, quality of opening presenter
- Format of the conference- timing and flow

4. What would you like to change?

- Dates- not leaving on a Friday

5. We asked the OSY who participated and those comments are in the newsletter.

6. Evaluation data shared.

- 250 people attended but only 35% or so filled out the forms.
- Susan Durón shared that there is a lot of anecdotal information and then tried to organize them by sessions/topics.
- Suggestion to give a reward (like the book, etc.) for filling out the evaluation and turning it in.

TST Workgroup Summaries

- Curriculum and Materials Workgroup (Brenda Pessin)
 - The first two years were spent developing a lot of materials so this year has been all about refinements and implementation.
 - Language screener has been developed through NYMEP and VMEP and some additions. There are some concerns about the format, so there has been some review to strengthen it. ALRC is revising the introduction so that it is clearer. There have been questions about the training video concerning the person administering the exam and how the score sheet can be seen. It would be very costly to reshoot the video, so there may be an introductory video made to address the purpose of a screener and tips on how to implement it in the most effective way. This is in the proposal process.
 - There was a conversation about a discontinuation rule- if student misses a number of sequential questions then the test ends. ALRC did not want to do this because:
 - ✓ the screener is only six or so questions
 - ✓ a student could answer later questions
 - ✓ a teacher can learn a lot from the wrong answers as well as the right answers.
 - There is an issue about non-responsive students who cannot answer any of the questions.
 - ✓ There needs to be more training/approach to introducing the instrument.
 - Brenda asked for more feedback.
 - ✓ Mary Mulloy piloted the screener in Vermont but she would like to know other states' feedback as her staff did not like the screener. Objections were:
 - ❖ humiliation factor
 - ❖ no gradation between the questions
 - ❖ too long for those with limited English skills
 - ❖ a chilling effect with the students
 - ✓ SST members suggested shooting video of actual OSY taking the assessment.
 - There are about 40 mini-lessons completed and the workgroup would like to set up something on the SOSOSY website to gather feedback for future revisions.
 - Discussion about how to do an introduction to the Math on the Move.

- Discussion about a mentor's manual on how to use these materials. As the website is redone it will be clearer. Discussion about changing the title from "mentor" to "instructor".
 - Data from website was shared as download: In a brief time period, there are over 104,000 downloads. How many were duplicates was not assessed from this data.
- Mentoring Workgroup (Ray Melecio)
 - Group prepared a survey to be sent to the three states that received mentoring from Jessica Castañeda or Barbie Patch.
 - Creating a SOSOSY 101 course for new/current members. Information will include who can you contact, etc.
- Technology Workgroup (Jennifer Almeda)
 - The big concern was aesthetics- how to get information and how to use it.
 - Working idea is that students / practitioners / administrators would each have a tile that would bring them to the most appropriate tools/areas for that audience.
 - Simplicity and ease of finding information are the main drivers to the changes.
 - Suggestion to try to track who visits the site: a counter/ from what site linking, etc.
- Training Work Group (Sonja Williams/Emily Hoffman)
 - Divided into two subgroups:
 - ✓ how to support trainers
 - ✓ how to sustain the training modules
 - ❖ A lot of attrition with trainers. How can we continue to support the trainers? Divided states into regional areas to provide support network and keep in contact with trainers. Proposing a new in-person TOT. Every state can send one person to be trained. States who do not have trainers will have the opportunity to have a trainer. It will not be mandatory.
 - ❖ Look at trainer competencies to determine who should be a trainer. Looking to do the TOT in September 2015.
 - ❖ Sustainability of modules- use *Schoolology*.
 - ❖ Three modules will be put online:
 - Developing a State Training Plan
 - Cultural Competency
 - Goal Setting
- Continuation of Service Matrix Workgroup (Heather Rhorer)
 - New workgroup was formed to address the FII indicator.
 - Question is - Developing a continuation of services matrix- how do we help people develop the system?
 - The group reviewed the education resource rubric and has converted it to Excel- adding the ability to search the resources based on the amount of time you have to work with the students as well as the quadrant into which the student falls. Each will have live links to it and they are adding new resources, especially for resources that are needed in one of the quadrants (around Spanish literacy)
 - Creating a flowchart on how to tie everything together- looking to add the quadrants to the profile and the Student Assessment Score Sheet (SASS) so that it connects and flows.

Budget Update (Tracie Kalic)

- Tracie updated the SST in regard to the mid-year balance.
- She recommended using funds to support a TOT for one additional trainer per state this fall.

Quality of Implementation Tool (QI) (Susan Durón)

Susan shared the revised Quality of Implementation Tool with the SST and solicited additional feedback from the group.

- States will administer at three sites prior to August 28, 2015 (due September 1, 2015).
- QI tools will have to be returned to the State MEP director.
- Tool is still in draft. All feedback will be incorporated and this can be finalized and available on the website asap.
- Discussion of Evidence (Far right column). Support how the implementation levels are being measured. It can include further information/evidence/comments on the back of the form.

TST Questions/Issues for the SST to Consider

- Should the State Form 1 be incorporated into #9 (Use of data for program evaluation and improvement)?
 - Should the OSY Language Screener be added as an element?
 - How should technical assistance and professional development be defined?
 - Should we mention the mini-lessons specifically for pre/post assessments?
 - ✓ Feedback
 - ❖ Form 1: Take it off- local folks don't understand what it is.
 - ❖ Should the Screener be added: we could add the language screener/NY/VT/OSY and are supported by OSY (so that it would include all three resources).
 - ❖ Add 'potential evidence' as opposed to 'evidence' and that would eliminate the need to list out the specific screener being used.
 - ❖ Tech assistance/professional development definition: should be determined by the individual state- needs to be clarified that it is OSY specific training- leaves it more open-ended. By including all the training offered by state (not just SOSOSY- funded) it shows sustainability by state.
 - ❖ Pre-Post assessment: mini-lessons should be listed as one of the sources of evidence- makes it inclusive. The rubric marker doesn't encompass whether the data is used for further instructional decisions (differentiation) so what do you do with it?
 - ❖ Instructional/support services for OSY- no (on form 1).

- ❖ Re-enrollment/GED- on form 1 with more definition.
- ❖ Provision of ESL in state (not needed on this form).
- ❖ OSY Profile/Screeners- can we roll that into individual learning needs assessment (then the OSY profile and screener can be evidence for that)?
- ❖ Wording needs to be rewritten to be more broad and more about how it actually impacts the work and services.
- ❖ Change 'evidence' to 'evidence of implementation'.
- ❖ QI is a version of a FII- that is required by OME.

Capacity Building/Planning for the Future

The SST spent time examining ways to build state capacity and plan for the future and address sustainability issues.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm.