



Georgia Department of Education 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners Report

Georgia Department of Education FY16 Title I Committee of Practitioners

The Georgia Title I Committee of Practitioners as established under Section 1903, State Administration of ESEA is directed to be substantially involved in the review and comment on any proposed or final State rules, regulations, and policies relating to Title I prior to their publication. In an emergency situation where such rule or regulation must be issued with a very limited time to assist local school districts with the operation of the program under Title I, the Department may issue a regulation without prior consultation, but shall immediately thereafter convene the State Committee of Practitioners to review the emergency regulation before issuance in final form. The Committee is also provided with updates on national education reform activities, changes in Title I legislation and regulations, and other pertinent State and Federal information.

The 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners consists of 47 members representing the required groups as defined in Section 1903 of the ESEA Act of 1965 and each of Georgia's 13 Congressional Districts. The State Board of Education approved its membership at its July, 2015 board meeting. Members represent Title I and Curriculum Directors, superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, vocational teachers, classroom teachers, parents, Local Education Agency (LEA) Board of Education Members, private schools, LEA charter schools, Migrant Education Program Coordinators, pupil services personnel, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Department of Early Education.

The Committee of Practitioners will meet twice during FY16. The first meeting was convened on November 20, 2015. The Summary Minutes from the last meeting were presented and approved by the Committee. Federal Programs personnel also attended the meeting held at the Georgia Department of Education in Atlanta. **The following Federal Programs gave a brief summary and update of their Program to the Committee of Practitioners:**

- Carly Amber, Education Program Specialist, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Division**
Title II-A
- Amanda Buice, Math Science Partnership Program Specialist, Title II, Part B—**
Mathematics Science Partnership Grant
- Joann Hooper, Division Program Manager, Division of School and District Effectiveness**
School and District Effectiveness
- Nathan Schult, Outreach Programs Division School Improvement**
21st Century Community Learning Centers
- Yesica Ordonez, MEP State Data Collections Coordinator, Migrant Education Programs, Outreach Programs Division—Title I, Part C (Migrant)**
- Eric McGhee, Grants Program Manager, Outreach Division of School Improvement**
Homeless, Neglected and Delinquent, Title VI, Part B
- Amy Park, Program Manager, Parent Engagement Program, Outreach Division of School Improvement—Parent Engagement/Parental Involvement**
- Dr. Randy Phillips – Title I, Part A Program Manager, Federal Programs Division**
Title I, Part A Schoolwide changes and ESEA in Washington
- Dr. Jennifer Davenport, Title I, Part A Program Manager, Federal Programs Division**
Flexible Learning Plans (FLP) and Maintenance of Effort (MOE) in Georgia Schools

The purpose and duties of the Committee of Practitioners as an Advisory Group was reviewed and discussed. Following this discussion, **Dr. Karen Suddeth, School Improvement 1003(g) (SIG) Program**



Georgia Department of Education 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners Report

Specialist presented the specific item for the Committee of Practitioners input. SIG is requesting an extension on the availability period for SIG 1003(g) federal funds for FY 2014. SIG is requesting the availability of funds to go through September 30, 2018. **Lynn Howard, the Committee of Practitioners Chairperson** had the Committee break into groups and discuss the request by SIG. Each group and/or individual was asked to respond on the Committee of Practitioner Review Form detailing the barriers and the enablers on the district, school, and classroom level. At the end of the working lunch, the individual groups were asked to report their findings and opinions to the Committee. The Committee found the following items to be **Barriers**:

1. One year delay on new schools receiving funds
2. Was this going to impact additional schools receiving these funds; may reduce funding for other schools
3. Having commitment to grant wain
4. Having teacher and parent “buy in” for a longer length of time
5. Application process is a barrier
6. Less money per year per school

The Committee found the following items to be **Enablers**:

1. Importance of being fair
2. Time to serve more
3. Sustainability after third year
4. Lowering class size
5. Extends time with more resources
6. Additional support
7. Additional data
8. Extra year to transition
9. More time to plan and implement
10. Turnaround-hire effective teachers and staff
11. One year of planning and one year of sustainability
12. More time for a positive impact to take affect
13. More support or teachers and students
14. Great for transition and supporting continues student success
15. Planning year
16. Time and energy invested in Professional Development can move to other schools
17. More time to reform
18. TA from GaDOE to District to Schools
19. Extra years of support
20. Allows greater time for mastery

These completed forms were turned in to Robyn Planchard, the Title I contact for the Committee off Practitioners. The comments and/or recommendations will be placed in a summary report for review at the next Committee of Practitioner meeting in March. The Committee then discussed spring meeting dates and decided **the second meeting date will be scheduled for Friday, March 11, 2016**. Finally, Dr. Randy Phillips reviewed **the process for submitting the completed form to receive travel reimbursement**. **Mrs. Lynn Howard** then conducted the closing and **adjournment of the meeting**.

The Committee of Practitioners second meeting during FY16 was convened on March 11, 2016 at 9:00am. The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Lynn Howard. Minutes from the November meeting were reviewed and approved with Beverly Strickland and Doug Cline making the motion to accept and seconding the motion.



Georgia Department of Education 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners Report

Dr. Randy Phillips, Title I Program Manager, led the presentation of the topic of the day, Schoolwide Consolidation of Funds Pilot Project. The first document reviewed by the Committee of Practitioners was the “SIP, SWP, TA Plan—Schoolwide Improvement Plan.” After a review of the document led by Dr. Phillips was completed, the Committee broke into groups and was asked to respond on the Committee of Practitioner Review Form detailing the barriers and the enablers on the district, school, and classroom level. The Committee found the following items to be **Barriers**:

1. The Superintendent Signature—make sure the superintendent or Curriculum/Instruction (designee) signs
2. Add highly qualified paraprofessionals to the last page
3. Is it possible to add prompts in the template or some of the missing sections—migrant, transition programs, etc.
4. Lack of informing and including teachers—Teachers should be at the table to develop the plan—Teachers need to be involved and have input
5. Add specifics—TA and SWP Components—what components meet TA checklist?
6. Add pulldown for monitoring met not met, progressing, revised
7. Area to include additional requirements for Title I (Migrant, Homeless, Transition, Historically Underserved Youth, CCRPI, Research to support action/strategies)
8. Migrant statement, SW checklist, Homeless addressed
9. Subgroup identification—would that be a concern to single out subgroups and post on district and school websites?
10. May help to have lines separating each action step to align Action/Evidence/Monitoring and Funding (Like PL template); add lines for strategies page 5 and page 6
11. Add evidence and artifacts
12. Exemplar and Webinar would be very helpful
13. Committee members signature pages added to front page
14. Could become redundant if not sufficiently detailed
15. Could be “copied” rather than truly updated, keeping district from accessing information deeply enough
16. Time
17. Resistance to change
18. Somewhat open to interpretation
19. Teachers may not see this as a fluid document
20. May not be updated after formative assessment
21. Clarify where will scientifically based research strategies be addressed
22. How will schools be able to align strategies
23. Add all courses on page 9 are taught by a HQ teacher
24. Decrease font on front page so signatures can be added at bottom with expanded boxes for planning signature
25. Add 1 page after page 2 to include brief background and overview (Admin may change, demographics of school can be entered here; this helps with accreditation, grants, etc.



Georgia Department of Education 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners Report

The Committee found the following items to be **Enablers**:

1. We need to streamline planning to ensure ALL stakeholders can effectively engage in supporting student learning
2. Teachers can easily see strategies school is using to support students, teachers, and parents
3. Easy to monitor/evaluate; Quick view of school's plan for academic improvement
4. Easy to review one plan and quickly provide feedback to schools; Have ability to monitor the Title I Plan
5. Easy for schools to provide action/strategies to support struggling students
6. Easy to monitor/evaluate effectiveness at the school level
7. Be able to include plans for all entities in one document (SIG, Title I, Title II, etc.)
8. Easier for teachers to remember the focus areas or improvement
9. Consolidates and simplifies and makes it easier to update
10. A comprehensive plan
11. More user friendly for staff
12. Living document/simplifies
13. More concise
14. Easier to monitor progress
15. Allows a better process for adjustments
16. Bridges gap between schools and district
17. Easier to keep visible
18. Leadership team monitoring is easier
19. Keeps the goals visible and easier to keep them visible
20. Grade level/subject level monitoring
21. Great to list bullets
22. Schools can focus their efforts on one plan
23. Addresses specific expectations or classroom
24. The document provides a simple, effective, very user-friendly format which is easy to read and understand
25. Simple works better! Principals will, too!
26. Could save time; will provide a one-stop overview of needs and remedies
27. Will appeal to those who see it as a time-saving document
28. Could be adopted to meet non-title and non-school improvement schools next
29. Would help focus on assessment (formative and summative)
30. Would allow or easier transition for change in instructional staff

Dr. Randy Phillips then led the presentation of the topic of the day, Schoolwide Consolidation of Funds Pilot Project. The next two documents reviewed by the Committee of Practitioners were "Implementation of a Title I, Part A Schoolwide Consolidation of Funds Pilot" and the "Budget Templates". The Committee broke into groups and was asked to respond on the Committee of Practitioner Review Form detailing the barriers and the enablers on the district, school, and classroom level. At the end of the working lunch, the individual groups were asked to report their findings and opinions to the Committee.



Georgia Department of Education 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners Report

The Committee found the following items to be **Barriers:**

Sp. Data Element:

1. Monitoring/Percentage changes
2. Personnel additions in accounting
3. Budget monitoring/percentage changes
4. Meeting various program requirement
5. Internal Control issues
6. Takes away flexibility
7. Incredible amount of JE
8. The added concern of not being able to directly monitor overall spending
9. Increased staffing will add a burden on the budget
10. Increase in errors
11. State and local funds will now have to meet the requirements of Federal funds
12. Parent Involvement would have a risk that would be ignored
13. A lot of unknowns..
14. Creates more issues for accounting personnel
15. Less flexibility due to set percentages
16. Add a way to have schoolwide plan on reduction in class size for teachers and paraprofessionals
17. Justification of Staff paid by Title I reflected in Needs Assessment
18. Support is needed—train Finance Directors Some district personnel may not be knowledgeable enough to be able to guide schools who do different things
19. Districts may not effectively monitor funding
20. Districts have to employ more staff to monitor this process
21. Increased training needed
22. No split-funded logs

State 150

1. Monitoring/Percentage changes
2. Personnel additions in accounting
3. Budget monitoring/percentage changes
4. Meeting various program requirements
5. Incredible workload, accountability, and responsibility for monitoring
6. Auditing nightmare!!!!NO!
7. It's not a good idea—would be difficult to track
8. Limits on Internal Control
9. School leaders would see increased responsibility and need additional staff
10. Training and monitoring would be challenging and heaped on an already overburdened principal
11. Technical assistance would be needed for school leaders about the specific guidelines of federal programs that district leaders currently monitor for compliance
12. More room for errors
13. Creates more issues for accounting personnel
14. Changes become a cumbersome issue for accounting
15. No matter the option add 2900-
16. Justification of Staff paid by Title I reflected in Needs Assessment
17. Need to increase assessment and distinguish what had greatest effect



Georgia Department of Education 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners Report

18. Can be extremely difficult to keep track of whether expenditure is compliant with federal requirements
19. Internal controls will be an issue
20. More staff will be needed to perform fiscal tasks
21. The intent of the funds driven by federal funds intent could limit usage by teachers
22. Inventory of equipment
23. No split-funded logs

Pilot 150

1. Accuracy
2. Accountability to federal programs
3. No because of district set asides and responsibilities
4. No because of the district set aside
5. Who would sign off on requisitions?
6. Increased opportunities for fraud
7. Improper use of funds could take funds away from students for certain groups of students
8. Not a good idea—How would funds be approved and tracked?
9. Offline worksheet tends to lend toward fraud, waste and abuse
10. Internal control problems
11. MOE problems
12. Extra work on school districts' finance personnel
13. Shouldn't consolidate parent engagement and m/operations

The Committee found the following items to be **Enablers**:

Sp. Data Element:

1. Automatic calculation is beneficial as funds are easily identifiable
2. State can track funding source
3. Potentially provides more resources to students
4. No because of the district set aside
5. It's not a good idea—would be difficult to track
6. Who would sign off on requisitions?

State 150

1. Increased flexibility with funds allows district to maximize use of funds: Lower class size
2. Increased opportunities for flexibility
3. Students would benefit from school creativity and flexibility
4. Provides districts with flexibility especially smaller districts
5. Provides flexibility
6. Allows bookkeepers to monitor through spreadsheet prior to entering into accounting system
7. State will be able to view information
8. Easy for accounting
9. Like consolidation of object codes (210, 220, 230, 290)
10. Make sure needs assessment aligns with staff



Georgia Department of Education 2015-2016 Committee of Practitioners Report

Pilot 150

1. Options for districts to choose
2. During a general session: please cover ALL major audit findings WITH EVERYONE in each compliance area so we can internally give extra attention to these areas—at annual training in June
3. Provide clear guidance on roll out of ESSA
4. GA DOE—Implementation Plan Chart
5. Can allow differentiation among schools in district
6. Can allow flexibility in meeting individual needs
7. Could lead to classroom if correctly utilized
8. Allow district to maximize obtaining resources for student achievement
9. Bring more of an awareness of funding sources and how they can be used
10. Increase opportunity for resources
11. Could provide more funding for teaching staff subsequently lower class size

These completed forms were turned in to Robyn Planchard, the Title I contact for the Committee of Practitioners. The comments and/or recommendations will be placed in a summary report for review at the next Committee of Practitioner meeting in November. The Committee then discussed fall meeting dates and decided **the first meeting date will be scheduled for Friday, November 4, 2016.**

Membership for FY17: 26 of 51 members have replied in writing that they are returning for FY17. 16 of 51 have not yet responded. 9 of 51 members are retiring or not returning and will need to be replaced for FY17. Chairperson Lynn Howard asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion was made by Beverley Strickland and seconded by Katrina Thompson. The meeting was adjourned.