Technical Support Team Meeting, Kansas City, MO

January 25-26, 2011

January 25, 2011

In attendance*: Emily Hoffman (MA), Guadalupe Ledesma (WA), Lysandra Lopez-Medina (PA), Jessica McKenzie (MS), Barbara Patch (NH), Brenda Pessin (IL), Michael Rea (MT), Erin Shea (VT), TJ Sparling (NY), Kelsey Williams (ID), Sonja Williams (NC), Bruce Wright (SC), Jorge Echegaray (FL), John Farrell (KS), Andrea Carter (KY), Sara Mullin (IN), Kathleen Bibus (MN), Margarita Colindres (CO), Bob Lynch (NPC), Cindy Bartelsmeyer (FSCC), Tracie Kalic (SOSY Director)*

Tracie Kalic opened the meeting with a review of the agenda, expectations of the Technical Support Team (TST) work, and outline of the day. The updated contact list will be posted on the website. Tracie introduced the *SOSY Agricultural Trends Newsletter*, a new product that SOSY will share with the states.

Day One Agenda
Welcome, Introductions, Overview of the Agenda, Opening Activity
Keeping the Momentum Going: How to Involve New and Experienced States
Discussion and Analysis of Survey Monkey Results
Update on OSY Activities
Discussion of Fidelity of Implementation Index and Timeline
Work Groups/Creation of Action Plans
Continue Work Groups
Wrap Up and Adjourn for the Day

Overview of SOSY

Tracie provided a brief overview of SOSY:

- Expectations of SOSY: Collaboration, participation, data collection, implementation of activities, response team to receive onsite TA, build capacity
- Objectives:
  - Increase number of OSY identified and recruited;
  - Serve a larger number of OSY; and
  - Increase number of OSY who meet performance standards
- Framework: Systems, ID&R, TA, collaboration, communication, best practices, research, train trainers to train staff, address needs of OSY

- Responsibilities of TST:
  - Comprised of *recognized experts* noted for their work with OSY or for their technical expertise in curriculum, graduation/career planning, technology, health education, ESL and/or GED/pre-GED.
  - Will complete the activities outlined in the Consortium's Fidelity Implementation Index (FII)

- FII activities the TST will focus on:
  - Use of new and innovation technology
  - Technology to reach youth where they are
  - Create an information clearinghouse
  - Develop materials and instructional support

New States and Experienced States Facilitated Discussion

Bob Lynch facilitated a discussion on the topic of keeping the momentum going in regard to experienced states and bringing new SOSY states on board. See a summary of the discussion below:

2008-2010 states: Bob asked each state to identify and share the following:

1. What does your state want out of continued participation?
2. Lessons learned from the states during the original Consortium grant

- Vermont provided useful materials and assessments.
- South Carolina contributed to identification and recruitment as well as mini lessons.
- Illinois helped to develop procedures to document and keep track of information and services, and spearheaded the development of audio lessons to supplement *Living in America*.
- New Hampshire can help with pilots since it is small and 90% of the population is OSY. They actively use technology and the State Director is very active with the OSY themselves.
- Kansas was able to use the profile, gather data, and produce a picture of OSY in the state. They have benefitted from working with others in the OSY grant and their expertise.
- North Carolina was able to go beyond English classes and look at what OSY want to do, including art and photography.
- Pennsylvania contributed best practice mini-lessons, improved data collection to align to the evaluation requirements of the grant, and brought the subject of OSY to the front and center.
- Tennessee developed innovative use of iPODS as well as the literature review.
- New York provided considerable materials development including the health lessons, *Finanza* and the *Living in America* curriculum. NY is involved in guiding the development of audio lessons to supplement selected *LIA* lessons.
- Florida wants to see the profile results used to drive decision making and planning. They are interested in how states plan to use the data, how to create an educational plan quickly based on initial data plan, and how to use the information to address the school issues, dropouts, etc.
- Montana developed ID&R strategies and piloted OSY forms. Network opportunities and curriculum and resources

2010-2012 States: Bob then asked the new states:

1. How to best involve new states
2. How to best increase involvement of experienced states
3. What do we need to focus on to move support for OSY forward in all states?

- Indiana – The OSY population is growing but isolated. The MEP has provided work dictionaries, health packets and English classes. IN has a small staff and some resources; they are very willing to learn and contribute. They struggle with outreach and want to build capacity with instructors. IL would like to work with IN on a joint effort to serve OSY along the state line, particularly in southwest IN.
- Kentucky – There has been a shift in recruitment in KY to reach out beyond K-12. There are 3,000+ migrants in the state with 1317 being OSY. They have been focused on ID&R and can share those ideas for recruiting. Now they want to go beyond ID&R and focus on expanding services, knowing that standardized services are not necessarily the answer. There have been referrals to health and mental health; there's a need to collaborate among the districts. They want to do a better job of sharing best practices and making sure they are accessing and gathering needed information. The profile used to be optional; now it is required.
- Idaho– ID wants to learn about what has already been done, so they can be one step ahead. They are very rural and spread out and feel somewhat isolated. They have used IPods and have partnered with a virtual school. A mobile health van provides immunizations, health checks, etc.
- Mississippi – MI is seeking innovative ideas and is ready and willing to pilot almost anything. They need to consolidate everything around the state.
- Massachusetts – They will have a more centralized profile.
- Washington – WA has a strong ID&R and data collection component and a passion for OSY. They are interested in ways to better organize and make the data real and meaningful. The shift is moving from identification to focusing on what they are going to do with the OSY population.
- Colorado – CO is ready to serve OSY and are currently collecting data to help determine how to do so. They want to collaborate with the other states and try out different things.
- Minnesota – MN is not yet seeing the upsurge of OSY, so they need strategies for ID&R and ways to serve the new population.

Survey Monkey Results: Tracie asked each state director to respond to 4 questions via Survey Monkey. The survey was designed with a 2 fold purpose: 1) to elicit information from states in regard to how often the website is used/what types of resources are still needed; and 2) to find out exactly what types of curricula are needed. SOSY is charged with creating an information clearinghouse.

Each member of the TST was asked to expand on the ideas that were submitted. First, members selected their 5 most important ideas; then, they clarified those ideas by writing additional thoughts. The Curriculum Work Group will use this information to inform its work.

Update on OSY Activities

States were asked to share information in regard to the following:

- How are you currently supporting OSY?

- Share one strategy for getting started and/or one strategy that has been successful in providing services to OSY
- How have you used materials/resources from the Consortium?
- What technical assistance does your state need from SOSY?

Kentucky:

- OSY task force got people together for a resource rubric.
- Website can be overwhelming; time is limited; the rubric is great because everything is right there.
- Technical assistance – how to use the technology as a tool, not as the end all, be all. More training is needed.
- How to make sure you get iPODS back and how to you use it as a tool for instruction; what is the performance?
- Data management; want to see how other states use profile to make a CNA.

Florida:

- Shared a form that lists what are allowable and non-allowable purchases .
- Need another section on the website that addresses "what works" with examples given instead of "best practices".

Illinois:

- Use profile data as a connection to needs assessment and service delivery.
- A form is used to develop an individual instructional and supportive services plan for OSY including the time and place where instruction will take place.
- Aggregated profile data were used to produce an update to the State CNA focused on OSY.

North Carolina:

- Built reports into MIS 2000 to ensure that OSY data are captured as completely and cost effectively as possible.
- Services have increased. A services summary report that highlights OSY can be filtered out by county, age, etc. is very helpful. The same report also is used for K-12 and PreK.

Pennsylvania:

- The document and instructions used for needs assessment (includes notes for instructional services vs. support services) was shared with the group.

Massachusetts and Vermont:

- Shared a case management approach of utilizing multiple strategies.
- Creation of useful forms (VT shared several of these with the group.)
- Discussed need for technical assistance around safety issues for employees (ConQIR did a safety tip sheet and there is a chapter about safety in the OME ID&R training materials).

Montana
- Identify OSY and complete the profile and needs assessment
Montana

- Network with Washington state to continue working with OSY that travel back and forth
- Focus on GED completion

Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII) and Timelines for Work Groups: FII indicators broken out by the project's three objectives and timelines were discussed. Expectations were clarified and two facilitators were identified to work with each work group. Tracie will serve on each of the work groups and monitor their progress to ensure that work is completed in a timely manner. The groups likely will overlap. Work groups formed at this meeting are not intended to stay intact for the length of the entire project. The commitment is to work in the group at this meeting and then finish whatever members have agreed to do. Members can move to other groups and provide input as they wish.

Members selected their work group interest. Expectations and team norms were discussed including: acknowledge time, confidentiality, positive experience, honest discussion, ensure everyone is heard, address individual issues, consistent basis, and appropriate communication.

The next TST meeting will be held in April in order to prepare for the State Directors update in May at the NASDME Conference. Annually, there should be 3 meetings of the TST. In addition, monthly conference calls should occur. Tracie will send a letter from Norma regarding travel prior to each meeting to aid in state travel approval.

January 26, 2011

Agenda Day Two
Review of previous day's activities and outcomes
Review Work Group action plans and discussion
Discussion of Communication plan
SOSY website
Review of documents, data collection
Report to SST
NASDME presentation
Schedule additional meetings and conference calls, other issues
Wrap Up and Adjourn

Tracie will type action plans for each work group and make sure everyone has an electronic version.

The TST discussed locations for the next meeting (Denver, Philadelphia, Seattle, Chicago and Clearwater) on April 12 and 13 with a travel day on April 11.

Work Group Reports: Work groups shared their action plans for addressing their specific FII indicators. Each team discussed the activities that would be designed, the person(s) responsible, the timeline/deadline, and developed a plan for how the workgroup would communicate and move the work forward. Tracie will convene the work group conference calls, assist in designing the products, and ensure that the work is completed on time. Technology will be used as much as possible to aid communication and work progress.

ID&R Work Group:

- *FII Indicator 1.4 Collaborate with HEP/CAMP, NPC, NCFH on the identification process to recover OSY*: 2 areas collaborating with HEP and CAMP, etc. on ID&R. Add collaborating partners. Bring recovery youth back into the system to achieve GED.

- *FII Indicator 1.10 Develop SOSY ID&R Strategies and Materials:* Look at materials that OME has developed, ConQIR, previous OSY Consortium. Put materials together in a cohesive matter.
  - To recover youth may not be the same as recovery youth, but it is the process of identifying. Utilize recruiters to fill out the profiles at the same time as COEs so data are not lost. FL has incorporated 2 ideas the Consortium might want to utilize: age and last grade completed. Include generic templates for displaying and analyzing profile data as another way to make sure states utilize the survey.
  - A message will be sent to member state directors (with a copy to TST members) reminding them that that they have agreed to use the profile. A short, targeted message using bullets is recommended.

Curriculum Work Group:

- *FII Indicator 2.7 Develop the lessons and utilize technology*: Finish up the materials development already in process. Add a pre-test for Math on the Move. 4 more health lessons will be done by the end of August.
  Start a blog to keep conversations going and gather input from states. Assign topics that different people could be in charge of each month. Share what technology is being used and what is working.
- *FII Indicator 2.8 Develop/Adapt SOSY website to include an information clearinghouse:* Catalog materials and make a searchable link. Put together the delivery models – how to use the different tools and how each state is implementing. Add a role model page to the website with success stories of a variety of former migrant students. Include current students in action using some of the curriculum/technology.
- *FII Indicator 2.9 Design Podcasts:* Put together guidelines for developing podcasts so they reflect best practice and there is consistency across states.   Ask the ALRC for their assistance in developing suggested guidelines. Consider purchasing iPODs in bulk with orders taken perhaps twice a year.
- *FII Indicator 3.6 Design, develop SOSY materials, pilot and revise*: Develop career materials (e.g. resume building, how to get a job, career choices), mini lessons focused on legal issues often encountered by OSY, and parenting lessons. Concept papers will be developed.
- *FII Indicator 3.11 Pre GED reading course*: Put together a concept paper with information about proposed reading level, language, etc. Both English and Spanish versions should be available.
- The group discussed the following questions/issues:

  - Use of the SOSY website by students—Is this an academic or tech piece? Do students have internet access? OSY social networking (Facebook, OSY chat) has great potential to link OSY and get them interested in various topics and tech. Facebook is not confidential; would this create a problem for the youth? Would an online safety mini lesson be recommended?
  - Technology awareness—NC uses technology with the youth and it works well to keep them connected. Of concern is the extremely public nature of social networking—you cannot control who they are friends with.

Technical Assistance Work Group:

FII Indicator 1.15 Strategies and tools. OSY profiles are already done by most states. Dump the data into Excel for a snapshot of OSY population. Create a generic list of services so staff can identify services

for youth based on needs upon completion of the profile. Urgent health/safety needs would take precedence.

FII Indicator 1.14 Provide tools and identify innovative technology: Create a template SDP and provide training around it to include OSY population.

SOSY Response Team: The response team will depend upon who can go and who has the expertise to handle particular requests/needs. TA can run the gamut from conference calls to face-to-face meetings, online webinars, etc. In the last project, some state directors mentored others.

An area that will require more immediate attention is providing assistance to states that request it in developing or updating their CNA and then linking it to their SDP. Examples of CNAs and SDPs from states that have gone through the process would be helpful. SOSY should connect with CA to see how the CNA was handled there. A template to present and analyze OSY demographics should be developed.

Training Work Group: 2 staff per state will be trained and they, in turn, will train local service providers. A training guide will be developed. A number of training ideas were identified. Modules and templates will have specific objectives, printed materials and possible PowerPoints as well as assessments. Materials will be developed to reflect the different stages that states are in with respect to OSY and will engage experts already in the field for products that already exist. Suggested topics for modules include intro to OSY/demographic information; practical ID&R for reaching out to and working with OSY; use of the profile by practitioners; needs assessment; service delivery—case management, developing educational plans, adapting materials to meet needs; resources available for OSY; advocacy; safety; and data collection and management (ties into the TA group with SDP work). A plan for dissemination will be included.

Training could be done regionally to minimize travel costs, taking into account the budget situations states are facing. There could also be a combination of online and face-to-face training. A change should be made to the FII: develop the training guide this year and then conduct the training next year. Tracie will follow up with Susan Durón, the evaluator.

Questions from the TST:

The TST had some questions in regard to how the TOT differed from the dissemination event and raised some concerns about having the skills needed to train others. The dates as indicated in the FII definitely need to be revised. One scenario is to have a draft of materials and guide developed by July, followed by a meeting in the fall, and training in the spring. Perhaps better would be having the draft materials by this fall with training next spring. The dissemination event could be held the following fall.

Document Revision: The TST discussed changes to the following forms. Input was sought.

- **OSY Student Profile** – The form contains the common data elements agreed upon last year. The group does not want to change these but may want to clarify some of the elements and instructions. If a state wants to add elements, that is left to their discretion. The form will be updated to include the group's suggestions for clarification. Tracie will get this out a.s.a.p. *The Profile will be mandatory for all states to use and complete with OSY.*

  The group was interested in how the Profile was developed and evolved over time. CA began with a very detailed needs assessment survey that was used with OSY which they shared with

other states. Given the short amount of time staff often have in working with very mobile OSY, some states like IL decided to shorten and consolidate the form. FL pared it down even further and added some elements they found particularly helpful. IL took that version, changed it slightly, and reformatted it to ease use in the field.

In the first year of the OSY project, a few states volunteered to use the profile. The data gathered were very useful when the project was asked to make a presentation to OME on its progress. Data collected by KS were featured and presented in a series of graphs and charts that depicted the demographics of this vulnerable population. OME staff responded very positively to the presentation and when it was later shared with the Leadership Team, more states agreed to use the profile. They also decided that when the states entered into consortium again and applied for the current grant that all states would use the profile.

Now it is a logistics challenge for states to figure out when and how they will administer the profile, what happens with the data, and how they are used. The issues of how to aggregate the data and get summaries to the states must still be addressed. Tracie will speak with the Susan regarding best methods and whether composite or individual student data should be submitted. Tracie could produce state-specific reports. She will also investigate how states can upload information to the website with password-protected access. We will try to keep it simple.

- **SOSY Coordinator Survey –** Tracie will ask Susan to make the following changes to the coordinator survey based on the TST discussion:
    - Clarification of achievement assessment on the instruction sheet
    - Definition of goals on the instruction sheet
    - Add "Recovery" to the form

The revised form will be posted on the website and covered in an upcoming webinar for new states. The APR is due in December and the supplement in Feb. Deadline for completing the baseline is Sept. 30, 2011.

It was recommended that a version of the coordinator survey be developed for use by local projects to enable the state to gather the same type of information from all sites and compile it.

- **Evaluation of Services—**This optional form that was originally created by IL to collect information directly from OSY on services received. Data collected are included in the State's MEP evaluation report.
- **Tracking Form—**Add PreGED to the GED column label.
- **What Works Submission Form—**This form will be discussed in February. Members will be asked to volunteer to look at quality control on all of the forms.

Monthly TST conference calls of not more than 1 hour will continue. It was agreed the calls will take place on a set day of the week each month: the 3rd Tuesday of the month at 2:00pm Central. The first call will be held on February 15. Tracie will send a reminder email. Those who cannot participate will receive notes.

There will be a request for agenda items starting with the next meeting.

The meeting concluded at 12:00 pm.