

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT
MEETING MINUTES FOR June 18th 2008

Barbara Clark, Member
Thad Ballard, Member
Mary Clair, Member
Rollins Stallworth, Member
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Member (excused)
Debi Millet, Member
Alison Turner, Member (arrived 10:10 am)
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen, Member (Absent)
Patricia Lopez, Member (Absent)
Darrin Rohr, Member (Absent)

Staff Present:

Gloria Dopf, Deputy Superintendent for Instruction,
Research and Evaluative Services, NDE
Lori Johnson, Administrative Assistant for the Parental Involvement Council

Audience in Attendance:

Denise Hedrick, Executive Director of the Education Collaborative
Eva Melendrez, Parent Involvement Coordinator for Clark County School District
D'Lisa Crain, Grant administrator for Washoe County, PIRC
and the Education Collaborative
Nancy Hall, UNR/ PIRC Parent Involvement Liaison
Margaret Ferrara, UNR Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning
Steve Mistere, Local Business Owner

1. Call to Order; Roll Call

Chairman Clark called the meeting of the Advisory Council on Parent Involvement (PIC) to order at 9:35 a.m. in room 233 at the TMCC/UNR Redfield Campus in Reno, Nevada, Roll call showed members present as indicated. Chair Clark indicated that Darrin Rohr has sent notice of resignation from the Council. Member Stallworth made a motion to approve May minutes and approve a flexible agenda. Member Millet seconded the motion, Member Ballard abstained, the motion carried.

2. Distribute and Review Parent Involvement sections of all District Improvement Plans (DIP) and parental involvement plans from certain schools designated High Achieving and Exemplary.

Ms. Dopf explained the matrix, included as attachment 6A, is a collection of parent involvement practices from District Accountability reports and the DIPs. She explained that this attachment was not complete because of time constraints. Some districts report every effort and some just mention that there is ongoing communication between parents and the district. It is possible that the districts and schools are doing community outreach practices but are not reporting it here.

Ms. Dopf will complete the review and if there are other highlights to add, she will do so. She is open to the Council members additional information they want in the report. In rural districts, where there is not a parent involvement point person, this report is usually brief.

President Clark commented that only two questions are asked in this report; whether they have parent teacher conference attendance, and what are the district communication efforts? She did not feel that was sufficient, and asked how the two questions connect to the PTA six standards.

Ms. Dopf also explained attachment 6B which Member Stallworth completed was a component of one of Councils statutory duties which was to measure current practices against the PTA standards.

There was discussion among the members of how to use these current reports to get more accurate feedback and if the accountability report could be changed to be more of a template for everyone to provide the same more expansive information which this Council needs to move forward.

Ms. Dopf asked if anyone on the Council was aware of additional district practices that should added she would be happy to do so. She will make a note on Attachment 7 that this is an ongoing attempt to compile a listing of best practices. Once this list is more inclusive it can be shared with other districts.

Member Stallworth mentioned this matrix could be part of the dissemination of general information and material that this Council could provide to all districts. This would achieve a goal of this Council to network with all districts about best practices and to help the districts with other resources.

Ms. Dopf commented that if the districts knew that someone was reviewing and using this data, they may be apt to provide more detailed information.

Ms. Dopf stated that statues set the elements or templates for the questions that are asked of the district. If the district is a Title 1 served school, the implementation efforts are often broader and more conclusive due to federal requirements. She delineated how the accountability plans and improvement plans relate and where the Student Achievement Gap Elimination (SAGE) fits into this process.

After further discussion it was agreed that there is a need to establish the link between achievement, accountability and improvement activities.

Ms. Dopf offered that the school improvement process and the SAGE processes which is the jurisdiction of the NDE, would be easier to manipulate then the accountability report. Changes to the Accountability information would have to be done by statute. Of course statutory change is an option which should be done through the Legislative Commission on Education. Ms. Dopf agreed that currently the parent involvement policy is a set component but the action/implementation component is lacking.

Ms. Dopf continued explaining how the District Accountability Report is mandated statutorily. NDE's current process is to provide the public data. This data, from the district and each school, includes demographics, gender, testing and AYP school performance plus additional mandatory and NCLB requirements. The State provides this data on an annual basis and is made available on our website. Our State Improvement Plan, as well as District and school plans, translates this data, provided by each school and each District, into a need statement and an action plan. These plans must also have an evaluation and a monitoring component.

Ms. Dopf clarified that the six PTA standards were adopted by the State Board of Education and included in the Accord and Parental Involvement Policy.

Ms. Melendrez restated that the information given within the District Accountability Plan is not directly tied to the six PTA standards.

Ms. Crain is the person who develops the parent communication section for the Washoe County District Accountability Report and she never considered how that data might be used further by an entity such as this Advisory Council. She provided a much longer version of Washoe activities and she was asked to limit the amount of words for the ARC. Ms. Crain suggested providing a better template within the Accountability plan with regard to the Parent Communication section.

President Clark reminded everyone that the Council's ultimate goal is how student achievement is linked to parent involvement. She asked for suggestions on how to formulate that within each district.

Ms. Crain said that from a district perspective, it would be helpful for this Council to create a guiding document on how to translate policy into an action plan which then can be effectively evaluated.

Ms. Dopf said that this type of technical assistance would not be available unless the NDE is able to hire a consultant. She said that the Council needs to decide what structure or data you want to look at, to show effective Parental Involvement. As suggested in the report, a survey might be able to accomplish this. The elements need to be identified before you can apply data to show success or failure.

Steve Mestre asked how to address the glaring issues of social-economical issues that create barriers for different parents in regard to involvement.

Ms. Dopf directed the group's attention to Attachment # 8 in the report, which the Southern Nevada task force put together regarding recommendations for those "hard-to reach" parents. Ms. Dopf asked the Council to think about ways to define or measure the level of parent involvement.

Ms. Crain suggested looking at Washoe County's pilot survey for parental involvement.

Ms Turner stated that what currently needs to be evaluated are the programs for family involvement that the schools/districts are using and which of these programs are successfully in reaching the parents. Accountability plans are about past actions and improvement plans are reporting on future action. Ms. Turner asked that any data this Council is going to request for collection be linked with strategies that have been

successful. Ms. Dopf suggested adding a recommendation to the report, to identify mechanisms for finding needs, which is a duty this Council was to address. It may be premature to suggest conclusions or actions before we have studied the data already collected.

3. Review and Drafting of the Statutory Report from the Parent Involvement Advisory Council to the LCE July 1 Identify Items 1-8 Review and Recommendations

Ms. Dopf told the group how the report is constructed and inclusive of all of the documents that this Council has created. She asked for a vote on whether the document should be pared down or if the current size is fine. Her experience is that the report should be a "reader's digest version" with detailed attachments for those who want to look at further relevant information.

Mr. Ballard suggested putting the recommendations up front in the report.

Ms Dopf explained that she had reread the minutes from each meeting and looked at the information the task forces produced before attempting to translate the Council's discussions into actions the Council feels should happen in order to move this process forward. Ms. Dopf asked for everyone to forward any suggestions and word changes to Lori for incorporation into the final report.

Each recommendation was discussed and some sentences were reworded and moved around. Concerns of members were addressed. Some new verbiage was incorporated.

Ms. Dopf suggested that including a budget and expected expenditures (i.e. cost of the Summit would not be available for this report due on July 1, 2008.) This could be addressed at future meetings.

Ms. Crain mentioned that Clark County has been doing a parent survey for many years, so it is possible that we have enough longitudinal data.

Ms Turner offered to do some "word-smithing" on some of the paragraphs on the draft of the report. (She offered that in talking with some legislators they thought the and funding requests for 2009.)

Ms Dopf stated that the NDE must follow directions from the Governor in submitting its budget for FY10-11. NDE is not allowed to include in a base budget, any funds that had not previously been expended. They may not even allow for enhancement requests for reinstatement of deleted positions. A viable alternative to get this funding is a request through the LCE and parent involvement advocates to legislators,

Discussion was had about future funding for this Council and how to approach legislators. Ms. Dopf asked for changes and direction from the Council in wording on the paragraph regarding PIRC paying the expenditures to be sent to Lori by June 30th at the latest. More changes were discussed to be made on the final report. Ms. Dopf asked if President Clark gives her permission to produce a transmittal letter with her signature after she approves the final draft.

A motion to approve the draft of this report with modification was made by Mary Clair Debi Millet seconded the motion and a voice vote was taken in favor of the motion.

4. Updates from the Parent Involvement Resource Center (PIRC)

This will be a standing agenda item. Ms. Hendricks suggested this Council use the survey that Washoe County sent out to all 62,000 parents in the school district, to identify common links and correlations between parents and student achievement.

Ms. Hendricks informed the group that there will be a stakeholder meeting for the PIRC grant with the focus on making sure that the key goals and objectives are still the same, now two years into this grant. They are working in partnership with UNR to infuse the standards for parental involvement into the pre-service requirements for new teachers and well as in service modules for current teachers as well as “train the trainers” in customer service for front line staff and bus drivers etc.

5. Comments from Council Members

Discussion occurred about possible future meeting dates but no firm dates were voted on. It was also agreed that the Council would continue to meet every other month during the school year.

7. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

8 This meeting was adjourned at 12:35p.m.