

| Topic | Discussion | Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Welcome, Introductions</p> <p>Meeting was called to order at 11:04 AM</p> | <p>Working Group members: Jim Fitzpatrick, Sarah Teel, Ginny Burley, Harry Frank, Barb Russ, Karen Scott, Holly Morehouse, Tom Alderman, Ann Manwaring, Katie Mobley</p> <p>Also present: Amy Shollenberger, VTA; Ethan LaTour, MMR; Jonathan Wolfe, Primmer; Emanuel Betz, Karen Edwards, Rebecca Holcombe, AOE.</p> <p>Unable to attend: David Gurtman, Brian Campion</p> | <p><i>Handouts will all be posted online after today's meeting.</i></p> |
| <p>Meeting minutes</p> | <p>No changes noted.</p> | <p><i>Motion Tom, Barb – accepted minutes</i></p> |
| <p>Updates</p> | <p>Plan for the day reviewed. Secretary will make recommendations on the November 15th to the legislature. This working group will be making recommendations on November 16th at the Pre-K16 Council.</p> <p>Dec 10 – will be on VT Child Poverty Council agenda and Holly will be representing the working group.</p> <p>PLEASE consider attending the VT Afterschool Conference on 10/23 in Stowe – you are all invited</p> | <p><i>Please consider attending the Pre-K16 Council on Nov 16 as a full committee.</i></p> <p><i>Please see Holly if you would like to attend the VT Afterschool conference.</i></p> |
| <p>Discussion – Flexible Pathways and ELOs</p> | <p>ELO discussion – see draft of recommendations.</p> <p>Charge: how could VT make better use of ELOs to support EQS, PLP, PBGRs. How to be part of the conversation. Funding for a summit is available from VSAC according to Holly and through a mini-grant via NAA (Karen Scott is working on that).</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the character/nature of the qualities – what does a good experience look like? Should we use the 8 qualities? • Age-related framework • What is engaging students in elementary school – make suggestions about what it looks like • Getting the community ready – scaffolding that prepares parent, community and students • Forwarding the value of the education through a framework to support education – beyond information about how many graduates go to college. • Recommend PHASES of implementation-extracurricular camps and activities that could | <p><i>Handouts will be on the website</i></p> <p><i>An updated framework will be drafted.</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>become legitimate avenues of proficiency – look at this first as a way to push the system. Acknowledge their value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start with extracurricular activities that ARE ALREADY part of the school community – ASP. • No legislative requirement that outside people are certified in any way; credits are approved by the school. • Where is there overlap within the proficiencies – individualized and general requirements both may be open to students. • ELOs – need to describe what they can do within the standards, and share that with schools. • Pathways to explore topics – via ASP; discovering interests and ideas. Proficiencies? PLP should be a plan, a PS plan, future plan over time. • Mapped to standards vs. mapped to proficiencies? • Adults in the system? Most leverage comes through assessment – • Badging/digital badging – larger framework? Some states have moved into standards; MD has moved into recognized by higher ed. No standard. • Badge holder – someone meets standards • Higher Ed – talking about industry credentials; graduation assessments; the value of ELOs could be emphasized. • Home school community – how do they document this? They put a plan in with the state – often don’t have a diploma, some get GED, some do high school completion. • Where does school accountability connect with formative assessment of student standards. Teacher preparation and supporting teachers • What will help move a system? • PLP is a driving mandate – to get to the standards – one tool are ELOs – building the demand for ELOs – making the connection <p>Who do we need to hear from?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helen Beattie – Up for Learning • Renaissance program at Twinfield – how are they certifying and accepting credits? How do we scale up? • Amy Fowler – school accountability. Consider how teachers are supported. • U-32 – how are they scaling up. • NESSC – Secondary schools – grade schools – Great School Partnerships • Lake Champlain Maritime Museum- as another ELO example | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>What are the structures that need to be in place?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELOs described in language of standards • Equity and access are front and center • Training – students, parents, teachers, admin, • Vision for teaching • Using EQS – school, school boards, parents, students (7-12), teachers <p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School needs the place to start; schools need to be ready, and what are schools doing now? What is on the menu? • Placing students at the center of the construction of their own educational pathway. The ELO is a tool, as is CTE, etc. <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are you? Where do you want to go? Curious? • Opportunities and responsibilities • How do you get there.... <p>Include a philosophical statement – what does a good ELO look like?</p> | |
| <p>ELO Special Fund</p> | <p>Rebecca Holcombe, Secretary, Emanuel Betz, 21C Coordinator, Karin Edwards, Agency of Education - Opened at 1pm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that this was a high level conversation – vs. comprehensive responsive • AOE feels this is a priority; evidence that gap is accelerating • Extended learning – critical equity tool • Socially supported adult involved with children during key hours • Concern – fiscal ask of \$5M is big – redefine at local level; targeting resources where we get the most value; clarified that the report is not asking for all \$5M from the same source • Trying to close the gap – closing the gap is putting pressure on state govt. • AOE is concerned that they don’t have the capacity at this time for monitoring this fund based on what is needed. • Lots of initiatives – serving the same goals • Strategically – ELO as part of how we personalize education in VT? Based on financing that is available; dual-purposing our funds • Complicated the committee/oversight needs to be the most efficient; spend time on the | <p><i>AOE will have additional discussion and will provide an update to Holly</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>journey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you make sure that large public investment are the ones that really needed. • Intentionality and targeting – supporting equity goal <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EB: eligible entities – business as a manager of ASP: could be partners as opposed to leading an ASP. Recommend- not including businesses as eligible entities. • EB: No designated time for investment. Recommend: should be multi-year vs. one year. • EB: Match requirement – discrimination against small, rural community – start-ups; limited businesses in rural areas. Recommend- other options for support instead of the match requirement • EB: Numbers don't align to 21C number; doesn't think 86 sites would not be funded. Programs cost money and more would be needed. • HM: Explained that estimates were generated from 21C data; full explanation included in the previous report (2014) • EB: Expressing a commitment for a longer term • HM: Grant process was designed so as not to exclude businesses from applying at the outset; however, in order to be funded any proposal would have to be competitive. Opportunity in the grant review process for the committee to decide on whether or not something should be funded. Any community can apply, priority set. Priority is geographic need, low income families. • HM: Goal for what should be in the fund = \$5M: A role for private/business – to the committee....philanthropy tends to be local. • EB: Political process; historical process about funds strike; looking for a smaller win. • BR: The truth is looking at the 22,000 kids • RH: How do we message that to the right audience; schools need to understand that personalized learning is part of ELO – are we putting the dollars to the best use? • JF: described a 5M problem; how do we being to attack it? Private funds are fickle. Doesn't preclude a \$100K start. • GB: local control; incentivize certain experiences • AM: any funding that is new is not going to be probable. ELO can be a tool, capacity building, best practices, likes committee structure that is in place. Budget squeezes at local level that is going to PK vs 3-4. • EB: cited BMS – major investment in ELOs; holistic approach. Started with 21C investment. • HM: re-allocating the priorities – making change with investment. • RH – how are we using the money out there; what is your goal? Value – if can win mind | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>and hearts. Schools will then follow. Publications – huge impact. Keep it in the forefront of the conversation. Keep having the conversation. Empty bucket now; until then, need to look at other streams (local can allocate). Helping families. Welcome audience.</p> <p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acute situation at the state level. Helping people understand that ELO and PL is a reconfiguration of delivery of service. Acknowledgement of its importance. Need to create public understanding. • Embedded at school assessment process. • Annual snapshot – could count ASP, but could be considered, but since there isn't a goal at the state level. Need to move in a policy direction. • Unclaimed lottery funds – • Have to put the need forward and use the frame of personalization as a way to create the need • KE-Quality must be the key part of the discussion. • We are asking our schools to do a huge amount of vital needs. • Re-tasking existing funds – new is personalization of learning. • Opp. To define personalization – use of ELOs as a priority. • Targeting – funding structures – using funding streams creatively • JF – described the process and procedure of the committee for the past 2 years; some concern that the discussion today isn't bringing in anything that the committee hadn't looked at considered over the last two years • Add a bullet point or page of other funding opportunities – re Title 1. 38 SUs are sending funds back. Depends on leadership, had 21C. • VTAOE is looking at better guidance on title funds, part of the EQS? • Streams from federal funds and targeting those to ASP – all goes through the funding. Institutionally aligned. Clarity of goals – complexity of jobs. • RH – 2 target audiences – kids and parents. Guestamite - \$5M. Some existing, some special funds, school district resources. Include a more complex framework. • AM – identify what we have now, then begin to broaden. • HM- We do have that information in the first report. Can pull that up if needed. <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the cost of not doing it? Opportunity cost? • Frame it as an opportunity we can't afford not to provide • What we can do in the interim? Need to keep bringing the issue forward • Best practices for SU – how can we get that info in? | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AOE will have a discussion. • Braiding federal funding | |
| <p>Discussion – Finalizing Recommendations for ELO Fund</p> | <p>Strong agreement across the committee in most areas. All present agreed to the following principles as outlined in the report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Tying to other education issues and initiatives 2) Including key data and research upfront in the report 3) Creating a state level committee including business and philanthropy and big picture, innovative thinkers 4) Setting up a separate, smaller subcommittee to handle the grant process 5) Creating a grant process that is flexible, aligned, streamlined, and that uses Agency resources and capacity wisely 6) Identifying clear priorities for the funding (e.g., low-income, underserved areas) 7) Supporting the field through professional development, training, and networking 8) Creating a role for private contributions both through the 1-to-1 match requirement as well as through contributions to the fund <p>All (except for Ann) also agreed to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9) Setting \$5 million in the fund as a goal and how that would benefit students and communities (noting that not all \$5 million needs to come from new state revenue) 10) Claiming a role for state leadership <p>Holly will modify page 10 of the report to include language around the funding piece being more complex than only asking for new state revenue and noting some of the other sources of reallocated funds that the AOE is going to research (more info can be in an appendix if needed).</p> <p>Holly will send the modified report to the full committee. Committee members can make specific suggestions by noting page number and sentence in the report- please be specific. Once all modifications are in, the committee agreed to vote via email on the final report. We need to get this done prior to our next meeting on November 5th.</p> | <p><i>Adding bullet point on potential reallocation of funding sources; also will look at modifying language on page 10 to acknowledge complex funding structures</i></p> <p><i>Committee will submit any other suggestions via email by citing page number and specific sentence</i></p> <p><i>Committee will then vote via email on final report (before Nov. 5th)</i></p> |
| <p>Next Meeting</p> | <p>Thursday November 5, 2015. 11-3. Room 32 – House Ed. Committee room</p> | |