

NDE/ESUCC Collaboration Meeting Agenda

LPS Administration Building

April 3, 2019

Attendance:

ESU Administrators: 1 (Bill Heimann), 2 (Ted Deturk), 3 (Dan Schnoes), (Gregg Robke), 5 (Brenda McNiff), 6 (Dan Shoemake), 7 (Larianne Polk), 8 (Bill Mowinkel), 9 (Joe Haney), 10 (Melissa Wheelock), 11 (Greg Barnes), 13 (Laura Barrett), 15 (Paul Calvert) 16 (Deb Paulman), 17 (Geraldine Erickson), 18 (Liz Standish), 19 (Connie Wickham)

NDE Leaders: Matt Blomstedt, Deb Frison, Dean Folkers, Mark Schultz, Cory Epler, Russ Masco, Lane Carr, Diane Stuehmer, Ryan Foor, Brian Halstead, Shirley Vargas, SuAnn Witt, Don Loeske, Brad Conner, Eric Zeece, Pat Madsen

ESUCC Staff: David Ludwig, Deb Hericks, Scott Isaacson, Beth Kabes, Priscilla Quintana, Craig Peterson, Rhonda Eis

ESUPDO & Initiative Representatives:

PD Planning , SDA (Julie Downing - DL), TLT (BJ Peters (DL), Eileen Barks), ESPD (Jean Anderson), NOC (Jamen Hall), BlendED (Beth Kabes), Data (Russ Masco)

10:00-10:15 Networking and Conversation - Dave

- Find your table (a mix of ESUCC and NDE, department, and expertise at each table)
- 4-6 at a table, need 9 tables

10:15-10:30 Group Norming - Shirley Vargas/Lane Carr

- Are you where you need to be?
- **Meeting Norms: CourageRenewal-CircleOfTrust-Touchstones-stones**
 - Give and Receive Welcome
 - Important to feel welcome
 - Be Present as fully as possible
 - Try to be present as possible
 - What is offered in circle is by invitation, not demand
 - Speak your truth in ways that respect other people's truths
 - No fixing, saving, advising or correcting
 - Reign in thought and behavior - live in the moment
 - Learn to respond to others with honest open questions
 - Respect thy neighbors, quiet
 - When the going gets rough, turn to wonder
 - Attend to your own inner teacher

-
- Tap your inner teacher
 - Trust and learn from silence
 - Observe deeply and confidently
 - Know that it is possible
 - It is possible

10:30 - 11:00 MOU

[http://www.couragerenewal.org/PDFs/CourageRenewal-CircleOfTrust-Touchstones-stones-\(c\)2016-web.pdf](http://www.couragerenewal.org/PDFs/CourageRenewal-CircleOfTrust-Touchstones-stones-(c)2016-web.pdf)

- Facilitators: Matt and Dave with Karen and Brian
 - Discussing, communication
 - Leap of faith - needed to create structures, functions
 - 10 years - new people, new vision
 - Only one administrator left from when Matt Blomstedt was the ESUCC Exec Director
 - NDE turn over of people
 - Today is about the possible
- Historical perspective
 - Purpose (Why)
 - No structure, functions
 - What is the common work
 - Rule 84 - to meet twice a year to communicate, discuss
 - Creation of MOU
 - Not everyone was present in October for that work. Important for each table to have deep conversations to move forward.
 - How and why the MOU was originally created
 - Created to show our collaborative work
 - Review data - what schools need
 - How we can be the most impactful for our schools
 - Work done on the MOU since its inception
- Revision/Update process
 - Reflect on Oct. 2018 outcomes
 - [DRAFT of MOU](#)
- Alignment of MOU with current and future action plans
 - NDE Strategic Plan
 - Bold Steps
 - PDO Work Groups
 - **Feedback from group on draft: (1) Item D, make it accreditation/continuous improvement, and F make it AQuESTT and School improvement**
- Next Steps

11:00 - 12:15 Review Oct Outcomes

- Who were the stakeholders (5)
 - Facilitator: Dave

-
- [Link to 2018 NDE/ESUCC Collaboration Report](#), see page 2
 - Group time:
 - When we do this again, who/what stakeholders (no names necessary) should attend again?
 - Do we have the right people at the table?
 - Who are we missing?

 - Who were we missing?
 - Table 1: No higher ed is present, different stakeholders attended both meetings (inconsistent attendance), How are the stakeholders identified (NDE specifically), should there be school district representation,
 - Table 2 No Higher education- post-secondary;- possibly invite Dr. Nick Pace, UNL; early childhood learning regional coordinators
 - Table 3 - School district representation
 - Table 4 Were we missing higher Ed? Do we have enough representation to address the perspective of each AQuESTT tenet? Someone from teacher certification (specifically to address teacher retention/shortage issues)
 - Table 5 Post secondary education
 - Table 6 maybe not missing but continuity of participants- same people over the course of the meetings
 - Table 7 Jeremy Heninger, Jen Utemark
 - Table 8 District/ representatives (diverse in size and locations)
 - The reality is the group represents a diverse perspective in so many different fronts... a key is to consider the outcomes and purpose to determine the right stakeholders. There may be opportunities to engage additional stakeholders (e.g., business and industry or public sector state agencies ... Dept of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor, etc., also consider higher education and coordination/alignment of these areas... at the very least educator/leader preparation.)
 - Table 9: District/school/teacher representatives (thinking about the historical perspective of the ESU, address areas of needs of districts, inclusion of teacher voice) Professional Associations such as, NSEA, State Literacy Association, NRCSA, check for overlap of different initiatives such as the cadres.
 - Zoom: At the affiliate level, we feel there is adequate communication and collaboration, even if that isn't reflected in the attendance at ESUCC meetings. I.e: Russ Masco at SDA Strategists, ESPD/NDE Conference calls, Dorann Avey with TLT

 - Which Data was used to determine priorities (10)
 - Facilitator: Russ
 - [Link to 2018 NDE/ESUCC Collaboration Report](#), see page 3
 - Data Cadre is a resource for each priority group later in the day
 - Later...What additional data is required? Each priority group will be identifying data.
 - Table 1: ESU Service Plan, (in-common services, unique services), general student achievement data, specifically disaggregated student data, Priority plans and what they have in common, Needs Improvement schools and their goals and

priorities, CSI and TSI school list, the MOU is not measurable (too many items, use the action plans instead?)

- Table 2 - process to create specific data that is looked at all areas;; root causes;; teacher shortage report;; SPED data; early childhood data, specific groups of students to address equity issues;; Rule 10 review feedback
 - Table 3 - National trends or other state data to compare; occupational/job data and how that impacts school programming.
 - Table 4- Data needed-What are we doing new and different to support the needs improvement schools? What are we doing with needs improvement and CSI schools that respects the local context and culture of the school (avoiding a one size fits all model for improvement). Work group on statewide inventory of ESU services- this is available but not widely disseminated.
 - Table 5 - Connecting the data from all sources and what we can learn from it, what's important?
 - Table 6 ESU Service Plans (reports from SIMPL) CSI/TSI school data--looking at the bubble schools and how can we help those schools. Also data from our schools that are Excellent -how can we learn from them.
 - Table 7 How do we connect the broad categories of priority to the actual work in schools. It will be important that the collaborative work of NDE/ESU is targeted to the needs of schools
 - Table 8 -- The data did not really include any context around the data that was a part of the process. Seemed like the quantitative data was missing context or comparisons or benchmarks. Missing SPED data and early childhood data... There was a part of the process that the data was overwhelming and not a clear purpose about the reasons for the use of the data. In the future... it might be helpful to have interim updates or review or sharing of progress of the work vs. trying to recall the conversations. It may have also been an approach to have a small group focus on the depth of a data set and "drill down" to identify the meaning and nuances of the data as well as what data points may be missing, etc. The purpose of this would be to create a deeper value to the use of the data for prioritizing the potential work.
 - Table 9 - While student achievement data may have been used, it is important to provide access to ESUs to school and district level achievement data in advance to anticipate support to schools, Potentially add: EBA data disaggregated by tenet, CSI Needs Assessment data and trends, NSCAS data, NWEA MAP data,
 - Zoom: there seems to be ample data: SIMPL. Data seems to be more consistent with using SIMPL; Early childhood-no data currently collected and they really aren't represented at ESUCC or in affiliate groups ; we have a lot of data sources, but it isn't directed at a specific ESUCC goal. Are all bold steps aligned with these data sources?
- What were the Priorities (10)
 - Facilitator: Larianne
 - [Link to 2018 NDE/ESUCC Collaboration Report](#), see page 6
 - Solo time: Read through the section.
 - Discuss as a table group.
 - Clarification? Questions?

-
- Table 1: curious accreditation/school improvement was so low, funding was the highest but how will this group resolve the priority
 - Table 2 - the MOU generally describes the partnership; the structures are the action plans describing the work; ;look into Rule 84 and start conversation of standards for ESUs
 - Table 3 - funding that is protected, and goal focused either locally, regionally, or state.
 - Table 4- The structure of the MOU is a BIG priority according to the data. Looking at data this time of year, teacher retention/ shortage has become a MUCH bigger priority as districts are experiencing a complete lack of applicants.
 - Table 5 - Why did SIMPL get such a low score? If it's not a priority, why are we doing it? The MOU needs improvement and clarification based upon the high score.
 - Table 6 How can we create an MOU that is specific and create actionables tied to analyzable data sources? With efficient funding.
 - Table 7 Not too interested in endless committees. Maybe an all encompassing MOU is not doable. Are there 2-4 actionable priorities that we could come together on
 - Table 8 A better MOU will provide for clearer understanding of the work and provide insights to the data areas for the future. The highest need and the highest scored items seemed to be a little out of order... It looks like the scores were added together after a sorting, but then not readjusted for the priorities.
 - Table 9 How can we make the data process better to inform the action planning step? The structure of the MOU action plan? Does it incorporate the 5 Bold Steps? What's possible and within our control? Accreditation/School Improvement were low on the list.
 - Zoom: We agree these are still priorities.
- What were the Theory of Action (10)
 - Facilitator: Larianne
 - [Link to 2018 NDE/ESUCC Collaboration Report](#), see page 9
 - Solo time: Read the section
 - Discuss as a table group.
 - Clarification? Questions?
 - Table 1: These theories specifically for funding seem more like advocacy and not as much. Could there be more discussion as to how the current resources are allocated. How can ESUs and NDE work together on accreditation and define NDE/ESUs in the role of school improvement. More articulation.
 - Table 2 - picking two or three areas to focus on and frame them in the Bold Steps piece; do data review on them and then assign the work
 - Table 3 - restructure funding and services maybe even at the state level; teacher mentoring is needed for better retention. Possible restructuring of ESUs and how services are distributed. Some are already consolidating efforts. More effective use of online collaboration or delivery of service.
 - Table 4- An MOU is a conceptual framework. An action plan is how we are going to make steps toward those concepts. Are we expecting the MOU to do too much? Should we have an action plan that is separate from the MOU?

-
- Table 5 - Teacher retention - survey current college students as to why they are not going into education not just those already in education or leaving the field.
 - Table 6- MOU needs to reflect the vision of where we need to be going.
 - Table 7 Need to agree on statement of purpose. What are the priorities of the education system in Nebraska. The priorities seem random and disparate in size
 - Table 8 The quality of applicants is more important than the quantity... There are several suggestions, but several are missing... There also seemed to be a lack of clarity around the problem in order to create the theory of action. Is this an opportunity to identify the root cause and then create a theory of action to address that... including the subsequent work associated with action planning, etc.
 - Table 9 - Actions need to include person(s) responsible, maybe forming teams for actions is the most important starting point
 - Zoom: Joint legislative efforts and a unified voice in funding need to continue in a time of limited resources; data-priorities may need to come from NDE, not exclusively from ESU level to ESUCC and NDE; structure-MOU isn't an action plan, so identifying responsibilities isn't always possible. Shared leadership can help create action plans to implement the MOU;
- Crosswalk
 - Facilitator: Dean (10)
 - Alignment to work that we do
 - [Link to 2018 NDE/ESUCC Collaboration Report](#), see page 11
 - Solo time: Read the section
 - Discuss as a table group.
 - Clarification? Questions?
 - Table 1: Funding=add student success and access as well as teaching and learning, Teacher Retention=add student success and access, may be helpful to have a list or link to the strategic priorities
 - Table 2 - continuous improvement is under each of them; how do all the groups work together; need to be prioritized
 - Table 3 - How do the different groups (NDE, ESUCC, PDO) work together to address each category? There could be competitive factions at work rather than collaborative efforts to achieve the same goal. If the "barge" is teacher retention, how does each "tug boat" (NDE, ESUCC, PDO) move the barge down the river?
 - Table 4 The behavioral mental health being linked to funding- does that relate to 2018 legislative session and the bill to fund a social worker at each ESU?
 - Table 5 - same comments as table 8
 - Table 6 Chart identifies how the work is connected in and between NDE, ESUCC, and ESUPDO. How can we be better at meaningful collaboration and not duplication of work but streamlining the work in order for our schools to not be like Octopus Arms- but have a Laser Like Focus.(Pat Roschewski)
 - Table 7 This chart identifies the connections between existing priorities and the actual work out in districts. The question is how to NDE and ESUs work in collaboration to ensure outcomes for schools. What efforts are being duplicated?
 - Table 8 What would be nice for the document to include clarity of what each of the "bold step" committees are targeting or working to achieve. In addition, the clarity around the Nebraska State Board of Education goal areas ... and the potential work of the department implementation planning. What current planning and support work should also inform the analysis and potential

duplicated of work and effort. What about a connection to the ESUCC Committee structure (e.g., Technology, PD, Budget, Exec, etc.) and the outcomes and discussions associated with these monthly meetings?

- Table 9 how do the three areas (NDE, ESUPDO, and 5 Bold steps) interact with one another? How do we prioritize each category given the prioritize section completed earlier and the overlap of each group?
- Zoom: this chart would be a valuable tool for taking this back to affiliates to connect the MOU with the work of the workgroups and understand the connections to the bold steps and NDE strategic plan. It might also be valuable to add an affiliate column to elaborate on that connection.

- Priority Plan Proposals (10)
 - Facilitator: Russ
 - Priority Plan and Purpose
 - Measurable
 - Actionable, and outcome focused
 - Components, [link to the template](#)

12:15 - 12:45 Lunch

12:45 - 2:00 Priority Plans

- Facilitator: Russ and Larianne
- There were 9 Theories of action.
 - Funding
 - Liz Standish
 - Mark Shultz
 - Jamen Hall
 - Eric Zeece
 - Structure of the MOU/Action Plan & Data for the MOU/Action Planning Meetings in the Future
 - - Ryan Foor
 - Brian Halstead
 - Dean Folkers
 - Dan Schnoes
 - Teacher Retention
 - Ted DeTurk
 - Bill Heimann
 - Laura Barrett
 - Geraldine Erickson
 - Greg Barnes
 - Pat Madsen
 - Early Childhood
 - Brenda McNiff

-
- Joe Haney
 - Connie Wickham
 - Melissa Wheelock
 - Jean Anderson
 - Instructional Support Systems
 - Rhonda Eis
 - Gregg Robke
 - Scott Isaacson
 - Craig Peterson
 - Russ Masco
 - BlendEd
 - BJ Peters
 - Eileen Barks
 - Beth Kabes
 - SuAnn Witt
 - Instructional Model and Teacher/Principal Evaluation
 - Julie Downing
 - Deb Paulman
 - Diane Stuhmer
 - Accreditation/School Improvement
 - Brad Conner
 - Shirley Vargas
 - Deb Frison
 - Don Loeske
 - Larianne Polk
 - Priority on posters on the walls.
 - Choose an area you want to be a part of
 - No more than 5 to a group (please evenly distribute)
 - Write your names on the poster
 - Name a Facilitator
 - Find a table/place to work
 - Go to the [Action Plan](#) template
 - Complete the items in the plan

2:00 - 2:30 Next Steps

- Facilitator: Dave
- NDE and ESUCC will review the priority plans for feasibility
 - Criteria: Partnerships, human capital resources, fiscal needs, contract possibilities, etc.
 - They will notify the Team Facilitator regarding the decision
- Priority Plan teams meet as necessary to accomplish work
- Planning for October Data Dig begins this summer
 - Will compile the Data Necessary as described in the priority plans
 - Other hot issue data will be additional
 - Native American Schools data
 - CSI, NI, and Priority areas of focus
 - Nebraska Leadership and Learning Network data
 - NEP data
- Timeline moving forward
 - July: NDE/ESUCC Leadership approve priority plans and notify team members

-
- September: PDO review of timeline and priority plans
 - October Data Dig: Qualitative and Quantitative
 - November: Any new priorities defined
 - December: PDO, New priority plans written for approval by NDE/ESUCC, update priority plans

Meeting adjourned at 1:55 PM