



**TST Meeting Notes**  
**April 11, 2012**  
**Denver, CO**

**Day 1 Agenda**

- I. Welcome and Introductions – Tracie
- II. Opening Activity – Susan
- III. SOSY Activities - Tracie
- IV. SOSY Pilot – Jessica
- V. OSY Tip Sheets – Jessica
- VI. Report on Migrant Health Collaboration- Bob and Alicia González
- VII. SOSY Consortium OSY Profile document – John
- VIII. Performance Measures Report/Evaluation Outcomes – Susan
- IX. Required OSY Profile Data Elements: What changes do we recommend to the SSST for data and OSY definitions?
- X. Group discussion and work group assignment – Susan
- XI. Regroup to focus on finalizing work (Silverton)
  - TOT Materials and Manual
  - Curriculum and Material Development
  - OSY Profile Data/Definition Committee
  - Technical Assistance
- XII. Wrap Up and Adjourn for the Day – Susan
- XIII. Dissemination Event Planning Work Group

**I. Review of Work Group Members**

- Trainer of Trainings (TOT)—Sonja Williams (NC), TJ Sparling (NY), Claude Christian (KY), and Emily Hoffman (MA)
- Curriculum—Bob Lynch (NY), Brenda Pessin (IL), Kelsey Williams (ID), Lupe Ledesma (WA), Dee Condon (NE), Joan Geraci (NJ) [for Danielle Anderson-Thomas, NJ]
- ID&R/Data Elements—Susan Durón (META), Erin Shea (VT), Barbie Patch (NH), John Farrell (KS), Jessica Casteneda(TN), Ray Melecio(FL), Bruce Wright (SC), Kiowa Rogers(NE), Kathleen Bibus (MN), Jennifer Alameda (SC), Brenda Pessin (IL), and Tim Thornton (KS)
- Technical Assistance—Erin Shea( VT), Margarita Colindres(CO), and Jorge Echegaray (FL).

**II. SOSY Pilot Process Discussion**

- ID&R Tip Sheets
  - TJ Sparling suggested that trainers pilot the ID&R Tip Sheet and ID&R Field Recruiting Guide.
- Field Recruitment Guide
- Agricultural Trends Newsletter

- Survey Monkey
  - Surveys need to go to at least three people from each state.
  - These should be evaluated by August.
  - Tracie Kalic commented that we need substantial comments from each reviewer.
  - Bob Lynch suggested that the three reviewers represent a cross section of populations being recruited.
  - Jessica Casteneda suggested that one be an administrator, one a field or staff person.
  - Ray Melecio suggested identifying who we want the survey to go to. Susan Durón suggested that the Data Elements work group draft a list of reviewers.
  - Tracie suggested that we add checkboxes to the top of the survey to know who is responding.
  - It was discussed that we aren't so much "piloting" but evaluating materials. Emily Hoffman suggested that the survey have a space for reviewers to write how they used the materials, such as in training.
- OSY Tip Sheet Discussion
 

These documents will be created to include the most up-to-date research on topical areas as well as contain specific state examples of what is working.

  - The documents will contain:
    - Basic strategies for teaching non-literate individuals and those who can't write.
    - Information on how people acquire a second language.
    - Research highlights and strategies for implementing what is working.
  - Kathleen Bibus asked if we're going to discuss what's working in each state.
  - Susan suggested that each state could state their service model, what's effective, and how they reach OSY. Because tip sheets are supposed to have suggestions from each state this would be a good way to get information with which to evaluate the sheets.
  - TJ said that they're looking at service delivery models and student characteristics.
  - Susan said the new CIG proposal needs to emphasize what's new and different.
  - Sonja Williams suggested that while the past SOSY was prescriptive we need to be analytical now.

### III. Performance Measures/ Evaluation Outcomes

- Susan discussed the performance measures and SOSY progress with the TST.
- Figures are from year one APR.
- Outcome-driven.
- These are renegotiated because the OME wanted more rigorous performance measures.
- Measure **7a**. There are not enough OSY recruited. This measure is a problem because we can't control the number of OSY moving into states.
  - Bob asked if the 23,000 number is the combination of two years. This was for the first year of SOSY.
  - Erin Shea pointed out that it's difficult to shoot for a percentage if you've saturated the recruiting and you're maintaining. Susan said there are a number of problems with this performance measure we proposed. In the SOSOSY narrative they'll explain how much was done.
  - (4) years ago before the first OSY consortium there was no infrastructure. During the first (2) years, the infrastructure was developed, while in the next (2) years, the emphasis was outcomes. The next two years they'll look at how they're doing in reading/math and lessons.
  - TJ was concerned that we're applying for another two years with year two data. Susan said they've talked to Michelle Moreno (OME) about this. While we're making progress (OSY #s have risen), we're making the wrong comparisons. Susan noted we should graphically show how migrant students are down but OSY are growing.
- Measure **7 b**. 80% of 21 states (4 states can opt out). All 21 states are doing it.
  - Susan has a problem with this so we need to see what this tells us if we pilot this. CHANGE THE WORD PILOT TO EVALUATE.
  - Kelsey Williams suggested using the word pilot for curriculum & lessons while Ray said that we should specify that we are evaluating or piloting ID&R Tip Sheets, etc.
- Measure **7 c**. FII—met this performance measure
- Measure **8 a**. Another problematic measure.
  - % of migrant students identified & recruited has dropped.
  - TJ asked if there was a way to put in a data update by next month.
  - Susan said we're already applying new criteria.
  - Susan and Tracie said OME is fine with the consortium's progress. They've been given the context for the low numbers and some areas have been knocked out of the park. The next

iteration will be brand new in OME's mind, a new project with a new focus, even though we're continuing our work.

- Barbie Patch suggested we rewrite performance measures for the next grant so if the numbers are down we'll show that we're serving more regardless. Not the number of students identified but the services provided.
  - Kathleen said it's hard when showing one year's data when applying for two years. Susan said they'd prepare another report because CSPR's not in until Feb. There's the interim, year one, final report, and another one. Theoretically there should just be an interim and final report.
  - Jorge Echegaray stated the number should show the ratio of OSY served to the OSY identified. Susan said they've been going back and forth with OME for weeks over this measure. Ray observed that 4 out of 5 aren't bad.
  - Regarding the proposal Susan wanted us to remember that 1) independent readers of proposals are working on this who have no idea what SOSY is; 2) if they pass it, and it were fundable it would then go to the OME. Don't want a data burden that yields little.
- Measure **8 b**. Got 50% higher of kids that are enrolled.
  - Measure **8 c**. Need to put in raw numbers.
  - Measure **8 d**. Professional development staff surveys 85% to 90%
  - Measure **8 e**. FII, right on target
  - Measure **9 a**. 20% consortium-wide have higher numbers in programs.
    - Kelsey said pg. 16 shows those currently enrolled in educational services, programs leading to a HS diploma or a GED.
    - Languages need to match up. Susan stated that the data for the profile helps inform CSPR, but these numbers are directly from the states.
    - Page 16 graph it's unclear how to fill in this question because this isn't a question on the OSY profile. Where did this data come from? Emily Hoffman said it was from the annual survey.
    - Erin suggested we tackle this when we discuss definitions. Sonja Williams felt like this is a mistake because there are different definitions in each state and we end up comparing apples and oranges.
    - John Farrell reported that the OME requested this. Sonja was concerned that this measure makes it falsely look like we're not doing anything. Susan said that bar graphs make sense but we need to clarify. They should have (3) sentences or so at the bottom that interprets each title.

- TJ said the profile information be the initial information from the student not information after they're enrolled. The profile information doesn't measure what we do but shows the need. Brenda pointed out that it's difficult to discuss this without looking at where we got the information.
- Susan noted that each state sent in a summary form or combination of items from the profile and tracking forms AND the services delivered. But it's all presented as profile and not as services delivered.
- Measure 9 b. Excellent progress
- Measure 9 c. Excellent progress
- Measure 9 d. Excellent progress
  - Susan said some people from CO have added NPO on OSY in SDP. They're thus seeing some buy-in by local projects and OSY numbers are up.
  - Bob stated he doesn't think the recruiting numbers are bad. Brenda said we have control over this while we didn't have control over the ID&R. The numbers are down all over so there's no way to know in advance how it'll be. TJ asked if these numbers are per year. Susan said the next project will have a different base number.
- Measure 9 e. The same sort of performance measure but it's a comprehensive needs assessment. We've exceeded the performance target.
- Measure 9 f. Professional development and technical assistance.
  - It's rating the Technical Assistance and Professional Development received.
  - Susan is not convinced that all are completing their surveys because the numbers are pretty low.
  - Tracie said we need to clarify how we ask this question. Part of the problem is most states evaluate their own work, not SOSY. There's a different set of data ranked higher than this data. Susan suggested the data elements group address this. Ray suggested they define SOSY professional development and technical assistance.
- Measure 9 g. FII 100% for year one

#### **IV. SOSY PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR 2010-2012 (handout)**

- OME wants these broken down by states:
  - participating
  - signed up for consortium
  - Is some data not being collected? Problem areas?

## V. Recommendations

- Student Profile/Data Collection /APR
  - Visual representation of the data is important
  - Operationalize the definitions
  - Actual data range needs to be noted
- Definitions
  - Recovery/Here-to-Work need better explanation
    - Definitions should be on website.
  - OSY Profile Instruction form has some definitions.
  - Regarding the Identification part of the definition issue:
    - OSY Recovery Youth still considered once in school/ for data concerns?
  - Title III has language needs so they still track the students.
  - New proposal there would be WOSY and ROSY.
    - WOSY—Working OSY
    - ROSY—Recovered OSY
    - Avoid term HTW to avoid Congress asking why the Department of Education is funding programs for workers.
    - Data collection tools and interpretation need to be the same for all.
    - Tim Thornton says KS uses recovery youth definition until the COE expires. If student considers dropping out again, one can justify OSY Advocates counseling them and providing help with school, like PFS kids. Susan notes this opens the door to continued services.

## VI. National Center for Farmworker Health

- Alicia Gonzales from the National Center For Farmworker Health discussed the health and education collaboration with SOSY, NPC and NCFH.
- Alicia Gonzales, TX, contact info
  - 512-312-5469, 800-531-5120, [Gonzales@ncfh.org](mailto:Gonzales@ncfh.org)
- Bob said NCFH large part of consortium
- (10) Health Lessons developed in first (2) years.
- Now, there are (5) more plus (1) on nicotine.
- NCFH serves national audience with 500 migrant health centers.
- Available to MEP families/OSY
- NCFH is a training and technical assistance organization.
  - Health centers call them regarding cultural competency, health literacy, and customer service.
  - Help Centers (HRSA) provide services to:
    - help write a grant for a new center;

- provide numbers of Ag workers at a proposed site;
- support for lay health workers, community outreach workers;
- Call for Health program: a 1-800 number that helps families get healthcare access during travels.
- Provide financial help if need is serious (800-377-9968)

## **VII. Collaboration with National PASS Center and Migrant Health**

- Goals/ Objectives/ Activities
  - How can MEP and My Health better coordinate?
  - List of strategies and best practices
  - Look at State Delivery Plans
  - Is there a mention of OSY?
  - Create a (1) sheet survey for each state to document models, best practices and make recommendations.
  - MEP and Migrant Health team up to provide special clinics
  - At the Bureau of Primary Healthcare at the National Advisory Council on Migrant Health they make recommendations of Migrant Health to HHS. They are happy with the PASS/NCFH collaboration.
  - They want to distribute CNAs and SDPs of individual states
- NY Migrant Conference held session on health issues.
  - Concerns about a healthy house
  - They brainstormed topics for 5 lessons:
    - Health tips/nicotine
    - Insect/rodent control
    - Refrigeration of food/meds
    - Bathroom and general cleanliness
    - Meds/finish prescriptions
  - Possible that food and medicine refrigeration should be separate topics.

## **VIII. More Health/ Nutrition Suggestions**

- Alicia Gonzales asked the group for guidance on more topics/topic refinement
- Erin suggested basic over the counter medicine uses, like dosage, but Bob and Sonja s cautioned against giving out this information and liability issues. Bob suggested a lesson on how to read dosages, like what is a teaspoon of medicine.
- Kelsey suggested nutrition for obesity and general issues.
- TJ suggested sleep issues, especially with swing shifts, caffeine & lack of sleep.
- Alcoholism, STDs

- Pesticides/ fertilizers: how to read posters, for ex., don't reenter an area even if you want more hours/don't use heavy duty pesticides on home gardens/understanding dilution
- AIDS, injected meds
- Sun exposure, heat stress, sunblock
- Emotional/psychological health
- Abuse of women/domestic violence
- Depression/isolation/loneliness
- Meth—some crew leaders get it for their crew
- Vaccinations/possible allergic reactions
- Bed bugs
  - Alicia thinks this is a separate issue from pests.
  - She said we need to focus on what behavior we're trying to impact.
  - Emily also noted there's a lot out already on bed bugs.
- Handling food—defrosting and storing
- Explain how the US processes food so they see why these precautions are so important
- Exposed wires
- EFNAF provides information on nutrition & food safety.
- Bob - should we move issues outside of healthy house to next year?
- Possibly an add on to the Healthy Series
- Possibly a specific change that can be written into the SOSOSY proposal.

THE GROUP ADJOURNED INTO WORK GROUPS TO REPORT THE NEXT DAY.



**TST Meeting Notes**  
**April 12, 2012**  
**Denver, CO**

**Day 2 Agenda**

- |       |   |
|-------|---|
| I.    | Review of previous day's activities and outcomes – Susan    |
| II.   | Discussion of CIG Application and Feedback - Susan          |
| III.  | Final meeting for work groups                               |
| IV.   | Report from Dissemination Event Planning Committee          |
| V.    | Report on TOT Manual and Training                           |
| VI.   | Report for SSST meeting at NASDME                           |
| VII.  | Presentations for NASDME                                    |
| VIII. | Fidelity Implementation Index Review and Evaluation – Susan |
| IX.   | Reflection: How to improve how we work                      |
| X.    | Schedule additional conference calls                        |
| XI.   | Other issues  |
| XII.  | Wrap-up and adjourn   |

**I. SOSOSY Proposal—Strategies, Opportunities and Services for OSY**

- Susan discussed the new CIG application with the TST.
  - There are 21 CIG states.
  - Eight states have their paperwork in. Paperwork is due the 17<sup>th</sup> in order to be turned in by the 24<sup>th</sup>.

**II. SOSOSY Organizational Framework**

- Susan the organizational framework of SOSOSY. It will include:
  - systems to serve OSY and MEP support staff
  - technology
  - mathematical and literacy strategies/state capacity building
  - Interstate Collaboration

**III. Measurable Objectives**

- The TST discussed the measurable performance objectives and provided feedback to Susan for the proposal. The data elements team will discuss this in more detail during the work group session.

**IV. Achievement Measures**

- 30% more OSY are participating in at least 240 hours of SOSOSY services
- Jessica Castaneda said that the average amount is (4) for each state, on average there are 1 ½ hours of instruction service per week. Ideally not more than 12 months per student. 1 ½ hours per week for 6 months equals 40 hours. We're supplemental, like SES.

- Erin said we plan hours based on the time the student is here, around one hour per week while they're enrolled in the program.

## V. Performance Standards

- The TST had a lengthy discussion about the performance standards for the new CIG application. It was determined that the Data Elements Work group would meet to discuss this and report back to the TST.
- Jessica said that we should distinguish between instructional services and supportive service.
- Bob said we should define this more with the number of weeks specified.
- Brenda said there should be a minimum of "x" number of weeks. There should be enough time with the student so that it is possible to measure gains.
- Bob said that 12 hours minimum is measurable.
- Sonja said that there should be a difference between participation level and achievement level.
- TJ suggested that there be smaller time periods.
  - For example, two months and eight weeks with one hour a week. That equals 8 hours. That number would catch all students there longer as well as seasonal students and the measure would increase.
- Brenda said this would be a data burden.
- Ray said that he figured out it takes 12 hours to show ESL gain.
- Erin said they find it takes 20 hours to show ESL gain.
- Barbie said they have 15 hours of service before they're tested.
- Brenda said if they have 15 hours' time they won't report many IL students because they're there for a shorter time.
- Susan pointed out that there is a subset for trying to consider achievement.
- Emily said they have OSY for longer time, but they barely have time to see if they're placing them correctly, let alone to figure out a post-test. This outcome won't look good for anyone plus the time it will take.
- Susan said OME wants to know how this is doing.

## VI. Performance Standards Continued.....

- Barbie asked if the feds accept the LEARN pre- and post-tests. 30% of people participate in 5 lessons. It's easier to go lesson by lesson. This should be a small, tightly controlled study. LEARN Reading Consortium is 15 minutes to one hour.
- Tracie agreed with Barbie and Erin It should be tied to achievement and outcomes. She's not sure the hours capture what we want to

capture and share. They should tie in work with KS and PASS to develop a lesson series available with post- and pre assessments.

- Kelsey said they should be based on pre- and post- test students that will show gains even if they're there for only one day.
- Jessica suggested that the pre/post-test include what the student knows prior and what they grasped and retained in order to guide instruction.
- Kathleen suggested a pre/post-test no matter what lesson.
- Jessica suggested a rubric, with 1-3 showing that they know something about the topic, and that they are rated at the start and at the end. Train teachers on criteria from 1 to 5, possibly an oral rubric.
- Kelsey pointed out that a rubric unifies data.
- Erin suggested we break it into two categories:
  - Short- term Life Lessons
  - Long Term English, which is a process.
  - You can't do a pre/post-test on language acquisition.
  - It takes them 4 months to show gain.
- Brenda said that maybe ABEs, pre-GED, but again, it's a very long process. It takes 12 months to pass one GED test.
- Erin said that if you could identify the actual skills, you can show gain.
- Kelsey said there is pre/post-tests for academics and to give them the TAB pretests to see where they're at to start instruction.
- Brenda said they're not at each sitting, and it would be too big of a data burden. Probably no if it's three weeks with some mini-lessons and ESL. They don't want to track for each student.
- Sonja suggested they separate them based on the materials used.
- Kelsey wants a definition of "short term"/"long term."
  - Erin said short term is less than three months
  - Long term is more than three months.
  - Ray said that short term for them is one month or less, so the mini-lesson is pre/post-test.
- Erin said we should eliminate the percentage gain because it's tied to the rubric.
  - It's all about mini-lessons/acquiring skills for those here less than three months.
- Susan said the problem is that the OME kept dinging us because there wasn't any percentage gain even if it's very minimal.
- TJ said we have to determine a statistically meaningful gain.
- Emily said that these percentages won't help us.
  - If there are 10-15 mini-lessons, each state could provide each student with more than 1 class.
  - Each state completes a lesson with them & report comparable data.

- Brenda said this defies what students may want. If we do these required lessons for each state we'll be obligated and may not be able to customize the lessons to students' needs.
- Barbie suggested doing a lesson on OSY website if with the OSY three times.
- TJ said that in states with large numbers it's difficult to implement this with a commitment to 150.
  - Can we do an achievement goal, on a certain % of students able to be served?
  - If we want to get their attention and build trust, give them what they want.
  - We should emphasize service delivery. We could run a list of students wanting life skills and get that word out.
  - Susan agreed that motivation and meeting needs are highly important.
- Tim expressed an interest in this and suggested we consider non-Spanish speakers.

## **VII. Deliverables**

- CIG collaboration taking the lead with offering to sponsor webinars on dissemination of products—the feds want this!
- Topical booklets for OSY: research-based with state examples.

## **VIII. Virtual Classroom**

- Put them on a virtual platform like Moodle. Accredited online courses could be on it.
- Erin asked more about Plazas Communities—with a connection on how to get a Mexican diploma.
- Jessica said some states are doing it.

## **IX. Work Groups Report Out**

- Curricula/Materials; they reported yesterday
- Data Elements Work Group
  - Emily suggested the addition of an “I don't know” box to the choices of how long the OSY is going to be there—0-3 months/4 months
  - OSY Definitions: The group will be working on OSY definitions.

## **X. Technical Assistance Group Report**

- Education Outcomes Table

- Post-FL revision—“Low-academic proficiency” out for “academic history”
- A visual with arrows on the left-hand
- Incomplete—reading/writing/math skills

## **XI. Training Workgroup**

- TJ to present two days before training dissemination in September.
- There are 8 training modules for each partner state to send two people to learn to be trainers.
- All aspects of OSY programming
- Program evaluation: Audience for module 8 to be state administrators. Module 8 broke off from TOT training so now have 7 modules.
- Goal setting-Education/English proficiency goals
- Build staff capacity for working with independent students for individual goals
- Help students see you model goal-setting.
- If the student has a grandiose idea, help them see it’s a long-term goal
- The process is like picking fruit. There are several stages. Look at how to reach the Long-Term goal in the meantime. What steps can be taken?
- Erin asked if Module 7 was written yet. She said the final part could be developing a personal education plan for each student.
- Margarita Colindres said that the term “goal setting” has a negative connotation for drop-outs. A documentary on it says they just want to survive, so we need to think of what’s important to them. An alternative phrase is “purpose statement” that lists their interests.
- TJ said there’s a real need to undo damage and to have a process where the final product is more important because the students live in the dia. For example, we could call it “the pathway” with particular steps.

## **XII. Dissemination Event Committee Meeting**

- See Brenda’s report.

## **XIII. Discussion of Dissemination Event**

- Barbie said that we may need more than one session on technology.
- Margarita suggested a session on the CO Newcomer Center for OSY
- Barbie asked how many we are inviting. Around 210, but the hotel has us at 175 to 180. Tracie will see if there’s any extra meeting space.
- We will give a proposal abstract form to all presenters and complete a proposal due mid to end of May. The deadline is July 15 because they have to prepare flash drives and lanyards for each participant.

- Erin suggested using volunteers and posting materials to the website afterwards.
- Regarding the registration fee they suggested \$75 in August and they will decide what to charge on-site.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm. The next TST conference call will be June 21, 2012 at 1:00 pm CDT.