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MS. HUNTER: So we're going to go ahead and get started, because I know you all have a lot to accomplish today. I will hold off on the administrative update this morning, because our computers -- our network is down in some parts of the building.

And my staff has sent me updates with regard to the travel and honorarium, so I do want to provide you with that update, but I will wait until we -- right before we adjourn to go over those items.

And then we have a couple of add-ins to the agenda. The Vice Chair can share those as we move along.

And then, what else is in there? Thank you.

Sorry. So today is just a working day, and I will turn it over to the Vice Chair. Thank you.
VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you, Tina, and good morning.

We will go ahead and start with -- we'll do things right again today and start right off with an opening prayer. Theresa, do you want to do the opening prayer for us?

MEMBER JOHN: Sure.

(Native language spoken.)

I'm going to sing a song of purification that our ancestors used to sing many years ago.

(Song sung in Native language.)

I ask the Creator to provide us purity, wisdom, and knowledge, so that the future education of our youth, of all children, will be brighter and enriched.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And then the roll call. We'll start with people on the -- by phone. Who do we have? I know we have someone on there. I heard someone. Hello? Okay. We'll have -- we'll start from
this end. Robin?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Theresa is here.

MEMBER JOHN: Here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I'm here, Deborah Dennison.

MEMBER THOMAS: Ma'am is here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And Virginia is here.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Patsy Whitefoot.

MEMBER McCracken: I'm here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Patsy Whitefoot is here. Okay.

MEMBER THOMAS: Somebody is online.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And then Wayne -- Wayne, okay, we hear you.

MEMBER McCracken: This is Sam. I'm here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Oh, Sam. Okay. And Sam. Is Wayne there, too?
Okay. We have Sam and not Wayne.

MEMBER THOMAS: Good morning, Sam.
MEMBER JOHN: Good morning, Sam.
MEMBER McCracken: Good morning, ladies. Early morning here.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER THOMAS: You knew the job was dangerous when you took it.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. We'll go ahead and get started.

MEMBER McCracken: Sorry about yesterday, but it's a really busy time for me right now. So I apologize for not being available yesterday.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. But we have you today, so we thank you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Can we get an update from Sam, what he's doing?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Sam, do you want to give us an update on what you're up to?
MEMBER McCracken: So tomorrow we launch our Summer '15 and what is especially significant is the special collaboration with the Grand Jordan, Michael Jordan's brand. We are super excited about the product, and, more importantly, the proceeds all go back to help our kids. So last year we gave out 122 grants, had $930,000 and touched the lives of 97,000 kids.

Vice Chair Jackson-Dennison: Awesome.

MEMBER McCracken: So we're getting ready to ramp up and start a new fiscal year. It's the second day of our new year, June 1st to May 31st, so it's day two as we accrue deposit money to give out to Native youth.

Vice Chair Jackson-Dennison: Well, thank you for your work and for the company and everything that -- all the people that work with you on behalf of Native children.

Okay. We're going to get started,
and I know we have something at 9:15.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Are we a little early? We still have a few minutes. I don't know -- we do have a new agenda that we came out with based on yesterday's requests. And so I don't know if you all have that.

Wayne, I hear you got on, right? Okay.

MEMBER RAY: This is Alan Ray.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Oh, Alan. Okay. So we -- and Wayne also --

MEMBER THOMAS: They all look alike on the phone.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: You all sound alike. Yes.

We have a little bit different agenda today, so based on the council's request yesterday we -- what we did in the afternoon, those of you that weren't on with us, we went through the whole report from last year with
both Bill as well as Joyce, and we went through it one by one, each item, kind of had a little discussion about where we were with those items, whether the report needed to stay the same or needed to change.

And we voted to have an overarching theme this year with our report being to, in a sense, reorganize the items that were on last year that we want to keep on again, and also rewrite some of them to meet the theme of tribal authority over education in general.

So a little bit more complex wording to that, but I'm just giving you an overview of what we did yesterday in case you weren't with us by phone, so you understand where we're going today.

And then through the duration of going through the plan from last year, we asked that we be allowed to hear from certain segments of the Department of Ed, what they could bring forward to us.
So we are starting our Day 2 at 9:15 with I think she said -- what was the first --

MS. AKINS: Monique Chism.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

Monique Chism will be on at 9:15, in a few minutes. And she is with --

MS. AKINS: Office of State Support.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

Office of State Support, and then we have another group coming in, or another person coming in afterward that will give us more information on -- that's assessment, right?

MS. AKINS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MS. AKINS: I think that's Sylvia Lyles.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

So those are the differences of what we have going today. So the agenda has been revised somewhat to have -- to hear from these groups, so that we know where we are in those areas of
the report from yesterday that we still have questions on as to our status.

Bill stayed with us all afternoon, as well as Joyce. Joyce was with us all day. So we're very much appreciative of that, Joyce. Thank you. That helps us a whole lot to help us be able to know where we are and what we need to report back to Congress as far as what has happened.

The other area that we probably need to look at to fulfill the report is the hearings that took place in Alaska last November. Or was it October? October of last year. Although, in my view, a lot of those areas that were brought forth were already things that we have in our report, so it's just a matter of making certain that there is nothing left out.

So with that --

MEMBER THOMAS: And we were adding data.
VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Oh. And then, also, we are adding data to -- the reason why we are having people come to us again today is to be able to get more data, and Joyce has been very good about going and getting the data that we are requesting, as we move along fulfilling the report requirements that we want to make certain that we have in the report that goes to Congress. So that is an overview of what we did yesterday.

And we have our first person that just walked in the door. We are thankful that she is here, and this is --

DR. CHISM: Hi. I'm Monique Chism. I'm the Director for the Office of State Support here at Ed.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. So we will move right along. Thank you, Monique.

DR. CHISM: Great. So, thanks. Joyce and Tina have kind of circled up with me
yesterday, based on some of the conversations, and I oversee the office that oversees Title I and also Title II, Title III, ESEA flexibility, our school improvement grants, and also our standards and assessments.

So they had mentioned that our -- in our conversation yesterday about standards and assessments, and so I thought I would come in and provide a little bit of information and then see if there is any questions that I can help to address.

So some of the things that I say might be a refresher, but I will start from just the statutory requirements.

Under ESEA, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it is required that all states have challenging and rigorous academic standards. Under ESEA flexibility, this was modified a little bit in that the standards had to be college and career ready. So the requirement under the law is that a
state has the same standards for all students.

So it's not that a district or a school could adopt different standards, because we want to make sure that they are the same rigorous challenging standards for all students. So it's an access to equity issue, really.

In addition to making sure that states have rigorous and challenging standards for all students, they are required to have assessments that are aligned to those standards. For math and English, language arts, those requirements are at grades 3 through 8, and once in high school. And the once in high school, the range is between 10 and 12th grade, 10, 11, or 12.

And then for science it is in grade spans. So once during grades 3 through 5, once grades 7 and 8, and once in high school. So the grade spans for science.

So the question was framed in the
sense of, what are the requirements for tribally controlled schools or for schools that are operated in collaboration with the BIE, the Bureau of Indian Education.

So with regards to that question, BIE has regulations that require that a school adopts the standards of the state for which it resides. So if the school is in Florida, they would adopt the standards that Florida has adopted. If the school was in South Dakota, the tribe or the school would adopt the standards that South Dakota has adopted. Same thing with the assessments.

We recently, just yesterday actually, we had an opportunity to announce the approval of the Miccosukee Indian Tribe. They have been approved for an alternate definition of adequate yearly progress. So essentially what that means is that over the last three years Miccosukee has been working with us and the BIE so that they can adopt their own
standards, they can adopt their own assessments, and they can set their own AMOs, or the academic measures of -- annual measurable objectives.

They are working on this in a three-phase process, and so the next phase that Miccosukey will engage in is really looking at their supports and interventions, and taking full ownership and leadership of those.

And then also, in that second phase, they are looking at adding in their own language standards to represent their language within the standards. And then in that third phase they will be focusing in on the whole system accountability. So anything that is missing --

MEMBER NEWELL: Good morning. This is Wayne Newell.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Hi, Wayne.

MEMBER NEWELL: Hi. The number that
I had for today is invalid, and I -- it's a good thing I checked my email with John Creek to get the right number. So I don't know if anybody else is having that problem.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We have everybody on now that -- we have all three of you that -- the three of you that were calling in today on. Okay.

MEMBER NEWELL: Oh, okay. All right. I guess we're all set, then. They must have read their email, because the one that was announced for Day 2 is invalid.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Well, we're glad you could join us.

MEMBER NEWELL: It was invalid for me anyway.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you, Wayne.

MEMBER NEWELL: You're welcome.

DR. CHISM: So why don't I pause there and first see if there is any questions
or -- yes.

MEMBER THOMAS: I do. I --

DR. CHISM: Can you introduce yourself, too? I'm sorry. I didn't get a chance to go around and say hello to everybody.

MEMBER THOMAS: Ma'am, I'm Virginia Thomas. I'm out of Oklahoma, Muscogee Nation.

DR. CHISM: Great. Thank you.

MEMBER THOMAS: Several questions. Is it because -- Miccosukee, is that because it's a sovereign tribe? Is that why they get the different standards?

DR. CHISM: Miccosukee is a tribally controlled school, but the reason that they are able to -- they were able to request the alternative definition, there is a provision within the regulations from the BIE. So there is a provision that any Indian tribe could ask or request an alternative definition.

MEMBER THOMAS: So is this the precedence?
DR. CHISM: This is our first time, yes, ever --

MEMBER THOMAS: That's a good thing to know.

DR. CHISM: Yes.

MEMBER THOMAS: That's a good thing to know. This is setting the precedent --

DR. CHISM: Yes.

MEMBER THOMAS: -- which makes it easier for the others.

I have another question that has always bothered me. It always talks about state standards, but there is not a national standard, because states vary from place to place. And how much difference of these standards are there in variance?

DR. CHISM: They are significant. One of our measures of that is the National Assessment of Education Progress, the NAEP. And that assessment is given every two years, and it's a sampling of students across the
nation. And that is where we have an opportunity to see how students are comparing to one another across states.

And there has also been studies that have been done from different independent organizations that review the rigor of standards. And so looking at those assessments, and then also the analysis that has been done, we can see that oftentimes Massachusetts has been held up as having the highest standards in the nation, whereas some of our southern states, like Mississippi, were pointed to as having the lowest standards in the nation.

And so that was of great concern, and so you saw around 2008, 2009, and 2010, a big push from states -- actually, it was a state-led effort, to really focus on increasing the rigor of standards across states. And so that is where you saw the big movement towards college and career standards.
There's a lot of work that was done by states on the Common Core. Many states then eventually adopted the Common Core because they wanted to make sure -- the question that you're raising -- that all students in the nation have access to rigorous college and career ready standards.

There has been a significant pushback from many fractions across the nation about the idea of national standards, because inherently education is a local control issue. And so some people are concerned about what might become national standards, and so there is a significant fraction that is out there that is putting some -- what I would say is unnecessary fear in parents and communities about the Common Core and the college and career ready standards.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I have several questions, and these relate to some specific recommendations that we have already made, and
related, first of all, to the Common Core.

We were proposing that we find some mechanism to, you know, integrate some cultural relevance, you know, with Native content into assessments. What would be the best mechanism to get at that? Is that strictly a state-by-state -- I mean, I have worked in Washington and Oregon, and I was actually on the leadership team in Washington for developing the Smarter Balanced Assessment items. And it was disappointing to me to see the lack of diversity in the educators that were pulled to develop those items.

And so if we wanted to have more culturally relevant items, you know, what avenues are there for us to recommend that that happen?

DR. CHISM: I think that's a great question. So two things. If a state decides to adopt the Common Core, there is a 15 percent leeway that they have. And so as long as 85
percent of the standards remain common, 15 percent of the standards can vary. And so that would provide an opportunity, as you are mentioning, to embed cultural and provisional language standards into the totality of the standards.

The challenge and where resources then need to be applied is that to have an assessment, then, that measures the full range of standards. So let's just say Oklahoma decides to add that 15 percent of standards that are unique for Oklahoma, that meet the criteria that you were just identifying.

They would also then be required to have an assessment that is aligned to the full range of standards that covers all of the standards.

And so right now we don't have a lot of assessments that cover the types of things that you were talking about, and so there would have to be an investment of resources, a
priority around helping to think about the design and the development of assessments.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Does the Department have any influence over the work that Smarter Balanced -- or what is the other one that --

DR. CHISM: Smarter Balanced and PARCC. Most grants are actually ending this June, so at the end of this month. Those assessments have become operational. They are ending --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Because some of I think what we would like is that -- that our Native content be integrated into the 85 percent, not just, you know, the extra portion. I mean --

DR. CHISM: Yes. And states, if they are following good practice, they will review and update their standards on a regular basis. And so I think that the cycle is three to five years that states review and update
their standards.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: So getting back to you, if resources were allocated, where would we possibly go to ask for those resources? Is that to Congress? Is that to the Department of Ed?

DR. CHISM: There is -- I know out of my office, and then maybe Joyce could help to look across the Department, but I know in my office there is one discretionary grant called the Enhanced Assessment Grant, and every year the Secretary sends priorities about what he -- what he is asking the field to respond to.

And so there could be an ask to the Secretary that for the Enhanced Assessment Grant that the Secretary's priority is around the development of Native language assessments. So that's one opportunity in my office that I'm aware of.

The other thing that I was thinking about as you posed your question was that the
standards are essential and very important. They are what we want our students to know and be able to do. But where there is often more flexibility -- and this is a space that the Department of Education has no purview over -- is around the curriculum. And so if we could help our instructors understand how to embed culturally relevant curriculum materials and instructional practices into teaching, I think that is going a long way.

We can say that we want students to analyze a primary source text, and be able to summarize the argument, right? That's what you want them to know and be able to do. How you get them there can represent culturally responsive practices. So I think that's a big opportunity that we have. Ed does not have any purview or say over curriculum.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: So can I ask one more question?

DR. CHISM: Yes.
MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Another item -- so that was under our Number 17, just so you know. And then one of the other things that we were talking about is sort of the disparate funding for the different titles. So when you look at Title VII, Indian Ed funds per pupil, it is so small compared to Title III or Title I.

Is there a way to get sort of some data on what those differences are? So if we wanted to ask -- did you provide that already?

MS. SILVERTHORNE: You have a copy of the budget for Indian education. It's in there. It isn't a comparative of all of those, but it does at least break out that component of it.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes. So what I wanted to see was the Title III and the Title I per pupil amount. And I know it varies from state to state depending on, you know, how they calculate their funding.
DR. CHISM: Yes. And actually it's -- for Title I and Title III, it's -- for Title I, it's formula based, and so there's four different formulas that go into the allocation for each state. And it is based on poverty levels in the state, it is -- there is a number of different factors, and so that's statutory. So if that was going to change, that would require a statutory change.

I'm not sure for Title VII. Is that formula -- it's a statutory formula. So then the mechanism for getting that addressed and changed is actually a congressional action. So those are statutory.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: So the recommendation would come into Title VII, recommending that it be brought up to the rate of, say, Title I?

DR. CHISM: It's not so much the -- it's not so much a per pupil rate. It's how the formula generates the allocation. So I
think if I was approaching this, what I would ask for is a study that looks at the formula and makes recommendation about equity in comparison to the other formula programs. And then that would give the ask, right? That would provide what the ask is.

And so through that analysis, one could determine if the formula benefits -- you know, what the criticism of Title I has been is that the formula benefits large urban districts, and it unfairly takes funds away from small rural districts. And so they have been able to, through their analysis, demonstrate that.

And so as they are going and asking for fixes to the formula, that is what advocates are asking for.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Okay. So, and one last question related to Title I. You know, in the grant applications for Title VII, the grantees are asked to describe how they are
coordinating with other title programs. But my experience at the local level in the district is that there is no requirement or I guess grant application requirements that they actually coordinate the Title VII.

So it often feels at the local level like we are saying, you know, "How can we work together?" But we're not equally across the state -- I'm from Oregon, they aren't getting a response from the federal programs to work, you know, more cooperatively with them. And oftentimes the Title VII program is bearing the burden of all the stuff that is happening for Indian kids, you know, so they are not getting the services that they deserve through Title III or Title I.

And I remember -- I just left Washington State as the Director of Indian Ed, and we got a survey from Title III asking our state level and our directors of Title III around the state to respond to a questionnaire
saying basically, "How are you serving Native kids?" And that caused, you know, a buzz around the state. It raised the awareness of the directors who were overseeing those programs, that they needed to take a closer look at services. And it provided an opportunity for some training, even for our Title VII folks.

Could the same type of thing be done through Title I, is to have something come out from the Department of Ed saying, "How are you serving Native kids? You know, how many do you serve? How do you coordinate with Title VII?"

So it is kind of a poke in the ribs to say, hey, you need to be paying closer attention to this. Is that --

DR. CHISM: So each program has its specific goal. So for Title I, the goal of the program is to ensure that low income students have access to the same rigorous academic standards as all students. And so while the
funds are generated by low income students, the serves actually go to the lowest achieving students.

And what they are required to do for Title I is to do a needs assessment, and in that needs assessment identify the academic needs and services to help ensure that the academic struggling students have access to the standards. And so in that sense, we could certainly provide technical assistance and guidance to say, as you're doing a needs assessment, please make sure that you are thinking about all groups of students and communities of students.

But the purpose of Title I itself is not directed towards any one specific demographic group. It is directed towards students who are at risk of failing. So it's more broad and focal.

One of the things that we have been working on across OESE and also with the Office
of Special Education is helping to raise awareness about fiscal flexibility. Oftentimes districts and schools get pigeonholed into just using Title I funds for this, and just using Title II funds for this, and just using Title VII funds for this.

And I think that's important because there is an intended purpose for these funds, but oftentimes what can happen is that you are trying to dissect a student who can't be dissected. You can have a student who is an English learner, low income, and Native, right? And so in that regard you should be thinking holistically about supports and services.

So we have been trying to do a lot of awareness and sharing information and guidance about supporting people thinking across programs and integrating programs and thinking more holistically about fiscal flexibility.

Part of what we have been seeing is
that there is a lot of finger-pointing. The schools are saying, "We can't do it because the district won't allow us." The district is saying, "We can't do it because the state won't allow us." And the state is saying, "We can't do it because the auditors won't allow us."

So we have been trying to do a lot of education across all of the stakeholder groups to really have those difficult conversations about what is stopping you from really thinking about more comprehensive supports and interventions.

MEMBER THOMAS: It seems like these programs are crossing over to where they are trying to -- one program is supplanting the other program. And that shouldn't be done, because that's one of our issues is that -- in our report is one program seems like they are asking the other one to supplant what they are doing, and we can't do this. So do you have any kind of compliance check to make sure that
these programs aren't using the wrong -- you know, to make -- like Title VII, to cover what Title I or Title II should be doing?

DR. CHISM: Yes. There is definitely the test of supplanting that we apply. For Title I, there's two types of programs -- a targeted assistance program where the services go directly to the students, and then there is also a school-wide program. And a school-wide program, after the school has done their needs assessment and their school-wide plan, the funds actually lose their identity.

And the test of supplanting becomes one of, is the school receiving all of the state and local resources that they would have received in the absence of Title I? And so, in that situation, we are actually asking for schools that are running a school-wide program, and that is where you have 40 percent or more of your students who are in poverty.
We are actually asking them to have a more comprehensive view and have the funds lose their identity. And so the supplement not supplant question becomes a different question. So where we target the supplement not supplant is really around schools that are operating a Title I school that is targeted assistance.

But, yes, we do look at that through audits. We do look at that through monitoring. We have compliance checks to make sure that happens.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Just a comment before you leave. I know you have to leave here shortly. But I just wanted to share all of these questions that we ask are critical to completing our report, but also, you know, putting ourselves in a place where we can strategically take a look at some of our long-term goals as well.

I just want to share that currently in the work that President Obama has been doing
there has been a major emphasis on Native youth, Native students, so much so that there has been a Native youth report. And I don't know if you have seen that report that outlines some of the statistics, poverty certainly that exists in Indian Country, predominantly in our reservation communities.

And also our report is going to be following a theme of tribal sovereignty, tribal self -- tribal control, because of the treaties, the agreements that we have with the United States Federal Government. And I think that makes it -- it makes it unique for the Department of Education to understand.

It is not only just the Native youth report, but this Department also has been engaged with Our Brother's Keeper, and tribal youth are a part of that as well, as well as under the Office of Indian Education there is the Native Youth Community Projects, as well. And this is all getting at suicide issues in
Indian Country, poverty issues, underfunded resources that exist.

You know, we have all of these federal mandates, however, that are typically underfunded and lack of resources that occur. And so the reason that we ask these questions is to get at the fact that when we are in the school systems we are -- we may be the only tribal person in that school system. And we are expected to do, you know, our -- I think our calling is to address the whole needs of Native children, given what I just shared with you, and so it becomes a challenge and you look around you to see who is providing support.

I mean, you have Title I programs, Title III programs, people who are in those programs who come to work on our reservations and know nothing about who tribal people are, don't know anything about the history of the people, the indigenous people of this land. And so there is a constant education that is
going on with the non-Native people that are working on our Indian reservations and in our tribal communities.

So we are not only, you know, sharing the burden of the work that we are doing there, but we are expected to be the sole source experts on everything that goes on in the school system. And I also come from the west and the same situation -- I mean, Alaska is just going through some major issues right now with schools shutting down and whole villages having to leave their original communities where they have lived.

And it just is frustrating, you know, to know that this is happening and what happens when families are just arbitrarily uprooted and forced to move once again. And so that is our plea. And so anything you can do -- a Title I, Title III -- all of that is important in your communication with state governments and LEAs.
VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I'll let you go, and then I have one thing I want to say.

MEMBER JOHN: Thank you for your report. Alaska -- the Yupik language is the strongest speaking in our society, indigenous societies. And we have a Yupik immersion school where the children speak Yugtan K-6, but every year they are forced to take the test in English, and miraculously they pass their AYP.

And the state of Alaska recently adopted Alaska Native language as an official language of our state. And the state of Alaska, in previous years, through University of Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative, had officially adopted a culturally responsive curriculum for K through 12. I don't think any of those have been implemented successfully into each school.

And I am glad to hear that you have Enhanced Assessment Grant that -- shared
throughout states or does somebody have to kind of figure out a way to assess that grant that would have a Native language assessment?

Many of my graduate students are trying to figure ways to help these children that are forced to take other than their indigenous language assessments to assess, you know, other than what they are learning in the classroom. It would be like for me taking a Spanish test, and I'm like, oh, okay, what do I do, because I don't know any Spanish.

So in order to help our young children that want to learn their indigenous language, that want to grow up in their own language, what can we do to help prepare them, so that they are growing up in their indigenous languages?

DR. CHISM: I think that's a good question. So to answer the first question about the Enhanced Assessment Grants, the eligible grantees are -- I'll have to go back,
and I can share this information back for sure, but I know that it's -- it states a consortium of states, institutions of higher education, and then I'm assuming it would also apply for tribal schools and BIE. But I will go back and doublecheck on that.

I think the question is a really good question, and it's probably the question that you guys are grappling with. And so if I had the answer, we could all go home, right?

(Laughter.)

It's a very important question. Maintaining -- building cultural identity, maintaining cultural knowledge, and sharing that and communicating that across generations. If I had my own school, so if I was doing it, what I would do is make sure that, as you're trying to accomplish, within the standards, so those things are represented, and then also in the instructional practices and in the curriculum that is represented.
And that there is ways to build school-based community partnerships. And so that it's not just that they are getting this in school, but it is also that the individuals who are coming in to help teach in the schools that might not have any awareness or understanding about the culture have an opportunity to also interact in the community, and there is more of a community-based partnership that is going on.

I feel like this is -- this is the huge --

(Telephonic interference.)

MS. HUNTER: Excuse me. I'm sorry, Monique.

Madam Chair --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes.

I'll go ahead and --

MS. HUNTER: Thank you. Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I'm sorry. You guys that are on by phone, can you
mute your phones, because we're getting a lot of distraction from noises in the background, and it's getting out of hand. So can you please mute your phones? And then when you need to speak, unmute, please.

MEMBER NEWELL: Okay.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you.

I'm sorry, Monique.

DR. CHISM: I think that the question that you raised is a really important question, and I think it goes back to maybe a stronger, broader national conversation that has to happen about our values and education and how we represent those in what we teach. And we ask students -- you know, and what we're asking students to know and be able to walk away with. And so for me it's a larger narrative about what is the purpose of education.
MEMBER JOHN: Yes. My students -- we are creating an authentic assessment for our public and our university teachers. Now we have -- we are this close to getting our PhDs out in Yupik in Alaska, which is like, yay, we are creating more indigenous doctors on hand that have firsthand knowledge and skills in reading and writing in our language.

So we're making some progress, but hopefully we can, you know, develop assessment rubrics or plans that will fit for our children's needs.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Monique, thank you. I have a -- I guess it's more of a comment, but then also a question in the sense of -- in looking at the Miccosukee tribe and what they're doing, in Mississippi --

(Telephonic interference.)

We are still getting distraction. I don't know who has their phone not muted. Please, guys.
MS. HUNTER: Someone must be on their cell phone, and they are close.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I guess it's more of a -- my own experience in immersion school settings. And also, I totally agree with you 100 percent on the -- whatever curriculum is adopted, whatever standards are adopted by a state, the answer to a lot of it is using -- it is almost -- it is in teacher training.

It is where you have teachers that are able to, in the immersion sense, using the state standards that are adopted and teaching in the language of choice, that really is a difference in immersion school, whether it's any language that we're -- that is being taught, or implementing immersion program that is being implemented.

So my question is more looking at the model that is becoming the model and looking at this idea of tribally controlled
schools or tribally authoritative schools. Is there -- I know that the question I keep getting from back home where I'm at is, again, the -- one of the things that people get concerned about is when you use Title VII or Title -- using the wrong funding to train teachers.

So is there a way that we can specify in some sense that we don't use the wrong funding that -- I don't know, again, if it goes back to the same question that Robin was asking, but the successes that I have been in immersion schools that we worked so hard to establish that have been successful, that go back to the values and everything else. Those come into play.

But it's not so much the standards that are the issue. It's whether or not the people in the system are able to teach in the language of choice, language of whatever -- that are immersing the students into meeting
those standards, and the methods being used.

So I don't know if I just muddied it up more or --

DR. CHISM: No. I hear kind of two things there. The question about raising awareness about use of funds, and so that people have the resources that they need to be able to do the work of immersion or of the -- of supports and interventions. The other thing that I heard there was around the tension between instruction completely in Native language and instruction in English, is what I took away from that.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right.

DR. CHISM: So for the first one, I wonder, Joyce, if we could work together to maybe -- I know that we just recently a couple of months ago did a webinar around flexibility of funds, and it just focused on Title I and Title II.

I wonder if we could pull together
some of our partners in the agency to have a more holistic stand on the conversation and talk about the flexibility of funds and how they can interact with one another. So that's something that maybe we could take on and commit to. So --

MEMBER THOMAS: Before you go on to your next one, I had a question about that. Is there a mandate in the regulations anywhere that they have to have a set-aside specifically for training of the teachers or trainers, or a specific budget towards that?

DR. CHISM: Yes. If you have not met adequate yearly progress, you are required to have a 10 percent set-aside for staff development.

MEMBER THOMAS: Is that the only time that it's side-aside, though? It's not from the beginning?

DR. CHISM: No. There is -- that's not a set-aside, though. If a state has a
flexibility waiver, that's not an issue any longer.

The state can take a set-aside off the top and provide statewide technical assistance. But there is no -- for Title I, there is not really district set-asides, because the funds are supposed to be driven down to the school. They can certainly support administrative things like salaries and things like that for personnel, but the funds are really supposed to be driven to the school.

So the last question is more complicated, and I fully -- fully understand the complexity of what you are presenting. I can't really speak for Congress or what -- their intent and purpose, but I guess what I'm going to have to do is read it.

The fundamental kind of purpose of many of the programs in the agency that both Joyce and I and others oversee is to protect the civil rights of students, and to make sure
that there is equitable access.

I think what was happening, or what continues to happen, is that for non-English-speaking students that they weren't -- they were placed into school systems where they didn't have access to the curriculum, didn't have access to a high quality education system.

And so as a protection, as a civil right, the law requires that after -- for students who are new, and that wouldn't be Native students, but students who are new, there is a requirement that after their first year here they have to be assessed in English, and then after -- and math, and then after two years have to be assessed in English -- or English language arts.

States can also have Native language assessments, and some states have a Spanish assessment that helps students transition. But the equity kind of crutch is that -- making sure that all students have access to the
standards in English. And so I think then it becomes a question about, how do you balance that, then, that requirement with the design of a school that also helps to make sure that there is a protection around Native language. So --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes. I think in this sense where I'm coming from, in my experience, has been the children are coming into the system speaking English already, but it's not developed to the level that -- and they are no longer speaking our language, Navajo. So they come into the system, and it's more of a revitalization, and that's the approach that we're -- we've always taken.

And so you're -- we're looking at the language of choice being Navajo in an immersion setting to try to revitalize the language, and there is no question that they are going to take the test assessments in English. That's a given. But it's the
materials, the curriculum, and everything that have to be developed. It's the teacher training. There are the holdbacks.

So when you are looking at the different title programs, Title I, Title III, especially in Title -- where we can pull from to make certain that we're not crossing over and using Title VII money for everything, because that really does become --

DR. CHISM: Title II funds would help to support that. Title II funds would help to support.

The purpose of Title III funds is to help English -- like to support English acquisition. So that would actually be the reverse of what --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Well, except for the subsection we call the Puerto Rican amendment, which does --

DR. CHISM: Right.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: -- allow dual
language. I mean, Indians aren't mentioned specifically.

DR. CHISM: Right. That's accurate.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Can I ask a question about sort of the comprehensive plans? Are those still the requirements, that the state have a comprehensive plan and that districts have comprehensive plans? Is that how they are using their federal funds?

DR. CHISM: There is the state consolidated plan.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes.

DR. CHISM: And that was required several years ago. That was probably -- I think it was 2007. And states have made updates and amendments to certain sections, that the whole plan has not been recalled or asked for I think since 2007.

We are actually -- we just went through a reorganization in my office, and we are actually -- one of the things that we are
working on is the idea of the consolidated plan and making sure that it is actually a plan that is used. So what happened was that people just slapped programs together and it became a 300-page document and sat on a shelf and nobody really used it.

So we are working on trying to have this idea of what we're calling an implementation plan that would really be a comprehensive plan that would support the integration of thinking across programs. And we're kind of early in the design stages of that.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Well, because one of the things that we have been thinking about is trying to have something in there that stipulates when you have a Native population that you consult with, you know, tribes in Native communities in developing that consolidated plan.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: It is in there,
because it -- Washington came to our tribe to ask.

DR. CHISM: It's part of the ESEA flexibility that --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

DR. CHISM: -- but many states have not updated their consolidated plan.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Right. So it's not universally there for everyone.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I just have one final question. Can you please provide the other factors for Title I? One was poverty. What were the -- what's the others?

DR. CHISM: There's three programs, three -- I'm sorry, four formulas -- basic concentration. I'm going to forget the other two.

One looks at the poverty data using the census information. One formula essentially looks at -- it looks at the amount of money that goes to students and the equality
of the funding. And so if a district has a per pupil expenditure of $14,000 per student, and a neighboring district has a per pupil expenditures of $7,000 per district, the formula provides more money to the district that has a $7,000 per pupil because of the difference -- the funding gap that exists between the districts.

The other two I would have to go back and talk to my -- the person who writes the revisions. I can't remember.

MS. JUNG: What I'm going to say is -- this is my plug for reading the congressional justifications. So there is a really good description in -- well, we say for short the CJs, or the congressional justifications, and it's the President of the administration's request to Congress each year.

And the beginning of each program request includes a description of each program that I -- I mean, I rely on heavily. So if you
go -- Tina can share the link with you, but I --

MS. HUNTER: I'll forward it to you, Madam Chair, and you can --

MS. JUNG: Yes. It describes each of the four --

DR. CHISM: Formulas?

MS. JUNG: Yes, formulas in detail. So, and I can read it if you want, but --

DR. CHISM: Yes. I think it's -- page 14 is where it --

MS. JUNG: That's the press release, so that's like an abridged version. But the full justification is a bunch of pages. And they are all the same format, so it starts with a program description. And so this is for grants to local education agencies, and the basic grant is concentration targeted and what we call EFIG, or Education Finance Incentive Grants.

And then there is a description for
each one, what they -- how they differ. And then what follows is what the budget request is and what our rationale is for that request. And that will be true for, again, every single program.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: What was your name again?

DR. CHISM: I'm Dr. Monique Chism. Thank you. Thank you all for the time that I was able to spend here this morning.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Can I just ask one -- just a clarifying question? So is it possible to ask for, when you send out the Enhanced Assessment Grants, that at least a portion of those be targeted to deal with Native language serving communities?

DR. CHISM: I think that's a fair ask.

MEMBER THOMAS: Has it been done before?

DR. CHISM: I don't think so. No.
MS. HUNTER: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: NAEP has a new program, then, in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. And the Office of State Support is up and running only since --

DR. CHISM: October.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: -- October. So you're hearing some of the wisdom from how that is coming together. She has been -- yesterday and today they had a whole series of sessions I would have liked to have joined that were sessions informing the folks on the floor about their program and how we are interacting with each of them as well. So this is an ongoing development.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Can I ask just one more question? Title II used to have states establish like an absolute priority for how they were going to use -- maybe it's that
10 percent that the state can set aside for teacher training. Would it be possible to ask for, you know, an absolute priority that states could target some of those funds for teacher training at Indian schools?

DR. CHISM: Yes. I think you're correct. I don't think there is any absolute priorities right now. I think it's just based upon a needs assessment, the district needs assessment. So that sounds like something that is --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: So a follow-up to that. So if a state like Arizona or New Mexico that has -- do they no longer have that 10 percent set-aside?

DR. CHISM: Right. That has been waived.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. That has been waived.

DR. CHISM: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: So
what are states like those doing with high populations of American Indian children doing to make certain that -- is there anything replacing that 10 percent that was set aside?

DR. CHISM: So part of what ESEA flexibility required is the development of three areas. First was standards and assessments, the second was accountability systems, and the third was teacher-principal evaluation. And throughout the entire request we have asked states to think about different student group populations.

They are also required to consult with different groups, including Indian tribes and Native populations. And so part of what you should see represented in their holistic -- whole request is the answer to that question. If it's not there, there is an opportunity to really engage in some conversations with the state about better approaches to that strategy, and to lean in on things that are important.
But, yes, for states that have ESEA flexibility, that was one of the provisions that was waived.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MEMBER JOHN: Just one more question. Alaska language --

(Telephonic interference.)

-- dual language program, which is the most accessible model that we use, I was wondering if we can get a copy of that provisional -- the Native -- the reservation framework that have developed their own standards and assessments to share with the teachers that are developing their own assessment models?

(Telephonic interference.)

MS. HUNTER: Excuse me. Excuse me. We have this number until 1:00.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: This is the National Advisory Council on Indian Education meeting that you are talking to.
MS. HUNTER: What meeting are you --

MS. LUEZA: This line was reserved from 10:00 to 11:00 for the Math-Science Partnership.

DR. CHISM: Hi, who is speaking?

MS. LUEZA: Theda Lueza.

DR. CHISM: Who was that person that you were connecting with from Math Partner Science?

MS. LUEZA: Theda Lueza.

MS. HUNTER: Theda.

DR. CHISM: Theda?

MS. HUNTER: In Sylvia's shop.

DR. CHISM: Okay. We'll connect with her and ask her to send out a new contact number for you guys.

MS. LUEZA: This is Theda Lueza.

DR. CHISM: Oh, Theda, this is --

MS. LUEZA: I will get our group a new number.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you.
MS. LUEZA: Thanks very much.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you, Theda.

MS. LUEZA: Bye.

THE WITNESS: Once again.

MEMBER THOMAS: A perfect example of crossover.

(Laughter.)

DR. CHISM: So the question I think is the example of the dual language standards that Alaska is using. Is that right?

MEMBER JOHN: Because they are establishing or using the dual language model, I thought that if they could look at that -- the Mizzu --

DR. CHISM: Miccosukee?

MEMBER JOHN: Yeah, yeah. How they developed -- adopted their own standards and assessments, I think that would be a good framework to --

DR. CHISM: Oh, yes.

MEMBER JOHN: -- thinking about
developing their dual language program assessment.

DR. CHISM: Yes. And the language standards are actually in Phase 2. So what they have adopted right now -- Miccosukee has adopted the Common Core and PARCC assessments, and they will start to work on their language standards and the assessment items that correspond to that. So they're in development on that right now.

MEMBER JOHN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you so much.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Wayne, was that you trying to speak up?

MEMBER NEWELL: Yes. I hung up automatically -- I mean, accidentally.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.
We can hear you.

MEMBER NEWELL: Thank you for calling me back.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Make sure your phone is on mute.

MEMBER NEWELL: I'm going to put it on mute. Yep.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER NEWELL: Yep.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We have our next --

MS. HUNTER: So we have Britt Jung here, and Britt is in the Office of School Support and Rural Programs. And she is going to address a couple of the questions that you had regarding technical assistance.

MS. JUNG: Good morning.

MEMBER THOMAS: Did they warn you about this group?

MS. JUNG: No. They just said you
were lovely and --

(Laughter.)

-- I said I would come and try to answer a few questions.

So Tina had sent me the questions under support technical assistance to Indian Country, or I guess it's recommendation and rationale. So I'm not exactly sure what the best way -- what is most useful for you. Would you like me to just try to address each one? Or do you have specific questions?

MEMBER THOMAS: Would you cover the ones that we had from yesterday?

MS. JUNG: Yes. Yes.

MEMBER THOMAS: Those are the ones we were mainly trying to --

MS. JUNG: Okay. 13, 14, and 15? Is that right?

MEMBER THOMAS: Yes. Yes.

MS. JUNG: So, I mean, I wanted to -- so I will respond in a way that I know -- I'm
the acting group leader of the Technical Assistance Group within the School Support and Rural Programs Office. And our group is responsible for administering two discretionary grant programs, the comprehensive assistance centers and the equity assistance centers.

And the comprehensive centers are authorized under the ETAA, which is the Educational Technical Assistance Act, which is due for reauthorization, and it looks like depending on when you ask and who you ask it seems like it's promising in terms of being reauthorized this calendar year.

And then the equity assistance centers are authorized under the Civil Rights Act, and that's a much smaller program with a slightly -- with a different focus and different audience. Again, I mean, I could answer any questions. If you have any, feel free to jump in.

So the first recommendation is about
providing -- improving technical assistance in Indian Country and requesting support for the Department in its efforts to implement strategies to provide TA to tribal and state education departments, tribally controlled community colleges, state offices, Indian Ed, educational labs and centers, to use qualified Native educators where at all possible.

What I can say is -- and I probably can't address that comprehensively. I can talk about the comprehensive centers. The comprehensive centers are authorized to provide support to state educational agencies and all sorts of tribally controlled schools. They don't have the authority to support the BIE directly, but under the new -- and I'll say a little bit more about that in a second.

But under the new -- or at least the draft law that we've seen, we have --

MEMBER NEWELL: They'll be here in a
little while. They'll tell you what they want moved. They'll tell you --

MS. AKINS: He's not on mute.

MEMBER NEWELL: And then the big stuff --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Hello? You need to mute your phone. We're hearing your conversation in our meeting here.

MEMBER NEWELL: Okay. Excuse me.

MS. JUNG: In our budget request, you can see in the link that Tina is going to send you, for the comprehensive centers we have requested additional funds for the program, $7 million. And as part of that -- of the justification for that request, we have said we'd like to make sure that the centers have the authority to support the BIE in the same way that they support SCAs.

So, and that also is part of the reauthorization proposal. And also, in the draft bill that we have seen, it includes the
BIE as an explicit recipient of technical assistance. So I think that's a positive.

But the other part I wanted to say -- go back to -- is to say the centers, if they are developing tools or resources or holding a convening -- the BIE is welcome to be at the table. They are not, you know, turned away. It is just that they are not -- the law doesn't give them the authority -- the centers the authority to explicitly provide technical assistance to the BIE.

So I think that -- I think there is a lot of -- I think it is very probable that the law will pass and that then this provision will be included in the new law that oversees the comprehensive centers.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: In addition to the BIE, though, you know, which represents about seven percent of the Native population, 93 percent are in public schools, and the only way that we have gotten additional technical
assistance is to tap the national funds of Title VII.

We were curious about how to find some other -- I mean, the labs and centers should be servicing all of the communities within their regions, but the reason we got those funds is because they are not.

MS. JUNG: So there is a whole -- another piece I haven't talked about yet. Joyce's office -- well, I'll say two things. First of all, the centers -- the regional centers sit down with the states every year as they develop their technical assistance plan for the following year. And it's the state that is really driving the work or the SEA that drives the work of the comp centers, the regional centers.

So if the SEA is trying to -- is looking at, you know, reducing achievement gaps between different populations, including Native American students, they -- that could be part
of their -- the technical assistance that the comprehensive centers provide.

In addition, Joyce's office has provided additional support to five comprehensive centers at this point in time. Four of those centers are regional centers that were identified because they have -- because they work with states that have large populations of these students.

And so three of those centers are getting a total of a million dollars each year, and then this additional center -- regional center is getting -- last year it was around $150,000, and this year it will depend on her funding availability.

In addition, there is a content center that is a national center that addresses the needs of all states and provides support to regional centers and states in the areas of standards and assessment.

And Joyce's office has provided
additional funding to that center to specifically address the needs of Native American students. And so there are on our website -- on the Department's website, you can see each center and there's a website for each center. And then there is also -- we note where each center has a focus, again, where they receive support from the Office of Indian Education.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes. I know all of that.

MS. JUNG: Okay.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: My issue is that I was working at the state level in Washington, and I worked at the state level in Oregon, and I have had to go directly to staff at the state to ask them to include the needs of Native populations in their request to the lab because they don't do it automatically.

MS. JUNG: I see.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: So I'm
wondering if there is something in the funding of the centers themselves that could say, "When you have a population of Native people in your area, you know, please include, you know, them in the services that you provide." I mean, some centers have done it, but a lot of them haven't. And if you don't happen to have somebody right there, you know, sort of bugging either the Department staff, it didn't happen. And so it's really frustrating.

MS. JUNG: I think I understand what you're saying. And I think that the -- you know, Monique's office is going to be -- we are going to be -- we are working together, the Office of State Support and the comp centers, to make sure that the communication is fluid. But, I mean, her office is really the best. They are the ones that really have the biggest levers in terms -- at the state level, right?

So the comp centers, I mean, they can make suggestions, and I will certainly -- I
hear what you said, and I will think about how we could --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Just some way to nudge them into being more accountable to all of the students in their region.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: What is the name of the reauthorization?

MS. JUNG: It's SETRA, S-E-T-R-A, which stands for Strengthening Education Through Research Act, I believe. It's S-E-T-R-A. And it passed in both houses back in the -- I guess in the -- I think in the spring, and then it got stalled, so --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: What were the last two -- Strengthening Education Through?

MS. JUNG: Through Research.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Research.

MS. JUNG: So the comp centers are authorized under this research --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So it passed
where now?

MS. JUNG: It's currently -- I have heard from our Office of Legislative and Congressional Affairs that it might be taken up again this late summer or fall. But in the draft bill that I last saw, it did call out the BIE as being, you know, a legal, eligible recipient of technical assistance.

But I think that, I mean, Joyce can talk about what she thinks. We had the directors here in May for their annual meeting, and then the day after the directors of the five centers that receive this additional funding stayed on and, you know, we had a dialogue with them and they talked about the work that they have been doing.

So, you know, I think Joyce could talk about that -- the specifics of that. I don't know if you want to say something now.

MEMBER NEWELL: Is there a master list available for the entire country and
Alaska and Hawaii?

MS. JUNG: A list of what?

MEMBER NEWELL: Of Native populations. Because we seem to have an awful lot of trouble here in the east getting included by some of these organizations.

MS. JUNG: I'm sorry. Is there a master list of what, the --

MEMBER NEWELL: Of people to be included in what you are talking about, because every time that we deal with them it seems like we don't exist, and we have to kind of fight for our own identity. I'm wondering if they are only talking about Native populations in the west.

MS. JUNG: Oh. Well, under the --

MEMBER NEWELL: Particularly, the big tribes. The little tribes in the east seem to have a difficult time being identified.

MS. JUNG: Well, under ESEA, states are required to report on students in different
-- of different subgroups, right? So is that what you're --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I think he is referring to the fact that none of the regional centers that got funding are in the east.

MS. JUNG: I see. I see.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: And that's true and we didn't have the funds to go further with that. However, at each of the annual meetings since that funding was established the centers that were funded share with the other centers. And so there is an intentional knowledge sharing among them, even though we weren't able to fund in the east. And they do recognize that there are Indian tribes in other communities where the comp centers that were funded don't exist.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And the centers have --

MEMBER NEWELL: You're talking about a possible reauthorization of the law, and I
wasn't understanding what the reauthorization would be.

MS. JUNG: The law that governs the comprehensive assistance centers is up for reauthorization. And we -- it got pretty far in the spring, and then it stalled. There were other distractions, like ESEA, but we believe that there is a good chance that it could go forward this summer or fall.

MEMBER NEWELL: Is it possible to have some inclusive wording so that we don't -- so that it would be in the reauthorization law and we wouldn't have to fight for what you've identified?

MS. JUNG: Do you mean -- so that's -- the additional funding that those centers receive is -- was a decision made internally at the Department of Education.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: Here. We recommended it.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: We helped to make
that decision.

MS. JUNG: Okay. So it's not something that we need Congress --

MEMBER NEWELL: So that's something that --

MS. JUNG: Yes. You were a part of it.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I think one of the issues is that if we didn't have this pot of money, again, we're going to Title VII to address the needs of our students when their needs should be addressed already by these comp centers, even without those funds. And that is our frustration is that we have to keep adding money in to be considered worthy of time and attention, because they'll say, "Oh, your populations are too small," you know, and so --

MEMBER NEWELL: Yes. We are small, and that sometimes is a problem, because we are a small population. But the need is great, but we still speak our indigenous language.
MS. JUNG: I hear you.

MEMBER NEWELL: Thank you.

MS. JUNG: The next --

MEMBER NEWELL: I didn't mention youth.

(Laughter.)

MS. JUNG: Thank you. The next recommendation is about including TA -- including stronger language to current title programs during any reauthorization to emphasize the accountability of the federal government to American Indian/Alaska Native schools, students, and communities for programs for bilingual education and drug-free schools and related educational programs.

I'm not exactly sure what to say about that. Under your rationale, you talk about discretionary grants to and administration of comprehensive centers, equity centers, special assistance, TA, must provide for the delivery of services by qualified
Native educators, and must also demonstrate strong Indian preference in hiring, and preference for tribal partnerships for all specific programs and projects.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I think the point was to take a look at the comprehensive needs of Native students, and that includes our work that goes on with bilingual education, you know, drug-free substance abuse kinds of programming as well, the health care needs. It's just we need the support to be able to address that holistically, even though we're functioning on supplemental funding. So that was the intent of that language.

MS. JUNG: Okay.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So just basically saying, "Help." And just be aware of the holistic needs. And we're trying to reorganize our report process to be able to get that.

MS. JUNG: Okay. The next recommendation is for Congress to support the -
and it says school support and technology programs. I just want to note it's the Office of Statistical Support and Rural Programs now. And technical assistance programs identified how current TA is being targeted.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So technology is still a part because there is a need still for technology, and that was the --

MS. JUNG: That program hasn't received funding, and so that's why the name of the office was changed.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: But with the name change, do you still --

MS. JUNG: School Support and Rural Programs.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: -- do you still offer technology -- technical assistance at all?

MS. JUNG: There is not a program, so --
VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. But that would still be a recommendation for us, then, to --

MS. JUNG: So then maybe it would be a -- it would look different. If you wanted to make a recommendation about support for technology, then I would just suggest reframing.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right. Okay.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Because the needs in Indian Country are huge around technology. We are very poorly equipped.

MS. JUNG: Got it. Got it.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Or just one example. Trying to work on the revitalization of the language, we would all make it a priority in our school systems, and don't have necessarily the computers, the technology at all in our classrooms, even though we are in a public setting. We are lucky if we have one in
a class of about 30 -- 20 to 30 students daily.

MS. JUNG: You might take a look at the budget request for 2016. I don't know this program well, but I know that we did ask for money for educational technology for the first time in quite a while. So you might take a look at that and see how that addresses your concern, because I think there was an attempt to revamp that program and ask for money for it.

And then there was one other comment that Tina -- or a recommendation that Tina pointed out to me on impact aid. And I just wanted to clarify that sequestration happened in 2013, and we haven't -- and the impact aid was like every program was subject to sequestration.

We haven't had sequestration -- been subject to sequestration since 2013. So I just wanted to clarify that. And I have no doubt that, you know, because impact aid is funded
annually, current funded, I have no doubt that there was an impact, but -- and then whether it's forward funded or current funded, I'm not sure how that would change -- I guess it would change what you would -- what you would know going into it, you would have more of a heads up.

But I think that the program has stayed pretty -- has been funded at basically the same level for many years now, which that doesn't mean it couldn't change, but --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: The problem is that it -- we don't -- schools don't get the funding until later. It is not -- it is -- they are still trying to pay off on years back, so it's not -- and then when sequestration did hit, it sent a ripple effect across Indian Country, very big because we had to -- leaders had to budget for sequestration. And because of it being -- the money is not going to be coming and it is going to hit us,
so you had to budget ahead of time. So that's where the --

MS. JUNG: For funding?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes. For funding.

MS. JUNG: I understand.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So where do we look for technology funds specifically?

MS. JUNG: In the budget request.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: No. Under which program or --

MS. JUNG: So it's under -- well, Joyce has the summary here, and it's under the overview. It's like one, two, three, four, five, six, seven -- it's the eighth one down, educational technology state grants.

So I think you have a link. There are two different volumes of the congressional justification. But if you just look for educational technology state grants, it might take you a minute, but it's in there.
MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay. And under which agency or which program?

MS. JUNG: Well, it is all the Department of Education. The link that Tina sent you is all the Department of Education.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I forwarded it out.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right. I understand that, but you had different --

MS. JUNG: Look under --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: School Support and Rural Programs?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: It's not a separate title itself. It's under something.

MS. JUNG: Elementary and Secondary Education.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Under what?

MS. JUNG: Elementary and Secondary Education.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I sent it out to everybody except Wayne, because I
don't have his email. I forwarded it already.

MS. JUNG: The reason -- the justification is organized is by account, which is how Congress --

MEMBER NEWELL: Excuse me. You don't have my email?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes. Let me have that, Wayne.


VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER NEWELL: Is that it?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes.

MEMBER NEWELL: Okay. Back to mute.

(Laughter.)

MS. JUNG: Wasn't there another link? So what Tina sent you was specifically for education for the disadvantaged, which includes Title I, and that didn't include the other programs. But if you -- we'll send you
another link.

Do you have any other questions?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So what is the other link? So it's education for the disadvantaged. What is the other one?

MS. JUNG: Oh. Well, so under Volume 1 there are different chapters. There is education for disadvantaged, school readiness, which talks about preschool, impact aid, school improvement programs, which includes the comp centers and the equity centers, state schools and citizenship. Indian education has its own chapter, innovation and improvement, English language acquisition, special ed, rehab services.

So Tina can send you this page, and it shows you the overview of both volumes. And then technology, I'm not sure which chapter it's in, but I can try to find it quickly.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: That's not necessary, just to understand --
MS. JUNG: Okay.

MS. HUNTER: Madam Chair?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HUNTER: If you don't have any more questions for Britt, we do have the early learning --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Let's do that.

MS. HUNTER: -- here. I think we should --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Thank you, Britt.

MS. JUNG: Thank you. You're welcome. And if -- I will make note of your comment and think about how we could include -- you know, to make that part of their conversation.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes. That would be great. Thank you.

MS. JUNG: Thank you.
MS. HUNTER: Thank you, Britt.

MR. HICKS: Good morning. I know you have a full agenda, so I'll get right to it.

My name is Steven Hicks, and I know I -- I think I've met a few of you before. I'm in the Office of Early Learning. The Office of Early Learning is a dedicated office that this administration created to focus singularly on early learning, which is birth to age eight, as we define it and as most early childhood organizations define the initiative.

And I think the White House Initiative on Native Americans also looks at early childhood and talks about birth through age eight. So I think we are all consistent.

And we are located in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, an office I know you are -- with which I know you are very familiar. And we have two major programs -- Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge and
preschool development grants, which we jointly administer with our colleagues at the Department of Health and Human Services.

Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge and preschool development grants were authorized by Congress using the Race to the Top original authorization. So, as you know, unfortunately, this excluded the BIE from competing or getting a set-aside, states or tribes. States were defined as the 50 states plus D.C. and Puerto Rico.

Now, we are currently supporting 20 grantees in Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge, which is a systems-building initiative that supports these states in pulling together their disparate systems or programs around early learning and funding streams.

So Early Head Start, Head Start, home visiting, child care, which all are operated by and administered by the Department
of Health and Human Services, and then Title I preschool programs, state preschool programs, IDEA Part C, and Part B 619, which support young children. And those are administered primarily, with the exception of state preschool, from the Department of Education.

So the two administration -- the two offices -- two agencies, sorry, work together to support Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge states. Many of -- the charge for those states is to provide a high quality early education and build a system for all children in the state, which would include of course Native American children. And they are at various stages of supporting all of their children from birth to five.

The preschool development grants were made just recently, in December. We have funding for the first two years, and then the next two years we will be asking Congress for additional funds.
Montana, for example, is -- oh, the goal of the program is to support expansion of high quality preschool for four-year-olds, from families making 200 percent federal poverty level and below. States were to identify high-need communities, and we specifically called out that states speak to the high-need communities, for example, communities that serve children on tribal land or Indian lands and communities that are serving children in rural areas.

So several states are beginning -- are addressing those communities. We have not really analyzed their work yet, and they won't be given until the fall. But we did know Montana, for example, is working in seven tribal areas to implement and expand high quality preschool programs for four-year-olds.

The hope is that in the FY16 budget, which I know you were discussing just a moment ago, for preschool development grants we are
asking for $750 million. That is a $500 million increase over the last two years that we got. So we have $250 million that we will need for continuation funds for the next two years, for which I just mentioned, but we also want another $500 million to expand the program.

And the Secretary is very passionate about this and has specifically asked OMB in this request -- well, the President actually asks for the budget, but the Secretary put this in, that we extend the program to tribal entities, to the BIE, to support -- and the territories, but to support those children that we know are -- and families that are so in desperate need of these kind of opportunities.

So we are putting it in the hands of Congress to hopefully give us those additional funds, so we can extend this program to support this very vulnerable population, of which I know you work with.
Now, as far as your recommendations that I saw, I know that you would had recommended to Congress to promote early learning, and we are -- my office is very grateful that you are doing that as well. And of course this population is near and dear to our hearts because we recognize that if we don't begin early to set the foundation for success at school, and prepare schools, communities, to better support young children and their families, then those children will not be successful later in reading by third grade and graduating and going on to college and career and being productive citizens.

And I know that you have four specific recommendations under promoting early learning. The first one was for preschool for all. So the President, again, is asking for the third time in his budget request, $75 billion over 10 years for a state-federal partnership, which would include funds for a
set-aside for the BIE, to expand high quality preschool for all four-year-olds from low to moderate income families. So, again, that 200 percent federal poverty level and below. And incentives for states to expand preschool for all children, all four-year-olds.

You also mentioned boosting equality of early childhood. So Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge is working to do that in those 20 states. But, additionally, we have technical assistance provided by one of our comp centers, the center for enhancing early learning outcomes, that supports states but support certainly the tribal entities in advancing early education, providing resources, technical assistance, as well as our two TA centers that are focused on our grantees for Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge and the preschool development grants, but can also support other early childhood programs such as those on Indian lands.
And that is the early learning challenge technical assistance center and the new preschool development grant technical assistance center, and I can -- can I send some links to you later --

MS. HUNTER: Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. HICKS: -- that you can forward? Great. So I'll send Tina some additional information that she can share with you all, so you have those resources.

And I know -- and a third recommendation was raising the bar for early learning. Through the preschool development grant, we have identified 12 specific quality improvements that we are insisting that our grantee states and their programs adhere to. So those include high staff qualifications, commensurate salary for preschool teachers with K through 12 salaries.

As you I'm sure are aware that many
of the -- much of the workforce in early childhood is paid really below poverty. Many of the teachers could actually qualify for Head Start, which is 100 percent poverty level. So we want those preschool teachers to be well qualified and then compensated at an appropriate salary and benefits to their K through 12 counterparts.

We also insist that these programs be inclusive programs for children with disabilities, meet high level standards, and have opportunities for culturally and developmentally and linguistically, which I know is an important piece of your work, linguistically appropriate programs.

Those are just some of the high quality benchmarks. But essentially it is not babysitting; it is actually preparing children to be successful later on when they enter kindergarten.

Your final recommendation was around
reforming and expanding Head Start and Early Head Start. And that is really in the domain of the Department of Health and Human Services, so I can't speak a lot to it, but I will say -- and I hope you have an opportunity to speak with that agency as well, but -- and I can bring your concerns also to my colleagues there at the Department of Health and Human Services. I'm happy to do that.

But I will say we do have an initiative -- a proposal in the President's budget again for Head Start to increase the current funding, which is about $9 billion, by another billion dollars, and that would lengthen the Head Start day. It would provide for full day, in some cases full year, services for young children, which many of our families really need.

So I am going to stop there, and then open it up to any questions that you may have. Yes.
MEMBER WHITEFOOT: My background is in early childhood education.

MR. HICKS: Oh, great.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So --

MR. HICKS: I'm sorry. Would you mind saying your name?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Patricia Whitefoot from Yakama Nation in Washington.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So the role -- you didn't speak to the role of parent engagement, which is I think the centerpiece of early childhood education.

MR. HICKS: Sure.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I know that over the years that there has been a lot of work, but I wanted to pay attention to the Native parents.

MR. HICKS: Yes. So we are -- the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge has several components, and I should have mentioned
that. Thank you for bringing that up. It's a really great comment.

Around creating the system -- and it's around early learning standards, comprehensive assessment systems, developing the workforce, data systems, and one of them is -- and health, and also family engagement. So each of our Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge states are working specifically on family engagement, some at different levels because of the priorities that they decided for themselves.

The preschool development grantees, one of those criteria is around comprehensive services, and within that is a focus on family engagement. So all of the preschool development grants will also be using their funding stream from the preschool development grants to support family engagement, because, as you wisely stated, you know, family engagement is such a critical piece of this
work.

The Department has been focusing on trying to develop a framework around family engagement that all of our programs could use, and then our work with HHS, we have this interagency policy board that has representatives from HHS and Ed. We have also invited and had a representative from the BIE come to our meetings that are quarterly. And at our next meeting on July 22nd, from 4:00 to 5:30, we will be having an open session of the interagency policy board.

Traditionally, there have just been these, you know, meetings similar to this, although I do -- I know you do have a public aspect, but mostly not attended by a lot of people. But this one will be an open session, and I will get that information for you and we can probably -- we will be able to live webcast that. And we're going to be specifically -- from 4:00 to 5:30 on July 22nd, specifically
talking about family engagement.

And the two agencies are working on a family engagement policy, similar to the one that we put out about six months ago on reducing suspensions and expulsions in early childhood. And we currently have one regarding inclusion that was out for public comment on the Office of Special Education blog site, and we will be taking those comments, putting a statement through clearance, and then publishing that and disseminating that policy statement.

These are just recommendations. They are not binding, but they are the policies that we think would help in a particular area, either reducing suspensions or expulsions, increasing family engagement, or making our classrooms more inclusive settings.

Yes. You had a question, and then that way. Oh, I'm sorry. You're facilitating.

MEMBER THOMAS: I'm always behind.
(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We'll go to Robin, and then Virginia.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Thank you. In your preschool development grants that were just funded, how many of those were there? And were there any that kind of targeted in Indian Country?

MR. HICKS: Yes. There were 18 grants. We had limited funding. We only had $250 million, and Congress gave the $250 million and then we used that for the first year with the hope that they would give continuation funds. But they are working in about over 200 communities.

So I know that Montana does have seven early learning high-need communities they have identified, and there are some others, too, but I'm not sure --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I thought you said the early learning challenge grants went
to Montana.

MR. HICKS: No. Sorry. I may have misspoke.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Oh.

MR. HICKS: It's the preschool development grants. Yes.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Okay.

MR. HICKS: Yes. Preschool development grants going to Montana, and they have seven high-need communities. But I think there -- there are some other ones, too. I just -- I don't know off the top of my head and --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Do you have a list of the states that --

MR. HICKS: I do. I will send you -- I will send through Tina -- we have a two-page flyer that will list all the states, and then you can -- that's good. If you can kind of match up, we'll -- we have higher populations in this state or that state.
I know California, as a Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge state, you know, they have a lot of -- a high population of Native American children. So they are definitely focusing I know on different tribal areas to increase the quality, and that is birth to five.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Virginia?

MEMBER THOMAS: My question is about the teacher qualification. I know that there is different standards that they have to make in order to be with early childhood. But when they come down -- when you spoke earlier about the linguistics part of it, we were asking for a waiver, you know, for those kind of language teachers that are coming in. Is that something that you have already put into your plans, or how does that work with early childhood?

MR. HICKS: Yes. And I saw that on your recommendations, and I think that's -- I
completely understand your need for that. You have elders that are the ones that really know the language and can be helpful in supporting the language.

I love your thinking on that. And when we -- and specific recommendations. So these are -- when I think of that, there's two ideas I have. I mean, one, we do -- if we get more funds and can expand this to tribal country and also -- or Indian Country and also the BIE, and that is actually what I would love for you guys to help me with, like what is the best vehicle? Because in the congressional justification for the budget we said it expands eligibility beyond the states to include the BIE, tribal education agencies, territories, and the outlying areas.

So I'll come back to that in a second, because I wanted to ask your advice on that. But as far as the qualification of our teachers, we really do want to set a high bar
of bachelor's degrees. The National Academies of Science just came out with a consensus report called Transforming the Early Childhood Workforce. I will also send that to you, so you have that link, because you can look at it online, read it online. And their recommendation is the lead teacher at least has a bachelor's degree.

Now, our office is pretty committed to that, but that doesn't mean we don't have room to think of other alternatives, because I know -- I understand this linguistic language need that you are talking about.

I would suggest that it is possible to have a lead teacher be the teacher with the bachelor's degree, because they are doing beyond just language, you know, support. And then the idea is in a classroom of 20 kids, for example, you would have a one to 10 ratio. So you'd have 20 kids, 20 four-year-olds, and you'd have two adults.
So the lead teacher we do feel should have a bachelor's degree. The teaching assistant that would be there all day as well, and we would support that, could be someone that doesn't necessarily have to have a bachelor's degree. And I would think that could be the elder that offers the language support.

But I think, you know, there is room to think about what -- you're asking for a waiver. Now, I think you were also specifically talking about the Head Start programs and those that are offered by HHS. So that I really can't even speak to because I don't -- I don't know how open they are to those things.

MEMBER THOMAS: But you have nothing in place under early childhood.

MR. HICKS: In the preschool development grants?

MEMBER THOMAS: Yes.
MR. HICKS: In the preschool development grants, we don't, but probably -- we don't right now. We require a bachelor's degree. That was -- for all the programs we wanted to raise the bar, and it was really building on what a lot of states are doing right now for quality is they have these -- the highest quality programs have a bachelor's degree.

They don't have to have it in all their programs, but for the ones that we are funding we wanted to make sure that those kids were getting the benefit of a teacher with a bachelor's degree, and we wanted to pay for it. So we were providing the funding for that.

MEMBER THOMAS: I think, you know, since we don't know how many tribes are involved, you know, with these grants that are coming through or who is actually being affected, but I know that it is very important for tribes now to start the language progress
earlier, you know, in life. So early childhood is where they would definitely want to start it out. I mean, even by kindergarten it is a little late, you know, to get going because it was automatic, you know, at four-year-olds. You know, that could help out.

So I'm just concerned, you know, what can we do to help you, you know, to put some kind of an initiative in there that says what we're asking for for Head Start, to be happening in their early childhood, you know, what could happen. You obviously know that there is a need. You obviously know that there is a need within the tribes, that what we would recommend.

And you obviously know that our teachers of the languages do not have credentials, do not have life experience or language experience. So if there is something that we can put into our report that could assist you and say, "Yes, you know, NACIE does
support this."

MR. HICKS: So would you -- I mean, is there a consensus that you would not require -- want to require the --

MEMBER THOMAS: I think Theresa would be the best one to answer that one.

MEMBER JOHN: In Alaska, it would be difficult to fit that requirement, because it is very expensive to go to school. And many of the grandparents who are caretakers of their grandchildren live in rural Alaska. With the population explosion across the state among our high school students, it is kind of like a situation of where, you know, the local women who work year-round and live year-round don't have time to go to school, end up in an early, you know, learning center.

And out there it takes 20 years to get bachelor's degrees, unfortunately, because when you're a full-time grandmother, a full-time, you know, tribal clerk, or whatever, it
is difficult to, you know, be a full-time student. So that would be, in my opinion, difficult for village women to, you know, fit that.

MR. HICKS: So I will say in the Preschool for All proposal, which is really the bigger proposal, we have language -- so Preschool for All is a proposal in the budget from the President, but it has also become introduced in the Congress under the name of Strong Start for America's Children Act. We don't have -- it was introduced -- Strong Start for America's Children Act was introduced by Senator Murray of Washington -- Senator Murray -- but there was no Republican co-sponsor.

And then in the House it was introduced by Bobby Scott and also Richard Hanna. And Richard Hanna is a Republican; Bobby Scott is a Democrat. But we need to get more Republican co-sponsors. In the last
Congress, we got 120 Democrat sponsors, co-sponsors, and three Republicans. Well, that's not going to fly. You know, that's not going to pass.

The Strong Start for America's Children Act includes the Preschool for All, the preschool development grants, of which I spoke that are at Ed, but it also includes Early Head Start, Head Start, more funding for children's programs reaching children with disabilities, and home visiting.

So it is really comprehensive birth to five. In that, there is also provisions for tribal entities, and there is the provision, as far as teacher qualifications, that says you don't have to have a bachelor's degree, but you should be working towards one. So do you think that would be a viable alternative for this population where you said, "Okay. Maybe you don't have a bachelor's degree. Although that's preferred, we prefer that, but if you
can demonstrate competency in early childhood education and are working towards a bachelor's degree."

MEMBER JOHN: I like that, because, you know, I am all for higher development or higher education. And something like that is doable. You know, like our school district had designed career letter program where eventually 20 teacher aides got certified. Eventually, like 20 years later, but it still worked. And so I like that idea.

MEMBER THOMAS: As long as there is not a time limit, you know, that you have to -- because some would say you have been five years over the --

MEMBER JOHN: Okay. Okay.

MEMBER THOMAS: That would be, you know, a problem.

MR. HICKS: Maybe we could say with a flexible time limit or in a reasonable amount of time or -- I don't know.
VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Even in rural areas, that's -- they are giving -- I like your idea of a bachelor's degree, but I understand that in the most rural part of Indian Country, because it's different in different demographics or different -- so I know in certain other areas the expectations are what you just stated.

MEMBER THOMAS: Even distant learning is impossible in some areas.

MR. HICKS: Right. There is no internet connectivity. Sure.

MEMBER JOHN: No internet access. We have one GCI in our region, and without the activities -- sometimes my phone doesn't work some days, because too many lines are being used by somebody. Yes.

MR. HICKS: Well, the other -- if we do get this funding for preschool development grants, so the decisions are not going to be made today. I know you have a report due, but
if we get those additional funds, and the Secretary really wants this to happen, so that we can extend this opportunity to our Native American/Alaska Native children, as well as the territories, we will be going out for public comment.

So there will be an opportunity for you to look at what we draft, publish it in the Federal Register, and then you and your colleagues and organizations can make the recommendations on how this piece or any piece should be framed.

MEMBER THOMAS: I think that should be on our agenda for our next call in meeting or something, because I think this is, you know, it's pretty important right now, especially with early childhood. If you tackle anything, that's where we should start.

MR. HICKS: Well, and let me tell you that, you know, we are really dependent on Congress. I mean, this administration has a
commitment, you know, to advance the educational opportunities for American Indian and Native Alaskan children. But we need the funding from Congress, so we need the $750 million from Congress, we need -- or at least more than the 250- that we are getting for continuation funds to extend this, and we need ideally more funding -- the funding for Preschool for All, which is the state-federal partnership with the set-aside.

The President also proposed in his State of the Union $85 billion -- or $82 billion for high quality child care for all children in America from low to moderate income families. We also need the funding from Congress for that. I mean, these -- we think these are not just funding; we think these are investments. And these are the kind of investments that we need to make.

But Congress needs to hear from folks that that is what they are --
MEMBER THOMAS: We are all used to soft money, believe me.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I think we had -- Patricia had her hand up over here, and then I -- and then we'll --

MR. HICKS: Okay.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Well, two things. One has to do with facilities, and I know that's not in your shop, but there is a need for technical support for facilities. We currently have a tribal Head Start in our school district that has had to move every year, because the tribe does not have the resources for a facility. And so we have housed them in our school district, but every single year in our school district they have had to move in K-12 facilities.

We lack the preschool facilities that are necessary. You know, we talk about, you know, building capacity and supporting one another, collaboration, but there is just a
tremendous need for facilities. So as you are talking with Health and Human Services on, you know, the Head Start side, there is just this major need for facilities for early childhood education.

We have also experienced major growth in our school district. We have had to move all of our second grades out, and we've put them all in portables this past year. For some reason, there was an explosion, and we continued to keep growing, and we are bursting at the seams with children.

But, yes, still trying to collaborate with early childhood education because that is an important vehicle to success for our students. So --

MR. HICKS: Yes. I completely agree. And a lot of our grants, as I think you were alluding to, we have a restriction on construction costs. The most they can usually do is minor improvements, minor remodeling, but
that doesn't mean that there couldn't be put in a new preschool development grant or Preschool for All a provision that some of those funds can be used for facilities.

Right now, in the Preschool for All, 20 percent of the funds can be used at the state level, or in this case the tribal level, to -- for quality improvements. Right now, there is also a prohibition against construction, but that could be different. You know, that could -- and that could be one of the recommendations that you make. Should this go out for comment and we get the funds, that funds also be set aside for facilities.

And we are very sensitive about this, and we have talked about that as well. Haven't quite figured out how to make that happen, but I agree with you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right. And then my final question, or I guess it's more of a comment, because you have already heard about
the linguistics side of it. I think at the early childhood level, tribes and Alaska Natives have the greatest opportunity to restore and revitalize our languages, and that I think in any way that early childhood can provide that critical support is vital, because in restoring and revitalizing language it also means that we are working toward the concept of truth and reconciliation as well.

Why we have to work so hard and struggle so hard to restore our language is because of the BIA system and the BIE boarding schools, where our families were putting -- forced to go into boarding schools, whether they're run by churches or a military organization. It's a part of the federal government, and where our children were forced to go, so my grandparents were forced into that system. And so now we are struggling to revitalize the indigenous languages from this land.
And so it's a very sensitive topic and one that we have to -- people have to understand the truth about what happened, and we also are working toward, you know, reconciliation and resolution about this issue.

MR. HICKS: You know, one of the things that we have in the grant programs are priorities, competitive priorities, invitational priorities. So if we are able to go out for comment, because we have more funding, that would be something we should consider, that there is a competitive priority for programs that support Native languages, for example, that makes sure that they have that as a priority, you know, and that certainly I think would help move the needle, and I appreciate your comments about that.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And we can't, you know, be in conflict or contradict what the standards say. The standards do say culturally and linguistic standards. However, when it
comes to practice in the classroom, and being monitored, the priority is on the educational aspect, the academics of moving from preschool to kindergarten, and so we are using that same -- the same curriculum, the same testing standards, and people that are coming in to provide technical support to help move along. Language is put aside, and that's not the priority. And we can't be contradicting ourselves.

MR. HICKS: You're right.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And that's what happens.

MR. HICKS: You're right. That's true. Thank you.

Thanks so much. And I will send some of these resources, which I spoke, but I will also have -- if you will share my contact information, that will be great.

MS. HUNTER: Absolutely.

MR. HICKS: And if you have
additional questions, or anything you want to share about the work that is happening out in the field, we love to be able to get stories about both successes and challenges that we can give to the Secretary or others that are speaking around these issues. So I appreciate those real stories, too.

Thanks so much for having me and inviting me to come today.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you so very much.

MR. HICKS: Thank you. Thank you.

Take care.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you so very much, Steve.

MR. HICKS: You're welcome. I do really appreciate you inviting me, too.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. It's now five after 11:00. Let's take a 10-
minute, 15-minute break, and then we need to really put into place the framework of the next report, because I think that is going to be important to use our time, and just work straight up through 1:00. Unless anyone is open to staying after 1:00, because I know some of you are -- I think Patsy is leaving.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Tonight.

MEMBER THOMAS: I'm fine.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: You're fine staying later?

MEMBER THOMAS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MEMBER NEWELL: What time do you want us back?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Let's see, make it 1:30.

MEMBER THOMAS: Right now he is asking for the break.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: No. I'm asking, are you guys okay with coming back
at -- get back on schedule at 1:30. I mean, 11:30?

MEMBER NEWELL: 11:30? Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: That's more than 15 minutes, but it -- we're ahead of time, so -- or we can come back earlier, too?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: 11:20.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: 11:20. We'll make it 11:20, and then we'll get right back in and work through as far as we can go, and then we'll -- if people can stay late, we'll stay late.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:04 a.m. and resumed at 11:36 a.m.)

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We're back on. Is everybody online? Sam?

MEMBER McCracken: Sam's here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And Wayne? Alan?
Okay. As we move along, we do need them back on, so hopefully we can get them back on. But we're going to go ahead and get started for the sake of time, and we want to thank Robin from the Impact Aid Office for being here.

And this is the NACIE Council. We have -- we are working on getting our report to Congress in. And last year's report -- I don't know if you had a chance to look at that at all --

MS. ROBINSON: I didn't.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: -- we made several recommendations regarding impact aid.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And we know that it needs to be revised, because some changes have happened, and so we are just wanting your -- you to go over what we have there and give us some feedback on the
recommendations as well as the important theme that we have over -- on this year's report, as you probably heard, being involved with impact aid now for years, is that we are working toward, in our report this year, having a different theme of gathering our recommendations under the tribal authority, moving into giving tribes more authority, so that we -- yesterday Mr. Lott was here.

He talked about the IPP revisions and what is happening in Congress and legislatively what is being pushed to give tribes a little bit more authority over their education. So we wanted to include that in our recommendations to Congress this year, and so that is why we have asked that you come in and look at what we had last year, because we are hearing sequestration is no longer an issue.

We don't know if that is true or not, so -- I don't know if it's true, because I have been out of the loop for about a year now
with public schools on Indian reservations and
the NISA Board and everything else. So we just
wanted to hear from someone here at this level
to give us some guidance on what we should have
in our report.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. My name is Robin Robinson. Some of you are typing I know. And I'm the group leader for the Programs Operations Group, Impact Aid Program. And my staff is the one that actually looks at the applications and make decisions, do the audits, the monitoring, and look at the Indian policies and procedures and things like that, and make decisions on how much the payments are, and we send out the payments.

So this first question about sequestration -- and I just got this like five minutes ago, so I really -- if you could just ask me questions, it would probably be easier. Okay? But I think you would always want to exclude sequestration. I don't think
sequestration is a question at this particular point. I guess it just depends on if it comes up in the future. You would always --

MEMBER THOMAS: But it is not an issue now.

MS. ROBINSON: No. Because there is not a sequestration on the board right now. I think this was a couple years ago when they were talking about there was going to be across-the-board sequestration. And at that time, they wanted to be excluded from that, so we wouldn't be cut, but I believe it was still cut anyhow.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: It was cut.

MS. ROBINSON: Right. So, I mean, because, you know, we -- the funding is by the number of kids, the type of kids, you know, the federally connected kids. More weight is given to Indian land kids who -- kids who reside on the Indian lands that we -- eligible Indian
lands.

So there is different things. It depends on how many -- how much percentage the federally connected kids are of the other -- total population. So there is a lot of things that affect how much they get paid. It's not a straight course number or anything like that.

So, of course, you know, we would -- I'm sure you could hope that it wouldn't be cut, if there is a cut, because this money is definitely needed in areas. And I think for the Indian applications, we usually get about 1,200 applications or so, and usually at least half of those, or a little bit more, have children on Indian lands. Okay?

Do you want --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Could you give that number?

MS. ROBINSON: Oh. I could probably give you exact numbers later. But I just pulled this -- I just gave you certain sections
of -- the other pages I have in my office. I think it's still like 600-and-something for last year's applications, but I can give you the exact numbers later if you'd like.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I know you used -- I know we used to always have, when I was working with Indian lands, we had access to the -- what the breakdown is by state. If we can get that for her to get into the -- as far as how much -- by component as well as by state, so there is military, the Indian lands, and then --

MS. ROBINSON: So all the different categories.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right. The categories as well as the --

MS. ROBINSON: Categories by state. Okay. I'll have to get James to --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: -- work on that.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank
you.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay?

MEMBER THOMAS: And you can send that to me, and I'll make sure the Chair gets it.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I thought maybe prioritize them in the tribal lands where the primary tribal lands.

MS. ROBINSON: We wouldn't have information.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: It's only by state.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Because it's -- ours is just on, you know, all of the -- all of the other ways that apply for each state, and we just break it down by state. And then we have all of the different properties listed, and there are so many different Indian land
properties that we don't have a breakdown of that. That's probably -- it has hundreds and hundreds of properties, and sometimes properties aren't listed correctly, and different things like that. So we wouldn't have a breakdown.

MEMBER THOMAS: Do you have demographics as in, you know, Indian students?

MS. ROBINSON: We have -- like our only -- there are a couple of sheets of this here, because I wasn't sure what you wanted. I have some -- we have other whole webinar type things that I can give to you as well. But what we did was we have students who are federally connected for impact aid, so these children who -- they are on -- their connection is by their -- wherever they live, their parents and they live or work on federal land.

MEMBER THOMAS: Those are good numbers, if we can get that.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. So all of our
applicants have to have children who are federally connected. So we have military children, we have children who live on Indian land, for -- Indian land is the only category they just have to live on the land. The others, the parents also have to work on the federal property. Okay?

So like military, military folks, as long as they are active duty military, they are eligible. But Indian land, as long as they live on it, their parents don't have to work on it. So there's different categories like that. Okay?

We have low rent housing, and then we have parents who just work on but kids -- the kids don't live on. So there's different weights, different categories. And the highest weight, which is 1.25 weight versus like one for just military who live on base, or .2 for military who live off base, or if parents just work on federal land is .05. But for Indian
land, if you live on Indian land, it is 1.25, so they get the highest weight. Okay?

And the formula is very complicated. It looks at, you know, what percentage are these federally connected students of your total population? So the federally connected students are only 10 percent, you don't weight as much as somebody who is 100 percent Indian land.

Okay? So if you want to just kind of ask me questions, I didn't do a full presentation because I wasn't sure, like I said a couple of minutes ago, what you wanted. I did bring some information about the Indian policies and procedures, but I think that's not what you're looking for here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Well, that is kind of what we're looking for because I think that -- there lies the -- you already said to the point of what I know is to be kind of the misunderstanding in Indian Country about
-- from Indian leaders wanting impact aid to flow through to the state, through their teacher education programs --

MS. ROBINSON: Right.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: -- which the concept of it -- of understanding that it's not -- whether the child is Indian or not doesn't determine whether they get the funding.

MS. ROBINSON: Right.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: It's determined by where they live or where their parents work or --

MS. ROBINSON: Right.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: -- and so that is really the one thing that we need to approach as to -- as we move toward having more tribal authority as a recommendation to Congress, impact aid is one of the things that is always brought up in the different places I have been where tribal leaders say, "Oh, if we
could just have that money, we'd do with it what we wanted to," and --

MS. ROBINSON: Right.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: -- it's not necessarily that easy when it comes to -- and so that -- coming from that direction of hearing it from you all, as we make this report, in the IPP section is where a lot of those -- where tribal parents and people can be involved --

MS. ROBINSON: Right.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: -- what happens in the education system more than actually running the funding through a state or an agency that wants to control it. It's more controlled by the IPP, I would say.

MS. ROBINSON: Right. Because that is where there is some involvement.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right.

MS. ROBINSON: So what I have given you here -- I've passed out about 10 copies --
is just -- the first page just gives you the definition of eligible Indian lands, and basically it's lands that are in trust or restricted lands. And there's different things -- Alaska lands, Oklahoma lands. I'm not going to go into all of that right now.

But as we go to the page -- it says page 19, because I pulled this out of someplace else, and the purpose of these Indian policies and procedures is for equal participation of the Indian children in the LEA programs and activities, to improve the communication and cooperation between LEA and the community, and to involve the parents and tribal officials in the planning and development of educational programs.

And so what the -- oh, hey, this is the numbers right here. This is for FY2015. We don't have -- I might have '16 numbers. But for last year's application, 626 applicants we have for 2015. So it is on this page 20. I
wasn't sure if I had brought that page or not.

MEMBER THOMAS: But that 626, that is for Indian land.

MS. ROBINSON: There is about -- I think last year we had -- 1,263 maybe was our number, or something like that. Out of those, at least 626 had at least one Indian land children. I'm just counting at least one, not only Indian land, but they had at least Indian land children.

MEMBER THOMAS: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay? So within the policies and procedures, they have -- their school district has established these board approved policies. And they have to be reviewed every year, and they have to be approved every year.

Now, with these policies, for what the school system has to do, but they have to involve the tribes in what they do. But one thing that is important is that we don't pay
any schools that have any other children that should have IPPs unless we see they have approved IPPs. Okay? So there is only -- we hold back the payments until we know that the payments have been -- until the IPPs have been submitted to us.

Also, out of all of our Indian land schools, we have 600 -- and of course we have a limited staff -- we take about 100 every year that we do what we call a monitoring of the IPPs, is where we ask for more documentation. So initially we just ask for them to submit the IPPs, tell us what you are planning to do, okay, and that your board has approved this every year.

In this you'll see -- I'll give you a little bit of information -- it talks about how they involve the tribes, that they invite them. They don't have to -- the tribe doesn't still have to sign off on it, but they have to invite them and make sure -- and request that
they get involved. Sometimes they will say, "Well, nobody came." Well, you know, we don't -- can't hold it against them if nobody comes, but they have to make sure that they invited them.

When we do the monitoring, we ask for the documentation that they have done these things. So show us what you sent out, and when did you request it? Did you have a meeting? Things like that. What is the documentation that you showed? So every year we do at least 100 out of the 600 or so we have to get the more --

MEMBER THOMAS: Is this a random draw that happens?

MS. ROBINSON: No. We just do it through the host states.

MEMBER THOMAS: Oh, okay.

MS. ROBINSON: No. So we'll start from Alaska, go on down, and when we get to -- like this year we have Oklahoma. Oklahoma is
so large, we always have 246 districts in Oklahoma. So we'll go through Oklahoma and we'll also do part of another state. So it may take three years to do Oklahoma. We don't want to just focus on Oklahoma for two years to get them done. Okay? So we'll focus on Oklahoma and then we'll do the states around it.

So we go through everybody, you know, kind of like in order. Okay?

So as you start on page 22, just going to briefly just look at the standards. So it is giving the tribal officials and Indian parents an opportunity to comment on whether the Indian children participate on an equal basis. So some of the things I think that Alfred talked about yesterday was getting more information that these things were actually done.

I think we talked about putting that into the new regulations, you know, so like can you show us what the comments are and what was
done about the comments. So those are some of the changes I think we have requested to the regulations. But that's not what we have now. Okay? So we're just asking them to comment.

Number two is the extent to which Indian children participate on an equal basis with the non-Indian children, modifying, if necessary, the educational program to ensure that Indian children participate on an equal basis with non-Indian children. So this is just general, you know, educational programs.

For disseminating the relevant applications, program evaluations, making sure that you have given them to the tribes, allowing them enough time to do it before you schedule a meeting or something on it. There is gather information concerning Indian views. Again, including the frequency, location, and times of meeting.

So, you know, so this -- and we have really been looking at this one closely to make
sure they are not just saying like, "Well, we set the meeting for September 1st on August 31st." Well, no, did you give them enough time to come to the meeting? Do you always hold the meeting at the school board? Or do you sometimes say, "Well, would you rather have it at the tribal location?" or things like that. So these are the type of things we're looking at when we ask these questions.

MEMBER THOMAS: Before you go any further, my concern is that the parent involvement on this, to have them here. It's all good and well that you say that, you know, you haven't gathered any information, but then do you do something in your evaluation or compliance checks to make sure that some of these ideas or comments of the parents are followed through?

MS. ROBINSON: That's what we're saying. We don't have that in the regs now,
and I think that's what I think Alfred talked about yesterday is that putting it into the regs where we can get that information and then --

MEMBER THOMAS: So that process is starting?

MS. ROBINSON: We have to --

MS. SILVERTHORNE: So is this part of the rulemaking process now?

MS. ROBINSON: Rulemaking process.

MEMBER THOMAS: Oh, okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Because at this point here, you know, we can ask them, have they done these things so far. We can't really get more into what they are doing in the school district and all of that at this point until we put into our regs that allows us to ask more information.

So now when we say, "Did you get information on the Indian views? Did you get these comments?" Well, the new part is like,
"What did you do about these comments?"

MEMBER THOMAS: Exactly.

MS. ROBINSON: What are the comments? Right. What are the comments? What did you -- how did you respond to them? You know, not just leave something --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: You just had a meeting and nobody showed up, and you just said, "Okay. Well, nobody showed up," and then you never followed through on it.

MS. ROBINSON: Right. Right. So those are the type of changes we have asked for the new regs. Okay?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Is there a way we can get a copy of those recommendations we made?

MS. ROBINSON: I will have to check.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I think he gave us that. He gave us --

MS. HUNTER: Yes. You'll have to use that.
MS. SILVERTHORNE: The notice of proposed rulemaking will be coming out. Remember, he said yesterday that that is in drafting form now, and it will be out for comment in a month, before the end of the month.

MS. ROBINSON: I haven't heard a date yet.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: Haven't heard a date. Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: I just came off of vacation last week. They might have come up with a date; I haven't heard about it.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We have a sheet that --

MS. SILVERTHORNE: It's in process.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes. I know that -- I mean, at this point I know that he is still working with the lawyers and all of that, so I'm sure once they get everything approved with the lawyers they won't mind sending it out to
you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

MS. ROBINSON: Anytime. So, again - so the last couple of ones are, six, notifying the Indian parents and tribes the location and times of meetings. Seven is consulting and involving the tribal officials and parents of Indian children in the planning and development of LEA programs and activities.

Okay. And then the last one is modifying IPPs, if necessary, based on input. So if you say, "Well, I think you need to add more or change more," or whatever, if we are -- that they would be something that the comments and things would actually say what has been done.

MEMBER THOMAS: So as far as we're concerned, that should be part of our comment, that we support this effort?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We
support the efforts because, like I said, in the past what I have heard from tribal leaders at this level, especially whenever the Secretary has had meetings, that Bill Mendoza mentioned yesterday it has always been about, "We don't have a say. We don't have a say."

They want -- and some go as far as, "We want impact aid to flow through our tribe as a state agency" instead of -- well, right now, impact aid doesn't even flow to the states. In Arizona, it doesn't. It does straight to the school district, to the country, transfer to the school district.

And so that is what -- the push back is from local school districts, and is that we don't want it to go through the tribe because it will be used more in other areas than given directly to students. So there are pros and cons with each of them.

Yes, it's about having more authority, but right now I think the -- from my
position anyway, my -- from my experience working with the Indian land school district for many years is this is where the -- where we can -- this is a great starting point is to beef up the IPP process, so that tribes can no longer feel left out of making decisions of what happens in the public school districts that receive impact aid funds.

MEMBER THOMAS: I know in Oklahoma, because I have worked with a lot of the districts there, is that when impact aid came up they thought, what's the use? You know, they thought their voice wasn't going to be heard anyway.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And that is really the --

MS. ROBINSON: So, see, you know, the money basically goes directly to the school systems. And it's the general funds for them to use any way they want.

MEMBER THOMAS: Exactly.
MS. ROBINSON: And it just helps, you know, for taxes that they've lost.

MEMBER THOMAS: Right.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay? So the only -- like I said, the only -- this is just a little -- kind of a little weight that you have here is these IPPs. This is the only program of our programs that -- I mean, of our different category of kids that has this. So this is a little extra that says, "Well, you have to do these. If you don't do these, we don't pay them." And we don't. We don't make payment until we receive the IPPs, and we -- and this year -- and these last couple of years I have had my -- all of my staff has really been working on this, and we have been really tight on this, to make sure that if it's -- we make them rewrite it and rewrite it until we say, "No, that still doesn't say what it needs to say."

So we're getting them to say that
and put it in there. Now, the rest of the part we don't really have a say at that point. That's why we're trying to get -- look at more involvement in, well, do they actually implement and how? You know, if they don't implement it, you know, what -- can we see that? Can we ask them for more information? And things like that.

So that's what we've kind of added into this year. You know, we have met with our staff director and talked about it, and we said it would be helpful if we can say, "Okay. So what did you do about the comments you got?"

MEMBER THOMAS: Right. I mean, we are greater for the IPPs. You know, what this -- this has come a long way, you know, from when it first started. But the follow-through is all we are concerned about now, and to make sure that it is actually listened to.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And it's something that, in my experience, again,
it differs from school district to school district. The process differs, and the input differs from parents. But if you go the extra mile and you include -- like I know in one school district I worked in we go all the way -- go all out and either go to the Department -- within the Department of Education and go through their whole school-work process and get their input and everything, whereas other school districts we will just go get signatures from the chapters, which are many, many, many chapters.

And most of the time those chapter officials don't even know what they're signing anyway. They just kind of sign and say okay, and then don't really question it. And there is no presentation, there is no -- so it varies, but it is really important to -- because of this whole wanting to -- self-determination and self-control and -- from tribes that we are -- or tribal authority at
this point, this is what really needs to be looked at, the process, and recommendations to support that.

People here at the federal level know that there is some due diligence that was done at the local levels to really include the tribal parents and grandparents, stakeholders I should say, to say what is happening in the public school system, because there really is a disconnect.

And that's where we hear it, in these meetings here at the DC level with Secretary Duncan. Heard it several times. Patsy and I heard it at the last tribal leadership meeting a year ago, or two years ago in November now, that we want -- they came right out, "We want impact aid. We want impact aid to come through our tribal system."

And so there is -- I mean, it -- as a former superintendent, the hairs on your back stand up. It's like, oh my gosh, to let loose
of that funding, there is a distrustful voice, and so that is where I feel like it really needs to be put clearly in the IPP process what has to happen in order for them to feel like they have a say as well as to make certain that it is happening, too, in the school systems, how it is being used, and what is happening in the curriculum instruction assessment, and the whole realm of educating Indian lands children in a public school system on an Indian reservation.

MS. ROBINSON: Now, there's a couple of other things I just want to make sure you're aware of. There is a waiver. I don't know if you're aware of the waiver.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right.

MS. ROBINSON: Now, the tribe can write letter to the school district to sign off on waiving. If they have a really good relationship.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right.
MS. ROBINSON: And they say, well -- or maybe they're 100 percent of a particular tribe, and it’s like, okay, there is no need to be doing this, because we know that you are working well with our students, and you don't have to bother to do all of this. They can waive it.

Now, it works well for the people who work well together. But in situations where there is some concern, then it is better that the tribe does not waive it, because once they waive it, they don't have to do this.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Is it a yearly waiver?

MS. ROBINSON: They have to do it every year, right. Okay? So sometimes we -- you know, we're -- right now we're reviewing for the monitoring groups, and we'll review them and we'll say, "Okay. Well, you know, you
need to take this over and I'll get a waiver." And then they don't have to do anything.

So -- I mean, so it kind of works. It works well for organizations that are working well together. But did that tribe really understand what they're doing? And we want to make sure that the tribe has understood that they waive their requirement for the school district to do that. Okay?

And one other thing is on page 36 there is a point process. And that only a tribe with authorized designee for a tribe that has children attending that school may file a written complaint with the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education regarding Indian policy and procedures.

And then the Assistant Secretary will designate a hearing examiner to conduct a hearing, but only the tribe -- a tribal representative, tribal chairman or authorized representative, but also has a child attending
the school. So like a lot of times we have --
may have parents call in and complain or
something like that. We can't do anything with
that. It has to be a tribal official.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Was there any other
questions that you all had?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I want to go back
to the weighed unit, because we have a number
of children that are military as well that are
moving around the country, Native children.

MS. ROBINSON: Right.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So the -- it is
.2 for military families who live on base.

MS. ROBINSON: 1.0 for military on
base.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Oh, 1.0 Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: .2 is for military
off base.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Military off
base. Okay.
MS. ROBINSON: 1.25 for Indian land.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Yes. I've got that.

MS. ROBINSON: Other people who live and work on the federal properties, also 1.0. So that could be like a national park, if you live on a national park, you work on a national park, that's the 1.0. So as long as you live and work on the federal property it's 1.0.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay? Low rent housing is .05, or is it .10? .05, I believe. I think it's .05. I don't have it right in front of me right now. But I know definitely parents who work on federal property only is only .10.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Any other questions for Robin?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Well, I guess just with regard to, you know, military
families, I just want to say that there is a need for support for military families as well.

MS. ROBINSON: Oh, definitely.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: There is a tremendous need. I mean, my grandchildren were in the military and living in San Diego. No air conditioning whatsoever in San Diego on the military base there. Nothing. It is very, very hot in that area, so now they have moved back to the northwest again. So they are moving, you know, across the country, and we need to pay special attention to the needs of military children as well.

MS. ROBINSON: Definitely. And they have -- as you are aware, MISA is part of the organization, and NAEP has a big group, coordinates a lot of the military parents and activities and things like that for the schools. So they do have a good organization just like yours. Denise is --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I understand.
MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you, Robin.

MS. ROBINSON: Any other questions?

MS. HUNTER: Thank you, Robin.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. So let me know if you have anything else.

MS. HUNTER: Thanks so much, Robin.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: There were some questions on Number 19 of our last year's report.

We're so glad to have you again.

DR. LYLES: Glad to be here.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Well, we are getting ready to revise our report, and going off of last year's report, looking at we have -- I think we saw our report question Number 19, and giving us some --

DR. LYLES: Some feedback, yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: -- feedback as to what your thoughts are, and then
if the -- if the rest of the Council has additional questions, we'd like to give -- and thank you for coming to meet with us.

DR. LYLES: Well, thank you. I'm -- actually, I was on my way over to -- because we actually have that -- in that Alaska Native Education Program grant competition going on right now.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Wow.

DR. LYLES: And it is -- and according to my response here, we have quite a number of Native Alaskan reviewers here with us.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Awesome.

DR. LYLES: So we did it onsite this year.

I wish we could have more. We didn't have but 12 to apply, and we selected all 12 that applied. We did a heavy push to really try to get as many reviewers that we
possibly could. So we are continuing. And this is -- even though 12 out of 30 might not be the ideal number, but it is has been -- prior to me coming, you know, we have only had one or two in the past. So we feel really proud of this work.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: That's great.

DR. LYLES: We really do. And then here we are learning a great deal from them, and I talked to a few of them yesterday while we were doing the work, and it is just a value that they bring to understanding the culture and the language within the community and how these programs and projects impact that. It's just -- it can't be overstated in terms of the value added for that. So we are just really excited about it.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you. Thank you for that, for sharing that.

Do we have any questions for her? I
think it was mainly on Number 19? I did get kind of a draft of -- "The Department agrees that Native Language and culture must be preserved in the education of indigenous community."

And then, "Since 2011, the Department has made special effort to recruit Native American and Native Alaska, Hawaiians, and Indians to participate as panel reviewers," which you just spoke to kind of a statement of that sort. So I will give this to you to --

DR. LYLES: And in addition to what I responded to in terms of also we added to our training, so -- but prior to any competition, we train our reviewers on, you know, what to expect, and so forth. So I wish I could take credit for this, but Lisa Murkowski's office recommended that we bring in a culture expert as part of that training.

We started that about three years ago, and we get better at it every year in
terms of what to talk about and how to -- but it is also informed, and really set the stage for how culture and language really impact and should be considered as our reviewers are looking at these grant applications, because, you know, people can write, you know, really nice applications.

You've really got to know if what they are writing is really going to inform and improve within those communities, and that is how we could have our experts having -- you know, people can write a good application, and we need people to be able to distinguish between what is real and what's not.

MEMBER THOMAS: You spoke about the Alaska group coming in reviewing.

DR. LYLES: They're here.

MEMBER THOMAS: What other groups have you had involving in other Native people on reviewing panels?

DR. LYLES: So I have two
programs. That is the Native Alaskan and the Native Hawaiian. I do the same thing. It's mirrored with the Native Hawaiian. For my other programs, like the teacher, I don't have it anymore. But when we had a teacher incentive fund, which is about teacher quality, and so forth, we work very diligently from not only Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives, but the diversity had to be there because we have children who are -- that we really need to focus on who need to have the teachers in the classrooms really paying attention to their needs.

And that's what the teacher incentive fund was about. So for those programs, we did a real heavy push for reviewers of all types. And we were very successful. The reviewers, when you looked at like for the teacher incentive fund program, which is not cultural language specific, but you have those cultures and different languages
within those classrooms, when you look at that
group of reviewers that we had at that
particular time, as I said, I don't run the
program anymore, it was very diverse.

So, yes, we do a heavy push --
Indian, Alaska, Native Hawaiian, just all kinds
of cultures. That's part of that. We have not
had the cultural training in those other
programs, because it was so diverse.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: What was the
official action taken by Lisa Murkowski in this
training? What was that called?

DR. LYLES: We just called it a
cultural expert that we included in our
training. So we call it peer review training,
and we brought in a cultural expert. So she
just recommended -- her office, Karen,
recommended -- so Karen recommended that maybe
we might have someone to come in and talk about
the cultural language and the uniqueness of the
needs of the children in Alaska.
So we included that in our training. It's about a 60- to 90-minute training with our reviewers for each time that we have our reviewers. We usually have a half a day training for our reviewers, and we included a culture expert.

MEMBER JOHN: May I ask about the standard or criteria you used to select the reviewers? Are they like from the school districts or tribes or university? Or how does that work?

DR. LYLES: All of it. Because when we are looking at -- and this is an important -- that is a really great question. When we are looking at the reviewers for any grant competition, we are also looking for people to bring other types of skills and knowledge.

In addition to the language and culture, we need someone who understands the -- for example, you submit an application on
building a curriculum for like their Native community, that you understand what building a curriculum looks like. Or research, using research. We have a lot of grants in these programs from universities. We want people who can really look at those grant applications and tell if there is quality, if it makes sense, is it based in best practices. So you are looking for a different variety and different types of people.

So what we did in terms -- and I hope this kind of helps to answer your question. When we build our panels, so usually there are three panel reviewers to one panel, we are looking at maybe bringing that culture or language expert or the Alaska Native to the group, so they can provide that expertise.

But we also want those folks to have the educational background, the training background, a number of different types of criteria. We also want to have someone like we
may have someone who knows about evaluation, because there is an evaluation component. And then we'll have someone that knows about the research.

So we try to blend -- when we look at the reviewer's qualifications, we just don't assign someone to a panel. We are really looking at their skills and knowledge and try to pull the right skill and knowledge together for each panel and build a panel based on that knowledge. So it's well-rounded.

Does that answer your question?

MEMBER JOHN: Yes. I was -- I have never heard of, you know, any calling for that. And I'm with the university, so I'm just curious as to what the process of --

DR. LYLES: We spell that out very clearly. You're going to make me go back and look and make sure we do, but --

(Laughter.)

-- hopefully we are explaining when
we put out our call for reviewers what the criteria are. And it is not just that you are -- you know, you have the Alaska Native background but that you have all of these other skills and knowledge as well.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Good.

MEMBER JOHN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Any other questions?

Okay. Well, we thank you. Dr. Lyles, thank you.

DR. LYLES: Welcome. And I hope you have a good stay.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Is Karen here? I think we need to tackle how to proceed from here, given that we are going to probably lose a quorum when we go into working -- if we can just motion and approve that we can do the rest with the committee. Is that
possible to do?

MS. HUNTER: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. So we are at that point now, and we're -- we've got about 45 minutes before we officially adjourn, but we can go ahead and adjourn now, but then before we adjourn I'd like to ask for a motion from someone. Who all is on? Let me make certain we have a quorum right now.

MEMBER THOMAS: Sam?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Sam, are you on still? He was leaving at noon.

MEMBER THOMAS: So I don't think we have a quorum.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We don't have a quorum.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Right. But could we set some timeframes for the work? That we are going to do some work today, but then there probably should be a conference call, and then we could schedule a full board
vote.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. That's what we're going to have to do because we lost our quorum. So we'll go ahead and adjourn. We'll adjourn now and then we'll -- the subcommittee will stay here and continue working on -- as far as we can.

MEMBER THOMAS: Well, we got approval yesterday by action for the subcommittee, so we're --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right. So I'll call for a motion to adjourn?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: So moved.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Any discussion on that?

(Laughter.)

All in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Motion approved. And thank you.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Well, I thought actually we should set those dates before we
adjourn, so they are --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Oh, yes, yes, yes.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Or can we just do it when everybody is on?

MEMBER THOMAS: That could be on the subcommittee report.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right. Yes. Okay.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:03 p.m.)