



**Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE)**

**Office of Indian Education (OIE)**

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INDIAN EDUCATION (NACIE)**

**PUBLIC MEETING**

February 7, 2013

The National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE) met in the Discovery Room II, Holiday Inn Washington Capitol, 550 C Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 8:00 a.m., Thomas Acevedo, Chairman, presiding.

**NACIE MEMBERS PRESENT**

THOMAS ACEVEDO, Chair

THERESA AREVGAQ JOHN, Member

DEREK BAILEY, Member\*

ROBIN BUTTERFIELD, Member

DEBORAH JACKSON DENNISON, Vice Chair

SAM MCCRACKEN, Member

WAYNE NEWELL, Member\*

STACY PHELPS, Member

S. ALAN RAY, Member

VIRGINIA THOMAS, Member

PATRICIA WHITEFOOT, Member

\*Participating via teleconference

FEDERAL PARTICIPANTS

KAREN AKINS, OC Committee Manager

JAMES DEATON, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

JENELLE LEONARD, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

ALFRED LOTT, Director, OESE/Office of Impact Aid

CARLAS McCAULEY, Acting Director, OESE/Office of School Turnaround

JOYCE SILVERTHORNE, Director, Office of Indian Education

FRAN WALTER, Group Leader, OESE/School Support and Rural Programs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order .....5  
 Thomas Acevedo, Chair

Roll Call .....5

Administrative Matters..... 6, 10  
 Thomas Acevedo, Chair

Overview of Process of Presentation of Recommendations  
 Thomas Acevedo, Chair .....7

Report to the Secretary of Education ..... 11  
 Deborah Jackson-Dennison, Vice Chair

Recommendation 1..... 11, 14

Introductory Paragraphs of Letter to Secretary Duncan ..... 12  
 S. Alan Ray, Member

General Discussion of Recommendations to the Secretary and  
 Annual Report to Congress, Timelines and Process..... 15

Remarks ..... 29  
 Alfred Lott, Director, OESE/Office of Impact Aid Program

    Questions and Comments..... 31

Remarks ..... 38  
 Fran Walter, Group Leader, OESE/School Support and  
 Rural Programs

    Questions and Comments..... 47

Remarks ..... 57  
 James Deaton, Statistician, National Center for Education  
 Statistics National Indian Education Studies

    Questions and Comments..... 65

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Comments Regarding Prioritization of Funds for States with Gaps ..... 70  
Stacey Phelps, Member

Engagement and Outcomes..... 71  
Carlas McCauley, Acting Director, OESE/Office of School  
Turnaround Engagement and Outcomes

Business Meeting..... 89

    Motion Regarding the STEP Pilot Project..... 89

    Motion that NCES Closely Align with OIE..... 91

    Motion to Direct the Secretary to and Formula, to LEAs and  
Communities that Have Achievement Gaps for American Indians,  
and in the Case of SEAs, They Do So with the SEAs Working  
Collaboratively with the Local LEAs.....98

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:11 a.m.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Greg Anderson? Greg will not be here.

Therese John?

MS. AREVGAQ JOHN: Here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Derek Bailey? Derek is on the phone.

Robin?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Deborah?

MS. JACKSON-DENNISON: Here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Sam?

MR. McCracken: Here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Stacy?

MR. PHELPS: Here

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Alan?

MR. RAY: Here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Alyce? I know she is absent.

Virginia?

MS. THOMAS: Here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: MaryJane is absent.

Patricia?

MS. WHITEFOOT: Here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: We have a quorum.

We are convening the second day of our meeting on the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

With that, let's start our discussion. Or is there any other business you want to talk about before we start our recommendations to the Secretary?

MEMBER NEWELL: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Yes?

MEMBER NEWELL: I didn't hear you call my name. Or did I miss that?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Wayne?

MEMBER NEWELL: Present.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you.

Other business before we start? Any administrative things we need to do?

MEMBER NEWELL: Tomorrow I am not sure if -- I hope I don't make the quorum. We are expecting a blizzard, and I am supposed to be on the road. So, I don't know whether or not I will be able to call in. So, I just wanted to let you know that. Hopefully, I won't be the one that makes the quorum.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Jenelle?

MS. LEONARD: Mr. Chairman, you might to canvass and find out how many people will be here, because I think some people are leaving tonight and will be on the phone tomorrow. So, we need to see if we will have a quorum for tomorrow.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Question: any of you leaving tonight? Stacy, Patricia, and we will miss Wayne. So, that is three.

MEMBER PHELPS: I will be on the phone.

MS. LEONARD: Stacy is going to be on the phone.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Oh, you are going to be able to call in?

MEMBER PHELPS: Is that possible?

MS. LEONARD: Right.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Yes. Okay. All right. Okay.

The other housekeeping matter that we need to talk about is, if you have got your forms ready for your lunch, we will take from you. She can call in now and do credit card orders for you or take cash, either way.

The second thing is Jenelle mentioned this morning, those of you who have been to the White House in the past or to the Old Executive Office Building, it will take us, as Jenelle says, the full hour. So, as soon as we close here a little before 1:00, we will get in the cab. We will head straight over to the Old Executive Office Building and try to get through all the required clearances, and then locate the room we are supposed to be in, all at the same time. So, it will be a challenge.

MEMBER THOMAS: Let us get done early.

MS. AKINS: Aren't we coming back tomorrow, though?

MEMBER THOMAS: Do we have the address?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Room 474.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: Room 474. It is in the Eisenhower Executive Office Building, room 474.

MS. AKINS: I am pretty sure, once you get there, they are really good about directing you where you are supposed to go, so people aren't wandering around. Trust me. They will probably have people leading you right to where you need to go.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: With that said, before we start our discussion regarding the recommendations to Secretary Duncan, the approach that Deborah and I are going to use at our presentation on behalf of the Council, I will do an overview of who we are from the perspective of the work that we have done in the past and our reports to the Hill.

I will also, then, go into a discussion regarding our new responsibilities as outlined in the President's Executive Order. And then, Deborah is going to cover our key areas of priorities that we have worked on, and that should take the time that they have allotted to us to do that. So, that is our plan for us.

MEMBER NEWELL: Before you start, Mr. Chairman, I have one last question. I have been getting in the email something about a panel I am supposed to be on. Does anybody know anything about that? It is concerning NACIE.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: We don't have any information on that. I am looking at Jenelle. Nothing here from our end.

MEMBER NEWELL: Okay. Well, it sounded official, and it is scheduled for two o'clock and I know that you were doing other things at two o'clock.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: All right. Here is what that is, Wayne. There is at the Old Executive Office Building, the White House is hosting the Interagency Working Group in compliance with the President's Executive Order.

And so, we will be adjourning just before one o'clock here and, then, going over to the Old Executive Office Building and being a part of the remarks that are there. So, you are going to miss that, Wayne.

MEMBER NEWELL: Well, they gave me a telephone number to connect to. So, I might not.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Well, good. All right.

MEMBER NEWELL: Yes.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: You will have a chance then. Good.

MEMBER NEWELL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you.

Any other housekeeping matters?

(No response.)

If not, I am prepared to have you all start to talk about recommendations to the Secretary and try to get that formatted, so that we can meet that obligation and get that in the hands of Secretary Duncan.

MEMBER NEWELL: I could not open the document, the stuff that you sent me and that little computer thing to do. Is it possible for somebody to fax that to me, if it is not a long document, recommendations that you are going to be talking about?

MS. LEONARD: Yes, we will do that. We will do it right now.

MEMBER NEWELL: I will give you a fax number.

MS. LEONARD: Okay.

MEMBER NEWELL: 207-796-2726.

MS. LEONARD: Okay.

MEMBER NEWELL: Thank you.

MS. LEONARD: Let me repeat it. 207-796-2726?

MEMBER NEWELL: That's correct.

MS. LEONARD: Okay. We'll take care of it.

MEMBER NEWELL: Thank you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: A housekeeping matter. Tom, I just had a question about the Working Group meeting. Is somebody going to be outlining the diversity of the Native students that are in the country? I am hoping somebody has that information.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Ask the question again.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Is somebody going to be outlining the diversity of Native students, those that are served through public education, Bureau-funded schools, et cetera? Do we know?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Oh, you mean the demographics?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: I don't know if we have that.

Jenelle, do we have it?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: During this Interagency Working Group, I am just thinking, because the various agencies do not necessarily know that.

MS. LEONARD: And I am thinking, since it is a White-House-sponsored meeting, and you have Jodi Gillette there, that that information would be available and shared.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay. Good.

MS. LEONARD: Yes.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I just want to make certain.

MS. LEONARD: Yes. Now that is just my thought.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I just think that is important to highlight, demographics and the diversity of where those students are.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: We don't have that information in front of us; I know that, yes.

MS. LEONARD: And I don't have it available to me, either. Maybe Bill, we could see that is something that Bill would have, but we will try to get in touch with him to see if they will take care of it, or if that is something that is part of their presentation. I'm not sure. Okay?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Being that we only have 10 to 15 minutes, I think that it just needs to be a general statement. It doesn't need to be getting into the detailed demographics. The percentage of students that attend, what school they attend, what the makeup, how many tribes, just a real simple, general overview is all we need.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: The other part is where they are disadvantaged because, if you look at the list of people speaking, you know, it is going to the Secretary, it is going to be the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, and then, we have got the National Center for Education Studies. We have got Bill speaking. We have got Brian Draper from the BIE. So, we don't know what their topics are and how broad they are covering sort of thing. So, we will have to tailor that, yes.

Go ahead.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. The Chair has asked me to lead the discussion and the process as to what we are going to do with the letter to Secretary Duncan. So, I don't know if we can bring that up on the screen, and if everyone has had a chance to read and go through and make comments on your own. We can start with the first one.

And these pretty much, as I mentioned, follow the similar format. The draft format follows a similar format that was submitted to the Report to Congress.

So, the first one is to "Continue to raise the profile of Indian education as a priority for the federal government." The recommendation is for an Assistant Secretary of Indian Education, that the position Assistant Secretary of Indian Education be created or reestablished within the Department of Education. And that went to both Congress and the Secretary, but I think it can go probably even deeper into the letter to the Secretary.

So, I don't know whether anyone has added anything other than what we have already added there.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Are we having someone type in the --

MEMBER THOMAS: That is why if we could bring up the red-letter copies that were up there yesterday? I left my laptop up there, but I did have two that I mentioned to you yesterday. I highlighted them, but I can't remember off the top of my head.

MEMBER RAY: I would also like to recall for us that, when we put that congressional letter together, that report, we had decided to prioritize in descending order, I think. So, No. 1, that Assistant Secretary of Education was up there at the top. So, if we want to change any of those priorities as written, this is a good time to do it, I think.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right. Okay.

I think that is still our No. 1 priority. Would you all agree? Or I don't know. I am thinking that that might be the No. 1 priority.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I think the No. 1 priority is to continue to raise the profile of Indian education within the Department and to seek greater cooperation from all departments in providing services to Native students.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Now the question becomes, even before we get into the priorities, the format, I guess. I know Dr. Ray said he would go ahead and put it together. My thinking is that it should follow a different format than the Recommendations to Congress. And so, I don't know if anyone wants to give him any ideas, or if he already has it all figured out in his head. He has already written the letter last night, I'm sure.

(Laughter)

MEMBER RAY: I was going to put it in a letter form, and it will be prefaced with a paragraph or so that puts out the process points that we made yesterday about the desirability of responses to specific items. And so, punching that up at the front, and then, whatever substance we come out with today, I was going to put that in a narrative format. So, it would be a long letter, but it would be in a letter format as opposed to the sort of outline format that we used both here in this draft and in the Report to Congress. Most people want it a different way.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: So, do you have a draft of sort of that introductory language that you could read to us?

MEMBER RAY: Yes.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Because I think it provides a context.

MEMBER RAY: Yes, I do. I would be happy to do that. And this is just a draft.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes.

MEMBER RAY: Let me pull it up here.

MEMBER THOMAS: Who is controlling the thing up there? Could we scroll down a little bit towards the bottom, so we get the full, the red comments?

MEMBER RAY: Okay, I will read this introduction that I drafted out. Of course, anybody who wants to make any changes feel free to suggest it.

"Dear Secretary Duncan:

And this is in Tom's voice, as Chairman.

"I write as Chair of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE) to offer the Council's annual recommendations to the Secretary of Education for the improvement of educational opportunities for Native Americans. This letter supplements NACIE's Report to Congress dated" -- fill in the blank.

Paragraph 2. "Consistent with our role as the primary consultative body for Indian education in the United States, we believe it is imperative that regular, focused dialogs on specific NACIE recommendations be established. These dialogs would occur between NACIE and your office, as well as the leadership of the Interagency Working Group established under" -- cite federal regulations. "As often as possible, they would be held in conjunction with regular NACIE meetings.

Paragraph. "The focus of these dialogs would include, but not be limited to receiving your response and that of the President's Interagency Working Group to the specific recommendations for Indian education set forth in this letter and its successors and in our Annual Report to Congress. We believe that feedback to our concrete proposals is critical if federal work on Indian education at all levels is to proceed in a focused, coordinated, and effective manner. Such feedback is also necessary if NACIE is to fulfill its congressional and presidential mandates. We look forward to beginning this dialogs soon."

Paragraph, then the lead-in: "The following represents NACIE's substantive proposals to your office. They are presented in what we consider descending order of priority. Please let me know if any are unclear or require elaboration."

That's what I threw together.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you, Alan.

Any comments? Suggestions?

(No response.)

We will go ahead and move with the substance of the letter then.

So, the first is, again, "Continue to raise the profile of Indian education as a priority for the federal government."

Is there anything in here that we want to change or leave the same, or what is the recommendation of the Council?

No. 1 is the Assistant Secretary of Indian Education.

No. 2 is the Native language teachers.

No. 3 is Native language and technical assistance.

We have a bullet that says "undecided". I don't remember what we were thinking there. We have rationale, and then it says "undecided," and it goes into the rationale under No. 3.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I believe the "undecided" just referred to whether it was to be placed in the Report to Congress or to the Secretary. But I think in this instance it should be to the Secretary because it deals with technical assistance.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

We have two No. 3's. I don't know if we made a typo there. But the second No. 3 is Common Core Standards. Yes, so that must be No. 4.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I want to go back to the "undecided". To me, that would be more along the line of federal/tribal/state relations in that federal legislation doesn't always translate to the best interest of the tribes when it comes through the state. So, I would highlight it as something like that.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I agree, and I did talk to some people out in the field that are very -- as I was telling Virginia yesterday, I did get some feedback from people in my area that are strong proponents of Native language. And I don't know if it would fall under No. 2 or No. 3, but I did get some recommendations from people in the different school systems that have Native language programs, and including my own school system.

So, I will forward that to -- I don't know who we want to send it to. My problem is I only have my iPad and I have to email it to someone that can put it into the actual letter, the draft that we have going.

MEMBER RAY: Could I ask where in the document would this, then, be moved, if I understand correctly?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I think the order is still the same.

MEMBER RAY: Okay.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: It is just a matter of the substance that needs to go into it. I don't know why we had "undecided," but I think we were trying to figure out, if I recall, it was several of us working in one of the rooms across the way that were trying to decide where that would go, what would go there, or whether it would go into No. 2 or No. 3. So, maybe that is why we have two No. 3's. I don't know.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Well, the word "undecided" is right in the place under each one of the recommendations where we either say "Congress/Secretary". So, I think that word only deals with that decision of where to put it.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: So, I would just disregard that because we are working on the Secretary letter, and it does fit in that.

MEMBER RAY: Yes, and I will include it there.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes, yes.

If I could just make a comment, I am a little frustrated with this process because this is so rough at this point. I think maybe what would be the most helpful is that all of this needs to be reworked, obviously. It is very rough, and that is probably more effectively done with a smaller committee.

So, in the larger group, what we should be focusing on, I suggest, is just are these the key ideas. And then, whoever is going to do the wordsmithing, we can sort of leave some of that to a smaller group.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. I agree. I think that would be more -- and then, give some dates when we need to make it finalized by.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And then, the Subcommittee can, just like we did the Report to Congress.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I just wanted to be sure we are on the same page in terms of what we are doing because we could get really bogged down here.

MEMBER RAY: I agree with that. As someone who may be doing that wordsmithing, or whoever it is, I think it is imperative that we get the list and in the right priorities. That would just simply save time when the drafting comes around.

My intent, if I were doing it right now, would be to take this language and the first step would be to craft it into short, narrative paragraphs to see if it hangs together, and if there are conspicuous things we need to add, just flag those. And then, I would send it around the Subcommittee when it is all put together in that way, so people could augment it or correct it.

So, with any luck, we could do one turnaround in the Subcommittee, and then I could polish it final, and send it out to you guys and to Tom, something like that.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I agree.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I agree.

MEMBER RAY: Okay.

MEMBER THOMAS: This is Virginia.

I think that is really helpful because there are some of the notes in red that we all don't have memory of and it flashes by real fast, that we needed to add to these things that we have discussed yesterday. So, that is an excellent idea to give us a little time to put this where we need to be onto this.

MEMBER RAY: It does raise a question of what is our timeline to get this thing turned around. Is there an external driver to doing this? As a drafter, I would like to get this thing done within the next three weeks.

MEMBER THOMAS: I think yesterday's conversation was as soon as possible. I think that was the comments made.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: As Subchair of this Committee, we would like to have it sent to the Secretary by March 15th. Is that a good date?

MEMBER RAY: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: That give us some time to work on it as a Subcommittee, and then, also, work with Dr. Ray. And I am thankful to Dr. Ray for agreeing to do this. He did an excellent job with the Report to Congress as well.

MEMBER RAY: Thank you, Debbie. I am glad to do it.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Let me just interject for a second.

Wayne, did you get the fax that we sent to you?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Well, I don't know where Wayne.

And then, so we do need to have a Subcommittee meeting shortly after we adjourn from this meeting here in Washington. And then, we need to have somebody from -- Jenelle here or someone to coordinate that.

MS. LEONARD: I will. Yes, I will do that.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MS. LEONARD: Yes, I will do that.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. I am thinking probably early next week sometime.

MS. LEONARD: Okay. What I will do is, before you leave, well, by the time you return to the meeting tomorrow, I will send out a doodle, and you can let me know.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MS. LEONARD: Okay?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Now, remember, we did have challenges with the Report to Congress. So, I just want to remind the Subcommittee that we can't afford to have those challenges. We need to get this out, and timelines are really important for the benefit of our whole objective of what we are working toward accomplishing. So, if we are on this Subcommittee and we agree to be part of this, we need to get on the phone when we say we are going to get on. And I was guilty of it, too, at one point because I was caught up in a meeting somewhere. So, we know what it is like back when we are back in our home workplace, but we do need to remember the time difference, too, that everybody is on. So, that is one of the problems that we have come into.

And then, also, the election took place. And so, it was just really hard to get things moving at that time. But this time we really do need to stick with that March 15th deadline, I want to remind the Committee.

MEMBER RAY: Could you remind us who is on the Subcommittee?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. There was myself and Virginia, Greg, Patsy, and Robin.

Anybody else want to join?

MEMBER PHELPS: I volunteer Sam.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: No, you weren't on it, Sam, were you?

MEMBER McCracken: No.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Okay, then, I guess we can move on with other business.

MEMBER THOMAS: I would like to make a recommendation from the Subcommittee. When we get a chance to look this over, and if we get the red copy to us --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MEMBER THOMAS: -- you know, we can make recommendations over to Alan and say, "Could you please add this into it?" and "See where you could put this into it." We could give the input to Alan prior to where we get the first draft.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. So, if we could get that draft sent out to the Subcommittee and then, any other additional -- because I know some of you have some additional things that you have been working on since last night; get those to Alan as well and see what he can do with it and come up with.

And then, by the time we have a meeting set next week sometime -- I would like it to be early in the week, if possible -- that we are able to have a document to work off of when we are all online.

MEMBER RAY: I should interpose as to my availability. I am actually traveling all of next week.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MEMBER RAY: So, I don't know if that will influence what you want to do, but I would be able to jump into this the following week.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Okay. Let me see my calendar.

MS. LEONARD: May I suggest something in terms of the working document? And I am looking at our contractor to see if we could put it in the working space, you know, [nacie-ed.org](http://nacie-ed.org), and there is a private working space for members only. And so, if we could put it there, then you will have access to it immediately.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay.

MS. LEONARD: Okay? So, we will work with the contractor to have a common working space. And if other members wanted to see progress being made on it, updates to it, it would be available in the private working space.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Okay. Go ahead.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I think, since we know who the Subcommittee members are, why don't we, before we leave, set the date ourselves without Jenelle having to go through polling us.

We can just sit down with our calendars and set the time when we need to meet before we leave, so that we have that already.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: That sounds good. I just don't want to get into forgetting and making certain that our Chair holds us to it as well, that we do get this done by March 15th. So, just a reminder for everyone.

MS. AKINS: Mr. Chair and Chairwoman Dennison-Jackson, I just wanted to remind you, too, before the March 15th, the Subcommittee also just needs to make sure that they roll it out for the full Council to review and sign off on. So, that needs to go through Jenelle when you have your "final" final. They need to send it out for the entire Council to review and sign off on. So, I just want to be sure I point that out, so you can build that into your timeline.

MEMBER THOMAS: I have a question to Karen. When you say it is for review and to finalize, does that mean that we need to call a special meeting or something for action?

MS. AKINS: Not necessarily. Not necessarily. Jenelle could send it out to all of the members, and unless anyone has any serious objections, they could just send their approval straight to her and, then, that is it.

MEMBER THOMAS: Oh, okay.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: We are going to push the date to March 29th then, and give a couple more weeks for that process to take place. It was just like what we did with the Report to Congress. Everybody got a copy and we were able to give it a read-through and give it a thumbs-up, and then let Jenelle know. And then, it went through the process. So, March 29th, but that extra two weeks is not to drag it out further, but to give us some time for the process to be sent out to everyone and to have that two weeks to review.

MEMBER RAY: Debbie, not to divert to a completely different subject, but I was just thinking, with the June 30 deadline for the report, you know, backing that work up into the spring, I was wondering if -- this is, I guess, to the Chair -- are we going to be having another NACIE meeting telephonically between now and the end of June that would produce information that would be captured in that report?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Excellent question. I think we do need one, a telephonic one. We did, as you know, a year ago we did one as well to work that out. So, we need to send out a doodle on that, so that we will agree to -- it usually takes -- what did it take us, two days last time, or one day did we do it? I can't recall. Two, yes.

Go ahead, Jenelle.

MS. LEONARD: Actually, one for the telephonic it was one.

Mr. Chair, may I make a couple of suggestions?

For this meeting, there was a hope that at least you will begin to discuss your plans for, and set some timelines for, your Report to Congress as well. So, it is kind of like a two-report action this time, as well as you would set your meetings, which Dr. Ray is referring to, Alan Ray is referring to.

And there are two additional meetings, too, that you are going to add on. So, it is kind of to think through, if you are going to have three meetings, what are the three meetings for. And if it is the second meeting, is it for to solely concentrate on completing that Report to Congress by June? And then, if you have meetings after then, is it to work on the EO? So, hopefully, you can get that accomplished before the end of the meeting this time.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: My suggestion to the Council would be that we do have -- I mean, we have already bifurcated, and we will get the Secretary -- I think we have the dates locked on that. So, that one is fine.

And then, Alan's question is appropriate with respect to our next scheduled meeting, and it will be by telephone, to deal with the recommendations or the Report to Congress. So, that will need to take place.

There is always a built-in delay because it comes back to all of you here. So, what was our deadline last year?

MEMBER RAY: The end of May, as I recall.

MS. LEONARD: Correct.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: All right. So, one would expect that we will need to meet no later than the first part of May to discuss it, and then, being able to put it together, to get it to you all by the end of May, I think.

MS. LEONARD: Will there be a separate Subcommittee working on the recommendations for the Report to Congress, the Annual Report to Congress?

MEMBER RAY: The same group? Yes. I am volunteering myself to be on that Committee, if that will be helpful to you all.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes, I think we did a lot of the work last year because we came in a day early -- remember that? -- and we worked on it. Several of us were here a day early, and we put the substance of this past year's Report to Congress. A lot of will, I'm sure, still continue with just adding the different -- I guess we would probably want to put some of the challenges that we have come across, and then, also, if there is anything else that needs to go into it. I don't know what everyone else's thoughts are.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I agree. I don't think a whole lot has changed because so much has been kind of tabled because of what is happening legislatively.

However, one of the missing pieces, at least for me, is we were promised to get summaries of all those consultation hearings and the roundtables. And I think if there are any recommendations from those summaries that we could include that would be very helpful, because I have never seen any document that kind of captured that. I thought we were supposed to get something. Am I off base?

MS. SILVERTHORNE: There was a summary of consultations in the first two years, "Tribal Leaders Speak". And that has been distributed on several occasions. I don't remember an actual mailing just to NACIE as NACIE members. But, as a matter of fact, they will be available this afternoon.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: The roundtables were held after that.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: The roundtables were held after that, and there isn't a mechanism to get a summary done. We haven't had bodies on hand to try and do that. We attempted last summer to work through an intern that we had from the Udall Foundation. It turned out to not be something

that worked well with an intern. Too much background, too much -- it just didn't work well for a summary.

We had some funding for the initial summary of the two years of consultation, but it came from upstairs. It wasn't through our office. And so, we are kind of on hold with that.

The transcripts are online. The raw transcripts are all online at Indian-Ed.gov. I can get that address to you shortly here.

MEMBER THOMAS: This is Virginia.

I think the only thing that came up yesterday that I understood that we would want to add to this Annual Report was the response back from Committee or have reports back from staffers or something, that we could suggest that in our Annual Report, say this is as a follow-through, because we didn't have that in the last report. We didn't ask if we could get a response back. And maybe this time we should.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I agree, and I am also wondering if that should be mentioned today, that we want to have a response back. That is one of the main things that we are really pushing for, is a response back from Congress, even though they never respond. We want to start that new expectation.

MEMBER THOMAS: I think Jenelle was very clear and correct yesterday. If we don't ask, we are not going to get it, you know. So, it is our responsibility to ask.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Just to clarify and add to what Deb has said, I do have that, the mention that it is a black hole, words to that effect. How's that? So, I will say something about that.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I had a quick question about the report process, about the possibility of us including photos rather than just a written report. What is the criteria for putting the report together for Congress?

MS. LEONARD: It is your call. It is your call. It is your report.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MS. LEONARD: And it is however you want to present the information.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Graphs, et cetera, those kinds of things?

MS. LEONARD: Yes, the graphs or pictures, they don't cost any extra.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MS. LEONARD: This is including in the document itself.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MS. LEONARD: There is no extra cost, no. So, it is your call. It is whatever you want to put in the report.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Oh, okay.

MS. LEONARD: Yes. They have not given us a template for you to follow or anything. It is however creative you want to be, how much information you want it to be, however long you want it to be. It is yours.

And I can say, by example, I have, I think, four reports that I submit to Congress for my office. And the reports vary from 25 pages to 200 pages. So, it is just however much information you want to share with Congress.

MS. AKINS: Jenelle, the only reason why I asked about cost is one of our Committees recently submitted something to Congress. So, if the Council decides that they want something bound or anything like that, I just want them to give you the heads-up, so that if there is something that may cost more, you will know ahead of time.

It is their report, but I am saying if they get into where they want, if the Council wants something bound or anything like that, just to be sure they let you know ahead of time, so if there is any roadblock to that, especially since they are telling us about cost-prohibitive things coming up and cost cuts, and so on and so forth. So, I just don't want us to promise that we can bind it or do glossy pictures or plastic covers if we are not able to

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I think Patsy raises a really good point. You know, we do have a lot of new legislators. Perhaps we need to think a little more thoughtfully about kind of the report.

I like the idea of possibly some graphs. And I was thinking, because we have limited time, adapting perhaps. You know, we had worked at NIA, in cooperation with NEA, to create the "Native Education 101," the little booklet that basically describes the whole arena of Indian education, that you have all these variety of types of schools, percentages of students in public versus Bureau. You know, it just was kind of a quick overview. Possibly even attaching that kind of a document to our report -- we don't have to reinvent the wheel -- or lifting a couple of sort of the key ideas from something like that for the report.

But we might need to meet a little sooner, like the last part of April, to give us a little more time to put the report together. It may have some stuff that we already have, but just to organize it, so that it would be something that you could just hand to a congressional person and it would be all self-inclusive of what we want to say.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: I was just looking to Patsy. What is the "Gee whiz" back there you are looking for, so that Congress will actually or the staff will actually read our report? Do you have a secret?

(Laughter)

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Yes, I just think, you know, we are all educators and we know that pictures make a difference and graphs make a difference. And it is just that we are doing the same thing that has been done to our own children historically, just given them the data, but not helping to walk them through about Indian education and Indian country.

And the work that we did with NEA of those graphs, I think really make a difference. I don't think I am talking about colored photos, those kinds of things, glossy; just something simple to put in front of Congress, men and women, to educate. It is an education tool, and we should take this opportunity to be able to educate the new folks that are in town.

And we have new people taking new positions on our behalf, the Native Caucuses both in the House and the Senate Committees. You know, it is important for us, I think, to be able to educate them. They want to know. So, I am all in favor of us making this drastic change.

MEMBER RAY: I also like that idea.

I will also note that the new element to the environment in which we are writing is the addition of the Interagency Working Group and our role in that. And specifically, that we are essentially charged with more than a coordinating and oversight role to this, not just to the Working Group, but to the whole initiative.

So, I think rather than burrow into the kinds of issues, well, into the way that we have done it in the past, we are going to write it, I think, in a way that asserts the proper role that we have in this discussion, according to Congress. And that may mean we speak to the work of the Interagency Working Group. We don't want to be duplicative of whatever reports they generate, but I think that there is a role here for us to speak to that as well that we haven't had in the past.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Well, I am also on a Committee; you know, Secretary Sebelius appointed me to a Committee. And every time I come into town, it is always education of the staff of, you know, the whole Mental Health Division, Substance Abuse and Mental Health. It is always educating, and I think that is important. Also, I think about educating this Interagency Working Group as well and their agency heads.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: I am really glad that Patsy brings this up because it is an issue that I feel is part of the problem. We are trying to teach our children back home. You know, they are in a digital era. Most of them, if not all of them, and many of us, are not as quick on our feet when it comes to electronics and everything.

And one of the things that happens when we end up meeting with staffers up on the Hill on different issues, and we don't really ever see the Congressmen or women themselves, but we have a short amount of time. What I have found to be very beneficial when we meet on the Hill with people or we are talking to people is to have a nice, simple brochure or something real quick with a few pictures and the bullet points of like talking points of what our different, maybe five or six of what we are going to go over today, just right there, ready in a handout, and we are talking off the top of our head. And then, you say, "Oh, it's in the report that went to you, and here is the brochure that goes with it."

And something of that nature, it helps because you have got to remember that most of the staffers up there nowadays are of the generation that have been raised with that type of -- so, just a hands-on, quick brochure or something of that nature would really help us when we are making our trips and talking about it, and asking, if we are really wanting to hold accountable.

But that is my thought exactly, is here we prepare these big documents and we expect them to read it in their spare time. You know it doesn't get read.

MEMBER McCracken: I love the idea. I work in that environment every day about visual, right?

And heard from our agency over there that resources are an issue around that. How about if we created something, but looked for someone to sponsor the cost of building the document? Is that in compliance with the work that we are doing? So that we can create the document that is impactful and can send the appropriate message.

MS. AKINS: We will have to check that, Sam, and let you know. I know it has been done, but -- yes.

MEMBER McCracken: It is a general question. I mean, you can let the Committee know. I just wanted to bring that up. If that is an option, then there might be someone willing to help support the information because it is beneficial to the people we are here representing. So, I just wanted to bring that up as a recommendation.

MS. LEONARD: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Jenelle?

MS. LEONARD: Before you segue and close the session out, a couple of things I wanted to follow up on that are administrative.

During the course of the meeting, it has been suggested that the various reports, summary reports, be presented to the Council in order for you to make informed decisions. For tomorrow, can we, for the record, identify what those standing reports would be, so that we have it on record, and I will be very clear, have a clear understanding of what I need to do to have those reports prepared for you, and either sent to you before coming to the meeting or have them at the meeting?

Robin has mentioned a couple of reports throughout the meeting that she would like to see prepared for the meeting. So, for instance, the summary of the roundtables. I think budget was one. A summary of the EEO activities. All of those reports, they are being talked about, but I would like for you to define them and say this is exactly what we want, so I have my marching orders as to how to make that happen during the interim period of the meetings.

And following up with what Patsy had said about including graphs and charts, and so forth, in the Report to Congress, if there are data that you want -- and I am really talking about validated data that you want to include in your report, like data coming from the National Indian Ed Study, something for every recommendation, not every recommendation, but for recommendations, to have some evidence of data that supports your recommendations or gives some rationale or justification for your recommendations.

We have Alfred Lott sitting here. Impact Aid, if there is data that you need from Impact Aid and you would request it, then I would ask Alfred to provide that data. If it is the Comp Centers, if it is the STEP program, whatever, or it could be Indian ed, their budget, whatever data that you need to support your recommendations, I just need the request coming from the Council, so that we at Ed can be like busy little bees, providing that data for you to include in your Report to Congress.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: I would also like to add that there are some things that are relatively quick to access, to be able to use. I am going to pass around five of the bookmarks that have been developed by the NCES folks, and they have access to some of the artwork that has already been purchased, already is available. And so, some of that is possible.

Also, you will remember that a number of years ago we had the calendars where we had student artwork. The student artwork became our artwork. In the release of those, the artwork stayed with us. We have them in places around the office, and you saw some of them on your brochures about OIE that were handed out yesterday. That is some of the artwork that is possible.

So, those are things that are already available that also enhance the appearance of the report that could be utilized.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you.

With that, I would like to transition over to Director Lott, who is here. He is the Director of the Office of Impact Aids.

With that, welcome.

MR. LOTT: Good morning, everybody.

My name is Alfred Lott. I am the Impact Aid Program Director. From all of my 29 people, greetings and welcome back to Washington, D.C.

I have four slides. Jill, my program attorney, was good enough to give me a copy of your recommendations that you all made last year, and I studied that a little bit and I came up with four slides that are packed with information that I think will be relevant to this Council about Indian education.

All right. The first slide is to talk about the appropriations. As you all know, Impact Aid is about a \$1 billion or \$1.2 billion program. About a billion of those dollars goes to our Section 8003 program, which is federally-connected children, of which children who are receiving free educations and living on Indian lands, of course, are a part of that group.

As we looked at this year and the budget issues -- I will just use that word -- and a six-month CR, we tried to get as much money as we could because we aren't forward-funded like some other programs. So, the monies that are going out for the 2013 applications, we are doing that now. Of course, those school districts have budgeted for that money in this current school year.

Thanks to John Forkenbrock and his connections one place or another on the Hill and within Ed, Impact Aid, instead of getting a six-month CR, which would have been \$550 million, we were able to get \$845 million, which is tantamount to a nine-month CR or two-thirds of what we would normally get, based on the '12 appropriation.

As a result of that, the good news is that we were able to distribute monies, initial payments, to LEAs who were eligible -- and many of those are in Indian country -- at the 70 percent of LOT rate, rather than 45 percent, which was very helpful to most districts, especially those in Indian country who don't get as much money from other sources, as opposed to some LEAs. And of course, some of them are almost completely dependent on Impact Aid. So, knowing that, working with John Forkenbrock, we were able to do that, and that is a positive thing.

We were able to get \$35 million of our dollars for children with disabilities, and \$16 million was for our Section 8002 program, which has been recently revamped, as you all know about Impact Aid, and we are working on that right now.

If we were to get the monies that we got last year -- and I'm not sure that we will; I hope that we will, but I am just an administrator -- we get \$1.1 million in basic support and a total of \$48 million for children with disabilities. And we also would get construction monies up to \$17 million.

Now, I will say, we have just put out about \$13 million worth of construction grants from last year's money. I think nearly all of that money went to public schools that educate children living on Indian land. And we have more money to put out with regard to that. We have to conduct another advertisement, if I can use that term, to get the other \$4 million spent.

So, that is how much money we have, and that is sort of a short story as to how we got it. It could have been, we could have been short \$300 million, and I think it would have been dire straits. So, thanks to Forkenbrock and NAFIS and all of his connections. We all benefitted from that.

On the 2013 applications, which is what we are putting out right now, so everybody understands what happens, last January, the 31st, was the end of the application process for the 13 applications. Impact Aid, once we received those applications, we had between the end of January and the 30th of September to review those 1200 applications and have them ready for payment for a theoretical or an actual appropriation 1 October, where from that point I have 60 days from the appropriation to pay the initial payments, which are significant.

So, based on what I have just told you, here is where we stand with that. We had about that number, 1163 eligible applications. We set the payment rate at 70 percent of LOT because of the limits we had on funding. And of course, as you all know, the Anti-Deficiency Act makes it a crime to over obligate the government. So, we have to make sure we don't do that.

We established \$800 per waived student unit for children with disabilities. Now the good news that we paid 1116 LEAs at their initial payment at 70 percent of LOT, which equals almost 96 percent. So, we are doing quite well on that, which totals out so far, of that \$845 million, we paid out \$779.4 million to date.

I have done some reorganization and made some adjustments in the program to become more efficient, without making mistakes, of course, and those changes are paying off for us.

Now here is another slide, which is particularly relevant to this Council, I believe. This shows you that we have 628 applicants that claim children living on Indian land, which is about half of

our applications. That equals 123,000 children living on Indian lands, and that is quite a large number, of course.

We paid out \$442 million in basic support, which is what we call B1, not to start speaking in that kind of language, but it is what it is. But B1, initial support to public school districts educating children on Indian land who claim them, and \$14.3 million has gone to LEAs who have children who are living on Indian lands that have disabilities. And the total is \$456 million of the money that we have right now.

So, what I wanted to do was arm you all, so you will have that information and that much of an understanding of how much funding has gone from the Congress through Impact Aid out directly to the LEAs.

And I believe there is one more slide. Oops, I'm going backwards here. I'm sorry.

When I was reading your recommendations and your report last year, it was obvious there was concern about the Section 8009 Equalization Program that exists. Presently, for '13, we have three states that are approved for equalization: Alaska, Kansas, and New Mexico. And the evidence indicates that those states apply and/or are approved every year. It is just a matter of fact.

And so far, for '14, which is where we have an organized hair-on-fire experience, what happens in Impact Aid. Because once we get our applications in, we have to really work hard to review the applications, and we are doing that with '14 right now. And so, that is what our people are over there logging and checking and working feverishly, dedicated federal employees doing their job.

But we have also got an application from New Mexico already for '14, for your information. And, of course, the deadline is listed right there.

And that concludes the data that I wanted to present to your organization. I would be happy to take any questions about the Impact Aid Program.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you.

Questions?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you, Mr. Lott. It is always good to see you, and thank you for the work that you do on behalf of Impact Aid and the Indian children.

I just have a question, and, of course, you know I am a proponent of Impact Aid, NAFIS and everything, the work that happens up there. And just a challenge that we have -- and I know you are aware of this, but I just didn't know -- schools that are high LOT districts that serve 100 percent Indian lands were held up and the money held back year after year. And if there is a way that, as we struggle -- like right now there are a couple of districts out in my area that are really struggling, including my own school district, really struggling to make ends meet. In fact, when I left Monday, I wasn't even sure if I was going to come because we started to implement the RIF process.

MR. LOTT: Right.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: And it is really getting difficult out there, and it is hard for people to comprehend what is really happening here because it is just very difficult.

And so, I am wondering, what are the chances of getting to school districts that are high LOT districts, like the one I work in and others that are out there, that you know the data is what it is and it is not going to really change much as far as the claims of being 100 percent. But, yet, there is money held back year after year. And I am looking at my own records. For us, it is \$1.6 million that is being held back because of trying to go in and make certain, I guess evaluate the data and make certain everything is accurate. So, I am just wondering what the chances are of releasing some of that to schools to get a relief to know what our real figure is going to be.

MR. LOTT: Well, I think I got your question. For others, after the initial payments -- and, of course, I mention the 60-day rule -- after that, that normally takes up about, you know, 80 to 90 percent of the appropriation if we get a full appropriation. And then, the cycle from the application is about two and a half years from the application to closing out that year.

And there are a number of issues within particular school years, a number of issues with certain LEAs which precludes us from paying all the money out because we would leave people out potentially, which is the problem.

And so, we are working to get better at the review process, so we can cut that critical timeline from two years and three months to a year and a half, which is what I am working on as an administrator, keeping in consideration the statutes and the regs that the lawyers keep reminding me of, but we have to do that.

I will say one thing, though, for this particular year. I realize that this is stressful because the 70 percent LOT is the lowest LOT rate I think ever in the history of Impact Aid. Two years ago, it is my understanding -- I wasn't here then -- the initial payment was 90 percent of LOT. But, fortunately, there was a full appropriation and life was simpler.

Whenever Congress takes its action with this particular budget, and we get an appropriation like in '12 or any significant appropriation, the first thing I am going to do is sit down with my planners and my financial folks to see just how much I can raise the LOT rate up to immediately without breaking the bank.

And we did it last year. Initially, we went out with, I think, it was 45 percent of LOT. And after we got the final appropriation, we pushed it up to 85 within a matter of weeks.

Technically, it is a simple thing for us once we have already processed the applications and paid somebody. It is a matter of changing the number, going through our internal controls, and then just distributing the money. But I plan to do that as soon as we get more money.

Now, as you could see, I got 845 and I have spent -- I am getting really close to the end of the barrow for what we have so far. And I expect that once we get our heavily-impacted folks paid, which many of those are LEAs that educate children living on Indian lands, we won't have very much money at all. We will be waiting for the next round of money.

But I am working to streamline that program and at least knock six months off that.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you.

MR. LOTT: You're welcome.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I just wanted to know if we can get a copy of the PowerPoint.

MR. LOTT: Certainly. Everybody's got laptops, right? We can just attach it to an email and send it out right now, I guess.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: It is on our site already. The PowerPoint is on our site now. Will we be able to list that to NACIE-ED? And you will have it immediately then.

MR. LOTT: Okay. Great.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Any other questions?

MEMBER THOMAS: I do. I just want some clarification here.

You know, the LOT that you have up there, you said that 70 percent --

MR. LOTT: That's right.

MEMBER THOMAS: When does it ever reach 100 percent that they get this? Has it ever come to that point? Do they get it in time?

MR. LOTT: Well, that is a really good question. At one point, it did, up until last year, I mean when the final payout. In years '11, the evidence will show that '11 and back, when the final payouts would be made, the actual final LOT rate would be as much as 105 and 100-plus percent of LOT, understanding our formulas and all.

The problem now is that the appropriation hasn't grown in concert with the cost of education across the country. The per-pupil expenditures are going up, are higher now. And so, more people are authorized more money, and more people are applying for Impact Aid than they did before.

And so, what has occurred is that last year was the first year that we predict, because we haven't closed that year out yet, that the final LOT rate will be somewhere between 95 and 100 percent of LOT for the first time, and the first time it will be below LOT, 100 percent LOT, unless the appropriation grows.

MEMBER THOMAS: Now do different programs, do they get fluctuation in what percentage they get or is it an across-the-board thing?

MR. LOTT: It is across the board. It is very fair, right. Everybody gets the same.

And we have our own Impact Aid financial management system that actually computes the formulas for us. So, what my analysts and ed specialists do, they input the data. And of course, when your LEAs apply using G5, the data is put in also. So, once we set the rate, that rate applies to everybody who is in the system.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Just for further clarification, so if sequestration goes into effect, how much of the percentage of LOT will those schools get?

MR. LOTT: Well, let me start by saying this: the monies that we have already paid out, that is history; that is over. That is not going to change.

If there is some sequestration and that sequestration affects Impact Aid, it will be an arithmetic, not math because it is just going to be a simple case of subtracting from a pot that would have been \$1.4 billion -- excuse me -- a billion-dollars-plus to whatever it ends being, if we don't get that other \$300 million, is my point, \$250 million.

Right now, if we get another \$250 million, \$280 million, then we are close to the appropriation we got in '12. But if there is a significant cut in that, then I won't be able to pay out. I will be limited by whatever that cap is, and I am not sure what that would be or could be. I am hoping it won't be anything at all.

MEMBER THOMAS: I have another question. Maybe Debbie can help with this. I am not really clear about when they get the percentage and, then, there is a cut or you don't reach that certain percentage of the LOT. Is that why you have a reduction-in-force, because you have paid these contractors or people that are serving these children, and that if the money is not there, you are going to have cut back? Explain that to me.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Well, it is a combination of a number of things. It is not just Impact Aid. It is some issues that happen on our county side, too, of investing money. That is an internal issue that caused it. But the sequester and all that is a threat, and it is the timing of contracts that are given for next year because, by law, we have to offer contracts for next year by April 15th, and we don't know.

So, when the term "kicking the can down the road" comes into play, it doesn't do us any good, even though we have a six-month CR. It even hurts us because we don't know what the decision is going to be made. We don't know. So, we have to plan as though we are not going to get it because we can't enter into contracts with people for next year.

So, the question I was asking about, we are just looking at trying to get through this year now. And the formula is based on need. And so, school districts that are in the middle of Indian reservations that don't have a tax base, they are considered high need, high LOT, where school districts that are off, there are some border-town school districts like in our area, Holbrook, Page, they are considered 70 percent or 80 percent or they are still high-need districts, but they are not as high as the

ones that are right in the middle of where Robin was talking about, right where everybody's skin is brown and there is absolutely no taxpayers in our area. And so, they are considered very needy, high-LOT districts.

What my question was that they hold back because they go through this process of making certain that the data that was submitted from school districts is accurate, that they are not overpaying, because it is hard to get money back, and I understand that, when they overpay.

But my question was, for school districts that are right in the middle of where there is no tax base at all, that are 100 percent LOT, 100 percent need, very needy for this money, is there a way that they can release some of that that is being held back because you know the numbers are not going to really change over the years. So, that was my question.

As we go through this process of trying to wait for the answer of the sequester, but, yes, whether it is going to happen and how hard it is going to hit us, because it really didn't do us -- I mean, I am really glad that we did get a Continuing Resolution, but at the same time you are thinking, well, that puts us right in that timeline internally with the offering of contracts for next year. And we don't want to get into offering contracts that we can't pay for. So, that is where we are going with it. That is what we are dealing with in our various situations.

MEMBER THOMAS: If that is happening to you, it must be happening all over. And you are from a pretty good-sized school district.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Right.

MEMBER THOMAS: And so, it concerns me, the smaller school districts, how it affects them.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes, and that is why we invited school districts to give us testimony last spring, if you remember, because it is hurting everyone out there, especially the high-LOT districts because they are the most needy.

MR. LOTT: Thank you.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you very much.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I have one question about schools on military bases or near military bases.

MR. LOTT: Yes.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: What is the per-pupil expenditure for those, because we do have a number of Native children that are in our military families and they are traveling around the country, and we don't get to see them often. Grandparents don't get to see these children often. So, what is the per-pupil expenditure for children that --

MR. LOTT: Well, it varies by LEA and by state. So, I would have to have -- if you give me a specific school district --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: California.

MR. LOTT: California? I would have to go back and look that up for you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: The San Diego area.

MR. LOTT: Okay. I will that up for you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Well, we have a number of military, Native military families that are in the San Diego area as well as in the Northwest area. I mean, they are all across the country.

MR. LOTT: Well, San Diego is a large naval --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MR. LOTT: -- operation, and they do rather well in Impact Aid, Fort Hood, Fort Benning, places like that, where you have very large concentrations of military kids, right.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: That is interesting because where my grandchildren were they didn't have air conditioning in the San Diego. And I thought, oh, my gosh, that wasn't available in their classrooms.

MR. LOTT: Well, I lived in LA for a couple of years. It really doesn't get that hot out there, but I don't know.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Well, I don't know.

MR. LOTT: And it is even cooler in San Diego, but I guess, you know, you always have your high days.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Yes.

MR. LOTT: But, I mean, what we do is the money goes into the general fund of the school district, and it is up to those administrators --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MR. LOTT: -- to determine how they manage the facilities and such.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I understand that. I understand that. Okay. Interesting. Thank you.

MR. LOTT: You're welcome.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you very much.

MR. LOTT: All right. It has been my pleasure. Good day.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thanks.

Jenelle, do we have Fran?

MS. LEONARD: Yes, Fran is here.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: This is Fran Walter.

Welcome to the Council. You are the group leader for the School Support and Rural Programs.

Thank you very much. You have the floor.

MS. WALTER: Good morning, everyone.

I am glad to be back again to talk with you. I know I recognize some of your faces now because I have talked with the Advisory Council, I think this might be the third or fourth time that I have been here.

What Jenelle asked me to do in terms of talking with you this morning is to give you an update on what is happening in the Comprehensive Centers, with specific focus on what is happening because three of the Centers have Office of Indian Education Program funds now in their budgets. And so, I will get to that in a minute.

But I just wanted, for those of you who don't remember exactly everything I said last time, which is certainly entirely possible, I just wanted to go back and do a little brief overview of the Comprehensive Centers in general and talk about what we did in the last year. And then, I will get into more detail about what is being done in the three Centers that have Indian education money.

As you might remember when I talked to you last time we were anticipating doing a competition for new Centers. The old Centers, as we call them, were first awarded in 2005. And typically, those are five-year grants. So, around 2010, we were supposed to be competing new Comp Centers. Well, for a variety of reasons, one of which was that the Administration was anticipating that the ESEA would be reauthorized, for instance, but for a variety of reasons, the old Comp Centers were extended for two years. And so, we didn't really do a competition until last summer in 2012.

When that competition was being put together, there were a few things that changed from the old Centers, but, in general, it stayed the same. And so, there are now 15, what we call, Regional Centers that are spread around the country in geographically-contiguous areas.

And then, we now have -- and you might remember from the past we had five, what we call, Content Centers, which are really national and focus on specific topics. And this time, the Administration decided to expand that number to seven. So, we have 15 Regional Centers and seven specific Content Centers, one of which, for instance, is focused on early learning because that was not a priority in the other Administration, but it certainly is now. And so, typically, the Content Centers parallel what the high-priority topics are for the Administration.

So, we made the awards. They began in October of 2012. So, that is not really very long ago as grants work, because there is a lot of startup and a lot of putting the pieces in motion to get the plans laid out and get the work actually started.

But, in that 2012 award, as you know, three of the Centers where the highest concentration of Native American and Alaskan Native children are located got money from the Office of Indian Education Programs. And it was about \$331,000 per Center for these three Centers.

The Center name is South Central, which is Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma; the Northwest Center, which serves Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and the West Center, which serves Arizona, Nevada, and Utah.

And so, those three Centers, what the language in the notice that we put out said is, if you apply for one of these three Centers, there will be additional funds that you will get on top of what you get from the Comprehensive Center Program. And so, the services that you provide in the region should reflect a proportionate service that will impact Native American students in a positive way.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Can you speak into the microphone, please?

MS. WALTER: Oh, I'm sorry. Sure.

I am making that point because there was not language and there is not language that says take this \$330,000 and set it aside and put it in a separate bank account, and only do as much, when you use that money, do it for these specific activities. The language was very clear that there needs to be a focus that is proportionate to that amount of funding on the needs of Native American students.

I don't have to tell you that the needs of Native American students often crossover with the needs of other students in all kinds of areas. And so, the work that is being done that I am going to report out to you is really things that are very specifically targeted at Native American and Alaska Native populations, but not all that is being done because there is so much crossover between the needs of all kids, and especially the needs of poor or disenfranchised kids and Native American and Alaska Native students.

The money that went in -- and as I said, it was about \$330,000 -- comprises about 15 percent of the South Central budget and about 17 percent of the Northwest budget and the West budget. So, you can tell that they don't have a lot of money. None of them has a lot of money.

The way the Comprehensive Center Program money is distributed is by the proportion of students ages 5 through 17 who are in any geographical area. So, even though the Northwest has a very large, as I named the states to you, you can imagine a very large geographical area that they cover, the number of students that are there is much smaller than the number of students, say, in the Southeast, where there is more geographic proximity, but there are also more students.

So, I am making that point because these three Centers have always been on the handicapped side in terms of they have a very big geographical area to cover, but they don't get what you might intuitively think is a proportionate amount of money that they should get because they have such a big area to cover. It is really about where the kids are.

So, that being said, let me just go through. I had a conversation, and Joyce was in on this conversation as well. At the end of January, we did a conference call with the three Centers who have this Indian education money. They initiated the call with Joyce and me and our other Program Officers because they really wanted to make sure that -- they wanted to report out on what they were doing, but they also wanted to check in and say, what are the other things that we should be thinking about? Are there things that you wish we were working on that we weren't?

And I saw that as a really good sign because, without getting too complicated, when we give money to grantees, we give them that money because they have proposed to do a certain amount of work and a certain scope of work. It is not a contract.

In contracts, that you might be familiar with, the Department can go back to the contractor and say, "You know, we changed our minds. We don't want you to do this anymore. Now we want you to do this." Or "We want to add," what we call, "a task order, and we will give you more money and we want you to do this instead."

Discretionary grants work differently. They are certainly closely watched the Department, and we have what is called a Cooperative Agreement with them. So, we have monthly contact with our grantees. But, basically, the money that we give them is given in response to the proposal that they put out and that is read and scored by outside peer reviewers.

And so, I was especially heartened that they called, and they have been in very close communication with not only me, but also with Joyce and Bill Mendoza, and really trying to make sure that what they are doing is the most effective use of the money that they have. I think there is a long, long, long list of needs. And so, they want to make sure that what they are going after is really what is the highest priority.

So, all that being said, this is what reported out to us. And I did kind of a high-level summary of what they reported out to us from these three Centers.

They are doing work in probably, I think I have six or seven different areas here that I focused on. I would like to just kind of summarize that.

First of all, they are working with the TEAs. They are doing work to support the STEP grantees in being able to have this collaborative and productive relationship with the State Education Agency.

We specifically -- and I think this is what we talked about last time I was here -- there was specifically a decision made to not give technical assistance money to the STEP grantees, as you know, to not take that money and say, "We are going to make a contract and we are going to support these STEP grantees." But the charge of the Comp Centers is to work with the State Education Agencies. And so, high on the list of these State Education Agencies is that desire to develop a working relationship with the TEAs.

And so, specifically, they reported out that in Oklahoma they have begun having a series of meetings with the leadership in Oklahoma to really broaden awareness and facilitate discussion between the TEA, the STEP grantee, and the Oklahoma Department of Education.

And in the Northwest, they are developing a collaborative work plan with the two STEP grant recipients in the region between the Oregon Department of Education and the two tribes there that have STEP grants. So, again, I see that as a very positive sign that they kind of took the initiative, knowing that this was going to be a need that the SEA would have. And again, their charge is to really try to build the capacity of the SEA to do its work, and this is a high priority in those areas.

The other area where they are doing a lot of work, and they have done work in the past -- I know because I am the Program Officer for a couple of these Centers. I remember, even in the past, they did a lot of work on Native language issues. So, specifically, the things they talked about in this conversation that we had were the involvement of modifying state guidelines to address the need for Native language teachers and what we would call alternate certification. So, really working -- specifically, Oklahoma was mentioned, that they have facilitated a stakeholder meeting to address and discuss the language certification guidelines that the Oklahoma Board of Education is going to be considering this month.

And so, they really are trying to help move along that idea that tribes should be able to certify their own teachers by their own standards. Again, the Comp Center can often be a really good

interface between the workings of the SEA and what the desire is to move things along. And so, they obviously can't make any guarantees on what the State Board of Education will do, but they are definitely working in that area.

And they are also doing similar work on that issue in Arizona. There are 21 tribes in Arizona that are working to establish who teaches in their classrooms and how that certification gets done. The State Board in Arizona has already passed a rule that created a teaching certificate for Native language teachers. The emphasis would be on their cultural background and their language skills, rather than on their traditional teaching credentials. So, they are moving forward in that way.

The other big topic -- and again, this is something that I worked with the Alaska Center last year, and I know that they for many years have been working with the SEA on these cultural standards that have been passed, and really pretty far along in terms of having them codified in Alaska, and having those cultural standards be a part of the Alaska curricular program.

But I also know from working with them that, as always, the devil is in the details. It was really getting those standards in place down at the classroom and school level. And so, that work, there is no longer a specific Alaska Center because that was incorporated into the Northwest Center, but in the Northwest Center there is a specific Alaska person. And I talked with her as recently as yesterday, in fact, about something else. And she was saying that really the only State in that region that she works with is Alaska, and they are really working on, again, everything the SEA can do to get those cultural standards really incorporated down to the classroom and school level.

The other thing that was mentioned was the possibility of working with the National Indian Education Association to create a framework for the implementation of the Common Core Standards that would specifically have an emphasis on the needs of Native American students.

I have to be honest and tell you I don't have a very good picture of what that will actually look like. As you know, the Common Core Standards, their popularity seems to go up and then goes down, and then it goes up and down. And there are lots and lots of questions about the implementation of the Common Core.

But I do know that the Center that is in Oklahoma in prior years -- they were one of the old Centers as well -- they did a lot of work on how can non-English-speaking students -- and specifically,

they were talking about Latino students -- how can those Common Core Standards be brought in line with the specific needs of that subset of students.

And so, I know that Oklahoma, when they talked on this phone call, they said, "We are looking at that same perspective now about Native American students." And again, I don't know that anyone knows exactly what it would look like to have this framework that accommodated more individual needs when you have a Common Core.

But I guess the underlying notion that I wanted to emphasize is that there is a real understanding on the part of, I think, all of the Centers that, even though the Common Core might be good in terms of articulating what it is that we want kids to know and be able to do, there are still what we not very graciously call "subgroups" in our student populations who are really going to struggle with issues that are related to the Common Core.

And I think the thing that I like about the approach of both the Comp Centers and the Equity Centers is they really are approaching this from an equity point of view. So, how do we ensure that students who are Native American or English language learners or African-American, or whatever minority population that there is, how are we going to ensure that they have equitable access to the Common Core Standards?

And so, that is probably a better way to describe the work, that that is the focal point, and then, what can be done to make sure that happens is going to be what the work plan would actually lay out.

There was a little bit of conversation -- and I thought this was interesting -- about the access to data. Again, in Oklahoma, the Oklahoma Department of Education is working with the Choctaw and Cherokee Nations to give them access to data on students that has been collected by the SEA.

The purpose of the data-sharing would really be to help design innovative supplemental programs for students from these tribes, and that would really focus on improving their academic performance.

So, the Center is working, again, in that sort of liaison capacity between the SEA, helping the SEA try to make this data access really work. The Center is also going to be convening a summit for

tribal leaders this spring to talk about the data access program and mostly to raise awareness of it, so that it actually gets used.

The last two things that came up, again, across all three Centers is really the focus on turning around low-performing schools. And again, this is not an issue that is unique to Native American issues. It is not unique to Alaska Native issues. It is a very widespread problem, as you know, in our education system.

But these Centers do have what we call turnaround schools, which are those that have really been targeted as needing a strong intervention. There are turnaround schools in all of these areas, and some of them are actually on reservations or in proximity to reservations.

So, the point that got made was that, again, in all the efforts to turn around low-performing schools, there seems to be, at least among these Centers, an emerging sense that really focusing on family engagement strategies, coordinating community services, and then really a focus on instructional strategies, despite or in addition to all the other elements that get looked at in a turnaround school, like the leadership and the quality of classroom teachers, and those things, that they really want to make sure that there is maintained an emphasis on these other elements of taking a low-performing school and having it do better. And so, as I said, they are really working with their SEAs to keep that idea of family engagement and community engagement and coordination of community services out in front as the turnaround efforts are taking place.

The other thing that the West Center talked about -- and again, they serve Arizona, Nevada, and Utah -- they have been engaged for about three years in a partnership with their SEAs and an organization called the Darden-Curry School of Leadership at the University of Virginia.

I was talking to the Director of that Center the other day and said, "How did you end up finding a place that is so far away from where you are? It doesn't make sense."

But this Darden-Curry School has been working on school leadership for many, many years, and they actually have quite a good reputation for developing leaders and developing a program that develops leaders who are specifically looking to work in a low-performing school. So, there is the whole idea of being a principal and there is the overlay of being a principal in a school that a lot of people wouldn't want to be a principal in.

So, as I said, the Center in the old iteration of the Comp Centers developed this partnership and began taking teams of school SEA people, district leaders, and school leaders two or three times -- twice a year they would go to Virginia, and then once a year Virginia comes to them. But in between is basically what I would call a curriculum of leadership development that the University of Virginia works closely with them on implementing.

And so, this is the end of their second cohort, and they are continuing that work. And so, when we were talking about it, they were saying that the school leadership on the Apache reservation that they are working with is really, the school is really showing some promising results. It is way too early to say it is because they engaged in this leadership curriculum, and it is a very difficult task, as you know, to untangle what makes kids do better or not do better.

But they are making a commitment to create another cohort of school leaders and continue on this path because it really is giving them some reason to think that this is a good path to go down. And so, that will involve the Native American school leadership as well.

And then, the thing I saved for last is just because I think we talk a lot in the Comp Centers about not only building capacity, but sustaining capacity. And so, we put a lot of emphasis as Program Officers on creating structures and processes that will outlive any one individual person.

And so, I think that all these Centers took that to heart and have really begun thinking about, and in some cases developing, structural processes that will really move the game forward. For instance, one of them has developed an Indian Education Advisory Board. So, they have representatives from every SEA they work with, and they have the Indian Education SEA person in this group as well. And so, it is a regular meeting of the people who are tribal leaders as well as people who are in the SEA and working on Indian education issues.

Again, we just started this in October. So, I don't know exactly what their agenda is. I don't know exactly what they are working on. But I, again, thought it was good that they realized that this would take some kind of a systemic approach to keep moving progress forward.

And then, the other structure that actually was in place before the new awards, but it is also continuing, is something that the participants call the Mountain Plains Desert Technical Assistance Collaborative. And they have an Improving Results for American Indian Students Initiative.

This Collaborative -- again, I am aware of it because I worked with the Comp Centers in the old iteration -- it is a combination of the Special Education Regional Resource Center in the West, the Comprehensive Center that is in the West, the Equity Assistance Center that serves those states, and other TA providers who are funded by the Department and come in more on an as-needed basis.

But because all three of those organizations that I mentioned work in the Northwest, about I think it was three years ago, they decided that they should start talking to each other, and instead of stepping around or over each other, really try to do work together to advance all kinds of issues in that region.

But, as I said, now they have developed this Initiative, and they really want to try, again, to heighten awareness and inform action. They, probably largely because the EAC is involved, they are really also taking the civil rights approach to it.

So, inform action about the civil rights of the American Indian populations in the education system, such as decisions of policy and practice that lead to access and higher access and ensure access. And so, there again, I don't have a lot of detail about their specific activities right now, but the fact that they are in place, and they have been in place, and that they have this equity lens that they are bringing to the work, I think it really bodes well for their work as well.

So, in the future they have agreed, and we are very eager to do that, to have quarterly calls with Joyce and Bill and the Comprehensive Center staff, so that we can really keep checking in.

And again, I can't emphasize enough that they are very eager to do the right thing. They feel like they are getting a lot of input from their region about what the right thing is, but they are also very open to suggestions and very open to us advising them on what the issues are. So, I think that these ongoing phone calls are actually also a really good idea.

So, that is the end of my presentation. I would be glad to take any questions or comments.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you, Fran.

Questions?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Which region had the advisory group?

MS. WALTER: I believe that that is the West Region. Yes, it is. So, that is Arizona, Nevada, and Utah.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: When were these Centers -- what is their fiscal year? When did they officially begin?

MS. WALTER: They began on October 1st of 2012, and their first performance period ends on September 30th of 2013. Assuming that everything doesn't go away with sequestration, they will be funded again for another year. We are anticipating it will be a five-year grant.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And what were the Content Center focuses? Again, I was being asked by staff a question, and I didn't hear those.

And which states is the Northwest serving?

MS. WALTER: The Northwest Center serves Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And the Content focus?

MS. WALTER: The Content Centers, you didn't really miss that because I didn't say it.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Oh, okay.

MS. WALTER: You don't have to feel badly about that.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I heard you, and then I was asked a question over here.

MS. WALTER: We have seven of them, and now I am going to try hard to remember the names of all seven of them. One is called Standards and Assessments Implementation Support. So, again, with the acknowledgment that a lot of states are trying to implement the Common Core or Common-Core-like standards in their states -- Iowa, for instance, has its own standards that it is trying to implement.

And with the anticipation of new assessments, then, being developed to correlate to those standards, the Administration thought it would be really important to have a Center that is specifically focused on that topic. That is kind of a morph from the old Center, which was Assessment

and Accountability. Their focus was much more on assessments and helping people develop good assessments, helping states develop good assessments. So, that is one Center.

The other one that is brand-new is one that is called Building State Capacity and Productivity. And again, the Administration was really trying to address the notion that, with declining revenues in states and declining amounts of staff in states, it would really be a good idea for the Department to help states build their capacity to be more productive and more efficient about what they do.

Again, because that Center started in October and it is only February, they are still very much in the startup stage. But we have been -- I have been, I should say -- surprised at the very positive reception that the states seem to be having to that Center. And they have already gotten requests for services. I was afraid the states would be insulted by us saying, "We need to help you get more efficient," but I think states are really understanding that that is to everyone's benefit if they become more efficient.

Then, we have a third Center called Great Teachers and Leaders, which is really a continuation of the old Content Center which was called the Teacher Quality Center. This Center is really, really busy right now because so many states are working on developing evaluation systems, and evaluation systems that take gross measures into account, that have to evaluate non-tested grade teachers. And so, they had barely a blink between their old work and this new work, and they have been called on a lot already, I know.

We also have a Center, College and Career Readiness and Success. This is kind of, again, a morph of an old Center we had called the High School Center. This Center's charge has really broadened. It is really trying to bring a greater, I think, definition to what we mean by college and career readiness. So, as a result, they are doing a lot of work with career and technical education, really trying to articulate what it means to be college and career ready. And really, a lot of their work will be sharing resources, research about what is out there and what is working.

We also have a Center on Early Learning, Building Early Learning, Early Learning -- I don't remember the exact name. The focus is on early learning, which, again, is very exciting for everyone because, as you know, the Secretary has been very vocal about the need for early childhood, birth to third grade education.

And that is a Center that, again, I think a lot of people are excited about, but it has been interesting to see that the states really don't, a lot of states don't have a lot going on in early learning. Or, if they do, it is not at the SEA. It is in some other agency in the state.

And so, that Center will have a lot of what I call advocacy work to do, which is really probably not the right word, but really publicizing what they do, what they are about, what the value is of incorporating early learning into what typically would have been a K-20 program.

Then, the next Center is the School Turnaround Center. That is just what it says. It is a Center that really tries to provide resources and services to states who are working very hard to turn around these lowest-performing schools.

I don't know how much you keep track of the School Improvement Grants, the SIG grants, but we also now in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education we have a School Turnaround Office. And so, they are managing the School Improvement Grants and any additional funds that come through for turnaround. And so, we are envisioning that this Center, as they propose their work, a lot of it really aligns very nicely with what we are trying to do at the Department as well.

And again, the Content Centers get about -- all right, so let me say it; there is one more. It is called Center on Innovations in Learning. And again, that is a brand-new one. The focus of that right now is really on alternatives to traditional classroom sit-and-get kinds of things. And so, it ranges from electronic access to education to improving instructional strategies, and probably everything in between.

And again, they are brand-new. They are started in October, but we had no Center like that before. And so, we are really kind of waiting to see what comes of that.

But the point I started to make about the Turnaround Center and all the Centers is each of the Content Centers gets \$1.5 million a year, which is really -- well, I should say they get almost \$1.5 million; I think it is \$1.45 million. And to serve a national audience for \$1.45 million is very challenging.

So, a lot of the work that the Content Centers do, they do in coordination with the Regional Centers. And there is a lot of common sense to that because, then, when they go away and they go to the next place, the Regional Center staff is still there to work the issues and has a much more daily presence in the SEA.

But also because they have limited funds, the other thing we emphasize with the Content Centers is really producing usable tools and products, and sometimes things like briefs. You know, here is a summary of what seems to be working in school turnarounds.

But the most successful Content Centers have really created what the states call tools; you know, a workbook for how to develop your teacher evaluation system in your state, not a follow-the-dot so much as these are the important questions that you really need to be able to ask and get answered, as you are developing your system.

So, we are trying to look for ways with the Content Centers that they can really develop things that have a wide reach without them having to be in that specific place all the time because they just can't do that.

So, that was a long answer to your question, but seven Centers is a lot.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: No, that was important to know because in the schools we do keep track of that and, also, the research work that is going on.

MS. WALTER: Right.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: So, that is very helpful.

MS. WALTER: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: That was really helpful. Can we get -- usually, you provide a chart that shows where these are and --

MS. WALTER: Oh, sure, I can make sure we do that.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes.

MS. WALTER: Uh-hum. So, the location and anything else that you --

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes. Well, I would just like the graphic of the different Centers.

MS. WALTER: Okay. Okay,.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: But I also had a question around the Indian Centers. Have you talked about how they are going to be evaluated in terms of the services that they provide?

I am really glad they are helping the STEP programs, but that is like one site in the entire, one or two sites in an entire region. So, I just want to know your thoughts about what kind of impact they may have in terms of TA.

MS. WALTER: Well, that is a really good question, and I can't say that I am aware of any specific evaluation of that use of funds. As I said, when we gave them that money, we gave them. That money was part of their award. The language and the expectation that was set out was that the work would be proportional to that, that their efforts would be proportional to that amount of funding, which isn't a very satisfying evaluation question to answer because it is really more about outputs. You know, did you spend the money, did you spend a proportional amount of money on these services?

With the discretionary grants -- and the Comp Centers, as I said, fall in that category -- we require what is called an Annual Performance Report and an Annual Evaluation. And so, the Center, when they give us their plans at the beginning of the performance period, they identify certain objectives and strategies that they are going to pursue. And so, at the end of the year, like 60 days before the end of this performance period, they will be required to submit an annual performance report that says, "Here were our objectives and strategies and here is what we did, and here is our success or failure." Again, there isn't as much emphasis on impact in that report, but that is a standard report that every discretionary grant has to provide.

The other thing, though, is that all of the Centers have an evaluator who is not part of the Center, perhaps is part of their larger organization, but is not part of the Center, who does data collection on, again, what these objectives are that are laid out.

And so, my expectation is that in that Annual -- I don't want to misspeak. So, I don't know what the reporting-out on this money will look like in the Performance Report, but I feel very confident that in the Annual Evaluation, which we will get in December -- so, the award period ends in September, and then they have three months to produce an evaluation -- that for these three Centers there will be an accounting of what they did in this area.

So, I guess, again, without getting too complicated about it -- and I know I am probably at the end of my time as well; I am over the end of my time --

(Laughter.)

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I have two questions, though.

MS. WALTER: Okay.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: We are not going to be able to take a break. We are running very long. So, we will just go straight through. We won't break.

So, go ahead.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Thank you.

I just have a question about the fact that these funds are discretionary grants as Cooperative Agreements. Yesterday I brought up the fact that the STEP programs were in place, and we mentioned that there was a need to document this process. And so, since these Technical Assistance Centers already have the STEP projects, perhaps this is a task that they could take on, the reason being that it is the NACIE Board that took formal action to identify specific Technical Assistance Centers. And we specified those areas where we wanted these Indian education Technical Assistance Centers. We also specified the amount of funding that we wanted. I think in our motion that was made I think it was about \$3 million. And so, I would hope that NACIE could provide some guidance in this process as well, particularly around the topic that Robin brought up around evaluation.

MS. WALTER: Well, the Comprehensive Centers are specifically prohibited from conducting evaluations.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Not evaluation; I meant to document the process of the STEP process that is going on --

MS. WALTER: Right.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: -- the interaction that is going on. It is not to evaluate it, but to document it.

MS. WALTER: Okay. I misunderstood.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And then, also, to find out, I guess from us, what kind of evaluation measures are going to be important for us to be able to do our work as well.

MS. WALTER: Uh-hum. I probably can't give you a very complete answer to that.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MS. WALTER: Because my guess is that, as I indicated, there is a lot of work that the SEAs are doing with the Comp Centers to bring along, I would say, the STEP program. In all of their work, the Centers have to document what they do.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right. I understand.

MS. WALTER: That becomes the basis of their reporting to us at the end of the year.

But the point I want to make, I guess, is that the Comp Centers, as I said earlier, are specifically required to work with SEAs.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MS. WALTER: And so, the reason they are able to work with the TEAs is that they are side-by-side with the SEA. And this is something that the SEA has identified as a priority.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MS. WALTER: So, it is probably not my place to say what it is that they would or would not be able to do to respond to the Advisory Board needs. I would leave that to Joyce and Jenelle and other people.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay. All right. The reason I bring that up is I am just wondering if that is a formal action that we need to consider taking, is to make certain that we are getting some kind of documentation on the whole process, particularly of the TEA STEP grants working with the SEAs.

And then, my final question has to do with just the last, this Mountain Plains Desert Collaborative Initiative. You mentioned that there were three collaborating focus areas, one being the special education equity. And what was the other one?

MS. WALTER: Well, the Comprehensive Center is part of that in the Northwest. So, the Northwest Comprehensive Center is one partner.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MS. WALTER: The other partner is the Equity Assistance Center, and then, the third partner, the third major partner is the Regional Resource Center, which is the Special Education Center. So, those three Centers are really the core of this Collaborative.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MS. WALTER: And then, other people come and go as needed.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right. Thank you.

MS. WALTER: You're welcome.

MEMBER AREVGAQ JOHN: Yes, thank you for your work.

The Center that includes the State of Alaska, where is that going to be located? And I would like to learn more about how the elders or local Native people are going to be involved in the implementation of certifying the language teachers.

I know in Alaska we have mothers that have been teacher aides for 20 years. In many cases, they work for the certified teachers who cannot speak the language. So, I am really interested in how that process is going to be implemented into this process.

MS. WALTER: The Center that serves Alaska is the Northwest Center. And so, that makes sense. I mean, that is geographically the region.

But it wasn't the Alaska Center that specifically talked about the certification. So, I don't know what efforts are being made specifically with Alaska around the certification issues. That was in the West Center, which is in the Southwest. I can certainly try to find that out and send the information back.

I know, again, because I worked with the Alaska Center, I do know that they, as I said earlier, the cultural standards is something that they have really been working on a lot for probably three or four years. And so, the certification thing, I am not aware of what is going on in Alaska. Okay?

MEMBER AREVGAQ JOHN: Yes. Just for information, I brought the packet of the Alaska Culturally-Responsive Standards when I came here first, so the Board members would have copies.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thanks.

We will try to take one more question because we are already into the next speaker. So, go ahead, Stacy.

MEMBER PHELPS: Can you tell me, I think it is the Midwest that serves South Dakota? Is that correct?

MS. WALTER: It is actually the North Central.

MEMBER PHELPS: Oh, North Central? And do they currently have one of these supplementals?

MS. WALTER: No, they do not. Again, it was a matter of getting the data from Joyce's office on where the highest concentration of Native American students were located. And so, that ended up being Oklahoma -- I don't remember the exact states off the top of my head, but the Dakotas were up there, but they weren't -- we had to do a cutoff at a certain point. And so, these Centers serve higher numbers than --

MEMBER PHELPS: It is not based on where highest concentration of need or academic gaps are? It is just numbers?

MS. WALTER: It was based on numbers of students.

MEMBER PHELPS: So, if it was based on numbers, couldn't you have just done it more based on a formula, so all Centers that had high concentrations of students --

MS. WALTER: That wasn't my decision. So, I can't really speak to that.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: That was the decision that was brought to NACIE, and there was a presentation that was made in Oregon, and there was quite a debate about it. It wasn't a perfect process, but it was a limited amount of money that was available. And with a million dollars to spread over Centers, we wound up -- we tried to look at whether -- I think part of the discussion had to do with if it can be a Content Center.

MS. WALTER: Right.

MS. SILVERTHORNE: But a million dollars is a third less than what others are receiving for a Content Center and the issues are pretty broad. There's a lot of states involved.

I am not sure how we can make some extensions, but I don't think it is impossible for the Comp Centers to share what they have learned, either. When we have met with the large group of

Comp Centers and Equity Center folks, they are all interested. So, I don't think it is an exclusion. You still have kids in those Comp Centers and Equity Centers.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Jenelle, you have a comment?

MS. LEONARD: Yes. Stacy, to address your question, it was at the October 2nd and 3rd meeting. You were present. We spent, I would say, close to half a day on discussing, and pretty much the decisions came from the Council to do the three Centers. And you also identified the areas for it.

So, the way this played out is the advice came from the Council, and the Department acted on that advice. So, the decisions, the discussions, all in the transcript of the meeting October 2nd and 3rd in Portland.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: I am sorry, I apologize; we are going to have to cut this off out of respect for the next speaker. I think we are going to have to allow more time for Fran each and every time. This is a highly, highly interesting topic for the Council.

So, with that understood, Mr. Deaton, come up.

Thank you, Fran. Thank you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I would still like to do a motion when we return.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: We will have an opportunity just before we break for our meeting at the White House.

With that, Mr. Deaton, are you here?

MR. DEATON: I am.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Please come forward.

Welcome. You have the floor.

MR. DEATON: Before the PowerPoint is turned on, let me introduce myself. My name is Jamie Deaton, and I work for the National Center for Education Statistics.

As part of my role, I am Project Director for the National Indian Education Study. So, I am here to talk to you a little bit more about the National Indian Education Study.

We just released the results from the 2011 NIES -- and that is an acronym for short -- in July 2012. So, that has been out for about seven months now.

And also, before beginning today, I really wanted to thank Joyce's office, the Office of Indian Education, for providing funding for the study. We are grateful to have it.

Before we dig into the results from the recent NIES report, I think it is helpful to understand the educational environment for today's students. American Indian and Alaskan Native students make up about 1 percent of fourth- and eighth-graders in the United States. About 90 percent of these students attend public schools. About 6 percent attend BIE schools. And the remaining 4 percent attend other schools, such as private schools, Department of Defense schools. Nearly half of American Indian and Alaska Native students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch, which is an indicator of low family income.

NIES is a nationwide study that describes the condition of education of American Indian and Alaska Native students in the United States. As part of NIES, students in grades four and eight answer questions in either reading or mathematics as part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, known as NAEP for short, and it is also called our Nation's Report Card.

To clarify this a little bit, our assessments do not consume much of a student's time. So, the students would either answer questions in reading or mathematics. No student would have to answer questions in both.

And the second component of NIES is a survey that is intended to provide information on the educational experiences of fourth- and eighth-grade students. The NIES survey is given to students, their teachers, and their school administrators.

In addition to providing results at the national level, we are also able to provide results at the regional level. And this is reported online, and it is reported online for five geographic regions, which you can see on the map. It is Atlantic, North Central, South Central, Mountain, and Pacific.

We also provide results at the state level, and those are reported both online and in our report as well. We report results for 12 states. The 12 have abbreviations on the map.

And you will see Alaska is shaded in yellow. For Alaska, we do not have survey-level data. That is due to a low response rate.

One of the challenges for Alaska is they have an opt-in procedure where we need to get parental permission slips before students are allowed to participate in a survey. All other states have an opt-out procedure, meaning that we need permission slips if parents do not want their kids to participate. So, that has lowered our response rate.

The other thing I want to make clear here is NIES involves more than these 12 states. We sample students across the nation to get a nationally-representative sample. It is just these 12 states have enough American Indian or Alaska Native students in them participating, so we are able to reliably report results at a state level. So, an American Indian student in Florida would still be part of our assessment, and they would contribute to the national-level results.

So, given this context, I will discuss American Indian and Alaska Native student performance on the NAEP assessments beginning with reading. As we review these results here and throughout the presentation, please remember that our results are based on the samples we discussed earlier. And for this reason, there is a margin of error associated with each score or percentage. When comparing scores in other NAEP results, we only discuss differences that are larger than the margin of error and those that are statistically-significant.

So, first, I would like to bring in results from the grade four reading assessment. You will see the graph on the left at the top, it is the scores of non-American Indian/Alaska Native students. In the middle, the larger numbers, starting with 15, is the score gap between the non-American Indian/Alaska Native students with American Indian and Alaska Native students.

So, you can see on this graph there is only one asterisk, and that is for 219 at the top. That indicates that the non-American Indian/Alaska Native student population had a statistically-higher score, which was 221, than they did in 2005 of 219. None of the other changes are statistically-significant. So, the score gap that has gone from 15 to 19 points is not significantly larger in 2011 than it was in 2005.

And now, I would like to bring in the grade-eight-level results. So, looking at the grade eight level, once again, we see about the same pattern. You will see the American Indian and Alaska Native students had a score of 247 in 2007, at the bottom, and it has an asterisk. So, the notation is their score of 252 in 2011 is a statistically-significant improvement over their 2007 score.

One of the questions I often get asked has to do with the non-American Indian/Alaska Native students at the top of the graph. You will see their score has gone from 262, one point higher, 263, 264, 265, one point difference each time. Every single time, though, even though it is one-point difference, it is significantly higher. And this has to do with the large size of this population. Literally 99 percent of the students in our assessment are considered non-American Indian or Alaska Native. So, even though you have a one-point increase, because this group overall is so large, it is statistically-significant.

Next, I would like to move on to discussing some other results. And this has to do with low-density public schools, public schools, high-density public schools, and then BIE schools.

Low-density public schools are defined as having less than 25 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native; whereas, high-density public schools have a concentration of 25 percent or more American Indians or Alaska Natives. And then, there is BIE schools. And these three groups, low-density, high-density, and BIE schools are all mutually-exclusive. Of course, BIE schools will have much more than 25 percent American Indians or Alaska Natives.

So, this is the fourth grade reading data. Now I would like to bring in the eighth grade reading data.

Once again, we see about the same pattern as we do at grade four, but there are a couple of pockets for improvements. For example, looking at the purple line in 2007, 248 with an asterisk next to it, you will see that American Indian and Alaska Native students in public schools showed significant improvement from 2007 to 2011.

And then, looking down at the bottom, within the BIE schools, you will see that the BIE school students for grade eight reading showed improvement compared to 2009 and, then, also compared to 2007.

Next, I would like to move on to some state-level data, and there is a lot of information on this slide. So, I would like to take it pretty slow.

At the top you will see the gap in our nation. On the left, the score 202 is the score for grade four reading, American Indian and Alaska Native students. In between, you will see the score gap, which is 18 points, and then, on the right is 220, which is the score of the non-American Indian/Alaska Native students.

Let's bring in two states, Oklahoma and Oregon, where we see the gap that is smaller than that of the nation. For Oklahoma, you will see the 212 with an asterisk, which is noted that their score 212 is significantly higher than the nation overall for American Indian and Alaska Native students. In the middle, you will see a 4 with an asterisk, and that notes the score gap of 4 is significantly smaller than that of the nationwide gap of 18. And then, on the right, Oklahoma, you see the score of 216 has an asterisk, and that notes that the non-American Indians and Alaska Natives are performing significantly lower in Oklahoma than that of the nation.

I would like to next bring in four states, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Washington, where the gap is not significantly different than that of the nationwide gap.

And finally, we see six states, Alaska, Arizona, Montana, North Carolina, South Dakota, and, finally, Utah, where the gap is significantly larger than the nationwide gap. Montana is the one state where their students are not performing significantly lower than the national average. Rather, it is the non-American Indian/Alaska Native students, at 228 in Montana, they are performing significantly higher than the nationwide average.

And then, for bringing in the grade eight reading results, we see a roughly similar pattern. Once again, Oklahoma is present as the state in our nation that has a smaller gap than the nationwide average.

I would like to turn our attention now to the mathematics results. Once again, we see a somewhat similar pattern to reading. We have seen a widening of the gap over the years, though, comparing non-American Indian/Alaska Native students to their American Indian and Alaska Native peers. The cause of this gap is not that, generally speaking, American Indians and Alaska Native students are doing worse than previous years, but, rather, the non-American Indian/Alaska Native students have shown statistically-significant improvement compared to earlier years. And this is evidence comparing to 2009, 2007, and then, also, to 2005.

Once again, for mathematics, now we are looking at the data from low-density public schools, high-density public schools, and BIE schools. Once again, we see some areas of improvement.

One of the things I want to point out, too, if you look at the right of the graph, for BIE schools for grade eight, you see 244 is asterisked, meaning they are showing significant improvement from 2007. In 2005, their lower score of 242 does not have an asterisk, and that is because in 2005,

when we started the NIES, not all the BIE schools were in our sample. I believe there was approximately 40 BIE schools at grade four and grade eight that were in our sample.

Starting with 2007 and every NIES study since, all grade four and grade eight BIE schools are in our sample. So, it is essentially like a Census collection. That doesn't mean that all elect are able to participate, but they are all eligible for participation. I think with our most recent 2011 year, we about 83 percent participation, roughly, at both grade four and, then, grade eight.

Bringing in state-level data, we see roughly the same pattern. Once again, Oklahoma is that one State that has a smaller gap than that of the nation. We have six states where the gap is not significantly different, and then, the gap is larger in five states. And this is for grade four.

And now, I will bring in the grade-eight-level data. We see a similar pattern with this as well. Oklahoma, once again, being the one State where the gap is statistically smaller than that of the nation. We have three states where the gap is not significantly different, and then, eight states where the gap is significantly different.

So, to give you an overall summary of what we saw so far, there is no national-level change in reading or mathematics scores for American Indian or Alaska Native students compared to the previous assessment of NIES in 2009. We have seen some gains among students in BIE schools.

In terms of achievement gaps, for reading, there hasn't been a change in the gaps compared to 2009 or 2005. For math, the gaps are wider when compared to 2005 and 2007 and 2009 as well, and the widening for these gaps appears to have occurred because of an improvement of the non-American Indian/Alaska Native students.

And another narrative of the study is that, for Oklahoma, the gaps are smaller than the nation, and that is for both subjects, grade four and grade eight, and both subjects, both mathematics and reading.

The other component of the National Indian Education Study is the survey. I wanted to show you a couple of variables from the survey as well.

The report itself, the printed copy, and available online as well, does not link assessment data from reading and mathematics to the survey-level data. However, we have something called the NAEP Data Explorer. Through that Explorer, anyone can link the variables together.

And we have survey results for students, for teachers, and for school administrators. The student questionnaires ask students themselves, their families and communities, and their classrooms and schools. Students typically complete the questionnaires after the regular NAEP assessments. A study administrator is present to help any students who have trouble reading or understanding the meaning of the questions.

Teacher questionnaires are completed by teachers of participating American Indian students to collect information about the instruction of these students in their schools. And the questionnaires cover teacher backgrounds and general classroom approaches, as well as specific reading, language arts, and mathematics instructional practices.

School questionnaires are completed by administrative staff at the school.

The NAEP Data Explorer, which I referenced a little bit earlier, allows users to create statistical tables, charts, and maps for NIES survey responses. Through this Data Explorer, users can link NAEP data, reading and mathematics results, for American Indian students in grades four and eight to NIES survey data.

I should also mention that the NIES Data Explorer contains survey questions that are asked of all NAEP participants for grade four in reading/mathematics, in addition to the NIES-specific survey questions.

One of the great strengths of the NIES Data Explorer is its ability to disaggregate data into different populations. And you will see there is also -- I don't know if it is shown here -- but each of the Data Explorers, both the main NAEP Data Explorer, the Long-Term Trend Data Explorer, the High School Transcript Data Explorer, and the NIES Data Explorer, they all function in the same way.

And there is a tutorial on the page that allows users -- it is about a 20-minute tutorial. It has audio capability. So, it will walk you through how to use the Data Explorer. If you know how to use one of them, you know how to use all four of them because they are structured in pretty much the exact same way.

So, I would like to present a couple of slides of our survey questions, too. And the first one is student eligibility for the National School Lunch Program. This is based on school records.

You will see there is a red line going across, and I think that is right about at the 49 percent mark. And that the national average of all students. We have about 49 percent of fourth-graders eligible for school lunch. This is higher for American Indian students in public low-density schools, which means there is less than 25 percent American Indian students in those schools, and that is 62 percent. For high-density public schools that have 25 percent or more American Indian students, the National School Lunch Program is about 83 percent of those students that are eligible. And then, finally, in BIE schools, 87 of the students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch.

Moving on to the NIES questionnaire, we asked this for both grade four and grade eight students, but I am presenting the grade four responses. We asked the students, "How much do you know about your American Indian tribe or Alaska Native group?" So, we can see their responses, and they had four possible responses. It is nothing, a little, some, or a lot.

And moving on, on the teacher questionnaire, I am showing data for grade four teachers. We asked teachers, "How many years have you worked as an elementary or secondary school teacher?" And we categorized. We had four response options. One was zero to four years; one was five to nine years; one was 10 to 19 years, and one was 20 years or more.

One of the interesting things about this that it reveals for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, essentially, one out of every three teachers -- and we linked these to students -- has taught in those schools for 20 years or more.

We also asked students on the regular NAEP questionnaire, "Is there a computer at home that you use?" It measures whether students have a computer at home. We don't ask or delve into what type of computer. So, whether the computer is 12 years old or one year old, it all counts the same. We notice a significantly fewer amount of American Indian students report to having a computer at home. This is most pronounced among Bureau of Indian Education schools.

And the national average, you will see the red line at the top, is about 90 percent of students overall report having a computer at home.

This concludes my portion of the presentation. I wanted to be sure I leave some time for you to ask questions. I have my email address on there. It is on the last slide. I am certainly happy to take questions today, but if you have questions a week from now, six months from now, please feel free to email me anytime.

Before taking questions, I also want to mention that the full copy of the report is available online, as well as full copies of all previous NIES reports. So, you can get 2005, 2007, 2009 report.

Previous to 2011, we had two reports. We had a report that combined -- it was called Part 1, and Part 1 had the reading and math achievement data, and then, we had a Part 2 report that had the survey data. In 2011, we merged these reports. So, our 2011 report, it is a little bit sleeker. It has reading, mathematics, and survey data all in one report. Beyond that actual report, there is a lot more data available online for you or anyone in the general public to access as well.

And at this point, I would like to open it up to questions.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Questions?

Robin?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I was just curious how many schools were in each of the categories. I know how many are in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but how many are in low-density and high-density?

MR. DEATON: Sure. I am not sure exactly the school number. I believe that might be available in the report itself. We do some rounding overall. We are very protective, not just with NIES, but with NAEP overall, about student IDs and not identifying the students as well. But I believe that information is available within the report.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes, this wouldn't be the students. It is the schools.

MR. DEATON: So, the schools, uh-hum.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Robin?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I am just curious about the numbers that you were --

MR. DEATON: Sure, and I am sorry, offhand -- I would be glad to follow that up with an email to you.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: If I am reading this -- oh go ahead.

MEMBER PHELPS: James?

MR. DEATON: Yes?

MEMBER PHELPS: Are you familiar with the Education Week Graduation Reports?

MR. DEATON: I am, and that just came out, I believe, a couple of weeks ago, I believe.

MEMBER PHELPS: Right. Do you know how that data is computed? It gives a state-by-state breakdown of the four-year graduation rates.

MR. DEATON: Now this is not something I work on, but this is something that I just looked at because I was interested in that as well.

MEMBER PHELPS: Yes.

MR. DEATON: So, if memory serves me correctly, I think they are looking at a percentage of ninth-graders that graduate four years later. So, if you were to graduate, you know, within five years, you might not hit that mark.

I believe among the American Indian population, I think their graduation rate was something like 68 or 69 percent. I believe for African-American students their graduation rate was 66 percent. The other groups were higher. I think for Hispanics it was 71 percent. And then, for White students and Asian students, it was significantly higher. I am doing all this on memory right now.

MEMBER PHELPS: Well, yes, I have them here. I was just curious because it lists like South Dakota's graduation as 26 percent for American Indians.

MR. DEATON: Okay.

MEMBER PHELPS: Which is a much different rate than the BIE rates or the State rate. So, I am just curious how that number is different than the other two rates that are reported.

MR. DEATON: Okay.

MEMBER PHELPS: I was just curious if you knew that.

MR. DEATON: That is really interesting because that is certainly significantly lower than the nationwide average as well.

MEMBER PHELPS: Yes. But it is interesting, if you don't have one, they go state-by-state and give every state. And I have the one from '07 and then '08. It is interesting to see the drop. I mean, ours dropped from 33 to 26 in one year.

MR. DEATON: And you are talking about high-school-level data. I think it is a nice segue, too, to mention for NAEP and for the NIES we are assessing students in grade four and grade eight, but we also do a 12th grade assessment for NAEP, too, which is smaller.

So, for the American Indian population, we wouldn't be able to provide state-level data for that. But I believe for the vast majority of our subjects, if not all our subjects, we would be able to provide national-level data for American Indian students for grade 12 for other subjects, such as social studies, U.S. history, science. We are starting to do more grade 12 state-level data as well. I think there are about 12 states. So, there might be a subject where we have South Dakota grade-12-level data for the American Indian population.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Yes, thank you, James, for the report.

If I am understanding this report correctly, you have 550 students that are assessed at the fourth grade and 4100 at the eighth grade. I am just using reading for now.

MR. DEATON: Yes.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And so, if that is the case, then we are looking at probably about 500 students. If we have 11 states that have been identified, we are looking at about an average of 500 students that are being assessed. And out of that 500, you are going to have an average of 250 elementary and 250 high school students that are being assessed in each state. Is that correct?

MR. DEATON: You know, I think it would vary from state-to-state --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MR. DEATON: -- certainly depending on the population.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right.

MR. DEATON: One of the things I wrote down before is I think at grade four I want to say offhand there is probably about 1900 students in grade four that are beyond those 12 states that we

give state-level data for. So, those would be in the remaining 38 states, including the District of Columbia.

The other question you might have is why are we assessing more students in grade four than grade eight. And that is because at grade eight in 2011 we also conducted the science assessment.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Right, right.

MR. DEATON: So, a fair amount of American Indian and Alaska Native students, rather than taking reading and math, they took science instead.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay. So, on an average, though, going back to my original question, it is about 250 students on an average for each state because you have identified like 11 states, is that correct, where you are getting this data?

MR. DEATON: That is probably pretty close.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MR. DEATON: If you look at -- and I know we don't have a full copy of the report available to you --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Eight.

MR. DEATON: -- but in our technical note section, on page 48 of the report, we are able to break down about how many students are available in each state. So, for example, at grade four we assessed 10,800 students. Of those 10,800, 8,900 are in one of those 12 states. Grade eight, we assessed 8,200 students. This is rounded to the nearest 100. Of those, 8,200 at grade eight in reading; in math, 6,700 are in one of those 12 states, meaning we have about 1500 left in the remaining 38 states, District of Columbia.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Okay. I just went off the national sample that you are using for Native students. Okay?

MR. DEATON: Uh-hum.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And so, if that is the case, then, you know, just rough figures here, if that is the case, then, let's say if I have -- and I know we have more than 250 in our

school -- what determines which schools are selected to participate in this study? What determines if they are reservation-based schools or if they are urban, suburban? Who makes that determination?

MR. DEATON: Sure. So, we have a sampling data collection contractor, Westat, who helps us with all our sampling questions. To get at the reservation schools, that is a pretty easy response because all BIE schools are now in our sample. So, if it is a BIE school serving grade four/grade eight students, it will be in our sample. There are some reservation schools, certainly, that are non-BIE, and then, some of those schools would be in our sample as well.

And then, in addition to the sample, we use weighting as well to make sure that when we output the final data, that it is representative of American Indian students and Alaska Native students in our nation, just like it would be representative for any other population as well.

I also wanted to add I think an important note is, from 2005 to 2011, NIES was administered every two years. The next NIES administration will be in 2015. So, it will be shifting to every four years.

We worked really closely with the Office of Indian Education to look at funding priorities and how to make this decision. We knew that there are budget constraints. And we also knew that one of the real values of the study was depth, being able to report down to state-level data, being able to report regional-level data, being able to report BIE-level data, low-density schools, high-density schools.

So, we looked at our results and we really didn't want to compromise the depth of the study. So, it is shifting to once every four years.

Having said that, we are still conducting the National Assessment of Educational Progress in 2013. Actually, we are conducting it this very minute. It is running end of January to early March.

In 2013, we will still be able to report American Indian and Alaska Native data at the national level and, also, for seven states, for Alaska, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and New Mexico is six. Historically, those were the six states that were able to report out without doing an oversample. In 2013, we refined our sample for Arizona, and we are really confident that, even without oversampling, we will be able to report Arizona-level data in 2013 as well.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: One last question, Alan. Then, we have to move on for the next presenter. Go ahead, Alan.

MEMBER RAY: Thank you.

Just a quick question. I am curious regarding the categories reading and mathematics. Now did the children choose to be tested in one of those categories or were they assigned one of those two categories?

MR. DEATON: They are randomly assigned, and that is true for all our students.

MEMBER RAY: Good. Thank you.

MR. DEATON: No problem.

And I also just want to add before we leave, all our survey questions are available online. It is considered not secure. Each year for all of our assessments, for reading and mathematics, we do release a portion of our items. We would hold some, so we can use them in future assessments, but there is a really good data tool we have online, so you can see the types of questions that students were asked.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you very much.

MR. DEATON: Thank you.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Jenelle, do we have our next presenter in the room?

MS. LEONARD: I know that he is going to be present. I talked to him at least an hour and a half ago. So, he is coming.

MEMBER PHELPS: While we are sitting here, you know, I know when we are discussing some of this, but because I know the Department does this a lot, and I think Robin asked this question about how have discretionary grants or looking at discretionary spending within the Office of Indian Ed been linked to achievement or prioritized towards that. And I know we are working on this report, but, you know, as I look at these datasets, I mean, one thing I sit on a State Board of Education in South Dakota. I know for the new assessments on the Common Core we use, they are going to be more closely aligned to what this NAEP data looks like. And so, we are looking at in South Dakota kind of the

wool is going to be pulled off, and we are really going to see our test scores for students drop significantly.

But one of the things I would like to discuss -- and, hopefully, maybe eventually get to a recommendation -- is that either we ask for additional funds to prioritize these states where these gaps are significant or growing or that the existing discretionary funds somehow be prioritized for states that have these gaps that are significant.

Because, then, that was one of my frustrations that I was trying to voice to Joyce yesterday. You know, the funds are shifting, and sometimes it is the least resistance or easiest to assign, or however you guys do that, but that doesn't mean it prioritized where these gaps are and where the drops in the test scores are.

And I know all of our kids need resources, all of our states, all of our communities do. But when I look at these gaps, you know, for our states and for our regions, they are growing, and they are growing significantly. I know it is easier to look at it and say, well, you know, it is a level playing field. Well, it is not. You know, we have concentrations of poverty in our community that, you know, it is not a bragging right; it is a reality. We have seven of the poorest counties in the entire country that are in South Dakota, and six are on reservations.

So, I guess when we are talking about this, you know, I would like to have that discussion about how funds are prioritized, or especially discretionary, how are they prioritized for these states where the problem is becoming more significant? It is not getting better. It is getting worse.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you. A point well-taken. I think we have an opportunity, after we hear from Mr. McCauley and we do our short break before we have to go over to the Old Executive Office Building, to be able to address Patricia's pending motion and the discussion that you just raised very significantly.

With that, M. McCauley, welcome. Introduce yourself, and you have the floor.

MR. McCAULEY: Thank you very much.

Good morning, everyone.

My name is Carlas McCauley. I work in the Office of School Turnaround.

I wanted to spend a few minutes this morning talking to you about the School Improvement Grant.

Just if I could, by a show of hands, how many have heard of the School Improvement Grant? Wonderful, wonderful.

To date, the Department has invested over \$5 billion into the grant itself. The grant is meant to focus its resources on the lowest-performing schools throughout the nation. Part of the requirements of each state is to identify the bottom 5 percent of schools in several categories, but the bottom 5 percent or the lowest-achieving schools, and to provide targeted resources, targeted support, targeted efforts towards what we identify as turning around those schools. All 50 states have received those funds plus D.C., Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Education.

There have been many things that the grant has allowed states and locales to do. First and foremost, it has asked states to develop these plans to have a targeted approach, a support approach.

On the NCLB, there was a focus on compliance at the state level. And the School Improvement Grant, by way of statute and requirements, is asking states to think differently, to think differently about identifying, thinking differently about supporting the lowest-performing schools. There have been some great opportunities for states and districts to develop some great relationships as they have taken on this effort. We are now in year three of this effort.

There have been some challenges, obviously. Some states have had a difficult time thinking about a tiered approach to support their lowest-performing schools and districts. Some states have had a challenge thinking outside the box in terms of moving from just compliance to support.

I was say two-thirds of the states have made the move toward the support mechanism. How do we better support not only the low-performing schools, but all of our schools?

One of the great things that the grant has actually done is it has identified what we term as "persistently low-achieving schools," those schools that for decades have experienced a lot of challenges in making progress.

On the NCLB, obviously, there was the identification of, quote/unquote, "a failing school" without the resources, without the knowhow to support that school. The grant itself has

identified, through the state's own definition, schools that are not only low-achieving, but have a graduation rate that is 60 percent or less.

Across the board we have seen in some instances states that in these schools have graduation rates of 20 percent or less. We have seen achievement in reading and language arts and mathematics combined in some of these states in the single digits in many of these schools.

I think the grant has had a lot of success in bringing the attention to those schools and those locales. I think, also, the grant itself, although there are requirements, within those requirements is the vehicle to get to turning around the school is a local decision. It is approved by the state. It is developed by locales. And I think that, with the influx of \$5 billion, it has forced locales to develop plans that are really fit for those communities.

All of that, again, is not without its challenges. I like to these states and this wave of the past three years the pioneers of the turnaround movement and turnaround effort.

There are many states that have a particular challenge as it relates to rural schools. In particular, many states -- and I can name a handful of them, Montana, as you mentioned, South Dakota, the State of Washington, Arizona, New Mexico -- that are continuing to have a challenge in working with schools on reservations.

We have seen some innovative things in terms of the resources allowing a State like New Mexico to recruit better-trained teachers for schools on reservation. But challenges still exist.

In Montana, all five of their schools in the initial year of SIG, the bottom low-percent schools were schools on reservations. Montana was very innovative on how do we work with schools on reservations. Montana does not have State takeover authority. So, with the approval of the districts, the grant is actually run from the State level. The State has provided additional resources in terms of staff on reservations that are there five days, six days a week to help support these schools. As Denise Juneau, the Superintendent, will say, they have seen tremendous progress in the initial years of SIG.

Other states such as Arizona have not taken on those innovative processes and, yet, are struggling to find ways to support the low-performing schools and particularly those schools on reservations.

We are at the process right now where we are trying to understand what we have learned over these past three years of the School Improvement Grant, what we have seen, what we have learned; more importantly, how we can improve from the Department's standpoint.

We have begun initial conversations about re-regulating the requirements in the grant itself. One of the things that surfaces is how do we better work with the rural schools. Obviously, there are conversations about from states, how do we better work with alternative schools; how do we better work with schools on reservations?

North Dakota is an example of all five of their schools were on reservations or are on reservations. Out of all 50 states, plus those BIE, Puerto Rico, and D.C., North Dakota has been the only State that has not taken on one of the reform models. The State feels that the schools on reservation cannot take on these efforts. Each year there has been a school that has been identified and awarded a grant that has been unable to draw down on any of those funds because they have not had the capacity from their standpoint to implement one of the reforms.

They have made award to one school this year, again, in its third iteration of the grant, in the third round of the grant. They have made another award to one school on a reservation. They are experiencing difficulty in providing supporting and finding capacity for those schools.

So, today I wanted to make this more about a conversation and input from you all. As the Department thinks about SIG and school improvement and the turnaround work itself, because SIG is a component of the turnaround work -- there is also ESEA flexibility; there is TIF that looks at Teacher Incentive Fund, and the teacher evaluation, which is a component of SIG. There is RTT, Race to the Top, that is also part of the turnaround work.

So, I wanted to take advantage of this opportunity with you all in the room. What are some of the things that we should consider as we have this conversation around re-regulating the School Improvement Grant?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Discussion?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Thank you.

I am a school superintendent in Window Rock, which is the capital of the Navajo Nation. We are working as a part of the pilot with the Arizona Department of Ed on the whole implementation of our teacher evaluation system and all of that.

And it is just amazing to me, the connections between that particular area. I was wondering about this with the last presenter as well, as to the dropout rate, all these different areas that we see that we are not doing well in Indian country, and if there has been any discussion on that particular area of teacher performance and the impact to the learning that we provide, the quality of learning that is provided to Indian children. I still feel like we are missing the boat there. I mean, I see it going on everywhere, but that is the reality.

And it goes back to, again, some of these grants that are out there that are for that very reason, to improve the quality of teachers that are recruited into the system or grow your own, and those type of processes that we undertake. But, still, it seems like that is where, in my view anyway, in my experience, that is where a large part of the issue lies, the quality of the teacher that we recruit or that we grow, and the professional development that we are giving that teacher. We pour money into it, and what is happening at that level? The "what" is there, but the "how" is where we struggle. I mean, we have identified what needs to happen, we have identified what needs to take place, what the training, but, then, how do you get them to actually make a difference in the classroom? That is where the struggle is, in my view, from my experience of what I have been dealing with in my own district and what I see in other districts that are neighboring to myself.

There are all kinds of conditions that end up -- the teachers that we recruit from the outside don't want to come to our schools because of the conditions that you just mentioned with the other presenter. So, then, when we do get them, it is almost like, why are they there versus being in Phoenix, Arizona, where it is metropolitan versus the rural area, the ruralest of the rural and the conditions that we offer.

And so, then, once they are there, how do we -- even in New Mexico, you mentioned that they are in a process of recruiting higher-quality teachers. I mean, we have tried that in our district, but, even there, we are not batting very good because they are supposed to be there for two years, and then, we have had two instances now where they just up and leave. So, it is that way.

And I would just like to see the connection more in Indian country on Indian reservations, that particular area, the professional development that is being offered to teachers and

whether it is really making an impact or not, because I really see that as a struggle from my point of view.

Our children learn. Our children are smart. But where is that gap right there that is showing up on the statistics that we see every time we come to these meetings and every time we see reports in our own districts? It's there. I mean, the dropout rate, the graduation rate, it is never good. So, where is that connection with the teacher performance, teacher quality?

I see it as an opportune time now. I mean, I am going through some struggles in my own district right now financially, but here is a chance to really clean up that area.

The other thing that I am curious as to, we were one district that applied for the Race to the Top Grant. And I was just curious as to whether or not there was a difference in the competition we were compared to. With all the different conditions that we have versus schools that -- we just don't have the same and weigh the same. My staff, I encouraged them to apply anyway. We worked on the application and got it in, but that is another area that I am struggling with as a leader in my community.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Just a little bit of context. I actually worked in a number of capacities around school improvement. I was in the Office of Professional Development within the Bureau of Indian Education for about 16 months. I oversaw 13 tribal colleges and universities that were delivering teacher training to all of the Bureau system.

I also worked in the Northwest with 14 schools in the system and was their School Reform Specialist. And then, I have also been the Director of Indian Education in the State of Oregon, which are all public schools, with the exception of Chemawa.

And so, I have been in lots of schools. I have always been trying to answer kind of your question.

I also worked at Northwest Regional Lab and developed the Effective Practices in Indian Education Monographs, which we used to go out and do school reform for 12 schools throughout the four northwestern states for a period of time. So, I helped even develop some content, you know, for school improvement.

So, my lens is rather broad. And I agree with Deborah, it is the classroom teacher that needs the greatest level of support, and the retention and recruitment of teachers is certainly one

problem. But what I have observed in even talking with administrators, a number of them in a variety of schools, is they don't know what they don't know. And so, they need that outside pair of eyes and ears to sort of help them sort of retool.

One of the things, I was also put in charge of coordinating a systemwide school improvement conference in the Bureau. One of the things that I observed in going to the schools in the Northwest, for example, was that every single school had a different measure for teacher evaluation. Some had nothing. Some had real intricate checklists. But there was no system in terms of common understanding of, when you walked through a classroom, how did you know whether good instruction was taking place?

So, there are all kinds of issues around continuity, consistency, quality that educators in those schools need to have conversations around, and looking at all the professional development around site-based instruction. You know, lots of our Indian schools send people out to a conference for an hour of something, and they don't come back and actually implement anything new. I mean, they are well-intended, but it is just the research on good professional development, it doesn't take.

So, I mean, we could probably have a long conversation about some strategies, but one of the things, when I was working with those 13 tribal colleges and universities, that we asked them to do was to focus on the research on professional development, make minimum number of contacts per year where they went back and held those conversations with the staff, observed them in the classroom, you know, gave them more quality feedback, so that they could actually track their own change and development.

But one of the conversations I even had with Arne Duncan was that, when these grants become available, a lot of our schools don't get the money because they can't write a competitive grant. And so, the "have not's" continue to have not.

When I was recommending work with Technical Assistance Centers, it is really more around how do you help these low-performing schools do a better job. So, I would love to have a longer conversation around this, but those are just a couple of quick thoughts.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Other comments?

MEMBER PHELPS: One of the things I would point out, probably from a lower standpoint, you know, than Robin, we wish we had teachers we could start training because our pools

are just so small. I think it is hard to start with a base content if you have teachers who just aren't there, especially in the upper grade levels. If you are doing a lot of PD to somebody who may not be the highest-quality teacher, in the end you just have to ask how effective is that going to be. And so, I think that is another conversation.

But I think the initial step point for a lot of this is I think there gets to be a lack of connection between the agencies that are sort of pushing on these things and the local community, whether that be the tribe or the school board. I think it is always a heavy-handed hammer versus kind of a mutual process.

You know, a lot of the schools we talk to, they will do exactly what the State tells them to do because that is the easiest thing to do. So, they can say, "Well, we did everything you told us, and it didn't work. So, don't beat us too much, you know, because we did everything you told us."

And if you go back and ask the staff or the principal, they will say, "Well, we knew that wasn't going to work, but that is what they were telling us to do. And we have had 10 years of bad data. And so, we don't want to suggest anything because, then, they say, 'It's your fault,' and the principal gets fired in their model."

So, it is this constant, you know, the axe is going to fall every single time we step out of line. And there is a lack of understanding, I think, between what you identified as how do you support improvement versus just regulate and evaluate.

You know, at a certain point, the other thing I would maybe look at is, is there a way that you guys can start looking at states where, probably like ours and like yours, where there is constant non-improvement? You know, can things be done with those states to help them prioritize their focus?

In South Dakota, we try to go after Race to the Top after all these things, but 90 percent of our schools have a 92 percent graduation rate. So, they don't have to do teacher incentive stuff. So, it is the schools that have nothing that always you just stay in this pot because, when eight or nine out of ten of your schools are doing fine, you just say, well, you know, we don't have to change these rules; we don't have to do teacher incentive.

We had a measure where they tried to do merit-based pay, and our voters voted it down because everything is okay in most people's view, except for our lowest 5 percent.

So, I guess making sure that those SEAs, if that is who the cognitive agency, really understand their role in the community and how they can be a better partner, not just sort of lay the axe on all the time.

MEMBER McCracken: Mr. McCauley, how are you?

So, after hearing the dialog, I have a question directly for you. How can we, as an advisory committee, help you help us?

MR. McCAULEY: Thank you for that, and thank everyone for their comments. I want to be able to kind of respond a little bit to some of the comments.

I would say the first thing -- and I apologize for coming here with an "ask" of you -- but I think priority, from our standpoint, is going to be how do we think differently or remain the same as it relates to targeting resources to the lowest 5 percent of schools, the bottom of 5 percent of schools?

With that said, one of the things that will extremely helpful for us is any proposal that you have over the next couple of months, because this is on a very, very fast pace, for us to consider as it relates to working on schools, with schools, with a high population of Indian students or on reservations, I would ask that you submit that to us. And you can submit that to me directly. I can give you my email address with Joyce and make sure that you all have that. It is just [carlas.mccauley@ed.gov](mailto:carlas.mccauley@ed.gov).

Any recommendations you have, as we think about the grants, to help states in terms of how they support priority giving to schools on reservations, anything that you all have in terms of proposals, things for us to consider as we re-regulate, I would ask that from you as quickly as possible as a group.

The other thing is we think about, from the federal perspective, how do we incentivize system change? And I think, I know from the Department's standpoint, the Secretary, when we first sat down with him in 2009 -- and he is currently right now speaking to the Senate Education Committee right now about the waivers and turnaround effort -- the first thing he said is, "Talent matters. How do we think about this to provide resources that incentivize folks to look at talent?"

And in some instances, that is the recruitment of new; in a lot of instances, it is looking at what we currently have as we think about PD and how do we better prepare teachers. From the

grant perspective, that is the hidden agenda. The hidden agenda is how do we get talent in our low-performing schools.

Now I came from a school district where as I was part of many conversations where principals and teachers went to the lowest-performing schools because they didn't have the experience. And that was the place where you gained the experience.

From the grants perspective, what we want to do is to flip that. We want to turn that upside down. How do we get in our lowest-performing schools, our most challenging schools, those people that have shown that they can move schools, those staff members that have shown that they can move classrooms and that they are good instructors? How do we begin to flip that concept to say that our low-performing schools isn't where principals and teachers go to gain experience while they wait to move to another place? And that is what the grant is trying to do. That is the hidden agenda, because we believe that talent matters.

And so, as we think about moving forward with the Department's approach in the low-performing schools, at the heart of it is, how do we continue to incentivize talent matters? A piece of that is incentivizing change at the state level to ensure that there is a changed relationship.

And I can tell you that that has been one of the biggest, biggest obstacles in these first few years, that 1300 schools are implementing these reform efforts, but there is still a mindset change that needs to take place. And we need your help to do that.

MEMBER McCracken: So, as you say that, are those resources available for development opportunities? Because I see it as the President's agenda is jobs, right?

MR. McCauley: Yes.

MEMBER McCracken: And those are jobs, but we have people in our communities who are willing to do the work, but maybe not have the skill set to be able to execute upon the work that needs to be done to educate our kids.

MR. McCauley: Sure.

MEMBER McCracken: Because our people know our kids.

MR. McCauley: Yes.

MEMBER McCracken: Right?

MR. McCauley: Yes.

MEMBER McCracken: So that I can understand correctly, so I can help, as we can help as a Committee --

MR. McCauley: Sure.

MEMBER McCracken: -- are your resources available to develop that talent to be successful in those classrooms?

MR. McCauley: The resources are. And in fact, the school program now, most people focus on replacing the principal, rehiring only 50 percent of the staff. But, in our limited scope, the Department never gets into curriculum instruction. That is more at the local level.

But if you look at the models themselves, there is a focus on PD, there is a focus on curriculum. And there are funds and "ask" of locales to look at those funding streams to do exactly that, to reframe how you are looking at professional development, to reframe how you are looking at curriculum and instruction. So, the funds are there to do that.

That is actually an open-ended aspect of the grant itself. Replacement of the principal and the staff, again, gets to that talent. Essentially, it is saying not fire folks. It is saying, looking at your lowest-performing schools, are those the right people in those schools? Is that the right individual leading that particular school, as I kind of mentioned to you before?

But the hidden piece of that -- and many do not talk about it -- is the PD aspect. That is up to \$2 million that can go toward a reform effort. And in doing that, there is an opportunity for you to think differently about professional development and training the people that you currently have that are a major component, the component, to turn around the school and look at instruction differently. So, that currently exists now.

The question I will have for you all myself is, is there a way to better, for the Department, as we think about doing this differently, is there a better way so that we could be more clear in incentivizing those particular pieces? I think the talent piece is there.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: Yes. Thank you. You hit it right on, and I think some of the answer, now maybe not all, lies in the process of how these grants are rewarded and the conditions.

The one-size-fits-all just doesn't work. If they are competitive grants, especially like the Race to the Top and some of the grants that are out there, but as far as school improvement, when you talk about school improvement, the areas of improvement, that you might have similar results on paper, but how did those results get that way are different from community to community, and especially from Indian country to other societies that are out there.

And so, I think that is where we are missing a lot of the connections that need to be made. I know I am speaking from Arizona, and I sound like a broken record sometimes because they fail to see that.

When Secretary Duncan first became Secretary, I knew it was coming when I saw the writing on the wall that, wow, the time is going to come when our State says, "Okay, Indian Reservations in Arizona, we can't ignore you anymore." And that time has come, and they finally reached out and they are trying to say -- but, yet, it is almost still to the point of really getting out and understanding the conditions that exist and not being able to say, okay, we are going to apply for the Race to the Top Grant as a State.

When the State applied, they were rejected at first, and then, later, they started saying, "Okay, we have to face the reality of what is happening in our lowest-performing." And so, that happened.

And now, it is to the point where you are here telling us what can we do more. And it is starting to move that way, but it needs to be stronger, I guess, and really reaching out and confronting the brutal facts. What is it really out there that is causing our scores to be what they are? And it is not that our children can't learn. It is really not. We have some of the best examples out there. But why is it few and far between?

And that is really what I am getting at, is that that time has come for the process to change to really identify the conditions in Indian country that affect learning and affect the scores that we see, and that impact it.

And it is not the one-size-fits-all. We are totally different than even 30 miles down the road another reservation school district. We are different, but we are more so different than the schools in metropolitan Phoenix, even Flagstaff. I mean, even recognition that rural Arizona is not Flagstaff -- Flagstaff is metropolitan to us in Indian country.

(Laughter)

But when you talk with people down in the valley area, they refer to northern Arizona, rural Arizona, as Flagstaff and Prescott. Those are big cities to us. So, there is a difference there just in that mindset you talked about. That really has to be where we start. It is changing, but we are not changing fast enough.

Until people recognize that, we are still going to see the same results over and over and over, and really tackle these awards that go, this funding that goes to Indian land schools, it should be a different set of circumstances that it is aimed toward.

Because we sit in those meetings. I just sent staff to the meetings in Flagstaff the other day. They came back and said, "Okay, we have got to do" this, this, this, just what you are saying. But, yet, it is like, well, we have tried that. Well, just do it again because they are telling us -- yes, yes, exactly.

(Laughter)

How do you recruit that? Even with all this money, who is going to come to our schools?

I mean, I can say, where I am located in my school district, I have more opportunity because we are closer to Gallup, New Mexico. We have actually had people say, "Well, we don't want to live there. There's no Walmart. There's no grocery store."

(Laughter)

There's no Starbucks at the corner. But we have greater access to that than the other school districts that are more centrally in the middle of the reservation, which is miles and miles away from anything.

So, it depends on your location. That is why I say we are different from even 30 miles down the road, because it is just that is the mindset of people coming in. They want to have at their fingertips a nice house to be able to live in, a nice store to be able to buy groceries in. And those are the situations that we are dealing with that hone-in on the ability to recruit quality people into our schools.

MR. McCAULEY: I just wanted to acknowledge and compliment you on what you just stated. When we initially rolled out SIG, the mindset of many states was, can we exclude certain schools? I can't tell you how often those questions came in. And the Secretary was very clear. If you look at the policy behind SIG, it was, unless you are a school that is a recovery school only, you have an accountability, then you have to be included.

And I cannot tell you the calls that I personally received from alternative schools, schools on reservations, to say, "Thank you, because we have felt excluded the entire time."

So, I just wanted to acknowledge that.

MEMBER AREVGAQ JOHN: Yes, I would like to follow up with her comment. In Alaska, we have a huge turnover, both at the administrative level and certified teachers, because of the diversity in the landscape, in the linguistic and cultural. A lot of the teachers have that culture shock experience of where they don't even get off the plane when they realize there's only 300 people with no store, with no road, and the only way to get there is by air.

(Laughter)

And that has caused a huge turnover in Alaskan schools of where the teachers are not adjusted. They don't have that adjustability or don't have that efficient training to orient them to the local culture, the local landscape, the local lifestyle of where there are no stores to go get chicken when you want to bake chicken or anything like that. Your only option is to eat whatever the children eat at the school level that has been shipped by barge for months at a time, and it is not even fresh.

And so, the issues that we face in Alaska are diverse, a huge landscape issue, the demographic issue, as well as the connectivity between the children and the students. They don't have the same language. They don't have efficient training. They don't have efficient curriculum, resources, that are relevant to their culture.

So, the students' learning system are materials from the Lower 48 cultures where they talk about curbs and trains, which are foreign concepts to the children's lifestyle.

So, on top of that, you know, the administrators are scattered all across the State. I know that there is a statewide administration organization, but it is very difficult for them to convene.

So, I just wanted to reiterate the reality that we face, like when the teachers face minus 50's for a month straight, they get very -- you know, their attitude is not healthy for the children. So, I just wanted to reiterate on that comment.

MEMBER PHELPS: The other thing I was going to try to put in is -- and it is a challenge -- you know, I think maybe looking at in some of these schools, and Robin might have a perspective on this, but I think one of the most difficult challenges in our high-poverty areas with the schools on reservations, sometimes schools are looked to as the "solve all" in our communities.

Maybe I think if there is some really good -- and maybe do a planning process in that first year where there is some facilitation and some shared accountability between how the state or the LEA, whoever, or the cognitive agency, if it is the BIE or the tribe, or whoever, you know, whoever is in the stakeholders, where there is some planning process between the school boards, the state or tribe, the parents, the teachers, where you do some facilitation, so everybody gets on the same page.

Because we see sometimes a principal wants to do the right thing and evaluate or dismiss teachers. But if somebody's job is on the line, and that teacher is feeding five or six other families, and they go to the school -- you know, there is no chain of command that exists in reservation schools. You can be the janitor and you can go straight to the top.

(Laughter)

You know, literally, this happened where a person got hired in a local school back in South Dakota. They were an uncertified person. The principal was checking everybody's licensures to make sure they were credentialed. That person needed the job, pretty savvy politically, got that principal fired. A new principal came in and started doing the same thing, got that one fired. The School Board started to step in, went to the Council, got the School Board removed. This was all within two months. This was all before Christmas break. They have had three principals and a whole new School Board.

So, the reality is, you know, unfortunately -- you know, we all, as educators, say, "But what about the kids?" -- unfortunately, parents who are making decisions as School Board members or whatever are thinking, "I've got to feed my kids." Education is kind of down below.

So, sometimes decisions are made not with the educational interest in mind, but with the economic. That is a hard thing to solve, except maybe there is some facilitation of kind of shared goals, shared direction versus, hey, we are going to fire the worst, and where are you going to get them? You know, when we fire from one school, they go to the next. And so, they just rotate, you know.

So, maybe having some, instead of just hit the ground running, some planning process and some facilitation where people come in and facilitate: what is the role of the School Board? How do you keep focused on your goals and objectives? How do you support principals? How do we support and improve teachers?

Because a lot of times I think, when I heard the words, "We are going to do it with fidelity," in my mind, that just says, okay, so we are going to shift the focus of responsibility to somebody else and we are going to target to buy time. I mean, those are some of the school improvement models.

"Well, the principal didn't implement with fidelity." So, you know exactly what that means. Well, that principal is just going to be targeted because it is easier to get rid of one than 20 here or remove a School Board.

I mean, I think that shared accountability and buy-in is important. I don't know if that happens in a lot of the SIG things. I think you submit a plan and you are expected to hit the ground running. Well, that is not real in any grant, but especially when you are trying to reverse that.

MR. McCAULEY: I just wanted to say I couldn't agree with you more. I think one of the ways, as we begin our conversation; I think it is safe for me to say that one of the things we failed at was the timeliness of the grant, for a variety of reasons.

Because we wanted to, and the Secretary wanted to, send a sense of urgency, but the timing of it during that initial year -- and it took a couple of years, and there was always this constant catch-up.

Another area that we just didn't go as far as we needed to, and we will correct it, is this community engagement piece. We did not go as far as we needed to go, in part, because of the timing. But that is one element.

We just met with the Secretary two weeks ago on this. And it was one of the things we knew in working with the grant, but it was the first thing that he said. Because, unfortunately, the story you just told has happened too much. And so, from our standpoint, how do we help locales mitigate this? And the way to mitigate that is to be a lot stronger on the community engagement aspect and allow that time for that to take place.

Because at some point, you know, we talk about sustainability, and most of them talk about it from the -- forgive me for using this phrase; I know you guys are tired of hearing about this -- funding cliff.

(Laughter.)

Most of us talk about it, a lot of people talk about sustainability from the funding cliff, when the grant ends. But there are other aspects of sustainability, and that is sustaining promising practices and bringing to scale those things that you have shown and have proven to have the potential of success.

And that cannot occur, the turnaround efforts cannot occur without that community engagement in order to sustain these efforts. Because turning around a school is, for all practical purposes, is a community taking a hold of this entire operation in terms of having the climate change. That takes that community being a part of that. And so, we will look to correct that as it relates to the grant moving forward.

I'm sorry.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: No, I completely agree with what you are saying. The teacher quality component of school reform is so much a part of what needs to happen.

My observation is that the people who are going to stay in these very rural, isolated communities are the community members themselves. A lot of our folks are teacher aides, and they have been in the classroom for 20 years, but they have never been given what it takes to give them the certification to be the classroom teacher.

And so, that is a very long-term approach to school reform. It is how do you develop and engage the capacity of the local people who really care about the community who aren't going to go anywhere.

And every time I have been in a school, there is sort of this critical mass of teachers that have been there forever and they say, "Oh, we're just going to wait out that administrator. We know this, too, shall pass." And they kind of cruise along.

So, it is that critical mass of people that will sustain something. Once they get excited about it, they will even try to turn around a principal that comes in to something that was really successful.

So, thinking about capacity-building with sort of that core community nugget that needs to be developed and nurtured and supported, but that is not a three-year process. It is ongoing and long-term.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you very much. We appreciate your listening to the Council attentively, and we are here and we will participate regularly. So, thank you very much.

MR. McCAULEY: I just wanted to thank all of you. And I would love to be able to somehow, as we go through this process, be able to continue to have dialog with each one of you.

It is a challenge definitely from the rural standpoint. We are really trying to develop ways, in partnership with everyone, that kind of helps address the rural challenge that exists.

I love your last statement because that is something that we want to try to move toward, as we think about not only just the models, but the resources itself, and providing enough time beyond those three years. And the Secretary was very clear in saying this two weeks ago. "Let's think about beyond three years," but allowing enough time for these changes to occur, particularly from the community standpoint.

So, thank you all very much.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you again, Mr. McCauley.

We are going to take a break here for 15 minutes, and then have you all back in. You guys have really been diligent today and really good. We will take a break, and then, we will come back in. And then, we will take up the action items that you want to deal with.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 11:40 a.m. and went back on the record at 12:17 p.m.)

CHAIR ACEVEDO: We will take action on those items that you desire to have motions on, and then try to break early, so that you can get ready to head over to the Executive Office.

With that, the floor is open for discussion.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Mr. Chair, I have two motions that I would like to make.

The first motion is regarding the STEP Pilot Projects. I make a motion to recommend that OIEP develop and implement a plan to document the STEP Pilot grantees to ensure a historical record, capacity-building and sustainability to support our Indian education goals in collaboration with the three Technical Assistance Centers' Indian Education Programs.

MEMBER THOMAS: I will second that.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: There is a motion and a second. Discussion?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Would you repeat that again?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Sure. A motion to recommend that OIEP develop and implement a plan to document the STEP Pilot grantees process to ensure a historical record, capability-building and sustainability in support of our Indian education goals in collaboration with the three Technical Assistance Centers' Indian Education Programs.

MEMBER PHELPS: I have a question. So, is that going to be done under the guise of the current Cooperative Agreement or is that going to take additional resources? And if so, where is that going to come from?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I don't know if I can answer that, but it is for the OIEP to develop a plan and to communicate with the Office of Indian Education programs. And we don't know what their goals say, but they are already working with these particular grantees. And I would assume that is

something that I don't think would require much more funding because it is already in existence. So, to just simply document it, but come up with a plan to be able to document that for our use in the future.

MS. LEONARD: It is not going to cost that much more money or not any, as I see it, because part of the grant is that they do Annual Performance Reports as well as some evaluation. It would be just a matter of the Office of Indian Ed preparing a summary report that documents the process, based on what their applications included, what the Annual Performance Report included, as well as what the evaluation. So, it is just going to be current staff, Indian Ed staff, that would pull that report together for the purpose of NACIE.

The question I had, you used the acronym, O-I-E-P?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Office of Indian Education Program. I don't know what the current --

MS. LEONARD: Oh, okay. I got it.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I guess that is the current --

MS. LEONARD: Oh, it is just OIE, and I thought it was another --

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Oh, okay, OIE.

MS. LEONARD: OIE.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: All right. I'll correct it. OIE.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: I thought for sure that Sam would have questioned an acronym.

(Laughter)

Further discussion?

(No response.)

Hearing none, call for the question.

All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

There being none, motion carried.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: All right. My second one is regarding the National Center of Education Statistics. And the motion is that NCES closely align with OIE and its mission to ensure meaningful engagement of the American Indian/Alaska Natives in all phases of the NIES study, such as planning, assessment, the reporting, including the NCES Institute to Promote Tribal Capacity-Building, Best Practices, Sustainability, and the Effective Planning and Use of our Native Student Data.

(Laughter)

MEMBER THOMAS: I will second it because I want a discussion point.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: There is a motion, and it has been seconded.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Don't let Sam --

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Discussion?

MEMBER THOMAS: I don't know who it should be address to, but is this something that is pretty much feasible or is it going to take -- you just took a bite, Jenelle. It's on the record you took a bite.

(Laughter)

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I might just add, while she is eating, in the meetings that we have had previously I have always had this question about making certain that American Indians/Alaska Natives are guiding this process. Every time a staff person comes, it is a different individual that presents. I don't know what the turnaround is here at the Department of Education. I mean, we talk about our own tribal communities and our turnaround. The same thing happens also in federal agencies as well.

And so, I just want to make certain that the American Indians/Alaska Natives are helping to guide this. And to help prove that point, I made it a point this past year to make certain that we had

an individual from our community that came to the Summer Institute. And it is my understanding when she returned that there weren't Native people that were participating in this process.

And so, I think it is incumbent upon me and us to make certain that we have active and meaningful engagement of Native people throughout the process. So, it was just like my question about, if it is like 500 students that are in those 11 states, there's like 500 students, so what determines which schools participate? It is going to be 250 fourth-graders, 250 eighth-graders when you start doing the math. So, where are those schools? Is it one school? Is it 10 schools? Are there only 25 from those schools? You can't tell. So, that is the reason that I bring this up.

MEMBER PHELPS: Did he say that that doesn't happen? Did you ask that question?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I did, and he didn't answer it. It went around.

MEMBER PHELPS: Well, I think he said they randomly select them.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: Yes, with Westat. Now that is the first time I have heard of Westat. So, there is another player engaged in this process, too.

MS. LEONARD: Patsy, a couple of things. With the NCES NIES study, the Department of Ed doesn't actually conduct the study. It contracts with Westat to conduct the study. As well, Coughlin is also a contractor on this study because they do the survey part of it.

And then, there is also a Technical -- what do we call them? -- Technical Working Group. When you look at the makeup of the Technical Working Group, it is predominantly Native American. Actually, Robert Cook, who used to be on the Board, is a member of that Technical Working Group. So, it is heavily guided by Native American influence.

Westat and Coughlin have to follow the evaluation guidelines of the Department. And so, the random selection, they have to adhere to evaluation standards. So, that is the selection and all go through that rigorous process.

But, to respond to your question, you can -- not you can -- but it is certainly within the NACIE Council's authority to request that they come back and they address the issues that you want to see in this regular update or report that you have proposed.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Thank you, Jenelle.

Additional discussion?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: I am not sure if I heard right, but when he gave his report, he said that the next survey wouldn't happen until 2015, was it, four years from now? I thought that NACIE had made an earlier recommendation in the very first time we met, or one of those first times, to maintain the current schedule of that assessment.

It was a high priority that we continue to gather regular data. I just was curious in terms of why the decision -- well, I guess they said funding, but we weren't involved in any of that.

MS. LEONARD: And to some extent, you were. Yes, you were involved in the decision. At that time, it was a conference call, as well Peggy Carr, the Commissioner of NCEC came over and made a presentation, too.

The funding issue is in terms of, I guess, economies of scale, cross efficiency. It is that when you look at the data since 2005 to now, there is no change. It doesn't show any significant change.

And the question was, do you still want to invest \$4 million in a study that you are getting the same result? Can you use that money -- is there some way that you can -- well, when you look at the fact that monies are being reduced, do you still want to take away that \$4 million to get the same results?

Because when you look at change and you look at increasing achievement and closing that gap, it is a two-to-three-year period. So, in terms of using your money other ways, look at that, and then come back and do the report. See if there was actually any gain.

So, that whole conversation took place, but we can pull it together and share it with you to show what the chronology was in terms of making that decision.

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: And perhaps it is a plan, then, a plan that demonstrates that we are all working toward building tribal capacity, best practices, and sustainability. Maybe it is a plan, and we have just not seen this plan because every time an individual comes, it is primarily the data. But what are the long-term goals and plans that we have? Because we are working toward comprehensive Indian education goals from preschool to lifelong learning.

You know, I am trying to get it to closely align with OIE and our mission. And so, it would be good to know what that plan is.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Any other discussion on the motion?

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Can we hear it again?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Would you please repeat, Patsy?

MEMBER WHITEFOOT: I am changing it a little bit now.

Something along the lines that NCES and NIES study plan to closely aligned with OIE and its mission to ensure meaningful engagement of American Indian/Alaska Natives in all phases of the study, such as planning, assessment reporting, including the NCES Institute to Promote Tribal Capacity-Building, Best Practices, and Sustainability in the Effective Planning and Use of Native Student Data.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Any further discussion?

(No response)

Hearing none, call for the question.

All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

Those opposed, the same sign.

(No response)

Hearing none, the motion is carried.

MEMBER PHELPS: Yes, and I don't know if, after some brief discussion -- I know we want to get going, but I just want to have a discussion focused around and maybe ramping it up to a motion that we look at having the Department of Ed focus and prioritize resources, either discretionary or within the same streams that they have, on the states where this gap in achievement scores continues to grow, and that there be some sort of focus and priority on those states, so that authentic, meaningful solutions can be looked at.

Because if we are going to look at data that drive decisions, then this data is, unfortunately, something that is hard to observe. And like I said, all of our kids and all of our communities need resources, but at the same time the numbers just kind of stick right there. You know, they stick out.

And so, I don't know about having a discussion on that or how we want to talk about that or make a motion or what the process would be.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes, I support that, Stacy. I think it fits under our No. 1 in our letter to the Secretary because we have said we want to elevate the issues around Indian education within the Department. And I think we could add that we would like priority efforts to be placed, in particular, on our lowest-achieving states.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Other comments?

MEMBER THOMAS: Well, do we want to get specific with states? Because, you know, Debbie was talking earlier about within her State there is a wide range; to where she is located, that it is lower, and then, just down the road it is a different scenario. So, I don't know if we want to be very specific in saying that it is a state. District, maybe district might be better, you know, something other than state, because I think that is too broad.

MEMBER PHELPS: In some states, you might have LEAs that are performing very poorly, even though the average or the gap isn't as significant. So, yes, I would be amenable to either LEA or district, or I don't know what the best term is. Is it LEA? Okay. And BIE schools are LEAs, too, right, grant schools? They are considered LEAs?

MEMBER THOMAS: Yes, they are. Yes.

MS. LEONARD: So, if you can help better figure out which one you want to go with, LEAs or a district, going back to what Stacy said, if it is a discretionary grant program, discretionary grant programs have eligible applicants. And so, some of the eligible applicants could be State Departments of Ed. For instance, the Comp Centers are not the State Departments of Ed. It is nonprofit institutions, higher education, what have you, so depending on what set of funding you are talking about.

If it is formula grants, very much like Title I, Rural Education, Office of Indian Ed's Formula Grant Program, some formula grant programs are formulated to the state. Then, the state,

based on whatever funding formula that is prescribed in statute, determines the allocation amounts for the LEAs. So, we make awards to the state. And then, the state, based on the formula, makes the awards to the LEAs.

Under Indian Ed, the Title VII program, it is a formula grant, but the statute authorizes the funding to go directly to the LEAs.

Under Rural Ed, we have a state program and we have an LEA program. So, half the funding we award to the state; the other half we award directly to the LEAs.

So, whatever captures all of those kind of options would probably be your best approach.

MEMBER THOMAS: What is your recommendation?

(Laughter)

MS. LEONARD: I think the best way to say it would be SEA/LEA, meaning State Educational Agency/LEA, as applicable.

MEMBER PHELPS: That wouldn't prohibit -- I mean, in a scenario let's say state like Arizona or South Dakota, could they get those funds and then, not in the spirit of what they are for, make localized decisions on how those funds would be assigned? Does that make sense?

MS. LEONARD: It does. But the state, by law, couldn't do that. They couldn't arbitrarily do that.

What would happen is you are making a recommendation to the Secretary. Either the Department would work with the appropriators to get language put in the appropriations to say that there is a priority or there is a -- yes, we call them priorities, right.

MEMBER PHELPS: You could say something, that SEAs and/or LEAs will prioritize funds, you know, whatever identified funds to focus on LEAs that have the widest achievement gaps or something to that effect?

MS. LEONARD: You could put it that way.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON-DENNISON: It can get really confusing because, although we are saying LEAs, in especially Title I in the grant applications that go for Title I and those type of -- the LEA is considered the state in many cases. Is that still the way it is? Because I know it used to be that way when I was a Federal Programs Director years ago, and the LEA was the state. And it is not like that when they apply for -- okay, so never mind then. That was my concern.

MS. LEONARD: And then, the thing here is you are just making a general recommendation. The devil is in the details. So, Ed would operate off of your recommendation to try to tailor language to meet your recommendation and could propose that to the appropriators. Once the appropriators got it, they would tailor it to suit their -- to come up with language.

So, you won't be crafting the language. You will just be making the recommendation. Others will craft language. Okay?

And by example, let me just say, for instance, one of our programs, one of my programs expired. And this allowed states and outlying areas to use that. Because it had expired, you couldn't use the program. But we worked with Budget and other senior policymakers in the Department to propose to the appropriators that they extend the authority to use that language or to use that program.

And what the appropriators did, in each budget year they put appropriation language in that allows not the states, but the outlying areas to continue to use that program until reauthorization.

So, it is a matter of making a recommendation, the Department acting on it, and then, it has to go to Congress to further act upon it, if they, in fact, agree. And it could appear in appropriations language, not in statute.

MEMBER PHELPS: So, do you have to go as far to say something like, in the case of SEAs, that funds prioritized are done so in collaboration with local LEAs or something like that? I mean, do you have to go that far?

MS. LEONARD: I think in your recommendation that you would explain exactly what you intend, and then, let the Department act accordingly. So, all of the details, you know, as it applies to states or as it applies to LEAs, just explain very clearly in your recommendation what your intent is. Then, they will act accordingly or respond accordingly.

MEMBER BUTTERFIELD: Yes, I think what we are trying to state is essentially what you said. It is that we want the Department to prioritize resources to the best of their ability that target our schools and communities that have the largest achievement gaps. And so, we can state that, and then, whatever regulations need to be created to ensure that those resources are allocated in that manner is really a Department responsibility. So, it is really more of a directive in terms of how to prioritize.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: I suggest if you are going to make a motion, someone do it now. We are losing our quorum. People are getting ready to head over.

MEMBER PHELPS: I make a motion to direct the Secretary to prioritize resources, both discretionary and formula, to LEAs and communities that have the achievement gaps for American Indians.

MEMBER NEWELL: I will second that motion.

MEMBER PHELPS: And in the case of SEAs, that they do so with the SEAs working collaboratively with the local LEAs.

MEMBER NEWELL: Now I'll second the motion.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: It has been moved, and seconded by Wayne.

Further discussion?

(No response)

Hearing none, call for the question.

All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

Hearing none, the motion is carried.

Wayne, did you get the new call-in number? I assume you did because you are on the line.

MEMBER NEWELL: No, I did not.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Oh, she emailed it to you.

MEMBER NEWELL: Okay. I will write it down if you give it to me.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: It is 1-800-871-9742.

MEMBER NEWELL: Uh-hum.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: And the access code is 852229256#.

MEMBER NEWELL: Okay. 1-800-871-9742?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Correct.

MEMBER NEWELL: 852229256#?

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Correct. Thank you.

MEMBER NEWELL: Thank you.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: I would just like to put it into the record; there was quite a bit of discussion yesterday regarding our preparation of the agenda. I didn't want to leave the impression that there was not a formal agenda that was brought forward. There was one, since we are on a public record and we want to show that we are diligently following it. We just moved to improve how we formed the agenda.

With that said, motion to adjourn.

MEMBER PHELPS: Second.

CHAIR ACEVEDO: Nondebatable.

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes)

We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:44 p.m.)