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MS. HUNTER: Good morning everyone. I am sorry for the delay. We -- hopefully we will be starting very shortly. We are just one shy of a quorum, and so we are just trying to get in touch so that we can begin. Okay? Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 9:26 a.m. and resumed at 9:35 a.m.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Good morning everyone.

(Native language spoken.)

CHAIR DENNISON: We are going to start. I know we have Virginia on line. Virginia, are you there?

(No audible response.)

MR. ROULAIN: All callers are muted.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. So -- even her, as a council member? She should be unmuted, I would think.
MR. ROULAIN: Okay.

CHAIR DENNISON: We are running a little behind, but we are going to go ahead and start with -- I am going to ask Patsy if she would do our opening prayer for us for our council meeting and for our Indian education. Thank you.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I am pleased to be here with all of you today. And I just want to ask for a blessing for each and every one of us.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. WHITEFOOT: So, in my language this morning, just sharing blessings and asking our creator to be with us on this -- this land that we stand today. Thankful for the ancestors that were a part of this land. Ask for blessings for each and every one of you -- for your health, your well-being. Blessings for your family and community where you come from so that there will be blessings with them, too. Especially thankful for the leadership at
the Department of Education and the role that
the NACIE has with the Department of Education.
Ask for all of these things on behalf of the
children, the grandchildren that we have back
at home that depend on the work that we do. So
these few words I share with all of you this
morning as well. Thank you.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Patsy.
Okay, I just got -- we are going to let
Angeline do some housekeeping, and then we want
to do introductions after that.

MS. BOULLEY: Sure. And are you on
the line at all or able to text --

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, I am -- I am
getting --

MS. BOULLEY: If you could let her--
- let us know what her phone number is, the
logins on the virtual meeting, she didn't put
in her name, so we don't know which number to
unmute so that she can participate virtually.
Hello everyone, we've got--

(Native language spoken.)
MS. BOULLEY: My name is Angeline Boulley and I work with Tribal Tech, LLC. And we are the meeting support contractor for the Office of Indian Education. I tried to get around to everyone and give you my business card. If you have any questions or if you can't hear or cold or anything like that, please feel free to text me, or, you know, let me know and I will try to resolve any difficulties that you might have.

We are having the meeting recorded and it's very important, when you speak, if you can speak into the microphone and if you can say your name, that will help our stenographer, Albert, very much and make for a better document to capture what everyone has said. The bathrooms -- in addition to the bathrooms that are past the coffee station, there is a closer set of bathrooms and it is -- as if you were going into the FEMA area, there are some bathrooms that are right there.

And then, also, we had posted the
information about accessing the internet. And so there is internet access for you and we have the -- can you put the instructions back up? So if you want to make sure that you choose the Holiday Inn Capitol, and you have to choose from the drop-down access code and enter capitol2 for your wifi. And that's it.

(Native language spoken.)

CHAIR: Thank you, Angeline. I just texted you Virginia Thomas's number. So you have her number. She says she can't hear, so that's what we're dealing with.

Okay again, welcome. It's been a long time since we've met. We're very appreciative to be back together again. I know we have a lot of work to do, but we can proceed with the -- with the work that does not entail administrative work as we await a quorum. I know it's pretty early in the -- in the west coast, so waiting on Sam to get on to make a quorum, so -- I -- go around the table and we'll start with Patsy. You all met her.
Thank you, Patsy, for the beautiful prayer. I am going to go ahead and start with you. Introduce yourself and -- to the rest of the council. I know we all know each other, but for the audience and for the record -- thank you.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. WHITEFOOT: I greeted you in the language of the Yakama Nation. I also shared my Indian name, Patricia Whitefoot, and my English name is Patricia Whitefoot. I am a member of the Confederate Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation and live in a community of White Swan, Washington on the Yakima Reservation. And I also work with our Indian Education Program at Toppenish School District as well as the Yakama Nation Wellness Coalition. So I work part time for Indian Education and part time for a prevention program on the reservation. So I'm glad to be here with all of you.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Good morning. I am Robin Butterfield. And I am a Ho-Chunk,
Anishinaabe tribal member. Currently retired, sort of. I am the current president of the Oregon Indian Education Association and president-elect for the National Indian Education Association. And I've been doing some work with the NAPTAC Center, the Native American Parent Technical Assistance Center, and several other kinds of things. But I am very happy to be here, and looking forward to jumping back into the work.

MS. BROWN: Good morning, I am the daughter of Lucy and Sam Brown, the granddaughter of George and Maver Hoffman (phonetic) of Aniak, Alaska and Beatrice and Everett Brown (phonetic) of (inaudible). Most importantly, my name is Doreen Brown. Most importantly I am also a mom. I have a 22-year-old who's a senior in college. And I also have an 11-year-old, she's a fifth grader. I am the senior director for Title VI, Indian Education in Anchorage, Alaska. We have over 9,000 native students. My heritage is, I'm Yupik
Eskimo and Athabascan Indian, and I am a tribal member of Aniak. And I am pleased to be here.

CHAIR DENNISON: We are being asked to use our mics as we speak. I know it's -- we've gotten into the habit of not using them. So, if we can use our mics when we speak.

(Native language spoken.)

MR. LESSARD: How's that? Can you hear me? Good morning, everyone.

(Native language spoken.)

MR. LESSARD: My name is Ron Lessard and I am the acting executive director for the White House Initiative on American Indian and Alaska Native Education. I am Mohawk. My family comes from Kahnawake and we also lived in Akwesasne. And growing up I spent many, many, many years living on Pine Ridge. My Indian name from that period is --

(Native language spoken.)

MR. LESSARD: -- which is Eagle Going Out. And I am happy you're here. It is good to see everyone come in and have a safe trip.
And it'll be a good day. Thank you.

MS. RAMSEY: My name is Tara Ramsey, and I am the acting director of the Office of Indian Education. I will be giving you a little bit more information about me when I speak a little later. So we will move right along.

(Native language spoken.)

CHAIR DENNISON: I am originally from -- well, my father is from Arizona and I am currently married into the people in Tohatchi, New Mexico, are my in-laws. And my husband is Carl and my -- I have three children and I have been really excited about being involved with NACIE since we started. I know we have accomplished so much, yet we have so much to do. My professional background is, I am currently a superintendent at San Carlos Unified School District on the Apache Nation and -- but most of my life I have been -- most of my administrative experience has been on the Navajo Nation, so it is an honor to be here. I
am your chair of NACIE and I look forward to all the work that we're going to be doing throughout this year. Thank you.

MS. BROADDUS: Good morning. My name is Mandy Smoker Broaddus. And I am from the Fort Peck Reservation, Assiniboine and Sioux, in northeastern Montana. I have one child, a son, that's five-and-a-half years old. And we currently live in the state capital of Montana, Helena, and I am a former school administrator. But I've worked for the Office of Public Instruction in Montana, which is our state education agency, and I am the director of Indian Education.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. PROUDFIT: Dr. Joely Proudfit. I am a descendent from the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians from Temecula, California. I currently reside in the traditional homelands of my people, the Payomkawichum Luiseno people in northern San Diego County. And I am the director of the California Indian Culture and
Sovereignty Center and the Chair of American Indian Studies at California State University, San Marcos. And I am mother to Piper Proudfit, who was the six-year-old who just returned back to school today after a two-week spring break. So my husband is very thrilled this morning as he's preparing her to get ready to go to school. And I am very grateful to be back with all of you here and excited that we can continue our work, so --

(Pause.)

MS. PROUDFIT: Tina, did you want to introduce yourself?

MS. THOMAS: Can you hear me?


MS. THOMAS: Oh, this is Virginia. The one in Oklahoma in Oklahoma that's stuck here. But I wish I was there with all of you. And I want to be able to help in any way that I can. But I can only be on the line for a
couple of hours today and I can't be on at all
tomorrow. So I wish you all well. But if
there's something I can do to from a distance,
let me know, I am willing to do it. So, I am
glad you guys are back together.

MS. HUNTER: Hi there. I am Tina Hunter. I am the DFO for NACIE. And I thank
you for allowing me to serve in this position.

(Off microphone comments.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Oh good, Aaron. Aaron, you're on by phone. Go ahead.

MR. PAYMENT: Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes.

MR. PAYMENT: Oh, there's an echo. Let me see if I can -- are you guys hearing an echo?

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay, I will proceed. If you -- if you're not hearing it, then I will -- so I can only hear, like, the first two words out of each person. So I don't know if -
you have to keep your mic very close. I can hear Denise very well. So I am glad to be back. And I know that we will do great work. And I am sorry that I can't be there in person. I have a Council meeting tomorrow.

CHAIR DENNISON: I think part of the echo might be from people keeping their mics on. And so we can turn it off every time we speak and then turn it back on when we're going to speak.

MR. PAYMENT: Is it echoing now?

CHAIR DENNISON: No.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay, I think I figured it out. So if everybody could please speak directly into the microphone when you do speak, because I heard -- I -- during the introduction I only heard actually three people. And I only heard like the first two words out of each person.

MS. THOMAS: This is Virginia.

That's the same with me. I could only hear bits and pieces.
(Pause.)

MR. BROWN: Hello? Can everybody hear me?

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes.

MR. BROWN: This is Dahkota I am on the -- by phone, also.

(Native language spoken.)

MR. BROWN: Good morning, everyone. I am here at Stanford, sorry I couldn't be with you all this morning. But glad to be back.

CHAIR DENNISON: Oh great. I am glad you are there, Dahkota. I didn't know you were on by phone. So we do have a quorum. And welcome back. And I hope you're doing well in school. Are you going to be able to be with us for the full two days, Dahkota?

MR. BROWN: Yes, yes. I will be on tomorrow. I have to hop off a little bit before lunch today to get to class. But I will -- other than that.

CHAIR DENNISON: Understandable.

Okay, good. Did I leave anybody out that needs
to do introductions? Okay. We can proceed, then. We'll go ahead and go on to the introduction of Tara and -- she did one already, but -- so do you want to go on to the -- let's -- let's review the agenda -- the meeting overview. Today, and I know we are a little behind time, but we do have Tara that will be presenting from the Office of Indian Education on the OIE updates and initiatives. And we also have Ron Lessard who is acting executive director of the White House Initiative on American Indian and Alaska Native Education, who will be doing updates on initiatives. And we do have a quorum, so after their updates, we will go on with the order of business. First one will be the OIE director position. Then we will work from there. So, Patsy, you have question?

MS. WHITEFOOT: Oh, I did. I am sorry.

CHAIR DENNISON: She did. It was very brief, but she did. So we will turn it
over to -- any other questions? Okay, we will
turn it over to Ms. Tara.

MS. RAMSEY: Okay, I want to make
sure that I can be heard. I speak rather
loudly anyway, as a former teacher, so -- but
with all the electronics I just want to make
sure that -- that everybody is hearing me. Is
there a way we can --

MR. BROWN: I can hear you.

MS. RAMSEY: Great. Great. Well,
first of all, good rainy morning. If you were
in the room or here you realize I -- I did not
bring an umbrella this morning, by the looks of
my hair. So -- but, I am still glad to be with
you all. And I -- I wanted to go ahead and say
a few words about me now than, rather take it
up during the introduction. Again, my name is
Tara Ramsey, and if you decide for some reason
you don't like me, you can always refer to my
name backwards. Because my first name
backwards is a rat. So that will go ahead and
give you a way to talk about me if you need to.
I don't think I've told my staff that yet, so -- but, anyway, as you get to know me or work with me, one of the things you know that I always like to start with is either the mission of the organization that I am working with, or I like to start with appreciation. That my staff does know.

And so today I am going to start with appreciation. I -- I want to thank you all not only for serving on NACIE, but thank you for helping me fill this important and temporary role as acting director of the Office of Indian Education. To tell you a little bit more about me, I have been with the department for 13 years this summer. And I started and stayed in the Office of Migrant Education. And through the Office of Migrant Education I came to cross over with some issues with students. For example, I have been out to Yakama at least two times for Migrant Education. I've been to northern New Mexico, Espanola specifically, and Albuquerque. And I know that we have some
students in common. I also, in 2012, was detailed to the Office of Indian Education as the Competition manager for the first ever state tribal education partnership step competition. So even though I am relatively new in this role as of October 2017, I have had some work with both -- with both sides of the office.

You know, with that work for step -- and certainly since starting in the Office in October, I have really come to understand and further respect the work of the colleagues of the Office of Indian Education, but also specifically the work of the director of the Office of Indian Education. And I can't tell you how much I am going to appreciate all of your input and support in finding someone to take over this very important role. Because again, I've learned not only is there a lot going on in our office -- and I will be talking to you about that -- there's obviously a lot of responsibility for the director of Indian
Education throughout the department. And if you hear a little sigh of relief in my voice, it's because yes, there's a lot to -- a lot of work to do, and I am very excited that you are going to be working on finding a good person for this position.

And so, with that, again, I want to thank you for letting me serve native students in this capacity. I also want to take time to thank my staff, who is here -- the staff of the Office of Indian Education, not my staff. They're very independent people. If they could all just stand up -- any of those that are in the room right now, could you guys just stand up for a second so everybody can see you? They're not happy about that. Yes. Thank you guys. I just want to thank them for all the work they do.

(Applause.)

MS. RAMSEY: So with that, I do want to just give you a few updates. I just want to make sure I am on the right part of the agenda,
right? Okay, all right. And so, I do just
want to remind you of a few personnel changes
and updates that have happened over the last
little while. As most of you know, Bernard
Garcia retired from the department in December
of 2017. And some of you might not know this,
but he was actually right next to me for many
years when I was working in Migrant Education.
And so, not only do I miss him in my role here
with Indian Education, I just miss him as a
colleague. As you know, he was always very
positive and very good at reflecting on the
work that you do here.

But given that I know he had over 40
-- or 45 years in federal service, I am very
excited that he is getting the chance to have
some fun and relax. And I think he's got a
honey-do list that's pretty long as well. Also
retiring last year in September 2012 was John
CheekSheet (phonetic). And John, you know -- I
know from working with him in the STEPtep
Program that he was -- he was always a go-to
guy and he was always willing to take on more. And so he left the department in -- in September of 2017.

So, if you're keeping count, that's about 11 people in the office right now. But we are working -- we can make some moves to take up for those changes. Amaya Pirgo (phonetic) Amalia Cuervo goes down over the NYCP Program, K Candice Kosticaustik (phonetic) who is not with us either today, is also working on the NAL. So you see some changes to help make up for these. We are also working on getting some temporary detailees into the office. And we hope they're going to be here within the next few weeks to also help us as we get into our busy grant making season. And it is going to be a busy grant making season because, as hopefully you know by now, we got more money. And so with that, I want to turn to appropriations updates.

On March 23rd, 2018, Congress passed a Consolidated Appropriations Act. And in that
act Congress provided new appropriation for the Office of Indian Education and our programs for the remainder of the FY -- Fiscal Year 2018. And Title VI, just to kind of go over what the different places -- what the different programs go, Title VI received $105,381,000. And my staff, if I get any of this wrong, then you will have to jump up and correct me. That is an increase of nearly 5 percent from the FY 2017 appropriation. In fact, all appropriants for the Office of Indian Education received increases from year's appropriation. And again, that's why I say it's going -- continues to be a busy year, because we've got more money.

In our special programs appropriations, we have received nearly $68 million. And of course, under Special Programs, just to remind you, we fund our demonstration grants, which currently are the Native Youth Community Projects, the NYCP program and the Professional Development
program, the PD program. This appropriation was about a 17-percent increase from last year's appropriation. And just as a reminder, this money not only goes for new awards that we'll be making, but also for continuations of existing awards and running the competitions to make new awards.

Finally, for National Activities, which includes the Step Program and the NAL, Native American Language Program, we received about $6.8 million. And again, this funds the staff in the NAL, but it also fills some of our other contracts, our tactical assistance contracts, as well as our contracts for -- for example, for the EZ System for the Title VI application system.

And so turning from appropriations, I want to go ahead and tell you a little bit about just some program dates. As I mentioned before -- a minute ago, with formula we will be awarding $105,381,000 to Title VI applicants. As you know, this is already in motion. Part
two is open and will be open until early May. And I believe there's not a problem with me telling that we've received about 1,314 applications -- 13-14, applications for the formula grants. Which is actually up from last year, as I understand it.

And so on the discretionary side of the office, with the Native Youth Community Projects -- NYCP -- again, as I said, we will be writing competition for new awards for that. And we do plan to announce the notice inviting applications very soon, likely mid-May. We do expect that there will be a few changes to that notice inviting applications. So please, if you know anyone who is going to be planning to apply, make sure they review the application carefully. Of course, we cannot get into the specifics here until that notice officially goes out. But, at least we can tell you that it will have some changes from the last competition.
This is also true for the other competition we will be completing this fiscal year, and that's for the professional development program. We will be holding a new competition and pretty much everything I just told you for the NYCP program is also true for the professional development program. We are hoping we might get a notice inviting the applications out a little earlier on that one, but again, we will see about that. And just as a reminder, too, and I don't have all of the specific information here, but we can get you that information. For those -- both of those programs we will be looking for readers for those competitions, and people to work as a part of that to help us get those awards out. I believe we are announcing a PD request for readers -- either went out last week or this week, depending on what list serves and websites you're looking in. And then we will be sending out a solicitation for readers for the NYCP soon. If you wondered about that or
want contact information, we can get you information about that. But as always, it takes a lot to do that. And so, if anyone has any interest at all, please make sure that they get in contact with us.

Finally for STEP and for NAL, I --- they are not having new competitions this year. So I guess that's the biggest news. We will be making continuation awards for both of those programs. And so moving from those general updates on the program I did want to just take a minute to tell you what's going on with monitoring for the programs. We have limited the number of monitorings that we're going to do for all of the programs this year as we work with the management support unit of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Ed. to revise monitoring protocols, report templates and things like that.

Oh wait, here we go, it's back. Okay, hopefully the mic is back and you can hear me. So for **Formula** we are looking at how
we conduct a holistically plan for monitoring of the grants throughout the grant cycle. And we are looking at that with the help of the management support unit. For NYCP, we are also partnering with our management support unit to target fiscal monitoring for a few grantees so that we can revise our monitoring grant policy for that program as well. And for NAL, given it's its first year in implementation, we are directing targeted technical assistance rather than monitoring so that those newest grantees are getting the full help of technical assistance before they are called to be monitored. We are also doing this for STEP as well. And then finally for the Professional Development program, we also are doing our monitoring with them as targeted desk monitoring. I am happy to talk about any of that if you'd like in more.

To go on just briefly to technical assistance, as we discussed monitoring, for some grantees we're doing more technical
assistance rather than monitoring. And for this year we have -- just to kind of give you a reflection of what we've done this year, we've held different project directors meetings for the various programs. We've been doing webinars with our contractor for staff at NYCP. And -- and just as a reminder to help figure -- in case you need to know this, we do have a technical assistance contract for the NYCP and Step programs, and then we also have another smaller TA contract that helps with issues with NAL and NYCP. And I am happy to review any of the contracts or go over anything you guys need to know from the office. Again, it's my pleasure to serve you in any capacity that I can.

We did want to let you know that we have been thinking about doing federal technical assistance day a little differently this year. In the past we've spent a lot of energy and a lot of time on the logistics and kind of getting that TA day going. And so we
are taking a look at how we are doing that and how -- how best we can use that -- that time and that energy to serve you. So we are happy to hear more about that, if you have comments or feedback for us. We are also seeking opportunities to where we can get to more state conferences or scheduling on-sites. So again, these are things I am hoping to hear more about certainly from your perspective. We do a grantee satisfaction survey every year where we hear from some of our programs. And I just wanted to remind you of what the last grantees satisfaction survey said, in case that also helps you in the things that you're working on.

In 2017 the grantees satisfaction survey went up for the Title VI program and for the Demonstration grant program. For the Title VI we had a response rate of 37 percent. And a response rate of 36 percent for the Demo grants. Now, there are several questions on the customer -- I mean, the grantee satisfaction survey. And from those questions
they determine something called a CSI, and that's the customer satisfaction index. And that particularly score is the signs -- kind of the general overview of how we're doing for our grantees.

Title VI, I am really happy to report, came in the top ten of all programs surveyed under the grantee satisfaction survey. So that really speaks well to what that program has been doing, and our team there. The Demo had a CSI of 68 -- and I am sorry, the Title VI had a CSI rating of 68 points. And in the areas of technical assistance for OESE programs, Title VI was in the top five programs with a score of 87 for that combined technical assistance score, and the Demo -- the Demonstration program had a 67 for technical assistance. And of course, this is just an overview. Again, if there are questions about the survey or want to know more about that, we can certainly -- certainly give you that information. We are in the process of -- I
think we've just finally submitted our -- our questions for this year and we weren't planning many changes. But if there's anything else or any other ideas that you all have about that, we would be happy to hear about how we might ask different questions, or somehow get the best feedback we can from that survey.

So, I am actually going to close and turn it all over to you so I can listen and learn from you today. Certainly as you work through your meeting today and tomorrow, if there is any other nation, any other resources that I can help provide for you, please don't hesitate to let me know how I can be of service because I know how important the work you're doing is. Thank you again for all the work that you're doing for our native students. And thank you again for all the work you're about to do.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Tara. Do you have any questions for Tara before we move to the next presenter?
MS. BUTTERFIELD: Okay, this is Robin. I have a -- first of all, sort of a point of order, I think we need to approve our agenda. But in terms of the -- the Office of Indian Ed, when did you say that the professional development competition would open?

MS. RAMSEY: We are hoping, I believe, in mid-May -- is what we're hoping. Again, sorry -- we are hoping that it will open in mid-May. Again, that's subject to a lot of different clearances and things happen, but that's what we're planning on.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: And then I had a question about the National Activities Funds, I think, before some of those were dedicated to putting money in the technical assistance kind of comp centers, or the National Legal Centers, to be their outreach to -- in communities. Are those still in play?

MS. RAMSEY: I am not aware that they -- that we use those National Activities
funds for that purpose. In the past they may have -- in the past they may have, but I am not aware of that at the time. But I can find out more information about those.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Okay.

MS. BROADDUS: And I spoke with my comp center -- Education Northwest, ours, and they told me that they -- yes, that funding has gone away.

MS. RAMSEY: There -

MS. BROADDUS: Gone.

MS. RAMSEY: There will be a representative from the office that oversees the comp centers coming in later this afternoon, too. And we will make sure that they have more information beforehand.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes, but they got the money, I thought, out of the Indian Ed funds under National Activities, which I think also funds the oversampling, you know, for the state.

MS. RAMSEY: I am not aware of that,
and -- but again, I am happy to get more information and get clarification for you. They do -- they do use the National Activities and Jamie Deaton is here and he will be speaking with you more later about that particular part of those activities of the National Activities fund. Patsy?

MS. WHITEFOOT: Yes, good morning, Tara. Thank you for being here with us today. I just want to clarify your email address is a-rat?

MS. RAMSEY: No, it's tara.ramsey@ed.gov.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Oh, okay. So what was a-rat then?

MS. RAMSEY: That's my name spelled backwards. Just --

(Laughter.)

MS. RAMSEY: It was just my opening bit, Patsy. Thanks for -- thanks for bringing that up.

(Laughter.)
MS. WHITEFOOT: Oh, okay, I just --
(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. WHITEFOOT: Thank you for clarifying that, I would have been trying to --

MS. RAMSEY: Sure.
(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. RAMSEY: Maybe I should get that as an email. Maybe that would -- it's Tara, T-A-R-A. My mother hates that joke, by the way.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay, thank you.

MS. RAMSEY: Sure.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I just wanted to say, first of all, I really appreciate the work that you've done in Migrant Education because for many, many, many years this is an issue we've been addressing in the northwest. So much so, that we've done resolutions to address this issue of making certain that Native students are a part of migrant education. And unfortunately, even though we do have migrant education in our area, still they're
overlooked. And more recently the Office of Superintendent of Instruction did advertise for a Migrant Education position, specifically for Native students. But it's still an issue. I just want to say that. In terms of getting support for Native students on that and the recruitment, the outreach, all of the work that needs to go on. And generally two people in our state focus in on that. It -- and with 29 tribes have been significant populations, particularly in the urban communities, so Seattle, Tacoma, Spokane, Vancouver, Yakama -- of course -- there's still a need to continue addressing the needs of native students as well. And I know migrant education -- you know, is somewhat complex in how they do that, too. Very complex. So -- and -- by the way, are you going to be attending the migrant education conference in Portland?

MS. RAMSEY: I will not at this time. And -- but that is something I am a little bit more familiar with because I know --
I think from having to deal with that, especially with some of our minor grants in northern New Mexico, I have been really trying to understand the agricultural movements and the migration in the tribes and in reservations because I think that's part of the disconnect.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Right.

MS. RAMSEY: That the local migrant programs, and even the other discretionary programs, don't quite understand how that works, so they're not sure how to know whether those students are eligible. But that's some -- that's something I do know more about and how to talk more in that realm. But I think it's a matter of educating migrant programs about what kind of agriculture -- and migrant agriculture is happening on reservations and around reservations. But it's also about helping the tribes understand what it means to be migrant in those programs.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Well, and I think another issue -- not just understanding it, but
also what is the understanding about the work that goes on? Particularly for us in the northwest, it's about the subsistence fishing lifestyle that we have as well as the traditional medicines and foods as well. And I know we can't say that when it comes to migrant education, but it's something I think that there's a need for serious Education with migrant education staff as well.

MS. RAMSEY: Well, I can certainly share that with the Migrant office. So we can talk more about that.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Yes. And, you know, for future purposes would really like to have a discussion on migrant education with NACIE as well.

MS. RAMSEY: Actually there may be -- actually, I see there not on the agenda, but I am happy to discuss more and I can certainly share -- you know, maybe they can approve it, or -- in another meeting.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay. Okay, thank
you very much. I have a -- want to follow up with the National Activities Fund and NACIE's fund. So where is NACIE in -- where are we housed?

MS. RAMSEY: In the National Activities Fund.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay. And what is the budget for NACIE?

MS. RAMSEY: I don't have that on me right now, but I will get that for you. And our team may have that, actually.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay, yes. Just want to know what the fund is and also, like, for NAEP too, what is their fund? As well, what is their budget? I just know that over the years that we have been very active in the -- really conducting the work that needs to be done for the Congressional Report and we've done that ourselves. And just want to make certain that we really take a look at getting technical support for that, too, because we are just doing that on our own.
MS. RAMSEY: Sure. Matt, you are writing this all down.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay, all right.

MR. RAMSEY: And I don't -- I am not going to talk off the top of my head when it comes to numbers.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Right, I understand.

MS. RAMSEY: But I will get that information for you before we leave. Before today is over.

MS. WHITEFOOT: And then the final point I just want to make has to do with formula funding -- really taking a look at the holistic approach to the Title VI funding. I think -- thank you for sharing that information. I think that's important. That's a -- that's a -- you know, a serious issue in our communities because the work that's done with, you know, Title VI is important and sometimes that's the only funding that you have in communities that are addressing the needs of native students. And so that holistic approach
that you're looking at, I think, is something that you seriously need to consider. Thank you.

MS. RAMSEY: Well, and just to clarify, when I -- I said holistic, I am looking to, again, how we are looking at the programs. In the office we spend an enormous amount of energy right around this time of year just pouring over applications. And I am concerned about, like, how we look at and help programs throughout the whole year. So that's kind of also where -- where I speak from.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay, thank you for clarifying that.

MS. RAMSEY: Sure.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Patsy and Robin. Okay, go ahead. You have one more?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: I am sorry, this is Robin again. I've got a couple of questions in terms of just looking at the charter and -- is that directed to you? It looks to me like our charter is running out this month.
MS. HUNTER: We are updating the charter this -- it is running out.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: So what is the process for doing that? Is it just -

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. HUNTER: It's every two years.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Is it just an administrative function?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. HUNTER: Yes, it's an administrative function.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Oh, okay.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Robin. And then, now that we do have a quorum I guess we could go back up and -- I am a little bit worried.

MS. BROWN: Deborah, I have a question. This is Doreen for Tara.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, go ahead.

MS. BROWN: Good morning, Tara. I am Doreen. So I just -- can you speak to the Title VI survey that's going out and -- right,
as a timeline? Because I think that information is going to be useful to NACIE and many other grantees and the people across the nation in utilizing and looking at Title VI services. And so, if you can give us a timeline and just a brief update on the survey.

MS. RAMSEY: I believe you're talking about the study -- the survey that goes along with the study that our Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development is doing -- we usually just call them OPEPD. And they spoke last year at the Federal TA Day. I believe it was with Joanne Bogart and some others. That survey is part of a study that that office is doing for Title VI. And it -- I am afraid I don't know what the timeline is for that survey. But I can get that information for you. And I am not sure if anybody is speaking from there, but I can get you some more information on the timeline, not only for the survey, but I can get you a timeline for the study itself and -- and I can get that for
you. It's just not out of our office, so I don't have the information right here in front of me.

MS. BROWN: Okay, thank you.

MS. RAMSEY: Sure.

CHAIR DENNISON: Any more questions before I move on?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, we will go ahead and go back up and approve the agenda because we do have a quorum. I am a little bit worried because I know that people are on and off by phone. So I don't know if we can sometimes go back and double check that we have a quorum before we take any action so it can be legitimate. Right now I think we have -- we do have a quorum, but I know -- Sam McCraken just texted me said he is getting on but he is only on for a short while. Virginia is leaving in a couple hours. And so we do still have Aaron and Dahkota on -- I hope that they're on all day with us because we need them. So, please
let us know when you're -- text me or text --

yes, I think it would be better to text me. If

you don't have my number, I will have someone

send it out. I will have Angeline send it out

so that we can be able to keep in

communication. Those of you that are on by

phone, I am talking to, to make certain that we

have a quorum so we are not taking action on

something that is not legit. So we will go

back up and approve the agenda. Do we have a

motion to approve the agenda?

MS. BROWN: Motion to approve the

agenda.

CHAIR DENNISON: Motion by Dr.

Proudfit. Motion to approve the agenda. Do we

have a second?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Well I will

second.

CHAIR DENNISON: Second by Robin.

Any discussion?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes, based on what

you just said, could we sort of prioritize the
action parts of the agenda to make sure that
we're going to have a quorum -- in terms of
covering those? Like, I am assuming there
would be action around the director position
and probably the annual report which isn't
scheduled --

CHAIR DENNISON: That's tomorrow.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Until tomorrow.

CHAIR DENNISON: But the -- we do
have the NACIE business meeting, OIE, that's
right after Ron Lessard's presentation. I
think we can get that in. Or, do we want to do
that first before Ron? Is that what you're
asking?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes, so that is
just my recommendation.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, that's your
recommendation. Do you have a view from --
you're the motion, Joely, so do you -- except,
that is part of the -

MS. PROUDFIT: I accept that.

MS. BROADDUS: And I accept it.
CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, so the motion is to move the NACIE Business OIE Director Position discussion and possible action up before Ron. And all in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Any opposition?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR DENNISON: The motion passes. I didn't hear any opposition, so however many we have, it passed. So that would be the next order of business, then. So thank you, Ms. Ramsey. We really got to know you in the short period of time. I know we are going to get to know you for the next two days. That's pretty interesting, what you've been involved with in your career. We are excited to be working with you. So -- so let's go ahead and move on to the next order of business which is the OIE director position. We will open it up to discussion on how we want to proceed with that. And the last time we had a subcommittee -- I don't know if it's the same thing we want to do
again -- we had a subcommittee of, I think, about five of us. And we had one person that screened, and that was Virginia. Okay, the subcommittee -- it's on Section 8 of your booklet. Our subcommittee -- our committees are on page 8 -- or, Section 8. For the hiring process and questions we had Co-chairs Sam McCraken and Virginia Thomas last time. We had Robin, Joely and Patricia as the committee members. Do we want to keep that the same?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Are you all okay with the same, I guess? The only one -- Sam, are you on yet?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Virginia, I know you're still on.

MS. THOMAS: I am still on, and I am great with that.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. We can leave it the same and I will circle back with Sam and let him know that he's still on. So we -- we
can leave that as-is, and do you want to set the timelines? And what we want to do moving forward from here?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Well, maybe we can get I guess input from Tina in terms of how quickly we need to get it to HR and -- you know, what's the timeline for them getting it out there?

MS. HUNTER: Sure. Since everything -- we had gone through the entire process before the freeze, everything is still in place. The only thing we will need to do, the PD, was classify the vacancy announcement was created. We just need to repost the job for another 30 days, and then we will start the interview process. So we posted the job before for 30 days, so we can repost again. Today is Monday. We can have it reposted by next Monday for 30 days if everybody is okay with that.

MS. BROADDUS: This is Mandy. Can you make sure that we get that information so that we can circulate it -- help circulate it?
MS. HUNTER: Absolutely. As soon as it's posted, I will do the same thing we did last year and send out the link.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: So, then what's the timeline once the 30 days has expired? Then that's when Virginia and the committee will do an initial review?

MS. HUNTER: Yes, absolutely. So once the 30 days expires, we have to wait for HR to issue a certificate. The last time that took about a week. I don't expect it to take any longer this time. And then we start the interview process. And Virginia, do you remember -- that was -- that was about a week also, I think. Was it a week?

MS. THOMAS: I believe it was.

MS. HUNTER: Okay, so We're looking -- once the vacancy closes, we're looking at another two to three weeks to make a selection.

MR. PAYMENT: Tina, can you hear me?

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, we can hear you.
MR. PAYMENT: Okay.

(Pause.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Go ahead, Aaron.

(No audible response.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Now we can't hear you. Aaron, can you hear us?

MR. PAYMENT: I can hear you, can you hear me?

CHAIR DENNISON: Now we can, yes, go ahead.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay, I have no idea what's going on, but I will give this a quick shot. So can we formalize the communication to previous applicants? Because all of this was out of our control in the hiring freeze. But I don't want to send a confused or mixed message to people who have applied before because I do think that the 30 days -- we should try to move as quickly as possible. So we fill the position before another hiring freeze comes around. And -- but I would like to be courteous to the people who took the time to
apply before, so can we formalize a communication out to say that the hiring freeze has been lifted, we're proceeding and it should basically just ask if they would like their application -- or, just to explain to them how to reapply?

MS. THOMAS: This is Virginia, can you hear me?

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, Virginia.

MS. THOMAS: Aaron, we -- I don't know if you remember, but before the applicants that came in -- they actually denied them because of their lack of experience and understanding of the Office of Indian Education and -- I think every one of them didn't even understand what NACIE was. So that's why we had to close it and start all over again.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay, thank you. I appreciate that. That's fine.

CHAIR DENNISON: Virginia, no, we did make an offer but there -- there was a -- we made a recommendation, but the freeze came
into play and that was what stopped it. Because we did -- we did make a -- and it took longer than three weeks.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, well we took -- it took -- I don't know what happened after we made the recommendation, but we did later hear that nothing went through. And so we are back to square one. And so I do see what Aaron is saying. But we did do our part. We made the selection. We weren't -- I know I can say that we were back and forth on it a lot, but we did finally make a selection. And we did make that formal recommendation to Dr. Chism, if I recall, and then months later we heard that it never went through.

MR. PAYMENT: Yes, this is Aaron again. My preference is -- I do support and I appreciate, actually, the willingness to do a 30-day and then a quick turnaround because this is a critically important position. And -- and -- but also for people who previously applied,
that doesn't mean that we're telling them they're going to be hired, it's just -- you know, I want that back in front of us so that we have a good cadre to choose from. And then we can get through all of our networks and encourage people to see the posting and all of that.

CHAIR DENNISON: That's understood. Patsy, you have a question.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Yes, I just wanted to be clear because we did not get any communication that the offer that did go out did go to a male individual. Is that correct?

CHAIR DENNISON: That's the communication -- no, the communication from NACIE was for a male. I don't know what went forward from there. But our recommendation to Dr. Chism was for a male that we came to consensus on as the council, as a recommendation, and then I don't know about any -- I didn't hear about anything from it's -- from that point forward. So there was so much
going on, and at the same time I didn't ever --
I understand a different recommendation was
being considered. But then at the same time, I
don't know what happened and why, but we never
were communicated back to.

MS. WHITEFOOT: And I raise that
simply because we weren't communicated with.
Excuse me.

MS. BROADDUS: And I don't know how
-- I mean, it is relevant, but that's not my --
I know the individual that the position was
offered to, and it was not a male.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes, and I -- I
think that was a concern in that we did have
quite a discussion about who to recommend, and
we sent that to HR with two possibilities, but
the one that we wanted was not the one that was
given the offer. And so that was, I think, one
of our issues is sort of, what is the authority
of NACIE to make the recommendation and not
have it be a priority with HR?

MS. HUNTER: So, it's actually not
HR that makes the final decision. So it was -- it's the OESE leadership team. And Monique Chism was leading that. She has since departed. And you will meet Dr. Lisa Ramirez tomorrow and Jason Botel, who is the acting assistant secretary. The individuals that were recommended by NACIE were interviewed by a panel of senior leadership. And the offer was made to another individual that was -- that was on the certificate. So that is the individual that later declined.

CHAIR DENNISON: So back to the question, then, what is our authority and what is our role? Because that's a -- I mean, after all the work that we do, if it's only a recommendation, we want -- we -- we need to know that. We -- we -- if I remember the memo that went to Dr. Chism, it said we recommended two people. One was a male, our first recommendation, and our alternate was a female. Neither of those two were considered and they went to a -- someone that was -- that we
actually interviewed as well, but it was -- she declined the offer. So that goes back to the work that we do. And if someone can explain what -- what it is that our role is and our authority is as well, I'd appreciate that.

MS. HUNTER: Absolutely, the recommendation of NACIE is taken into consideration, but the final decision is that of the department. So the recommendation will be taken into consideration, but of course the -- the department leadership does have the final decision to make.

MR. PAYMENT: This is Aaron, can I make a statement?

CHAIR DENNISON: Go ahead, Aaron.

MR. PAYMENT: So I serve -- I won't give enough specifics so you can't figure it out -- but I serve on another advisory and we were given the opportunity to give some input. And the person was selected and they were deselected. And the advisory didn't know anything about it. We were contacted by
candidates. We basically told them we, you know, it's not our choice. It's the -- we're advisory only. It was very frustrating and felt disingenuous. But I -- I recognize that we are an advisory.

But I think that how you manage that from the department I think is critically important. Because otherwise it will feel like our opinions doesn't matter. And all the work that was done on that interview -- so, it sounds like, and I know I was disconnected for a bit because I was working on my dissertation -- but everybody works really, really hard to vet the candidate, to do interviews, to make a recommendation. And to -- and to be magnanimous in giving you a couple of choices. And then to not select from those two choices, but to select somebody entirely different does not feel right. But I would recommend to -- to Department of Education is that you work a little more closely with the advisory in selecting the possible candidates so that
whoever we're looking at is in the -- in the mix. And then, doing your interviews and -- so I have served on presidential search committees for universities. And I -- and as an advisory, and as a component, know that my role is only advisory. But what I think that how you manage that in finding the input and advisory of your key advisory group I think is critically important.

So as we move forward, if you have somebody that's -- the committee that we just talked about I think did a great job before. If they can be part of the -- the upper tier level as well in -- in discussions or interviews and advocacy. I think that would make me feel a little bit more comfortable. But it did -- at the same time that we weren't sure that we were even going to exist as it was all being looked at and discussed at the department level -- is the same time that it came down. We were wanting to fill the position because it's so important. And that's
why the committee took a lot of time and effort
to try to get that done before the end of the
last administration.

And so, you know, you're not at all
saying that we believe that who we pick should
be picked, but certainly somebody who we
prioritize should be in the running. And then
somebody who is not -- has not been vetted by
the committee should -- in my personal opinion,
shouldn't jump ahead and be selected because
then it makes it feel like all that was for
nothing. That's my opinion. I think it could
be managed a little bit better and recognizing
that we're advisory.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you so much.

CHAIR DENNISON: Go ahead, Virginia.

MS. THOMAS: Yes, Debbie. There was
one other issue that came up, and I know that
when I reviewed the applicants and made my
recommendations to the committee for what I
think that the top one we looked at, and then
what we actually didn't do, the Department put
another application in that I never seen (inaudible).

CHAIR DENNISON: Joyce -- I mean, that was the first time when we selected Joyce. That wasn't this last interview process. That was the --

MS. THOMAS: Yes, but that did happen.

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, it did happen. Yes, it did happen in 2010.

MS. THOMAS: But be aware of it.

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, that happened in 2010 and we were all taken aback by it, and I guess that's where the confusion comes in as to really if our, I know it's a fine line, but we do all this work and then it's almost like it becomes an appointment by the department instead of the work that we do and the work that we contribute as part of NACIE. So go ahead, Tina.

MS. HUNTER: I will, I definitely share your concerns, and I will also share those concerns with Dr. Ramirez, and you will meet her
tomorrow and she will speak to the process for this round.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Anymore comments or questions on how we'll go time line-wise or any other part of this discussion?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Just that point for clarification. So once we get to the interview stage, that will probably be by phone again, like we did the last time?

MS. HUNTER: Yes, it will be by phone.

CHAIR DENNISON: And if I remember right, Virginia, the first time you actually came into D.C. and went through, but the second time you did them from home.

MS. THOMAS: Right.

CHAIR DENNISON: To review the application and to go through and look and see. So is that possible to do it that way again?

MS. THOMAS: Either way is possible.

CHAIR DENNISON: What do you recommend?
MS. THOMAS: We'll decide once we finance the job.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. I guess I'm jumping ahead. So any other questions or comments from the council? So right now, just for clarification --

MS. BROWN: Actually, Deborah --

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. BROWN: This is Doreen. I'm right here. So I guess, just thinking from where we are, just the number of years and expertise that we bring to the table and making sure that we're very clear with Patricia and with John tomorrow when we're speaking and potentially maybe, with our recommendation, just reiterating that we are an advisory and we advise based on all of our years of experience and just our role and just being very clear tomorrow and also in the email when we do make those recommendations. I think it's just reiterating that would be really important to the two people tomorrow.
CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Doreen. I agree with that. We will do that. Thank you.

MR. PAYMENT: Denise, this is Aaron again.

CHAIR DENNISON: Go ahead, Aaron. And, Aaron, it's Debbie or Deborah, not Denise. Go ahead.

MR. PAYMENT: That's right. I'm sorry. All right. So I serve on the FAC (inaudible), like during the 4 to 5 time, so we can outline? I do think it's helpful, rather than the associations with key staff that we outline the items that we want to discuss.

CHAIR DENNISON: Can you clarify what you're talking about? We do have an agenda that we're going by that was just approved.

MR. PAYMENT: No, I'll explain it again. The HHS Secretary (Inaudible) but, in addition, tribal leaders throughout the day (inaudible) will identify issues that they would like to (inaudible).

CHAIR DENNISON: I think that's
something we can look at for future possibilities. I think right now we felt like it's really important to get together and take care of the business that was left in limbo in December because I think, for the most part, I think the message to us was that we weren't going to be reconvening again as a group until, I think January of this past year I got the phone call and I think we relayed the message on to everyone else.

So moving forward, we can look back and look at doing things like that to plan for it. So those are good ideas, Aaron. Thank you.

Any other comments?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes, this is Robin. I really agree with what Aaron is saying. It felt like our very last meeting we had all of this energy and support from leadership of the department, and then we were done. And so, if at all possible, we could get the ear of the Secretary of the Interior and the Department of Ed would be, you know, sooner than later, so
that they, I just remember, especially the Secretary of Interior wasn't even really aware of what NACIE did, and that impacted, you know, the BIE.

So I think, in our next meeting, anyway we could get, you know, them, the actual secretaries to meet with us, that would be a really good idea.

MR. PAYMENT: So this is Aaron again.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Aaron and those of you on the phone, I've been asked to ask you to please speak louder and speak into your phone. We cannot get a recording of you as to what your comments are, so thank you.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay. So (inaudible) I went back and read the language (inaudible) primarily the leadership (inaudible). And so, what I was referencing today (inaudible). What I was saying was (inaudible) that we formalize those (inaudible). Rather than coming to me and having discussion and don't follow up with anybody (inaudible).
CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Aaron. We get that now. Tomorrow, the Assistant Secretary and the Deputy will be here, to my understanding, so that would be a time that we can present our questions, I guess is what you're talking about. But I really, those are good ideas, and I know that it took a lot to get the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Education here the last meeting, and we were, we did leave on a high note. We hope that we can keep that going with the new administration and the new Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Education eventually. We do really hope that we can meet with them, as well.

So we'll push for that in the future. I do know that Chief Anderson was very, very, very influential in making that happen from her. And so if we can get that going again that would be so great to see happen. And it goes back to that feeling of what our real roles and responsibilities are and how important we are or are not. You know, it's like one way or the
other, so we don't want to go through this whole selection process and then -- we hope that our recommendation, with the years of experience, is understood and that's the main part of it we're looking to for that relationship building.

Any other comments or questions before we move on?

MS. WHITEFOOT: This is Patricia Whitefoot. I just want to also just reiterate and highlight what Aaron Payment is saying regarding an opportunity for us to just gather together and take a look at some of these issues and be prepared. At the end of the day, like he said, there is a period for us to be able to do that. So I'm willing to do that. I think that it's critical that we, you know, that we convene ourselves to do that.

CHAIR DENNISON: So how would you like to do that, individually or in the subgroup over lunch?

MS. WHITEFOOT: Well, we have the end of the day or the questions/comments, just take
that period.

CHAIR DENNISON: That will work.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Well, I think the other main charge that we have, you know, based on timeliness, is the report to Congress. And to me, the report is the summation of our decisions around priorities and recommendations. And when we establish the agenda, I was hoping that we could move that conversation up, if at all possible, you know, to make sure that that activity is moving forward if it's due by June 30th.

MS. BROADDUS: And this is Mandy. Just to clarify, we did not submit a report in 2017, right? We only did it in 2016.

CHAIR DENNISON: No, the last report we submitted was in 2016 because we were not, we didn't even meet in 2017 at all. But the reason why I didn't move that to the top is because we needed to know where we are with these departments and what's going on and give their
reports to us and then go back and use that information to put our report together. That's the reason why I didn't move that when it was brought up to me to possibly move that. And then you all just approved the agenda, we all just approved the agenda, so I think it's best to hear the updates from the different departments being that we skipped the whole year of doing reports and so we can go back and look and see if anything has changed and then go back and do our report for 2018.

Doreen, do you have your hand up? Okay. Any other comments or questions? Okay. We'll end that discussion, and we'll move on to -- hold on. Theresa John is calling me. Let me take this call. Do you want to co-chair?

Okay. We'll go ahead and move on to Ron Lessard. Ron?

MR. LESSARD: I did have one question. I'm just curious myself, too, but when the hiring freeze was waived for the director, Tara, when the hiring, but when it's
waived for the director's position, I mean, when it's going to post which is Indian preference, are there other positions, I know there's still some vacant positions that doesn't have anything to do with NACIE's decision. That's an internal thing by the new director; is that correct? And are they Indian preference also, do you know?

MS. RAMSEY: My understanding, and, again, I want this confirmed, my understanding is the positions in the office are all Native preference. But, again, I'd want Tina to confirm that, but that's my understanding. Yes, all the positions are. But did you have, is there something -- I thought there was something else that you were getting at. But I think it would probably be best if Tina answers some of those when it comes to the personnel.

MR. LESSARD: But I was just thinking, imagining most of the directors in place, then those positions will start to --

MS. RAMSEY: I believe, again, there's some of that stuff I am not ready to
MR. LESSARD: Just curious.

MS. RAMSEY: But the Native preference is, that's something that's been standing, that's been there for a while, yes.

MR. LESSARD: Okay. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, those on the phone, Virginia, Aaron, Sam, Dahkota. Anyone else? Can you hear me? Speak up, Sam.

So first I want to start out by -- oh, we do have the hotline there. First, I want to start out by, I got a very nice text from Joyce to say hello to everyone and she wanted to let you know that she flew into retirement and that she's back teaching a class. She wanted to let you all know that.

Okay. So what I put together for you, there's a packet on the table and those on the phone I'm sorry but I can send it electronically about all the contents of the packet. I can do that. When we're finished,
I'll send it to you.

Just a couple of things I want to go down. I know there's some anxiety and interest in what's happening with the initiative. Do those on the phone have the outline? Can you see it? They can see it? Okay.

Again, it's my name, and I'm Acting Executive Director and I have been since November of 2016. And prior to that, I was the chief of staff for the initiative.

A little update. We operate under Executive Order 13592, which is Improving American Indian and Alaska Native Educational Opportunities and Strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities. And also in your binder you'll see an earlier executive order, which is 13647, which was the White House Council on Native American Affairs. That was created in June, and I don't know, at this point, if that's active or not. I don't believe so, although we are mentioned. The initiative is mentioned in that, but that's not active at this point.
There's a fact sheet in your packet, which talks about what we do currently. Until there is a new executive order, we are operating under the 13592. And I'll have a little update on that soon.

The other thing is I serve for the Department of Education as the tribal consultation official. And in that capacity, anytime that a department or office within the department is considering consultation, we're asking that the topics that they have been looking into rise to the level of a tribal consultation. And then we certainly help to start that process. But also it's to provide training, and we're starting to do more training internally on what tribal consultation is. We have a PowerPoint slide they use. We talk about tribal consultation and Executive Order 13175. We talk about the trust responsibility that go into those things because I found, like most of us over the years and even previously when I worked at CNCS, that we start talking tribal
consultation and there's not necessarily a real understanding of what a real tribal consultation is and what I call capital TC or what are just listening sessions. And we've heard from tribal leaders that it's important that not only do we have topics that could have an impact on the tribe but that also we have decision-makers and leadership at the table.

So that's part of the training that I do and getting ready to set up some others. We've been waiting, actually, through the transition to see who would be on staff because it's important that staff and leadership receive that training.

The other thing is I'll mention we have an upcoming tribal consultation. And in your packet, you have, you'll see the agenda for the upcoming consultation. It will be in Albuquerque on this next Saturday, Sunday, so on the 22nd, and we'll be there.

You'll see in the packet and you can also go to the White House imitative website and
it's on the front page, there's a summary of the topics of what we'll be consulting on and discussing. And that's coming up. We don't have any dates or confirmations, but there could be some additional consultations coming up in the near future, whether they be face to face or webinar. But we are looking at that, so I'll let you know as soon as we know and get those confirmed.

The next thing I want to mention, so two reports in ESSA. First, I'll go with 6006, which is the report and responses to Indian student suicide. That's in your packet. That also was submitted to Congress in July of this past year. The secretary submitted that to Congress. The report on Native American language education is now in clearance in the Department of Ed, and it's going through, it will take a little while but we think we can submit that to Congress in May. I'll make sure you each have a link to that, to both of them.

I won't go over the whole study but
if you look under ESSA's in the 6005, you'll see that what we were tasked with is doing a study. We've done a study over the past couple of years, which included tribal consultations and it included some webinar consultations. We did one at NIEA, we've done it at NCAI, and gathering information for the report, as well as the language summits, the Native American language summits that we did.

So mentioning that, I was going to go back up to the language. So, you know, we have a memorandum of agreement with HHS, ANA, BIE, and Department of Ed. That's what we were operating under, that MOA, at this point, but we actually, with Tony Dearman and some of the folks over at ANA, with Stacy and others, we've started editing that particular MOA because we've found that there are some things that it needed to include, including possibly some other agencies. But that is still in operation, and we're in the process of getting that edited and put into place and signed.
We want to get that done as soon as possible, which in that includes the Native language workgroup which we created with the MOA. We've done Native language summits. Since 2014 to 2017, we've done one each year, and we're going to be doing one again this year. You know, I wanted to mention to you that we just started the planning of this. We're looking at possibly doing it in the last week of August, and we're looking at possibly Oklahoma City area. Certainly, we welcome any suggestions you have on that. This has been very successful, for those of you who attended the last one. So we've gone from starting out with maybe 50 people up to, I think we had close to 200 at the last one last year at the Indian Pueblo Center in Albuquerque. So it's really growing, and it's a lot of great opportunities to speak with experts in the field. One of the things I did, I had the privilege of representing the Department of Ed at the United Nations Indigenous working group on Indigenous
languages. And we received a lot of great suggestions from other countries as far as how they use not only the federal government but people on the ground working and philanthropic organizations. So we're going to incorporate more of that into what we're doing.

So let me get to these updates. You know, I love it when, I remember my mom was in the boarding school system and she always, she used to say I'm an elder in training, so I should put EIT after my name because she said you'll learn, you'll get to know that there are things you know, there are things you think you know, and there are things you just don't know. And that's happened a lot in the new administration. There are things we still don't know.

So let me go to Executive Order 13592. Again, like I said, we're still operating under that executive order. However, there has been some movement, from what I understand, within the White House. I have met
with one person there who appears to be looking at all the executive orders of all the White House initiatives and creating language. So he's asking for some input on languages and tribal colleges. I think we're still some months away before they actually create a new executive order, but I do think it's coming.

Also, the same thing with the position, you know, the executive director's position, which is an appointed position from the White House. I checked Friday trying to get an update and status on that, and, basically, the answer was that they are keeping me in the loop as the process goes forward, which means I don't think they know yet. And I haven't heard any time line of when they want to do this. I just know that they have filled just about all of the executive directors' positions at all the other initiatives.

And so we're the last one, and it's different, they did that because, as you know, you might know, that the charters for the
commissions, for the other initiatives expired on September 30th, the fiscal year. So that's why they went ahead, I think, and filled those positions as quickly as possible, where ours didn't do that.

So they're still looking and still -- I don't know how far along they are, but I definitely want to not only keep you informed but, you know, just let you know where that's at and any advice that you have or any contacts with the White House, you know, you can help us all find out.

The other thing is one of the priorities and just letting people know the facts and, even though it's the Executive Order 13592 that talks about strengthening and tribal colleges and universities, one of the things that we found, you know, as it was created, it was tribal colleges and universities, and then under the administration, President Obama, it was expanded to include K through 12 and all Native students. I think when that happened,
which was a good thing; however, I don't believe that the initiative, and this is just my personal opinion, all the attorneys told me when I went to the United Nations that you can say personally I believe this but don't say the department. So, personally, I believe and I feel that in the several years past with the initiative, once that was created to expand to K through 12, that we kind of neglected the tribal colleges and universities. I think that part was not really, not really, we didn't step up to that, and I heard from tribal college presidents recently and over the past year that the more we can do around that.

I've spent a lot of time with AIHEC just recently. We brought Kerry Carrie Billy and two tribal college presidents to meet with the Secretary. Jim Manning, who is my boss and who is the undersecretary, we both spoke on panels twice at AIHEC and they're starting to do more around that with tribal colleges and universities and the students in them.
And then, you know, one of the things that was discussed and certainly any advice you have is, you know, how do we continue to get, within our initiative, how do we get youth, you know, that is in the K through 12 to be, how much more outreach can we do as an initiative to inform them of what's available in the tribal colleges and universities?

And, again, it's just the update. One of the things that was important to us when I met with the White House was to, I know there have been some ideas to possibly go back to, like, the African-American initiative has HBCUs and they also have an African-American initiative. Whether they would go back to something like that and have two initiatives, you know, I didn't get the feeling from the White House they want to do that, but they certainly want to emphasize, you know, the TCUs in there.

And then the other thing, what we need to do is, when we finally get to a point
where I can actually have staff, then we need to have someone dedicated to TCUs, as well as the other things that we're doing. And I know I'm going quick, but I don't want to take up all your time.

The last thing I put in your packet, this is pretty neat. We met with the Smithsonian. They have a program, and, if you don't know about this, then go to their website. It's a great website for students, for teachers. It's a different framework about understanding American Indians. I gave Edwin -- he's the manager of the education section, and he would really like to reach out to all of you and talk to you about this. They're going to be doing, in November they'll be doing some work and they would like the department and others to kind of partner with them. They'll probably put on some kind of a small conference or summit at the museum, so we'll take part in that.

But it's a great approach because, you know, as you know, we can't do curriculum.
One of the things that Ed is doing is reaching out to the states and contacting them and working with them and working with the tribes in those states to do what they can do to work with curriculums and have those tribally controlled.

So that's a quick rundown. Any questions?

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Ron. Do we have any questions?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes. Thank you, Ron. I appreciate all the information that you've got. You know, in looking at the actual Executive Order 13592, on the second page right at the top, you know, it mentions that the executive director shall coordinate frequent consultation --

MR. LESSARD: Yes.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: -- and provide staff support for the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. So that's one place where NACIE is mentioned. And then on the second page, the second paragraph from the bottom, it
talks about finding administrative support subject to the availability of appropriations. The Department of Ed shall fund the initiative, including NACIE.

I think, you know, we struggled over, well, ever since the executive order was created to get clarity on what the role of NACIE is with the executive orders. It sounds like, well, it sounded like, I'll just say, from my personal opinion that, you know, we were sort of an oversight body that was supposed to help advise the implementation of the executive order, but we had a very -- how do I say this -- a very frustrating communication between the leadership of this executive order and NACIE.

And so did I hear you say that this executive order is going to change? And if so, does that mean the role of NACIE will change, whatever that is?

MR. LESSARD: So my understanding -- and, one, I totally agree with you. One of the things that has always bothered me since I've
been a part of the initiative was that, with all
the experts that we have on NACIE, the members,
that when we're thinking of an initiative of
doing something like language program or, you
know, whatever that is, that we should bring
that to you and get your input and your advice
in how maybe we should do it, something like
that of what you would like to see. I think
it's always been the reverse. It's always been
we have an issue as an advisory committee, it's
been go to the meetings and report out. I think
that that needs to change. So that's definite,
and I think that has to be right up-front with
whomever the leadership is, you know, that NACIE
is not a group that you meet with once in a
while and just tell them you had a nice
listening session. You know, it's important
that we use you and work with you.

But the other thing is, in the
executive order, I feel certain that they will
probably take the NACIE information and things
like to be probably the same. And I think
didn't they do that with the other initiative?

So the commissioners for the other initiatives pretty much stayed the same, didn't it? They didn't change their --

MS. HUNTER: It's varied, I'll just say that. So there really hasn't been any consistency across the board with the initiatives, changing the executive order, as well as appointments. So I think, like I said, we're all just waiting for direction and guidance from the White House.

MR. LESSARD: But I think the leadership of the advisory councils stayed intact as far as, you know, having commissioners. And I know that they know, and I spoke to them recently about this executive order, that they know that NACIE is our advisory council and they need to be included in there. You know, I would like to see some other things written into that, like we have in this one.

You know, frankly, the problem that I've seen since I've been acting and there's
been a hiring freeze, you know, occasionally I can get interns, but to reach the capacity of everything that's in the executive order, it's almost impossible. So you have to look at priorities, and we've spent a lot of time through transition emphasizing and taking apart parts of that executive order and explaining to the folks in the transition team how important that was and also explaining that we are not like the other initiatives, regardless of what people might think, that we are citizens of tribal nations and we represent the initiative is not just reaching out to a minority group but that we have political entities.

You know, I've talked about this over and over. It comes up quite often, and it came up again at the White House that we should, not that we should have extra consideration but they should have the understanding about the trust responsibility, the federal trust responsibility, and how we operate. I meet with the other directors of the other initiatives,
and it's not unusual for me to be on the phone or visit, you know, an elected official of a sovereign nation. That doesn't happen to the other initiatives. So we're trying to emphasize to the White House that that needs to be taken into consideration.

MR. PAYMENT: This is Aaron. Can you hear me?

MR. LESSARD: Hi, Aaron. Yes.

CHAIR DENNISON: Go ahead, Aaron.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay. So this is a bigger picture, and I think we are over the hump already.

CHAIR DENNISON: You're fading, Aaron.

MR. PAYMENT: In 2017, in June, at NCAI, Billy Kirkland and Ben Keel had a session (inaudible) that all advisory councils be eliminated and instead what was going to be created was an advisory to the White House council. In July (inaudible) of NACIE and other advisory and how they're already budgeted, and
especially NACIE, created by statute, and so I explained how all of that would work and that it would be better (inaudible) the critical nature of our advisory (inaudible). It doesn't look like (inaudible). We're talking with Billy Kirkland to communicate to the White House our needs. So I think we're ok, (inaudible). (Inaudible) have to make sure we coordinate and bring into the fold the White House initiatives so that it's more integral to what we do at NACIE.

MR. LESSARD: No, I agree. And I'd be happy to share the contact, you know, the person that I met with that my understanding is probably working on the executive order and you could certainly provide some input. It's not a secret. I actually was there when Robert Cook and Teach for America, we met with them and they were also emphasizing the importance of not just the initiative but just the difference between us and, you know, the other initiatives.

But I'll send you that information,
if you can send it out. And maybe it would be
great for you to contact him and get a status.

MR. PAYMENT: Absolutely, absolutely.

Thank you.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Aaron. I
want to jump to Dr. Proudfit but fit --

MS. PROUDFIT: This is Joely
Proudfit. I just wanted to clarify, Ron, are
you fairly certain that the White House
initiative will be renewed?

MR. LESSARD: Yes, yes.

MS. PROUDFIT: But it will be
changed?

MR. LESSARD: I think the executive
order, the charter, and I think so because it
was signed by the previous president. And I
think, before they sign a new one, they're going
to make some adjustments to it. That's my
understanding. You know, my biggest concern
was, one, that it stays, you know, that we still
have it, the initiative, but I've been assured
within the Department of Ed that the initiatives
are going to continue. All of them have, you know, started getting new directors, and they're up and running, and especially now that we have a budget to do things.

But I feel certain it's going to be the same, not the same but I think it's going to exist. I would like to have and I would like you to have more input in how it's framed and how it looks and what the initiative looks like, considering you're the advisory committee to the initiative. And I think that they should take your advice into consideration, as they have with AIHEC and others, you know, because I think it's important because, without that, the only White House connection, from what I see, is, you know, like Billy or someone who's at the White House. And, frankly, in the previous administration, we had a lot of support within the White House.

But, I mean, I think we will. I think it's going to continue. I would just like to see them do something stronger. And, you
know, there's some things in the initiative that are just, personally I don't think they're, I think they're lofty and not always achievable unless you have the staff of about, you know, ten people. But like I mentioned, the main thing I see in that is that the collaboration and the work with tribal colleges and universities needs to be really at the forefront, so I've expressed that to them and I know others have. And then I think, you know, how we approach the --

MS. PROUDFIT: So that I better understand the process, are changes being made to it now? Can we impact that change before they have a new executive director, or are they looking to appoint a new executive director and then continue to make those changes? What's the process?

MR. LESSARD: So I'll go back to the point I made about some things you know and some things you just don't know. My thought, from what I hear, is that I was told Friday that,
again, they would keep me in the loop as the process goes as far as choosing an executive director, but I don't know or think that the position is working hand-in-hand with the executive order. In other words, I don't think they're going to wait to hire someone and then finish the executive order. I don't know for sure.

But I do know that they have been working on language, and the gentleman at the White House has been working on language for all the initiatives from what I understand. So my understanding is even those initiatives that have an executive director now that's been appointed by the president will still probably undergo some changes within their executive orders, you know, their charters.

So I think, yes, I think now is a good time if you can reach out to them. You know, I don't see, because they haven't said, well, here's the time line, we're going to be working on the executive order, we're going to
post the position, you know. It's not real
clear when it's going to happen but I think that
I've been happy that they've included me
recently in some of the thoughts around the
language. I think I know that TCUs, I just met
with them and they've spent a lot of time
talking about integrating TCUs, if not a
separate executive order but into this one. So
they are, it's taking them some time, I think,
to work with me and listen to me and hopefully
know that I know what I'm talking about.

CHAIR DENNISON: Any other comments?
Go ahead.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Yes, I agree that we
should also take a look at this as an initiative
and one perhaps during the 4 to 5 p.m. hour we
could also address it. I appreciate your
report. Thank you for being comprehensive.

I do have a question. So since your
meeting with the White House, and I don't know
who this goes to, maybe Tina, about the role of
NACIE, if we either have the status of NACIE, as
well, what is our status? And I don't know where this lies, so that's one question.

And I just want to also just speak to supporting the tribal colleges. That's so critical that we address that just because the poor funding level that they have, as well. So I would also make that a priority for the work that you're doing.

MR. LESSARD: Absolutely, yes.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Thank you.

CHAIR DENNISON: We can ask those questions also tomorrow, but I know today, I know also that, I think it's a real opportunity right now to educate. We may not have people that really understand right now, so it could be a chance, an opportunity to educate those as to what we believe our role should be because of the experience that we have here. So go ahead.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes, I totally agree with that. This is Robin. You know, having been involved for quite a while, even in the language in this executive order, my
understanding is that it was intended to be oversight for the whole work of the whole department, you know, all the programs and services that impact Native children, you know. Recognizing that there is a grant mechanism through the Office of Indian Ed that directly provides specific services to Indian children, you know, it's a pittance in terms of the dollars, you know, that Title I gets or Title III get or might get for assisting students.

And so, you know, this executive order was supposed to elevate the attention of the whole department around that holistic view of servicing Indian country based on the trust responsibility. And so even at it's, you know, creation, it never felt like that was what was going on. It seemed like the office got sidetracked trying to develop this relationship with the BIE, but it neglected working with the Department of Ed, which is also NACIE's charge is to look at all of the services throughout there and determine where are the holes and the
gaps, you know, in terms of Native communities.

So I think there's a lot that can be done, you know. Philosophically, what was in place was great, but there's a lot that can be done in terms of, you know, actually creating better opportunities.

MR. LESSARD: Well, I agree.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: That's my understanding of the relationship of the executive order versus the Office of Native Ed and then that position in relation to NACIE.

MR. LESSARD: Yes, I agree. And I think that whoever becomes the executive director needs to really understand the executive order and how it's written and how it's implemented and that I found that there was a lot of time spent on things that I think were wonderful, you know, if the White House came out with Gen-I or something like that. But getting down to the technical side of the policy side and the things that within Ed that we could work within, you know, each of the offices, not being
a grant-making office, it's important for us to work with the grant-making offices so that we know what's going on in Indian country with our kids. And there were times that, you know, I found the disconnect was not externally as much as I found it was internal. So that's definitely going to be changed.

I have to say that one of the things that came out, and I just want to throw it out there because they asked me if I would consider, you know, the appointment, I just couldn't answer that question. But I basically feel that I need to be there and stay there to make sure that whoever is, you know, whoever they decide to appoint from the outside that that person really gets a good understanding of what we're supposed to be doing under the executive order to help Native youth, you know.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Ron. Are there any more questions for Mr. Lessard or anyone on the phone want to ask any questions? I don't want to leave you out. Well, thank you.
MR. LESSARD: Thank you.

CHAIR DENNISON: It is now 11:28. I think we could move to have the National Center present, or we could wait until 1:00. What's the -- we're 15 minutes ahead of schedule. You want to wait? You want to move? Okay. So we're okay with having you -- thank you.

MR. DEATON: Would you like me up-front? Okay.

MS. BOULLEY: You need to -- yes, wherever there is a microphone.

MS. THOMAS: This is Virginia.

CHAIR DENNISON: Go ahead, Virginia. Yes?

MS. THOMAS: I'm sorry, but I have to get off the line. I wish you all well and hopefully we can meet together, but I have another commitment and I have to go. I apologize for leaving, but I wish you all well.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, Virginia. We still have a quorum, though, I believe. Thank you, Virginia.
MS. THOMAS: Okay, thanks.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HUNTER: What topic are we on again?

CHAIR DENNISON: We're moving to the National Center for Education Statistics.

MS. HUNTER: I'm sorry. I'm just getting --

MR. DEATON: Okay. No problem. I know how it is.

CHAIR DENNISON: We're getting set up, Aaron. We're getting set up for one presentation before lunch. This is from the second bullet point at the 1:00 agenda. We're moving ahead with that one because we have a little bit of time.

MR. PAYMENT: Great. Thank you.

MS. BOULLEY: And please note that we have talked with housekeeping and I believe they're blowing out warmer air, but it still doesn't feel like it. We have notified them.

Jamie, I didn't pass out one of
these, but I do have these available. I thought it would be better.

MR. DEATON: Yes, I think you're right.

MS. WHITEFOOT: What is it that we're waiting for?

CHAIR DENNISON: Oh, for them to -- okay. Go ahead.

MR. DEATON: Great. So ready to begin? Great. So my pleasure to be here with you today. I am Jamie Deaton from the National Center for Educational Statistics, or NCES for short, and that's with the U.S. Department of Education.

One of my primary duties there is I serve as project director for the National Indian Education Setting. And since I last met with you, NCS released the results on the report you have in front of you, which is the 2015 National Indian Education Setting. These results and that report was released in March 2017.
So what you see here is a high-level overview of information I will be sharing with you today. That covers the history and overview of the study, whom we had partnered with which includes a variety of American Indian and Alaska Native stakeholders, who was included in the study in terms of participation. I'll be sharing results at the national level and also across different subgroups of American Indians and Alaska Natives, as well as going into the NIES survey questionnaires, as well as talk a little bit about tools for further exploration.

So the setting was established in 2004, and it might be said, though, that NIES really began with a dash and the goal to turn that dash into data. When we don't have enough data to report a subgroup, we'll commonly see the dash in its place. And the main goal of NIES is to be able to report out more of American Indian and Alaska Native student achievement data, as well as subgroups for American Indians and Alaska Natives, as well.
So NIES was first administered in 2005 and was conducted every two years through 2011. Due to a reduction in funding, the study is now conducted every four years. It was last administered in 2015, and it will be administered again in 2019.

When we received this reduction in funding, we considered possible approaches. We also reached out to you all at NACIE, if you remember, and we worked closely with OIE in our technical review panel. I'll be saying more about our technical review panel in a forthcoming slide.

In considering all possible options, we decided one thing we really didn't want to compromise was the depth of reporting among various American Indian and Alaska Native subgroups. And you'll see this depth of reporting of subgroups on later slides.

NIES is administered as part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, also known as NAEP, and it's funded by the
Office of Indian Education. This national study has received widespread support across American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

And there are two main components of NIES. For grades four and eight NAEP reading and mathematics assessments and their accompanying survey questionnaires which were given to all students, not just American Indian and Alaska Native students, an NIES study-specific questionnaire. And there's an NIES questionnaire for three different respondent groups: American Indian and Alaska Native students, their teachers, and their school administrators.

American Indian and Alaska Native students have always been in the NAEP sample. But due to the small size of their population, we frequently were not able to report data for the subgroup.

For NIES to be successful, we believe it's essential to collaborate with others. This has included the Office of Indian Education and
the Bureau of Indian Education. We also have a technical review panel comprised of American Indians/Alaska Natives across the country. It includes representation from different tribes and its members that serve in a wide variety of positions, including classroom teachers, principals, school district officials, professors, directors of American Indian educational organizations, as well as Doreen Brown in this room today.

In addition, we have an NIES contractor now, and some of the duties they perform include recruitment of all the schools in the study, an outreach of national-level conferences such as NIEA and NCAI, as well as the TEDNA conference that they presented at last week. Lastly, Karen Francis-Begay, who serves as Assistant Vice President of Tribal Relations at the University of Arizona, served as a collaborator and co-author of this report.

In terms of participation, we identified students as American Indian/Alaska
Native. They sent school records, and these students were sampled with other students participating in NAEP in 2015. This included nearly 17,000 American Indian/Alaska Native students across grades four and grade eight.

Results in the report are primarily disaggregated into three mutually-exclusive categories, and these are BIE schools, low-density public schools, and high-density public schools. As defined by the Office of Indian Education, low-density schools are those in which less than 25 percent of the students or American Indians or Alaska Native. And high-density schools are those in which 25 percent or more of the students are American Indian/Alaska Native.

In terms of the overall sample size, about six to eight percent of our sample comes from BIE schools and the remaining totals are, roughly, in two equal buckets, meaning half of our remaining sample comes from those defined in low-density public schools and the other half.
comes from high-density public schools.

So there are some profound differences in demographic characteristics between BIE, high-density, and low-density schools that I'm going to show on the next slide. And these differences will help us better contextualize achievement results we'll see in the later slides.

So this slide, we're going to look at four different variables: the percent of students that attended rural schools, the percent that are English language learners, those that are eligible for free and reduced price lunch, and those having a computer in their homes. So you'll see in the data, for all students in fourth grade, so we see 45 percent attend rural schools, 11 percent are defined as English language learners, 73 percent are eligible for free and reduced price lunch, and 69 percent have a computer in their home.

So first looking at low-density public schools, only 27 percent of those attend
rural schools, only 6 percent are English language learners, 64 percent, and you see that number drops a bit, were eligible for a free and reduced price lunch, and 74 percent, an increase, report having a computer in their home. And now let's bring in the high-density public schools to compare. So when you look at the numbers for low-density to high-density, each of these numbers is significantly different when you compare the two, nearly double attending rural schools, double those identified as English language learners, 87 percent are eligible for free and reduced price lunch, and fewer students report having a computer in their home.

Now let's bring in the BIE schools. If you compare the BIE schools to high-density, all those numbers are significantly different. If you compare those to low-density, all those numbers are significantly different. And here let's bring in the eighth grade data. Now, the eighth grade data, you'll
see the numbers themselves are different. The pattern is identical. If you compare low-density to high-density, each of those numbers are significantly different. If you compare BIE to high, as well as to low, each of those numbers is significantly different.

Yes?

MS. BROADDUS: So this is administered along with the NAEP?

MR. DEATON: This is -- correct.

MS. BROADDUS: So this is not, you've chosen, the schools are selected that participate?

MR. DEATON: Correct.

MS. BROADDUS: So don't you control for the location and some of those other variables that you're reporting out on?

MR. DEATON: Sure. So for BIE schools, every BIE school is in our sample.

MS. BROADDUS: Okay. That's different than the others?

MR. DEATON: That is different. And
that used to be the case. I'll get to it a little bit later. In 2005, a quarter of the BIE schools were in our sample. Starting in 2007, all the BIE schools were in our sample. It doesn't mean all participate, and that's foreshadowed in a future slide. And then low-density and high-density, you know, the goal is to create a nationally-representative of --

MS. BROADDUS: Right. So you oversample American Indians.

MR. DEATON: Absolutely, we do. And through the over-sampling, we're able to get more state-level data than we would have. So with that list, we'll move on to the next slide.

From here, I'm going to be showing national-level results before we get down to the state level. So let's bring in the next.

So first showing NAEP results for grade four mathematics. There's a few main takeaways from this chart that I want you to focus on. We were not able to report grade four BIE results for 2015 due to a school
participation rate that fell just below the 70 percent cutoff. Reasons for BIE schools not participating included too much testing, not wanting to pull students out of classes after they've missed many days due to inclement weather closures, or our assessment window is from the last week of January through the first week of March so that is high season for inclement weather closure time, and also because NIES, just like NAEP, do not provide school-level results.

Going into our 2015 assessment window, we had, there was a little bit above 70 percent, but we just had a variety of schools that dropped out. Also, in Pine Ridge, we had a number of schools that had a number of suicides at that time, and they did not want to participate in any activities, given that current climate, they didn't have to so a number of schools there that dropped out just beforehand. However, data for all participating grade four BIE schools still contributed to the
overall American Indian/Alaska Native average.  

The other thing we don't see on this graph are any extras noting any significant improvement or decline among scores over time for grade four. So you see a stagnation for stability. It also confirms our discussion with you, as well as other stakeholders, that we really didn't want to compromise the depth of the reporting because we don't have much of a change when you look at '11 compared to '15 overall. So we wanted to keep capturing and keep that ability to do report depth. 

Let's go to the next slide. This is looking at grade eight mathematics results. So for grade eight, we were able to report out for BIE. There's just a couple of asterisks you see. So we see at BIE, for 2007, they scored 244. This is significantly different than their score 252. Score 248 in 2009 significantly different than their score 252, so a slight improvement. You also might think there's a mistake on this graph. The score 242 in 2005 is
not significantly different than 252. That, as I mentioned a couple of minutes ago, is because in 2005 just a quarter of the BIE schools were in our sample. So standard years were higher. When you get to 2005, 2007, all BIE schools in our sample, so that's the reason for that distinction.

Please.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Has the assessment remained the same over that period of time or have you adjusted it?

MR. DEATON: Yes, it has largely remained the same over that period of time. And we see the same pattern among other subgroups, as well. One of the big changes in 2017 is NAEP went digital for the first time, so we shifted from '15 to assessing kids with paper/pencil to 2017 and we assess kids with digital-based equipment. We bring in all our own equipment to do these assessments to level the playing field as much as possible. We do recognize, though, that what we're not able to level is the student
experience prior to us coming in, how exposed are students among different subgroups and different areas, how are they exposed to digital technology?

So when NIES is next conducted in 2019, it will be conducted on a digital-based platform. We use Surface Pro 3s and 4s to assess the kids. So a lot of data coming out from that assessment and that helps us inform how 2019 will be structured.

I think one of the nice things I will say about the 2019 assessment is we've been particularly cognizant of American Indians who were not in BIE schools or not in high-density schools where they're literally the only student taking that NIES. And we don't want that student to feel awkward or called out. In the past, they physically had an additional paper for them to complete. On a digital-based format, it's a lot more seamless because the reality is students take different parts of our assessment to begin with. I might be taking reading, you
might be taking math. Someone else might be taking reading, but they're taking two different blocks of reading.

So the digital platform is nicer in terms of I think it might be more low key and students are able to work more at their own pace than in a paper/pencil world. We also get a lot more observable data in terms of how that student navigates or struggles to navigate through that assessment. They can help inform and design future assessments, as well.

So with that being said, let's shift to reading. Reading, again you see numbers might be a little bit different but identical pattern to what we saw for grade four math in terms of you don't see any asterisks in the slide, you do see the BIE schools at the bottom when compared to their other peers of American Indian and Alaska Native in terms of low-density and high-density schools.

And let's bring the grade eight data. So, again, similar to reading, grade eight, what
you see here, similar to reading or to mathematics grade eight, you see a couple of pockets of improvement for the BIE schools when you look at '15 compared to '07 and '09. And then also looking at American Indian students overall in 2009, you see real improvement when you compare that to the 2015 score.

From here, let's shift to state-level results. So a lot of numbers on this slide. So I want to have you look at a couple of things. One is, when you look at 2005 data, you see a lot more asterisks. We didn't do that over-sampling in 2005 that we have since done. Generally speaking, if a state has anywhere about over one percent American Indians/Alaska Natives were able to get their state-level data or have a good chance of getting their state-level data through over-sampling.

One of the keys, though, is not the overall number of American Indians/Alaska Natives but the percentage of American Indians/Alaska Natives in the state. For
example, California has far more American Indians in their state than Wyoming. But by percentage, it's a lot less, so that's why that is something that we're just not able to get, whereas Wyoming, through over-sampling, we are.

Okay. So I am highlighting Arizona here because that is the only state where we see a significant change in state-level results. I'm sorry. Alaska. Compared to 2015, compared to 2011. So Alaska we see a significant improvement among the grade four mathematics scores.

Okay. Bringing in grade eight, we don't see any significant areas of change from grade eight at any of the states compared to 2015 to the more recent data point in 2011.

And then we can shift -- so this summarizes what we saw on the previous slides. You see a couple of things. So Oklahoma at grade four performed significantly higher than that of the American Indian/Alaska Native peers. And then we see multiple states that performed
lower work than the nation overall. So that is six states at grade four and then seven states at grade eight where their state-level average is worse than the American Indian/Alaska Native national average.

From here, let's look at grade four reading results. Click again. So comparing 2015 to 2011, we see increases for Alaska and Oklahoma, but we see a decrease at the state level for Oregon. Okay. We can go on to grade eight. And grade eight reading, similar to grade eight math, we saw no significant changes where there are significant increases or decreases for that.

Next slide. So, again, somewhat similar to mathematics, we see a general pattern for reading, as well. So Oklahoma at both grades, their students performed higher than the national average. And the same four states are coming up, Alaska, Arizona, New Mexico, and South Dakota, as performing lower than the national average at the state level.
Yes?

MS. BROADDUS: So have you, I'm sure that you've done this, an analysis comparing not to high-density/low-density but then also free and reduced lunch numbers?

MR. DEATON: There's a lot of different ways to cut obviously, so we've done kind of that type of digging.

MS. BROADDUS: Right. I just think people would really want to know why Oklahoma is that low.

MR. DEATON: Yes, absolutely. I should mention, too, that what you have is the first of two reports. We are working on a follow-up report to this report, as well. There's only so much you can cram into this report obviously, so one of the goals with that follow-up report is to help explain how we see differences among the American Indian/Alaska Native population. Oftentimes, we notice that the media narrative has been that American Indians and Alaska Natives are just not
performing as well as other students. What is being lost in that narrative is there's a wide range of performance just among the American Indians and Alaska Native population, and I think that's worth capturing and that's also worth taking a closer look at, as well.

And I mentioned at the outset, too, that I work at NCES and NCES's reports, by and large, have gone exclusively digital. This is the one report that we're really holding onto wanting that paper-based copy and wanting to reach our stakeholders that might not have as easy internet access. This report is still available on digital. There's things that you can do digitally that you can't within that report, but we did feel that it was really important to have a physical copy to send out to our stakeholders.

So from here, let's look --

MS. WHITEFOOT: Just a follow-up with what Mandy said.

MR. DEATON: Sure.
MS. WHITEFOOT: I think it would, it's a really important intersection to look at poverty --

MR. DEATON: Absolutely.

MS. WHITEFOOT: -- you know. I mean, you've got the density issue, but I think poverty has got to be a contributing factor.

MR. DEATON: Yes, and I think we do see that in Oklahoma, too, where the poverty among the American Indian kids is probably quite as profound as other pockets, and that might be one area of explanation of, well, why are they doing better than their American Indian peers nationwide?

You know, at NCES, this study, like other ones, you know, we deal with it as a way so I'm going to tell you why there's differences in achievement across grades. It is something that we want to get out to stakeholders at District levels, at state levels, at policy levels, and offer up this data and help you walk through this data. But it's not something that
I will say this is why one state is performing better than another state.

MS. WHITEFOOT: So just one more question, when you have the hyphen with a state, were you not able to get that from the Department of Ed or --

MR. DEATON: Oh, these with a dash?

MS. WHITEFOOT: Yes, the dash.

MR. DEATON: Yes. So that was an area where we weren't able to meet our reporting standards. In NAEP, we have a rule that's often referred to as the 62 and 5 rule, so for any subgroup reporting we need at least 62 students across five schools. And if you just meet that benchmark, obviously the standard errors are going to be much higher, so you might have a larger swing in score that's actually not significant. But that is kind of a minimum that our psychometricians felt that we meet for reporting. And so if we don't meet it, you know, for example, there's other states, California, Florida, Texas, that we still draw
American Indians and Alaska Natives from. We sample throughout the full country. They all contribute to the national average, they'll contribute to low-density average or high-density average respectfully, but we weren't necessarily able to report out through that state.

Okay. So --

MR. PAYMENT: I have a question.

MR. DEATON: Sure, please.

MR. PAYMENT: So this is Aaron Payment. My question is is there a way for the BIE schools, some government schools or direct service schools, and then I have a comment.

MR. DEATON: Sure. So I am blanking on the exact variable that we ask, but I know on our school questionnaire that is available online, we did ask about, you know, different school designations. And when I finish this presentation, I can look that up and, Tina, I'll send you that questionnaire so you can make that available. But happy to do so. And that's --
MR. PAYMENT: Let me refine my question.

MR. DEATON: Sure.

MR. PAYMENT: So some government schools are schools that the tribe would be operating the school, receiving the tribal grants, received upon establishing the school and direct service schools are where the BIE actually does the, provides the education of employees for the BIE. I have to believe there's a difference in quality of education between those two, so that's what I'm wondering if that can be sorted. And then I just have a comment.

MR. DEATON: Sure. So I'll look at that exact school questionnaire so we can see. I do know you can sort according to different groupings on that, and that's available via the NIES NAEP data explore also. I believe it's on my last slide, but that allows everyone, public, you don't need restricted access to use that data explorer. So in that way, you know, from
there you can sort that into many different variables.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay. That's actually a pretty good segue to my comment.

MR. DEATON: Great.

MR. PAYMENT: My comment is going to be so I did my own quantitative analysis, identification, so I've got some experience when it comes to data analysis. But I can tell you that migrating the data, mining the data is not easy. So my comment is I'd really like to play a role mainly to help build capacity for tribes to look at that data to be able to, themselves, analyze it and interpret it. And I think some of the hesitation for tribes to participate is because they don't know what's going to be done with the data, but I think that can be our friend in planning and becoming primary to make decisions. So is there any plan or can we help facilitate developing a plan to build capacity to surround the community so tribal users can be trained in accessing that data on a wider-spread
basis so that tribes can become effective stakeholders in their own data.

MR. DEATON: Sure. Aaron, I do want to follow-up with some of my colleagues back at NCES on that question. I think, for one, it's really important and it's something I want to help with. We did it years' past. It's been a couple of years since we did it. We offered NIES ND EE training, which was an in-person training where we would bring in people from across the country to help build that capacity. I think it's been several years since we've had that training, so I do want to check with a couple of my other colleagues that have provided that in the past to see what kind of forum we can have. It is something I would really want to play a role and help build because it's, we want this data used and we want this data used by stakeholders and we want to help as much as we can to get the word out because this is publicly-available data, too. There's not a lot of --
MR. PAYMENT: My final comment is it possible to develop, and I would volunteer, I'm co-chair of the education subcommittee for NCDAI. And I just have to believe that there is some kind of certification on the other end. Because the danger is people incorrectly adding value to what the data actually tells us. And the other thing is at different national meetings we've had some direct service schools use the data, and so the typical use because there's no way to differentiate between those. So I think that would really be helpful in maximizing the use of the data so that we can use it to provide services to improve our education system. Thank you.

MR. DEATON: Thank you.

MS. BROADDUS: This is Mandy, and I'll just dovetail with what Aaron said. I don't know how comfortable you'll be with this, but we had, in Montana, a very skilled, independent researcher dig into this data, much more so than -- I mean, I do appreciate what you
still --

MR. DEATON: Sure.

MS. BROADDUS: -- but gave us a very deep analysis that's been very useful to us at the state level in doing our work.

MR. DEATON: I'm really glad you said that, too. Unfortunately, Montana, in 2015, didn't participate in the NIES survey questionnaire.

MS. BROADDUS: Yes, intentionally so.

MR. DEATON: Intentionally. And we would love to have Montana back in the fold, given the size of the sample and --

MS. BROADDUS: Well, yes. But so Superintendent Juneau made that decision because she wasn't happy with the overall process and protocol. However, we have now turned that over. We've initiated a formal conversation with our tribes because many of them have institutional review boards and it should be up to them whether or not their citizens want, they want their citizens participating in the study.
And we've asked of your organization if a tribe in our state opts out, which is fully, should be their option, and we've been told preliminarily that that could be a problem, that could make all of Montana not eligible --

MR. DEATON: Sure.

MS. BROADDUS: -- which is problematic, but I'll just leave it --

MR. DEATON: I'll look in on it myself. Thank you very much. Yes?

MS. PROUDFIT: This is Joely. So can you tell me why California wasn't included?

MR. DEATON: Oh, California is included and students in California do take NIES. It's just we don't have enough American Indian/Alaska Native students to meet our reporting standards.

MS. PROUDFIT: I have a problem with that.

MR. DEATON: Sure.

MS. PROUDFIT: I mean, I think that is not a good enough response to not address and
report that data. So I would think that, if you do this again, that we need to have a conversation about those small population numbers and how to better address that, rather than say they don't meet your reporting standards. Because I do, the California American Indian and Alaska Native report for us because of these types of national surveys who tell us our population size is too small. So I think if you're going to ask our students to respond and then not include it because the number, the sample size is too small for your reporting, I think we need to re-evaluate how we're doing this.

MR. DEATON: I do want to clarify we do include them but not as a California-specific, you know. So they are included and they help contribute to the national average for low-density schools, for high-density schools.

MS. PROUDFIT: That doesn't help California, so I have real concerns with that.

MR. DEATON: Sure.
MS. BROADDUS: No, it's okay. Carry on.

MR. PAYMENT: This is Aaron. Can I jump in for a second.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Aaron, how much longer is the presentation because I think we're using up --

MR. DEATON: We are three slides, including this one.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, okay. Go ahead, Aaron.

MR. PAYMENT: So real quickly, it seems like, so what I'm going to do is get into I'm going to get into the data in California, because the numbers, the raw sample of pupils is going to exceed most states. So the standard that you're using by using a proportion of the total students is a standard that can't be met. And an alternate analysis would be in those states where the raw number meets the minimum threshold, specifically when you're using the
number of students from California versus the total students, it may be end up being an insignificant number, because you're using a proportion of the raw number and certainly large enough to be able to make a conclusion, you may have to use the total sample from California in order to be able to do that. So an alternate analysis could be done and could include those states where there are large numbers that are not reporting. And so, again, that would be where training would do that analysis. I would think that the National Center for Educational Statistics should do an alternate analysis, other than in the individual presentation.

MR. DEATON: And I did want to clarify we don't exclude them. They are included. We just don't report out at that state level.

CHAIR DENNISON: But it is possible to extract that --

MR. DEATON: Absolutely. We could look at the restricted use data, and it is
possible.

CHAIR DENNISON: At the request of the state could probably --

MR. DEATON: Yes.

CHAIR DENNISON: -- or anyone else.

MR. DEATON: Very much so.

CHAIR DENNISON: All right. Thank you. Any more questions? Go ahead and move on.

MR. DEATON: Sure. So turning back to survey questionnaires, the main focus of this report is on two central constructs and that is the extent to which American Indian and Alaska Native culture and language is part of the curricula and school resources available for improving American Indian and Alaska Native student achievement. Depending on the respondent group, there's a slightly different focus. So for students, the focus is on knowledge of Native culture and languages. For teachers, it's knowledge of skill development for teaching American Indian and Alaska Native students, culturally-specific instruction, and
classroom practices. And finally, for school administrators it's involvement in American Indian and Alaska Native community members, sufficiency and quality of books specific to American Indian and Alaska Native culture.

I also wanted to briefly show you how findings are presented in this report. I'll start by reading this student survey question. So as you can see here, we've disaggregated results into three different groups: again, low-density, high-density, and BIE schools. Grade four results shown at the top, eight results shown at bottom. And the general takeaway from all this data is that BIE students are significantly more exposed to their native language and culture compared to their other peers in other schools.

And then final slide is what I mentioned before, and this is the NIES data explorer. And this includes all NIES survey questions, not just the few that are mentioned in the report themselves, and it allows users to
disaggregate the data into different subgroups, as well. And I should mention, for the NIES survey questions, those are considered publicly available. Those are publicly available even, in fact, before the study was administered. They continue to be publicly available, as well.

So thank you very much for your time and for your questions. I look forward to meeting with you again.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you. Do we have anymore questions? I'm sure we do.

MS. BROADDUS: Can we add this? This is a discussion point for our 4 to 5 --

CHAIR DENNISON: Sure. We can add this. Okay.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Yes, I was going to make the same suggestion. It also just, there's so many correlations, you know, with Indian ed and the funding opportunities that are out there. I mean, we've had this history, this history of these types of scores for Native students, and I guess I just want to highlight
that, in some cases, the education programs of
limited funding that we have, Indian people are
the major ones addressing these issues and
they're huge issues and it has huge
implications, as well. That's all I'll say for
now.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Patsy.
We can add this to our list. Okay. If there's
no other questions, we can adjourn for lunch.
It's now 12:10, so we can come back at 1:30.
1:30? Is that okay with everyone? So we'll
break until 1:30. That will give us some time
to get Dahkota back on, as well. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
went off the record at 12:10 p.m. and resumed at
1:36 p.m.)

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, I think we're
about ready to get started, so everyone will
reconvene. I'd like to call the meeting back to
order. I know that there were members of the
American Indian Higher Education Consortium here
this morning, and they left the booklets for me
to pass out, so I'll pass these around from each side.

Okay, we're going to go back and reconvene, and we'll pick up with Patrick Rooney, who is a Deputy Director in the Office of State Support. Patrick?

MR. ROONEY: Thank you, good afternoon, everyone. Hi, I'm Patrick Rooney, I am the Deputy Director in the Office of State Support within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education at the U.S. Department of Education.

Our office is responsible for administering several of the large K-12 formula grant programs that the U.S. Department of Education administers, so Title I Part A, which is the largest grant program, falls under our office, along with Title III, which is Support for English Learners, Title II, which is support for educators and principals, and also school improvement grants, which are phased out and actually being replaced by similar but slightly
different funds under the statute. But those are funds for low-achieving schools.

All of those programs fall under our office. I was going to give you a few general updates, and then some of my colleagues and fellow offices in OESE are going to follow me.

So I thought it made sense for me to go first and just do a quick overview from a big picture of where we are at this point in time, with the initial implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act. I have a few slides; Tina told me I should speak for maybe 10 or 15 minutes, and then give time for questions.

So I'm going to do a pretty quick overview, but please feel free to stop me if you have questions. I know we have people on the phone. It's harder for you to stop me if you have questions, but hold your questions, and I'm happy to take them when I have a break. I'm going to start by going through a little bit of the state plans.

PARTICIPANT: Did you send us the
slides?

MR. ROONEY: Did I send you slides?

No, I did not send you slides. I have slides from my own -- I did not provide any slides for you guys, so I apologize for that. If there's questions you have, things you'd like to see afterwards, I'm happy to share things.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I have a question.

Can we get copies of the slides, as well?

MR. ROONEY: Yes, I'm happy to --

MS. HUNTER: I will email all of the slides, and I'm going to bring that tomorrow, the slides to put in the back.

MR. ROONEY: Great, all right. So under the Every Student Succeeds Act, which is the re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or ESSA, every state has to submit a plan for how they are going to meet the different aspects of the statute. And one of the features that we offer states is that they get to create a consolidated state plan, which would be one plan that covered all of the
programs under the SCA.

The program is offered by the Office of State Support, and the other programs my colleagues administer. One application that would then guide how states were going to use their federal funds to help support districts and schools, principals and students throughout the lifetime of the Every Student Succeeds Act.

In March of 2017, we put out an application for what was the basic information, what was the absolutely necessary information a state needed to submit in order to receive approval in order to receive federal funds. So we have been working with states over the past year, since March of 2017, when we put out the application.

Our states are developing their plans, submitting them to the Department. We review them both individually; all our programs review the plans, and then we also have peer reviewers who review Title I Part A, the Title III, and also the home assistance program plans.
So we had peer feedback that guided us as we were talking to states.

And we have been working with states over the past year to review their plans, to give them feedback, have them make any changes or clarifications that were needed in order to get those plans approved.

It's important to get those plans approved, because that is then how we work with states over the next -- however long until ESSA gets re-authorized. That is how we work with states as they're implementing their plans, and how we check to make sure that they're complying with the federal statutes and regulations, all the requirements.

It's also how, if their plan is approved, that's how they can get funding. If they don't have a plan approved, it's a harder way of working how we get the state's funding, if that's the case. But if their plan is approved, and as long as they're implementing their plan, they're in compliance with the law,
and they can receive federal funds. And then we monitor against their plans and do all the fun federal bureaucracy aspects of the work that we like to do.

So we've been working with states on that aspect. At this point, we have 37 states plus D.C. and Puerto Rico have had their plans approved, so there are 13 states that we are still working on. One of the things I had a slide of, a map of who is not approved.

I know you guys are all in different parts in the field. Do you know if your plan has been approved or not? Raise your hand if you don't know if your plan has been approved.

I will tell you the states that are not approved for now, if that's helpful. I'm going to go through the map, so it's going to go from west coast to east coast. Alaska, California, Utah, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Oklahoma, Alabama, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida.

Those 13 states we are still working
with in order to help them ensure they've got a plan that meets all the requirements of the statute, and that they are ready to start implementing their plans. The other 39 states, 37 states plus D.C. and Puerto Rico, have all been approved.

We hope that those 13 states I named will be approved soon, we're making good progress with just about all of them. I feel pretty confident that we will have them approved before too long, but we haven't quite gotten there yet for those 13 states.

Now, I want to talk a minute about our office in particular, Title I Part A being the biggest part of what we do, and the biggest part of Title I for our purposes is the fact that every year states need to have an accountability system that is annually, meaningfully, differentiating all schools within their state. So the biggest part of what's in our state plan for Title I is the accountability system. It's the measures that
the state has identified in order to hold
schools accountable for the progress that
students are making.

And one of the big changes from No
Child Left Behind to ESSA is a freedom from the
top-down approach of No Child Left Behind, where
you had academic progress, and you had very
strict measures of what each school was being
held accountable for. They were mostly the same
from one state to the next.

Under ESSA, there's still a focus on
academic achievement, there's still a focus on
graduation rates. But the design of the system
is much more fluid, and states have a lot of
flexibility in how they create their systems.

And as we've been working with states
over the past year, we've seen that
accountability systems are very different from
one state to the next. At first, I think that's
one of those interesting and exciting parts of
the new law, is that we are going to end up with
52 different accountability systems that are
going to have very different structure, very different design, often with very different outcomes, in terms of how they're identifying the schools that are doing really well and the schools that are doing poorly and might need the most support.

And I think we are going to learn a lot, and I think states are going to learn a lot over the next few years, as they implement these systems for the first time this year, and as they start to identify the schools that need support, they start to evaluate the systems themselves. Are these the right measure to identify schools that are doing well, and schools that are doing poorly? And they're going to start to learn from one another in ways of, what happens when you start adding in different kinds of accountability measures? What happens when you start trying to measure different aspects of education, not focusing just on reading and math achievements, but adding in other components? But I think it's
going to move the field really quickly in the next few years. So I'm really looking forward to that, as states design their systems.

Every state does need to have five different types of indicators in their system: achievement based on reading and math, graduation rates, another measure for elementary schools or middle schools, which for many states, is going to be individual student growth from one year to the next.

But some states either can't measure student growth or didn't want to measure student growth, and they've added other aspects of some sort of academic achievement like chronic absenteeism or science achievement or social studies tests; some other state-wide measure that they have.

States also have to include English language proficiency as a measure, and that is a slight change from NCLB to ESSA in that, under NCLB, districts were held accountable for progress in English language proficiency. Under
ESSA, it's now a school-level measure, so it's a measure at a school level rather than the district level, and it gets folded into the state's accountability system which, I think, adds more emphasis and weight to it as part of the accountability system.

The last measure is the school quality or student success measure. That measure is interesting in that it's a very broadly-defined measure, and we have seen states going -- this is where we see the most variability in how states are designing their indicators.

Several states have started doing things around college readiness, where they're looking at advanced course-taking, AP or dual enrollment. Some are looking at a range of measures like SAT and ACT scores, plus career readiness features like kids taking career internships or on-the-job training.

We've also seen some states try to measure things like military readiness and the
ASVAB test that a lot of states offer for students; they're looking at scores on that to see if kids are going to have the kinds of skills they need when they leave high school, to be ready for the next step, whether that be a career or military or college. They're looking at ways to measure that across their state and do it in a uniform manner.

I think that makes it an area where we're going to see some interesting outcomes in the next few years, as states design their systems.

I looked at this earlier; this is the first year of states' accountability systems are in place under ESSA, and what's coming next under Title I Part A is that states will be running their accountability systems this summer, based on the data that they collect from this school year.

So the tests will be given -- most of them are being given right now. The other measures that they're going to collect, like
chronic absenteeism that they'll collect during the spring and the summer, all of that is going to be rolled together, and we will have, however the system is designed, they will come out of it their annual meaningful differentiation for all schools in the state in the beginning of the 18/19 school year.

And the other thing is, they'll start to identify schools for improvement for the first time, so they are going to start looking at the schools that are identified for comprehensive support and targeted support. And the statute lays out those broad definitions.

Comprehensive support are the schools that are performing in the lowest five percent of all Title I schools. So it's designed for the state to identify the schools that are the ones that need the most support, however the system is designed, wherever you're adding up all your indicators and designing, what are the worst-performing schools? Those are the comprehensive support schools.
It's also any school, whether a Title I school or not, that has a very low graduation rate, and the law actually defines that as a graduation rate of 67 percent or lower. So the bottom five percent and the schools with a very low graduation rate will be identified for comprehensive support this fall.

Then states also have identified schools for targeted support if they have some pockets of students in their school that are performing equivalent to however their bottom five percent of schools overall are looking. So if they've got a pocket of kids that are performing equivalent to the bottom five percent of schools overall, those schools are identified for improvement, and also schools that have consistently under-performing subgroups. That's a term that's not defined in the statute, but it's defined by each state, and they each define it differently.

But generally, states are looking at subgroups of student who, over a three-year
period, are performing very low in one or more measures in their accountability system. Those schools will also be identified for targeted support. As the name implies, if you're a targeted-support school, the goal is that you're identifying your intentions to support whatever is the targeted population that needs support.

You can tailor support for those groups. If you're a comprehensive school, the goal is to identify supports to help the overall school population and comprehensive reforms for the school.

So for both of those groups, we have school improvement funds under Section 1003 (a) of the statute, where it essentially replaces the school improvement grant program. Districts can apply for funds for those schools identified for targeted or comprehensive support.

And similar to how the accountability system is looser, school improvement rules are also looser under ESSA when compared with NCLB. Under school improvement grants, there were very
specific formulas and plans of how you would attack school improvement for the schools that were identified as the most in need of support.

Under ESSA, the funds are much broader, and schools can use those funds for however they best see fit to support their needs. The one caveat to that is, there is a focus on evidence-based interventions under the statute. That is well-defined under the statute, what is evidence-based intervention, and there's different tiers of documentation or evidence that you would use to identify whether the interventions you are proposing for your schools that are identified for comprehensive or targeted support are matched to the needs of those schools.

There has been an outgrowth of literature in support or reaction to ESSA passing, and we write some of those resources, and I know that our comprehensive centers are also working on finding out how we can help schools and districts figure out what evidence-
based interventions are to help low-achieving schools address the cause of them being a low-achieving school.

I know there are a lot of other resources out there that are trying to come to bear, to help districts as they start -- I think about this fall -- what's that going to mean in practice? How are they going to identify the needs of the schools, whether it's an evidence-based intervention that has been shown to work in other places that they could apply to help support these schools that are need of support?

I think that's going to be an interesting dynamic, and I and my colleagues will be looking to see how we can help support states and districts as they start to roll this out. This is really a pretty different way of how states and districts are working together to help support low-achieving schools.

I'm going to stop there. Any questions?

CHAIR DENNISON: Do we have any
questions? Go ahead, Robin.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes. I'm curious about, in your list of evidence-based interventions, how many of them have been used with Native schools, or schools that have a significant Native population?

MR. ROONEY: So that's a good question. I don't know the answer to that specifically. I'm happy to go back and look at it.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: I ask the question because so often in my experience, and I used to work at the State Department of Education; I've been on monitoring consults with the Bureau and public schools.

And what I have observed is that people try to plug in some kind of intervention that doesn't -- it may work in non-Native schools, but it doesn't translate necessarily well to Native schools. And oftentimes you'll see that with programs that people are recommending, and there's been no attempt to
modify or adapt it until it arrives on the
doorstep of one of those schools.

MR. ROONEY: I think that's a good
question, and it's an important point for us to
keep in mind as collectively, me and my
colleagues and others are thinking about how to
implement this. I mentioned that the statute
lays out different tiers of evidence for
evidence-based design. We put out some guidance
for states and districts; we've been working
with one of our TA re-centers, the state support
network, over the past year and a half on this.

One of the key things to think about
is, what is the evidence that the intervention
works? Are there positive effects from whatever
the intervention is, without any other
unintended consequences that you should take
into account when thinking about picking an
intervention?

The other thing this is to think
about the applicability of the intervention.
Has it been applied where it has shown effect in
a similar situation, both in terms of the setting of the school and of the students impacted? I think both of those are really relevant to your question.

My guess is that there's probably not a lot of evidence out there that's been looked at specifically about being used in tribal schools. My guess is that research is not as robust as we'd like it to be. The gold standard that we always talk about is the What Works Clearinghouse, which the Department's Institute for Education Science runs, where they have a pretty high standard for what they will accept for having shown positive beneficial effects.

That's where I always encourage people to go first to see what research is there, and where they could try to draw from. They do have a pretty high standard for what they accept, and I don't know if anything in there has an impact for tribal schools in particular.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: I want to give you
an example of one of the schools that I was on a
school improvement team for. The school had
decided, for some reason, to start at the
primary grades and move the kids back and forth
from -- like, one teacher was going to
specialize in reading. So they would move kids
in and out for reading instruction. Then
another teacher was going to be more of the math
specialist, and they would move the kids in the
primary grades into a math region, so no one
teacher had to be an expert in both.

It was a strange decision. We
questioned them as a team, why they came up with
this particular model. They just said, Well, we
need to do something different. It just didn't
seem to be based in knowing the community and
the kids. It was just weird.

MR. ROONEY: I think that's a good
flag. One of the challenges with ESSA -- it's
got a lot of good opportunities for us, and more
importantly, for districts and schools and
states. But one of the challenges is that it
does provide a lot of flexibility at the local level to make decisions, and it emphasizes consultation throughout the statute.

It's repeatedly talked about how districts and schools are making their plans, they should be consulting with their communities, they should be thinking about what makes sense for the context of the students around school improvement, in particular.

They should be looking at evidence-based strategies that have been proven to work somewhere and looking at the evidence that they worked to make sure they're applicable for whatever the causes are, whatever the reasons are that the school has been identified for improvement.

But it also does create some flexibility for districts to make decisions like that, to think about what they know best for what makes sense for their students. Our hope is by emphasizing the consultation, by emphasizing evidence-based interventions, that
will bring people together to make good decisions at the local level to help figure out what is needed.

I certainly don’t think or my colleagues at the U.S. Department of Education have a good sense of what is needed at a particular school. But I’m hoping that by bringing the relevant people together to think about the cause of the problem and what is the evidence base for a different intervention, that will help proceed make smart decisions.

MS. BROADDUS: Thank you for that. Can I add to your question? I’m from Montana, and I work for the SCA. I’m the director of Indian Education, and I also oversaw our state grants for the past eight or nine years. I forget how long it’s been. There is very little evidence-based research that we can apply. I’ve looked actively for it, so I could suggest some to our schools, but there’s limited resources there.

But the issue is compounded by our
rurality, and the fact that we have high administrative and staff turnover. So what happens is, yes, absolutely, a school board should set a vision for the kind of leader they want to bring in, and that should be executed. But that's not what really happens in a lot of our communities.

All of our schools -- 90 percent of our schools identify for comprehensive who are on our American Indian reservations. And the reality is that the administrators are probably 90 percent of the time, not from that community, and they're not American Indian. So doing the level of work that you're describing is very difficult for them.

And not just difficult, but they are sometimes resistant to even taking those steps. That's our reality. So the level of the SCA engagement with both the tribes and the local schools is deep. We have to do a big lift, and I just don't want that to be forgotten.

Indian Country is just different from
Detroit or Chicago or D.C., in that a lot of our schools -- the school and the district are one and the same. So when you talk about capacity -- again, with high turnover and real turbulence in the system, it's not easy work.

MR. ROONEY: I definitely appreciate that point. It's definitely a real concern. There are two things we are doing in my office that to help support that, and I know my colleagues have things they could point to as well.

Through the TA arm in my office, the state support network, we have created one community practice that is up and running, where we're beginning in rural states to talk about rural issues in implementing the statute, and I think that's obviously one real current issue. I think Montana is a member of that group, although I can't remember who all the members are of that group.

A second is a new community practice we're just about ready to launch, and we'll be
announcing in the next few days on school improvement itself. I think one strain of that we're hoping to spend time on is the rural needs of school improvement.

We'll look at how to do some of these evidence-based interventions in schools where you don't have a lot of options in the community that you can draw from and look at the options that you can focus on in those communities to help support those schools.

So I'm hoping that community practice will help bring some states together to talk about how you can all try address these things, which are very real, I realize.

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, and to add to that, you hit right on what I was going to say. To add to that, I know it's state by state, where the determination of how the letter grade is going to work, but in Indian Country it seems like -- and I'm from Arizona, so I'm speaking on behalf of Arizona when I say this, and I'm pretty sure it's the same way across Indian
Country -- but the socio-emotional part of a school and how that letter grade is determined is totally left out, to the point where there really isn't much hope, when you're giving fours to schools and school districts across Indian Country, because that's not ever considered.

To me, in my experience, that's been one of the greater areas that's been pushed aside. Yes, academics is important, but you can't really get to that until you've addressed the socio-emotional part of what's going on in the community, or the student in the home and all of that.

So that's been something that I've been trying to push for in Arizona. But it seems that we're one of the states with the largest number of tribes. It seems like it's not considered. Every time something new comes out, it's totally left out again.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I just want to add to that. My name is Patricia Whitefoot, I'm from the Yakama Nation in Washington State, as well,
and also have worked at the SCA level in Indian education. I wanted to echo what everybody said here, but also wanted to say that within our tribes, we're focused on our indigenous ways of knowing, our native ways of knowing.

And that means re-capturing, re-vitalizing our Native languages and history, which has been left out of the LEAs. And while there might be laws in place that expect that at the state level, that isn't necessarily provided in the LEAs today.

So the need to really look at this in a more holistic and comprehensive way is going to be important, because we're not only talking about language re-vitalization; we're also talking about the health of our children and the healing that's going on in our community, just because of the poor health as well.

That's a major issue too, and along with health goes poor school facilities and classrooms and environment. My granddaughter was in a portable, a special-ed child being in
portables with no rest rooms, no running water. And I worried about her in the wintertime, along with the other kids who had to go out of the building to be able to just use the rest room across campus.

So many of our schools and public schools, if you looked at some of them, some of the reports on school facilities in Indian Country, you would find that there is a major issue that's going on in Indian Country.

So I can appreciate having a consolidated plan, but I also just wondered as you were beginning the report, I was wondering if there were any Indian people involved in the peer review that would know about some of these kinds of issues that we're bringing up? So I'm curious: Were there any Native people, American Indians, Alaskan Natives, involved in the peer review processes?

MR. ROONEY: That's a good question; you've put me on the spot. I believe there were; I'm trying to remember. The statute laid
out particular categories of individuals who needed to be involved in the peer review, and I believe Native American was one, or tribal leaders was one of the categories. But I'm blanking on the full list in my head; I'm trying to run through it.

I'm pretty sure there were, but I will say there were teams looking at each state's plan, so there wasn't a tribal individual on each state's plan I was looking at, but there was some representation across the full panel of peers who were looking at state plans to give us some feedback.

So that was definitely part of our thinking. But to both of your points, I think you both raise good points about socio-emotional learning, and other aspects aside from academics. And I kind of skirted over this when I was talking about that fifth bucket of indicators, the school quality or student success, but that really is designed to look at the well-rounded education.
While a lot of states have focused on college-career readiness, there have been other states that are trying to figure out other ways to capture education. I think chronic absenteeism is a very popular one that many states chose.

But other states have chosen other things like access to health professional or guidance counselors per student. A couple of states are looking at surveys of students as a way to get some feedback on the culture or the health and well-being or socio-emotional aspects of the school that they can enfold into their accountability system as a component.

It's still counterbalanced by all the academic pieces, but it can be a component of their system. I think that's an area where a lot of states were interested in going, but there weren't objective state-wide measures already in place that they could use. So they are thinking about ways to add those in a few years, but they don't have them yet.
A couple of states are starting to push there, and I think they may serve as models for other states over the next few years, as they're starting to evaluate their systems. I suspect we'll see some more states trying to push that way, or communities in states pushing states to go in that direction, which may be interesting for the field to see how that plays out and what impact that has.

MS. PROUDFIT: Hi, I'm Joely Proudfit from California. When the question was asked earlier about peer review or Native involvement in those reviews, and you said that you weren't sure that there was a Native person at the state level for all of these states, can you be more intentional, going forward, that those states, especially with a high Native student population or tribal density, that it's intentional to have a Native reviewer as a part of that process?

MR. ROONEY: That's a fair suggestion; I'm happy to get that back, it's seems like it's a good suggestion.
CHAIR DENNISON: Any other questions from anyone? Okay, thank you. Moving right along, we'll go on to Sylvia Lyles. Oh, I'm sorry, we skipped --

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Deborah, I actually do have one more question. In your Title I data, do you track Native students' performance?

MR. ROONEY: Yes. So your question was whether we track Native American students' performance. Yes, it is one of the subgroups -- each state is required to report on children with disabilities, English learners, economically disadvantaged, and then regional or racial and ethnic groups.

And almost every state identifies Native American population as one of their major subgroups. They report annually on their state and district report cards, and they also report annually to us on performance of each of those subgroups that they've identified. So even going back to NCLB, we have performance on all of the academic indicators under the
accountability systems under NCLB. Now, under ESSA, we will have the states' report on performance on all of the indicators in their system.

(Off mic comments)

MR. ROONEY: We do, and we publish it annually. I'm happy to send a link to where that information is available. We've got a website where you can look at performance by state and by subgroup. Each state also has a consolidated state performance report, which is a pdf file, which shows their performance year by year. I'm happy to send both of those to Tina, and she can share with the group.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I forgot to ask this one question, and it had to do with your office meeting on a regular basis with Indian education or the White House Initiative as well. Are those kinds of planning meetings in place here at the Department of Education as well?

MR. ROONEY: Yes. We definitely meet closely with Cara in the Office of Education,
and also with Ron in assisting with the White
House Initiative. And we also meet with BIE.
They don't have to do a consolidated state
report, like the 50 states, D.C., and Puerto
Rico, but they have something similar that they
put in place that guides how they are
implementing the statute.

As I think you guys know, they are in
the midst of going through a negotiated
rulemaking in order to create their
accountability system. That is the first step
they have to do. They're going through that
phase before they have an accountability system,
which is the underpinnings of the Title I Part A
aspect of the consolidated state plan.

I have a colleague on my team who
talks to BIE very regularly to help support them
and see how he can make sure they get what they
need in order to support the BIE-funded schools.

MS. RAMSEY: And I'm just nodding my
head, confirming that what Patrick said is true.

Definitely regular meetings with them and with
CHAIR DENNISON: Mandy?

MS. BROADDUS: I'm sure you've heard this before, but it is somewhat of a problem. When you have to mark your racial subgroup, and the mixed race in states like our can definitely skew our numbers and make our American Indian population seem much smaller than it really is.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. I look forward to hearing more as the time goes on, so thank you very much. We're going to move right on to -- we're going to skip a couple and move to David Cantrell, because he's asked to go next. Thank you.

DR. CANTRELL: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you. I'm going to start off with an overview of the Comprehensive Centers and Equity Assistance Centers, and then Kim Okahara, she will provide some details in terms of the types of services that the Equity Assistance Centers and the Comprehensive Centers provide to Native American students.
The Comprehensive Centers is a 52-million-dollar grant that we award to 15 regional centers and seven content centers across the United States. Each of these centers provide a range of topical areas of support for states and districts.

These areas may include college and career readiness, effective teachers and leaders, school turnaround, early learning, standards and assessments, building state capacity productivity, innovations in learning.

When you think of an educational entity, whether it's a state or district, these are the core topics that every educational professional wants to address within their organization. So what are some specific examples of technological assistance that the Comprehensive Centers have provided?

They include providing supports to implement the Every Student Succeeds Act; providing support to retain and support teachers and school administrators; implementing school
improvement and turnaround resources; and supports to low-performing school districts, coaching and mentoring state staff to build their capacity to support English language learners.

We're currently in the process of sunsetting our current cohort, which runs through the 2018 fiscal year. Next year we are ramping up and beginning efforts to do a new competition for the Comprehensive Centers for the next cohort, which will go into play for the FY 2010 fiscal year.

Now let me shift gears and speak briefly about the Equity Assistance Centers. This is a 6.5-million-dollar grant that we award to four regional centers across the United States. The centers provide -- and once again, consistent with the Comprehensive Centers -- upon request from the state or district, help us out in the following ways:

Some of the ways the Equity Assistance Centers may provide support include
addressing bias regarding race, sex, national
origin, and religion through the preparation,
adoption, and implementation of plans for the
desegregation of public schools.

Some specific examples of the types
of supports the Equity Assistance Centers
provide include: addressing inequities in
access to effective teachers; addressing student
isolation or disciplinary practices; providing
accessible and culturally-responsive practices
in instruction and assessment; and finally,
providing open, safe, welcoming, and equitably-
accessible classroom and non-classroom spaces.

We do have some specific examples of
the states which have requested services either
from the Comprehensive Centers and/or from the
Equity Assistance Centers, and those specific
example Kim will go over now.

MS. OKAHARA: Thanks, David. I'm
going to start with an overview of the FY 19
Comprehensive Centers supports and end with some
supports that are being offered through our
Equity Assistance Centers.

For FY 18 --

MS. WHITEFOOT: Can you speak up, please?

MS. OKAHARA: Sure. Sorry about that. Is this better? For FY 18, our centers are supporting 18 SCAs, and included in that number is the BIE. That's one additional update for this year; the West Comprehensive Center is now the designated regional center to support the BIE for this year and next year.

In terms of the estimated level of investment for this year -- these are estimated -- we're investing about $1.2 million to support all of these projects. We have six centers; our Building State Capacity and Productivity Center, one of our content centers, as well as the Center on Standards and Implementation, the North Central Comprehensive Center, the North West Comprehensive Center, the South Central Comprehensive Center, and the West Comprehensive Center, providing support to a variety of
I'll start with the BIE summary. In a coordinated effort, the West Comprehensive Center, our Building State Capacity and Productivity Center, BSCP for short, and our Centers on Standards and Implementation -- I'll just say CSAI -- are providing support to the BIE around strategic performance management.

You are all probably aware that the BIE is engaged in a very intensive effort around their strategic plan, so all of our centers have contributed to the stakeholder engagement efforts, as well as drafting the plan and the corresponding milestones and tasks.

Our National Conference Center, CSAI, has been providing support to the new Office of Assessment and Accountability around data reporting in general, so building capacity through peer-to-peer exchanges and developing a data-reporting calendar for the BIE, as well as other technical assistance generally.

And finally, I think Patrick
mentioned this; the BIE is engaged in negotiated rulemaking, that process. All of our centers are engaged in supporting the BIE through helping them develop issue papers and in generally managing all of the very bureaucratic paths related to negotiated rulemaking. So that's with the BIE.

As far as single-state supports, our North Central Comprehensive Center is providing support around a South Dakota Native American achievement school pilot project. They're specifically assisting Todd County School District, which includes in that the Todd County Middle School and He Dog Elementary School.

In North Dakota, our North Central Comprehensive Center is supporting the Department of Public Instruction by providing technical assistance in tribal consultation, chronic absenteeism, and dropout prevention. They are also providing support around tribal stakeholder meetings, as well as collaborating with the Department in planning their chronic
absenteeism and dropout prevention conference.

Now I'm going to move to the more multi-state efforts. Our North West Comprehensive Center and South Central Comprehensive Center are supporting a number of states: Arizona, Montana, and Washington are included in that, in the American Indian Achievement Task Force project. There, they're facilitating cross-state convenings of Indian Education directors to create a community of practice among SCA peers and also assisting in the development and implementation of state-specific plans around the Native language policies and tribal compact schools.

In Oklahoma and Arizona, our CSAI and the West Comprehensive Center are providing supports around culturally-responsive formative assessments for American Indian and Alaskan Native students. There, they are planning and implementing effective dissemination strategies for use of online learning modules for culturally-responsive formative assessments.
Also in Oklahoma and in New Mexico, our South Central Comprehensive Center is supporting the Oklahoma State Department of Education, New Mexico Public Education Department, the Oklahoma Advisory Council for Indian Education, and the New Mexico Indian Education Advisory Council in improving the effectiveness of the advisory councils and addressing critical issues of communication, cooperation, and collaboration among various organizations and agencies that have Indian education as a primary part of their mission.

The last project that I have to highlight is related to the American Indian English Learner Research Alliance. The topic of language acquisition came up, so our South Central Comprehensive Center is partnering with the world-class instruction design and assessment, as well as the University of Wisconsin to plan and implement a process for a membership-based research alliance to recruit and support Native researchers to address
critical issues related to Native English learners and promote culturally-responsive pedagogy.

Those are several highlights for the Comprehensive Centers, and I'll end and take questions after that, with highlights around the Equity Assistance Centers.

So for the Equity Assistance Centers, there are two projects, one in North Dakota and one in New Mexico. The estimated level of investment is just under $20,000.

The first project, also in North Dakota, our Region 3 Equity Assistance Center is working with the Department of Public Instruction to support an annual summit that will promote the use of culturally-responsive practices related to American Indian students.

The second project is through our Region 4 Equity Assistance Center, and they are supporting the Gallup and McKinley County Schools in New Mexico, to provide support to the district's gifted and talented education program.
and advanced placement program.

There was an issue related to the exclusion of participation of American Indian students in that particular district, so that Equity Assistance Center is working with our Office for Civil Rights to address that issue and develop policy and procedures.

CHAIR DENNISON: Do we have any questions? I always look at those two over there.

(Laughter.)

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes, my question is, how are you measuring the effectiveness of these initiatives or programs, and can we get copies of what you just read off to us?

MS. OKAHARA: Okay. Regarding the second one, I think we can definitely provide copies of the project summaries, and also contact information for those project directors. They can provide much more detail than we could at this level.

The second about measuring the
effectiveness -- this is something that we will
definitely see as we transition to our new
cohort, about how we're measuring whether or not
there's added value, that technical assistance
is being provided.

So right now, our Comprehensive
Centers do provide annual performance reports at
the end of July, and there we assess what did
you propose in your annual management plan to
the department, and how much did you accomplish,
essentially, so what are those outputs,
outcomes, milestones, and what is the progress
that you've made.

So we do receive that information
right before we issue continuation awards. And
we also receive an annual evaluation at the end
of the calendar year, so December of every year.
There they provide project summaries, usually
case studies or vignettes of the type of work
that they do, as well as provide in an
aggregate, summaries of client satisfaction, the
extent to which they've used the resources, the
extent to which there have been changes in policies and practices.

CHAIR DENNISON: Are there any other questions? Mandy?

MS. BROADDUS: One comment I would make is, from my SCA, I serve on the alliance with two of the comp centers, and we did not know about the work that was happening in the other regions, so it has been helpful for that purpose.

But there should be a way to disseminate that information out to the Indian education communities, they really appreciate that level of information.

MS. OKAHARA: Great. We're planning in the next month to roll out the Comprehensive Center program website; that is new. On that website there will be resources that have been developed by both our regional centers and our content centers. So that might be another vehicle, and we'll definitely make sure that we provide that information to Tara and anybody
else on this council.

    MS. BROADDUS: Because as you heard
us say, there's such little out there for us in
Indian Country to build on. So the more
information we have, the better equipped we are.
And that goes for all -- like a clearinghouse
for Indian education would be the perfect type
of system. What works in Indian Country?

    CHAIR DENNISON: Any other questions?
Okay, Patsy?

    MS. JOHN: Yes, this is Theresa. I
was wondering what were the standards for your
culturally-responsive pedagogy right now? And
where can I find those?

    MS. OKAHARA: I don't have that
information here, but I can certainly provide
information about that particular project that
addresses culturally-responsive pedagogy. We
can connect you to both the content center and
the regional center that's in charge of that
work.

    CHAIR DENNISON: Did you hear that,
Theresa?

MS. JOHN: Yes, I can hear.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. And Patsy, go ahead.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Can you elaborate a little bit on the criteria that you're looking for in the Comprehensive Centers? I think that would be very helpful for us to know, to try to give us a snapshot.

I also am on the Northwest TEA as well, and have been engaged with the Comprehensive Center over 40 years and still involved with them. But it would be nice to know what that framework is that you're looking at, particularly if some of us have been really engaged with these centers and trying to support their efforts as well, because what they're doing is providing support to us as well, the research work that we're doing.

So in response to Theresa's question, yes, it's out there, but it gets lost in all of the maze of these centers, some of the research
work that's going on and best practices. So I'm just urging the Comprehensive Center to do a better job of organizing that information for us.

DR. CANTRELL: That's a really good question. When you think of the protocol in which the Comprehensive Centers provide the services, right now it is set up that an LEA or school district can go to the state, the state can go to the Comprehensive Center and say, help us out with implementing a state-wide assessment plan, for example.

But by nature, the structure is set up that the Comprehensive Centers can provide a wide range of support services based on the needs of the asker, whether it's the district or the state. We haven't gone out and said, narrowly, Comprehensive Centers can only provide X, Y, and Z types of services.

Granted, at the very beginning, I gave an overview of the types of services they're charged with providing: college and
career readiness, protective teacher practices, effective pedagogy, helping administers. But the idea was that, initially what the cohort that is in play right now, which does sunset at the end of Fiscal Year 18, the idea was that we set up the cohort in such a way that the districts and the states across the United States have a wide range of needs.

So they could go to respective assigned Comprehensive Center and say, We need help with reducing our dropout rate. But another district or another state may say, We need help with providing secondary opportunities for advanced-placement courses or dual enrollment.

But the second prong of your question was, how can we build capacity such that one Comprehensive Center is working on a range of topics in one part of the country, whereas the other part of the country may have some interests in the same type of topics?

As Kim was saying earlier, our
solution to mitigate that challenge is to roll out a comprehensive website so that all of our stakeholders, not just Comprehensive Centers, employees themselves, but state leaders, district leaders, and education staff can use this website to identify the types of supports, interventions, training opportunities that many of the Comprehensive Centers have already worked on.

It's searchable; there are also opportunities to identify events that are coming up. There's going to be calendar platform as well, and we are planning on launching that this summer. I think that will help address the issue of communicating across the different levels, where it's the school level, state, district, or geographical locations across the United States.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I did hear your response with regard to taking a look at state and school district level interests. However, for Indian education programs and tribes, we're
looking at our communication and relationship with the Comprehensive Centers on a tribal base level as well. So in our area, we're working with the tribal leaders, which I think is important. The tribes have been involved with the work that we're doing, particularly in the Northwest. So I just want to highlight that, to not leave out the role of our tribes.

DR. CANTRELL: Absolutely.

MS. BROADDUS: I will highlight one thing you didn't mention, that in the Pacific Northwest, we created a tribal consultation guide specifically for tribes. So that's a resource that's available to anybody. But it's really cool. I just wanted to give it a plug.

DR. CANTRELL: So our Comprehensive Center that is in charge of this website and making it go live is in the process of calling and reviewing all the information that is out there. So I'm sure they came across this product that you were just speaking about. That will be weaved into the website as well.
MS. WHITEFOOT: And it would be helpful because I've had to go through the lab's website, and you can't find it, because Indians are just buried in there. It would be helpful if you organized by Indian education and by region as well.

MS. OKAHARA: I think it's currently organized by region and state. We're more than happy to develop a collection so it's very easy to see all of the resources that have been developed from the beginning of this cohort in 2012 through the end of next fiscal year.

CHAIR DENNISON: Go ahead.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: This is Robin. One of the issues that we've talked about, even one of our very early NACIE meetings is the void of technical assistance that actually goes out and works directly with schools. We looked to states to be able to do that, but again, it's like there's this tiered system of technical assistance, and at every level there is a lack of knowledge, experience, research, resources,
to be able to really assist low-performing Native schools.

I'll give you an example: I was on a school improvement team within the last three years for a public school that was on a reservation. I served on that team, and when I started to make some recommendations that they didn't want to hear, I was removed from the team.

So then I went to the state level and said, It seems to me that it's really important to have diversity on your reviewers, because most of their reviewers for support teams were principals that had retired, which in Oregon are largely not people of color, let alone few, if any, who had worked with Native schools or were Native.

Then you go to the Comprehensive Centers, and they are yet again removed in terms of not having the experience level of a local district or the state. I worked back when it was Northwest Regional Lab, over the whole
Northwest, but there were no Native people at the lab.

Now at Northwest, they're struggling to find staff to work there. So at almost every level there is a lack of research experience and support for those schools. So our schools keep looking for help and assistance, and they can't get it. It seems like we need a focused center that can really dive deeply into what the strategies are that can help those schools.

We did some of that work back in the late '80s, early '90s, when I was at Northwest Regional Lab, and we had our effective practices sites. We went out to 11 or 12 schools that had various populations of Native students. We used the school improvement process, we had resources we could give the school. We took them through a continuous cycle; but when the money dried up, that went away, and they had no support.

Then when I went out and monitored 14 BIE schools in the Northwest, one example was, I went to every single school and asked the
administrators, What do you use to determine whether or not good instruction is happening in those classrooms? How do you evaluate your staff?

Every single school had a different instrument, from nothing, just a casual conversation with staff, to a really detailed checklist. And that was supposed to be in a system which was not a system. So it just feels like it's chaos out there for Indian education.

Our kids are the lowest performing, and they need the greatest amount of support, and we get the least amount of money and resources. And it's so fragmented; it just feels so discouraging sometimes.

And when I think of a Comprehensive Center, it should be comprehensive. It should be focused on the client and not the state. The clients are the actual schools that are desperate for support, because a lot of those teachers don't know what they don't know. They're very well-intentioned service providers,
but they're missing the mark. So we really need good technical assistance.

MS. OKAHARA: Yes. In terms of direct support to schools, under the prior administration, the priority was to provide SCA-level support, and to some extent, district-level support. So when we go back to the original 2011 requirements, it's not that centers cannot -- if we review the statute, they can provide support to schools, but that was definitely not the priority for this cohort, with the rationale being that if we were interested in systemic change, it had to begin at the highest level, the SCA.

Now, we are, as an office, revisiting what the appropriate levels of support are, and who are the clients -- to your point -- who are the direct beneficiaries that we should be serving through this program? And I think through the competition, we will issue a notice of proposed priorities and requirements, and there will be the opportunity for public comment
and recommendations about how we can better strengthen this network.

And then as far as what we can do with this current cohort, all of them are required to have advisory councils, and there is a requirement around categories of individuals. And I really think that's an opportunity where we can prioritize the work of our regional centers and/or our content centers.

And we will continue to provide support to the BIE through a supplement in this next year. The supplement for this year was around $300,000 for the West Comprehensive Center. Our content centers are continuing to provide support around strategic performance management, around negotiated rulemaking, around data reporting. We know that will be a continued effort through the end of next fiscal year.

And there is where I think we are seeing how some of the supports can be transitioned to the regional entities that
oversee the BIE-controlled schools, as well as the schools themselves.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: To the line officers?

MS. OKAHARA: They're the regional entities that -- I'm sorry. I don't have the acronym in front of me.

But I think that is the plan for the next year, now that there will be a strategic plan. How do we start cascading those supports down to the schools?

CHAIR DENNISON: So your support doesn't just go to the states, it can also go straight to school districts?

MS. OKAHARA: I think it's supporting our states and our districts and supporting schools. It's kind of a mouthful.

CHAIR DENNISON: And then after 2019, you have a --

MS. OKAHARA: I think we're contemplating what the support will look like at every level within any system, whether it's
primarily SCAs or our regional education agencies, our LEAs, and so on -- school boards.

So I think, through the end of this cohort, which will end in FY 19, I think the direction is still to primarily support state education agencies, and to some extent, local education agencies.

DR. CANTRELL: If I could just add a few words to that: We recognize now with the current cohort that, to your point, we have somewhat of an image issue. We want to make sure that the Comprehensive Centers are providing the appropriate services that the stakeholders need, whether it's the district or the school, or it's one state versus another.

So with our new competition going forward, as Kim was saying, we are in the final stages of deciding what that protocol is going to look like five years from now in terms of requesting services. Might a school directly go to the Comprehensive Center, or might there still be some type of stove piping of the
requests through the district or the state?

But your comments are not the first time we've heard that opinion, that we need the targeted, specific, individualized instruction for Native American schools. It may look differently in the Northwest, it may look differently in the Northeast.

So those are themes that are on our radar right now. We are looking at, certainly with the new cohort, we're going to have an extensive public relations campaign once we roll out with this new cohort we'll have the website. So at the end of the day, we want not only our districts, our schools, the Indian reservations, Native Americans, all the states to know that the Comprehensive Centers are there, the type of services that they provide, and furthermore, the same thing for our Equity Assistance Centers as well.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Any other questions from anyone?

MS. WHITEFOOT: You talked about the
role of the Office of Civil Rights. It would be helpful to know what the status the Office of Civil Rights is.

MS. OKAHARA: That was in relation to our Equity Assistance Centers, and it was to resolve an issue or a complaint that was sent to the Office for Civil Rights. I can't speak to the status of the Office within the Department, but we continue to work with them in partnership through our Equity Assistance Centers to provide support to districts and schools.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Right. So I guess my question is, so those offices are still in place, then?

DR. CANTRELL: Oh, sure.

MS. OKAHARA: Yes.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Okay. Just want to make certain.

MS. OKAHARA: Yes.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you for all answering. Thank you very much for your report, and I'm sure we'll be in contact for more
Okay, we'll go on to Tammy Proctor, who is Acting Director of the Office of Early Learning program update. Thank you. Welcome, Tammy.

MS. PROCTOR: Thank you, welcome. As I said, my name is Tammy Proctor, and I'm the Acting Director for the Office of Early Learning. We're going to talk a little about young folks today.

I wanted to come to you guys and share with you some of the work that the Department has done over the past four years, and talk a little bit about some of the work that we're going to continue to do in the years moving forward with our partners at HHS.

The Department started around four years ago with making an investment in early childhood, and the approach was to advance early childhood reforms by developing high-quality professionals, building a birth-to-third-grade
continuum and connections, strengthening family partnerships, and focusing on aligning those early-learning standards in curricula and practices that we found that a lot of the early childhood programs were implementing.

And when we speak of early childhood programs, we're speaking of programs that lend themselves to our partner agency, HHS. We're thinking of the Head Start programs, the child care programs, some of the home visiting programs that we have.

And so at the federal level, we made a conscious effort to build a partnership and a collaboration to address some of the reforms that we thought would help states build a fairly comprehensive, state-wide preschool program for those four-year-olds that were in high needs but were in low economic communities.

So we're in our fourth year of our preschool development grant program, and we've funded 18 states to try to reach out to four-year-olds to build the access and increase the
quality of those programs by actually using some of the strategies of building mixed-delivery systems and working across the programs to build a more solid and comprehensive system, and a system that eventually prepared student for school readiness and for that transition into their kindergarten and, moving forward, on up to the third grade.

What we've done over the past years, we've served in over 250 high-need communities in 18 states, and we also continued to improve the access. This year we served over 34,000 preschoolers across the 18 states. And of those 34,000 children, we had 745 children who were of American Indian and Alaskan Native descent, per reports from the states.

While that is a small percentage -- when you think about the 34,000, it's about two percent -- we have recognized the need to increase our reach. We've encouraged states to continue to reach out to Native American communities to ensure that we are being
inclusive of four-year-olds as we talk about young children as a whole.

Most of our Native American communities have been in Montana, Nevada, and Arizona, with Montana serving the most children as reported. I just have to echo what was said here earlier about the challenges of working with some of the tribal communities, because we've heard that, as we push states to work with the tribal communities, we've had knowledge of some of the challenges that come with doing some of that.

In the preschool development programs, we've pushed in terms of professional development and quality. We talk about BA-degree teachers, and we push, and we talk about equitable salaries for those early childhood teachers and the school-age teachers. So there's been some challenges that we have recognized, not only in the American Indian communities, but in other communities as well.

We'd also just like to share with you
that we have received, under ESSA -- we were excited that ESSA preschool landed in the ESSA regulations, and that under ESSA, we did receive an additional $250 million in FY 18, to build another preschool program. This is going to be slightly different from the current program.

The current program focused a lot on access and quality. While the new program will also have an arm for access and quality, we're kind of stepping back a little bit and pushing for more of the collaboration, doing a needs assessment.

It's going to be a program that will have the initial year award, and that initial year award will focus on doing a state-wide assessment and building a strategic plan and building those collaborations and partnerships, and states really putting forth the plan, telling us how they would like to move forward in building a state-wide comprehensive system that meets a mixed delivery, allowing states to use their funding across several federal pools.
We'll also encourage states to make investments on their own. We've always pushed from preschool from the beginning of the preschool program, that the push was to get states to make their own investments, and so there was a match tied to that work.

But we also push governors to make some of those investments, and so when the program first came out, it came out through the governor's office. So we took that angle in the past administration to get the governors to make some of those commitments.

We have seen lots of commitments across different states for early childhood. But as climates shift, sometimes early childhood remains the priority, and sometimes early childhood is not the priority.

So with the program under ESSA, we're hoping to continue to push the states to really think about how they include young children in their state education plans, and how they blend in terms of their childhood, how they work with
some of the other community-based programs that
are serving young children.

Under ESSA, it allows for early
learning opportunities and work under Title I,
as it has always been. Preschool has been an
option for slots there, so that work continues.
Under Title II, it also allows to expand the
support for professional development activities
for elementary and secondary early childhood
educators, so it's giving the opportunity for
states to bridge some of those gaps from their
community-based providers to the elementary
school providers, and do some of that
collaborative professional development training,
so that you build a more streamlined system of
best practices in how children are transitioning
from one environment to another.

Another under Title III, it also
continues the professional development not only
for teachers, but for ELL, including
professional teachers and school leaders. So
under Title III, it allows the pooling of those
school leaders and do some training with them around early childhood, and how we best might serve young children.

And I'm going to pause with that. Are there any questions?

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you. Do we have any questions from anyone out here? Is everyone on phone okay? I'm getting messages that maybe you're not. Are you guys okay? Aaron, are you still there?

MR. PAYMENT: I am still here.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Dahkota, did you get on?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I'm on.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay, thank you. I was just a little worried about you. Who else? Theresa, you're on too. Okay. So any questions from any of the council members?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Yes. Mostly I have to express my ignorance about the early childhood program. Is that a separate title?

MS. PROCTOR: That's the challenge we
have in the field. We go back and forth from calling it early childhood to early learning, but mostly you will find in the HHS base that it's early care, early childhood education programs.

So you're speaking of your Head Starts, your child care, and some of the home visiting programs. Here at the Department we call it early learning, as we are referring directly to the four-year-olds through the third grade. So that term fits a little better and more in line the work that we do here at the Department.

But we have recognized as a field that we do need to streamline and get on the same page. And using the same terminology as we talk about blending resources and mixed-delivery systems and streamlining standards.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: So where do your funds come from?

MS. PROCTOR: For the last four years, our funds have been appropriated by
Congress, and it's come to the Department. Going forward, it will be coming through the Department of Health and Human Services.

The new program under ESSA -- we're currently working jointly with the Department to put together a funding opportunity announcement that will be coming out this early spring. But we do know that we will have to be making our awards by the end of December of this year.

So I would encourage you to touch base with your state leaders and your state education programs, your state health and human services programs and make those connections and those partnerships.

Make sure that your population is included when we talk about high-needs communities, so they're not making plans and identifying communities outside of your community and making sure that you can tap into some of the resources that are going to be put forth.

This is especially true in this
initial year, because that is a year they're
doing the state-wide needs assessment. So it's
good to be at the table in the beginning as
opposed to hearing about it later and the plan
is developed.

MR. PAYMENT: I have a question, this
is Aaron Payment. My question is, so is it
under ACF, then?

MS. PROCTOR: Yes. It is under
Administration for Children of Families under
the Department of Health and Human Services.

MR. PAYMENT: So it's not under Head
Start, but it's under ACF?

MS. PROCTOR: Yes. It's not under
Head Start, and it's not under the CCDF, the
Child Care Development Fund. It is standing
alone under the Administration for Children and
Families, and it is called the Birth to Five
Program, and it's for pre-school daughters.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay. For the benefit
of NACIE, I serve on a SAC, so I can monitor
from that side and then bring reports back as
necessary.

MS. PROCTOR: Absolutely. That is a good place to be on, because we are still pushing the work of the SACs; we know that those funds have gone away, but we're still pushing SACs being involved.

The state advisory council, that was funded through HHS years ago, and the goal of the SACs was to have an oversight committee that would look at all of the early childhood programs across HHS and build some coordination and collaboration.

MR. PAYMENT: Oh, I have to clarify, I'm sorry; HHS STAC, Secretary Travel Advisory Council, which is the tribal oversight over different programs, including Head Start, and then ACF.

MS. BROWN: Sorry, this is Doreen. So for clarification, are you still working together, Aaron, with this particular funding source?

MR. PAYMENT: See, I don't know that,
because I took a year and a half off to finish my dissertation, and then I put back in to get on STAC. My first meeting back will be in May, so I can ask that question.

MS. BROWN: One of the concerns that I have is, when we're talking about sovereign nations as tribal entities and having to work with state after state, this states' assistance or funding purposes -- that's a concern that I have. So it's just working with our sovereign nation and making sure that they are able to access this early childhood funding sources, not necessarily always through the state or through that particular education track.

I think, when you're dealing with communities, they often know what's best for our students and our young people, and I just feel like the way it's channeled right now, that's not necessarily a consideration. And since it's a new funding source, that might be something that someone would consider that we talk about sovereign nations or tribes being able to apply
our tribal organizations being able to apply in lieu of the state or district.

        MS. PROCTOR: Well currently, you'd need Congressional funding just allowed for states and the territories to directly apply. And as we move forward, we could most definitely have a conversation as we build the funding opportunity announcement, putting in some requirements that states work with their sovereign nations and their tribal communities to make sure they are included.

        MR. PAYMENT: So this is Aaron again. I will pledge to our NACIE group that I will do what we've done in the past with similar situations. I 100 percent agree that tribes should not be subordinated to states, because that's a breach of our sovereignty. Principally, our position at tribal leaders advising the Secretary of HHS is that, wherever possible, there should be direct funding to tribes.

        And where we can achieve that, there
needs to be consultation with tribes, so we're not ignored. So that will be our position going forward, and we will advise that.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Aaron, this is Doreen. That two percent of over 200 communities of 34,000 getting served, and only two percent are Native -- we really need to get on the ball, especially with this new funding source. So thank you, Aaron.

MS. PROCTOR: Yes, we appreciate your comments.

MS. BROADDUS: I would just dovetail with that. There should be someone providing some oversight or paying attention to the reality that's happening in the states, because when the work does get tough, like we've experienced in Montana -- I work with our team. It's often easier for them, on the next round, to say, Oh, well, we're not going to work with that particular location or site. We'll just go on down to the next one, and it might end up being a non-Native-serving preschool entity.
Because doing the work of understanding why our typical approaches aren't always successful is, it's work. And we should be doing that with whoever is the original grantee, the FDA or whoever it might be.

Examining our practices, examining the way we give out these funds and our expectations, because it's coming from a land that's culturally different from the community that it's serving.

And so I think sometimes they'll just get skipped over, and that might be why you don't have higher population numbers in the mix.

CHAIR DENNISON: You just described the issue for lots of other programs too, the land --

MS. BROADDUS: Right.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you. Patsy?

MS. WHITEFOOT: Yes, I just want to say hi.

MS. PROCTOR: Hi, Patsy.

MS. WHITEFOOT: My name is Patricia
Whitefoot from the Yakama Nation, and yes, I started my career in early childhood Head Start, but also have worked not only as a Head Start manager, but also as an early Head Start for public school on the Yakama Reservation.

So I just want to say an investment in early childhood is vital to the lifelong growth of that child, and the success of that child making it even through school.

I think it's important, so I'm curious about -- I think you said there was $215 million appropriated by Congress, I believe? And I think that this isn't a high-level initiative that certainly I think NACIE needs to be engaged in, but also tribal participation dialogue on the use of those funds.

If you've been here listening to our discussion, definitely Indian Country depicts the high needs and low economic issues that impact the lives of children, families, and their lifelong aspirations that they have. And the whole comprehensive nature of Head Start or
early childhood is so critical and vital to that child, and the entire family.

Just myself, I've benefitted to begin my life in education by being a volunteer as a parent. By volunteering as a parent, I became more educated about the needs of my own children, and that helped me through the professional development program, then to go on to become a teacher.

So I think we really need to have a serious dialogue about early childhood education. While you might say that you serve 34,000 children, while you suggest that it's a small percentage, it's not so much the small percentage. If you were to really take a look at the land base of where our children come from and what they represent in terms of the lands of where we come from, and our responsibilities that we have as it relates to the lands.

While I might be currently living on the Yakama Indian Reservation of 1.4 million acres, that doesn't mean that we're not paying
attention to what was spelled out and what our elders have talked about, or the inherent rights of the Yakama Nation.

And that we also have ceded lands, which is about 11 million acres, about a third of the state of Washington. So we're very involved in protecting those resources that we have, just like other tribes across the United States.

So please don't just count on the small percentages. We really have to take into account the work that we do to ensure that we continue into the future, along with the lands that were ceded by the U.S. Government.

I just want to highlight in early childhood education, when I went into my teaching career, I happened to be in a classroom that had home-bases services, but also a follow-through program.

I would hope that as you begin to take a look at these programs, you will consider the follow-through program, because that's where
-- you know, it starts with early childhood education, and you follow those children up to Grade 3. And I happened to be in one of those classrooms, a third grade where children were being followed.

And today what happens, because I'm in a public-school system, that transition and that fluidity of that child coming from early childhood into the kindergarten system isn't necessarily followed through today. So I would hope that we would take a look at that type of model as well.

Then in addition to that, I just want to put a plug in for some of the socio-emotional learning needs that we have. I'm currently doing a teacher in-service training for all of our teachers in our school district on the impact of historical trauma.

This is something that is impacting our children today, substance abuse, mental health issues as well. Just want to put a plug in for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health
Services Administration. I happen to be on an advisory committee; I was appointed by Secretary Sebelius to the SAMHSA prevention advisory committee, and there are a number of us tribal people that are working on that committee.

So similar to the work that Aaron's doing, I also have been on tribal council as well, so I'm familiar with all of those committees. So there are these other committees that are important to reach out to.

I just want to say thank you for the work you're doing, but make certain that we get tribal voices in there as well, into planning these new resources that will be coming in.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you. We'll go to Joely.

MS. PROUDFIT: Hi, I'm Joely Proudfit from California. We spent a couple of years working on this particular book. There are nine others coming out, and I'm the series editor. They cover the entire country, in terms of Indian education.
One of the reasons it took so long to finish this book is, we couldn't get anyone from the State of California to respond to what the early childhood efforts and initiatives were towards Native children. So we have three articles that we threw in together to hit that area, because we need all of the different regions to address early childhood education.

So I'd like to find out how we can encourage our various states to clearly articulate what they are doing in terms of early childhood education when it comes to Native children. Because we're in a place like California, with the political and economic tribal power, and we still couldn't get anyone to respond to what is happening -- that's really disconcerting.

So I think that information should be made publicly available and more easily accessible.

MS. PROCTOR: Thank you all, appreciate your comments. You've given me some
great comments to take back as we continue to build our funding opportunity announcement, how we might consider how we might more intentionally call out the sovereign communities and tribal communities to make sure that you are, in fact, included. Thank you.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Tammy.

MS. PROUDFIT: She asked me to say the title of the book.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay.

MS. PROUDFIT: I'm not trying to plug it or anything. It's On Indian Ground: A Return to Indigenous Knowledge - Generating Hope, Leadership, and Sovereignty Through Education. This is the California edition, edited by myself, Joely Proudfit, and Nicole Quinderro Myers-Lim.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you for that, Joely. Let's go ahead and go on to Sylvia Lyles, Director of Office of Academic Improvement.

MS. LYLES: So hi, everybody. I have
to say to you that it is truly a pleasure to be here before you today. I have the distinct pleasure. I have probably a portfolio of $3.5 billion, but my two little programs, I call my two little programs because they are funded at about $33 million, the Alaska Native Education Program and the Native Hawaiian Education Program.

That's probably where I get most of my gratification, because we manage programs at a department level, but we don't get to work and see what's actually happening out in the field, and this is where I get to see that work that's happening.

Every year, I go to either Alaska or to Hawaii, and I don't take these wonderful, beautiful trips because you have wonderful country, wonderful places to see. I'm not doing it for that reason. It's because that's how I learn. I am not able to make recommendations or to develop a program if I don't have some sense or some understanding.
For some of you here in the room, I know, and I appreciate what you have taught my team and myself over the years. We still have a lot of work to do, but this has been a very rewarding part of my career. I just want to state that up front.

So I'm going to talk today -- I have in my portfolio the literacy program; some of you are familiar with the Striving Readers Program, the Innovative Approaches to Literacy, and the almost two-billion-dollar after school program. Some of you here in the room actually are at state grant and LEA level, where you actually may have some of those after school programs.

But I'm going to talk about Alaska Native Education Program and the Native Hawaiian Education Program. First, I'm going to talk about them together, because they're very similar. Then I'm going to break them apart and talk a little bit about the uniqueness of each.

Someone mentioned earlier today about
the indigenous ways of knowing; I get to do that with this program. The Native American, the Native Alaskan, and the Native Hawaiian programs are focused on those communities. So the programs are designed to create opportunities for those students to continue to learn about their language and their culture.

It's based on an academic, but these programs have an opportunity to develop creative and innovative strategies for how to teach in the academic area, but also through a cultural and language lens.

I have to tell you, the most important thing, the ah-ha moment for me, and I apologize to you up front, but the ah-ha moment for me was when I went to Alaska and didn't realize that the young Alaskan kids did not understand their heritage. I'm like, What happened?

That's when a light went on for me, that this is what this program is all about. So we get an opportunity for the people who are
doing the work, the Alaskan Natives and the Native Hawaiians to actually design these programs.

So we have programs such as family and community engagement activities, where the — I wanted to think about the elders -- there's a name for the elders in the Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiians -- but the elders, where they really take a significant role in the community and helping them design some of these programs around the cultures.

Some of them actually teach some of the courses, some of the work. The early learning; we were talking about early learning and childhood programs. We have many of those programs in each, the Native Alaskan and the Native Hawaiian programs. We have professional development for our educators, as well as other different types of activities.

So I'm going to start now talking a little bit about each program. For the Alaskan Native Education Program, that program was
funded at about $35.4 million. We have currently approximately 56 active grants that are being administered. For the Alaskan Native Education Program, we have worked over the past 10 years, really trying to make some improvements in that program, to really focus on that community.

For example, with our reviewers, it took us a little while to figure it out, to really understand where some of the conflicts of interest may reside. For example, with our reviewers, we make sure that our reviewers, at least the majority of our reviewers, are Alaskan Native. And I'm here to tell you that about 60 percent are.

And the reason why they're not all -- because that's our goal, all the reviewers are Alaskan Native -- is because there is conflict of interest or some experience that we're trying to match experiences for each one of the review panels. So sometimes we have to reach out.

So the other improvement that we have
made in making sure that the Alaskan Native community is involved is, if they're not all Alaskan Native reviewers, we bring in a culture expert. And that's where sometimes these elders come from.

And they come in, and they provide usually a half-day session with the reviewers, talking about the population, so that our reviewers who are not Alaskan Native will have some kind of focus. We know that's not enough time, but it gives them a little bit more information.

We spent a significant amount of time over the past three years providing technical assistance to the Alaskan Native Organizations, because what we found in developing our applications, what we found was that when they submitted their applications, Alaskan Native Organizations, they didn't do well. They didn't score high, because they did not have some of their experiences.

So we spent a lot of time providing
technical assistance on how to apply for the application, but also building coalitions, building partnerships, and bringing the right folks together to be able to write those applications.

And the ESSA: For the Alaskan Native Education Program, the ESSA changed eligibility so that Alaskan Native Organizations and Alaskan Native tribes are the eligible entity.

SCAs and LEAs may apply for the grant, but they have to do it one of two ways: in collaboration and in partnership with an ANO, or they have to be sanctioned or they receive some kind of approval from Alaskan Native tribes. So that ensures that the funds are going where they need to go, and with the right groups of students that the program is targeted for.

I'm glad that we have moved into the direction of providing technical assistance because we're ready. We have Alaskan Native Organizations that scored really high on the
last competition, which takes me to what we plan
to do with the Alaskan Native Program for 2018.

In 2017, it was the first time in
ESSA that we provided awards under their
program, which means we did not have time to
rule make, so we had a waiver to rulemaking for
2017. But because we defined or expanded upon
clarified parts of ESSA, we are required to rule
make before we can have other competition.

So we're doing that now. We have
started the internal process. I am working with
the Office of Indian Education to do an Alaskan
Native consultation at the National Conference -
- I can't remember the name of it, but it's in
Kansas City in June.

MR. PAYMENT: That's the National
Congress of American Indians, the NCAI.

MS. LYLES: Okay, good. We're trying
to work that out, so we can do that consultation
there in June. So the definitions that we
created as part of 2017, we'll go back out and
consult and get feedback and so forth on that.
We have to use the funds, and this will be consultation for next year.

For 2018, we are going to fund down the slate, because we are starting our rulemaking process that takes between 12 and 18 months. So we're funding down the slate this year, and there are a significant number of high-scoring Alaskan Native Organizations on that list that we're really excited about. We just don't have enough money to fund everybody who scored high, and so this gives us an opportunity to go down that slate to be able to do that. So we're really excited about that.

That's the Alaskan Native Program; for the Native Hawaiian Program, we are also funding down the slate for the Native Hawaiian Program. We anticipate that we might be able to fund approximately 8 new awards, and I will tell you that we are still in the scores of 100 and higher, even funding down the slate.

So we're going to give some people the opportunity not to have to apply again who,
if we would have had enough funding the last time, we would have funded them. So that's what's happening.

The difference with the Native Hawaiian Education Program is the Native Hawaiian Education Council. As part of the law for the Native Hawaiian Program, there's a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Council. They usually get $500,000; under 2018 appropriations, they've been plussed up to $650,000. The money never expires, it continues until they use it. So they have a real nice operational funds.

The council is designed -- it's very unique, but it's very important to the operation of the program. The council is made up of Native Hawaiians from across the islands. They come together -- the have a specific mission as established under ESSA. But one of those missions is to provide leadership, to provide counsel to the Department. So we work with them very closely in developing the grant and
developing our priorities and so forth.

But what they bring to us is, when we have talked here today in a room about making sure that the American Indian, as well as the Native Hawaiian, Alaskan Native communities, are involved, they are there. They are part of this grant.

They provide magnificent reports; those reports are on our website. But they work directly with the Native communities, directly with our grantees in helping to provide technical assistance and advising us on what those needs are, where those grants need to be, who the people are, are really involved in the work. That council has really been invaluable to our work and the design of our program.

So those are the highlights of the two programs. I do want to give a shout out for the Innovative Approaches to Literacy Program. It is a 27-million-dollar program where national organizations and LEAs on behalf of schools apply for the grant to develop library-type
activities, including technology. And technology is a big part of this, where kids are reading through the technology, they're learning through technology.

And that grant, we are hoping, keeping our fingers crossed, it will be announced next week. Yes, and I want to give a shout out in the Federal Register, Doreen has another grant you can get, because I know you're getting grants.

(Laughter.)

MS. LYLES: So I wanted to mention that, because I think that's another source. So that's my overview of the two programs. Are there any questions?

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Do we have any questions?

MS. LYLES: Okay, good.

CHAIR DENNISON: I guess we don't.

MS. BROWN: I just want to say thank you, Dr. Lyles. Their leadership has been amazing and that's one of the things with the
Alaskan Native grants; one of the changes that was very significant is their strong partnerships with our tribal organizations and our tribes.

I think that was one of the -- although I'm an LEA, it's been wonderful to be able to collaborate with our sovereign nations, and I think it's been much stronger, and I think that's how, because of that leadership and because of that innovation, it's made stronger programs in Alaska.

So I look to that, and I think of that, and it resonates with me when we're talking about all these other programs that we've been discussing or hearing about this morning, that that is foundational. We have to honor and respect that, so I appreciate all of the work that you guys are doing. Thank you.

MS. LYLES: Thank you.

MS. JOHN: Yes, this is Theresa. I'd like to thank you for involving the elders and the local tribes as well. I've been involved in
summer sessions where the elders and the students and the teachers are working together.

It's very important for the community members to have a visual of people that are willing to reach out and help them succeed in terms of improving their assessments, their reviews, especially the overwhelming framework of implementing culturally-responsive curricula development that is inclusive of their holistic perspective of their language and their culture. I really appreciate that service as well. Thank you.

MS. LYLES: Thank you.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you. And then there is one, and someone that I know pretty well; Marilyn Hall, Director of Impact Aid Programs. Thank you for being here. We'll turn it over to you.

MS. HALL: Okay. Good afternoon. Last but not least, and I'll try to keep it fast. I think everybody's probably getting pretty tired at this point.
I'm just going to give you an update on where we are with Impact Aid. The funding -- we're healthy. We were very pleased that the Congress provided, through the omnibus appropriations, an 81-million-dollar increase for the basic support payment program, and that's about a 6.8 percent increase over 2017.

And as I'm sure you know, Impact Aid serves about 600 local public-school districts that educate children who live on Indian land. So it is a major source of funding for the school districts that serve Indian children who live in rural areas and on the reservations.

Since I've become director, I've really focused on trying to make our operations work smoothly, and the application process work smoothly, and I'm trying to keep us on a schedule where we release the funds in an orderly and predictable way for the school districts. So I think that is going well so far.

I wanted to particularly give you an
update on where we are with the implementation of the revised regulations governing the tribal and parent communication for Indian parents and tribes. I think Kristin Walls was here last year and talked about this with you. No meeting is complete without extra paper to take home, right?

We revised our regulations for the Impact Aid Program. We started working on it about three years ago, and one of the particular areas we wanted to improve was the implementing regulations for the Indian community consultation. The shorthand is the Indian Policies and Procedures that every school district that educates children who live on Indian lands has to present to us, and we actually really strive to help them improve their processes for communicating with the Indian community.

Before we started working on those regulations, we engaged in tribal consultation. And through those consultations, we heard that
one of the frustrations in the Indian community was that often they perceived that their input and comments were falling on deaf ears; that they would make suggestions and not hear anything back.

So that was something that we particularly tried to address in the new regulations. So one of the new features is that the school districts will be required to respond in writing to the input that they receive from the tribes and the tribal parents. We have not yet gotten to the point of monitoring this, but we plan to look at that when we monitor.

We found that when the regulations went into effect a year ago in January, which was actually the application deadline for our 2018 application, most of our applicants were not informed about the change in the regulations. So what they submitted to us with their 2018 applications was not compliant with the new regulations. But we understood; this was a mismatch of communication and application...
submission.

So last year we started an intensive technical assistance effort to educate the school districts on what the requirements of the revised regulations were, and to help them create policies and procedures that comply with the regulations.

So what I've passed around is a packet with a copy of the new regulations. It has an example from Lower Kuskokwim, Alaska, of a set of Indian policies and procedures that we think are pretty good and match what the regulations require. Then the last document is simply a sample format that we use when we are working with school districts.

We put together a toolkit and sent it out to them, along with a sample, and we did about 20 webinars with school districts last fall. We're still working; we found that when they submitted for 2019 this past January, a good majority of them looked like they're compliant with the new regulations. We have
fewer than a hundred that are still out of the loop and need to catch up, and we are working with them intensively this spring to help them revise their Indian policies and procedures and get them in place for the coming year.

The next stage for us: We are developing our own rubric for how we are going to monitor. When we do reviews as part of the Impact Aid review process, we will be looking at how the school districts actually implement their written policies and procedures. We're also trying to educate our own analysts on how to do that, and we'll be starting to go out and take a look at those.

Again, the emphasis is on improving the quality of communication between the Indian community and the tribes and the school districts, and hopefully we'll get there.

I don't have a lot more to say on that, but I'm certainly open to questions. There's more I can talk about regarding Impact Aid, but probably not of interest to you.
MR. PAYMENT: This is Aaron. I do have a question. In developing their plans and submitting their plans, do they have to include any kind of retention data?

MS. HALL: Retention data -- the procedures require that they track the rates or participation of children who live on Indian land in comparison to the rest of the population. I don't think that there's a requirement about retention of the data.

MR. PAYMENT: So you mean just to count the number of Native students? So effectually, it's the appropriations, but no school improvement plan or any --

MS. HALL: Oh, maybe I'm not understanding your question. Is your question about the Impact Aid application, or about the Indian policies and procedures?

MR. PAYMENT: Well, it might be under the policies and procedures. Let me explain: Our first experience in our district back home was the requirement to hold a -- as I
interpreted it -- to hold an annual meeting of
the school board on the reservation.

Then year after year, we would go, and we would say, Well, you've got all these issues affecting our kids -- and it did fall on deaf ears. It seemed like it was forever we would give input and there was no change.

Then we got real specific, and a group of us formulated a team, and we asked for the retention data: How many Native students are they graduating? What percentage of the student population were graduating? What were the trends?

And that's where things got real dicey for a while. But as a result, we formulated a Native task force and as a result, the school improved, the district improved, and they didn't see us as an irritant anymore. They actually worked with us.

But is there anything in the reporting that they have to do any metrics? Or is it just simply count up the Indians and get
the appropriations per pupil?

MS. HALL: No, there's no specific requirements, as far as metrics that are in the regulations. Certainly we could encourage a school district, and the Indian community can always encourage the school district through the consultation process to collect and report that kind of data over time.

MR. PAYMENT: Okay, thank you.

MS. PROUDFIT: Well, I'd like to say thank you for bringing us a handout and a best practice sample. I think that's really helpful, and I would like to ask for all of the various individuals that come and present to NACIE that they bring us an outline or a handout of what they're talking about so that we can have something to review and make notes. That really helps us.

I know some of them are going to provide them so that we can add them in our books, but I think just going along with folks to hear what they're saying, I think is very
helpful.

To No. 5 where now it requires that there's a response at least annually in writing to comments and recommendations made by tribes or parents of Indian children; when that says annually -- could a school or school district say, Well, we'll get to that annually, when we submit our annual report? Or as a parent -- I think there needs to be a more timely response to a question or an issue. So help me understand that.

MS. HALL: I think the structure of this reflects the fact that the school district is required to annually review and approve as the board has to approve its Indian policies and procedures. And as part of that, they must be communicated with the tribe and the parents. Any comments that are presented in that context has to be addressed in writing.

That is something that we would be looking at when we monitor, to make sure that the school district has done that.
MS. PROUDFIT: Okay, good. Thank you.

CHAIR DENNISON: Are there any more questions? Okay, well, thank you, Marilyn, and we appreciate your coming here and giving us a handout. Thank you for your report.

Okay. I think we'll have a break now. We do have a few minutes; let's have a 15-minute break and then we'll start at 4:00 for the -- are there final comments and questions? If we don't have any comments from anyone, we can do this as a -- we can start the list that we were talking about doing. Okay? It's actually a 20-minute break, and it will be four o'clock then. Thank you all.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:39 p.m. and resumed at 4:02 p.m.)

CHAIR DENNISON: I did get one request so far for public comment so we'll go ahead and start with, I can't remember the name.

Dan Lewerenz will introduce himself
and then we'll hear him out. Thank you.

MR. LEWERENZ: And can you hear me on the phone?

MS. JOHN: I can hear you.

MR. LEWERENZ: Okay, thank you.

My name is Dan Lewerenz, I am a Member of the Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska and the Staff Attorney at the Native American Rights Fund, where I work with the Tribal Education Directors National Association, or TEDNA.

I was asked to make this statement on behalf of TEDNA. I apologize, I do not have this in writing yet.

I was at their meeting in Michigan also and between our travel and my not having access to their letterhead, I don't have that today. I will have it for you tomorrow.

But their statement reads as follows:

Ms. Tara Ramsey, Acting Director of the Office of Indian Education and Members of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education, we thank
you for this opportunity to speak today on behalf of TEDNA.

TEDNA is a national membership organization for Tribal Education Departments and Agencies in American Indian and Alaska Native tribes. The Federal Register notice announcing this meeting identified four priorities and I will first address my comments to those priorities.

The first priority was to discuss the OIE Director position and I should interrupt myself for a second to say I was very encouraged to hear that a number of the things that you will hear in this statement have already been addressed by this group in one way, shape or form.

TEDNA is encouraged by the fact that this was listed as the first Agenda Item. The Office of Indian Education has operated for too long without a full-fledged Director.

In more than 100 treaties, the United States took on a sacred obligation to our tribal
nations by making a commitment to educate our children.

Within the Department of Education, the OIE Director helps fulfill that obligation by serving as the point of contact for tribal consultation and by facilitating communication among tribal, federal, state, and local education directors.

It is important to TEDNA Members that the OIE Director position is filled as soon as is reasonably possible.

On a related note, TEDNA also strongly encourages the DOE and the OIE to renew their commitment to and the practice of Indian preference in hiring and promotion within the Office of Indian Education.

For more than 80 years, Congress has committed the Federal Government to practicing Indian preference for those positions like those within OIE that are directly related to tribal self-governance.

The second priority was to hear the
Department of Education program updates. One of the most important programs that the OIE undertakes is the Administration of the Indian Formula Grant Program and the Indian Administration Grant program and the Indian Professional Development Grant Programs.

These programs provide valuable resources that enable Tribal Education Directors to fulfill their sacred obligations to educate Indian children.

Tribal Education Directors, however, and Tribal Education Agencies are as varied as the tribal nations themselves and many are faced with severe constraints on both their financial and their human resources.

This is why TEDNA strongly encourages OIE to provide more technical assistance both for grant applicants and for grant recipients.

A commitment to robust technical assistance will help ensure that the Department of Education and OIE and the tribal nations they
serve get the most out of their critical resources.

The third Agenda Item was to hear an update on ESEA implementation. We're eager to hear how ESEA implementation has progressed; in particular, TEDNA is eager to hear how DOE and OIE are ensuring compliance with the Tribal Consultation Provisions contained within multiple sections of the ESEA.

Congress required such consultation because it knew that both local education agencies and state education agencies would benefit from tribes' expertise in educating American Indian and Alaska Native children.

However, in the short time since those consultation requirements were enacted, TEDNA Members have reported that local and state education agency compliance has been inconsistent at best.

TEDNA already has requested that the Government Accountability Office conduct a study of local and state compliance with ESEA's
consultation requirements.

In the meantime, we encourage DOI and OIE to emphasize to state and local agencies their obligations to consult the tribes.

And the fourth Agenda Item was to conduct discussions and begin work on the annual report to Congress.

TEDNA recommends that NACIE take this opportunity to remind Congress that American Indian and Alaska Native education is a shared trilateral responsibility among tribal, Federal, and State Governments.

The education of tribal citizens is central to the continuity of tribal nations as is the education of others about our tribes.

In addition to the four Agenda Items you have identified, TEDNA encourages NACIE to commit itself to two further priorities.

First, NACIE can and should work to ensure the individual states' definitions of Indian are compatible with the definitions of Indian in the operable Federal education
statutes and regulations.

Too often, we find that students who qualify as Indian for purposes of Federal law are not included within individual states’ definition of Indian.

The result is confusion on the ground and ultimately, the exclusion of Indian students from some state programs.

The states in ratifying the U.S. Constitution committed themselves to the privacy of the Federal Government in the field of Indian Affairs.

Accordingly, states should defer to Federal Government’s determination of who qualifies as an Indian.

Second, NACIE can and should facilitate Government-to-Government relationships among tribal, Federal, state, and local Governments for the collection and analysis of education data.

The shared responsibility of American Indian and Alaska Native education necessitates
the sharing of data. In order for tribes to be part of an informed decision-making process, we need access to the same data that other institutions are using in their deliberations.

Tribes may also require technical assistance in making use of that data as some may be unaccustomed to how it is presented and the implications of its use.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak today. TEDNA and its Members look forward to our continued partnerships with NACIE, the Department of Education, and the Office of Indian Education.

MR. DENNISON: Thank you. And we will all get a copy of that tomorrow?

MR. LEWERENZ: Yes, ma'am.

MR. DENNISON: Thank you. Is there anybody else that wants to --

MR. PAYMENT: Deborah, this is Aaron, I'm online --and if somebody else wants to go first, that's fine.

MR. DENNISON: Who is this?
MR. PAYMENT: Sorry, this is Aaron.

MR. DENNISON: And you want to do what?

MR. PAYMENT: I'm going to be posting my notes for everybody to see but if somebody else wants to go first then I'll wait.

MR. DENNISON: Okay, I guess we're moving onto that then. I'll just give one more opportunity for public comments for anyone that had any public comments.

So, we'll move on to the next section. We wanted to work this hour to develop, home in on -- I guess that's what you're working on, Aaron on yours? And I think we want to go first on theirs?

Remember how Aaron said that we wanted to use this hour I guess to strategize on a list of things? Go ahead, Janelle, did you want to say something? Okay, Janelle wants to make a public comment.

MS. LEONARD: Good afternoon, everyone, Jenelle Leonard, retired from the
Department of Ed, former DFO. I didn't come prepared to really make a comment but I can't miss this opportunity to share some information with the NACIE Board.

So, one of the things that I have been volunteering on is the National Collaborative for Digital Equity.

And it's a nonprofit organization where we are working on the behalf of local school districts, State Departments, community-based organizations, and communities to try to find, well, first to try to level the playing field as it relates to digital equity.

And I don't want to go into all the details about digital equity but I will point you to their site, the National Collaborative for Digital Equity.

The one important piece that I wanted to share with you is that we've been working with the banks across this country, the Federal Reserves, and the three Federal Agencies related to banking, and we've been working on the
Community Reinvestment Act. It's called CRA.

And annually, the banks put in or set aside $100 billion dollars for community reinvestment.

The Director for our Collaborative has been working with the bank and recently, we have gotten the banks to agree to set aside 1 percent of that $100 billion dollars to go towards leveling the playing field and going towards digital equity, which amounts to about $100 million.

And so we've held two national summits, one in San Antonio in June and we just held one here in D.C. March the 5th and 6th. And in fact, I invited Debbie to attend, Ahnina Wwake, I also invited Ahnina Wwake Rose to attend.

I think she attended the first day and Sea delta as well.

Because the one thing is that when we're holding these national conversations, I want to be very inclusive and I have to make
sure that when you're talking to digital equity, you're also including Native American, right?

And so we're working with bankers to come up with policies and guidelines for what people need to do in order to apply for these funds.

We're working with schools and communities to come up with guidelines for high school boards who go about applying for this. But I just want to say that it's not restrictive so my purpose is to tell you that it does exist and the banks that the school districts do business with, they have community reinvestment funds and you should begin to talk to them about those funds, especially for digital equity.

But these are your business partners and so that money is there but we're at the very early stages of working through this and bringing people together and working groups together to figure out how to approach the banks on this. But there is a funding cycle and banks
are becoming more and more aware.

   But what I'd like you to do is -- I didn't bring the White Paper that we have but tomorrow I'll bring a copy of the White Paper for the records -- so that you can learn more about what the Community Reinvestment Act is and what funds possibly could be available to level the playing field.

   And it certainly speaks to something that James talked about earlier when they say that the study is going to go digital. And so we need to make sure that we are helping and moving in that direction in terms of providing access and opportunities.

   And it's not only for school districts, and in fact, my interest is more community-based. I'm looking at workforce fields, I'm looking at community fields, I'm looking at after-school programs, student programs.

   How do we get the technology to communicate to help — supplement and support what
the schools are doing? And this is a way to do that.

And certainly, with the parents we talk about homework and a lot of homework is online so how do we get those technologies into the hands of community-based organizations and people and come up with programs that support them.

So, anyway, I just thought I couldn't miss the opportunity to share that information with you and I just invite you to look up the Community Reinvestment Act and I'll have the White Paper that I'll put on the record tomorrow.

MR. DENNISON: Thank you, Jenelle, I appreciate that. Is there anybody else? Are there any more? Okay, Aaron are you ready?

MR. PAYMENT: Yes, I am. I'm sorry, it just takes a while to get back and forth. So here's what I have so far, and I haven't sent it to you yet, but -- so I've got three points and then one of them has some questions.
So in filling the director position how will this be done and what will our role be? And we realize we're advisory, but it's critically important that our input is appropriately called upon and substantively respected once we give it. And so that frames it so that we're not insisting anything. We're asking how are we going to be involved and how does our role play into any kind of a decision?

Number two, so state plans, with respect to those, can the U.S. Department of Education provide a link to a compilation of state plans and a score card of those states that have submitted and those that have not and are in the process or not working on it.

And then again, I'll email these so you'll have a copy.

And then NACIE finds its origins in dating back to the 1969 Kennedy Report and formalized in the Indian Education Acts and then subsequently. So the enacting just -- legislation identifies both secretaries and our
advisory role to them under the Department of Education where we find 92 percent of our pupils are there and the other 8 percent are under the DIE, which is under the Interior Department.

And so as you recall, we were successful in getting a joint meeting with both, and so I don't expect that we're going to have that regularly, but it seems like we should have access and we're -- through either or both to those individuals.

And so then will we have -- the question will be will we have access and are we providing advisement, questions or reporting out progress of our work?

And then finally with respect to the draft that goes to Congress, I think it would be helpful for us to have the ear of either or both secretaries as that draft report is being done. And then finally when it is submitted to Congress, if -- is it just provided a copy to or does the department request to testify on that?

I know that senators have -- and
Indian Affairs have asked for what are we doing in the past. That's what stimulated Chief Anderson. It's not at all lobbying. And I know we were faced with that, I think inappropriately, in the past because we do -- every -- all the work that we do is to report back to Congress. That's why we do a report to Congress.

And so that would be my input at this point. It sounds like we're going to have access to the assistant secretary tomorrow.

So and I guess finally what I would say is it's not unusual for us to have access to secretaries. That's typically how that works with other advisory committees. That's it for now.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HUNTER: That would be the assistant secretary.

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, it's the assistant secretary, not the actual secretary.

So I think we'll have Jason --
MS. HUNTER: Botel, yes.

CHAIR DENNISON: -- Botel will be here tomorrow, but he's the assistant secretary, but -- yes, and I think in the future we could ask for the secretary of both -- like the charter says, both secretaries, like we ended with in 2016. So that would be something that we would request.

MR. PAYMENT: Deborah?

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes?

MR. PAYMENT: At STAC we do have access to the secretary four times a year during our HHS Secretary Tribal Advisories. Somehow I don't think that that's going to be the structure under NACIE for access to even the Secretary of Education, but it seems like once we know what our annual meeting schedule is that at least meeting a year should include either or both secretaries. And then the work that we do for the rest of the year doesn't necessarily have to do that, but it seems we could coordinate our draft report to Congress to be
presented to either secretary.

CHAIR DENNISON: I agree with you 100 percent. So we can work toward having that. It should be that way. It really should.

Okay.

MS. PROUDFIT: Could we get the bios for the assistant secretaries that are coming tomorrow so we have an idea of who they are and their backgrounds?

MS. RAMSEY: Sure.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Anyone else want to add to anything that's -- the list that he's already come up with?

MS. BUTTERFIELD: I think just a comment about today. I really appreciate all the reports. Even though we may be familiar with some of these programs, the players change and the priorities change and it's good to get the updates on funding, etcetera. But it almost feels disrespectful not to get something in writing. It makes me feel like somebody just sort of dashed off a quick report. And I can't
take in all of the numbers and the programs and things. There were just a lot of things that were listed that I definitely pay attention to, and of course I'm always looking for -- so what is Oregon doing, you know?

And so could we make a formal request that in the future reports be given with the written documentation for our benefit? And if they could even provide it ahead of time then we would know what we could ask questions about. So it just takes time to digest a lot of information that comes to us.

CHAIR DENNISON: And that goes to Tina.

MS. HUNTER: So going forward we will make sure that we provide in advance, but please understand in no way was it intended to be disrespect. I apologize for that.

MS. RAMSEY: And I will absolutely echo that. As I mentioned this morning, I'm learning there's a lot of work in the office and now with no group leaders in the Office in
Indian Education right now -- I appreciate that it is good practice to have things too early so that you can reflect on them and be thoughtful. And we hear you and we'll try to do better.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: And maybe just another little caveat to that is wherever they can pull Native-specific data that would be helpful, like in Title I or Title III.

CHAIR DENNISON: Just to add to that earlier on around the beginning, I know 2010, we would have the book ahead of time. As we'd check into the hotel the book was set with all the presentations and everything. And that would be really great to have again. And then everybody -- everything's set. We have the mics set up and everything already set to go. And just a little bit of -- gives the NACIE Council a little bit more preparedness on any questions that we might be able to ask and really be able to do our jobs better in that sense.

MS. RAMSEY: We can do that.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Thank you.
MS. PROUDFIT: And I think going forward, too, is can we plan out our next meeting now so that we're not trying to juggle and -- try to figure out a meeting schedule. I think we would have had better attendance had this been more strategically planned out and focused. So if we could select some dates for the next time we meet so that we could prepare for that and put that on our calendars and have a larger consortium available.

CHAIR DENNISON: I think we can try our best. I think not to make excuses or anything, but I think it was a real -- it was -- there were so many new people and new -- it was really hard. And we didn't even know if we were going to continue. So it was kind of a -- I don't want to say last minute, but I do know what we're -- what it feels like on some parts where it's almost like we're just an afterthought. So just letting you know that's kind of what happened.

MS. PROUDFIT: Right, so I think if
we go ahead and select our next meeting time, whether it's 6 months or 12 months from now, it's on the books. Should we be disbanded, at least it's on the books and we've saved that week for coming here. Let's just get it on the books.

MS. HUNTER: That's fine.

MS. RAMSEY: And I would just note, not only that but there would also be a phone call at some point regarding the director, so there's maybe a couple of logistic pieces to think through.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I just want to add to that discussion. In the past we also have met in Indian country, NACIE. As a board we've met in Indian country. So I just want to remind us about that, about the possibility of meeting in Indian country, such as we've been to NCAI, NIEA, and I'm sure there are others. So trying to align our meetings with those tribal organizations as well. And if we can, I would like us to also consider the comprehensive
center locations, too. So maybe prioritize where we might meet as well in the future.

But I want to follow up -- first of all, I just want to thank the individuals who were here and who gave their public testimony. That's very helpful. Really appreciate the input and comments that are being made because generally we agree with those and we align with those same statements and sentiments as well.

But going forward I'm just thinking about the NACIE report. And I wish we had a copy in front of us as well. That would have been nice.

(Off microphone comments.)

MS. WHITEFOOT: Oh, is it? Okay. I haven't even had a chance to go through it. So there is a way -- well, first of all, before I even begin I asked earlier in the day about the budget of NACIE. So what is the budget of NACIE and who negotiates that budget on behalf of NACIE, because I don't believe as a board that we've ever been involved in that process.
And I recall some of the NACIE work from previous years. Today we're at a point where we're volunteering, we're doing all of the information gathering and organizing ourselves to do this report. However, in the past NACIE was at a point where it was able to go out to Indian country, conduct consultation and all of that and be able to put together a wonderful report similar to the one that NACE has. So I'm wondering, when we talk about national activities, what are those national activities and how much are they funded as well? And so where is the voice of Indian country in these -- in particular these national activities?

Two, I recognize that NACE does have an advisory board, but I also just am wondering about the tribal voice in the administration of NACE. And so just a question I'm asking, one, about budgeting. And then also being able to put together a report and provide -- having some kind of technical support.

The last time we were together a
request was made for data that we're talking about. We're all talking about data. And we weren't able to get that data until the final days that we were meeting. It finally started coming through, all of the data that's out there, about Native students and all of these programs. It came through during our last meeting. And so I recall that because that's something I'd been asking from early on about NACIE and our role and responsibilities.

So as we move forward I just want to remind us this has been a learning experience. And I think we all knew this, but we never know when transition will occur. And so in this case we went through an administration transition, Department of Ed transition. Just like we go through at home we go through transitions not only with the state education agency staff and personnel, but also the local education agency staff and personnel, as well as tribes and tribal councils and governments. So I know I was one of those and went through transition
myself from state agency to tribal council to local education agencies.

And so I think it's important to pay attention to these transitions that do occur because what it does is it impacts the education that we're working on with our children and our families back home.

And so when -- as we start thinking about our report as well, I'm just really starting to outline what the report might be. So one of the things I'm finding is that we also need to provide somewhat of an historical overview like Aaron has laid out, but also we need to include in the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act as well, because this whole history that we've been talking about today is history that people don't necessarily know that transition into the Department of Education as well, but it's something that we've lived and that we know about.

So I think we've called for before an Indian Education 101, basic Indian education for
personnel in the Department of Education, as well as government to government training as well, something that we've been working on with different institutions that we work within the Northwest area with our Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians. So just reiterating what has been shared before.

So that's where I'm at right now. So look forward to our conversation on the actual report. And my name is Patricia Whitefoot.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Patsy.

MS. PROUDFIT: In terms of the position can NACIE be more assertive in making a recommendation or insisting upon -- I don't know how strong I want to be with language, but that our recommendations are included in the final offer, but more importantly if we don't have what we think are qualified applicants or suitable applicants, can we close the search and reopen it so as to not put someone in the position that we don't 100 percent feel that they could do the job? Is there some kind of
language that we can insist upon, because I'd rather have -- close a search and reopen it than just try to put any warm body in there?

CHAIR DENNISON: We have done that in the past. We have reopened when we didn't find -- well, actually let me take that back. We did the search, we went through the applicants, we made our recommendations and then they put somebody else in there. We said no. And then they came back and said, okay, reopen it.

That's how it happened, right, Patsy?

MS. WHITEFOOT: Right.

CHAIR DENNISON: So we did -- they had recommended somebody else besides who we were recommending, but they didn't do an official -- they didn't -- it didn't get that far as to not telling us. It was made right along with us. So this last time I'm not sure why it happened as it did, but no one ever told me. I know that, that they didn't go with the recommendations that we made.
But it could have been that -- and I know this by the way the -- the way it was worded on -- the way I was told to word it on the memo that went to Dr. Chism that we had -- we recommended two, but we were uncertain about the candidates that had applied and we felt -- I know I felt rushed. So we made the recommendation because we knew that there was going to be a freeze.

And so we made the recommendation in the time that we were given to make the recommendation and I never heard back after that that they were going to go with somebody other than who we recommended and then -- until I heard it through the grapevine. So that's how -- there was no communication back to us, but there was that also understanding that we had at the time that we were no longer going to be on NACIE. So maybe that was why. I don't know.

So I think what my thoughts are as far as tomorrow when we have the assistant
secretary here is that we be -- I know I had a conversation with him early on about NACIE and he wanted to know as much as -- he was open-minded to what was NACIE really about. So I think we had the opportunity to ask him maybe -- how was it you put it? Oh, don't necessarily have to ask, but give our -- give it -- this is what we would like.

MS. HUNTER: Yes, at one point in your discussion you might need to -- and you cannot just ask, but say this is what we think.

CHAIR DENNISON: Put it in a way where this is what we maybe expect of our hard work, because I think it's -- it was enlightening for me for someone to call and ask me questions about what NACIE was. And so it's almost like fresh ground in a sense where we can say here's what we want, this is what we would like, this is what we expect, maybe along those lines, because it is a new group in there.

MS. PROUDFIT: I think at least to be informed of who the -- who is the offer being
made to, because to hear all of us kind of gasp of surprise that it wasn't one of the two names that we had submitted.

And I think, too, I would also recommend that when we have discussions over hiring and personnel that maybe we look at executive session so as to not have these discussions so publicly. I don't want whoever the job was made to feel that, wow, the Committee didn't want me. That's an awkward place to be, so -- and I don't know if those types of conversations should be had in an open discussion and they should be more for an executive discussion.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Sort of given what you said, I think at a minimum when the decision is made by the department to make an offer that that be communicated back to NACIE with the reasons as to why the decision was made. I think we -- whether it's compatible with what we recommended, that's great, but I think we deserve to know what the criteria was for making
the decision. Maybe it's really they had a
different insight than we did, but I just think
that we should be entitled to some kind of a
description of why those kind of decisions were
being made.

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Anything else
from anyone?

MS. BROWN: Actually there's one
more. So it looks like there's one vacancy for
NACIE members and I didn't know how that was
going to be addressed.

CHAIR DENNISON: Tina, do you know
how the vacancies -- I think there's more than
one vacancy, right? How many vacancies do we
have now?

MS. HUNTER: Now we have two.

CHAIR DENNISON: Two? Okay. So do
you know --

MS. HUNTER: The one that we had
originally and then Dr. --

CHAIR DENNISON: Is Wayne Knoll still
on our --
MS. HUNTER: Yes, he is still --

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay.

MS. HUNTER: He is still on. We are working with OGC and GSA --

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay.

MS. BROWN: We have two vacancies?

CHAIR DENNISON: We have two vacancies. So I'm not sure how those will be filled.

MS. HUNTER: The administration has not told us yet how those will be filled. We're still waiting for a decision.

MR. PAYMENT: So just a reminder, in our discussion if we can crystalize our questions, that would be a really good question for the assistant secretary is how will the two vacancies be filled?

CHAIR DENNISON: Okay. Anything else?

MS. PROUDFIT: So tomorrow are we -- tomorrow we are asking the assistant secretary for the budget. That's important.
MS. HUNTER: I'm sorry --

CHAIR DENNISON: For the budget specifically for the NACIE?

MS. PROUDFIT: For NACIE.

CHAIR DENNISON: Yes, what I was going to say earlier; and I don't know if this includes everything and I don't --

MS. HUNTER: I'm sorry. The budget for NACIE is in the charter. Yes, it's the -- it's on the second page.

MS. BOULLEY: Tina, could you speak into a microphone, please?

MS. HUNTER: Oh, sure. Sure, sure. I'm sorry.

MS. PROUDFIT: But since we didn't meet last year does that money roll over?

MS. HUNTER: No, that's an annual. It doesn't roll. Money doesn't roll over. I'm sorry. Money does not roll over in the Federal Government. So it's the amount that is on page 2, I think.

MS. PROUDFIT: And there's no
accounting so that --

MS. HUNTER: Those are administrative funds. Those aren't national activities dollars.

MS. PROUDFIT: Okay. And those -- we'll get an accounting so we know how often we can continue to meet?

MS. HUNTER: Yes.

MS. RAMSEY: Just in answer to one of the other things that came up, I think we're going to be able to get you the bios for the assistant secretary and the deputy assistant secretary. We had them for the consultation and they're being emailed around to finally get out to you. And so those -- I think we can get those to you this evening if we can get everybody's forwarded to the right place, yes. But those are ready to give you.

MS. WHITEFOOT: So I have a question, Tina, about the NACIE budget then. So it looks like there isn't any technical support then for NACIE to complete its annual report.
MS. HUNTER: That is correct.

MS. WHITEFOOT: So are there other resources though within the Department of Education associated with Indian education to provide those kinds of resources? Because we put a lot of work and effort, time and effort into compiling the report without any support.

MS. HUNTER: So what is it that you're looking for, Patricia? I'm sorry.

MS. WHITEFOOT: Well for instance, one of the recommendations or suggestions I had previously was to also include data, and it wasn't until like the end of the last time that we met that we started getting data in. We got a significant amount of data --

MS. HUNTER: Yes.

MS. WHITEFOOT: -- but you have to be able to -- you'll keep that going. You have to be consistent about that data, the annual data. I think it's important. And this report goes out to the community and to Congress, so if we were ever to go to Congress; and I've been
there, you've got to have data. And so it's not -- that kind of support isn't there right now.

MS. HUNTER: So --

MS. WHITEFOOT: So for instance, just take my comment I made earlier about really supporting the needs of Indian country, and I just highlighted early childhood education. The presenter said, well, we have only so many Native children, a small number or a small percentage, etcetera.

And my feedback to her was it's not necessarily always about the numbers because we're responsible also for a significant land base. And I just used my role as an example with the Yakama Nation in Washington. We're -- our role and responsibility is about the third of the State of Washington, or if we were to take the Columbia River Basin, it would be the whole Northwest and international because of the communication that goes on with the Canadian treaties that we're working on right now.
So to me there's more work that we need to be doing about being able to explaining it. It goes back to Indian Education 101 and government to government relations and understanding, because that's a constant that we're doing, not only here at the Department of Education, because we also do that at the local level, in the school districts that we work with, and at the state level when we're educating and training new state legislators, new superintendents of public construction. We're doing that constantly and I just -- I think we deserve better attention and support for the work that we're doing.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you, Patricia. I'll be sure to share your concerns, but the funding is actually for the meetings and the expenses that go along with those meetings. It's not to conduct the research.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I understand that.

MS. HUNTER: Okay.

MS. WHITEFOOT: I understand that.
And my question was are there other resources within the agency that can help support this effort?

MS. HUNTER: So I will speak with leadership to see if there are other resources that could help.

MS. RAMSEY: And this is Tara. I'm definitely going to take this idea and roll around with it, because again even though -- I'd -- we'd have to look at the authority we have for using national activities monies and how that would work. I'm trying -- I'm wrestling with the idea of how might something like that -- if it can't already be a part of national activities or something like that, how it might be, because I could see where it would be beneficial to our grantees, to any -- as a part of something for national activities. So just so you know, both of us are going to think about it from two different angles.

MS. BROADDUS: I might also suggest the comp centers as people who have researchers
and analysts and could certainly --


Well, we will also speak with David Cantrell about that. Thank you.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: So what I was thinking in terms of just the brief information that we got from the programs; and I mentioned this earlier, I think when the Title 1 Program was presenting it seems like each department should have a piece of the data that they could present about the Native students in their programs and what services they're being provided, what states. Because I'm thinking every time we've done the report we've had to try and pull that information as best we can. I know Joyce tried to help us with some of those numbers and statistics. But that's what we mean. We need help from the experts that have those programs to get what is the picture of Native children in those programs?

MS. HUNTER: Okay. Now, I understand, Robin, your question to be about the
experts that were presenting. So reaching out to them to get information. Okay. We can do that.

MS. RAMSEY: And the -- Robin, just -- I was just saying -- I mean, I was reflecting on it, too, when the different directors were coming in, not only the data from their perspective, but what I'm hearing -- and I'm kind of putting together several pieces that you've said into one kind of thing that I want to take back, and that's some kind of a profile of -- even if it's just minimal data that we can grasp from these different things, put we can in kind of a one-pager or something that would be helpful for you to not only reflect on as we meet or as you hear the different group program directors talk, it might be something that you could use when you go explain, hey, I'm on NACIE or you need to use it for outreach or anything that you do. Is that -- am I -- like I said, I'm kind of conflating several comments into kind of one idea, but I want to know if that's
helpful.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: Well, one of my thoughts in terms of having worked on these reports is -- and we brought this up before is that we never get feedback. We make recommendations. Yes, it's going to Congress, but then we ended up writing separate letters to the secretary asking for some kind of feedback. Like is anybody out there listening? It would be just astounding to me if even staff within the department looked at recommendations that might apply to whatever they're overseeing and say, well, according to what we have going on we hear you say X, and this is what we've done, this is what we could consider doing, no, we can't do that.

I mean, it just feels like we throw stuff out there and then we wait and nothing comes back. So it would be nice to have a conversation that included some back and forth within the department as well as sending stuff to the Hill.
MS. HUNTER: Absolutely. And under this new administration this is something that we can bring forward tomorrow to Jason Botel.

MS. RAMSEY: And although I didn't give you feedback, one of the first things I read once I moved into the office for the -- is transcripts from the NACIE meeting. So I just want you to know that I've at least read and have considered what you had -- I didn't know enough to give any feedback at the time. But people are reading the things that you've produced.

And again, as I mentioned at lunch, sometimes it takes us a while to act on that feedback or to be able to figure out how to act on that feedback. And certainly with the change in administrations some of that has gotten even more thoughtful before things are enacted.

MS. PROUDFIT: So can we assume that we will be here for another 16 to 24 months as -- what can we assume? Because the reason I ask this is the timeline and the work flow.
What I don't think is helpful is having a very short amount of time in which to do a report. It would be really helpful to have a meeting early on, ask all of these agencies to submit a report that has that data, whether it's a one to two-page report with that information, give us time to read it, think about it, contemplate it and then write the report from that. But it seems like we're just always trying to catch up, right?

And so if there was any way to have all of the materials and then develop a report rather than rushing to write a report; and it's a 14-page report, I think that would be a better use of our time and also allow us to be more thoughtful about what it is that we're looking for and -- or requesting.

MR. PAYMENT: So, Deborah, this is Aaron. I have something to say. And I don't mean this to come across as by comparing another committee and how we do it over that committee, but in some ways NACIE is an elevated advisory
committee established by Congress, advisory to education, Department of Education and Interior. So it truly pre-dates the executive order that created all these other tribal advisory groups.

And but under HHS secretary tribal advisory groups the way that works is they meet quarterly. And when we arrive, we each get both a booklet and we get a flash drive that has reports from all of the different departments that have anything to do with American Indians under HHS.

And so it's a thoughtful practice, it's an accountability practice where they report out on everything they've done since the last time that they reported on initiatives. There's data that's included. Like one big thing was the ACA and the implementation of the ACA.

And one other thing that they do is they -- from meeting to meeting there's minutes that are established and action plans, and tribal asks to the secretary are recorded and
then the progress on those are reported out at the very next meeting. And so that we don't feel like we're spinning our wheels and we're giving a bunch of input and nobody's listening. And it's a score sheet so that we can measure the performance of the staff and their role with our advisory group.

So I don't suggest that we reinvent the wheel. I don't know that everything that STAC's doing is what we should be doing, but certainly for accountability purposes -- and as far as the reports, earlier there was a comment about wanting written reports. So I understand especially under FACA and under federal reporting that everything's got to be cleared. It's very bureaucratic. But if you know a meeting is coming, there's plenty of time to get all of that -- those clearances done so that a written report is provided.

And I recognize that our Department of Education staffer that assists us is -- was asking us right up until the last minute about
what we wanted included. So then when we do that, we really can't expect a written report on that part, not at the meeting, but subsequently we can. So all of that has been vetted before. It's all -- it's in all the different advisories. And Patsy explained her role with the SAMHSA committee. That is the way they operate, too.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you for that. It really does go back to the systems approach and it's been the frustration expressed by several. Some of them may have stepped down because we don't have a system in place. If you remember back when we met in Oregon, in Pendleton, that was something we talked about. Not Pendleton. Where were we?

PARTICIPANT: Portland.

CHAIR DENNISON: Portland, yes. When we met we talked about that whole systems piece needing to be put in place because it does become very frustrating because it starts to feel like we're just, like I keep saying, an
afterthought. Oh, in education I get this frustration, and I'm sure some of you share it, but it's like it becomes check off the box. And some of us are -- we're all taking time away from our work, our job that we do get paid for. And I think that's where the frustration happens where people end up not wanting to be on this because we don't know. And then we get here and we don't get -- so that is a very good suggestion that we put a system in place where we have -- I like that -- the thumb drive that has all the information on it. We can have that readily available. Then we're able to make decisions. May be able to know what's coming and it's not just a check off the box. Okay. NACIE met. Now do whatever we need to do. And it does feel that way.

I'm just expressing that on behalf of what I've heard today and what I've felt myself, that what's our role, what's our purpose, why are we coming if we're not -- we're just spoken to and not talked with and not explained here's
what we're going through. And I do understand that we had a change of administration, but it's a time to now start over, I guess. Start some new trends and reboot and move on in a better direction than maybe we have in the past.

So I guess that's just something that we would want to expect from here on out. So I will say that much. And maybe we can express that to the assistant secretary tomorrow that what we want is for the secretaries both to be here, like it says in the charter that we're going to be meeting with both secretaries at least once a year. Thank you. Go ahead, Patsy.

MS. WHITEFOOT: So, yes, I don't want to start over --

(Laughter.)

MS. WHITEFOOT: Seriously, because I think my commitment to Indian education has been lifelong, and it's been lifelong and that's the reason I continue to stay here.

I appreciate the report that the National Center for Education Statistics
provided. Just want to remind us to look at this report that we all received today and look at our 16-page report that we have here. We do have this information. And I appreciate your condensing this information for us because we did get that data at the end of the last meeting that we had. So it was like at the end of all the work that we've been doing and the request was made there several, several times. And it is frustrating. It's very frustrating. And so just don't want to lose sight of how important this work is.

And the work that we do especially with Native children, especially that we do with our families and the work that we do in community -- and it's not necessarily just Indian education. It's about the overall health and well-being of our children and our families and our community. It's about our lifeline. It's about making certain my grandchildren continue into the future and have a hopeful vision about their life. And I think that's
what our commitment is to Indian education. I never want to lose sight of that and the sovereign roles of our government and the inherent rights that we have as indigenous people from these lands.

CHAIR DENNISON: Thank you, Patsy.

And I would just remind you that we have to end right at the 5:00 time frame, but we appreciate all the comments. And I think we have a list going for tomorrow and think about what we talked about. We'll see you all tomorrow. We're adjourned now. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:59 p.m.)