

Moore Collaborative Committee Meeting  
Talking Book, April 11, 2013  
12:00-3:00

Quorum achieved and meeting called to order at 2:10. Members in attendance: Brad Allen, Ed McLain, Sandy Kowalski, Sue Liebner, Kerry Boyd, Rich Mauer (phone); Rhonda Gardner (non-voting chair). Also in attendance: Commissioner Hanley and CEAAC Executive Director Wohlforth (until 1:30).

- Agenda reviewed and approved.
- Discussion: Targeted Resources applications
  - Ed asked if districts who submitted applications for less than the \$400 per student guideline could come back to the Committee in future years requesting additional funds.
  - After extensive discussion, the Committee agreed that the door should be left open for districts to come back to the Committee during the three-year life of their awarded grant with revised requests related to data and lessons learned from their experiences with implementation.
  - No mechanism was discussed for this but would presumably take the form of a narrative with a revised budget for the remaining years of the grant. The Committee would then consider this along with other applications received in the next available round.
  - There were no questions on the Targeted Resources applications themselves.
- Discussion: Teacher Retention applications
  - Lower Yukon School District
    - ☐ Applications revolve around security upgrades for district housing.
    - ☐ Charles expresses Dr. Knight's perspective that approving all applications, even those scoring below our guideline cut score of 90 points, could take advantage of economies of scale in securing materials and contractors for the work.
    - ☐ Dr. McLain expresses his concerns that these safety upgrades should be the responsibility of the district and there are other ways to secure funding for those capital projects. He further notes that the configuration and size of the district calls into question whether the assumed economies of scale could be achieved.
  - Rubric
    - ☐ Charles notes Dr. Knight's comments about the bonus scores awarded within the rubric overwhelming other elements.

- [[ The Committee had some discussion about the rubric and noted this question/discussion item for our call with Dr. Knight later in the meeting.
  - Bristol Bay
    - [[ Some discussion about whether there were items within the request that should have been one-time requests in the last round rather than ongoing assumptions.
    - [[ It is also noted that the score this round is lower than the score for this district/app in the previous round. This question is noted for our discussion later in the meeting with Dr. Knight.
  - Southeast Island School District and Hydaburg
    - [[ Discussion around why all four applications are recommended for approval by our contractor when two are below the guide cut score of 90.
    - [[ Charles shares his discussion with Dr. Knight around economies of scale and the ability of the districts to leverage funds for AHFC dollars.
    - [[ The Committee notes that in this case, all the schools are, in fact, on the same island, so economies of scale may well be able to be achieved.
  - Nuiqsit/Meade River
    - [[ Questions about whether both schools are accounted for on the same application. We will discuss this in our call with Dr. Knight.
  - In-Kind documentation
    - [[ Rhonda shares Dr. Knight’s question about in-kind documentation that is requested on the application but was not provided by any of the districts and how the Committee wishes to handle this.
    - [[ After substantial discussion and a tie vote on whether or not to go back to districts and ask for this information, the Committee deferred to Mr. Wohlforth and the Commissioner.
    - [[ The result was that we will revise the application to make it more clear and in line with the Targeted Resources application that we are asking for the source of the in-kind contribution. We will not go back to districts submitted in this round to obtain this information.
    - [[ Dr. McLain’s concern about this from an evaluation perspective is noted.
- Duration and process for Teacher Retention
  - The Committee discussed the confusion that exists around the duration of the Teacher Retention grants. The application calls for a one-year budget, but some districts believe the grants to be three-years in duration like the Targeted Resources grants.

- Charles notes that some items within a grant may be one-time items whereas others may need time to develop and demonstrate efficacy.
- After substantial discussion, the Committee decided that we will put together a Continuation Form for approved-districts/schools who can submit a request and revised budget for subsequent year's funding that the Committee will consider along with first-time submissions in that round. Rhonda will draft a form for consideration at our next telephonic meeting.
- Sue requests that the form also have a section asking for a brief evaluation of the work done to date that would support the request for continuation funding.
- Charles suggests that we also have the two already approved districts (NWABSD and Yupiit) complete this form by the anniversary of their already approved grants, and the Committee agrees.
- Before having to leave for a previous commitment, Charles shares with the Committee that CEAAC put a tremendous amount of effort into making sure districts were knowledgeable about the Moore grant opportunities. Though some were completely in the loop, others indicated they had received no information despite the numerous emails both CEAAC and EED have sent. The communication pathways are apparently extremely difficult and complex, and this is an issue for all concerned to continue to resolve.
- Charles also shares information on his conversations with districts that chose not to apply for early learning grants. Some chose not to apply because their numbers of children were too small for the dollars to work. Others chose not to apply because doing so might result in closure of their community's Head Start program, and that would eliminate an opportunity for three year olds, which they did not want to do.
- Call with Dr. Knight for questions
  - Dr. Knight noted that the Targeted Resources grant applications were very clean and strong applications. All have also been reviewed by Education Northwest, our evaluator, for ability to be evaluated, and all have been deemed appropriate for that purpose.
  - Teacher Retention
    - ☐ Dr. Knight shares his thoughts on the current rubric, noting that the schools who earn the two available bonuses are very heavily favored.
    - ☐ Dr. Knight recommends that we add a requirement for letters of support on the section on the ability of the school/district to leverage other funds.
    - ☐ This section would also benefit from some firming up on the range of scores available as it is currently very subjective.



expenses under the grant, even if there may be other sources of funding for these safety issues. It is further noted that all Moore schools in the group were above the cut score.

- [[ Lower Yukon Central Office – unanimous NO
- [[ Lower Yukon Schools above the cut score guide of 90 points were unanimously APPROVED (Alakanuk, Kotlik, Marshall, Pilot Station, Scammon Bay, Sheldon Point)
- [[ Lower Yukon Schools below the cut score guide of 90 points were NOT APPROVED on a vote of 5-1 (Russian Mission, Hooper Bay, Emmonak, Ignatius Beans)
- Southeast Island School District and Hyaburg
  - The Committee is reminded of Charles’ comments on economies of scale and leveraging funds with these four proposals, even though two are below the guide cut score of 90 points. Discussion of value of that versus needs of schools.
  - The two schools above the cut score (Howard Valentine and Naukati) are unanimously APPROVED.
  - The two schools below the cut score (Thorne Bay and Hydaburg) are NOT APPROVED by a vote of 5-1.
- Twin Hills – unanimously APPROVED
- Tetlin – unanimously APPROVED
- Nuiqsit Trapper School – unanimously APPROVED
- Chevak – unanimously APPROVED
- Bristol Bay
  - The Committee engages in considerable discussion on this application.
  - Members of the Committee are concerned about taking a piecemeal approach to the application in approving some elements but not others.
  - It is noted that the score of 80 points is well below the guide cut of 90.
  - The Committee unanimously votes NOT APPROVED for this application.
  - Given that Bristol Bay was approved in the last round, they may use the previously discussed Continuation Form for their current Teacher Retention grant, and it will be considered in the next round. They should be provided feedback that the Committee is interested in sustainable projects and are unlikely to approve expenses in a second round that should be one-time costs.
- Rhonda will update the financial documents to reflect today’s decisions for the Committee to address adjustments to their allocations at the next telephonic meeting.
- Rhonda provides a brief update on the work of Education Northwest Evaluation on the evaluation.

- Rhonda and Ed share basic information on a proposed Teacher Retention Evaluation plan to be conducted by ISER and jointly funded by CEAAC, ISER, and EED. This issue will be discussed further at our next telephonic meeting.
- The Committee briefly discussed the need to communicate with districts next year's application dates, which will be a single application date for the spring. We will set the plan for future dates at our next telephonic meeting.
- The Commissioner provides basic information on submissions for Early Learning grants.
- Meeting adjourned at 3:07.