



Agenda

- Review conference evaluation results
- 2018 Conference theme
- Review the proposal review and grading process
- Make final decisions on presentation themes and topic areas in preparation for opening proposal submissions on April 17, 2017
- Identify organizations that should be encouraged to submit proposals
- Identify other associations to be invited as presenters—outside the proposal process
- Decide whether or not to invite former Distinguished Schools to submit proposals
- Decide whether or not to continue the exhibitor presentation sessions

Conference Evaluation Results

As of March 15:

- **333 Attendee responses**
(11% of the 3000 attendees)
- Average rating of Good to Excellent on:
 - Registration process
 - Speaker selection
 - Online schedule & printed materials
 - Exhibit hall offerings

Conference Evaluation Results

Most Common Attendee Compliments:

- Keynotes were excellent
- High quality sessions
- Long Beach was a great location

“This was my first Title I Conference. It was informative, motivating and a wonderful experience. Thank you!”

“The speakers were outstanding. I felt that I gained a lot from listening to all the people. They pumped me up and made me want to try new things and challenge myself and others more. The engagement was superb. All the staff was very helpful. “

Conference Evaluation Results

More Attendee Compliments:

“The overall conference was very informative and much needed.”

“I really enjoyed the sessions. I took some really good activities and ideas home to utilize in my classroom. Thank you for organizing this conference.”

“High quality professional learning opportunities! My colleagues and I found this conference to be the best we've attended in years! Thank you!”

“Keynote speakers were excellent!!! Sessions provided valuable insight on the process of Turn Around.”

Conference Evaluation Results

Most Common Attendee Complaints:

- Not enough seating in workshop sessions
- Exhibit Hall should have been open 3 days
- Overlapping sessions
- Too many sponsored sessions
- Distance from session to session sometimes too far

Exhibitor Evaluation Results

As of March 15:

- 27 Exhibitor responses (Out of 220 exhibiting companies)
- Most Common Exhibitor Complaints
 - Provide more dedicated exhibit hall time
 - Don't open the hall at 7am (too early, no one in there)
 - Go back to the three day exhibit hall schedule
 - Provide more incentives for attendees to visit the exhibit hall

2018 Conference Theme

Liberty to Learn

All children should have the liberty to learn, but not all do. Many children, especially those served by Title I, Part A, and other federal programs, face barriers that impede their liberty to learn. Every day, some of our already vulnerable students come to our schools in the face of economic, social, emotional, language and cognitive barriers that challenge their right to earn an education. The 2018 National Title I Conference addresses these barriers by highlighting the work of individuals, schools, districts and organizations that have successfully removed some of these barriers; thereby giving our children the Liberty to Learn.

Proposal Review & Grading Process

Timeline

- **April 17 - June 16, 2017:** Proposal Submissions open
- **July 3 – 14, 2017:** Proposal Grading Online
- **July 20, 2017:** Proposal Review Meeting in Washington DC (During the Summer Meeting)
- **September 22, 2017:** Notification of Provisional Acceptance or Decline

Proposal Review & Grading Process

Final Decision on Themes

Three overarching Session Categories: Instruction, Leadership, Policy – have been used for the last several years.

- **Committee Discussion:**
Keep these three and add one more: “Family & Community Engagement?”
- Or, keep the same three?

Proposal Review & Grading Process

Final Decision on Session Types

2017 was the first conference to include “Engagement” or workshop sessions, in addition to “Lecture” sessions

- **Committee Discussion:**
Keep these two types, but replace “Lecture” with another term (?)

Session Topic Areas:

All sessions are grouped into three overarching categories:

INSTRUCTION, LEADERSHIP, & POLICY

Within the three categories listed above, topics of interest to the committee include:

- ACADEMIC STANDARDS
- ASSESSMENT
- AT-RISK POPULATIONS
- COLLEGE READINESS
- CULTURAL DIVERSITY
- CYBER SCHOOLS
- DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION
- EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
- EFFECTIVE LEADERS
- EFFECTIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
- ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
- ENGLISH LEARNERS
- FAMILY ENGAGEMENT
- FISCAL ISSUES
- FLEXIBILITY
- IMPROVING GRADUATION RATE
- LEGISLATIVE CHANGES
- MATHEMATICS
- MULTIPLE TIERED SYSTEMS OF SUPPORT
- NEUROSCIENCE
- PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
- PROGRAM COLLABORATION & COORDINATION
- READING & WRITING
- REGULATORY ISSUES
- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
- SCIENCE
- SECONDARY EDUCATION
- SCHOOL CLIMATE AND CULTURE
- STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
- TECHNOLOGY
- TITLE I SUCCESS STORIES
- USING DATA

Proposal Review & Grading Process

Final Decision on Topic Areas

Committee Discussion:

Keep same list as last year, with the addition of:

- Program Sustainability, Data Informed Instruction, and Social Emotional Learning (?)
- Add Native Americans (?)

Proposal Grading Rubric

PROPOSAL FOCUSES ON A KEY AREA OF INTEREST FOR CONFERENCE ATTENDEES AND INCLUDES TIMELY AND MEANINGFUL CONTENT

OUTSTANDING (8-10)	GOOD (5-7)	FAIR (2-4)	POOR (0-1)
The proposal fully addresses a specific topic of current interest along with a creative and innovative approach to professional practice, theory or research. The session provides timely, in-depth and new information of significant value for participants.	The proposal addresses a topic of current interest and clearly states what specific information and/or relevant skills will be provided to attendees. The content may shed new light on important issues and/or practice in the field.	The proposal topic, though interesting, is either something that has been presented frequently at past conferences or does not include any new information that would expand participant knowledge or skills.	The proposal topic is not current, relevant or of particular interest at this time. The proposal is poorly written and does not demonstrate thoroughness, quality or clarity.

RESEARCH BASE LISTED IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE TOPIC

OUTSTANDING (8-10)	GOOD (5-7)	FAIR (2-4)	POOR (0-1)
The proposal fully cites sufficient, relevant, and respected research studies, or local school data to verify the stated outcomes.	The proposal cites some relevant research or local school data to verify stated outcomes.	The proposal includes research or local school data that may be limited or subject to bias.	The proposal does not reference any verifiable research or local school data, to support stated outcomes.

PROPOSAL HIGHLIGHTS CURRENT, SUCCESSFUL, TITLE I SCHOOLS OR DISTRICTS

OUTSTANDING (5)	GOOD (3-4)	FAIR (1-2)	POOR (0)
The proposal's primary focus is on one or more current, successful, evidence-based Title I programs.	The proposal includes one or more current, successful Title I school programs.	The proposal mentions a Title I school program, but does not provide sufficient details to determine the success of its programs.	The proposal does not include any reference to a current, successful Title I program.

Proposal Grading Rubric

CONTENT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE IDENTIFIED AUDIENCE

OUTSTANDING (5)	GOOD (3-4)	FAIR (1-2)	POOR (0)
The proposal clearly demonstrates a full understanding of the needs of the selected audience.	The proposal is properly aligned with the selected audience.	The proposal does not appear to address specific needs of the selected audience.	The proposal is clearly not appropriate for the selected audience.

RELEVANT EXPERTISE AND SPEAKING EXPERIENCE FOR THIS TOPIC IS SHOWN BY THE PRESENTER(S)

OUTSTANDING (8-10)	GOOD (5-7)	FAIR (2-4)	POOR (0-1)
The presenter(s) is widely recognized and respected as an informative, engaging and thought provoking speaker on this topic.	The presenter(s) has listed successful experience for this conference type and topic.	The presenter appears to have limited expertise for this topic or experience presenting at conferences of this level.	The presenter(s) does not appear to possess the relevant expertise needed to present on this particular topic or at this conference.

PROPOSAL IS WELL WRITTEN AND USES PROPER GRAMMAR, SPELLING AND PUNCTUATION

OUTSTANDING (8-10)	GOOD (5-7)	FAIR (2-4)	POOR (0-1)
The proposal fully demonstrates high quality, professional writing and clarity of expression.	The proposal is presented in articulate, clear language, with very few errors.	The proposal is clear and thorough, but grammatical errors are a distraction.	The proposal is poorly written.

BONUS POINTS

Explain any bonus points (up to 10 at grader discretion) awarded based on exceptional ideas or implementation and the overall quality of the submission.

Proposal Review & Grading Process

Final Decisions on Grading Process

Grading Process – Completed by committee members online, uses Grading Rubric

Committee Discussion:

- Use the same grading process as last year, because it worked well (?)

Who Should Submit Proposals?

- Identify organizations that should be encouraged to have presenters submit proposals
- Identify other associations to be invited as presenters—outside the proposal process

Who Should Submit Proposals?

- Decide whether or not to invite former Distinguished Schools to submit proposals
- Decide whether or not to continue the exhibitor presentation sessions

Next Meeting

- April 20, 2017 at 1:00PM Eastern
(12:00PM CDT, 11:00AM MDT, 10:00AM MST & PDT)
- Topic:
Identify the kinds of keynote speakers to include

