

MAASE Focus Areas:

We will align and organize the strategic priorities and work of MAASE to focus on the following elements:

<i>High Quality Student Evaluations</i>	<i>Specially Designed Instruction</i>	<i>Skilled Staff</i>	<i>Program Evaluation</i>
---	---------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

Through the platforms of:

Association Partnerships	Legislative Action and Advocacy	Professional Learning	Membership Services
--------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EdCamp is an open format where group members share thoughts to help one another in implementation of "real life" practice. These notes reflect the thinking of someone in the group but do not represent an official position on behalf of MAASE. Anyone using this as a resource is encouraged to use their best judgement in interpreting the suggestions.

MAASE EdCamp Format:

1. Clarify the Problem of Practice to Solve
2. Collaborate around the Problem of Practice by offering suggestions and resources
3. Give feedback to the committee on how to improve next time

Notes:

What we know:

Can use title, Monitor or Technical Assistance Provider

The cards are going to shuffle

The monitors propose to:

Gather and share resources

A way to learn and train each other

Developing feedback loops

Work to ensure FAPE- multiple components

What we want to know:

What is our direction?

Clarity

What does General Supervision look like?

Components of the CrEAG

Consistency across ISDs

How/vision of MDE/OSE and ISDs/MAASE

What is required? What has developed over time? What do we have the flexibility to change? What do we not?

What did we learn?

We looked at the draft version of the CrEAG

Work has been done to determine which portions of the CrEAG are the responsibility of the local, the ISD, the state, etc.

Every state has a CrEAG, you can individualize it for your ISD

In terms of our direction, the conversation included:

Will there be additional resources needed to implement this?

The EOSD and Transition grants are specific to Michigan and not something required by the Feds. It appears as if there is flexibility in how the state does this. Will it change? What can we expect?

What do we think about having the money just be a part of flow through?

Some think it would be easier to have it in flow through. It takes away the PARs.

Would there still be a requirement to prove where we are spent the money?

Some people think it is helpful to have it at a separate grant because they flow all of their money out. Not to say they can't get there.

The perception is that the state gives us this money so that they can have some control over how we spend it and implement.

There may be something to learn about how we have done monitoring in the past. When monitors helped create the consistency (when the guidance from the state was lacking).

It may be unique to Michigan that Directors and Monitors (even on the GE side) are really setting the standard because OSE hasn't been adequately staffed. So now that we have to shift, who is setting the vision? How do we then follow this vision?

How do we gain clarity?

Use implementation driver's/science

Hexagon "fit" tool

Communication - OSE will communicate with Superintendents & ISD Directors only, which then relies on the Supt's and Directors to disseminate important and timely updates on policies/procedures within their ISD (concern - the game of telephone)

CrEAG may provide an opportunity to look at a district with real-time data (CIMS currently 1-2 school-years behind in data, and you may end up working on old procedures that may have already been corrected).

provide opportunity for Directors and Monitors to meet together with and without the MDE

Feedback:

- What made this time worth your while?
- What specifically can we do to make this better?