

EL Advisory Meeting

Minutes

May 30, 2019 9am-2pm PM

PARTICIPANTS

Andrea Townsend
Parasa Chanramy
Taffy Carlisle
Wei Wei Lou
Gustavo Balderas
Joel Cisneros
Frank Caroplelo

Ewa Campbell
Argel Jimenez- Int
Carmen Bittner-Int
Kim Miller (phone)
Josh Rew
Darryl Tukufu
Susan Merkariski

Maria Delgado
Carmen Xiomara Urbina
Colt Gill

NOT PRESENT

Item	Discussion	Action
Introductions/Agreements/Gallery Expectations-Dr. Tukufu and Sara Green	Introductions were made to the group.	
Welcome and Introductions – Colt Gill and Carmen Urbina	Colt dropped by before heading out to another meeting; showing up at the end. Colt talked about how today the advisory group would be hearing ideas about how to better serve and support the districts and HB 3499. Carmen talked about the “Taking it Up Training” that ODE staff are going through. There are 200 staff who have already participated and that will be addressing systematics.	
Target/Transformation District Data Drive – Josh Rew	<p>Josh brought handouts and a power point to the group. Josh showed the changes happening in districts. One of the changes pointed out was on the approach on districts. Josh talked about how they created an outcome index. Josh asked what is available for us to measure future districts? There were no elementary or middle School students measured, it was top heavy on high School Students.</p> <p><u>Indicators that Mirror ESA</u> ELA and Math Achievement ELA and Math Growth Regular Attendance 9th Grade on Track Graduation and Completion</p> <p><u>Establish Business Rules mirroring ESA</u> Students Current plus Former EL And Ever EL</p> <p>Transformation and Target are original targets from 2014-2015. The Goal is to transfer districts out of Cohort 1 into Cohort 2.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Long term goal is to measure of interim progress until 2024-2025. Level 5 is achieving the long term goal.</p> <p>Josh said they'd be creating a district profile. It would show performance on the 9 indicators and a summary.</p> <p>Josh talked about the large handout. On one of the handouts it showed all the districts. They weren't measured against one another but against the state overall goal.</p> <p>One of the members asked about ELA (English Language Arts) achievement and ELA growth?</p> <p>ELA Achievement is a percent of students are meeting the achievement standards. If they are getting a score over 3 they are meeting the ELA cut score.</p> <p>ELA growth is what is the ranking of the current ELA versus the prior year ELA score.</p> <p>An English learner is on track if they are proficient on the ELPA (English Language Proficiency Assessment).</p> <p>Josh said the goal is to move onto future ESA; and that there is discipline, and other indicators besides achievement. Largest challenges for discipline are middle school and early high school. He said the biggest challenge is money since money is needed to track new data.</p> <p>Transformation and Targets are the original districts from 2014, is what Josh said in response to Tim's question. He explained how this chart is about getting districts out of cohort 1.</p> <p>Ewa asked about the term transition. Josh explained it was once exit but changed it so it'd be softer, but he sees how it couldn't work.</p> <p>Josh answered one of the questions by saying they'd have to readjust the percentages in August after they get the data from in the school.</p> <p>Suzie asked about regular attenders. She mentioned how the Bulk of EL's are in elementary and intermediate. The best option would be to split to get more district data. Josh said they broke it up into separate fall bands in order to address the challenges in ESA. Josh said having current and former helps equal out the numbers. It does make it difficult to focus on specific grades, but it does include most districts and gives us valid indicators.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Tom asked if they could track those getting the Seal of Biliteracy as a way of weighing the importance of fostering Biliteracy among their students.</p> <p>Ewa said that she felt measuring by those who have the Biliteracy Seal would exclude the smaller districts who would not be able to afford it.</p> <p>One of the members said we need more weight to give a more holistic approach on how kids are doing. How did we get to here and the current presentation? Can we make any changes and amendments and what is our purpose?</p> <p>Josh said he could answer some of the questions and department leadership could answer others. How we got here was internally and external stakeholders and districts found ways our current model wasn't working. Because of this we knew we had to make some decisions. Internally we decided to come up with a proposal to see if it worked. The document presented is the new Accountability System thanks to ESA. How we amend and change it can only be answered by leadership.</p> <p>Sara mentioned that we are here to gather information from the group on the proposal. The advisory group will have some time before we come back together again to move forward. We want to explore unintended consequences and that is one reason that the group is here. What are the most appropriate indicators and weight formulas for this particular body of work, so that methodology is improved. As far as changes, there is nothing in the statute as far as we know that would prevent us from that.</p> <p>One of the members asked what the timeline was? Josh said that we'd be getting into that this afternoon. There was a work session where the work Josh presented was discussed.</p>	
Break		
<p>Potential Funding Models and Guiding Principles – Brain Reeder</p>	<p>Brian Reeder presented the different models. One of the ways is that smaller districts are weighted more if they have 2000 total students or less.</p> <p>First part of the column involves allocating the 5 million dollars based on the number of weights in each district. Next there are 2 adjustments. Revised grant adjusted for maximum and the second adjustment is to establish a minimum amount that each district will qualify for.</p> <p>This is first study that takes in amount of EL's as well as additional add-on's minus special ed. Brian asked if the types</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
<p>Break, Grab Lunch, Network and Settle</p>	<p>of weights the right ones? Brian mentioned financial need based off the proportion of students in their district. The base amount is 5 million dollars based on the number of weights in each district with the 2 adjustments being adjusted for maximum (max amount any district can receive (\$750,000) and the second adjustment is establish minimum amount each district will qualify for (so they have resources for programs and initiatives (\$45,000). The other columns had the \$90,000 or \$180,000 the districts had received from 2017. The final parts of the final grants per weight and final amount per current EL student.</p> <p>Brian asked if the Needs Index Josh created was compatible with what the graph he created? Josh said what this is shifting how we use the Needs Index. The objective is being shifted, it was never part of identification.</p> <p>One of the members asked how to measure the effectiveness of the different goals? How do you transfer outcomes to impact? One of the advisory members asked if districts who used funds effectively would be rewarded?</p> <p>Brian said the model doesn't assume anything about how dollars are sent and doesn't believe there is anything in the law that you must spend the dollars differently; whether the student be in special ed or not. It is the districts call of what to do with the funds. This model isn't mandating anything on the spending side. Brian said that there are different perspectives on the merit based model. Models need to consider things that are out of the districts control, like students in poverty. We want our model to be able to cover all the different circumstances. We want to incentivize higher performance.</p> <p>Suzie said that the money needs to go to districts and there needs to be if FTE (Full-time equivalent) and the minimum should be raised to a higher level, rather than just 45K.</p> <p>Ewa mentioned how one of the weights that is missing is recent arrivers. Tim also mentioned it interrupts education and that students also need to be taken into account on the weighted measure.</p> <p>Carmen said we have had a huge growth of EL students; especially from Guatemalan communities who have experienced that interrupted instruction. Within that we've had interrupted instruction too.</p> <p>Weiwei talked about severely interrupted education being collected by the federal government. Josh said we can add it and simulate it but it has been very recently collected.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Maria asked how the money would be tied to staffing of EL students and recent arrivers? John said they don't cover that. The weight that does account for recent arrivers does show it is weighted where there would be funding. He also mentioned guidance from teachers to help set weights at the proper levels.</p> <p>Frank felt that the current weights and districts being identified didn't take into account EL's who have been in the system for more than 5 years and long-term English Learners. They are the largest number in his district and continuing to grow.</p> <p>John asked if others agreed and Tim agreed. Tim said more nuance to the English learner definition the better.</p> <p>Andrea asked if the small and remote could be split. She brought up how in southern Oregon has districts that aren't small but are remote.</p> <p>Ewa said we need to cognoscente of what we are asking of the districts and it will be useful for them to engage in the work and that we should have simpler weights so they can engage in the work.</p> <p>Weiwei said that the 90K to 45K drop doesn't make sense for this year's cohort, though it does make sense for the year after. Because of this we should extend Cohort 1 for one more year or this change should even apply to Cohort 1. Carmen said we should put that conversation on hold and hold it off for next year so that you have something to respond to.</p> <p>Foster care data was also asked about and John said they are still trying to get that data.</p> <p>Sara said it was time for a lunch break to talk among the group on their thoughts on what was presented.</p> <p>Tim mentioned that he understands the shift in funding was meant to take into account higher concentration of English Learners in different districts.</p>	
<p>HB 3499 Update and Options for Consideration – Sara Green and Grant Manager Team</p>	<p>Options 1 (The status quo), 1.5 (a close reset) and 2 (end funding to September 30 and begin with new funding model) were the 3 options presented to the advisory group for HB3499 2.0. The Advisory Members voted using colored dots to mark which option they wanted for HB3499.</p>	
<p>Pacific Research/ External Evaluator – Steve Rider and Associates</p>	<p>Pacific Research presented a power point that covered the 7 key research activities they'd be doing. 1st would be an initial analysis of 10 Districts. 4 Transformation and 6 Target</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Districts were chosen based off number of EL Students in 2018. They chose both high and low percentages and urban versus rural Districts. Eventually all Districts will be a part of it. The goal is to complete it by end of June. While also including data from 3 years prior for districts. There will also be evaluation reports that has the teacher and qualitative data.</p> <p>It was asked if they include evaluations? Pacific Research said yes. They said it would be included for all 40 Districts.</p> <p>What does it look like between long term EL's and interrupted EL's and those in-between? What does that look like? Is the support helping to move the needle? After the report is completed is there going to be another report similar to the one being put out? How will we revisit how the Department has done in providing technical assistance?</p> <p>Pacific Research said they would love to cover those groups if the sample size is big enough and would love to cover the other issues based on contract and to come back in 6 months.</p> <p>Ewa said it was a bit generic but would like to see a different in extracurricular versus after school activities. How will you tease out the information from districts who didn't track the money in relation to the activities and impact? Pacific Research said that they were doing the historical analysis in order to help track funds and where they might be connected. Pacific Research said we probably won't be able to tie direct activities to outcome but can gather an assessment based on the qualitative data as a whole.</p> <p>One of the points brought up is that ELL teachers that are only with students 30 minutes of the day and the need for classroom teachers.</p> <p>It was asked what the purpose is behind the teacher survey? Pacific Research said it was to test to see how the bill has affected their changing in teaching. Tim said that it is usually under different names. Pacific Research mentioned that they'd be tracking funds going in and the PD impact.</p> <p>Weiwei said that they should observe a lesson and see how students respond as PD is not the best way to translate to classroom practice.</p> <p>Weiwei asked do any of these impacts make an impact? Sara said that Pacific Research should talk to middle and high school students.</p> <p>It was asked where the cultural responsiveness was in with the questions and if they'd be sitting in on any classes. Maria</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>brought up how there was one class where the students weren't paying attention at all.</p> <p>Pacific Research said they would be comfortable sitting in on classes since they are not qualified in that area.</p> <p>Sara introduced Mariana and her part with the Professional Learning Institute. Marian has been doing this work around the time of the EL Alliance Conference so that districts can touch base and learn from one another on what has been working.</p> <p>Advisory members were supportive of the idea. Pacific Research thanked everyone for their questions and feedback. They asked ODE to let the districts know that they'll be part of the initial analysis, but that the other districts will be sampled as well.</p>	
<p>Announcements – Colt Gill</p> <p>Next Meeting Information and Check-in on Today's Meeting – Sara Green</p>	<p>Colt checked in with the group and asked about hopes and concerns. Ewa said she was happy with the progress the agency has made. One member was happy that we can anticipate in 2020 to improve funding equity and reflecting on previous years while not falling into the same trap. One of the concerns that was voiced was that as some of the changes are being made understanding the consequences intended and unintended. Another concern was that the money being spent on essential products rather than niceties. There was also a concern that it was all around students, but not adult outcomes. Lastly if the equity trainings were happening in the districts? Weiwei said this was one of the best meetings they had and there was a lot of meat in the discussion. Her concern was it becoming a short term excitement and that system change has not been discussed. Another hope was that this evaluation would be exciting and that the meeting was well facilitated. Timeline was listed as a concern leading up to cohort 2; also, that many of the HB 3499 are working well on their own and bringing them together will help them. Targeted assistance from education specialists from ODE was voiced as something that was needed too. Maria's concern was that the parents weren't getting all this information out to the families. It was also voiced that staffing appropriately was needed so that ODE staff can get out in the field. The concern was also the need for translated documents.</p>	
<p>1:50 Gallery Comments, Questions, and Compliments</p>	<p>Thanks, were given to everyone for their time and feedback.</p>	
<p>2:00 Adjourn</p>	<p>Meeting was adjourned</p>	

Next meeting: