EL Advisory Meeting
Advisory Group Meeting Minutes
February 14, 2019|9am-2pm|Oregon Department of Education

Meeting Scribe: Victoria Garcia

PARTICIPANTS

☒Parasa Chanramy	☒Kelly Kalkofen	❑Kim Miller
☒Taffy Carlisle	☒Amelia Vargas	❑Kathy Cole
☒Wei Wei Lou-Phone	☒Mirela Blekic	❑Hernan Chavez-Avalos
☒Gustavo Balderas-Phone	☒Linda Liu	❑Latashia Harris
☒Maria Delgado	☒Chi Nguyen-Phone	❑Mariana Praschnic-Enriquez
☒Dawn Granger- ESD	☒Janice	❑Victoria Garcia
☒Frank Caroplelo	☒Veronica Leonard-Phone	❑Ben Wolcott
☒Ewa Campbell	☒Darryl Tukufu	❑Susan Merkarski
☒Argel Jimenez- Interpretar	☒Ryan Clarke	
☒Carmen Bittner-Interpreter	☒Jennifer Gilliland-Phone	
☒Tim Blackburn- Phone	☒ Andrea Townsend	
☒Josh Rew	**Members not Present**	

Item	Discussion	Action
Introductions/Agreements/Gallery– *Mirela Blekic*	Dr. Tukufu started off the meeting by introducing our two interim directors, Sara Green and Carla Gary. They will be part of the Equity Team. He also thanked them for taking on the roll and accepting. Carla Gary and Sara Green also wanted to share how privileged they feel to be able to come out of retirement and be able to take part of helping children. Mirela introduced herself to the group and welcomed members to our meeting. Members introduced themselves to our new directors. After introductions were made, Mirela went over the agreements that the group came up with before. It was stated that we will be look into the agreements more in depth at a future date.	Agreements will be looked into more at a future date.
	Ewa Campbell asked about the process of posting minutes to the website and indicated that some were missing. Mirela stated that she would look into this and see. It was stated that we will try to post them within one month or as soon as we can. Ewa also asked that Mirela explain the purpose of this group for the new folks coming on board. Kelly explained that this group was brought together to advise on all things EL. Ewa asked that moving forward at our next meeting if, we can state at the beginning as to "why we are here" would be a good idea.	Moving forward we will state the why "purpose" we are here at the beginning of the meeting to remind folks why we
	Kelly stated that our voices are important here.	

Item	Discussion	Action
	Sara Green agrees with having the purpose but suggested that we do a one pager that states the purpose and provide that at each meeting. This will help if we have new members, guests. Mirela let members know that we have had a change to the agenda. At 12:15 we will no longer be doing the EI State Report, this will be reported on at the next meeting in May. We will instead be discussing funding during this time.	are here and what we are doing? This will get put on the agenda for next time. Kelly agreed and said we can do this.
K-12 Data Dashboard Discussion – *Elyse Bean & Amelia Vargas 32*	Amelia presented her PowerPoint on the Data Dashboard Discussion. See handouts for more in-depth information on the presentation. It was suggested that if members had their laptops with them that it would be good to use them as, their presentation is an interactive presentation. Elyse passed out documents that Amelia would be presenting on. Amelia directed everyone to the ODE page and looked up the At a Glance Profile and went over it with members. We will be looking at the district profiles. There is a difference on what is presented on the data profiles verses what is presented on the district profiles. This is the first year that the At a Glance Profiles have existed. We have had report cards in the past but, those were designed related to accountability measures. Last year they were redesigned and perhaps some members in this group had a part in that layout or decision on them. Now that these have been released, we are going back to some groups and having follow up sessions. We are hoping to collect feedback on improvements that can be made or perhaps clarify any questions. We are really looking forward to continuing the relationships built last year and establishing those. The next part of the project is to design a website that makes the profiles more interactive and give you the opportunity to drill down for the details. We are hoping to provide the details folks want in an interactive web-based platform. That is why we are here today so, we can discuss with you all today so that we can go about and serves those that will use it. We want it to be equitable and take in things we have not yet thought about.	A copy of the presentation as sent to members who were on the phone.

Item	Discussion	Action
	Amelia went over some of the comments made about making the data clearer about what's being recorded. Also, for Spanish translation it's not always translated into the common way that people would have translated that. Members went over the PowerPoint handouts and discussed amongst themselves and provided feedback to Amelia. The feedback will drive a lot of the decisions on how the data dash board will look like. Andrea would like ever English learners broken down between the current and former. Ewa wanted to know if there was conversation around including ELPA 21 results were considered in the dials. ELPA 21 is a state level assessment and it requires us to report out on progress towards proficiency. So, If we could include the ELPA 21 results in the dial then add the ever EI's in the bottom that would take care of the progress toward proficiency then what's going on with the kids in the program. Amelia asked if it made sense to have it at the school or district level. Ewa, suggested that at both levels as, we produce reports for both. For the district with large numbers of EI students this, information will be powerful, and it would be a good snapshot for those schools and districts to have. Robin, historically why we have the Ever-English Learners there is the demographic data for the report cards comes from the student enrollment validation, and Ever English Learner is data point that we validate to schools and districts. So, that is where that came from. We have been having internal conversations on outcomes, and how to show this data in the future. Amelia stated that this goes into the timeline of getting these changes to happen and that we do have to have a validation timeline, so we can have the validation process that districts are aware of so, that the data we are reporting is accurate. Another comment is that when schools mail stuff it's usually in black and white and not in color. When we present it to them in color is almost like a different report that they are seeing. Anything to help it stand out would be helpful. Maria shared her concern that when she talks to the parents, the parents don't know that their student are in the program or, how long they can be in the program and that they are going to be monitored. How do we let the parents know their	

Item	Discussion	Action
	child is in the program and for how long they will be under monitoring? Amelia noted that she did see some of these concerned with the parents. Amelia mentioned that it is important that we keep the parents informed and have meetings with them. They need support. Another mentioned that a big issue is not providing documents in Spanish and not understand what is being sent out. Maria started from the Reynolds School District as a parent leader. Currently she works for the organization Unite Oregon. She works with the parents to teach them about the school system, advocacy and leadership. She advocates because her daughter is also in ESL. She mentioned if we have meetings at the state level to invite her so, that she can advocate for the parents and students. Amelia mentioned that they are trying to create something that would create guidance, have consistent layout that would have data presentations that would make things clearer with the dashboard. We are also looking into what, other states are doing with their dashboards. We also want to incorporate the perspective of the rural schools who don't have the same technical staff and support available. Amelia had a question for the group; what is the best way of going and reaching those districts? We do plan on having some webinars in March. It was suggested that we go to the ESD's. It was asked if we will have the dashboard available in other languages. Amelia said yes, we are working on doing one in Spanish at the same time. She has also reached out to other states to see what they are doing as far as this too. Carmen mentioned that the Oregon Department of Education is developing their own policies and protocol around translations and interpretations. We are looking into seeing if we need a translation department within ODE for translation of documents and provide services to be able to translate documents in five languages. We hope that soon you all will see the outcomes of this. Please feel free to email for any questions related to this presentation or dashboard.	

Item	Discussion	Action
Meeting Minutes		Minutes for February, November, and December will be looked into for finalization and then Kelly will make sure to get them posted.
Break (15 min)	Took quick break during this time.	
Essential Skills Decision Making – *Ben Wolcott & Cristen McLean (continuation)*	Ben provide all his documents in Spanish and will be presenting a power point. See presentation for more detailed information. His original plan was to help us read the scale by drawing lines between the lines of the power point but, decided against it. For our agenda today, we will discuss new things we have learned since our last talk then, we will make a decision. In order for students to obtain a high school diploma, students need to demonstrate essential skills in reading, writing and mathematics. A majority of students do this via state testing and some students who meet essential skills via work samples. Our decision today is for specifically provisions B and C. Ben asked us to make a decision on the following questions; 1. Do we want to keep r provision B, enrollment limit? 2. Do we want to change the time limit of this enrollment limit from 5 years to another number, like 6, 7 or 8? 3. Or do we want to remove it entirely. Likewise, for Provision C, our decision today will be; 1. Do we want to keep the sufficient language skills requirement, and decide and have another committee decide on a score on the ELPA that would demonstrate sufficient English language skills? 2. Or, do we want to remove it all together? You may recall that we gathered feedback from different stakeholder groups including staff, who worked with the population affected by this policy, and students. Our community outreach groups were not productive, and we received no feedback from them. Carmen asked for clarification as to who were the community	

Item	Discussion	Action
	groups we reached out too. Ben referred to slide on page 5 where it lists the groups. The groups were ones that the EL Advisory Group ask us to target as well as a few others. We have also created a survey for parents and chose the seven most languages in Oregon in terms of number of students. We have provided the survey to districts in online format for English and Spanish and pencil format for all surveys. The goal for the survey was to get productive parent input in language that would be readily understandable to someone who is not familiar with this policy. Ben referred members to the survey that they received in their packets for review. As previously mentioned earlier, our goal today is to decide on the enrollment limit. Should we retain that limit, or revise it to have a different number or, should we strike it all together from the OAR? And likewise, the sufficient English Language skills provision, should it be retained as is, or also eliminated from the OAR's? Ben showed the data that we got from the parent survey and then we will ease into discussions and then hopefully voting. On slide 13 it shows the OAR currently and on the following it shows how the OAR would change if we took any given decision. So, on the second page on the top it says, "Outcome of each decision point" and under provision B, you can see what the effect of the OAR would be for a retained, revised or remove. Ben had the group review this and then came back together and discussed it. During the group's review of the provision B, Carmen and Ben had a discussion about the community groups that did not provide feedback. It was agreed that we would reach back out to them and provide them an opportunity to provide feedback and too make sure their voices are heard in this process. We just wanted to let everyone know. State Board's first read is March 21st, 2019 so, we will make every effort to get feedback before then. Frank asked if we can extend the feedback to the board in order to get what we are needing. Ben, said yes however, we would like to get this implemented prior to the next school year. Carmen stated that we will be	See PowerPoint for specific details on presentation. At this time members reviewed and discussed amongst themselves.

Item	Discussion	Action
	working together to set up a meeting with the community groups that did not respond. We will work on doing this asap as their feedback is very important to what we are discussing. Ewa wants to know what guarantees that ODE does not have an agenda when it comes to this. Ben clarified by summarizing Zoe Larmar's summary of the State Board position; ODE has the freedom to make any recommendation, if ODE were to make a recommendation that was in opposition to the feedback of multiple stakeholder groups, there best be an awfully very good reason for it. His intention is that these recommendations mirror the feedback of our stakeholder groups that so far, are in agreement. Carmen clarified that ODE does not have an agenda and went over ODE's three stances. We are student centered. Equity Decision tool, stakeholder. We value the voices of our stakeholders, students and teachers. Our agenda is the greater good for our students and what is the best thing for our students through an equity lens. A motion was made in favor of eliminating provision B from the OAR. Group voted 11 in favor of removal and no oppositions. Ben stated that we will be reviewing provision C too. Tim Blackburn asked if perhaps a different method will be used rather than a survey. Ben stated that in an ideal world a better option would have been face to face dialogues with parents in regions around the state. The survey was not as desirable but, more feasible on options we were laboring under. They did try to conduct a survey that was more parent friendly. Ben please read the exact OAR changes that would result from a vote to either retain or remove. And then will open up for discussion on parent feedback means regarding these provisions. There were questions regarding language of origin and Ben addressed them during the meeting. Members read the OAR and a motion was made regarding provision C by Ewa and Janice to remove. 11 members were in favor and zero against. There is a strong majority of removing provision C. There is a strong	Members voted on removing enrollment B with 11 in favor of removal with no opposition. Ewa motioned to remove provision C in the OAR and It was seconded by Ewa.

Item	Discussion	Action
	majority in the panel to remove both provision B & C. We want to make sure that we get all stake holder input. Ben is going to try to get the stake holder feedback as soon as possible before the 2019-2020 school year. Preference is what we would like used instead of language of origin. Ben thanked everyone for their discussion and for returning and engaging with this topic. He is available for any further questions. Please feel free to reach out. It is our intendent to hear as many voices as possible before we make a recommendation to the state board.	
Working lunch – Funding Formula – *Kelly 3:26 Kalkofen & Josh Rew*	Kelly & Mirela talked about the new cohort coming up and needing to make changes. We want to get your input and any feedback. As this first cohort starting to wrap up come to an end, we need to start making some decisions about the next cohort. One of the decisions we will be making is, do we want to employ a funding formula? Do we want to take into consideration the size in this next cohort year? With this current cohort of 40 districts, the transformation districts received 180,000 each year no matter how many EL's they had. They got this for four years. We have made adjustments for a couple of districts that were exceptional. We didn't take into consideration their size for this cohort. Do we want to take into consideration for this next cohort that we identify possibly in one year? Target districts same thing for them, except they got 90,000 regardless of their El population. Kelly went over her slide with the group. See slides 3-4 for more detailed information. For the new cohort do we need to apply some kind of funding formula and what does that look like? What kind of factors do we need to take into consideration? In order for districts to get money, under what criteria do they get it? How do we allocate this money? What else should we be considering when allocating money? This is what we'd like to discuss today. It was asked that given the lack of data would we have done the same. Ewa feels that we need more data before we move on to the next step because this does impact kids. Andrea knowing that we don't have	

Item	Discussion	Action
	the data and knowing the amount of funding needing to support students. Ewa mentioned that there was two committees one was budget and one was programed. She thinks it would be useful if ODE came up with some formula options. Kelly agrees that there needs to be more. This is more of a brainstorming session. Maria is noticing that at a state level, all the districts would have to be on the same page with the EL program. What are the results at the state level? Before there was money left money over it and was used for the school district and, not the program or students. I want to make sure that they funds are being used for what they are intended for. Kelly, we do have state level data from SB1564 however, our most recent is our 2016-17 data. The districts themselves and with the individual goals they have set they have real time data where they can see if these funds are being used correctly or appropriately or effectively. This is where the external evaluation comes in. We will have that data but, we don't have it today. What we have at the state level is the El legislative report data. Once again, we can't use this to enforce any of the decisions we are talking about here. Carmen understands the historical narrative that has brought us to this point. She is hearing from members that we cannot go forward without certain data. What we can do as a staff what had been some of the success and the challenges. What does that look like and what are you wanting to achieve. Hopefully this will give us more funding give additional assistance to the children. Carla asked what have you learned from this and what would you want for the future? Maria in regard to the funds if there was money left over would those funds be rolled over or, would they be lost and given back. That is something that needs to be clarified that districts know what they are able to spend. Kelly went over how it worked and answered Maria's questions. Each district fills out a needs assessment and requested a certain amount of money according to their needs. So, when we say target districts had 90,000 they had up to 90,000. If, they only needed 80,000 and requested that then that is what they got. Because the funds were so flexible what	

Item	Discussion	Action
	procurement had allowed is for the funds to roll over to the next school year but once the four years is up they would have to give whatever was left over back if they have not spent all of their money. Frank feels that there is some inequities in the funding and that Scappoose and Reynolds have been given major different amounts per student.	
Possible Indicators for New HB 3499 Cohort – *Josh Rew*	Josh Rew went over where we started from. This is an aspect of 3499 that will come up at the next cohort. That is how we identify these school districts. Several years ago, when the process started there was two groups. One group was about outcomes, how we identify school districts. At that time, it was discussed was what was important and what should be used. So before in 2015-2016 we came up with these indicators and now in 2018-2019 things have changed. At this time Josh went over his presentation. See handout for more detailed information. He went over the indicators used and showed where we came from and where we are at now. Things have changed a lot. No child left behind occurred in 2001 and it was a federal accountability. Under that, there were three indicators involved; Achievement, participation and graduation. If you were a school that had an * by it and didn't have enough students, we used attendance as an indicator. Years later we were allowed ESA flexibility. This gave us the ability to do similar stuff as No child left behind. But we were able to add another indicator to this and It was growth. After high school flexibility came along, HB 3499 and there was no federal barriers or ties. At this time were given the green light to come up with what is the best set of indicators to identify districts in Oregon. We came up with four; ELPA Growth, Math Grown, Graduation and Post-Secondary enrollment. These four are different from what we did with the ESA flexibility Weaver and No Child Left Behind. Each of these previous systems informed the next. We look at what worked and what did not. We made changes where we were allowed to. ESSA was passed in December 2016 and once we got going with HB3499 the Federal Government	Handouts were passed around for his presentation.

Item	Discussion	Action
	changed everything. If you look at the indicators for ESSA it is very different from all its predecessors too. ESSA is about school and federal accountability. If you look at his handouts there are two arrows 1. HB3499 2.0 What we plan to do next 3499 and ESSA 2.0, what do we plan to do with the next generation? This takes years to prepare. What are we going to do to identify districts for Hb3499 2.0? See handout for further details. Josh went over HB3499 indicators and talked about its strengths and weaknesses. There was talk about what to do when a district meets their ADA goals and not get re-identified? Josh indicated that we need to have business goals and set them. We have a choice, we get to choose what works best for Oregon. We don't have to follow what the federal government was us too follow. We have flexibility and we need to think about that. What is our theory of action? We as a department need to revisit that and remember what our theory of action was. As a group we need to come together and decide if that is the course we want to stay or adapt it, enhance it in order to determine what indicators we want etc. etc. We need to create our theory of action or, go back and use the one we originally had or, enhance it and pick what works best for us. This is what we need to decide. Josh was thanked for his presentation. It was very helpful. Parasa stated that we are in a unique time where we take lessons learned from this first cohort of 3499 plus ESSA and all the different school improvement work that is happening and really build on that. It was asked that if we can take the data that is currently there on how group of English learners are doing overtime to inform some of the work we here and turn it into some of the progress monitoring we are doing for 3499. Feels that that information could be really informative to some of this work. We may want to do our own vetting process for the indicators. Josh indicated that he thought that this suggestion was a great idea. Mirela followed up and asked if she was thinking of any long-term outcomes from these students based on the work that has been done thru HB3499 or in general? Parasa indicated both. She'd love to	

Item	Discussion	Action
	see as folks exit and transition from the 3499 work, how are they continuing to sustain that work? That is where a longitude data system would be helpful in informing some of that. In the context of this broader committee since we are looking at the EI Strategic Plan how we might use some of that longer-term information to get a sense of how we are moving along as a state. What are some specific areas we may need to focus on a little more, and how that might impact some of the guidance and technical assistance the state does across different regions. She understands this is a combination of what we know now and tailoring that for the local level. More questions were asked of Josh for clarification and he answered them. Andrea was there any talk about the emotional component do the students feel safe? Social and emotional learning is being paired with this work. Members discussed this. Maria given the example of her daughter emotionally. Her daughter did not need to be in the program but, she felt comfortable staying that the group because of her friends and the curriculum was easy. She did not need it but, it was the fear of going to more advanced classes. Who is there emotionally when they need to advance past that? She feels that many students are similar. Who is there to support and make the student strong emotionally? What would be the support? Josh thinks we should always keep this on the table. Parasa asked what is the timeline for hb3499 2.0 if we do want to make the next cohort? So, we can figure out and organize our time as an advisory group. Josh responded that any changes to indicators will be driving by any changes we make to ESSA. We are already thinking about in three years when we identify the next cohort. For this group, we need to look at the timeline and see what needs to be done and when. By summer of 2020 we need to decide when the system needs to be operational so that information can come out and districts can be aware they've been selected. He stated that Parasa is right, we need to have a game plan with goals, and expectations that will define	

Item	Discussion	Action
	processes that will help this group provide information. Josh wants to know what information this group would want for the next meeting on the 8th. It was stated that we need him to bring up the following. 1. What kind of questions have you ask before, beyond the set questions for the OAKS? 2. What were the responses? 3. Which schools or districts if any are using an SEL curriculum? Are they doing specific teaching about social learning? Josh will research this and come prepared to discuss it at the next meeting on how we used the data. Kelly suggested that we as the districts about the indicators and get their feedback. The group welcomed this idea.	
Gallery Comments, Questions and Concerns	We at this time opened up to our guests for any questions. At this time there was no questions.	
Adjourn	Meeting ended at 2:00 pm	

Next meeting: May 8, 2019 2nd Floor Room 251A/B, from 9:00 a.m-2:00 pm.