OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
Oregon achieves . . . together!

EL Advisory Meeting Minutes
January 9, 2025, 9am-12pm
ODE – Virtual Zoom Meeting

PARTICIPANTS

Scribe: Estephany Membreno

Advisory Group Members:		MME/ODE Staff:	Guest Presenters:
Maranda Turner	Marcianne Koetje	**Mary Martinez-Wenzl**	
Elena Collazo Santiago	Creighton Helms	**Jennifer Fontana**	
Manuel Vazquez Cano	**Norma Ramirez**	**Kim Miller**	
Jason Echeverria	**Gonzalez Stacey Lee**	**Reza Norouzian**	
Jessica Dougherty	**Tereza Bottman**	Mirela Blekic	
Yannett Ayala	**Bill Rhoades**	**Gloria Espitia**	
Araceli Farias	David Contreras-Machado	Kristen Rush (TSPC)	
	Arcema Tovar		

Item	Discussion
9:00-9:20: Welcome - *ODE Introductions, Jennifer Fontana*	*Meeting Recorded for note taking purposes.* Notes: • Meeting opened with attending introductions • Main objective: develop a clear understanding of the Oregon English Learner Report to the Legislature, rooted in the same statute as this Advisory Group. • Input from Advisory group will play a critical role in shaping its content and be tied to the ML/EL Strategic plan and will suggest improved to EL report. • Poll: *How familiar are you with Oregon English Learner Report?* ○ Responses indicated: state of affairs, progress students are making, informational
9.20-9:35: Background and Purpose- *Mary*	Purpose and Background • English Learner Report to the Legislature • Multilingual Learner Strategic Plan • Multilingual Learner Strategic Plan Slides

	Notes:
	• The annual Oregon English Learner (EL) Report is due on July 1 each year. It stems from the same legislation that established the Statewide Plan for serving students designated as English Learners, the English Learner Advisory Group, and the EL outcomes accountability program outlined in House Bill 3499.
	• The report highlights English Learner demographics, progress, and Oregon's significant weighted funding as part of the accountability system.
	• Teresa asked about how districts are held accountable for ELS funding, particularly when funds are reported as going into the general district fund.
	• Mary clarified that accountability is through the English Learner Outcomes Accountability Program. The state monitors progress, identifying districts needing improvement. If no progress is made within four years, the state can take control of directing ELS funding. This process applies to districts flagged for improvement.
	• Yannette asked how to know if a district is flagged.
	• Mary explained that the Office of EDI identifies two cohorts of districts for improvement. When a district is flagged, the superintendent receives a phone call, and the district is informed directly.
9.35-9:50: Sections 1-3- *Reza Norouzian*	Overview of Sections 1-3 and alignment to the ML Strategic Plan
	Notes:
	• Data justice focuses on making all students visible to those most impacted and engaging communities in shaping the research agenda with equity and an asset-based approach.
	• This advisory group is one way to help ensure that the lived experiences of those represented are heard.
	• Reza provided a high-level overview of four key areas in the ML/EL Strategic Plan:
	o 1. Authentic and responsive community engagement through partnerships
	o 2. Systemic improvements in instruction and assessment
	o 3. Transforming education and administration
	o 4. Pathways to multilingualism
	• Tereza noted a significant undercount of identified students.
	• Reza acknowledged the issue and mentioned that it would be discussed later, including the shortcomings and how to address them during the breakout sessions.
	• Jennifer stressed the importance of having student voice in the advisory group and that a mechanism will be in place to support their participation once identified.
	• Resources for reference
	o Brief below came out last year on EL access to core content utilizing Oregon data

	■ https://www.elrdcenter.wested.org/resources-els-access-to-core-content ○ Link to the EdNW Accelerated Learning Dashboard ■ https://sites.ednw.org/or-accelerated-learning-dashboard/
9:50-10:20 **Independent Review** **& Breakout Group** **Discussion,** *Jennifer* *Fontana*	(3) Breakout Room Discussions NOTES • Which components of the report do you find most useful in your context? Why? • What would make the report more useful and/or supportive for your context? What is missing or what suggestions do you have for adding data and/or information?

10:20-10:35 Whole
group share out
Jennifer Fontana
	Whole group share out
	Discussion Notes:
	What other ideas do you have as to how this report and data could be more meaningful?
	
	• Section 1 Demographics - What was helpful or useful?
	  ○ Araceli: Former ELs performer at a higher rate. Noted that speaking another language is not a disability was good to see highlighted.
	  ○ Yannette: Shared that during their group discussion, there was a focus on making room to include a statement or research-based information regarding language acquisition and progression.
	  ○ Kim: Suggestion to tease out EL monitoring.
	• Section 2 Participation in targeted programs - What should be added/suggested. What is helpful:
	  ○ Araceli: Raised concerns about over- and under-identification of students in special education due to a lack of bilingual, bicultural professionals on evaluation teams, suggesting the use of contract services with specialized psychologists to address the gap.
	  ○ Yannette: Affirmed Araceli's input and shared that their district developed pre-evaluation supports to involve language specialists in the process, ensuring multilingual perspectives are included, and suggested statewide support for this approach.
	  ○ Bill: Contributed to the discussion regarding concerns about over/under identification particularly in targeted programs like CTE, advanced coursework, and college credit courses.
	• Section 3 Language Development and Academic Outcomes - Suggestions for improvement or areas to continue/expand:
	  ○ Kim: Appreciated the valuable resources Manuel shared, and the group discussed gaps in grade-level courses.

	o Manuel: Recommended creating a dashboard to view student outcomes at the school level, making data more actionable for schools, though it would require significant investment.
10:35 Break	*10 minutes*

10:45-10:55 Sections 4-5- *Reza Norouzian*	Overview of Sections 4-5 and alignment to the ML Strategic Plan
	Notes:
	
	• Graduation and Outcomes: Current ELs are less likely to graduate in four years compared to Never-ELs and former ELs, signaling a need for increased support and equitable access to academic courses.
	• ML Strategic Plan Alignment:
	    o Priority Area 4, Goal 3: Shows progress towards bilingualism and multilingualism in Oregon.
	    o Priority Area 2, Goal 4: Focuses on providing ELs equitable access to grade-level courses and additional learning opportunities, though challenges remain in ensuring full access and support.
	• Districts are spending approximately 87% of their allocated yield bonds on yield services, and the revenue-to-expenditure ratio has remained consistent in recent years. Funding for ELs has increased at the state level, with 99% of it coming from state funding and only 1% from federal sources.
	• Araceli raised the concern of not just providing access to classes but ensuring students are supported in those classes.
	• Reza shared the importance of not only providing access to courses for students but also ensuring their success once they have access. And noted that the next step after guaranteeing access is to offer additional support structures to help students succeed. This focus should be integrated into policy, ensuring that once students are given access to courses, the necessary support mechanisms are in place for their success.
	• Araceli asked how we can verify/know that districts are spending 87% of allocated EL funds on services.
	• Reza explained that districts collect this data through specific codes that categorize expenditures. They report the data to the office, which is then reflected in the report.
	    o Suggestion: Unpack how funds and spending is tracked in future meetings. Potentially bring in colleagues to help provide context and receive feedback

10:55-11:25 **Independent Review** **& Breakout Group** **Discussion,** *Jennifer* *Fontana*	(3) Breakout Room Discussions NOTES • Which components of the report do you find most useful in your context? Why? • What would make the report more useful and/or supportive for your context? What is missing or what suggestions do you have for adding data and/or information?

11:25-11:35 Whole
group share out
Jennifer Fontana
	Whole group share out
	Discussion Notes:
	
	• Section 4: Graduation and Beyond
	    o Bill: Asks to consider the need for cohort and grade-level data analysis, given the complexity of the variables. He also raised the concern about monitoring students post-exit, as there may be premature exits to address.
	    o Araceli: Noted that when discussing graduation rates, we must also address dropout rates. And mentioned that there is only accounting for students who stay, but we aren't considering those who have dropped out due to a lack of support, particularly among MLEL students.
	    o Manuel: Provided suggestion to categorize the data by key groups, such as by state, demographic, or performance level, to provide more meaningful insights. This approach can help identify trends and patterns that might otherwise be overlooked.
	    o Yannette: Asked how ODE finds EL attendance for students who were ELs in community college.
	    o Reza: Shared that ODE accesses some information through the National Clearinghouse, but data use is restricted, limiting the extent of available information.
	    o Kim: In response to Yannette's question, Kim shared that the agreement allows data use but prohibits resharing. In the past, ODI shared data, but contractual vendors restricted this. Data governance is now exploring ways to address this, possibly through new agreements or direct access to the source data.
	    o Araceli: Highlighted the importance of avoiding stigma for long-term ELs and the importance of recognizing the value of non-bilingual English learners and others outside traditional categories.
	    o Jennifer: Shared that their group discussed Seal of Biliteracy and the importance of being intentional about the data shared. The conversation raised the need to consider the underlying message of each data point and whether it might inadvertently promote harm or negative connotations, especially regarding the concept of being bilingual.
	    o Bill: Questioned whether graduation rates are prioritized over academic proficiency for English learners, suggesting that focusing on graduation

	could impact their access to higher-level education and proficiency. Also shared concerns about whether the criteria for graduation truly ensures that English learners are supported in their long-term educational development. - Araceli: Expressed concern about the capacity to support Latino students at Gresham High, noting that 40% of the student body is Latino, for example. They highlighted the challenge of limited funding and the shift from having one person with historical knowledge to multiple roles, which may be impacting the effectiveness of outreach and support. - Section 5: EL Revenues and Expenditures - Kim: Noted that some data is hard to understand due to differences between data and fiscal perspectives, and there may be system issues affecting how things are coded. She suggested exploring ways to drill down into funding codes to better identify where funds are truly being allocated. - Araceli: Shared that in their group they discussed the uncertainty around how and where funds are being spent, with one person expressing confusion about whether the district knows who is responsible for managing the funds. And that regardless of the language, funding for teachers and students remains necessary. - Stacey: Shared that they seek out counselors and teachers willing to collaborate, and works extra hours without pay. And stated that funding for assessments is still needed. - Jennifer: Emphasized that the report should frame dual language initiatives and the Seal of Biliteracy as essential investments, not burdens. It should clearly outline necessary expenses and advocate for continued support to sustain these programs.
11:35-11:45 *Jennifer Fontana*	Resources for supporting our immigrant, refugee and recently arrived students and families **Civil Rights Unit (CRU) Sanctuary Promise Community Toolkit** **Annotated Resource List for Supporting Newcomers**
11:45-11:50	**Feedback Survey**
11:50 Wrap-up- *Meeting dates* **Jennifer**	2024-2025 EL Advisory Meeting Dates (Thursdays: 9:00-12:00) - October 17, 2024 - January 9, 2025 - April 10, 2025 - June 5, 2025

12:00 Adjourn	