

EL Advisory Meeting Minutes

[SLIDES](#)

October 8, 2025 9am-12pm

ODE – Virtual Zoom Meeting

PARTICIPANTS

Scribe: Estephany Membreno

Advisory Group Members:	Advisory Group Members:	MME/ODE Staff:
Maranda Turner Elena Collazo Santiago Manuel Vazquez Cano Jason Echeverria Jessica Dougherty Yannett Ayala Araceli Farias	Amanda Kibler Angelie Fitz-Cortez Kevin Blanco Maria Lee Trevor Flaherty Will Flores Xinyu Luo	Mary Martinez-Wenzl Jennifer Fontana Kim Miller Reza Norouzian Mirela Blekic Kelly Kalkofen Gloria Espitia Kristen Rush (TSPC)

Item	Discussion
9:00-9:30: Welcome with extended introductions, Jennifer Fontana	<p>Meeting Recorded for note taking purposes.</p> <p>Name, pronouns, location & role</p> <p>Prompt: Name, pronouns, location, role and favorite fall treat</p>
9:30-10:00 ELOP, Kelly Kalkofen, Mirela Blekic	<p>Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Jennifer extended a special welcome given to student reps Angelie and Xinyu, acknowledging their participation and time commitmentAgenda overview<ul style="list-style-type: none">High-level background on the English Learner Outcomes program.Reza to present on accountability and reporting for English learners.Kim to discuss updates and gather input on dual language data codes.Jennifer to provide a brief update on the Multilingual Learner Strategic Plan implementation.Participants encouraged to ask questions throughout sessionKelly initiated a quick familiarity check with the group using a 1–5 scale in the chat to gauge knowledge of the English Learner Outcomes Program. Goal for today’s meeting is to have participants reach level 2 of knowledge<ul style="list-style-type: none">1 = first time hearing about it5 = could confidently present on itELL outcomes program requires ODE to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Publish annual reports on EL progressReport to the legislature bienniallyEstablish state-level EL advisory group to inform policyAccountability measures<ul style="list-style-type: none">Districts not meeting growth benchmarks must use weighted ADM funds for up to 3 years.After 4 years without progress, funding ends and ODE intervenes directly.First cohort ended in 2020; 3 of 40 districts entered directed funding in 2021.Districts are identified in fall/winter and must submit funding actions by March 1 of the following year.Mary noted funding details and expressed that ODE provides support to identified districts, not just accountability

- Fiscal transparency is a key commitment of the team
- Cohort 2 included fewer districts to allow for more focused technical assistance
- Designation period ran from 2021 to June 30, 2025
- Final data is pending; evaluation is underway to determine which 15 districts will enter directed funding
- ODE must submit expenditure plans by March 1, 2026
- Mary noted advisory work on the ELL Outcomes Program may influence broader state-level accountability efforts.
- Accountability is a top priority for the governor, alongside early literacy and summer learning.
- ODE is focused on aligning its work with these statewide priorities.
- Araceli asked how districts are identified. Kelly noted this question will be addressed later in the presentation
- Mary shared information about district 3
 - Student populations vary across districts
 - Current grant funding
 - Each identified district receives a minimum of \$175,000 annually
 - Funding levels are set with both a floor and ceiling to ensure equity and sustainability
 - Overview of fiscal concerns and sustainability challenges Large grants (e.g., \$1M+) often lead to hiring, which can be hard to maintain once funding ends.)
- Mirela provided an overview of cohort onboarding timeline
- Outcomes of onboarding
 - Districts identified data profile indicators to focus on for the next 4 years.
 - Indicators are tied to how districts are identified and aligned with the Multilingual Learner Strategic Plan goals and intervention categories
- Mirela shared that the annual program cycle begins with technical assistance as soon as districts are identified with support ongoing
 - ODE serves as a hub for EL/ML student administrators and programs, curating and sharing materials.
 - Regular check-ins are conducted, with frequency based on district designation (target vs. transformation).
 - Additional support is available outside scheduled meetings as needed.
- Have partnered with Oregon Kitchen Table to build district capacity for community engagement in Cohort 3.
- Districts will sustain the work after year 1. Feedback is positive, and the partnership spans four years.
- Districts submit quarterly reports to ensure accountability and use local and state data to track progress.
- External evaluation is a key component of the program:
 - ODE has partnered with Education Northwest, a Portland-based research organization.
 - Their role is to assess district progress and outcomes regularly.
 - Evaluation findings from Cohort 2 are already informing onboarding and support for Cohort 3.
 - These findings will also guide recommendations for districts entering directed funding.
- Mirela and Jennifer invited questions/comments
 - Amanda asked for examples of how findings from EDNW's evaluation have been used to refine the program
 - Kelly expressed findings can be shared
 - Mary noted the need to provide the most effective coaching and technical assistance and invited Dr. Vasquez to share insights
 - Dr. Manuel Vasquez explained they are currently analyzing interviews, reports, and research from Cohort 1 districts to align funding use with best practices for multilingual students. Findings will inform future support and be shared at year's end.

10:00-11:00 - Reporting and Accountability Indicators, Reza Norouzian

Notes

- Reza explained the structure of the annual report required by law.
- The report includes five key data categories:
 - Student demographics (e.g., number/percentage of ELs by grade and language of origin).
 - Program duration (e.g., on average years students are enrolled in EL programs).
 - Educational outcomes (e.g., number/percentage of ELs attaining English proficiency).
 - Program and resource data (e.g., district revenues and expenditures for ELs).
 - Additional information as identified by ODE.
- Reza described the current contents of the annual report, which includes:
 - Multiple indicators across demographics, educational outcomes, and access to core content.
 - Student voice data from the newly established SEAT survey, including measures like sense of belonging.
- Participants were invited to share questions or ideas if any information was unclear or if they had suggestions for improvement.
 - Araceli praised the updated annual report as more complete, shared it with her school board (adapting it to their format), and raised questions about whether districts must report on all sections or can report selectively. She seeks clarification on presentation and usage expectations.
 - Jennifer Fontana acknowledged Araceli's feedback, noted making the report meaningful and accessible, and suggested offering guidance for districts
 - Reza clarified data sources for the annual report
 - Will asked whether this data is already incorporated or could be added to future reports.
 - Reza explained the system uses a research-based trajectory to determine if students are on track to exit EL services. He noted the importance of segregating data by disability status, as students with and without disabilities may follow different trajectories.
 - Mary added that, according to research, students starting at level 1 typically reach English proficiency in about 7 years, and those with interrupted or limited formal education may take longer.
- Reza discussed data points required by law that are either unavailable or only partially included in the current report:
 - Average years in current EL program is not tracked and may not be useful for accountability; ODE is considering legislative revision.
 - Five-year graduation rates (excluding modified diplomas) are required but not currently included, only four-year rates are reported.
 - Houselessness data is reported as part of a broader category: SCP (Students Experiencing Poverty).
- ODE is reviewing these discrepancies to better align the report with legal requirements.
- Reza noted that the annual EL report is used to identify ELOP districts, linking it directly to program implementation.
- Reza explained how district performance is rated using key indicators from data profiles:
 - Indicators include academic outcomes (e.g., ELA and math achievement, on track to ELP), engagement and climate (e.g., attendance, exclusionary practices), and college/career readiness (e.g., post-secondary enrollment).
 - Each indicator is scored from 1 to 5, with weighted points contributing to an overall rating per grade band (elementary and secondary).
- EA comparison is being made between EL reporting and accountability data sources
- EL report is a state-level report using aggregated statewide data and trends
- Data profiles serve as an accountability tool at the district level, offering localized insights

- EL report breaks down English Learner populations into:
 - Current ELs
 - Monitored ELs
 - Former ELs
- Data profiles focus on Ever ELs, combining current, monitored, and former ELs
- EL report includes financial data (expenditures, revenues, ratios), while data profiles do not
- Formatting differs
 - EL report ~ 50 pages, details
 - Data profiles ~ 4 pages, concise and district focused
- Recommendations for 2025–26 reporting include:
 - Adding missing data like 5-year graduation rates, houselessness, math and ELA growth (grades 6–8)
 - Including expenditure breakdowns and average years in program
 - Aligning both documents with new metrics from Senate Bill 141:
 - K–2 attendance
 - 3rd grade reading proficiency
 - 8th grade math proficiency
- Mary noted the EL report acts like a state report card for multilingual learners while district improvement is tracked separately
 - Concern exists over disconnected tools and underused data insights
 - ODE seeks advisory input to improve alignment, accessibility, and usefulness, suggesting visuals like dashboards to better support decision-making and legal intent
- Breakout room activity (7 minutes)
 - How (if at all) are the Annual EL Report and District Data Profiles being used in your local context?
 - How can we report more meaningfully on expenditures and investments for MLs?
 - Room 1:
 - EL enrollment is steadily increasing, raising the importance of understanding how funds are spent.
 - A participant emphasized the need for staffing and newcomer programs, such as welcome centers, to support EL students.
 - These programs help identify educational gaps for students with limited formal education.
 - A student representative highlighted that many multilingual learners are unaware of their rights to assessment accommodations, leading to underutilization.
 - Districts should allocate resources to improve accessibility and awareness of these rights.
 - Another participant stressed the need for data literacy training so districts can better interpret data and make informed decisions
 - Room 2:
 - Discussed how the annual EL report is shared with school boards, but may not reach key stakeholders like district administrators and principals.
 - There's concern about limited dissemination and use of the report for decision-making.
 - Suggestion to provide bullet-point summaries instead of full reports to make the data more digestible and actionable for educators and leaders.
 - Full reports may be overwhelming, leading to them being ignored or set aside.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A suggestion was made for districts to present a brief, interactive snapshot of the report during in-service sessions, ensuring staff are informed, aligned, and engaged, rather than just sharing a PDF ● Mary noted ODE is considering future legislative proposals to improve reporting practices and is open to advisory group input on what those proposals could include ● Jennifer shared districts are updating their ML/EL plans and noted it's suggested to merge these efforts with the EL report to better align planning with statewide and local data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Room 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A district colleague shared how they synthesize report data and apply it with local context and anecdotes to support their team. ● Many schools across the state appear to follow a similar approach. ● There are concerns that not all allocated funds are being used directly to support EL students. ● As long as legal requirements are met, there's limited scrutiny on how funds are actually allocated, which raises questions about the appropriateness of current practices.
11:00 Break- (10 mins)	Break
11:15-11:40 Dual Language Data Codes- <i>Kim Miller</i>	Dual language data codes discussion Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kim acknowledged the technical nature of the meeting and encouraged participants to ask questions and offered their email for follow-up support ● Currently, ODE does not collect data on dual language programs at the district level. ● ODE only has data on students with EL status in these programs, not on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Non-EL students participating in dual language programs ○ Educators teaching in these programs ○ Specific classes designated as dual language ● ODE is working to address these data gaps to better support multilingual learners ● Kim stressed the need for state-level dual language program data. ● Currently, ODE cannot report program success or honor multilingualism due to data gaps. ● Next year, ODE will collect data on all students in dual language programs, their educators, and courses taught to assess access and equity statewide. ● ODE plans to use instructional unit identification data to link student class rosters > educator staff assignments. This will allow ODE to identify <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All students in dual language, transitional bilingual, or other bilingual programs, regardless of EL status ○ Educators assigned to these programs ● Kim and Jennifer reviewed and modified definitions related to dual language programs ● Participants were invited to review the updated definition and share feedback to ensure it aligns with their understanding and experiences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Araceli shared that a program should only be dual language if it spans K-12 and is comprehensive. Programs that end earlier (e.g., by grade 5) and aim to transition students into English are considered transitional, not dual language ○ Jennifer noted that dual language programs vary across districts, especially at the secondary level, depending on resources and staffing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ She suggested revising the definition to focus on the goal of bilingualism and biliteracy, rather than specifying program duration (e.g., through elementary school). ■ Clarified that both two-way and one-way programs fall under the dual language umbrella, even though their classroom compositions differ.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Proposed updates to the definition to better reflect program diversity and intent, aligning with feedback from other participants. ○ Mary clarified that dual language programs target bilingualism and biliteracy, while transitional programs support English proficiency. Most dual language programs start in kindergarten and add grades annually, but new programs may not yet qualify for the dual language code ○ Araceli noted that some K–5 dual language programs haven’t expanded beyond elementary grades and questioned if they should still be considered dual language, highlighting the importance of distinguishing growth-oriented programs from static one ○ Amanda asked whether some long-standing K-5 programs might be functionally transitional, based on how they shift toward English dominance in upper grades <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Amanda suggested evaluating not just grade span, but also the program’s purpose and language exposure. ■ Amanda supported the definition of dual language as one where both languages are studied throughout and questioned whether the programs mentioned maintain that balance. ○ Araceli clarified that the programs she referred to maintain a 50/50 language balance through 5th grade <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ These programs may start with a 30/70 split and transition to 50/50, but do not expand to secondary levels. ■ While the goal may be to expand, some programs have remained static, raising questions about their classification as dual language ○ Gloria suggested adding the dual language program definition that its ultimate goal is to support students in achieving the Seal of Biliteracy or Multiliteracy ● Transitional bilingual definition feedback invited <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jennifer suggested removing the word “maintains” ○ In the chat Amanda noted: Maybe “these programs typically are designated for Els. And similar for DL...explain typical student enrollment. ● Questions and feedback invited <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regarding the “other bilingual” Manuel suggested adding clearer descriptions for bilingual program models. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Recommendation: Include language like “this could include other bilingual program models not easily classifiable.” ○ Gloria asked whether the definition should specify if the program involves classroom seat time or alternative methods. Also suggested considering including such credit-earning options in the definition for broader context ○ Jennifer supported a flexible, broad definition of dual language programs, noting examples like early native language literacy programs and heritage language classes, emphasizing the need to include diverse strategies and models ● Kim mentioned a recent meeting with the data collection committee to gather district feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Proposals for next year’s changes due by early December. ■ Internal and district review processes follow. ■ Finalization expected by February and August. ■ Note: These changes will apply to the next school year, not the current one.
11:40-11:55 ML Strategic Plan Update- Jennifer Fontana	Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Jennifer transitions to final topic: an update on the Multilingual Learner Strategic Plan and highlighted where related resources can be found on the website ● Participants provided with a few minutes to read independently ● Jennifer noted team members have been assigned as leads for those actions, and much of the work is already underway (between 12-13 actions)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Three categories of strategic plan actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ODE-led actions: Already assigned and in progress within the multilingual team. ○ Local/district actions: Incorporated into district multilingual learner plans (e.g., community engagement, Seal of Biliteracy tracking) ○ Agency-wide actions: Require cross-office collaboration within ODE; identified as the next major focus area ● Jennifer explained that districts in the ELOP cohort conduct a comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) ● The CNA is part of the district's Multilingual Learner (ML) plan ● Strategic plan goals are embedded in this process to ensure alignment and informed planning ● Jennifer continued to expand on the efforts already achieved with regard to the ML Strategic Plan ● Mary noted that two key aspects of the ML Strategic Plan were featured in the meeting, focus on the EL Outcomes Program and state accountability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Additionally noted dual language program codes identified as essential for setting realistic expansion targets for dual language access in Oregon ● Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maria asked if the visiting teacher agreement for migrant summer programs only ○ Jennifer shared that ODE runs two binational teacher programs, a summer exchange for migrant programs and a year-round visiting teacher program with international partnerships in Spain and Mexico (the Mexico agreement is being updated) ○ Kelly clarified that agreements with Spain and Mexico have existed since 2008, distinguishing two programs: the summer Migrant Program (migrant team) and the year-long Visiting Teachers Program. Natalia coordinates both, and the programs should not be confused ○ Mary highlighted Oregon's leadership in binational teacher programs, noting recognition from Mexico and strong state partnerships. She emphasized the visiting teacher program's role in addressing bilingual teacher shortages, a long-term goal for two-way exchanges, and the growing number of U.S.-born students in Mexico, underscoring cross-border collaboration. ○ Natalia Piar, Multilingual and Migrant Education Program Coordinator, is the contact for both programs ● Jennifer closed the meeting, noted it was information-heavy, shared a survey for feedback, expressed interest in more interactive future meetings, and scheduled the next meeting for January 22 ● Jennifer ended the meeting with a prompt: How was our time together in one word. Participants shared. ● Meeting concluded
11:55 Wrap-up- Jennifer	2025-2026 EL Advisory Meeting Dates (9:00am-12:00pm) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● October 8, 2025 ● January 22, 2026 ● March 12, 2026 ● May 28, 2026
12:00 Adjourn	