

# EL Advisory Meeting

Minutes

December 5th, 2017 9-2 PM

## PARTICIPANTS

Andrea Townsend  
Wei Wei Lou  
Frank Caroplelo  
Abdikidar Bashir  
Rosie Santana  
Markisha Smith  
Victoria Garcia  
Gustavo Balderas  
Patti Anda (Int)  
Darryl Tukufu

Kelly Slater  
Argel Jimenez (Int)  
Joel Cisneros  
Kim Miller  
Taffy Carlisle  
Maria Delgado  
Gloria-Teacher of the Year YEEES  
Jennifer Gallililard  
Josh Rew  
Ben Wilcott

Susan MerkarSKI

### Not Present

Kathy Wai  
Ewa Campbell  
Helen Visarraga  
Hernan Chavez-Avalos

Item	Discussion	Action
<p><b>9:00 Introductions &amp; Agreements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome from Dr. Tukufu</li> </ul>	<p>Kelly went over Agreements with the group. Kelly stated that we have a slight change to our agenda today. Gloria Robertson – Teacher of the Year is with us to day to share her story. We also have the ESD EL Specialist here with us today and they will report out on their progress. Everyone went around and introduced themselves.</p> <p>Dr. T gave his welcome to the group and thanked everyone for their hard work they’ve done this last year. Dr. Tukufu also mentioned our Acting Deputy Assistant Superintendent Colt Gill may be able to stop by and say hello to the group.</p>	
<p><b>9:30 ESD EL Specialists Report Out- Introductions from Kelly Slater</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brittany Deckard and Katie Agee (Willamette ESD)</li> </ul>	<p>At our last meeting Kelly gave a brief presentation on what been happening with the EI Specialist and this time they are here with us to report directly to the group. The EI Specialist have been hired now and they have been out in the field working with districts. They will each give us an update on the work they are doing and some of the experiences and what they are doing.</p> <p>Brittany- reported that their primary task is working with districts that have 20 or less EI Students in their districts. They’ve noticed with the work they’ve done so far that ELD teachers support is a huge need especially in the smaller areas. It’s been great being to go out and support teachers directly and also support administration in setting up an ELD Program in which all students are being served. They also serve Linn and Lane counties as well.</p> <p>Katie- Reported that she has worked in the valley a long time in small rural districts. It was important for her to branch out and give opportunities for those other districts who may not be less than 20 and not have many resources like Salem-Keizer. They’ve set up a PLC situation which is set up in Polk-Yamhill County where they had their first one and they had 5 districts who were able to send their ELD teachers. It was refreshing for them to be able to come together and share stories and lay the ground work for their next</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Janice Scudder (Clackamas ESD)</li> </ul>	<p>steps. Those next steps will be continued lesson planning and professional development. So, now they have a network on their side of I-5. We plan to also have that available on the east side of I-5 in more of our Marion County area where we have about 12 districts on that side. We have a lot of good stuff going on.</p> <p>Housed at Clackamas ESD- She currently serves 2 districts with Clackamas ESD. She serves Sisters all the way out to Sherman and Napa which is east of Astoria. She is active right now in 7 out of 10 districts she's been asked to serve.</p> <p>She also works in collaboration with Northwest Regional ESD, in which she goes into districts and uses their local and national data to have conversations with their administrators and ELD K-12 teachers. From there they are building together individualized professional development based on local need. Below are some examples of what she is doing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Rainer she has professional development scheduled from now to the end of the year. She is also working with K2 teams on data driven decision making on how to use data to move instruction forward.</li> <li>In Banks working with the administration to help support the K12 ELD teacher. They plan on doing some instructional walk through next week to see how she can best support teachers in the K12 system.</li> <li>In Napa she is putting together a professional development program working in conjunction with ELD teachers. She is also mentoring 2 teachers there and working with the superintendent and the 2 principals that are in the district.</li> <li>In Colton she is putting together a professional development session on development academic language based on teacher survey and needs. The means helping them create those teacher needs surveys and from there differentiate professional development for teachers based on their specific needs.</li> <li>In Sister's met with the superintendent and principal, working with the new K12 teacher. She'll be back out to Sisters again in January.</li> <li>In Sherman which is about 3 hours from the ESD-It's a small community. She got a great welcome reception from them. She is working with them on writing their EI Plan which is due in February.</li> <li>In Gaston she is doing math coaching for a 2<sup>nd</sup> grade teacher.</li> </ul> <p>Everything is different depending on the districts she is working in at the time. She loves her job and she is meeting people who are excited, so this is great to have this opportunity.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dawn Granger (South Coast ESD)</li> </ul>	<p>Works for the South Coast ESD and this is a .6 position for her. She is doing much of what the other ladies have talked about. She is also the RAP lead for South Coast Connect for Success. She also serves Reedsport to the California boarder and into Southern Oregon. Currently works activity with 6 of her 13 districts.</p> <p>She is also able to bring in the community partnerships in working with Boys and Girls club, Hispanic Leadership Committee, and will be looking at how STEM fits in and everyone can access that STEM curriculum. As a former administrator she is able to have a conversation with the district at multiple levels. Having been an EI Teacher, one of the great things in working with them now is having this vision for Equity and making sure everyone feels welcome. One of our districts is wanting a district wide Equity plan. Our consortium team would like an Administrative SLOP training to give critical feedback.</p> <p>It's very exciting work and she loves seeing how it's all connecting together and she looks forward to more opportunities to get deeper into the classroom.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ashley Harsin (Intermountain ESD)</li> </ul>	<p>Just had a baby a few months ago. She has not done a lot, but has started some of her initial visits. She is excited in getting back out there and join PLC and help teachers with their professional development.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dotty Brown (Malheur ESD)</li> </ul>	<p>She works with Fields School District where they have 1 EL. Been able to go in and help get curriculum for the teacher. Works also in Arob where the teacher is pregnant and will be on leave soon. She will then have to go in and write curriculum and teach classes once a week for this student. She is also working with the transformation district which is Nyssa in helping them with administrative stuff like evaluating teachers advance their EI skills. It's been really great to look at professional development and bring that out to that area. Not everyone wants to go out to that part of the state.</p> <p>Is just absolutely loves to be able to do what she is doing now.</p> <p>Kelly asked if anyone had any questions for the presenters? Parasa thanked everyone for coming to our meeting today and how exciting it is to see that work that is happening. We started this 2 years ago and to now see it going is great. It gives us hope. Parasa asked the group the following questions.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What advice would you give us as advisory group members looking forward; in terms of how the state might better improve supports on the ground?</li> <li>2. Whether it's in your particulate role or based on trends in the first couple of months in your role?</li> <li>3. What would be helpful for us to consider?</li> </ol> <p>The ESD EI Specialist responded that if there was a capacity to place someone in the High Desert area, that would allow for more in-depth work in that area so they are not spread so thin. They are hoping by year 2 we can do into a deeper dive. Right now they are doing more triage with putting out files and getting things off the ground. We'd like to be more intentional with that in year 2 and foster closer relationships with districts that are more geographically closed to where they are housed.</p> <p>Just know that districts are really trying and are doing a good job.</p>	
<p><b>10:00 Update on additional data for districts on HB 1564-Taffy</b></p>	<p>We will be going over some data today. Both she and Kelly have gone out to their districts and as they are preparing to write their new plans for his year or continue with things they've done in the previous year, we asked them to look at data. We've look at the EL State Report, which is what we are going to talk about now.</p> <p>At our last meeting we shared the state level of the 2-year comparison for the EI support. This year for right now we are only looking at the 1564 report for 15-16 school year, which is the most recent report out. The 2-year report that is out already are the 2 years prior to being identified as a 3499 district as targeted or transformation district. This data is showing how you were and now you have your funds, and this next year, we will be able to look and see how you've done with the funds. We need to look at next year's report and by then we'll have 2 consistent years of the same data. When we had the 14-15 report, we had a different proficiency test, different cohort of math students that were taking into account. We are really looking forward to this version.</p> <p>Taffy shared with the group and both her and Kelly are working hard to support the districts. Taffy shared that Rudy is no longer here at ODE. Kelly shared that we are here to support the districts. Taffy went over the New District Assignment that are shared between her and Kelly. They both have been out and visited all the districts and wanted to let everyone know that the work continues even with Rudy gone.</p> <p>Taffy gave her presentation. See PowerPoint for more detailed information. Taffy asked who's look at the 1564 report for the school year 15-16? (52 min)</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Taffy went over her PowerPoint and touched on each subject.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• El Weighted Funds-Spending above 100% some spending under</li> <li>• Number of ELS: Current &amp; Former-Andrea Townsend asked if Monitored students are included in this chart? Taffy said they are in the Former chart.</li> <li>• Poverty by Percentage: Current &amp; Former- Taffy indicated that the Red is current and the Blue is former. Abdikidar asked what is the different in the timeline when you say former and current? Taffy responded to his question by referencing the chart on her PowerPoint.</li> <li>• District Count-Languages Spoken</li> <li>• Homeless EIS (Red is current &amp; Blue is former)</li> <li>• Recent Arrivers</li> <li>• Migrant Student Percentage</li> <li>• ELPA21 Growth-</li> </ul> <p>Wei Wei asked the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>How many students scored at that level in more domains? For instance, are they reading, writing, speaking and listening?</b></li> </ol> <p>Taffy said that we don't have that and that we can work on that. Taffy explained that her chart is all 40 districts however, she doesn't have it broken down by student count or their individual ELPA21 scores.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>How does this compare to non HB3499 school districts?</b></li> </ol> <p>Taffy explained that she did not do a break down for that either, this is just for the 3499 districts. We can do a comparison between them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. <b>Wei-Wei asked if we already had some kind of report for this?</b></li> </ol> <p>Kim said not for this we don't.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. <b>Wei-Wei asked what format do we have and maybe we should have that format in comparison to HB3499 districts?</b></li> </ol> <p>Kim said that we don't have it broken out that way yet, but we can. Jos also stated that this is something we can do. Josh went on to explain that in the 1564 report shows each of these 4 domains in medium growth percentiles for each district in the state. Josh said we can do a report however, it will just take some time to retrieve the data from the report and put it together.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. <b>Was this growth between 2 years of ELPA testing?</b></li> </ol> <p>Taffy said that this was just last year. What she is presenting on now is just the state 2 year. Taffy asked if the group would like her to put together a 2 year together for both reports for district wide instead of state wide? (1hr) Some members wanted to know if they could name the districts that are listed in the report?</p> <p>Also good to know that this is 15-16 data and it was before it was before the SD were identified. Gloria asked what ethnicity,</p>	<p>Josh will do a break down</p> <p>Taffy said that we can get for the next time for the 165 districts.</p> <p>Josh will work on getting this report done.</p> <p>Josh, said yes, this can be done.</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>language, social status because that will affect what they produce. Wei Wei asked for clarification on the chart. Josh answered everyone's question. Markisha-stated to make sure we are mindful on how we are conversing and having dialogue about predictors for outcomes and we have to be very careful about in which ways people want to see this. Let's also be mindful on ways on how out students and families come to us, regardless of what that is from an access based lens rather than a deficit based lens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Math Growth</li> <li>• Math Standards- 2014 report- Current ELS have current difficulty meeting math standards (see recording)</li> <li>• ELA Achievement Percentage</li> <li>• 5<sup>th</sup> Year Grad Rate-Is in the 1564 report- Abdi asked for the number of districts.</li> </ul> <p>Group would like to look at this data more in depth at our next meeting. Our next meeting is in April and the next report will not be out yet, but we can look at this data in more depth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drop out Rate- Most districts are doing very well.</li> <li>• Freshman on Track-Taffy went over this and the group wanted to know what does this mean? Taffy explained that Freshman on Track means that they have whatever the district has determined of 5-6 credits at the Freshman year. When they meet with the districts, she asks them, what does Freshman on Track mean in your district? Look also at our middle school students to help prepare them for high school. Wei- Wei asked if it's the same chart concept as the previous chart and josh stated that these are just percentages. 1.</li> </ul> <p>1. <b>Wei-Wei asked if we have any comparison to the previous year can do comparison?</b> Taffy said yes she can do this for comparison.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-Secondary- Concern was brought up that school districts are not meeting the needs of the students as far as keeping parents in formed nor are they properly informing them of what is happening with their child in the program. Taffy stated that the school district should be communicating with parents by sending out a letter in their language. A lot of times the districts will assume and send home a letter based on the child's surname. This should not be a determining factor.</li> </ul> <p>Joel also how do we know that districts are doing what they said they would be doing? Taffy said that when she meets with her districts they go over their plan from the year before. She does see 3499 money going towards advancing parent communication and not just document translation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELs with Disabilities-one school had 30% identified as having a disability</li> </ul>	<p>Josh can get this for us.</p> <p>Taffy will have this for our next meeting.</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
<p><b>10:40 Biliteracy Seal Update</b></p> <p><b>Break 10:50</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Chronically Absent-means kids coming to school</li> <li>• Discipline Incidents-28 districts said their current ELS have low numbers of disciplinary incidents.</li> </ul> <p>We are in our 2<sup>nd</sup> year of Goal Implementation. We've had 1 year as a pilot year and 2 years of implementation. Taffy went over the criteria requirements; they are as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet graduation requirements</li> <li>2. Pass essential skills in Reading, Writing and English by district pathways</li> <li>3. Score at the intermediate High on a Partner language assessment in all 4 domains.</li> </ol> <p>These are the requirements for the Biliteracy Seal.</p> <p>See Taffy's PowerPoint for more detailed information.</p>	
<p><b>11:00 Title III for ELs &amp; Accountability-Kim</b></p>	<p>Kim passed out her PowerPoint to the group and advised that we will have folks from ODE also present on this. Talked about English Learner Data from 15-16- We went over 61,000 in 2017. We made a jump of 5,000 in 1 school year. Most of our English learners over 75% are in our K-5 settings. Our Middle and High Schools ELs are shrinking. We have less than 8,000 ELS statewide, 9-12 enrollment. If a school declines Title III services, they are still held accountable on our state report card and meeting all OCR requirements and all the state laws. See PowerPoint for more detailed info.</p> <p>Holly Carter and Ben Wilcox came and spoke to the group. Holly &amp; Ben presented on their PowerPoint about ELPA 21 Screener Timeline &amp; ELPA 21 Screener Scoring Options. See handout for specific details on this</p> <p>We were assuming we'd be going with a local scoring model, but as we've had more information around the turnaround time for centralized. We wanted to open that question back up and get feedback from stakeholders to help inform which model will make the more sense for Oregon, at least the first year or two of that transition.</p> <p>Below are questions they asked of the group. They want to know from the groups perspective, the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the relative benefits and risks to districts of pursuing centralized scoring compared with local scoring?</li> <li>2. If ODE pursues local scoring, what considerations should ODE factor into the development of a training model?</li> <li>3. If ODE pursues centralized scoring, what consideration should ODE factor into its negotiations with the scoring vendor?</li> </ol>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p data-bbox="532 149 1218 220">4. What other questions should ODE consider to inform a decision?</p> <p data-bbox="483 331 1247 583">We are discussing the first two questions, and Wei-Wei wanted to know if there was a cost difference? Holly said not at the state level in terms of our contract, it would stay the same. Where we are trying to do something else is at the cost at the state level for supporting training, but also at the local level, what those implications would be there for supporting training at the local level. Some questions were asked.</p> <p data-bbox="532 590 1157 625"><b>1. Would we have to pay the vendor for scoring?</b></p> <p data-bbox="483 625 1247 695">We would not have to pay the vendor for scoring them it would be included in the contract.</p> <p data-bbox="532 699 1247 842"><b>2. Are there any other added benefits? It would be great if we could get access to evaluation research. If we went with a vendor how would we get access to that? Would that be part of the deal?</b></p> <p data-bbox="483 846 1258 1129">Holly stated that our test vendor AIR, also happens to be the test vendor that the consortium has negotiated with for the states they provide central or comprehensive support for. So, only one state is using a vendor other than AIR across the consortium. We do have data sharing agreements with the consortiums that they are getting from all the member states that they can use do research and analysis that then comes back to the states as part of our membership with them.</p> <p data-bbox="532 1136 1258 1245"><b>3. The states that have used centralized scoring, do they have relatively the same number of ELS that tested in a year as we do, or what do their numbers look like?</b></p> <p data-bbox="483 1249 1247 1608">Kim stated that our neighbors to the North. They have a larger EL population than we do. Ohio in the ELPA21 consortium is our closest peer. They have about 60,000 English learners. They also have Amish students who are English learners. When we go to talk with about ELPA21 computer assessment in Speaking and Listening, they have to think in the cultural requirements for that potential population. That is another reason why they take a little more time with us, as their students are not allowed to participate as we can imagine. Holly said that Ohio is currently also pursuing a local scoring process, and planning on rolling that out next year.</p> <p data-bbox="532 1612 1227 1682"><b>4. On average, Washington needs to have their scores back?</b></p> <p data-bbox="483 1686 1247 1791">Washington has a state law that they have to have their identification within 7 calendar days, it's a state statute. They have been meeting that deadline.</p> <p data-bbox="532 1795 1247 1938"><b>5. What is the intended purpose of this? Is it a performance driven test? Are we looking at other factors like environment where students will be when a student is doing the test? Who's testing them?</b></p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Kim, stated that the purpose is to determine if the student needs additional support as an English Learner to inquire English. It is a high states decision, and will impact a student's academic career and what classes and supports are offered.</p> <p>Frank expressed concerns for the potential of reducing bias. We've heard lots of issues where concerns are raised on identification process. Frank asked the following question based on his comments.</p> <p><b>6. Frank asked if the states that have gone to centralized scoring, have they done any side by side scoring studies to show that there is an advantage to one over the other?</b></p> <p>Holly stated that this has not been done currently. The pilot that was done and one that our districts participated in were done using a centralized scoring model. To date no one has rolled out a local scoring or implemented local scoring on any scale for the screener.</p> <p><b>7. If the goal is consistence and reliable scoring across the state, are we assuming that the centralized staff scoring these assessments are trained in a way that ensures their reliability?</b></p> <p>Both Holly and Kim states that, Yes, they are. The people doing this are trained individual and know what they are doing.</p> <p><b>8. If we look at this from a state wide perspective, would a centralized scoring model benefit any of the 120 or, so small districts that struggle with staff turnover or getting to training? Would this be something that benefits students and districts?</b></p> <p>Kim that right now we have a new district that has 2 ELS in their district. Halfway, Oregon is the place. They've never had an English Learner nor do they have an EL Plan. Two years ago, Juntura School District had 12 students in it K-12, and last year they had 2 students. So, yes the centralized scoring would help our more remote districts with those very small instance numbers and we wouldn't have to worry about which ESD can we borrow a screener from, and who's going to score it.</p> <p><b>9. Parasa asked if ODE, or the vendor provide training around the assessment literacy, or how to interpret the results from the screener, so folks have support there especially if you are in small rural district.</b></p> <p>Holly stated that it's something ODE has been looking at that Professional Development around score interpretation, and how we can do a better job supporting that piece.</p> <p>Joel is leaning more towards centralized scoring based on some of the comments that were made, and considering that the stakes are so high. He'd also like to know what are the conditions during the delivery of the administration of the test? Also, what is happening when that child is taking the test? Holly stated that right</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>now we are not making a firm decision, but we want to get an idea by show of hands what the room is supportive of ODE getting firmer data on what centralized scoring would entail and bring back to the group and other stakeholder's. We are taking a vote with fist to 5 with it being, please go forward, and do more pursuing on centralized scoring and a fist is, absolutely not.</p> <p>Group took a vote for moving forward. We will take these comments to other advisory groups as well. Holly stated that we have a planned meeting AIR next week and at that meeting we will be talking about screener implementation timeline. From earlier discussion with them it sounds like they would need 4 months to build the hand scoring system for teachers to access. If we are talking about live on August 1, we need to have a firm decision to them by April 1, 2018. This will give us roughly 3 ½ months to get information from them and report back to you at your next meeting.</p> <p>It was suggested by the group to ask AIR if they have suggestions around assessing kindergarteners in September on the computer, since they are the majority of elementary kids that would qualify. This is their concern of them moving from paper, pencil where they are interacting with the teacher and moving to a computer to where is different. Kim said yes, they can do that and get more guidance. Kim and Holly confirmed for the group that these tests will on be on the computer.</p> <p>Milestones- Kim went over some milestones since August for 2017-2018. See PowerPoint for detailed information. Also went over Upcoming EL Projects and Upcoming Events.</p>	<p>Group voted to move forward and look at centralized scoring more.</p> <p>We will reach out to you and communicate via email and surveys to get your feedback.</p>
<p><b>12:00 Working Lunch-</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion on Kim's presentation</b></p>	
<p><b>12:30 Teacher of the Year- Gloria Pereya-Robertson</b></p>	<p>Gloria gave her presentation. She is 2017 Oregon State Teacher of the Year awardee. She is the 3<sup>rd</sup> Latina in 62 years of the Teacher of the Year Program to receive the honor of this award. She has been a kindergarten teacher for 21 years. She has taught in San Diego for 6 years doing a 90-10 bilingual program, and then came to Oregon with the intention to teach a Dual Language Program, but Reading first came in and whipped it out over the summer. She had brought all her Spanish materials with her and then found out she was teaching an English only class.</p> <p>Gloria gave her testimony of how she became a teacher. She is 1 of 20 teachers in her family with 19 teaching in Mexico. When she first started as a teacher in the San Diego Unified School District she went in under an emergency credentials and when she walked into the class classroom, she had no teacher training at all. She had just enrolled into a teacher program, she had her bachelor degree in Spanish literature. They put her into a room and said if you want to stay you can have the job. She stayed and that is how she became a teacher. Gloria talked about her experience with</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>teaching and her ups and downs in her education career. She has a Master's Degree in Bilingual Cross Cultural Education. The group thanked Gloria for coming and sharing her story with our group.</p>	
<p><b>HB 98-High School Graduation presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Janell Ives, Jan McCoy, Susy Mekarski</b></li> </ul>	<p>Jan McCoy and Janell Ives introduced themselves to the group and gave their presentation on Measure 98. They'd like for the group provided feedback to what they are presenting. Jan stated the purpose of this bill is about improving freshman on track, improving graduation rates and to better prepare students for after high school. See PowerPoint for specifics on what Jan and Janell spoke about.</p> <p>Susie- Talked about the tool and how great it works and how it worked in Chicago when she was there. Susie mentioned that Janell and Jan and several others will be going with her to Chicago and will be attending the Network for College Success which is at the university of Chicago. Stand for Children is sponsoring 7 School Districts to go to Chicago to see how this works first hand. For districts that are not going the Network for College Success, they do offer a tool kit that can be downloaded from their website.</p> <p>Group worked in a group setting to discuss what does this mean for you? Jan passed out the two slides that have the graphs on them so groups can discuss them. Groups went around and shared out their thoughts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the Latino population dealing with suspension-no materials are given to the student who was suspended so they can continue their lesson for every class they missed. Maria also talked about how the information is not getting to the parent and also the instruction time that is then minimized due to the suspension of the student. It was brought up that how can we help the student so that they are not behind in their learning?</li> </ul> <p>Janel answered Maria's concerns by stating that schools are moving more toward in school suspension rather than out of school suspensions where they include learning outcomes, during those times, and where they involve parents, and where they think about those breaks and what students can do during that time. So, when you see schools truly focusing on that data on an ongoing basis and building systems, you see schools that are now focused on that.</p> <p>Jan stated that they are open to any feedback. Feel free to contact either him or Janell Ives.</p>	
<p><b>1:45 Questions and Closing</b></p>	<p>See Parasa 's email. What she'd like to see in April is she's looking for progress report on year 2 of 3499 and how grant and aid funds were being used and whether or not it was impactful or if more funding might be needed in the future? Kelly talked about we are really just in year 1 and wouldn't have 2017 year. For us to</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>look at outcomes and to see how this money is affecting is really early since we are just in Year 1. Taffy also advised that we wouldn't have SB 1564 out until July and this is a big data piece that we us to see how they are doing. By our next meeting in April, we will not have some of the information you are asking for until probably be in August that we'd have the information</p> <p>Taffy wants to do a survey to see how Technical Assistance has been working for them, she'll get this done prior to our next meeting in April. We'll share this information at our next meeting.</p> <p>Taffy- will bring to next meeting is a draft version with the EI Strategic Plan. We like stakeholder's eyes on it for review. We'd like to bring this to the group at our next meeting and have everyone review it. They'd like to come to various groups at ODE to share their plan with the groups. We will also be taking this to the EI Alliance Conference for more stakeholder input as well. We hope to have by June this product done.</p>	<p>Taffy will put together a survey and will share the results at our next meeting in April.</p>
<p><b>2:00 Adjourn</b></p>	<p>Meeting was adjourned at 2:05 pm.</p>	

Next meeting: **April 3, 2018 9-2**