

# EL Advisory Meeting

**Minutes**  
**April 3, 2018 9-2 PM**

## PARTICIPANTS

Andrea Townsend  
 Parasa Chanramy  
 Taffy Carlisle  
 Wei Wei Lou  
 Gustavo Balderas  
 Joel Cisneros  
 Dawn Granger- ESD (phone)  
 Frank Caroplelo  
 Ewa Campbell

Argel Jimenez- Int  
 Carmen Bittner-Int  
 Kim Miller (phone)  
 Markisha Smith  
 Josh Rew  
 Victoria Garcia  
 Kelly Slater  
 Blake Whitson  
 Darryl Tukufu

Susan Merkarski  
 Maria Delgado

### Not Present

Kathy Wai  
 Helen Visarraga  
 Hernan Chavez-Avalos

Item	Discussion	Action
Introductions/Agreements/Gallery Expectations-Kelly	Kelly welcomed the group, thanked everyone for coming, and went over the agreements that we came up with prior. Everyone went around and did introductions.	
Welcome/Update on Hiring Process- Dr. Tukufu/Dr. Smith	Dr. Tukufu announced that our position has posted for recruitment. Dr. Smith announced that it was for Martha's position. We are looking for someone who has EL Research background. We did an internal posting for Rudy's position and we were able to fill that position. Mariana Preschnik-Enriquez, who is currently with ODE, will be joining our team 60/40 split between offices. She will be joining us soon.	Taffy sent out the job announcement to the group.
Pre-conference IFSP to IEP-Kim ( Individual Family Service Plan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data for all EL's who have IEP's</li> </ul>	Kim updated to the group on the English Learners with Disabilities. We had a conference on March 7 <sup>th</sup> , which was at the Eugene Hilton as the ELL Alliance Conference. This conference came about after several folks at ODE presented at the Fall Special ED Conference. We had over 300 educators present, from teachers, administrators, special ED teachers as well as early learning personnel. We hope to have a pre-conference at the Fall Special ED Conference every year and at the EL Alliance Conference every year as well. We hope to continue to grow this capacity at our state. Kim presented her PowerPoint on data. Kim answered questions from members regarding her presentation.	

Item	Discussion	Action
<p>Monitoring districts-Kim</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On site or just desk monitoring</li> </ul>	<p>Would like feedback from group on this next topic. Also wanted to let everyone know that no formal decision on this from the state. <b>Wants to know from group, what works, what does not work.</b> This presentation will be on how we monitor districts and looking at the federal side of this. Keep in mind that when we do this the 3499 team, is also a part of everything that we do. About 90% of English Learners in Oregon, under Title III federal law are also under state law.</p> <p>Kim gave a brief rundown on what the process was before for monitoring. Prior to 2012-2013, ODE did on site monitoring for Title III, and in 2012-2013, we went to desk monitoring. After desk, monitoring then we moved to technical visits with the school districts. Any districts at the time under Title III, we required for any districts at that time under Title III improvement and any school that was a focus and priority school. We have also done a very specific on site if there was an area of concern.</p> <p>Kim went over some of the things that changed in federal law in Title III. They are below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Big changes in ESSA from change Limited English Proficiency to English Learner</li> <li>Changed Title I from Scientifically Researched base to Effective or Evidence based. For Title I, it is Evidence Based and For Title III, it is effective. This means we have to determine, how we are going to measure effectiveness of all of our programs.</li> <li>Under NTLB under English Language Efficiency Standards were required under Title III, now they are under Title I.</li> <li>The requirement for our standards to correspond with common core or content standard is still present and now under Title I.</li> </ul> <p>This could change who is monitoring for federal standards for federal monitoring. When US Dept. of Education comes out, they are looking at Title I to be able to answer the ELP Standards. They will also be seeing if they are aligned.</p> <p>Kim, asked the group for thoughts on how to change Title III monitoring? Keep in mind that desk monitoring is strictly pencil.</p> <p>Wei Wei asked- what is Title I unit planning to do with Title I monitoring? Kim responded that they will continue monitoring as they have been doing. They will continue doing a desk monitor and then followed by an onsite visit, based on the outcomes of the desk monitoring.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Jennifer Gilliland-asked if desk monitoring gave us here at the department enough information on what is happening at the district without doing an onsite monitor? Kim, said, yes, and no. Yes, it does provide information to us, and no, due to complaints on access to programs and instruction to English Learners. On paper, it appears that students have access to everything, but then we get phone calls from parents, community partners that it might not be the case.</p> <p>Kim would love to continue to get feedback on this. Who is best capable, what should we do? Wei Wei asked how to provide this feedback to her. Kim suggested that it be sent to Taffy.</p> <p>Frank Carapelo-having been through both/desk/onsite, he found it to be very useful and valuable. Everyone agreed that the monitoring is needed and good.</p>	
<p>EI Strategic Plan Draft for consideration- Taffy</p>	<p>Taffy went over her PowerPoint and talked about the EI Strategic Plan, and referenced who was on the group for the plan. This has been a work in progress for the last 2 years. The document was made available to members at the meeting. The hope with creating this plan is that it could serve as a tool the districts could use as resources for districts. They could use it for asking questions on how they are doing and for parents. We are presenting this at various stakeholder groups for feedback. Taffy asked members to review and see which one we should move forward with or should we combine them? Members reviewed the document. Does it carries the data we want it to carry? It is straight from the 1564 report. We have counts, percentage of what grade, percentage of when the exit as well as languages spoken in schools.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can we get summary information on the weighted information on the .5 funding? Can we could get statewide perspective.</li> </ol> <p>Taffy said this report is not connected with 3499, It is separate, but we could talk about the state weighted funding and how much districts are spending.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Gustavo also asked if we could include what the average is for the states? For example what is the</li> </ol>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>state wide average of EI Status for comparable points. In addition, what is the dropout rate?</p> <p>Taffy clarified that he is asking for statewide average for all the data points.</p> <p>3. Taffy asked is there any other data points you would like included, especially the indicators we want to know about, especially with what Josh talked about.</p> <p>Parasa asked for growth data to be included. Taffy stated it's on page 5. Parasa would like to see in size off all of what was in the data. In addition, to get a sense of how many students fall in that category? So, she'd like to see the number of grades,</p> <p>4. Wei Wei asked for Strategic Plan timeline, what is the monitoring assets of implementation?</p> <p>Taffy stated that the implementation part is that we are waiting for direction from districts. Right now, there is no monetary consequences since there is no money assigned to it. At this point we have not come up with how to hold districts accountable for using it, when it doesn't have the accountability of any funding.</p> <p>Taffy asked Josh how we could demonstrate how our EL Students are making progress toward that goal of 40/40/40. Josh stated that he would check with Brian Reeder, see about reaching out to other agencies, and collect this information. Blake also spoke about this.</p> <p>Taffy asked for feedback prior to April 17<sup>th</sup> as it would be very helpful as our next EL Strategic Plan meeting is. As of right now, we have 2 more meetings. I would like to share this with districts soon.</p>	
11:00 Working Lunch Question to Consider:	Dan and Holly presented on the Assessment Updates.	
EL Report-Blake	<p>Gave update, we are required to have it posted in the end in June. We are about 2 weeks ahead, so that good. Only a few things have changed. The graphs have changed, so the state averages are clearer. Another change is around assessment data for achievement on both English Language Arts and Mathematics assessment. In addition, we will have a breakdown showing the percentage of EIs that are meeting achievement standards.</p> <p>Putting tables back in the report like prior is not doable at this time due to web accessibility at this time. We will have an excel sheet. Parasa asked if we can put a hyperlink to the excel sheet, where they can download the report? Blake answered; we can put it in the section breaks, here is the link for the excel file. The excel documents is linked in the about section of the report. The Spanish translation version will be ready soon and be posted.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>We are working with our communications team to send to districts. We are looking on getting a list of the title 111 coordinators and sending it out to an extended embargo list. We are hoping to get more feedback on it that way.</p> <p>We Wei asked if we could list data a side by side. Blake said no, not with the way its set up right now. A timeline Prior to the report going out, there is an internal review, then communications, equity team; they offer feedback and then a final version with posting in June.</p>	
<p>Assessment Updates-Holly/Dan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited language of origin options to take</li> <li>• Collecting feedback</li> <li>• ACT?SAT may replace SBAC</li> <li>• Concerns about racial/low SES bias</li> <li>• Centralized scoring for ELPA21 screener</li> </ul>	<p>Dan provided the High School Assessment Option, handouts for members so they can follow along with his presentation. Also, provided a feedback form for member input. Presented his PowerPoint, refer to that for more information. At end of presentation, he is asking for feedback on impact on historically underserved students in Oregon.</p> <p>Asked for feedback on the following questions. What other concerns do you see that could be recorded on the feedback form? These are the actual questions that are on the form</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on historically underserved students in Oregon.</li> <li>2. Do you have concerns on students who are emerging bilinguals?</li> <li>3. Accessibility for Students with IEPs/504s</li> <li>4. Implications for meeting Essential Skills graduation requirements</li> <li>5. High School assessment options available</li> </ol> <p>Ewa asked if we are looking at one assessment or the possibility of multiple assessments. Dan, stated that the ask here is if we wanted to use SAT/ACT for accountability? Frank asked if there was any national consortia or universities that currently accept SBAC in luo of SAT/ACT in any states systems that have gone to that model? Dan responded that around 230 universities accept it. Asked for input on the form he passed out, feel free to fill It out now or on line if you would prefer.</p>	<p>Dan will also send the form out electronically.</p>
<p>Accountability for/of ELs-Josh Rew- Josh went early at 10:50 AM.</p>	<p>Josh presented his PowerPoint and talked about English Learner Accountability under ESSA and the changes under this. ESSA was signed into law on December 10, 2015. Some things we will see in the fall is: No overall Summative rating for a school. Instead, we will identify schools using a profile of accountability indicators. Went over Accountability Indicators, Reporting Indicators, School Identification. Parasa asked how much overlap between schools that have been identified as comprehensive and targeted? Is there a way with our targeted and transformation districts? Josh stated that we would have to look at that. He has seen preliminary versions and overlap.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>He said the hope is that there is some overlap, as that would mean the two systems are working together. Maria asked that in the beginning it was mentioned that the students will not have levels from 1-5, will it be by school, or students, Josh stated that the levels will be only for schools and not for students, unless you are talking about actual student performance on an assessment. Under the slides for Accountability Business Rules, Frank asked Josh to define less than 67% for high schools. Does that mean 4-year graduation rate that is 66.9% will be identified, but that 67.0% would not on question under School Identification? Josh said that in his opinion, anything less under 67.0%. Frank asked if we now when or how it will be clarified? Josh stated he was not sure, but feels that we should, as a department need to clarify, as people need to know what the rule is. Members asked questions and Josh answered them.</p> <p>Parasa asked if when sharing key decisions in advisory groups, to include the long term EI Definition at the federal level, and what we decided on for the state. Would also like to look at the long-term definitions. Josh stated that they would like us to report on students who are 5 years or more, and that is different from what the 3499 group proposed. He agrees that we need to have a solid measure of why.</p> <p>Josh is open to any feedback; please send via email/phone call, if you have any.</p>	<p>Taffy is asking Jon for clarification in how are we defining graduation below 67% rate, is it 4 year or 5 year?</p>
<p>Future Meetings-Kelly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 hours is still enough? Shorten? Lengthen?</li> <li>• Go to quarterly?</li> <li>• Progress Report feedback</li> </ul>	<p>Kelly stated she would be sending out an email to members asking if they would prefer to meet quarterly, which would be August, November, February and May, and still keep it at 5 hours. Group responded that yes, quarterly is good and same length is great.</p> <p>Do are also going to do a landing page that is readily assessable to the public regarding 3499. So be on the lookout for this.</p> <p>Would also like feedback on Progress Report.</p>	<p>Kelly will send doodle poll to members asking for input. As well as a lengthy email, so be on the lookout for that.</p>
<p>1:50 Gallery Comments, Questions, and Compliments</p>	<p>Thank you everyone for your time and feedback.</p>	
<p>2:00 Adjourn</p>	<p>Meeting was adjourned</p>	

Next meeting: August 16, 2018