

ELL Outcome Advisory Group

Minutes

October 6, 2015 9:00 Am-3:30 PM

Meeting Scribe: Victoria Garcia

PARTICIPANTS

Debbie
David Bautista
Aurora Cedillo
Parasa Chanramy
Chelsea Clinton
Marshall Coba
Maria Delgado-Parent
Rep. Joe Gallegos
Victoria Garcia
Kira Higgs
Cindy Hunt
Kathleen Jeskey
Marisol Jimenez

Wei Wei Lou
David Lougee
Kim Miller
Veronica Magallanes
Toshiko Maurizio
Jessica Nguyen-Ventura
Barbara Page
Ana Ramirez
Chuck Ransom
Brian Reeder
Josh Rew
Carmen Rubio
Myrna Salinas

Joseph Santos-Lyons
Karen Thompson
Ilana Umansky
Anselmo Villanueva
Amanda Wheeler-Kay
(interpret)

By Phone:

Charlie Bauer
Iaw Campbell
Rob Saxton

Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome		What:
Introduction & Welcome	David gave welcome and went over the scope for today. Talked about the models that we will be going over in the meeting. Spoke about elements for today. Looking at the data on elements.	David gave welcome & scope for today. We will be looking at Data today. Work speedily today. Members introduced themselves both those in person and by phone.
Policy Input-Group Exercise	<p>Members were asked to have small group discussion about the number of schools that should be identified for support in large-, medium- and small-ELL enrollment districts. People broke off into groups at their tables. Feedback from table discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Districts deciding needs and flexibility.• Budget 12.5 million were for 2 staff 2 million for ELL plan 10 million is to support. At this time we don't have a plan or know amount for districts. Nothing has been decided yet.• Districts size of population –what re the triggers to define them in that status• Size of school might be difficult• Flexibility and support and what cost it will be? Is it a strategy that can be implemented across the district.• Should they rule out other schools that are already receiving money• Balancing and having state/school• Rational of picking from bottom 15%• Identify schools that• History of low performance• No documentation of serving ELL's	<p>Members will be looking first at the summery then later look at items.</p> <p>They were working on reviewing models –The purpose of the group exercise was to have small group discussion about the number of schools that should be identified for support in large-,medium- and small – ELL enrollment districts..</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking closely to ELL program Having systems in place Great opportunity to define interventions as a state Defining number of schools Plan that aligns system wide What role does ESD have in this? Share resources once districts are identified. History of performance is important 	
Review Models with Preliminary Data-Small group exercise	<p>Brian went over data from where we left off 2 weeks ago. Brian clarified on what we are doing between now and lunch.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Needs Index Raw Data Statistical Model <p>We will focus on those with negative gaps or residuals.</p> <p>Kira explained how the group exercise will be. She also explained what the process of each table will be and that after lunch we will be selecting criteria.</p> <p>Groups reviewed actual data with district names suppressed.</p> <p>David went over for the members on the phone about what was happening with the groups and what they will be going over.</p> <p>We broke for lunch at 12:30-</p>	<p>Members worked in a group setting to discuss these models</p> <p>Chelsea, Brian and Josh sat with members at the tables and went over the models. They did this for an hour then the groups rotated tables but ODE staff remained at the same tables to repeat the exercise with the next small group.</p> <p>At this time folks broke off into groups and each found a table with an ODE staff member.</p> <p>Groups rotated again.</p> <p>Tables rotated again to the next tables.</p>
Model & Criteria Selection - Group discussion	<p>Cindy and Kira walked through a visual depiction to capture the direction about criteria that the Advisory Group has built toward over the last two meetings. (See attachment.) They described several discrete components of the emerging framework:</p> <p>At the start, apply HB 3499's stipulation that the following be excluded from consideration: districts receiving district improvement grants, and schools designated as focus or priority under federal guidelines. From there ...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Apply quantifiable criteria. Use objective data and analysis to generate approx 9 initial lists that sort by district. Pay attention to districts whose rank is consistently highlighted across multiple sorting elements. Next, apply subjective criteria (e.g., geographic diversity). This addition of professional judgment supports refinement the initial lists. 	<p>A framework emerged that combines objective and subjective analysis across multiple criteria, while reflecting resources available to ALL districts through HB 3499.</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>3. These two steps produce a list of 25 districts. They will remain on the list with continued monitoring of outcomes for 4 years. "Focus" districts will receive funding and support. "Target" districts will receive support (no funding).</p> <p>4. ODE will engage with these 25 districts to determine which category they enter, perhaps through an application process if they prefer to receive funding. Decisions about which schools in the district participate also will be determined at this time.</p> <p>5. ALL Oregon districts – 196 in total – will have access to the various resources and supports through ODE. These include (but aren't limited to) professional development, MOOC and access to grants.</p> <p>Feedback was shared for each of the three models. A self-designated leader from each of the three groups reported on their discussion, questions and recommendations.</p> <p>Josh's table - Needs Index –lots of overlap and great feedback. Check yellow sheet(Anna spoke, Marisol)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some kind of desegregation of indexes-example students by ethnicity and race • Refugee inclusion • Large group • Variables, consistent across the board • Removing the identification of the children who are ELL's • Defining qualitative work • ELL's not reported • Shared concerns of race and ethnicity • How many languages are spoken at a district level • Noticed that recent arrivals ???? • Professional judgment • Consider using data from minority educators act to capture data • What is the concern if we combine the weight of needs with outcomes • Seeing if speaking with minority educator's. Could this be a remind instead of a factor? • How do we use the needs Data verses that we need for consistency • Do we weigh all the pieces <p>Chelsea's table - Raw Data</p> <p>If we have 2 districts that have ELL's then we should select the district with the high one</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep it flexible 	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over emphasis on 12th grade data • Growth over time-trace development of districts • Segregate the modified diplomas and not look at them as the other ones • Green check marks indicate what was agreed upon • How do we measure student growth overtime • When we looked at raw data it did not show us the numbers so we can see the variation between districts. • Will there be an option for districts to opt out if chosen. • Youseff- Can we share information with schools <p>Brian's table – Statistical Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for different data that we may or may not have • Is the statistical model appropriate for this? • How do we capture students who leave to Mexico and come back • Can we include districts who fall under the 20 student • Low performing ELL and high performing • How will information help identify schools • Pieces that were missing –post secondary report. How are we capturing that • Students with disabilities • Wanting to know numbers • Many students have higher student percentage rates for those in • Dual Language • Qualitative Data- need better system to allow us to capture that • Questions on ELPA21 • Frank- Language that is used in the legislature. We don't want to influence districts in resources • Understand that we are going to have bad data • District by inn. We don't want to send money to districts to are not serving ell's <p>Kira asked if we wanted to add something around academic rate, what would it be? Smarter Balance was mentioned as a possibility but some expressed concern about it.</p> <p>Maria Delgado expressed concern about the new standards. Said most parents don't know or understand the new standards.</p>	<p>Small group leaders expressed consistent themes on behalf of their groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use actual numbers of students, not just percentages • Don't limit low income analysis to ELL students; look at the community • Combine objective data and subjective professional judgment • There's an over-emphasis on 12th grade / graduation. Add academic growth • Study trends and data over time, not just a snapshot in time • Use asset-based language when articulating the framework, elements, criteria, etc. • Not criteria-related, but important long-term: curate resources for all schools <p>Members endorsed using all three methods (Index, Raw Data, Statistical Model) as part of quantifiable criteria.</p> <p>People who voted 1 or 2 are encouraged to provide written summary of their objection (consistent with the Advisory</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Kira suggested separating out the different pieces of the framework to discuss and endorse them one at a time.</p> <p>Regarding #1) quantifiable criteria (see above) - Some members expressed concern about incorporate the statistical model while others expressed concern about omitting it. Using Fist to Five, the Group endorsed using all three methods for quantifiable criteria. There were several 5's, some 4's and 3's, a couple of 2's and one 1. The member voting 1 noted that _____. One person voted 2, preferring a trajectory over time instead of a snapshot in time. The other 2 stemmed from [].</p> <p>Regarding #2, subjective criteria, Kira invited Cindy to discuss the list that was included in the handout of Draft Rules</p>	<p>Group's decision last month to use modified consensus with room to dissent, and protocols for expressing dissenting opinions.) These will be included along drafts presented to the SBE.</p>
<p>Draft rules & Presentation to the SBE- Cindy Hunt</p>	<p>Cindy went over the Rules Draft for the group. She referred to page 3 of the Draft Rules handout, items 6 a-f. She noted that 6b would be removed – and inserted into step #3 of the broader framework – based on member feedback today and at the October meeting. She reminded the Group that these are draft only. The SBE will see an updated version in December for final adoption. The group asked questions and shared feedback.</p> <p>Kira suggested a Fist to Five vote on the subjective criteria, as modified in the Draft Rules list discussed by the Group.. The Group endorsed them with voting that included 5's, 4's, 3's and some 2's.</p> <p>Kira directed the Group to steps #3-4 of the framework, and how the list of districts generated through the combination of objective and subjective criteria would sort into "Focus" and "Target" schools. While members want some flexibility for district engagement, some voiced concern over district</p>	<p>Members endorsed the modified subjective criteria.</p> <p>Cindy will make further additions to Draft Rules based on Group feedback during today's meeting. These will be presented to the SBE during it's October meeting.</p> <p>Next steps: Cindy asked if anyone has specific comments to get them to her, via Victoria, by Oct 7 to be incorporated into the version shared at the SBE meeting this month.</p> <p>The Group will have opportunity to adjust Administrative Rules before final adoption by the SBE in December.</p> <p>The final step of sorting into "Focus" and "Target" districts was endorsed. Cindy asked Members to forward alternative labels for these two categorizations if they have recommendations.</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>accountability if they are under-performing. ODE staff noted that districts on both lists will be accountable for 4 years. The Group endorsed this approach with the understanding that more details need to be added for further clarification.</p> <p>Discussion resumed about removing from the District Eligibility section in the Draft Rules the need for districts to have enrolled 20 or more English Language Learners. It will remain to allow the SBE and others who provide public comment to note that there are differing opinions about this as a qualifier for eligibility.</p>	<p>ODE staff will provide Group Members with timing details of the SBE meeting on October 22. Members are encouraged to attend if they can.</p>
Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM		
Closing:	<p>David did a closing to the group. He thanked everyone for their passion and reminded them again as to why we are representing the voices of our students in this. Thank you everyone.</p>	

Next Meeting: November 10, 2015