ELL Outcome Advisory Group

PARTICIPANTS

Morgan Allen	Don Grotting	Barbara Page
Charlie Bauer	Kira Higgs	Ana Ramirez
David Bautista	Cindy Hunt	Chuck Ransom
Brad Capener	Kathleen Jeskeyh	Brian Reeder
Aurora Cedillo	David Lougee	Cecilia Salinas
Victoria Garcia	Veronica Maualines	Myra Salinas
Parasa Chanramy	Marco Mejia	Karen Thompson
Victoria Garcia	Kim Miller	Ilana Umansky
Victoria Garcia	Kimberly Miller	Mike Wiltfong
Rep. Joe Gallegos	Jessica Nguyen-Ventura	Laurie Wimmer

Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome & Introductions	Welcome by David & Cindy	
Agenda &ARC of Work for the Advisory Group Discuss Legislative Direction and Intent	Cindy went over the agenda for today. Cindy went over what we will be covering today: SBAC • Offered to all students • Use existing ESD to get resources to all schools? 2016 afternoon • "Why are you refusing the money" • Validity of Assessments/ "if not ELPA what is it?" • Multiple measures of testing out of ELL • Research on program models-why not looking at it? She also called up the folks who helped passed this legislation and they helped answer questions from the group. Why the Timeline? Start with 2016 SY- • Require criteria by 1-16 • Funding impact kids now What was a positive about the bill: Morgan said • Positive Interaction • Positive Support Ryan said • Incentives to more kids out of ELL successfully and quickly • Not punitive Joseph said • Broad consensus: accountability to track ELL Students • System to understand ELL needs-4 year clock & .5 compromise Laurie said	Folks from the Legislation and those who helped draft this HB went up and helped answer any questions the group had.

Item	Discussion	Action
Legislative Intent on District Selection	• "The What" Success for all kids with special focus on ELL • One all Highly variable, by student didn't have good data on district funding: Gave rise to that problem Iris said • Clarity more toward better understanding of funding • Understand schools are not monolithic in in success or challenges • Support share growing Rep Gallegos said • Value of Diversity in o putting together bill together • Participatory • Action • Research • Accountability • Evaluation Ryan- District Selection • Empower Advisory Group. What data districts collect supply to state • Data driven selection Laurie- Data Relevant? • ELPA Growth • Which programs are failing with kids? Which data tells you that? Joseph- • Didn't define # of schools within districts • Wait to see what range of data tells us about districts outcomes • Range of Interventions with 2 levels of districts • District support school support not either or Iris • Program Eval & Review. Not operating in a vacuum –didn't have to start with "STOP" start a exiting work Morgan • Based on Focus & Priority Schools-the baseline • Hoped $ would reach 40-60 schools' • Most schools would come from bulk of 40 schools? • Challenge=school selection Cindy- • 30-35 schools in $10 mm • Focus & priority School (FED) – 4 years in it –no opt in	
State Board of Education- Update	Cindy went over State Board Update. Draft rules were talked about at this time also. Members went over meeting materials that were handed out.	Cindy went over each of the draft rules with the group. They asked questions

Item	Discussion	Action
Review of Draft Rules-Policy Questions	Cindy went over the Rule Draft. Cindy said couple of comments came in over the rules. She showed this to the group. We had member discussion on the Draft Rules. Testimony was given by parent Maria who talked about certain districts not helping certain schools. Public Comments were also talked about that were held during the SBE meeting that took place. Cindy asked- 1. Amend out of the rules to talk about small/medium, large SD. Should not be certain number 2.	Salam said (see recording) 10:52) we don't have enough money to serve every student in the state. Members agreed by vote on this.
Break- Review of Draft Rules-Policy Questions	Break was taken at 11:06 After break Cindy went over the next slide and showed this to the group. Brian Reeder came to assist with explaining data if need be. Cindy talked about target districts and how we want to name them. The group came up with a few suggestions for labeling the districts and not Focus and Priority Schools. They are as follows: 1. Target : Tier 1 & 2 2. Tiered model, data-based prioritizing 3. Emerging 4. Fin. Award 7 Tech Asst 5. Transformation(Learning) 6. Refining Geographic Diversity. Cindy asked the group Should Geographic Diversity be one of the factors the agency decides? Cindy asked Briand and David if we have a small percentage of moving from year to year who cross districts lines. Kim answered because she had knowledge of this. Right now student movement is not a factor Should this workgroup continue past 2017? Cindy said she could not answer this question yet. Laurie said that is was not on the table to be supported or was it talked about during the legislative. Oversight committee needs to happen outside of this workgroup. Both Salam and Joseph touched base on this and talked about the bill. It was talked about how an over sight committee was not part of the bill. Compare data from district to district what is it?	Group came up with some names. They are as follows: At lunch members are to put a check by the name that they like, to be done at lunch time. The group selected by check mark 3 for Target Tier 1& 2, Emerging by 4 check marks, Fin. Award & Tech Asst by 1 check mark & Transformation (Learning) by 4 check marks and Refining had 0 check marks. Group agreed to be double identified by a raise of hands. These schools will be selected about same time as the focus and priority schools. Cindy took temp for room by consensus -Group agreed on geographic diversity stays in. Members voted that they are not sure if this should be a factor. Group voted to form a new committee to advise the agency. Group recommended having this and it passed by a vote of

Item	Discussion	Action
	Refer to recording to capture what group is talking about. They go to fast to keep up.	5's. This was passed to form a new group. Group discussed this with each other.
Lunch	Broke for lunch at 12:10 come back at 12:40 and will continue to work on rules then will do next agenda item.	
Definition of Long Term ELL-Small Group Exercise	Leslie covered for Victoria, 1:00-5:00. Did not hear much of meeting due to not being able to hear. Student coming in as 9th grader would not be considered a long-term ELL	• Biggest districts exit 5th &6th • When do they start? Monitor progress. Aggregative of indicators • Simple= Time in system • Longer not shorter • "7 years" high end of range • Should L.T. ELL students be used to id districts? • Canby study 5 families 100 % in severe poverty high % of Special Ed. • Is there a way to see: Dual- Identified & economic status? • Not exiting kids at high enough level- Should consider it • What are our strategies for LT? • Any K-12, 7+ years. Continuance V. Interruption is key • Learning Challenge Vs. Time • % of newcomers id Needs (outside of control of district) • Complicated scenarios (for ELL LT) • Depending on how used may need different definition • Recent arrivals is a factor in current criteria. Tease Out" • O of instruction • Newcomers

Item	Discussion	Action
		• How do schools monitor student progress, to exit the program? • K-12 7 + years • May be dictated by what exists • Concern: Kids were being held longer then they ought to. • Get better picture of _____ district is serving kids. Layer program infor. Red Flag! • HB 3499- LT ELL focused on best practices • Why not program models: Title 3: Inconsistent labels. (not common uniform defn) Starting SY15-16 with new clarification • Don't lose it completely. Keep and refine • Put EL LT in subjective &TA • ELL Program services. Depends on what we have now and what they'll report • Use LT ELL student data for district selection one of many factors for selection) K-12 ,7 years • No Vote
Data Modifications	Raw data 2:44 Josh gave his data presentation and the following is what the group came up with. Break 2:50 Back 3:12	The follow is what the group came up with: Data • Face higher challenges and students still struggling (Both correlate with statistical model) • Start with "top 50" look for districts on both lists Lost Statistical model (recommendations) • High Needs V. Needs Improvement

Item	Discussion	Action
		- Prefer 3 models for statistics/analysis - If punitive, include statistical model, if opportunity, excel statistical model - Needs improvement V Needs more resources - Candidate for selection, High needs –Low performance. Not punitive. xbt rewards - Celebrate achievement if you move off in 4 years - What goes out to public might look misleading - Not certain ….Data coming from other groups - What we'll learn in 4 years - We have app to serve ELL <u>because</u> we have assessments. No perfect accounting measure for every student - Risk upsetting students, not just adults in selected schools - Not perfect in focus & priority schools. But they're getting results - Drill down to pockets of greatest need - We have kids who've been in system too long; should be possible assessments. - Can we weigh time in ELL? Yes. - Present as assistance, not punishment Josh Needs Indexes Index as measure of need. - Weighting variables

Item	Discussion	Action
		- Easily accessible FRL (econ Disaolv) - ELL - All students - Single parent (not captured) - Immigration? - Languages - White English language learners? - How to include - Harder to focus resources as more languages are spoken in districts. - Serving needs V Prioritizing needs 9-11 grades no indicator - Prep for more arrivals - Use ELPA for middle school? - Trauma Refugee Stats? - Measure? - Collect data required by law
Support of Districts with small number of Ell Students	David presented on this and the results were captured in next column. Sm group discussion 3:20 – 3:35-Following is what the groups discussed. They are broken down into Groups 1 etc Group 1- - More Expansion in School Personnel needed - Data coaching training - PD that is ongoing, not one event - Expand list with a square miles covered factor Group 2- - In doing a needs assessment we should evaluate staff & funding sources - We recommend doing a needs assessment for each district with more than 20 ELL Students - E.G.-# of ESOL certified teachers	The group voted Yes - to support small districts - Build Capacity incl. for small ELL Districts

Item	Discussion	Action
	- Program model-ESD Capacity - PD needs - Identify Capacity of resources of neighboring districts & ESDs. - Find a way to build an existing collaborative models @ the regional levels - Resource Index shared regionally Group 3- - Creating a regional consortium through the ESD to address ELL's needs such as providing PD to teachers through the consortium - Now that Josh has included multiple years of data for every ELS, how many districts actually are not included in needs/outcomes indices? - A factor in needs index could be sparsity in (students per square mile OEA thinks is part of existing data) - Include $ to support the activities of the regional consortia (groups of ESD's) focused on ELL's - Create toolkit of resources, funds inter district site visits to schools/districts w/strong positive outcomes for ever ELLs Group 4- - Evaluating effective program models small population schools(outside box/mind set shift) - Assessment of District needs - Survey for teachers (recommendations pg 7) - Add a El Parent advisory (or use existing PACS) - Input missing parent/student input - Broaden goals of project beyond English proficiency to include academic graduation outcomes of ELS. - Who should attend: Add School/ Admin (Principals/VP) - This plan requires funding! - Coach (1 or 2) for each ESD & or -5 Admin Asst & or $ for subs & mileage - ELD teacher becomes the ELD district case manager/coach. ELD becomes a push in model & no longer use a push in model. - Not PD but capacity building of districts. Then PD for all teachers specialized lens on meeting needs of ELD. Build expertise & capacity of all teachers - Each region will have different needs. - Can't continue the same model - Instructional coaches by region to build capacity of all teachers on pedagogy	

Item	Discussion	Action
Phases of the Work	Charge 1: Criteria Are we on task?-Mix Charge 2-Annual report Not very far along Charge 3:-Technical Assistance Have not discussed Charge 4: .5 weight Mix Trigger to review rules? Funding guidelines	 Advisory Group has agreed to do this September
Next Steps	Cindy 3:45 went over next steps	- Review Rules - November 23 hearing - December10th SBE (9:45 –Comments) - Note Changes adopt Phase 1 of Rules - December 1-Other Phases of the bill 2016 dates-First Tuesdays - Note in email-Action required by_____ - New Draft of Rules-Action required
Public Comment	public Comments were taken from the group and this is what they said: **.5 Weight expenditures** - Highlight the consequences. What does it look like? Should we even be talking about it now? - Talk <u>Now.</u> (Programs since 1974) Share what's been learned. - Align ways .5 matters for Best Practices. Be prepared to follow them w/what we say. Law empresses us. Lay out a framework - Be clean on what it looks like to not meet bench marks. Be formative. - Intention was: for ID schools, under-preforming, dept can direct .5 for them only <u>State School Fund</u> provides by district - Bill doesn't limit us to schools we're working with - Depends on district - Flexibility	

Item	Discussion	Action
	• Decision should reflect needs of ELL Students. • Intention= only schools chosen are scrutinized (possible log 4 clarification) • Don't marginalize a school with a district "bad school" • Can't legislate to not marginalize • We'll know more at end of 4 years • 90% of survey respondents felt money wasn't getting to classroom (ELL teachers) • Can we be clean on assumptions behind .5 now? Dangerous to measure/manage…universal funding. Segregation at a minimum clarify assumptions before we can say with confidence. May do more damage than good. • **Right Level now** • High controversial when bill was worked on. • What if in 4 years we still don't have reliable measures? <u>**% of students/ in PSU**</u> • Rep Gallegos said: Data includes data in CC • Don said: Undocumented students don't have app for college <u>**Labeling Districts**</u> • Target is set by bill • Aspiring • Another bills names target & improvement • Initials? • School level? <u>**Double ID**</u> • Rules amended? Yes, you can be double identified • It's a lot of work in the schools to be included in programs • Un-silo practice by areas allowing double identity • Leverage opposite of focus schools • Help support focus schools <u>**Geographic Diversity**</u> • Models will be different urban & rural. Adds to learning • Recognize the diversity of the state • Model for ESD as a deliverer? • Plans for helping may include ESD partner. • **Add # to geographic map, not just %. Yes, Geog. Diversity** <u>**Student Mobility**</u> • Have data on student movement. • 1.6 % cross district lines. Pockets are larger (3-4% • Maybe mobility within district • Include in subjective criteria • **ODE will be explore data –vote inconclusive)** <u>**Oversight Committee**</u>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	- Legislative intent did not envision a 3rd work group. - Table for underrepresented community standing group to advise agency , beyond HB3499 - Disparities necessitates engagement with community's "New Era of Partnership" - Prefer that advisory be larger than this bill. Create a partnership-focus on needs of all students - Oversight committee discussion is bigger, happens outside this Advisory Group. **Recommend to ODE: Advisory Committee-ELL, Af American, Native, Blue + yellow-green** **Oaks, SBAC,ELPA & EPLA21** - Are length time starts to exit a factor? - Research: factors outside districts control impacts time to exit - Research: students in bilingual have longer time to exit, but better outcomes - Don't have # years in program - Student choice to opt out vs, teachers, to excel academically. - What are resources to help kids out of program? - Language Proficiency assessment is weighted before demographic factors are applied; No comments received on draft rules - Includes a growth measure, not just raw % of students meeting/exceeding - Title III % AMAO Districts already collecting **District Selection** Laurie-<u>Opt in</u> - Grants for most eligible. Districts volunteers, select. (no blame) - Acknowledges imperfect data - We work with schools to encourage "volunteering if they ought to"/**grants** Iris- - Language is impact! Support & collaboration - Avoid feeling of penalizing. But not intended to be an option for districts - Collaborate on what support looks like "opt in" misses working with districts that most need it. Salam- - Public list of eligible schools - Not a single until after decision - Public Domain. (Hard to not opt in) - Letter of intent. If not, engage in convo, districts wanting in is important Veronica- - Schools already receiving support?	

Item	Discussion	Action
	• Lens on emerging bilinguals. Don- • Sign letter if districts don't want funding • Letter to Opt-Out districts. Sent to super & Board. • What are consequences of districts saying no? Ryan- • 3rd option: Name district & district chooses between two categories • HB3499-Opt-In isn't an option , as written Rep Gallegos- • HB3499 Intent-Empowerment not punitive • Can district or schools with a sudden high influx **ask** for funding? **Opt-in** Salam- • Tech Asst for schools **regardless** • You were identified • Eligible • Partnership • Tell us if you attend to apply • Board & Super sign • Why not if not, ODE may say-It's ot an option • Board & community process Chuck- • Data may under or over identify. May not be indicative of actual performance • Cast wide net. 2 categories –not participating • Addresses risk of districts not opting in who should w/out consequences • **Capture in rues for most part Districts , ID list of schools** • **For selected districts it becomes collaborative with category.** **School Selection** • Bill says pick **districts** • **Why** large, med, small? Spreads across more districts • Not # districts. Support goes where needed in 3 dozen schools • Geographic diversity is valid concern • Students in small programs are being forgotten • Travel to closest/furthest schools with program support • What about other kids in districts? Not enough money. ID best practices. Try new approaches • Ask districts what are you learning? If effective spread to more	

Item	Discussion	Action
	- Loosen # schools in districts & allow focus schools & ODE advocates. **Geog** diversity Rural/urban - Focus & Priority - New 3 ½ years in –should be a convo on verge of gains? - High stakes assessments? - Some data we don't have - Applies to all schools - Limited Pot. But learning from this can help all students - Don't leave out large districts, eg, pps. - ODE should leverage learning there and follow best practices - Study pockets of success, eg, large # refugees **Amend out of rules # in each category districts** **Schools, amend # from Rules. Discuss with districts # are guidelines.**	
Adjourn	3:52	

Next Meeting: December 1