

PARTICIPANTS:

Parasa Chanramy
Jeanice Chieng
Maria Delgado
Susan Kaller
David Lougee
Wei-Wei Lou
Toshiko Maurizio
Christy Perry
Analivia Pollazo for Aurora Cedillo
Ana Ramirez
Karen Thompson
Ilana Umansky

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
<p>Welcome & Framing Markisha Smith</p>	<p>Welcomed the group back together for our meeting. Explained that Cindy will be going over the rules today. Taffy will be discussing the EI Strategic Plan. It will be organized in the way of our current ODE Strategic Plan. We have now taken on what the new mission values, goals look like and that is now reflected in the plan. Taffy will be going over this when she does her updated. Next month we will discuss what this group will look like after this group ends in December. In our next meeting in December we will be going over this.</p>	
<p>Continue Work of New Rules-Cindy Discuss & receive input on new rules adopted under Hb3499 relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Assistance 	<p>As you may recall on the master checklist of HB3499 we have 2 or 3 remaining things for this group is too advise the State Board on the final Administrative Rules. At our last meeting we had given our comments and she put them into a revised rule draft. She also added to the rule draft 1 on the .5 state school fund ELL Weight. The rule draft was then sent to the group in October. The rule draft that was sent was dated October 10, 2016 and it laid out the timeline for the rules and that was what was sent you everyone. Wanted to insure that all the comments were taken into consideration.</p> <p>The rules were presented to the SBE and they we sent out to various channels for general comment and scheduled a rule hearing on them. The State Board had some comments and we'll present them later. We will present to the board in December for adoption. If folks want to email Cindy with additional comments after today please know that you have time to do so. The 2nd thing that Cindy mentioned is that a rule advisory group was formed on the .5 ell weight rule. A few of those folks are in this group and a few submitted written comments to the rule. The comments were handed out to the group for review. Laurie Wimmer from Oregon Education Association submitted their comments & the 2nd group to submit comments is from the ELL Advocate Coalition (Jeanice & Parasa) Karen Thompson stated they also sent in their letter the day before and sent it to everyone in the group today.</p> <p>Cindy went over where she had taken the previously adopted rules and put them into a document and on some of the rules she had to do some technical amending too when we added to them. One of the things we were charged with doing is laying out what Technical Assistance looked like for these districts</p>	<p>Karen Thompson sent their letter to everyone in the group via email and hard copies were handed out for everyone's review also.</p>

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>that have been selected. Some of the changes she made to this rule based on the comments received are as follows below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement and monitor • Phases would be repeated as necessary (this is a comment that came in from this group) • Individualize based on district needs <p>These rules we are reviewing were changed based on the last group's meetings comments.</p> <p>Karen Thompson also provided their comments to the group as well.</p> <p>Cindy stated that we laid out the Technical Assistance phases 1-5 at a pretty high level. These rules were submitted to the districts that were named as transformational & targeted and we also asked for feedback also from them. She asked the group a question about the 5 phases that were laid out. The following questions were asked.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this it at the right level of detail for the rules? Rules are always a tension between setting up minimum standards on the one hand that we want folks to follow but also allowing for enough individualized assistance that we don't have it at such a detailed level that it inhabits that. <p>Members provided feedback and the following suggestions were taken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parasa recommended that it be stated it would be for 4 years. • Castaneda 3 prong test language <p>Karen Thompson discussed the Castaneda reference, and how it aligns with HB3499 w/the existing frame work that is in place. Cindy explained that she does not usually name court rulings in rules cases because things change for different reasons. Cindy clarified that the reference to Castaneda is for the 3 prong test and Karen confirmed that.</p> <p>Cindy brought the group to subsection (2) of the rules-Cindy's question on this section of the rules is 1. Are there other frameworks or another word to use is minimums that should be spelled out in this section as we engage in these transformational districts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analivia recommended that Culturally Responsive be included • Apply the Equity Lens as defined by the Chief Education Office • Jeanice recommended guide posts that align to the Federal Laws in regard to ELL's. They recommend more ELL contents specifics as they speak to really being able to evaluate root causes as to why students are not achieving outcome we know they are capable of • Have ENF definitions flushed out so that no ambiguity within districts • Evidence based practice <p>Cindy asked the group if that in the rules if we are advocating that ENF would almost be combined and culturally responsive</p>	<p>Members reviewed the changes of the rules that they had in front of them.</p>

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>would modify evidence based? Cindy referred to the comments that were provided by Karen and read them to the group. Do we feel like something should be added to this list of 10?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morgan gave feedback. He gave his concern as we are coming off No Child Left Behind; it feels like we are going back to that path. What he's hearing from districts is that they are concerned when they see a long list of things and they feel like they don't have a say or there is no real conversation. It feels like we are defaulting back to what we've had to do the last 15 years. Karen gave her feedback as well on the list. • David Lougee- feels these are good, but we didn't really base our conclusion of districts on these items, therefore when we look at how districts were chosen by and these they don't necessarily match up and then say that these are the things that you need to be checking off; there is not a real match there. <p>Cindy mentioned that we have the list on how we selected districts if folks wanted to refer back to it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Kaller- liked how we outlined the basic assumptions of what we all should be agreeing on should be happening. She feels like if districts look at it they see what they are not aren't doing, they can look at the list and it does provide a great outline for reference. It's a good idea of having a list of basic assumptions of what we are looking for in serving our ELL's. Susan sees this not as a checklist, but rather a basic agreement. <p>Cindy reminded the group that we have the rules and they provide the framework. We also have the tools, guidance the documents that Rudyane is using. Cindy said at times she may ask the group the following question. Is this what you're saying? Is this checklist that is more appropriate for guidance or a document that Rudyane is using verses the rule?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeanice- Agrees this is not a checklist. It's not telling a district or all districts on how you're supposed to be doing something, but it does say look at this factor when working with ELL students, take inventory of XYZ , make improvements on these areas and call attention to those basic kind of standards and criteria's. She feels this needs to be in a rule and not however in a tool or like a manual. If we are serious about improving systems out comes for ELL children who have been underserved decades upon decades then it needs to be in a rule. It needs to be clear and explicit and an alignment with federal standards. We need to have in a similar way that there's alignment and a lot of detail for students with disabilities in the OAR. There needs to be a higher level of detail for our ELL as both are protected classes under the law. And for us to have a very vague framework on what districts need to do and it's not clear and at the end of the 4 	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>years ODE could have an accountability issue. She restated that she does not feel like this is a checklist. This is something that districts along with ODE need to look at if they want to improve outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parasa- she appreciates the comments from Karen, Susan and Jeanice. The list of 10 was helpful to have some common language on framework and provide some guidepost and she believes it could even be incorporated if we were to build out phase 1 by identifying local district needs and using this as a frame for doing the needs assessment and making sure the rules around that are very clear. This is important for when the districts are analyzing the rules. • Dory Vickery –Director of Title III for curriculum and instruction for Central High School which is a transformation district. She gave her feedback from a district perspective. She is familiar of the tool kit and used it for the redesign of their program plan. She feels that this is a replication of Title III. Her question to the group was. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is this project going to be different from Title III plan? 2. How are we going to get beyond the requirements of Title III? <p>She was reading the plans earlier and was trying to in vision what our plan is going to look like and how this was going to be different from prior EL's improvement plans from years and years of not meeting AMAO's? She sees this language in Title III and feels it's a replication. She doesn't want to see another Title III plan.</p> • Ana Livia- stated that it has to be different and more. One of the things that this plan has to reiterate is that other people in Dory's position need to be reading their manuals. They need to review and understand the Civil Rights Laws to understand them. <p>Cindy stated that one consideration when drafting rules or statues is being careful of not repeating other statues. People don't necessarily fall into compliance because they are repeated throughout. The second reason is that if for example they state in the State Board that Civil Rights apply to ELL students for example and then we don't state it in another place that Civil Rights Laws apply to African American Students. We have not without intending to do so conveyed something other than the existing law and we are repeating federal law with one group and not the other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ilana Umansky clarified that the 10 is not a Civil Rights Law. This is a tool kit that just came out last year. It's a set of resources that the federal government put out. We are suggesting that this form the basis of the needs assessment. Just to clarify that this is not a checklist, it's just saying to have a robust program for English Learners, we should be thinking about these areas of support. So, 	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>if a needs assessment for a target and transformation district included just an evaluation of how are these 10 different things working in your district then it will allow for the coach, the team to work together to identify key areas of need for that district. She also wanted to clarify for David's comment that these are two different things. They are identifying districts who in different ways are struggling with their English learner students. They either have high need or low outcomes and it's different to think about how to best support them. This 10 is a way to think about how to best support these districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wei-Wei- gave her point of view as a Title III Directors. She asked the following questions. (1.) Is this framework here to guide us or here to hold us accountable? (2.) What are we trying to do here with this framework? Cindy responded that we are providing a framework for when Rudyane and other staff goes in the districts, it's setting up the expectations that ODE will follow as we work with the districts for the next four years. One of the questions is then is this the right framework to achieve this? Is these the right phases, technical assistance processes to provide the support to achieve that? And if you're not sure, then what would be added is the 2nd question. • Maria spoke next and asked what we are advocating. She is speaking to us a mother about what her daughter went through. She has already told us her story over several meetings. Cindy responded to this by referencing the two guidelines in the comments that may address what she just raised. The first is that says; avoid unnecessary segregation of EL Students and the second is; insure meaningful communication of EL parents. Cindy asked a question specific for Maria. 1. If she was advocating that these items are put into a checklist of guidance document rules that provides a framework for the Department Of Education to follow when we are working with districts? Maria responded that yes, it should be. She went on to talk about her frustration with the current system on how they pass students. • Laurie Wimmer spoke and said Thank you for your work on the rules. She talked about the comments that they submitted. They wanted to make sure they had a framework on general guidelines provided and wants to see technical assistance plan also for folks going out to districts. Laurie provided examples that were outlined in her letter to Cindy. She talked about those also. <p>Cindy brought us to sub section (3) of the rule. It states that the Technical Assistance process must include engagement with: We added some people to the prior list on this and they are as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELL Directors 	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Stakeholders • Federally recognized tribes <p>Cindy asked the group if anyone have comments on this sub 3 section of the list of folks who will be a part of the engagement with the districts.</p> <p>Laurie –under section C under to change the wording from parent to families due to the ESSA language.</p> <p>Jeanice-also on sub section 3 they added culturally specific community’s organizations. She also took the time to address some questions other members had about how this work is different from Title III work? She addressed the questions.</p> <p>Susan asked why improvement and instructional coaches are separated and not included with subsection (3)a are not a part of the district. Cindy & Rudyane responded to this question stating that they are not school district employees, but rather contracted workers.</p> <p>Wei Wei-our council had a meeting and she shared some concerns that was raised from this meeting. She shared some of her concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are that the coaches are not culturally responsive or not quiet knowledgeable about being culturally responsive. • They brought up the concern that some of the coaches have been retired for a long time and may not be up to date about today’s children. • Relationship with some of the school principals creates a barrier for the coach and principal to work together • Principals should have option to hire own coaches together with ODE staff. A Title I director suggested that an interview committee be formed of, community partners, ODE, parents and school staff to make sure they get the right fit for them. • The last concern brought up was that one principal ended up training the coach. <p>Wei-Wei said that their draft addressed these concerns and she’ll forward them to Cindy.</p> <p>Rudy spoke to the Technical Assistance part- She was humbled to complete these 15 districts visits. At no time during any of her visits did she get any negative feedback or was made to feel that is wrong. Everyone was aware and had their data pulled and had their root cause analyst ready because she had set it up that way. As a specialist for our unit Rudy is charged to uphold federal law which is already title III practices and be up to speed on best practices and have tools ready for people to go. And support as an Equity Unit member, everything that has to do around an equity lens and culturally responsiveness. All Districts were set up that way and they were all ready and happy to do it when she arrived for the visits. One of the biggest things she heard from everyone was lack of resources to some of these outcomes and lack of supports. Some systems were not in place while others had just started their systems. She got great feedback from folks.</p>	<p>Wei-Wei will send Cindy a copy of their draft letter.</p>

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADM .5 EL Weighted Funding 	<p>She wants to make it clear that districts came to them. They came prepared for visits and when visits were over they all left in a good place. They are aware they are on a 4 year clock and aware that issues need to be addressed. We have our districts working really hard and excited that money is coming in so that they can start making changes.</p> <p>Jeanice thanked Rudy for sharing her input, however she does think that there are a number of school districts that are doing it wrong, she feels they do need to be spelled out for districts because of students have been left out. This really needs to be spelled out specifically in the rules. We have many school districts that are not engaging with ELL parents at all. She feels these parameters need to be in the rules. She feels that even though school districts do have the best intentions they still need that guidance.</p> <p>District Expenditure of Monies 581-020-0621 (new rule)</p> <p>Now Cindy spoke to the group on the rule on 3499 that it say's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub (1) If a transformation or a target districts that after 4 years if they are not meeting student progress indicators that have been established jointly between the department and them. The department shall direct how they are spending that money associated with the .5 weight. In the state school fund if a student is identified for ELL that district is getting more money for that student. It's called a .5 weight because the district get a 1.0 weight and added to that is a .5 if a student is an ELL student the district can then count them as being a 1.5 student. The bill also says that "The department is to do this for up to three years for identified districts who have not meet expected growth and student progress indicators, and benchmarks. In sub (2) it stops when the district meets or exceeds the expected growth in student progress indicators. In other words if after a year of direction the district is met, then we are not going to direct them for three years, it will stop right then. Sub (3) talks about the framework under which the department is going to direct the expenditures of these monies. Just to be clear that up to this point the .5 weight of the money is that the department provides no direction on that to districts currently. This is all new. We do have the increased level of data reporting because of other elements of 3499. From this we have the annual report that went out that does lay out how districts are expending their monies associated with the .5 weight and what percentages of those monies are being expended on ELL students. So, by the time this kicks in in a little less than 4 years we will have even more information. Sub section (3) Framework states that the expenditure direction must be: (a) Individualized for each district based on the state district data and the data improvement work from the 	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>previous four years; (b) Has to be aligned with evidence-based practices; (c) Focused on supporting the district in meeting expected growth in student progress indicators and the expected benchmarks for student progress indicators identified for the school district; (d) The direction from the department must be in writing and communicate to the district the specific direction of expenditures and the rationale for that direction; and (e) Must be reviewed annually.</p> <p>In Sub section (4) The department may utilize the district and community engagement process as part of the technical assistance process receive feedback on the expenditure direction.</p> <p>Sub section (5) Which basically said the first time we are going to do this direction is on monies received by districts on or after July 1, 2020.</p> <p>So that is our .5 weight rule. One question that we did not address on here that we are wrestling with is that the rule advisory group started about how public should the direction should be? The following were suggestions made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some said it should be go on the department's web page as well as the school districts web page. • Other group members had concerns about that. They wanted to know what did that achieve is one of the questions raised. <p>Cindy wanted to pose that to this group is that that direction is in writing and being sent to the district. Does it need to be more transparent / public (websites)? Cindy opened it up for comments from the group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morgan- Yes, it should be and also on the departments website and made available at the school district level. Needs to be consistent. • Parasa also agreed so that parents and community members have access to the information and to have a have a better understanding and direction on how that .5 should be spent • Laurie- Better communication between the district and parents or families if the communication is more directed towards interested parties, rather than just putting it on a website and calling it good. <p>Cindy asked the district folks that we have in the room the following question regarding budgets;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you communicate elements of your budget out to your community now? How would you see a letter coming from this department, how would you see that fitting in? <p>Christy said that the budget itself is a very good communication tool. They do put some budget elements on their website but not sure if that's a great communicator either. She is not sure if it's a good communicator to post on website. It's tricky trying to find</p>	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best Practice 	<p>the right communication tool.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -David Lougee-Cindy asked him the same question. How does he see a this letter fitting in around communications around budget or even programs in this area? How should this be communicated to parents for example; other programmatic areas? He liked the personal approach to parents rather than just placed on the website. He said it can be both, but a lot of time by sending a letter home does generate more phone calls to them inquiring about it. Christy said they have to get the budget adopted by end of June for the next year. The process starts by beginning of April. The department will be directing you on how to spend a major portion of your budget that direction needs to come in by December/January. Cindy clarified that it looks like we will be communicating with districts who are not on track at end of year three, but end up being on track in at the end of year four. And this is what that will look like. Ana Livia-thinks we are talking about two different things here. 1. Transparency and the .2 figuring out the best way to communicate. She does not feel that best way is via a website. She feels like by putting it the website would be a form of shaming for the district and we don't want to do that. Maria- for her she feels like the best way to notify parents would be by doing community forums or at different schools before sending out a letter. Parent would prefer to be talked about it in person rather than by sending a letter home. They may not pay much attention to a letter if it has not been directed to them in person. Many parents do not make use of email. If a phone call is generated to them than it needs to be in their language so they understand it. For the Hispanic community she feels like it's better to have parent meetings and or letters but not email or on website. David Loguee agreed with this. Karen- she just learned that the focus and priority plans are public. She is thinking about the plan for the targeted and transformation districts and student bench mark progress indicators. It says the department shall identify those progress indicators. She feels this is a huge question mark on this as we are talking about weather this is public or not about what happens to the money. But before that, what determines whether the department has any say about what happens to the money is a progress indicator. She is curious to hear a little bit on the departments thoughts about how those progress indicators might be established? <p>Cindy responded to Karen by referring and reading from another part of the bill but in a different rule. Cindy read the following from the bill. "The department in consultation with the ELL Transformation District shall establish the expected growth of student progress indicator and inspect the benchmark for student progress indicators in English language learners for the district." We have been talking about it being very individualized for each district. Cindy provided the group with an example.</p>	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>Ilana asked what the process for determining those indicators is? Cindy stated that it's in consultation with the district as part of the technical assistance process.</p> <p>Karen feels like it could also see like a potentially be an equity concern if one district established indicators and then another district also establishes one. She feels like it's a tricky balance.</p> <p>Cindy and Rudyane both stated that uniformity is district to district is needed even though is individualized. Rudyane said we are working towards that because we have established that. At this point because we have outcome indicators right now that got districts into it. Based on their needs evaluation, they could focus their activity to move the dial on the indicators that we all choose together. So we have that as a gage right now. How much more detail on top of what has already been established, do we need to add to that when we have progress indicators of ELPA and math scores in the outcome?</p> <p>Josh Rew created a reference sheet around the indicator outcomes to understand. Rudy stated that we cannot judge progress on a needs index because they don't have control over poverty or mobility. The idea was to really be intentional and strategic on the action plan to help move the dial in the area of the list that they were struggling with. So, we have that go on and maybe perhaps calling that out more explicit to the outcomes is what we may need to do. Also keep in mind that in other areas districts were doing really well.</p> <p>Morgan gave input on the issue of the outcomes. He just wants to urge the department and the community to think about using the growth model process rather than just drawing a line and saying everyone has to hit this line. Because that is where we may get problems if one districts is five steps over the line and another maybe twenty and one takes fifteen steps. It needs to be a growth model and is just cautioning us. He feels a growth model better reflects the steps that the district been made improvement. He feels it's a much better model to use.</p> <p>Dorey Vickery had a concern about the measures of the outcomes and the frustration from a district perspective. We've gone from ELPA to ELPA 21 and from OAKS to SBACK and then it changed again by some modifications. It's really been frustrating. You're going to need to be able to guarantee the same measuring tool for five years out when we continue to change this. One of the questions she had on the outcomes is what about EL students who choose to do a career trades and not attend a post-secondary, how do we track that?</p> <p>We-Wei- brought up a different area of concern. She talked about the percentage of the .5 and how it's more critical than some of the items that were listed. She's not saying that we have to be descriptive and say you have to spend this much money, but rather feels it should be a pre requirement. Offer different amount. It should be listed as an adequate. Cindy clarified that department potentially directs all the monies received. Now how it's directed is individualized. The department directs 100% of the monies percent is contributed to the .5 weight.</p>	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>Susan is concerned about how much of the .5 will be diverted to dual immersion programs who are currently serving non EL's.</p> <p>Toshiko responded that the dual immersion programs are a great tool.</p> <p>Karen responded and Toshiko clarified that Beaverton SD provided to EI students in the Dual Language Programs.</p> <p>Ana Livia expressed her concern also.</p> <p>Jeanice asked if we could take a vote on the draft rules we were talking about? Cindy said at this time she does not feel we can take a vote and explained why. We have received a lot of great comments today. She feels if we took a vote right now that folks would not really know what they were voting on. We will be taking the comments and amending the rules. The SBE will meet again on December 8th and we can see them again.</p> <p>Ilana wanted to add a comment on the rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not state that ODE's control of the district money will happen if the district fails to meet expectation at the end of four years. She feels this maybe missing from the rules. • Indicators- It would be good to have two kinds of indicators. The outcome indicators that Rudyane was talking about. But also some sort of indicators that allow for monitoring of how the technical assistance plans is being implemented. Since the focus is on involving families, it would be nice to have some sort of indicators that monitor what sort of relationships are being built with families, and how many forums were held. <p>Cindy reminded members that they are open for comment until December 8th, 2016. A rule hearing will also be held and members are more than welcome to come speak and or listen.</p>	<p>Cindy will send out the revised rule draft to members prior to the SBE meeting.</p>
<p>Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EL Strategic Plan 	<p>Taffy spoke to the group about the plan. We have met twice and are meeting next week. What we have decided to do while looking at the 8 from the last version of the plan. We were originally going to put it with the agencies strategic plan. But since it has changed we are changing also. We are looking at the four components of the agencies strategic plan. That plan is as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Start Strong 2. Transition successfully 3. Graduate college and career ready 4. Experience outstanding customer service <p>We are looking at the eight goals that were in the previous plan and trying to figure where all of those fit into the agencies goals.</p> <p>Taffy went on to show the group a chart she prepared. Once she presented this to the group Taffy expressed that they are going work on some action steps some measure for success and doing some work with implementing the five phases that members suggested with our next process with 3499 and use those as well under this format.</p> <p>The team has been working very hard on this and feels very</p>	<p>We are going to go around the state and get community input before we make it a living document.</p>

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>good about the trajectory of the plan. Post getting this into some framework order we are going to go what Salma as done and even our Native American Group and our African American Black Students group have done is go around the state and get parental, stakeholder and community input. We want to do this before it becomes a working document.</p> <p>Wei-Wei asked if this grant had any specification about the HB3499 Identified schools. Do we include some kind of intervention or assistance for school districts that have done everything, but somehow still don't see everything?</p> <p>Taffy responded that she had a conversation with Salam and expressed that there is real importance with infusing the work that we are doing here state wide that includes the 3499 districts. The technical assistance and the coaching, monitoring and the phases from 3499 will also go into here. Here intent is to gather all the suggestions for the targeted and transformation districts and bring it to the broader state wide bill.</p> <p>Markisha addressed the group that at our next meeting we will talk about what our new structure will look like for the advisory role in this will look like.</p>	

Adjourn: Next meeting December 7th @ State Library. 1-3:30