

PARTICIPANTS

Barbara
 Chuck
 Marisol
 Parasa
 Toshiko
 Veronica
 David Bautista
 Aurora Cedillo

Maria Delgado
 Victoria Garcia
 Don Grotting
 Kira Higgs
 Cindy Hunt
 John English
 Kathleen Jesky
 Rudyane Lindstrom

David Lougee
 Jessica Nguyen-Ventura
 Kim Miller
 Christy Perry
 Bill Rhoades
 Kathleen Thompson
 Mike Wiltfong

Bolded by block by Jessica-This is what group decided on

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
Welcome & Introductions	Cindy gave welcome to group	
AGENDA & ARC of WORK for the ADVISORY GROUP	<p>Cindy went over the ARC of the work for the group. Discussion between Cindy and the group transpired.</p> <p>Framework for applying Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does Focus & Priority affect this? We have 15 SD & 30 schools What are the rules for SD that believe they are doing everything ? 	<p>Cindy said that the Rules addressed the comments.</p> <p>Group consensus & rules state the School Districts ca be both. ODE will show data and research to SD's.</p>
<p>. ADMINISTRATIVE RULES – DISTRICT SELECTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of public comments and amendments 	<p>Group went over slides on Public Comment that was presented last meeting. Cindy touched on Selection and collaboration and partnership.</p> <p>Use of average length of time as districts section criteria. Rules do not currently use other available data such as currently, former and long term ELL Student data</p> <p>Oversight Committee and stakeholder input. Rules do not create new committee. Work group continues until 1-2-17.</p> <p>Use of OAKS, SBAC, ELPA and ELPA 21- Rules direct use statewide standardized assessment and that data must be best available,</p> <p>Make SBAC or other test a language level verses on age-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Middle Schools 	<p>Workgroup voted to recommend to ODE to establish Oversight committee . It will not be specific to HB 3499</p> <p>Use ELPA Growth for K-8 as another factor.</p>

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>5-8 expanding Currently expanding</p> <p>10-12 combine them current</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why can't we use ELPA growth in K-8th • We do have that info • Can use this as a factor <p>Cindy reminded the group that we have rules going to SBE next week.</p> <p>Back to Public comment –</p> <p>How do we capture the needs of the district. Cindy asked Josh to come up with a precise list. Cindy went over the list on a slide and asked members if they had any questions about the list? Cindy asked if we had any examples of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current EL's • • This is one factor • 10-12 average ELPA growth current ELL • 1-8 current ELL ELPA Growth • 10-12 Current ELL ELPA Growth <p>Current ELLs expanding from 5-8 –group voted on this and it passed by vote consensus</p> <p>10-12 combine them current ELL and look at ELPA growth- Group voted to measure high school students. We are adding an additional data factor. Group voted Yes.</p> <p>Group voted by censuses and it passed to have this</p> <p>6-8 grade current/former – SBAC/OAKS growth. Group wants to keep data reliable on current ELL's.</p> <p>Rules will be altered to reflect what was on the list?</p>
<p>DEFINITION OF LONG TERM ELL</p>	<p>Cindy went over the Long Term Ell Definition slides and called on some members for feedback to talk about this. Cindy proceeded to show the slides and feedback and questions continued.</p> <p>Cindy asked group if they were ready to accept this suggestion that was listed under Rules currently defines” Long Term Ell Student”</p> <p>Suggested def:</p>	<p>Cindy asked the group to vote on this. Moving from 7 to 6 –Yes voted and passed by members. It was a split but passed.</p>

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>Any ELL student in grades 6-12 who has been eligible for, and enrolled in ELL Development for 6 or more years, or who has scored at the same level of English Proficiency for 3 or more years.</p> <p>Proposed Amendments “ Long term ELL Students”-any student in grades 6-12 who have enrolled in ELL for 6 or more years. Same score for 3 or more years? – Subjective ELL-No not include</p> <p>Should long term ELL be a factor in SD selection-YES</p> <p>ELL Long Term def=7-YES</p> <p>Cindy took temp of members regarding subjective criteria. Should it be still 7 years?</p> <p>In grades 6 to 12 the right grade levels</p> <p>Should we be including kids who are eligible and, and enrolled in English Language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used for identification of data for district selection • 	<p>6 or more in L.D. –passed Grades 6-12 years-passed</p> <p>ODE will appointment by judgment</p> <p>This was split</p> <p>Yes by show of hands</p>
LUNCH-Working Lunch	We will resume by 1:00 PM and dive into the annual report.	
ANNUAL REPORT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content • What is really reported 	Cindy went over the amended definition used for districts selectin to read: “Long term ell student” means any ell student in grades 6-12 who has been enrolled in an ELL program for 6 or more years Cindy presented to the group the District Annual Report Cindy asked the group if “Long term be a factor in district selection? 6 year to a 7 year should be a 7 ? should be 6 year District Annual Report- Cindy asked the audience (those who worked on the bill) By January we the workgroup need to.....	Cindy asked the group to vote and on a scale of 1-5 group voted tied, voted on the 6y years members voted . There was a split in the room with voting.

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>Michael Wiltfong addressed the group and introduced himself and talked about budget and money.</p> <p>Cindy continued to present on the Annual Report</p> <p>Cindy wanted to know if there was value in comparing other states to us(Oregon)</p> <p>Are there any other purposes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investments (report on how these are going) • Parents /community have information • Share best practices between SD's <p>Propose-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SD ID reports to Legislation on SD progress and best practices dissemination <p>Do we have a report on spending codes?-Yes, we do. We will add more codes</p> <p>Are there any other progress indicators/elements that should be used?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic info should be included • Indicate @what level SD's start (transformation, target or F&P) • Biliteracy state seal • Proportion of EI Students enrolled in high level math • Notification to parents- need data points • Library books • % of ELL students waiving ELL students • Track SD's who get funding and how much • Should the report include a comparison to other states? • Are there any other that do these? 	
<p>DISTRICT EXPENDITURE OF MONIES <u>And .5 weight</u></p>	<p>One of the areas that got the most comments . Bill directs the department to .5 weight.</p> <p>Members gave feedback and talked about this topic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change "adult" to review" • Do a student needs assessment V SD needs assessment • Clarify if the ELL weight includes former, current • Reorder • Clear that it's after 4pm 	
<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>Cindy announced that we have selected dates for group to meet.</p>	

Item	DISCUSSION	Action
	<p>Joseph suggested that we have shorter meetings. Cindy agreed it be fine as we got down the list. We can look into this.</p> <p>SBE meeting is next Thursday. Public Comment will be around 9:45 AM.. Cindy advised members that SBE meetings are recorded and streamed live</p>	
Parking Lot issues	<p>Where are all the other dual reports?</p> <p>Post-secondary include two, four technical schools- Docs not track military</p>	

Next Meeting: January 20, 2015