EL Advisory Meeting Minutes October 22, 2019 9am-2pm ODE - Studio A

PARTICIPANTS

Advisory Group Members: Andrea Townsend Parasa Chanramy Wei Wei Lou Karen Perez Ewa Campbell Maria Delgado

ODE Staff: Mirela Blekic Juan-Carlos Chavez (phone) Taffy Carlisle Sara Green (phone) Kelly Kalkofen Mary Martinez-Wenzl Susan Mekarski

Jeremy Wells

ESD EL Specialists Katie Agee
Brittany Deckard
Alison Mckay

- Bulleted items in the notes below capture statements/questions/sentiments from EL advisory Committee members Text within brackets are clarifications provided post meeting

	ets are ciarnications provided post meeting
Item	Discussion Control of the Control of
9:10 a.m Land	Dr. Mary Martinez-Wenzl introduced the new Assistant Superintendent, Dr. Juan-Carlos Chavez to
acknowledgement,	the EL Advisory Group.
introductions, and EL	
Advisory Group	Juan-Carlos opened the meeting by welcoming participants and sharing a synopsis of his
Leadership	background and expertise. He emphasized the importance of service to the communities that have
-Dr Juan Carlos Chavez	not had the opportunity to participate in the infrastructure and addressed the responsibility of ODE
	to those communities.
9:30 a.m	9:33am- Taffy presented trends from this year's HB 3499 plans submitted to date (n = 36).
Target/Transformation	Strategies and activities fell into these categories:
District 2019/2020 Plan	Professional Development
and Seal of Biliteracy	2. Improved Instructional Strategies
Update	Parent Engagement
	4. Technology
	An update was provided on the efforts to approve and finalize plans for the 2019-20 school year,
	work with ODE Procurement, and the Expenditure Reporting process.
	Mariana discussed the Theory of Action structure in this year's district plan template, which aligns
	with the Continuous Improvement Plan format.
	 Andrea asked how the Districts are spending money in regards to translation as it is usually
	pulled from General Funds. 9:37Am. Taffy said they are in the process of making a list of
	what is allowable.
	 Ewa asked if the funding was ever meant to supplant. Taffy said because it is General Fund
	dollars, the supplement vs supplant rules apply. 9:38am Taffy mentioned that the goals of
	this bill is to robustly engage parents. Maria shared her thoughts on the ability to provide
	translated materials to families and the negative impacts. Jeremy asked if all the 197
	Districts are included in the trends power point. Taffy responded that it includes only HB
	3499 districts (n = 4) and right now only the 36 plans that have been submitted are being
	reflected.
	Ewa spoke about the need to create a one pager that explains various funding sources and
	how they interact. Mary said she'd reach out once she has a new draft to review on this
	topic.
	Parasa asked how they are concentrating funds and resources to move the needle for
	emergent bilingual students and their district. Taffy took note on Parasa's question.
	,

Discussion

Districts are also increasing interpretation and technology supports.

Item

10:30 a.m. – Break

mes New Roman

mes New Roman

mes New Roman

Item	Discussion
10:45 a.m Update on	Mary talked about two key point:
HB 3499 district data	1. How do we plan to make the decision whether or not the current 40 districts have met the
review and directed	requirements for making progress on student indicators
funding process –Dr.	2. For the districts that have not made progress what is the directed funding process are going
Mary Martinez-Wenzl	to look like?
	Mary spoke about an accountability provision in the 3499 Bill, which is that ODE will direct the
	weighted funding for up to 3 years. Mary said Districts have been told they will be evaluated upon
	their individual plans across all 40 districts.
	11:09pm Mary presented 3 possible scenarios for determining which districts met the goals and
	which districts did not. Original criteria, revised set of criteria or goals set at the local level. There
	is no measure to know how many bilingual teachers are teaching in the classroom. There will be a
	neutral and transparent external evaluation to see if districts reached their goals. Mary spoke about
	a minimum of 3 reviewers per district. The key elements figuring who is going to be a reviewer,
	standardized format for a data portfolio for each districts, and something that can be read within an
	 hour. Lastly what needs to be done if a district doesn't agree with the outcome of the review? Andrea asked if ODE or the district will provide data used for this determination
	Andrea asked if ODE of the district will provide data used for this determination
	11:20am. Mary said for the first 2 options that include original and revised criteria, the data would
	come from ODE. For the third option that includes district set goals that it would be the PRE team
	using ODE data. Same format and template for all of the districts. Goals and outcomes vary across
	districts.
	How long will the process take and next steps:
	- August 2020 is when most data from the review would be available.
	 Reviewers would start in September 2020. Districts need to be notified of their directed funding prior to the fiscal year March 1st of 2021.
	Ewa asked what happens when the money stops. 11:27am.
	Mary said it stops June 30, 2020 that is when the grant agreements end. Four years of technical
	assistance and providing grant supports.
	Ewa asked if the label of Targeted and Transformation will be taken away after the money
	stops. Mary said after the time limit is up then districts will be eligible for funding
	direction from ODE.
	 Andrea asked if we can improve the OAR so we can include teacher instruction. 11:38 am.
	Mary said we can once the short legislature opens.
	11:43am Parasa asked how things were restructured several years ago and how that will import the reviews. She also asked how we build it into myel cases and implementing the
	impact the reviews. She also asked how we build it into rural areas and implementing the plan.
	11:44am Susy said we also need to take into account the professional development (PD) for
	principles and administrators and them calibrating best practices.
	Jeremy said there is historical precedent for consortiums to get funding for small schools.
	Mary said we may even be able to take "if then" structure to map out the next 5 years and look to
	the Federal Grant process in making those logic models.
	11:48am. Mary stated that it was decided to take all the information from the last 4 years and use
	the data from that process to inform the next cohort. Taking a fifth year would just delaying the
	process. Mary also shared that ODE is working on how to apply Equity Lens to the research and what kind of body of research informs our work. 11:51am. Directed funding is required to be tied
	to Student Progress Indicators.
	Kelly asked if we are going to have a year without funding going out to districts to plan for the
	next cohort. Mary mentioned that it was still being determined.
	Andrea asks who makes the decision. Mary said it will involve ODE leadership and
	legislature.
	 McKay asked how this will affect position of ESDs. Mary said she wasn't sure but just
	because districts are not be receiving their standard grants does not mean the ODE is not
	spending to provide technical assistance (TA) to keep programs going.

Item	Discussion
	Ewa made a recommendation that ODE be mindful of its own equity policy and how it impacts districts especially student success. This speaks strongly around equitable implementation cycles and what that does to a system. 11:57am. Any districts receiving annual funding will have an annual review. 11:58am. Every year going forward must have a funding direction by March 1st.
	Mary shared challenges:
	- Having limited capacity internally for getting things out quickly so ODE may
	need to contract out. - Data delay for highs school graduation and post-secondary enrollment
	- Time to fully evaluate what has happened over the last four yrs.
12:00 p.m. Working	, AA
Lunch	
12:30 p.m Pacific Research/ External	Pacific Research Team was introduced by Mary at 12:36pm. The evaluation plan has been revised. The revised plan included an initial review of 10 of the
Evaluator – Update Q &	districts, action plans and outcome reports along with budgets. Snapshots were created from that
A – Dr. Kristi Manseth,	review. Regina went over the high-level findings and how they have helped to shape and inform
Regina Wheeler, Irene	the next steps in the evaluation. The teacher survey is being developed as part of the evaluation.
Brandt, & Andrea Rogers	Evaluation reports will be done for every district The revised research questions:
Rogers	What are the approaches the districts have taken to their work?
	- How many teachers and administrators have benefited from the efforts?
	- How have the districts been meeting their goals and what progress was made?
	2. How ODE has supported the districts in these efforts?
	- Types of technical assistance?
	 How grant funds were managed during dispersed?
	3. The extent to which the school and the district capacity to serve EL students and families
	have improved?
	 How did they improve in engaging culturally linguistic families?
	4. What percent of EL students in the districts are on track to English Language proficiency
	and how does that compare to non HB3499 districts?
	- Does the pace of the HB3499 district out pace that of the non HB3499 districts?
	 Progress of current, former and never EL students in the HB3499 Districts.
	The revised research activities now include:
	- In depth interviews with grant directors on phone,
	- Interviews with internal ODE staff and Advisory Board members, and former ODE staff
	who were involved from the beginning (Interviews done by end of November) - EL program rubric will be used again to see where the districts fall on it
	- Support to help the (Education Specialist) Ed Specs with creating rubrics or create
	processes (Assistance meetings with Ed Specs before March)
	- Work with Ed Specs to send out survey to teachers
	12:49pm. Findings [from the evaluation] will be presented at the 2020 COSA EL Alliance Conference.
	Regina presented on Grantee snapshots. It was to get a shot of current implementation of 3499. 3
	transformation and 7 Target districts were chosen as well as urban, rural and geographical
	representation. 12:51pm. The themes that came out were: - Junto's curriculum, Equity trainings, etc.
	- Newcomer programs and support.
	- There was a focus on math and technology access.
	- After school tutoring and engaging families through translation, family nights, etc.

Item	Discussion
200	The barriers varied across district. It included staffing, changes in administration, homogeneous
	teaching staff and some of the issues were related to PD. 12:55pm There was a fiscal summary at
	the end of the snapshot and they were able to pull the fiscal information out of their action plan.
	The feedback from the Ed Specs will help guide and identify some of the gaps. The goal of the
	snapshots were to point out. What did they say they were going to do? What did they report doing?
	12:59pm Grantee report would include – teacher survey data, student outcome by district, and
	grant director interview data.
	Jeremy suggested getting the recommendations from lessons learned from the pilot.
	 Andrea asked if the documents would be made public. The Advisory Group, Ed specs and
	Staff talked about presenting to the districts and how to go about it.
	Jeremy said that a light version or even an executive summary could be shared with the public.
	Andrea said marking significant progress should be done too so districts know they are on
	track and presenting it as smart goals.
	1:12pm Mariana shared that if you look at the way the plan is structured the strategy portion has 3
	parts of the theory of action: the work that going to happen, short term outcome, and the long term
	outcome for students. Having this structure will help us to think through the entire planning of
	theory of action process will help cohort 2.
	Take away points will be develop a communication to share snapshots with districts, and what a
	broader dissemination might look like.
1:30 p.m Comments,	Research question number 3 will be what most informs the survey.
questions and concerns	The Advisory group gave feedback on the 3 questions and other related items to inform the survey:
from audience	Professional learning and development.
	Key instructional elements
	Parent and family engagement
	Other (anything that may not fall under the other 3 question shown above will fall
	under other)
	How do you support EBs in exciting EL services and creating a graduation plan? Admin training in
1.50 Clasina - 6 Markina	ELD. What support do you receive from Administrators? What input do you get from students?
1:50 Closing of Meeting-	Taffy said EDI is working on what is allowable with smaller districts and the general fund. Mary is working on a one pager on how various funding sources work and interact with one another that
Key points &Actions	will be reviewed by the EL Advisory Group. Taffy is going to look into how bilingualism affects
	employment and education employers on the bilingual brain. Create list of innovations for districts
	to implement for new arrivals.
	to implement for new arrivals.
	Pacific Research will present their findings at the COSA EL Alliance Conference in 2020. Funding
	needs to be determined for after the last year of funding in the grant agreements ends June 30,
	2020. The assessment team is coming up with an exit policy with EL Advisory Group feedback.
	Audience mentioned that it is very important that people know what's going on with funding. One
	take away is that the new transition year that is being planned needs to be communicated to the
	districts as soon as possible.
	W. J
	March meeting will also need to be rescheduled.
2:00 Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned

Next meeting: To be decided.

Formatted: Font: Bold