

**EL Advisory Meeting
Minutes
March 19, 2021| 11:00 am-12:30pm ODE -
Virtual Zoom Meeting**

PARTICIPANTS

Scribe: Ana Salas

Advisory Group Members:

Parasa Chanramy
Maria Delgado
Kathleen Jonathan
Anabel Ortiz
Wei Wei Lou

EDI Staff:

Mariana Prashnik-Enriquez
Mirela Blekic
Ana Salas

Guest Presenters:

Josh Rew
Susan Mekarski

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

Item	Discussion
<p>11:00am Introduction - Deb Lange</p>	<p>Deb Lange brought acknowledgement to the Asian American Community and the current level of hurt and pain they are facing. OEDI Equity Stance presented.</p>
<p>11:15 a.m - Review and provide feedback on weighted funding formula</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weights of students demographics • Top-up for transformation districts 	<p>Josh Rew presents on <i>HB 3499 Cohort 2 Weighted Funding Formula</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft weights for student demographics • Top for transformation Districts <p>In a past meeting Brian had presented a simulation and great feedback was taken and this really assisted with modifying the approach. General agreement that the funding formula was a great approach and the way it was being done. The weights are multiplied and then summed and calculate the share of the total weight. This is how funding will be allocated to districts based on the weighted student demographics. Josh mentioned that weights can be changed.</p> <p>Q: Parasa in a simulation for the weights for the mock of districts can you make sense of the grant range?</p> <p>A: The simulation was created that Josh will share during that meeting.</p>

Wei Wei mentioned that she does support the HB 3499 Funding distribution model example. The concern is that the per current EL value has a big gap.

Q: Wei Wei also requested that she would like to know more about the ceiling and the base. Josh Rew will follow up with Wei Wei questions.

Q: Parasa requestest timeline for advising?

A: We have identified who our cohort 2 districts are. We will not be funding until after July 1. There is some time until they are ready to fund. Hoping that the plan will be cilitified and ready to fund around June 30.

Q: Anabel should the recent arriver .5 be higher? Is this an appropriate point for the indicator?

- Increase the weights for new arrivals to 1.0. Deb requests that Josh and others have further discussion and adjust or increase weights where needed.
- Anabel shares increase migrant and homeless .25 and increase it to .5
- CEL Students with disabilities would like to see that go up from .75 to 1.0
- WeiWei would like to request to see that need factors (Add a new column that identifies students that are engaged with all needs indicators listed in this funding formula)

Q: Paulina will you update if the emergent bilingual is having a disability and if there are any changes in that?

A: Josh that data is shown at the end of the school year. This is just an estimation of what is generalizable for the four years of cohort 2. But this can be changed if there is a sizable change. Monitoring students are excluded from this.

Q: Maria: If you have excluded the students under monitoring, then where would they receive support other than from teachers, if there aren't any funds for them? What would monitoring look like then?

A: Districts are still required to engage in monitoring processes per Title III.

11:45 a.m - Framework for Cohort 2 TA and Strategic Planning

- Adapted ORIS CNA process that builds off the transformation work districts are already engaged in

Mariana shares the *Adapted Oregon Integrated System Supports MTSS Framework (domains and indicators)*.

- ORIS (Oregon Integrated Systems Framework)
- Cohort 2 TA and strategic planning

WeiWei requested that the language be changed where it says “ODE will” and change it to “Districts and the community”. Mariana agrees that this needs to be in partnership. OAR’s can be changed.

Q: Paulina “EL community” who is going to be involved in reaching out?

A: Who that community is, is up to each district. We can create strategic guidance for districts. The SSA process also has these.

Parasa is requesting to reach out to the OEDI policy rules so if we need to change a rule this can be done.

Deb shared this question to the advisory group “If you have excluded the students under monitoring, then where would they receive support other than from teachers, if there aren't any funds for them? What would monitoring look like then?”

	Q: Maria that is the same thing I am asking myself, along with the families for some time now already: how is it going to be done and when because it's already been a long time and families don't know.
12:25 Wrap-up- Next Steps, Deb Lange	<p>A: Deb shared that at the end of the month the monitoring districts will be let known by Deb and Carmen Urbina.</p> <p>We will be having our first office meeting in April. This is for the 2021 school year and they will have to have this communicated after July 1. After we have a recommendation and ready to act after the April meeting.</p>
12:00 Adjourn	

Next meeting: April

Recommendations for weighted funding formula:

- Increase the weights for new arrivals to 1.0.
 - How are needs indicators addressed in state school fund?
 - 5. For EL - not relevant to this formula because all students are EL
 - 1.0 for SPED
 -
- Increase migrant and homeless .25 and increase it to .5
 -
- EL Students with disabilities would like to see that go up from .75 to 1.0
 - 1.0 for SPED is the weight that is provided in the state school fund
- Add a new column that identifies students that are engaged with all needs indicators listed in this funding formula
 - This is good information to have and understand for the purpose of strategic planning and through the comprehensive needs assessment process. Adding this to the funding formula in an equitable way that serves all identified districts would require a diverse representation of variations for this column that is contextualized based on the individual school district. This would skew the funding formula for large districts and may produce redundancy and it would be challenging to create the mock-up allocation.
- Maintain the needs indicator for Economically Disadvantaged at .25 to align with the poverty weight in the state school fund as described in slide 18 of [this slide deck](#)