

# ENGLISH MASTERY COUNCIL

## District Policy and Criteria Planning Subcommittee

### Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 4, 2018

12:30 P.M.

### Meeting Locations:

#### Video Conference

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy Las Vegas, NV	Bighorn Conference Room
Department of Education	700 East Fifth Street Carson City, NV	Silver Ore Conference Room

### Call to Order

Laurel Crossman, Subcommittee Chair, called to order, from Carson City, the meeting of the English Mastery Council District Policy and Criteria Planning Subcommittee, at 12:42 p.m. on Wednesday, April 4, 2018.

### Roll Call

Laurel Crossman conducted a roll call. **Quorum was established (three members present)**

Council members present in Carson City: Laurel Crossman, Gladis Diaz

Council members present in Las Vegas: Duncan Lee

NDE staff present in Las Vegas: Sophia Masewicz, Karl Wilson

NDE staff present in Carson City: Susan Johnson, Blakely Hume

There was no public attendance in Carson City or in Las Vegas.

### Pledge of Allegiance

Lead by Laurel Crossman, Subcommittee Chair

### Public Comment #1

There was no public comment from Carson City or Las Vegas.

### Approval of Flexible Agenda

**Motion:** Duncan Lee motioned to approve a flexible Agenda. Gladis Diaz seconded the motion. Motion carried and a flexible Agenda was approved.

### Approval of Minutes – March 18, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Council reviewed the Minutes of the March 18, 2017 meeting. There were no corrections to the Minutes.

**Motion:** Duncan Lee motioned to approve the Minutes as prepared. Gladis Diaz seconded the motion. Motion carried and the Minutes were approved.

## District EL Policy Review Process & Progress

Blakely Hume explained how the review of the District EL Policy would be conducted during the meeting and indicated that in proceeding the meeting, each member would receive a homework assignment to research and review four to five additional policies. An additional meeting will be held and the subcommittee will then draft a recommendation to be presented to the English Mastery Council, and then the English Mastery Council would present the recommendation to the State Board of Education. The policies have been submitted, the policies for 2018 have been submitted, and the policies are not a document that would change on a yearly basis. The plans, however, would be documents because the plans indicate what that implementation procedure would be for the districts.

Blakely Hume advised the subcommittee that, with Sophia's help, two plans have been copied and distributed to the subcommittee for review, one for Carson City School District and one for Esmeralda School District. The plans submitted were not the full plans, but rather snippets of the full plans. The items that have the greatest impact on EL learning and target supports for EL were the focus of the discussion. These topics included Gifted and Talented programs, Special Education, Leadership and Staffing, ELD Curriculum, Program and Activities, Title III Funded Professional Development/Learning, and ELD Program Models of Instruction/Instructional Delivery Methods, and Parent Advisory Participation. The objection of the meeting is to ensure that the plans submitted fit within the criteria and rubric that has been determined.

Sophia Masewicz advised the subcommittee that the plans are now printed using an electronic monitoring system called ePAGE and that is the reason for the change in appearance from the previous year.

Blakely Hume advised that he would allow approximately five minutes to review the plans and a discussion would follow for each topic.

Duncan Lee noted that at the last meeting there were two districts that had not submitted information and inquired whether plans were submitted.

Sophia Masewicz advised that all districts have submitted a plan; however one district has yet to finish all the requirements within ePAGE. There are currently three districts in the review process.

Duncan Lee inquired whether a reminder had been sent out.

Sophia Masewicz confirmed this is accurate.

With respect to the Gifted and Talented AP plan for Carson City, Laurel Crossman expressed concern that while it is detailed for the GATE program, the process for AP and Honors programs are not. There could be some more specifics about the AP and Honors program, and what the process and criteria to allow qualified ELs to participate in AP and Honors programs.

Karl Wilson echoed what Laurel Crossman expressed and noted that the plan also lacks information and details regarding the supports that will be put in place to help English learners access those rigorous courses and achieve success.

Sophia Masewicz acknowledged that this is a problematic area, hence the reason it is being discussed with the subcommittee and will also be discussed with the Title III Directors.

## **District EL Policy Review Process & Progress (Continued)**

Ms. Masewicz further commented that a student does not have to have a gifted designation to be in Honors, and access to the Honors programs will need to be discussed further.

Laurel Crossman noted her familiarity with the middle school in Carson City School District and advised that math is open to any student who meets the math score criteria that the school sets forth, which is also not detailed in the policy.

Karl Wilson inquired if the subcommittee were to provide very focused comments back to Carson City School District, what would those comments be in terms of this part of their plan, addressing the needs of English learners, and accessing Gifted and Talented and more rigorous courses.

Duncan Lee inquired about the process in identifying EL students to qualify beyond the GATE screening in second grade, and what additional supports are being provided of the school districts.

Laurel Crossman stated that there should be more specifics on the process and criteria for identifying and supporting AP and Honors students. Ms. Crossman noted that the policy could potentially be outdated because the GATE program is now more fluid and offers testing at any year, not just in second grade.

Karl Wilson thanked Laurel Crossman for the clarification and advised that he was unsure if the testing is offered after the second grade.

Gladis Diaz noted that Washoe now has the same process in place in terms of identifying students for the GATE Program, offering testing after the second grade.

Karl Wilson stated that if the subcommittee becomes aware of a common issue, then that should become a general recommendation to the State Board and Local Board of Trustees.

Blakely Hume agreed and noted the recommendation is not specific to only one district. At this time, the subcommittee moved on to the second section, Special Education.

Duncan inquired whether the percentage of EL students that require special education is similar to the same percentage as the regular student population.

Karl Wilson noted that that would depend on the size of the district. In a smaller district, numbers could go up dramatically in terms of percent with just one or two students qualifying. Nationally, the percent of students that qualify for Special Education based on disabilities ranges between 11 and 13%. When looking at the K-2 there are 14% of English learners with an IEP, that's higher than the general population. Grades three through five, six through eight, and nine to twelve, are also higher than the general population.

Duncan Lee asked if the percentages were almost double.

Karl Wilson noted that in some cases, this is accurate.

Laurel Crossman stated that she believes the language in the plan meets the criteria for Special Education and inquired whether the data in the table reflects an over identification.

## **District EL Policy Review Process & Progress (Continued)**

Karl Wilson asked Laurel Crossman whether she felt any of the bullets in the table would ensure that students are not being over or under identified. For example, in the first bullet, the assessment for learning disabilities should be initially evaluated both in the primary language and English to determine whether English proficiency skills are dominant or subordinate to their primary language skill proficiency. Mr. Wilson further commented the school does have very specific strategies to help prevent the identification because there may have been a problem with how the assessment was administered, and could the student not really perform well on the assessment because of how that was administered.

Sophia Masewicz noted that most assessments have biases related to language, which is why other types of assessments are necessary when assessing English learners for a disability.

Laurel Crossman explained that her initial reading was that the plan meets the criteria. It explains that they have specific processes to test that, but the concern arises with the table and the numbers that were put into the table. Ms. Crossman inquired whether there are still students who are over identified, and why is there a different number even though processes are in place.

Karl Wilson noted that the subcommittee will need to discuss a separate issue with the English Mastery Council that most districts have gone to a multi-tiered system of support in terms of doing all of the supports prior to a referral for Special Education assessment. However, some districts have implemented a policy that says if you have a student that's an English learner, they have to go through that process for at least one year before they could be considered for special education evaluation. That's the other end of the spectrum where you might have an English learner who does have a disability, who's not assessed and determined as having a disability in a timely way.

Karl Wilson noted the two comments that arose under the Special Education section, one, the district has processes in place that avoid over identification, and, two, although those processes are in place, the data doesn't seem to reflect that there is a comparable percentage of English learners being identified as having a disability, as the general population.

Blakely Hume moved on to the third section, Leadership and Staffing.

Duncan Lee inquired, with regards to the current discussion of the ELAD endorsement and things that will hopefully get implemented, how does that change the requirement for Leadership and Staffing infrastructure.

Karl Wilson advised that it will not change the requirements in terms of their policies, it will provide additional supports and criteria to help teachers and administrators gain the skills that would then meet this expectation. If teachers are going through to get their re-licensure credits, they will need to take coursework related to ELAD. All new teachers coming out of Nevada's institutions, starting with the group that starts in 2020, will have ELAD endorsement.

Laurel Crossman noted that she was able to read the first-half of the requirement and asked whether the second-half of the requirements regarding another policy and regulation had been provided.

## **District EL Policy Review Process & Progress (Continued)**

Blakely Hume apologized that the second-half was not provided in the subcommittee's packet, however the second-half is in regards to the EL Policy which has been approved.

Laurel Crossman inquired whether the second-half of the requirement specifics on the defined roles and collaborative practices of instructional personnel are located within the policy and regulation that has been approved. Blakely Hume confirmed this is accurate.

Duncan Lee advised that the subcommittee will need to ensure it is aligned to the most current requirement.

Blakely Hume moved on to the fourth section, ELD Curriculum.

Sophia Masewicz advised the subcommittee that a number of the programs listed support the language development for English learners. They are not programs that are connected to standards. These programs, at the different proficiency levels of English learners, help their development of English in that language progression. They are targeted programs to help build language, not at rigor necessarily required by the State. These are appropriate resource materials to support students at the various proficiency levels, which would be Level I through Level III, for students to build their language. Ms. Masewicz continued, what was not included in this was the curriculum in the core, where we ask the question, do they have a process to evaluate core curriculum to ensure that there are appropriate ancillary materials, and in the core curriculum, that will support English learners to standards. This is supplemental, and the other would be support materials in the core curriculum to access the standards.

Laurel Crossman inquired whether NDE lists which programs meet not only the language development, but also the State Academic Standards, and give that as an example of, these are approved programs that we recommend because they satisfy both.

Karl Wilson noted that he does not believe NDE has reached that level yet.

Sophia Masewicz advised, in talking with the Standard and Instruction Staff at the State level, districts are to submit supplemental materials, but there is not a clear process yet for that review. The department does not necessarily review curriculum adoptions.

Blakely Hume noted that he sits on the Textbook Curriculum Review Committee and the districts will submit the textbooks and their curriculum that they want reviewed to the Standard and Curriculum Office. Part of the role of the Textbook Curriculum Review Committee is to determine whether the purposed textbooks and curriculum contain supports for ELs, and how this curriculum will affect ELs. The Standards website list what textbook and curriculum adoptions have taken place over the last couple years.

Karl Wilson noted that the Standards and Instructional Support group that are involved with textbook adoption are now looking at whether the materials align Nevada's standards, and whether the materials are evidence-based.

## **District EL Policy Review Process & Progress (Continued)**

Laurel Crossman noted that since coming out of the recession, Carson City has been approving many textbook adoptions, and every application has to meet previously determined EL criteria. Ms. Crossman also expressed to the subcommittee that due to not having an in-depth knowledge of each of the programs, it's difficult to review other districts.

Karl Wilson advised that as the subcommittee looks at other districts, the question is whether the curricula materials that they are using are appropriate and successful, or do some changes need to be made. Duncan Lee inquired whether that is part of NDE's determination.

Sophia Masewicz noted that this is part of NDE's determination, however supplemental materials are outside of that process, and the subcommittee is only looking at supplemental materials.

Laurel Crossman noted that once a school adopts a curriculum, by statute, it's seven years that they have to continue to use that same curriculum because of purchasing.

Gladis Diaz noted that no purchases can be made for the school unless the materials have been reviewed. Sophia advised that the future Title III application is being drafted in the electronic system so that school districts can explain, within their application, the evidence for the use of the particular material they are asking for.

Karl Wilson stated it appears that the curriculum supplemental materials listed do build on language development, not so much on core instruction. Sophia Masewicz confirmed this is accurate.

Karl Wilson commented on the need for NDE to provide approval lists to assist the districts as they go through the process. Laurel Crossman and Gladis Diaz agreed.

Blakely Hume moved on to section five, Professional Development.

Duncan Lee asked whether this is a reminder for the districts of what needs to be done.

Sophia Masewicz confirmed and noted that the districts have to go through a checklist process to inform how their funds are being used to ensure it is approved under Title III. The funding cannot supplement, however there are some allowable activities that they can do. This provides a picture to NDE of what the district is doing in terms of their program or services.

Karl Wilson noted that Appendix B doesn't have a section that specifically defines this part of the plan.

The subcommittee moved to section six, Program Services.

Laurel Crossman noted this section appears to be more of an explanation of what the district is doing with the funding.

Blakely Hume moved on to section seven, Professional Development.

## District EL Policy Review Process & Progress (Continued)

Duncan Lee asked whether this portion is a restatement or recommendation.

Sophia Masewicz advised that this is how the Title III Funds are being used. Ms. Masewicz further advised that a one-time conference might raise a red flag because the new law states that a key factor in looking at professional development is whether there is sufficient intensity and duration. The district will have to provide some explanation as to how the one-time conference rolls into further professional learning.

Karl Wilson noted that NDE is comfortable with the TESL Training without a description because they are familiar with the intensity of the program and are comfortable with that kind of commitment on behalf of the district. Sophia noted another program that NDE is familiar and comfortable with, LANGUAGE! Live, where materials are purchased through the program to provide an extensive training for staff.

Laurel Crossman noted that the Professional Development requirements appear to be satisfied. Karl Wilson agreed.

Blakely Hume moved on to the eight section, ELD Program Model of Instruction.

Karl Wilson noted the two tables identify the three primary models the school district is using, and it also states how many students are being served with each. Mr. Wilson further noted the policy doesn't identify some of the strategies for some of the students that are being served under those services.

Laurel Crossman noted that the table included all programs that are district-funded and then supplemented with Title III.

Sophia Masewicz advised the subcommittee that in the past, the Models of Instruction had given a description of each of the models. It is informational to know the models in classrooms and what they look like, whether it is a co-teach model or a pull-out model.

Blakely Hume moved on to the ninth section, Parent Advisory Participation.

Karl Wilson noted that while it is not required of any districts, Carson City School District went above and beyond the legal requirements when establishing a Parent Advisory Committee.

Sophia Masewicz noted that from time-to-time, NDE will see Agendas with parent participation in which the parents are given the opportunity to give feedback about the programs. Districts are obligated to communicate the EL Program and other opportunities to parents, but in this setting, the parents have a voice to give suggestions, recommendations, and to get feedback about the EL District Program.

Karl Wilson asked Duncan Lee for his opinion of the State requirements.

Duncan Lee responded that he believes there are a couple of minor suggestions for improvement, but that it adheres to the policy.

Blakely Hume advised the subcommittee he would send out an email with a homework assignment of further plans for additional school districts to review.

## **Discussion & Development of Potential Recommendation to the State Board of Education**

Agenda item number 6 was postponed due to needing further review of additional plans.

### **Discussion: Potential Next Steps**

Laurel Crossman noted that the subcommittee had discussed the future homework assignments that would be sent via email and suggested holding a meeting prior to the English Mastery Council Meeting on May 9, 2018.

Karl Wilson asked whether the subcommittee wanted to attempt to have a draft recommendation prepared for the EMC meeting on May 9.

Duncan Lee inquired whether the subcommittee was prepared to draft a recommendation or if more time should be allotted to review the additional plans.

Blakely Hume advised that in order for the subcommittee to have done its due diligence, all plans would need to be covered and reviewed. Blakely suggested that the subcommittee review their plans and come back together as a group to make the recommendation. Individual schedules were discussed and the meeting was set for May 7, 2018 at 12:30 PM.

Karl Wilson asked Blakely Hume to please send Paula Zona, a potential new member to the subcommittee, an invite for the upcoming meeting.

Laurel Crossman indicated she would meet with Paula Zona and fill her in on the events of the meeting.

### **Public Comment #2**

There was no public comment from Carson City or Las Vegas.

### **Adjournment**

Subcommittee Chair, Laurel Crossman, adjourned the meeting at 2:14 PM.