

ENGLISH MASTERY COUNCIL

District Policy & Criteria Planning Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

Thursday April 4, 2019

9:00 A.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	Battle Born Conference Room

Call to Order

Chair Laurel Crossman called the English Mastery Council Subcommittee Meeting of the District Policy and Criteria Planning Meeting to order at 9:00 AM on Thursday, April 4, 2019. She noted that the Standards and Curriculum Subcommittee did not have quorum so they would not be voting in the meeting, but were welcome to voice opinions and join discussions.

Roll Call

Montoya conducted a roll call and **quorum was established.**

Members Present: Laurel Crossman, Gladis Diaz, Duncan Lee, Paula Zona

Others Present: Blakely Hume, Mindy Montoya, and Maija Talso

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Laurel Crossman.

Public Comments #1

There were no public comments.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Motion: Paula Zona motioned to approve a flexible agenda. Duncan Lee seconded the motion. Motion carried and the minutes were approved.

Approval of September 27, 2018 Minutes

Motion: Duncan motioned to approve the September 27, 2018 meeting minutes. Gladis Diaz seconded the motion. Motion carried and the minutes were approved.

Approval of November 1, 2018 Meeting Minutes for the Standards and Curriculum Subcommittee

Chair Crossman stated that because there was not a quorum present for the subcommittee, they would move on to the next agenda item.

Finalize Current Recommendation to State Board of Education on ELL Plans

It was established that a copy of these draft recommendations was shared at the EMC meeting in January.

Ms. Talso read the draft wording for the EL Plan Recommendation: “All school districts must submit a detailed plan even if there are no EL’s currently identified in the district and regardless of size.” She asked if they wanted to specify more about what size district or what size EL student population.

Mr. Hume responded that part of the issues that are going on with some of the bills is there’s a big disparity in terms of size. Clark County is one of the largest districts in the nation and then every other town in Nevada is under 10,000. That sizing population affects more than the legislatures sometimes may think.

Chair Crossman pointed out that some districts had less than 4% student population being EL’s, and three of them: Pershing, Storey and Mineral, did not submit any plans at all. A recommendation would be that they still need to do the work to have a plan put together. The Chair asked who are they submitting the plan to, are they submitting it to NDE or are they preparing it for themselves. Chair Crossman asked if “submit” was the right word to be using.

Mr. Hume clarified each district is required to submit policies. If NDE doesn’t receive the policies from the districts, even the districts that wish to claim that they’re not able to account for any EL’s, NDE will have ongoing communication conversations with the districts about that. There’s nothing punitive the NDE can do to the districts, but given their levels of communication and their relationships with the districts, they reinforce the need to have those policies until they get them.

Chair Crossman explained all districts do have updated EL Policies; they are talking about English Learner Plans. She said that have to be mindful of the language they use when they make their recommendations to the State Board of Education.

The group did some wordsmithing around this recommendation and finally came up with the following: English Learner Plan Recommendation. All school districts must create an English Learner Plan to implement their EL Policy regardless of the number of EL’s in the district and even if there are no EL’s currently identified in the district.

Chair Crossman moved on to the second recommendation for ELD Curriculum Development. The draft wording for this one reads “ELD Curriculum Development Recommendation. NDE will provide a list of approved curriculum and supplemental sources that support language development that are high quality, rigorous instructional materials and practices that align with A) Nevada Academic Content Standards; and B) District identified program Models of Instruction/Instructional Delivery methods.”

Ms. Talso thought the use of the word “curriculum “ might be a problem because it’s got so many meanings.

Chair Crossman said when some districts turned in their plans they didn’t identify specifically their curriculums or what models of instruction they were using. The thinking was that if NDE could say the following curriculums or models of instruction, have been approved, then those districts could use those.

Finalize Current Recommendation to State Board on ELL Plans (continued)

Ms. Zona wondered about the word “practices” because if they’re calling it curriculum development recommendations, a list of approved curriculum or resources, to her a practice would be more of an instructional technique or strategy a teacher would implement versus something that NDE would recommend to a district.

Chair Crossman said they asked does NDE keep a record of all of the approved different curriculum, different textbooks, that are recommended models of instruction for EL students and they do not, and so that was something they thought would be helpful if they could give that information to districts as they are looking to do it. It would also be a recommendation that they would make to each individual district with their English Learner Plan to be specific on what they’re using, how it aligns with the standards and identify models of instruction. The Chair wondered if they should take out ELD and just say curriculum recommendations, period, because that’s what they’re talking about is developing all of their curricula to meet the needs of EL’s.

Ms. Talso said the difference is ELD Curriculum means the curriculum specifically for English Language Development where if you’re meaning the overall curriculum you would want to say curriculum recommendations to support English Language Development.

Chair Crossman said when they reviewed the English Learner Plans the weakness that they had is that their Plan did not specify their curriculum or their models of instruction and their delivery methods.

Ms. Talso said it sounded to her like they wanted to make sure the plan specifies how the curricula support English Language Development and they also want NDE to develop a list of curricula in all content areas that they’ve already been approved to support English Language Development.

Chair Crossman suggested the following revision: District English Learner Plans will specify curricula materials and instructional practices that align with A) Nevada Academic Content Standards, and B) District identified program Models of Instruction/Instructional Delivery methods. Then have a new sentence that says NDE will provide a list of approved materials and supplemental sources and instructional methods.

The group discussed what exactly districts are expecting on an NDE source list and what was the difference between textbooks and ancillary/supplemental materials for EL support. Another version of the recommendation was created: District EL plans will specify ELD curriculum, materials and instructional methods that support language development and provide high quality, rigorous instruction that aligned with A) Nevada Academic Content Standards, B) District identified program Models of Instruction/Instructional Delivery methods, and C) ELD standards.

And then the second part of that recommendation would be: The Nevada Department of Education will provide a list of approved ELD curriculum and supplemental materials.

Chair Crossman introduced the third recommendation for assessments. This currently reads: Proper and accurate identification of EL students regarding: A) SPED students that were over-identified; and B) Several districts that under-identify.

Finalize Current Recommendation to State Board on ELL Plans (continued)

The Chair said Nevada Administrative Code that allows an alternative assessment for EL students to qualify for GATE, so that should be included. They need to capture more EL students or other subpopulations for AP and GATE classes.

The group tossed some words around and came up with another, better, version of this recommendation: Districts should review assessment procedures and consider alternative assessments to provide opportunities for GATE, Honors, AP or Dual Credits for EL's.

Chair Crossman read the working version of the Building Educator Capacity Recommendation: Professional Development is recommended to support teacher capacity to improve instruction and assessment for EL's by enhancing teacher capacity to understand and use curriculum, assessment measures and instructional strategies supporting academic language development and equitable access to grade level content. The districts will increase educator capacity throughout the state through such opportunities as recruiting and providing incentives for teachers with TESL/ELAD endorsement or those with equity and evidence training.

The group went back and forth on this recommendation and Chair Crossman said the state's concern was getting more ELAD or TESL endorsed teachers in the rurals. Of course they want the districts to support teachers getting their endorsements but also, they want the state to encourage districts to support that. They don't want the wording to sound like there aren't highly qualified teachers in the rural counties.

Ms. Talso thought maybe there could be two separate recommendations under this heading with the first one for what they suggest the districts do to increase teacher capacity and the second one with what NDE will do to increase teacher capacity.

Chair Crossman asked what if they said the districts and NDE will increase educator capacity throughout the state through such opportunities as recruiting and providing incentives for teachers with TESL/ELAD endorsements or those with equity and evidence training.

After much back and forth, the group settled on: Building Educator Capacity Recommendation A) Professional development is recommended to improve instruction and assessment for EL's by enhancing teacher capacity to understand and use curriculum assessment measures and instructional strategies supporting academic language development and equitable access to grade-level content and B) throughout the state districts with the support of NDE will increase educator capacity through such opportunity as recruiting and providing incentives for teachers with TESL/ELAD endorsements or those with equity and evidence training.

The group discussed whether they should limit themselves to just three recommendations and they decided to go for all five. While they were deciding this, some members went back to parse words and phrases from previous sections. They then went on to the Parent Advisory Participation Recommendation. This currently reads: Provide opportunities for parent engagement through regular meetings and participation such as parent/teacher conferences, EL-specific events, school events for the purposes of formulating and responding to recommendations.

Finalize Current Recommendation to State Board on ELL Plans (continued)

The Chair said she didn't understand the last section - evidence for the purposes of formulating. She said some districts didn't have regularly scheduled meetings for parent advisory input. Some of them didn't necessarily provide of the opportunity for the parents to formulate and give recommendations. But the purpose of it would be to get input from the parents. The key is that the parents need the opportunity to give feedback and recommendations on the EL program.

Ms. Talso said maybe they should start it off by saying districts will establish procedures and opportunities for parents of English Learners to gather their input and recommendations.

Mr. Hume said districts need to be having regular meetings and participation for the parents. An unidentified speaker noted that the last time a parent group met in Washoe was in 2013, so there was something wrong with that picture. They couldn't mandate meetings. A parent advisory committee is not a requirement in law. What is the requirement is that schools and districts have a plan for engaging them in the education of their children.

Mr. Hume stated that a suggestion was made that they could add examples like engagement through parent/teacher conferences, EL specific events and school events. He stated that maybe they shouldn't give any suggestions or maybe they should not use the word "advise." He suggested that they use "feedback" instead or maybe they should not use the word "engage." The discussion moved to the big districts' advantages when it came to resources for EL parents. Then it moved to the disadvantages of the big districts when it came to EL parents getting lost and not feeling heard. They ended up with: Districts will establish procedures and regular opportunities for parents of English Learners to provide feedback and recommendations on EL programs and services.

Mr. Hume and the Chair discussed the timing of State Board adoptions and moving forward. If the recommendations move forward today then they'll go to the EMC in May and if that's selected, then it goes forward for the State Board in May. Part of the goals will inform the districts where do they need to go. There will be communication with the districts over the summer about here are the new recommendations and feedback. That then provides them incentive and the feedback to move forward. The hope would be then by perhaps Christmas of '19 everything can be set to review in the spring.

Chair Crossman said by statute they're required to review the policies annually and they haven't done that yet. She stated that at last check they were all compliant and asked if they needed to go through and review those now. Mr. Hume replied that could be a fall procedure.

Mr. Hume read through the recommendations to the EMC from District Policy and Criteria Planning Subcommittee one more time.

- #1) **English Learner Plan Recommendation:** All school districts must submit a detailed EL Plan to implement their EL Policy regardless of the number of EL's in the district and even if there are no EL's currently identified in the district.

- #2) **ELD Curriculum Development Recommendation:** District EL Plans will specify ELD curriculum material and instructional methods that support language development and provide high quality instruction that align with A) Nevada Academic Content Standards, B) district identified program Models of Instruction/Instructional Delivery methods, and C) the ELD standards.
Nevada Department of Education will provide a list of approved ELD curriculum and supplemental materials.
- #3) **Assessments Recommendation:** Districts should properly and accurately identify EL students to avoid over-identification of SPED students and under-identification of GATE students. Districts should review assessment procedures and consider alternative assessments to provide opportunities for GATE, Honors, AP or Dual Credit for EL's.
- #4) **Building Educator Capacity Recommendation:**
A) Professional development is recommended to improve instruction and assessment for EL's by enhancing teacher capacity to understand and use curriculum assessments measures and instructional strategies supporting academic language development and equitable access to grade level content.
B) Throughout the state, districts, with the support of NDE will increase educator capacity through such opportunities as recruiting and providing incentives for teachers or TESL/ELAD endorsement or those with equity and evidence training.
- #5) **Parent Advisory Participation Recommendation:** Provide opportunities for parent engagement through regular meetings and participation such as parent teacher conferences, EL specific events, school events for the purposes of formulating and responding to recommendations.

Chair Crossman said she would entertain a motion on the recommendations if there was no further discussion.

Motion: Paula Zona motioned to approve the five recommendations made by the District Policy and Criteria Planning Subcommittee. Gladis Diaz seconded the motion. Motion carried and the minutes were approved.

Combined District Policy & Standards District Development Opportunities

Mr. Hume suggested they use this time to think about next year because it would be good to hit the ground running in the fall. If there needs to be a combination of two subcommittees at that time this might be an opportunity to figure that out, and there will be some ideas in the agenda item that may support that.

Ms. Talso said she would like her subcommittee to take a look at Recommendations #2 and #4, Curriculum and Instruction, to see if they have any similar or additional recommendations and maybe develop some criteria for that or some additional criteria for what constitutes high quality material.

Chair Crossman suggested since they've approved the five recommendations, and 2 and 4 overlap, perhaps they can give them a copy of it and if they choose to have their own subcommittee meeting before the entire English Mastery Council meets on May 8th, then they would be prepared if they have enough time to discuss them and do that before the English Mastery Council meets.

Mr. Hume said he already talked to Dr. Navarrete about the ELAD endorsement and support for that so there's another opportunity to combine all those. And so that might be a good opportunity if this is sent out and they speak about it in the TESL subcommittee if Maija's group reviews and then they speak about it at the standards, it would be a strong conversation to have on May 8th that says the subcommittees have met individually, they've discussed and shared some notes and here's the thought for next year. That would be a strong way to go into 2019 to say professional development is going to be the next step that all three of these subcommittees can contribute to in some form or another.

Chair Crossman wondered if the other two subcommittees might want to have meetings before May 8th to review the recommendations, or perhaps they could even just be emailed the recommendations and then have conference calls to discuss where that would go.

Mr. Hume liked the idea of everyone getting the recommendations and then at the May 8th EMC the Chair could present their recommendations as voted on and approved and add some other thoughts.

Chair Crossman asked Mr. Hume how the recommendations would be presented to the State Board of Education. Mr. Hume said it would be Dr. Duradola's decision.

Public Comments #2

There were no public comments.

Adjournment

After thanking everyone for their hard work, Chair Crossman adjourned the meeting at 11:06 a.m.