

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE**

Thursday, April 14, 2011  
Senate Hearing Room 1 - 1:30 P.M.

Chairman Maguire called the meeting to order at 1:34 P.M. and attendance was noted by the secretary.

## **1. Call to order**

Present:

Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman

Mr. Hector Ayala

Ms. Margaret Dugan

Dr. Mark Joraanstad

Ms. Pam Pickard

Absent:

Mr. Jim DiCello

Ms. Johanna Haver

Ms. Jodi Jerich

Ms. Dawn Wallace

Mr. Maguire thought it would be helpful to revise the order of the agenda and to have Ms. Santa Cruz to do the presentation on the English Language Proficiency revised standards first.

## **1. Presentation on the Revised English Language Proficiency Standards (TIME PERMITTING)**

Ms. Santa Cruz presented the revised presentation of the revision process for the English Language Proficiency Standards. To begin with, in looking at the revised standards, we want to be sure we are addressing the needs of English language learners in Arizona to become proficient in English and to ensure we are addressing the knowledge levels that will give the students the ability to access content in terms of language, math, science, and social studies (i.e. the core areas). As we set out to revise the standards we worked very carefully with WestEd which is a research and development organization that works with the states to revise standards and assessments for English language learners. We are part of a collaborative group with other states that works to revise the standards. We followed a very specific framework for the revision of the standards. We followed a very structured and precise way of looking at the standards with the assistance of WestEd. In the end, we wanted to have the highest quality standards for our English language learners.

There is a WestEd framework that we followed. It provides high quality standards and assessments (that will be aligned) and can be used to evaluate the implementation of our program in Arizona. The revision process itself began in June 2009. We started with a gap analysis. We looked at each domain of the language standards and made sure we spent enough time going over that information so that the revisions would be very carefully crafted in the end. The process took almost a year and a half. We finished the writing of the revised standards in May 2010. That was not the end of the process. We continued to work internally and came to a point where we were able to roll out the standards in December. We had many committee members that participated in this process. In addition to ADE staff, there were members from the field including administrators, college/university faculty, community/business members, constituents, and members from WestEd. Our committee members were very important. We tried to get ten members from each group to assist us with the process. We were able to gain a good understanding of what these individuals had in mind when it came to revising the standards.

With the guidance of WestEd, we made sure there was an analysis between our existing English Language Proficiency standards and the existing English Language Arts standards. WestEd did an independent review, the committee members did a review, and ADE staff did an internal review. We learned where we needed to up the rigor so that the standards can meet the needs of the students.

Mr. Maguire stated that one thing that was pivotal on the discussion on how the models were developed was the relationship between the standards in the mainstream and the standards in a Structured English Immersion classroom. As you revise them, making sure that continuity remains is critically important.

Ms. Santa Cruz stated that they were very cognizant of that fact so that the students would have the requisite skills to be able to go into the mainstream. In terms of the goals of the revision process, there were several. One, was that we needed to ensure that we came up with a document that was teacher-user friendly. The old standards were not as friendly as they could have been. Two, we wanted to bring clarity to those standards, so that it was clear what the standard expected the student to do. The third point is that we wanted to add that rigor and level of intensity so that English Language Learners can be in line with the content that is proposed in terms of their learning. Fourth, to address the language of the content areas, we didn't look simply at language vocabulary words, but looked at the language that science and math teachers look for to understand the content. Fifth, we wanted to take the Discrete Skills Inventory that provides the grammar for our learning piece, and incorporated all those skills into the standards. Sixth, we wanted to bring alignment to all the stages, so that you can see the progression of those skills between the stages. Seventh, the standards are now more closely aligned to the common core standards. And finally, we wanted to produce the standards for the blueprint of the next assessment, which is currently in progress.

Ms. Santa Cruz referenced a visual that stated that as students progress in their English proficiency, then the demands and expectations on English Language Learners progress as well. There is more emphasis on the English Language Proficiency standards at the lower proficiency levels, and a higher emphasis on the content areas at the higher proficiency levels. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that when students attain Intermediate proficiency, they will receive a larger portion of the common core content in their classrooms. The main idea here is that as they progress in proficiency in language, the content demands and language arts standards demands are higher. Ms. Dugan stated that this visual should identify that content is still being taught at the pre-emergent level. On the continuum of teaching English, the content gets more challenging. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that the intent of this visual is to state that the content is part of teaching to ELL students. She stated that it was important to incorporate academic language into the standards. There was not a clear understanding of what that meant. It means how students can meaningfully engage with the academic content and the discourse of the mainstream classroom. We would include grammar, vocabulary, and anything that tells you what the demand would be in the ELD and mainstream classroom. If certain things are not taught explicitly to English Language Learners, then it will set them back. Mr. Maguire stated that sometimes this is misunderstood because the Task Force's challenge was not to have them speak in everyday conversation, but to pick up a textbook and have English Language Learners be able to read that type of academic language. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that ADE had a lot of training on the framework used for the revised standards so that they understood what it meant. Mr. Joraanstad stated that if students don't understand the academic vocabulary, then the math test doesn't actually demonstrate their mathematic proficiency, but their lack of English language proficiency. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that the concept of academic language being incorporated with the standards will be incorporated into the trainings. Ms. Dugan stated all kids have to take AIMS. And the training that she received from the department it was implicitly understood that academic language would be taught. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that what is assessed will be taught, and they plan to put this into the assessment. Ms. Dugan stated that this shows that SEI does teach academic language. I would just hate to say that we have never emphasized the importance of teaching academic language before. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that we felt that this piece needed to be emphasized even more so. She stated that it really takes a while for a student to become meaningfully engaged. We clarified what that meant as we look at the different levels of language that are demanded. Ms. Santa Cruz referenced a document in the power point that references a very clear focused list of language functions. It highlights academic demands that ask students to understand certain functions of the language. If they have not been taught these skills, they won't understand what has been asked of them. In English, a student who is not an English learner may know these, but an English language learner may not necessarily know these. These are thinking skills. We are teaching a thinking process. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that there with regard to language complexity they are looking at sentences, paragraph lengths, how that language is constructed, and how they get to what they've been asked to meaningfully do. A

student can be taught to handle that type of complexity. A student must be able to look at the density of a paragraph and a sentence. Being aware of these pieces that English language learners go through gives us a better way to address their needs in the mainstream classroom.

Another item that was very important was the English Language Arts standards and the common core. We took the common core standards, put them side by side with our standards, and aligned them both vertically and horizontally so that our students are responsible for them in the classroom. The revised standards now reflect those language skills in the common core. Mr. Maguire wanted clarification on vertically and horizontally. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that horizontal refers to proficiency, and vertical refers to skill level.

Ms. Santa Cruz stated that the revised standards are all-inclusive. This means that every level or stage includes all of those skills a student whether pre-emergent or high intermediate would need to know before becoming proficient. We do not have to go back to other stages anymore to find those lower-level skills. In the past, when we set out with pre-emergents, we didn't have the ability to know where to go. We had to look at first grade or kindergarten materials to get at those skills. No longer do teachers have to scaffold back to lower levels. They are much more teacher friendly. Mr. Maguire stated that there's a lot more "stuff" for a high school student than for a kindergarten. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that we also added a language strand that is similar to the common core's language strand. The language strand includes grammar and vocabulary and this is where the DSI went. We took the vocab section from the reading domain, and put it into the language strand. Now our standards mirror what was done with the common core. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that we have matched the labels for each proficiency level in the standards with the proficiency levels on the AZELLA. In addition, we know that a great number of English Language Learners are at the Intermediate level. So we decided early on that we needed to divide that up into low and high Intermediate. That is our goal to get our students into the high Intermediate. Mr. Joraanstad stated this differentiation is so critical for scheduling the kids because the high Intermediates need to be grouped differently than someone who just got into Basic. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that this is an instructional piece so that the teachers know where to start with these students. In addition, the DSI is now an integral part of the standards. It can be used separately, but it is now part of the standards. We have proficiency level descriptors that show a snapshot of where the students are. We have those for each one of the stages. She clarified that they are by proficiency level and by stage. Mr. Maguire clarified that "stage" is the same as "grade-band." He stated that maybe instead of "grade-band" we should use "stage" in the models now. He stated that he presumes there was a rationale for why certain groups were "staged" together. He stated that the grade-bands should match the stages. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that grouping depends on numbers and proficiency levels. She stated that even within a group, there are always variances. Each one of the standards is so specific, so you can always scaffold back so teachers have a very precise idea of where the students are.

To continue, in terms of the format, each stage follows the same format. There are three domains: reading, writing, and a language strand. There are the proficiency level descriptors. The standards themselves have not changed, but the concepts and sub concepts may have changed. There are also English proficiency level and performance indicators. These are the “bottom line,” or the skills a student needs to be able to demonstrate. We believe teachers can take those and put them right into their lesson plans.

Next, Ms. Santa Cruz showed examples of the newly revised standards. First, she showed a snapshot of what those students can do. For Kindergarten, it says for a pre-emergent, they have little ability to communicate in English. However at the bottom level, this student can consistently express and respond, which mirrors quite closely the skills of a mainstream student.

The next slide Ms. Santa Cruz showed is in the writing domain for grades 9-12. They use a coding system so that they can go easily into the lesson plan. Here, the standard did not change. But, the proficiency levels now go from pre-emergent to high intermediate. We have concepts and sub-concepts. We clearly reference the content. In some places we have put down the social studies or math content that is relevant for each performance indicator. Mr. Maguire asked if there are other items below this. Ms. Santa Cruz stated yes, absolutely, there are many additional items and they increase in complexity.

In the listening and speaking domain, we used to have three standards. We took the standard English conventions and put them into the language strand. These standards are taught in a very structured way. She stated as an example, you can't just have students talk all day long, but they need to be engaged in meaningful discussion and structured. These standards show teachers how they may teach the delivery of oral communications. Ms. Santa Cruz showed another example from Kindergarten where students are first responding to read alouds and then responding in complete sentences.

The next one is stage five, grades 9-12. At the high intermediate level, students are able to respond to conversations by rephrasing, asking questions, or expressing their own thoughts. It is very structured and these skills have to be taught. Within the same domain of listening of speaking, the skills get more difficult from left to right. In this next example, in grades 3-5, students are responding to academic questions in complete sentences. At the high school level for high intermediate, students are being expected to use compound complex sentences where they are able to communicate their thoughts. In the reading domain, there are four areas. Fluency is excluded from Kindergarten. There is phonemic awareness and decoding. All of these are now included in all of the stages. For high school, we have decoding. This is necessary for those pre-emergent students who need those skills. Mr. Maguire clarified that PE-1 is the same for that 9-12 as for the lower grade. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that yes it would be addressing

the same skill, but instead it would be more so at a grade appropriate level. If you compare grade 9-12 to kindergarten, they are different because they are developmentally appropriate for each level. At the higher grade levels, there are other skills that must be moved along and focused on. You would probably do some kind of assessment in terms of how much that student needs. And you have to make decisions at the high school level regarding where you spend your time. When you get to comprehension, this is where you need to intensify your effort, because that's where reading is. When we did an analysis of the current standards, we found a lot of skills that referenced non-fiction, but not fiction. When it comes to non-fiction, you are looking at the content materials. We are still working on that. We will label the standards better to show which standards should emphasize fiction and which should emphasize non-fiction. In the writing domain, have the five areas, except for kindergarten, which does not have research. In the writing, there is the concept and the sub concept. You might look at this and say this is similar to AIMS, and we did try to mirror that. Mr. Maguire said that the same kind of standard alignment exists with AIMS and the mainstream classroom. Therefore, if the ELP standards, eht AZELLA, and the common core align, then they will align with the AIMS. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that once students are in the social studies classroom, they will have a lot of work to do related to English language skills. Back to the example, there is the persuasive and functional. I mentioned the language strand was added. This has grammar and vocab from the reading domain. You can see that what is included is all the grammar and all the sub concepts. This is where they will be taught explicitly. The DSI provides the foundation for grammar for ELLs.

Next is an example of the language strand that is right out of the DSI. As you go along, you can see at the high school level the nouns are more complex. In terms of common nouns and proper nouns, it takes more time to do and include in a document such as this. Verb tenses are very much part of our training. We go from parts of speech to phrase construction to come up with sentence construction. And the other section in that language strand is vocabulary. HI-4 says the students will be using grade specific academic vocabulary. In grades 9-12 you teach idioms and other academic pieces in the strand. As mentioned earlier, we are conducting a correlation with our standards with the common core. This is a sample of a writing standard. We are asking students to demonstrate they can write a narrative paragraph. If you look at the language we have used, and the rigor we have infused into our standards, it's very similar to that of the common core. These are students who are still learning the language.

On our webpage we have a link to the standards where you can print them all or you can print them by domain. We put the standards online in February and have been taking comments regarding the standards from the field. There is a survey online available through the end of April. It is our plan to finish and finalize these standards early this summer so that they can be implemented in the fall. The standards also have a glossary that we've updated and there is also a list of irregular verbs from the DSI. We've also provided the language demands and language complexities documents from WestEd. We believe that these standards will provide the

blueprint for our next assessment to give the students the tools necessary to go into the mainstream. Ms. Dugan asked if they are going to wait for the common core to be done to move forward on the AZELLA done. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that we've already started the AZELLA revision process, and plan to have a new assessment in place by July 2012.

Mr. Maguire asked where he could find his favorite past perfect tense. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that it would be found in the language strand. It would be applied in the writing and possibly even the reading. There's a good crossover between explicitly teaching and applying the content. Ms. Dugan commended Ms. Santa Cruz and the department for doing such a thorough job. Ms. Pickard stated she'd be surprised if there were any negative comments because it's so well put together.

Mr. Maguire stated that now that the standards are revised, we need to go back and use the new standards and determine revised time allocations. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that we are actually in the process of doing that. We definitely are looking at those time allocations and how they fit into the revised standards. It's the next piece that will help those teachers in knowing what to use and when. Now, we need to give more guidance to the field in terms of where to use the revised standards. Mr. Maguire stated that the time allocations were designed to help the field originally.

## **2. Presentation and Discussion of the Tempe Union Proposed Alternate Model**

Mr. Maguire stated that Tempe Union's application for an alternative model is pretty unique. He stated that he is not sure that there is anything inconsistent with what they're doing and with the current model. They are simply using content materials to teach English. But the real challenge they have is making sure they don't lose sight of the English language proficiency standards in the process. He stated that what the Task Force has heard is that they have a pretty good handle on teaching content with the ELP standards. Mr. Maguire stated that he is concerned on the assessments and whether those assessments are measuring progress in English language proficiency. Mr. Maguire stated that perhaps the Department can work with Tempe Union on their assessments throughout the next year. Maybe the department could help them refine their process, but there is nothing inconsistent with what they're doing and the models. Ms. Santa Cruz asked for clarification that Mr. Maguire is stating that Tempe Union can implement their model next year. Mr. Maguire stated that he believes they could implement their model this year and still be in compliance. As long as they have the English language proficiency standards as the focus, there's no reason not to do it. Ms. Dugan stated that she wants to know if OELAS should view their formative or summative tests. She clarified that their formative tests will need to show English language proficiency and content standards. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that they are now crafting tests that are using both language and content. As an example, in science, where they are using reading standards, Tempe Union needs to identify a reading language objective

that will assess students on a question so that it generates an answer relative to science. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that she and OELAS staff did meet with Tempe Union. She stated that they understand that the language objective has to be there. They've come a long way and have crafted their lessons in such a way that they have both language and content objectives. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that OELAS would love to assist them and meet with them and could commit to meet with them on a quarterly basis every nine weeks. It would be very amenable to them and helpful to us as a department to help them develop. As they do that, they would have a course for language that would be very replicable for others who may want to use the same format in delivering content. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that OELAS has had very positive feedback from Tempe Union and stated that they've done everything OELAS has asked. One of the handouts they put together is not unlike the Phoenix Union model. In this handout they've showed that they are delivering explicit instruction. They've described the particular standards that they're going to cover and assess. This is a work in progress, but Ms. Santa Cruz stated that in her professional opinion they are moving in the direction that will ensure that they are incorporating that content.

Mr. Joraanstad stated that assessments attached in the packet appear to be a dual purpose assessment of reading comprehension and content. He stated that the sample assessment looks very much like an AIMS question. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that yes, that is exactly what they've done. Where they are doing the writing and social studies, the recommendation from OELAS is that they are assessing the unit, but also whether they can perform linguistically. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that one recommendation would be to create a rubric to go along with the writing assessment. Ms. Dugan stated that as an English teacher being a co-teacher, they are both responsible for the AIMS test. Ms. Pickard questioned that within their district and with regards to accountability, what is their check and balance. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that OELAS will be monitoring them to see how the standards will be implemented and will be working with them regarding the progress of these students. They will monitor to see how the students are progressing in their skill areas. Ms. Pickard stated that the department would be helping the teachers work successfully on this model. Mr. Maguire stated that he does not see this as an alternative model. It is a locally interpreted implementation of the model. This is just a very intense way of doing it. I don't believe that it is a deviation of the models. He stated that his thought is that they should go forth and do it, with the additional attention of the department staff to help them. The real challenge is going to be making sure that they are testing the right things. In terms of measurement, he stated that he would like to see some very detailed tracking of their students' AZELLA progress. Not even necessarily reclassification, but did they "move up" along the proficiency scale. He stated that he is perfectly happy for them to move forward with the model with the assistance of the department. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that she sees a great commitment on their part as a district. The fact that they are willing to commit two teachers is a great commitment. They are also willing to sit with the department and take the recommendation and guidance that OELAS has provided. Mr. Maguire stated that after the end

of the year we could write up an example of how you can effectively use content materials in the classroom. Ms. Dugan stated that even though they had done this before without our approval, they had great reclassification rates. She stated that they should be able to implement this model. She stated that her recommendation is to have OELAS work with them. Ms. Pickard stated that her concern is that we will have no benchmark or dialogue after one year of implementation and there needs to be some type of a check-in process. Mr. Maguire stated that the Task Force would like to see Tempe Union to come back mid-year for an update and also a third quarter update. The goal is to learn from this exercise and take advantage of the fact that there will be two highly qualified teachers in the classroom. We will probably be able to apply the lessons learned. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that the students in those classes are Intermediates so it will be great to look at that level of proficiency to see how they respond to the content. Mr. Maguire stated that everything we observe will be done with two teachers in the classroom which will be the exception rather than the rule. Mr. Maguire asked if anyone objected to them going forward with this model. Mr. Joraanstad stated that maybe they should have some sort of a “blessing” to go forth with implementation of this plan. Mr. Maguire stated that he does not want this to become a precedent for other districts, but that this is a “test case.” Ms. Dugan stated that she wants to get them going with this model and their master schedule. **Mr. Maguire gave a Motion to allow Tempe Union to proceed with the implementation of their new process as a pilot with the assistance and support of OELAS for the 2012-2013 school year with reporting back to the Task Force around the middle of the year, during the third quarter, and at the end of the year. Mr. Joraanstad seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **3. Discussion of the English Language Learner Models**

Mr. Maguire stated that over the next month or so it would be helpful if the Task Force could update various portions of the model and discuss what process the Task Force would like to do to get there. There are some critical things that need to be looked at in the models. For instance, the Task Force needs to review the language in the models with regard to the time allocations and how it should incorporate with the new standards. The Task Force should also review the grouping processes of the students. Mr. Maguire questioned whether any districts ever did sub-level grouping. The way the groupings work is from the most optimal to increasingly broad groups in order to allow schools to build classes, but make them as homogenous as possible. The Task Force needs to talk about the stages as a preferred constraint. He stated that keeping kindergarten separate should probably stay the same. Mr. Maguire stated that he had not heard of anything with regard to the class size numbers. They seem to work okay. The time allocations will probably be the biggest change. He stated that he is not sure that the information regarding classroom practices in the models needs to change. He stated that the Tempe Union pilot will be a great help as the task force moves forward. In sum, Mr. Maguire believes the Task Force should look into the time allocations, the grouping process, and update some of the language in the models.

Mr. Joraanstad said that he hasn't thought about the class size standards, but due to the current economic climate, a lot of districts are scheduling their classes much larger than what's indicated in the models simply out of economic necessity. He provided as an example a district with 100 students in kindergarten, where three teachers are allotted for those 100 students. If that district is then required to provide one class with 20 ELLs, then the 2 remaining teachers must split the remaining 80 students into two classrooms. When this sort of thing happens, it creates a backlash against the school and the very children the Task Force is trying to help. It's an issue that both the Task Force and the districts are going to be facing. Some districts are currently looking at scheduling 36 students per classroom in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. If the Task Force says the maximum class size is 23 or 25, Mr. Joraanstad stated that he is not sure if that puts the Task Force in an impossible position, but it's something to think about.

Mr. Maguire stated that he wondered how that can possibly be happening based on the marginal change in funding levels per student. This is not a funding issue; it is some other choice that is being made. But that is not a Task Force issue. But the way the SEI fund works is that if the class sizes precipitate an additional teacher, then it gets funded. The funding has been reduced, but it has been at the fully requested funding level. In most cases when in doubt, an extra teacher was funded by the SEI fund. Perhaps we can do some outside research on this issue. Mr. Joraanstad stated that in his district they don't generate enough ELLs to receive any funding to support a problem like he just described, but perhaps it would be helpful to hear some districts present on this issue. He stated that he is aware that the class size numbers are going up to distressingly high numbers. He also stated that he is not sure how the districts will be able to teach our ELLs if there are such high numbers.

Mr. Maguire stated we should also look at ILLPs. We should probably follow up on the changes made to the ILLPs from the first 16 level to the 20 level. It has been at the 20 level for two years now. And then later on, the Task Force should probably look at the training and monitoring portions as well.

Mr. Maguire stated that there is some information for OELAS staff to work on. Perhaps the Task Force could hear some testimony on the ILLPs and see if there has been a benefit for the better or the worse. Mr. Maguire also mentioned that the PHLOTE form is now changed. Mr. Maguire stated that the first and second year issue relates to the time allocation issue. The Tempe model helps the districts understand how they can deal with their students as they progress further through the model.

Mr. Joraanstad stated that some of the districts have been contacted by the Office of Civil Rights regarding reporting of what they are doing in the second year and they are wondering about flexibility of the models. He stated that there might be a possibility for some flexibility with

high intermediates within the models. Mr. Maguire stated this discussion is something that the Task Force would discuss once the time allocations are worked out. Once the standards are aligned with the time allocations, then the relationship between the time allocations and the second year will work a lot better. Mr. Maguire stated that the Task Force is charged with reviewing the models every year and that this revision process is part of that annual revision. This is historically done in the fall, but since there was no Task Force in the fall it is being done now. Mr. Joraanstad stated that what happens also depends on the progress of the Flores case. Mr. Maguire stated that instead of worrying about the Flores case, we just have to do what the statute directs the Task Force to do. Mr. Ayala stated that TUSD wonders if there would be any flexibility after the first year. TUSD would like to be capable of contributing their knowledge to a possible reduction in the second and subsequent years. Mr. Maguire stated that if a middle or high school student scored proficient on reading they can be out of one hour, and scored proficient on writing can be out of a second hour. Mr. Maguire the Task Force knows lot more about this topic now then when they first wrote the models. The question is how far do they go. Grammar and oral communication skills are unlikely to be taught in the mainstream classroom. So that it the balance the Task Force must decide is how much further we should push this two hour exclusion.

#### **4. Presentation and Discussion of Upcoming Task Force Activities**

Mr. Maguire asked if there were other topics that should be on the table for the next meeting. He asked if the members had interest in scheduling an additional meeting between now and May. This would be in approximately two weeks. The Task Force is now several months behind, so it would be helpful to meet within two weeks if possible. Then the Task Force will meet again the second Thursday of May. The goal is to get the models revised by the end of May.

#### **5. Call to the Public**

Ms. Roxanne Reese is a language acquisition achievement advisor in the Glendale Elementary District. She stated that her district rolled out the revised standards to their teachers and invited them to use them. They have been currently doing some walk-through observations in their district and approximately 98% of their teachers are using the revised standards and they love them. She had the chance to meet with their Curriculum and Instruction person that is putting together a new guide that will be aligned with the core. She was excited about including some of the grammar pieces in the mainstream classroom. The Pacing Guide shows what teachers should teach during instructional periods (i.e. 1<sup>st</sup> quarter, 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter, etc.). The teachers will be able to use their Pacing Guide along with the revised standards. Mr. Joraanstad asked if they have time allocations of the four hour model within their district. She stated that yes they do. She stated that Glendale Elementary District has done a lot of training for those teachers. They've had the great opportunity to have professional development with teachers at the grade level bands. Ms.

Dugan asked how the new time allocations were different. Ms. Reese stated that they were not that different, but that they are just much clearer.

#### **6. Discussion of future meeting dates**

The next meeting is May 12 unless one can be scheduled earlier.

#### **7. Adjournment**

**Mr. Maguire adjourned the meeting without objection at 3:29 P.M.**

---

Alan Maguire, Chairman  
English Language Learners Task Force

---

Date