

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

Thursday, February 24, 2011  
Senate Hearing Room 1 - 1:30 P.M.

Chairman Maguire called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M. and attendance was noted by the secretary.

## **1. Call to order**

Present:

Mr. Hector Ayala  
Ms. Margaret Garcia-Dugan  
Ms. Johanna Haver  
Ms. Jodi Jerich  
Dr. Mark Joraanstad  
Mr. Alan Maguire  
Ms. Dawn Wallace

Absent:

Mr. Jim DiCello  
Ms. Pam Pickard

Mr. Maguire stated that the Task Force has been reconstituted as a result of the original members' four-year terms ending. There are four returning Task Force members and the addition of five new members. The purpose of today's meeting is twofold: to allow Tempe Union High School District to present their alternative model and to provide background information for the new members of the Task Force and discuss potential changes. There are no specific action items today as at the time the meeting was scheduled the Task Force membership had not been finalized. At the next meeting the Task Force will address formal action items.

Mr. Maguire opened the floor to each of the Task Force members to introduce themselves.

Dr. Mark Joraanstad is the Superintendent of the Saddle Mountain Unified School District. His background includes 19 years in the Glendale Elementary School District working with and implementing English Language Learner programs.

Ms. Dawn Wallace is the Majority Policy Advisor in education and budget to the Speaker of the House. She was a research analyst for the Education Committee in this Chamber for four years. Prior to that she worked in Governor Napolitano's budget office, mainly on education budgets.

Mr. Alan Maguire has no extensive education background. Mr. Maguire was originally asked to serve on the Task Force by Senate President Ken Bennett.

Ms. Margaret Garcia-Dugan is on the Task Force as she was co-chair, along with Hector Ayala, of Proposition 203, which was passed in 2003 and rid the state of bilingual education and replaced it with structured English immersion. She wants to make sure that English language learners receive a quality education in speaking English.

Ms. Johanna Haver is a retired teacher of 32 years. She taught German and Latin and taught ESL and Reading to Spanish-speaking students in Avondale. She went to Phoenix Union and taught ELLs there as well. She felt strongly the curriculum was not as developed as it should be and that the children were capable of learning more than was being taught to them. She also experienced the school going into bilingual education, which she felt slowed down the learning process even more. She became interested in the initiative and was motivated by Ms. Dugan after listening to her speak one day and became involved and wrote a book called “Structured English Immersion”.

Ms. Jodi Jerich is the Director of Arizona Residential Utility Consumer Office, providing consumer advocacy services for residential utilities. Though not currently employed in a field related to structured English immersion, she previously worked as a staff member at the Arizona House of Representatives and worked on the legislation for formation of this Task Force.

Mr. Hector Ayala is an English teacher in Tucson with 25 years experience. He campaigned for Proposition 203 before it was called Proposition 203, co-chairing with Margaret Dugan to end bilingual instruction. His high school is mostly minority and receives free and reduced lunch. In addition, their immigrant population grows every year.

## **2. Approval of June 10, 2010, July 8, 2010, and September 9, 2010 minutes of ELL Task Force meetings**

Ms. Garcia-Dugan moved, seconded by Ms. Haver, to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2010. Ms. Garcia-Dugan moved, seconded by Ms. Haver, to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2010. Ms. Garcia-Dugan moved, seconded by Ms. Haver to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2010 Task Force meetings. The motions carried by a voice vote.

## **3. Presentation and Discussion of the Tempe Union Proposed Alternate Model (This is not an action item)**

Mr. Derek Hoffland, Director of Curriculum Instruction and Assessment at Tempe Union, thanked the Task Force and OELAS for the opportunity to share their proposed model. Listening to the Task Force’s introductions, the one common thread he heard was passion for our English language learners and he believes that the Task Force will see the same passion in Tempe Union’s presenters. There are two goals for the ELL students in the Tempe Union High School District: to see them become proficient and to keep them in school through graduation and go on to have success in their careers and in college. Their proposed model is similar to the Phoenix Union model with a couple primary differences, which will be delineated by Ms. Kate Glenn.

Ms. Kate Glenn is the Assistant Principal Registrar at Tempe High School. Their proposal is very similar to the Phoenix Union model with two minor differences. The Phoenix model addresses only reading, while their model addresses both the Reading and Writing hours. The Phoenix Union model only has one highly qualified English teacher, while the Tempe Union model has two teachers in the room—one highly qualified in English who also has a full ESL endorsement, and one highly qualified in either science or social studies, depending on whether they're teaching during the Reading or Writing hour.

In the 2009-2010 school year, Tempe Union used this model believing they were in compliance. In this model, students took two classes per day of traditional ELL periods, grammar and oral language, with a teacher who was highly qualified in English. In addition, those students also took a reading class and a writing class. There was a highly qualified English teacher in the room for those classes, but also a highly qualified history or science teacher in the room. Ms. Glenn referenced a table titled "Comparison of AZELLA Scores over Two Years, 2008-09 to 2009-10." The table reflects two data points, not two years of instruction. The AZELLA test is only given once each year to the students. At the end of 2008-2009 they had 60 students who tested at the Intermediate level. After going through the alternative model in 2009-2010, 30 of those 60 tested proficient, which shows a 50% reclassification rate. In preparing this presentation, they asked for a state reclassification rate average, but were unable to get that. The state threshold is 14%, so they far exceeded that. Their district reclassification rate average is only 31%, so they also exceeded the district average.

The next slide shows how the model fits the state requirements. In this model, there is one hour of grammar taught by a highly qualified English teacher in an SEI ELL classroom. There is one hour of oral language also taught in an SEI classroom by a highly qualified English teacher. Then there is the hour of reading co-taught with highly qualified science and English teachers. Finally there is the hour of writing taught by highly qualified English and history teachers. Ms. Dugan asked about the average reclassification rate of 31%. Is this for high school? Ms. Glenn said the district average was 31%, while her school had a 50% reclassification rate, and this was the only school in the district that used this model.

Why does Tempe want this alternative model? They found in 2009-2010, and it is even more apparent this year in 2010-2011 where they haven't been using this model, that using the science and social studies materials helps put the reading and writing of English learning in context for their students. Also, the co-teaching benefits the students by having two content experts in the classroom. The co-teaching benefits their teachers as well. All of the certified educators in Arizona are required to get 60 hours of staff development in SEI and newer teachers get 90 hours. The 60 hours doesn't go quite as far as when you have an ELL expert in the classroom

who can work with you on how to differentiate instruction. A bonus to their model is that students receive credits towards graduation.

Ms. Jerich asked how Ms. Glenn found out that she was not in compliance. Ms. Glenn stated that OELAS contacted them and told them to cease and desist. Ms. Jerich asked if OELAS told them in what way they were out of compliance. Ms. Glenn said that the direction primarily hinged on the co-teaching and the fact that both teachers were not highly qualified in English. Mr. Joraanstad asked if this letter was generated by a monitoring that had been performed by OELAS. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that there was an Auditor General report. Ms. Haver asked if Tempe Union is presently using this model. Ms. Glenn stated no, they are following the four-hour model to remain in compliance, though they would like to return to this model. Ms. Haver said she thought there would be a problem covering all of the science or social studies material and asked how they worked that out. Ms. Glorine Mira-Johnson introduced herself to answer this question. She worked last year with Ms. Charlotte Windsor, a highly qualified history teacher, and they taught an SEI world history class and an SEI American Arizona history class. The district has been very supportive in providing two teachers in the classroom and giving them hours to prepare. Ms. Mira-Johnson and Ms. Windsor looked at ELL Standards they wanted to address for writing so the content teacher could become familiar with those standards. They next looked at the standards for American and Arizona history. Realizing that it was a lot of material to cover, they looked at concepts that needed to be covered in history and that became their focus. They addressed all the different cultures, though they did compromise slightly on the African unit due to time constraints, since the pace was that of a regular class. Because Ms. Mira-Johnson was there, there was a lot of repetition. For example, Charlotte would give a PowerPoint presentation to the students. Because she is not an ELL teacher, some of it went over their heads. Ms. Mira-Johnson was right there as the back up and went over the information and discussed the vocabulary so they were bouncing off each other. It was an awesome experience. The students in that classroom were also with Ms. Mira-Johnson the other two hours, so they see her as their English teacher. As their English teacher in a content class she can divert content questions to the expert in history, and then re-word what is being taught, so that some time was lost, but not a lot. They always made sure the concepts were covered. Asked how an assignment would be performed, Ms. Mira-Johnson stated that every day they would have a language objective, which was handled first each day. Ms. Mira-Johnson would explain what skills the students were working on. As an example she showed the Task Force the next slide in Tempe Union's presentation.

This slide shows that students will write a five or more paragraph expository persuasive essay while developing essay and grammar skills focusing on subject-verb agreement and correct verb tense. Students would write simple compound to complex sentences. They would go over what the expectation was. The ELP Standards are addressed in the handout, though they don't go over those with the students they're highlighting those for the Task Force. They are focusing on ideas,

organization, voice, sentence structure, conventions, subject verb agreement, and verbs. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated use kid-friendly language when discussing the standards. Ms. Dugan asked if she uses the SIOP model. Ms. Mira-Johnson said not really but she expands on what the students learned in grammar class and brings it to the content class, so if they're working on present perfect tense in grammar, she takes that into the history class and expands on it and asks the students to show the present perfect tense in their assignment. Ms. Dugan clarified that Ms. Mira-Johnson teaches the ELD block, which was answered yes. Ms. Dugan asked who teaches the ELP standards such as literary terms and stated that those can't really be taught in history. Ms. Mira-Johnson says they focus the writing hour in the history class and she will cover the reading portion shortly. In this writing portion they're covering sentence structure and other writing conventions through the development of essays, research, projects, and papers through the history content. They always have as their objective the standards, using kid-friendly language, and then the expectation. With this particular assignment the content comes in as the students were brainstorming ideas, referring to their notes, and assignments they'd already done or readings already completed.

Dr. Joraanstad asked if "concepts" means the Arizona standards. Ms. Mira-Johnson said yes. Ms. Jerich asked if there was a physical change of classroom when the students were in the history class, and in addition, if there were non-ELL students in these classrooms. Ms. Mira-Johnson said yes, it is a different classroom, but no, there are no non-ELL students; it is strictly an SEI classroom.

Ms. Mira-Johnson said in the science classes the focus is on the reading hour. She was not one of the teachers, but there was a highly qualified teacher who also teaches ELL. In the reading class, because it's science, they're reading a lot of information and performing hands-on projects, but it's still a lot of content reading. In this particular lesson, they ask students to compare and contrast and organize information as they read a summary about mineral resources. The expectation is for students to read critically and complete a graphic organizer which will compare and contrast renewable versus non-renewable resources based on the reading. Two teachers working together has allowed the ELL expert teacher to share so many strategies with the content teacher. Graphic organizers, different ways of introducing vocabulary, etc., have come from the ELL teacher and into the science class, enriching both the teacher's and students' experiences. As far as the literary piece, they have four hours of English. Some of it does get addressed in history and some gets addressed in science, because they have made it a point to include some short story readings that reinforce what the students are getting in their oral language class. In the oral language class what they're covering is all of the literary elements, including plot, setting, and theme. They're reading lots of dramas, such as Shakespeare's "A Midsummer Night's Dream." Oral language is embedded in pronunciation of words, phonics, and morphology. She emphasized the teaching of the literature piece in the oral language class. Ms. Dugan asked if simile, metaphor, etc. are taught in the two-hour oral and grammar classes.

Ms. Johnson stated yes, they are taught. Each hour has its specific focus, but the reality of teaching is that there is so much integration. The literature teacher is going into the science class and bringing literature into that class, reinforcing those lessons. Ms. Dugan stated that students mainstreaming into Junior English, for example, need to have these abilities to ensure success, and that those are objectives on the AIMS test the students need to be aware of these applications and be taught and assessed prior to entering the mainstream classroom. Probably 90 percent of their life is process, reading and writing, and though they'll probably never be asked what a simile is the rest of their lives, it is part of the content. Ms. Mira-Johnson said they are very conscious of AIMS and that those vocabulary words (i.e., simile, metaphor, hyperbole) are on AIMS. They have to be intentional about making sure the concepts have been introduced and the students have had practice with them. She is really proud of the ELL department at Tempe High School because they are such hard working teachers and so focused on what the students need, so they are constantly embedding this in the curriculum. On the back of the handout, there is an American Revolution exam. This includes the regular exam and the SEI exam on page 50. They are basically the same exam with some minor changes such as fewer questions, but they decided not to reword the test because AIMS is not reworded for our students. They want them to see and experience all of the test vocabulary. They provided a vocabulary test guide to the students for every test. At the beginning of the year, the students had this while taking their test and were able to look up words so they understood the question and what the answers could be. By the end of the year, since so many test vocabulary words come up again and again, they weren't using their guide as much because they had learned the vocabulary and that strengthened their movement out of ELL.

Mr. Ayala asked if they've noticed any dynamic between ELLs and any transfers to AP classes with the AP exam or taking the ACT or SAT tests. Ms. Glenn said they have IB (International Baccalaureate) at their school and are brand new as an IB school. So, in order to support their students so that they will be successful in the IB classes, they have an AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) program. They opened an AVID section specifically for their ELL students, so one ELL teacher is also teaching AVID. This will ensure their success in IB classes. Mr. Ayala asked if any ELLs have been observed in this yet and was told no, they're still new to this program. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated several students took the ACT last Saturday and they are excited to see how they did. That is their first introduction to see how they did on these higher level exams.

Ms. Dugan stated that their model sounds pretty interdisciplinary but also very cost prohibitive. She asked how many sections had two teachers in a classroom. Ms. Glenn stated that right now they have none, but they had world history, US history, earth science, chemistry/physics, and health – five sections. Ms. Dugan asked if their district was able to support that, and Ms. Glenn responded that yes, the district was able to support that. Their ELL population has shrunk and so they're planning on only two sections next year – one earth science and one America Arizona

history. Ms. Dugan stated that students coming up from the elementary are fewer and fewer and wondered if this was the result of shrinkage. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated that it is definitely impacting the numbers in their program. The freshman classes coming in have fewer and fewer ELL students. Ms. Glenn stated that the economy and politics are also affecting class sizes, as their FEP population has also shrunk. Dr. Joraanstad asked if students can get an English as well as a science or history credit in this program. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated that yes, the students can receive credits in science and history or social studies. Dr. Joraanstad asked if Tempe Union is seeking to keep students on the graduation track. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated yes, that is the intention, but they only get one credit, for either the history or science class. They're already getting an English credit within the ELL class. These other English classes give them an abundance of elective credits which do not help them graduate. Ms. Glenn stated, with their proposal, a student would earn one English credit, one elective credit, one science credit, and one social studies credit. Currently, they get one English credit and three elective credits. Ms. Dugan stated that the elective credits do count toward graduation. Ms. Glenn stated that an ELL student's average time in the ELL Program is 1.9 years. So, if a student needs multiple years, and if they're earning three electives for two years, and the district only requires 5.5 elective credits for graduation, then they are short on credits needed for graduation. Ms. Dugan asked if summer school is offered. Ms. Glenn stated that they do have summer school and it includes a fee which many of their students cannot afford.

Ms. Wallace stated that from the first slide, there are 28 intermediate students. She asked if this means that there are 60 ELL students at their high school. Ms. Glenn stated they have more than that, but 60 at the intermediate level. This model applies only to intermediate students; basic and intermediate students would be in four straight hours of English. Ms. Wallace asked if this model were only for students of intermediate proficiency. Ms. Glenn said yes, all this will affect is students of intermediate proficiency.

Ms. Jerich stated she was confused. Tempe Union used the model they discovered was noncompliant. In 2008-2009, they had 60 students in intermediate and zero students in emergent or basic. Ms. Mira-Johnson said no, they had 60 students test intermediate that year. They deliberately did not include those statistics because they do not address their proposal. Ms. Jerich asked if going into the 2009-2010 school year there were 60 students new to intermediate. Ms. Glenn said yes. Ms. Jerich said at the end of the 2009-2010 school year, 2 went to basic, 28 remained intermediate, and 30 went tested proficient, and Ms. Glenn verified this as correct. Ms. Jerich clarified that the Phoenix Union proposal only dealt with the reading hour with one teacher, and the Tempe Union proposal is reading and writing with two teachers per class. In the Phoenix Union model do they get one English credit, one other credit, and then two elective credits? Ms. Glenn stated she believes this is so. Ms. Dugan stated that Phoenix Union discontinued this model and Ms. Glenn stated that she believes that is true, this model is not being used right now to her understanding.

Mr. Maguire stated that he thinks the focus should be on being confident that the English language development objective of the classroom has the priority. He noted that the standard for eligibility is a composite intermediate score on the AZELLA, as opposed to an intermediate score in relevant subcategories. Ms. Glenn stated that in order to place the student in the appropriate ELL section, for the two hours that are the grammar and oral language they use the composite score. If the student scored proficient in writing, that student would be placed in a regular history class. If a student scored proficient on the reading part, that student would be placed in a regular science class. Mr. Maguire stated that is a different problem with compliance.

Ms. Mira-Johnson stated that she has students who are proficient in writing who are with her for the grammar portion but don't have to be in the writing hour. They are in reading, grammar, or oral language only, based on their AZELLA scores. Mr. Maguire asked for clarification that the standards used are composite intermediate and intermediate in reading and writing, which Ms. Mira-Johnson answered yes. Mr. Maguire brought to the attention of the members of the Task Force that there are two sample tests for review that OELAS asked Tempe to submit. You can contrast the test used in the regular classroom versus the SEI classroom. Mr. Maguire said that the question he had regarding the tests is where is the ELD priority? Dr. Joraanstad asked if when referring back to the composite score, it would be possible for a student whose reading score was basic, but scores on subtests brought the whole score up to intermediate, if that student would be successful in this model. Ms. Glenn stated that situation did not come up during the time they implemented this model. Ms. Dugan stated that they need to be at some level to become intermediate. Ms. Mira-Johnson asked to address the statement that no ELD emphasis was seen on these tests. She stated that is because these particular tests are focusing on the content. But the vocabulary that they've gone over, as she emphasized earlier, is where they bring in the ELD content. In addition, she gives the grammar test either the same day or the day before, so they are getting a test for grammar, it's just not on this test. Mr. Maguire said that the challenge is that any of these approved alternative provisions are applicable to any school. To the extent that this practice deviates from the standard, they are ensuring the ELD requirements are met. Our obligation is that if someone duplicates what Tempe Union is doing, they understand that they have to do more than just what happens in these two hours to make sure that what happens in the other two hours catches the pieces that aren't addressed. Mr. Maguire stated that, as he understands their proposal, Tempe Union's ELD instruction in the non-content hours compensate for what the content hours may be lacking, but an outsider looking at their proposal isn't going to see that. Ms. Glenn stated that Tempe Union submitted those history exams because that is what they thought the Task Force wanted when it requested the information. Having observed Ms. Mira-Johnson and Ms. Windsor's classrooms, she's sure Ms. Mira-Johnson could show examples of other assessments done during that hour of the students' writing ability. Ms. Glenn was told the Task Force wanted to see two tests over the same history chapter so they could see the differences between regular education history and SEI history tests.

Mr. Maguire stated that he would like to see some different tests that assess the students' English language development and the ELD standards as this is their main concern. The two tests shared today looked very similar. Ms. Glenn stated it is deliberately that way. In AIMS, the ELD students do not get a watered down AIMS but have to take the same AIMS as everyone else. Mr. Maguire stated that the objective here is that they're trying to get two things at once and he'd like to see the evidence of that. Ms. Garcia-Dugan stated that the intermediate level is getting closer, so it's going to be hard to show ELD versus straight academic standards. For students at the intermediate level, the next level is proficiency. We want to make sure that when the student mainstreams there is no hiccup. We want to make sure these students are ready for the mainstream. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated that, had she and the history teacher known a year ago they would be presenting this program today, they'd have saved the writing assignments for use in today's presentation. It's a tough discussion because when there is a history test for that component, this is what the tests look like. However, there are so many writing assignments in that class that, though it's not really a test, it's equally weighted and is an assessment of the students' writing. So, when correcting that writing piece, they are looking at items such as subject-verb agreement and other items as determined by the standards. If you want to see a grammar test, that test will come from the grammar class. To evaluate a student's writing to see if the writing improved because they were in this history class they want to believe it did but the question becomes who gets the credit for that, as they're also in four hours of English. Grammar must be demonstrated by writing, and they're also getting writing experience in the grammar portion as well. It's hard to measure which hour gets the credit for the student's writing development. You will see a good grammar test from the grammar class and a content test from the content class, and you can see writing samples.

Ms. Wallace stated that if in the writing class they are using social science content to work on writing skills, she expects the test to include an essay question. A test that is intended to bring the two together should assess writing in addition to multiple choice questions. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated that she agreed and based on how the course was developed and implemented, they had a writing assignment every Monday so they didn't feel they needed to put a writing assignment into the test because they were evaluating writing every Monday in the lab. She said that Ms. Wallace makes a valid point, but these weekly assignments could be viewed as valid writing assessments. Ms. Garcia-Dugan stated that going back to her teaching days, getting ready for the AIMS test there are plenty of opportunities for students to practice their writing in history and science at the freshman level, practicing expository essays using science as the content. The teachers do this every two weeks, assigning formative essays. They probably won't do a multiple choice test and an essay at the same time because that's way too much so you don't want to give those two assessments on the same day. They know they have to get the students ready to pass the AIMS test. For sophomores, the goal is persuasive essays so throughout the year they gauge how they understand history through persuasive essays. Very seldom are the students given an essay the same day they're given a multiple choice test. Ms. Wallace clarified that when the Task

Force votes, they are not voting for Tempe Union to have its models, but instead are voting for the state of Arizona to have a new model. She asked if somebody else from another high school wants to use this model, do they have to appear before this task force and demonstrate their strategies that may be unique? Or are they able to say they're implementing the model agreed to on February 24, 2011? She stated that was the most intriguing part of Mr. Maguire's comment, the Task Force gets to hear how Tempe Union will implement this model but they may not hear how another school would implement the same model. She asked if this is a concern for this Task Force. Mr. Maguire stated yes, that when the Task Force has adopted alternatives in the past, there is an application process where the LEAs go through the OELAS staff, detailing their model and how it will be implemented. That's why he keeps probing and asking questions. He thinks from a resource standpoint, this is a big hill for most districts. Part of his quandary is that at the beginning of Tempe's application, it says this is an ELD class that utilizes academic standards. That is what he wants to see.

Ms. Haver asked if Tempe Union uses the standard science and history textbooks and Ms. Mira-Johnson said yes, they do. Ms. Haver thinks that this is a better way to teach and apply grammar, because these texts have sentences that are 25 to 30 words long, which requires students to understand grammar so they get to apply what they just learned. Ms. Mira-Johnson the books help her as the grammar teacher. Ms. Haver asked if Ms. Mira-Johnson uses examples from the science and grammar books. Ms. Mira-Johnson said yes, she does, and everything works together. Ms. Haver stated that the problem could be that there are not always teachers available with the ability to take the students through the transition of the grammar and content. Ms. Glenn stated that all of Tempe Union's ELL teachers are not only highly qualified in English but also have full ESL endorsements. They are very strong English teachers. Ms. Haver stated that this model gives the students experience with a higher level text.

Dr. Joraanstad stated it is admirable that the Tempe Union High School District and governing board have committed these financial resources to their English language learners. He doesn't think this model would be duplicated by most districts because of the cost factor of having two instructors in a classroom. Ms. Haver asked if the district saves money in the long run through larger classes. Ms. Glenn stated classes vary by proficiency level and that pre-emergent and emergent classes are the smallest. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated they are at 16 to 18 students per class. Ms. Glenn stated that the Basic student class size is close to 20 and the Intermediate class size is over 30 students. Ms. Haver asked how many students are in a regular classroom. Ms. Glenn answered that it varies by grade level. Freshman and sophomore classes have between 25 and 28 students while classes for juniors and seniors have around 32 students. Mr. Hoffland said that teachers are staffed at the rate of 26 to one for freshman and sophomore classes and 28 to one for junior and senior classes.

Ms. Jerich asked if social studies and history are two separate courses, or if history is now called social studies. Ms. Mira-Johnson said yes, they are the same thing, but that under the umbrella title of social studies you will find different types of history courses, such as world history or Arizona history, and that teachers need to be certified in those particular areas to teach. Ms. Jerich said for science, there are many different sciences: i.e., earth science, chemistry, biology. But, remembering back to her high school science classes, she doesn't remember a lot of essays, writing, or reading. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated that writing is for history and reading is for science, and that there was a bit of debate that went on about which would use reading or writing. When they looked at the curriculum, they thought they could do more with writing in history; it's more reflective, they do research papers, the students create PowerPoint presentations, and it's all embedded within the Writing. In science, a different kind of vocabulary is used. Science is rich in vocabulary and reading comprehension. They felt they could build on the reading in the science class. Ms. Jerich asked if Tempe Union knew how much it cost to implement this model and the differences in cost between this proposal and what Tempe Union currently utilizes. Ms. Jerich asked how Tempe Union would be able to afford this alternate model. Mr. Maguire said that is a question for the district and Ms. Glenn agreed. Mr. Hoffland stated that they believe this model is cost-effective and in the long run it helps to serve their students better by enabling students to work toward graduation while learning reading and writing skills within the content areas.

Ms. Dugan stated that social studies is usually a sophomore class and asked what Tempe does with their freshmen students in that case. Ms. Glenn stated that social studies is just the name of the department on their campus and that World History, within their district, is typically a sophomore class. She stated that in this model, given the number of students they have, their students will get US History first, and then will take World History another year, perhaps after they FEP. Because of the logistics of the number of students and the number of sections they can have, they will likely only have two sections, one of reading using earth science material and one of writing using US History material. Ms. Dugan stated asked if a freshman would be able to take US history. Ms. Glenn stated yes, that is the case. Ms. Mira-Johnson stated they want to focus on American Arizona history next year, since many students were able to take the World History SEI class they offered last year. This year they're getting no history and the students are panicking. They want to have that course ready for them as well as for the new students coming in. Mr. Maguire thanked them for their presentations and stated that he would like to see some ELP standards and assessment.

#### **4. Presentation on the History and Background of the SEI Models**

Mr. Maguire stated that the next item was a presentation of the history and background of the SEI models for the new members and a refresher for those returning members. He is delivering this presentation as Marlene Johnston was unable to attend today's meeting. Mr. Maguire stated

that we developed the models and an effective ELD curriculum, OELAS trains the field people and then monitors the districts. OELAS is the office within the Department of Education and they do the monitoring and ensure compliance with all state and federal laws. The number of ELLs peaked in 2008 to 150,000 and have come down since then. This decline corresponds with the implementation of the models. A number of students reach proficiency who would have been stuck in the ELL category for a number of years before implementing the models. The largest native language of ELLs is Spanish, but there are other languages typical of Arizona. The distribution by grade span shows there were a lot of younger ELLs in 2009; a lot of ELLs tested proficient and moved on, but new ones are constantly coming in, particularly at the lower grades. There has been good success with younger students in terms of their progress. Students tend to move more rapidly from Pre-Emergent to Emergent to Basic and then once they get to Intermediate they move more slowly. This is the function of the increased complexity of their learning and is one of the reasons districts focus primarily on Intermediates. A number of things have been done to address this, including the summer program HISEP. As of 2010, 71% of all Arizona ELLs are Intermediates. Regarding the federal law, there are a few important provisions that should be discussed. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides access for all students and the 1974 Act provides equal education opportunities for students. One of the most important cases is the Lau v. Nichols case where the U.S. Supreme Court established many of the standards for English language programs. There are parallels between some of the remedies from the Lau case and the way that the models work, i.e., identification of home language, providing a specific program, making sure a district has the right instructional personnel, addressing issues of ethnic and racial identification, providing notice to the parents as to what's happening, and evaluation. Another important case was Castaneda v. Pickard in 1981. That case went further and established the three prong test. The first prong is that there must be a sound theory for what you're doing, which is why the Task Force puts so much time in understanding the practice and theory. The second prong is to provide sufficient resources, which is why the law provides incremental funding for ELL students based upon associated results. Finally, the third prong, is that the program must produce results, and we've seen pretty good results to date. One of the big questions is what is the positive or negative relationship of the groupings of the students and potential segregative issues. Castaneda says schools may use ability grouping, even when such policy has a segregative effect, so long as it is genuinely motivated by educational concerns and not discriminatory in nature. This Task Force has been clear from the beginning that their focus is on the educational achievement of our students and moving them to proficiency and into the mainstream classroom as quickly as possible. There are also some Title III federal programs that give provide guidance. In 2000, Arizona voters passed proposition 203, the original genesis for this program. It provides that students who are not English proficient shall be placed into an SEI classroom and ultimately move into the mainstream classroom for a "period of time not normally intended to exceed one year." That does not mean that every single student will make it out within a year, but the goal is to design a model that would allow a majority of students to make it through in that time. However, Proposition 203 did not provide any specific mechanism for

achieving that goal. There is also a process for parental waivers in the classroom so that students can be placed in a bilingual program. But, in 2006 the legislature passed HB 2064, which provided a specific mechanism for the identification of ELLs (the original PHLOTE), how they were to be placed into classrooms, and their transition to the mainstream once they've reached proficiency. It also created this Task Force, gave us our assignments, and provided for the funding to implement and monitor for compliance. The SEI Models are governed by Arizona Revised Statutes §756.01. There were nine members appointed by various elected officials in the state: the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Members serve four year terms and their duty is to develop research based models of structured English immersion to be used by school districts and charters. That's what was done over a period of years. There was a brief recess that began at 2:54 P.M.

The Task Force began again at 2:59 P.M. Continuing with the presentation, the Task Force had a responsibility to develop research-based models of structured English immersion to be used by school districts and charter schools. The development process started out with policy, which was an attempt to understand the underlying policy of the legislation that was passed, and the prior initiative that was enacted. From that policy the Task Force began to try to provide the principles that would be applicable in the classroom, which led to the structure of the classroom, such as how long the students are in the classroom and how they move from one classroom to another. Finally, the structure in the classroom led the Task Force to create the time allocations, how much time should be spent in each block, and how the practice in the classroom changes as students progress in terms of age, grade level, and proficiency. This is why the Discrete Skills Inventory was developed. There were many requests from the field looking for guidance on what to teach these kids. The teachers wanted to know more about what to do in the actual classroom. The English language proficiency standards were simplified into the discrete skills inventory to help curriculum builders and teachers.

Mr. Maguire discussed a handout that had a timetable of events listed. The first Task Force meeting was on September 21, 2006. For four or five months, the Task Force met every couple of weeks and sometimes twice a week, as often as they could. They spent those first four or five months listening to people from the field and at every meeting there were multiple practitioners from different schools and districts to talk to the Task Force about what they knew and what they thought. They also discussed what they thought were best or worst practices. We also had various speakers who testified to the federal law requirements. The Task Force had testimony from in-state experts, out-of-state experts, and academic experts from around the country. In the early part of 2007, they did a survey to look at programs in schools that were effective, to see which districts had the most effective programs. The discussion today is simply a microcosm of that process. In May 2007, the Task Force adopted the basic components of the model and by June had a draft model submitted to the legislature for review. Public hearings were held around

the state to put forth the draft models, and then on September 13, 2007, the Task Force adopted the models. The original legislation required the Task Force to adopt the models by September 1, 2006, which was even before the effective date of the legislation. This would have been a real challenge.

There are a couple of fair conclusions to draw from the Task Force. Some of them are that time on task is important, teaching discrete skills is important, and it is important to have fixed periods of time for each of the components of the models, such as phonology, word order, and academic vocabulary. The research that the Task Force did is reflected in the principles they had, which is that the learning and use of English is fundamental to content area mastery. If a student can't read English then it will be very difficult for that student to figure out the American Revolution chapter in the history textbook. Related to this is that language ability-based grouping facilitates rapid learning and time on task improves learning. Another important factor is the teaching of discrete language skills as an appropriate method for English language teaching. The first part of the SEI model is a series of definitions so that there are uniform patterns across the state.

Mr. Maguire stated that the Task Force spent a lot of time talking about what would make the models effective. He stated that the concept of top down direction and uniformity of the curriculum across schools and districts is not something he comes to intuitively. He stated that he is a firm believer in local control, but with the testimony from the field, he was persuaded once he learned about the high level of mobility that seemed to characterize many of the English language learners in the state of Arizona. The consistency of the program between districts and schools helps to address that mobility. If a student lives in an urban area, they can move a few blocks in any direction, change districts, and if there is no comparability between the ELD classrooms in different districts then the progress of that student is substantially impeded. Mr. Maguire stated that he was concerned about the imposition of such a relatively uniform structure, but based upon the testimony from the field it seemed like a rational idea.

The key components of the model are entry and exit to get in and out of classroom based upon the AZELLA score and as required by law. Students are grouped by AZELLA proficiency because that allows for a more refined curriculum to their particular learning needs according to their advancement and progression. There are also specific time allocations. In the first six months of the Task Force's existence, there were multiple times where the Task Force was asked what they will do with the four hours of English and how will they fill up all that time. The Task Force came to the conclusion that they should break the four hours into blocks and those blocks would correspond to the English language proficiency standards. Another important component of the models is that ELL students are taught by highly qualified and trained teachers, that the classroom practices are based on English language development, and the proficiency standards and in turn lesson plans are built based on the Discrete Skills Inventory.

The basic principles underlying the models are that English is fundamental to content mastery. The key structures are who's in the classroom, classroom size, and what happens in the classroom to help the students move toward proficiency. The core elements of ELD as prescribed in the models and as required for first year students in the law is that the students are in an SEI classroom until they reach proficiency according to the AZELLA but that they are grouped within classrooms by proficiency level. The grouping process allows for flexibility by local districts. The four hours of ELD focuses on the English language skills being taught and the focus of the Task Force is primarily on those English language skills. Part of the flexibility that middle schools and high schools have is many of them use a block schedule that allows them to structure the classroom schedules differently and move the students into different classes. Students will stop taking an ELD class when they become proficient and then instead of the ELD class, they will take a core content class.

Regarding getting into the SEI program, AZELLA is the way in and the way out. The AZELLA test can be thought of as a permeable barrier. A student first enters into an SEI classroom based on what was answered on the PHLOTE and their score on AZELLA, and then that student is moved into the mainstream classroom once she scores proficient on AZELLA. In the mainstream classroom there are non-ELL students with grade-level appropriate content. In the SEI classrooms, there are ELL students taking English Language Development.

There is some degree of flexibility with regard to the proficiency groupings. First, students are sorted by proficiency level within a single grade. Then this expands, going from a single proficiency-level to a proficiency-level band. This entails putting Basic and Intermediate students together in the classroom as opposed to having two separate classrooms. If there are still not enough students to make a class with the proficiency-level bands, then students may be grouped by grade-levels, for example, putting third and fourth grade together. This allowed schools to group their students for efficient class sizes yet still allow for teachers to focus their instruction on narrow skills in those classrooms. The concept of putting students of like-skill in the same classroom to learn like-topics helps the teachers in terms of targeting instruction and makes the class content appropriate for all students. It allows all students to progress together and it allows for better monitoring of their progression. It helps the students progress together so they don't get large gaps between them. And it also makes it much easier for teachers to focus on the needs of their students.

Mr. Maguire said the certification process is different for high school and primary level teachers, which is a part of the overall structure of these models. There are also some alternative models. One of them is the Glendale Union model which was developed for fear that students wouldn't be able to graduate from high school on time when the four-hour models were first implemented. It was intended to be a transitional period model. When the Task Force implemented these

models for the first time, the concern was that high school students who were expecting to graduate soon, were suddenly placed into four hours of English, thus preventing them from reaching the requirements for graduation in a timely matter. A transitional model was provided, at the request of Glendale Union; because of its adoption by the Task Force, any district could have used this model. The problem which necessitated this model is now resolved because the models have been around for a couple of years now. Phoenix Union also proposed a model that allowed students who have reached a certain level of proficiency to focus more on content in their English language development classes. The third and probably biggest variation was the Individual Language Learner Plan, which was a mechanism the Task Force developed to deal with schools with a low number of ELLs. These are used when a school does not have enough students of similar proficiency and grade to group appropriately in the classroom. An Individual Plan is created for those students, and then they are put in the mainstream classroom. The teacher in the mainstream classroom is then responsible to meet the English language development needs of that student.

Once a student becomes English proficient, then they move into the mainstream classroom where they are monitored for two years to make sure they are maintaining proficiency. If a student does fall back, the student can be re-enrolled in the SEI program. SIOP offers tools and techniques in the regular classroom to help teachers address English language learners in the classroom. Four times a year, OELAS hosts the PELL meetings for all practitioners of English Language Learners. Mr. Maguire stated that for two and a half years he went to every PELL meeting and the outlook of the practitioners was “from jeers to cheers.” At the OELAS Conference in Tucson, 18 months after the implementation of the models, an elementary teacher asked him what she should do since she now because after implementation of the models she had so few ELLs left to even make a classroom.

AZELLA has four subtests. In addition to the models, the law provided funding so that there would be an incremental cost of group B weight allowing for funding of ELL program costs according to the process. The SEI Budget application was developed with the Auditor General to determine how the costs will be submitted to the legislature for funding. In addition, at the time, there was money available for compensatory education; this is for supplemental education for ELLs outside of the regular school day. This first year, quite a few LEAs applied for funding.

Another question was how AZELLA and AIMS correlate. Mr. Maguire referred to a graph that shows AIMS scores and proficiency levels. When a student reaches a higher proficiency level in English, then their reading score on the AIMS becomes much higher. Historically this wasn't the case, and this is a significant change. This correlation is the ultimate test as to whether the models work. The goal of the models is to make sure these students transition into the mainstream classroom with a reasonable probability of success. We want to make sure when

they make that transition they make it smoothly and use their newly acquired English skills to move forward for the rest of their educational period in the mainstream classroom.

The next presentation was from Ms. Adela Santa Cruz, Deputy Associate Superintendent for the Office of English Language Acquisition Services. She has been with OELAS for almost five years and taught at the high school level teaching English to English language learners for 31 years. She began her presentation by discussing the acronyms we often use. First, when we say ELL, this refers to the student themselves; this is the English language learner whose status is non-proficient in English. SEI models refers to the models of structured English immersion and that refers to the classroom where students are placed to receive their intensive English instruction when they are ELL status. The actual instruction is called ELD, English Language Development, and this is what is taught in the SEI classroom. ILLP refers to those students who are on an Individual Language Learner Plan. This is used when there is a low density of ELLs at a particular school. The AZELLA is the language proficiency assessment, the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment. The AZELLA-1 was replaced by our current assessment, the AZELLA-2. We are in the process of looking at our next assessment, which may be called the AZELLA-3. The Office of English Language Acquisition Services is commonly called OELAS.

Mr. Maguire stated that it might seem odd to those new to the Task Force why we bother to define English language learner and why we bother to define SEI classroom in the models. In the testimony received by the districts, there was no consistency in terminology, so the definitions in the models brought standardization.

Ms. Santa Cruz next addressed a PowerPoint titled "What is English language development?" ELD is the instruction of English language learners. An ELD classroom instructs students in the areas of language instruction: reading, writing, speaking, listening, grammar, and vocabulary. In those classrooms, the emphasized area of instruction is the language itself. Content is used to teach language, but language is the primary focus of the classroom. Everything is driven by a standard in one of the four domains. The discrete skills inventory specifies grammar instruction and vocabulary that arches over all areas. They are specifically addressed with performance indicators. We teach the students the skills they need to access the content. The primary focus is the language instruction. We teach five elements that are part of language. These elements work together and must be taught overtly. We cannot expect they'll be embedded in other types of instruction; they have to be taught explicitly and overtly. These are phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and semantics. These are the foundation for teaching the domains of language.

We also use the language star, the components of which make up English language development. First is phonology: the sound system, speech, and sounds of English. This relates to how you make the sounds. When you make sounds in English it is very different from how you would pronounce or make sounds in another language. Depending on the level of the student it may

take quite a bit of time to acquire the requisite skills. Next is morphology, which is the study of prefixes, suffixes, roots, base words—these are the integral pieces of how you put words together and this is also where verb tenses are taught. This is also where we teach concepts of time and expressing time with language. There is very little you can express without a verb in English so we spend quite a bit of time teaching the morphology aspect of the language as well. Next is syntax, grammar, and the rules of the language. The rules of English are different from the rules that you follow when you're writing in another language. We teach them subjects, complements, objects, indirect objects, when you have them when you don't have them. Those pieces are taught explicitly. They're the rules students learn to handle the language independently. Fourth is lexicon which is the collection of the words. Most teachers of English begin with the lexicon, teaching the meaning and context of words. This leads to semantics, teaching the meanings of words within context and that meaning may change depending on context. Those two pieces make up the vocabulary. And that's how we spend our four hours. To reiterate, phonology gets at the sounds of the language and how to articulate those sounds. We teach students where to put their tongue because they don't know how to articulate certain sounds. They may be from a country where they don't make those sounds or use their lips or tongue the same way we do so it's very important that time be spent with that aspect of language. We're also building on their listening. If they cannot pronounce something perhaps they don't hear it, they don't have the ability to discriminate sounds. When ADE monitors teachers they tell ADE staff that they're doing phonology because the students are talking all the time. However, when we speak of phonology, this is not simply speaking in the classroom, but it refers to the system that teaches students to speak correctly and accurately. And finally, there is morphology which has two main areas. The first area is word families: prefixes and suffixes, how to change words by changing the endings or beginnings of words, how to look at word families and understand not only that a word has one meaning but within that family it changes depending on the part of speech. The next area is verb tenses, what we used to call conjugating verbs, but more than just conjugating verbs, teaching the students how to think about time and how to express time when it comes to verb tenses and how to decipher time elements when reading different verb tenses and comprehending what they're reading. That's morphology, or syntax, the rules of the language. The students we teach may have a different flow when it comes to understanding language. They may read from the top to the bottom rather than from left to right. Syntax here has to do with the rules of the English language so that they understand what rules they must follow in order to make meaning from what they are either trying to express or trying to understand in their reading. Grammar is the foundation to our learning. If you're going to produce language, or decipher language, you must have the discrete pieces of the grammar. Grammar is the foundation of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Not just the writing. Historically we've taught grammar in the writing part of language but it's fundamental to all aspects of language. Lexicon is the collection of words that we can build on that but there are many sources that we talk about as we train so that teachers know how to use those sources in addressing the lexicon in terms of vocabulary assistance for those students. And semantics is actually the meaning of a language.

You have very little if you have words on a list, but if you take those words and put them into an environment or context then you have meaning and that's what we mean when we talk about semantics.

Next, Ms. Santa Cruz introduced Ms. Susan Eide, the Director of Technical Assistance. Ms. Eide stated that she would be talking about the new English language proficiency standards. The United States Department of Education requires all states have English language proficiency standards. In 2003, English Acquisition Services, the original name for OELAS, began the development of the English language proficiency standards. These were approved by the Arizona State Department of Education on January 26, 2004. OELAS, along with a framework in partnership with WestEd and constituents from across the state, began the process of revising those ELP standards in June of 2009, and completed the process in November of 2010. OELAS rolled out a draft of the revised standards at the OELAS conference in December and they are currently online for constituents. OELAS encourages the field to use them, although it is not a requirement at this point. There is also a survey online for teachers to provide feedback on the standards. The standards will be finalized this summer and will be ready for implementation in the 2011-12 school year. The English language proficiency standards are what drive the instruction for English language learners. The standards include the language prerequisites for the academic standards. The revised standards have upped the rigor for our English language learners that is so critical for their success in the mainstream classroom.

Ms. Garcia-Dugan asked if the revised standards had been aligned to the new common core. Ms. Eide said they used the common core standards in their vertical and horizontal alignment while completing the draft. Mr. Maguire stated that the critical underlying foundations of how the models were put together was the reasonable correlation between the English language learner proficiency standards, the academic English proficiency standards, and AZELLA. Ms. Eide stated that the ELP standards were not changed, but only the performance indicators were revised. The revised ELP standards include Listening and Speaking, the oral conversation time allocation, Reading, the reading allocation, and Writing, the writing allocation. The Language strand was added because the common core standards have a language strand consisting of grammar and vocabulary. The standard English conventions from the oral conversation piece was placed in the language strand, as well as vocabulary from the Reading standard. The discrete skills inventory was placed within the revised ELP standards in the language strand so it is all one document.

OELAS began training teachers on Round IIA, a 20-hour training, in January 2008. There were groups of five teams with two trainers on each team who trained from January until September. In October, trainings on Round IIA continued, but included another layer, Round IIB, a 13-hour training. In February 2009 we added Round IIC, the 12-hour training that rounded out the 45 required hours of training. Next we added a condensed training and encouraged administrators

and teachers using ILLPs to attend that training. It is a condensed, 13-hour Round II training begun March 2009.

We are in the process of professionally videotaping the methodologies so that teachers can access those on our IDEAL website. The person providing the training talks about the steps of the methodologies and then shows what it looks like in a classroom. These videos will show what the methodologies should look like for pre-emergents at the third grade level and maybe pre-emergents at the high school level. Teachers will be able to access every methodology we have done within our trainings.

In our trainings we also address the behaviors that affect the language acquisition of students and establish the language objectives and let the teachers know what they're being held accountable for. The 50-50 rule allows our students to practice English. This is the time for them to practice so we want the emphasis should be on the student speaking. Pushing students to their productive discomfort level is all about having high expectations for the student. Our students are capable of a lot it's just making sure that we push them in that area. If students are given sentence frames, and then the teacher models it, then they hear the correctly formed sentence can then model those sentences. Finally, the teacher does nothing that the students can do themselves, holding students accountable for their learning and ensuring they're engaged. We address error correction with teachers. It is vital that teachers make sure error corrections are done immediately so it doesn't become a fossilized language for the student.

We looked at program effectiveness and how we can take that to the next level and assist teachers. We have expanded our trainings to include some pilot programs that developed with a local district where our trainers work with the teachers in the classrooms and we then observe the teachers and provide feedback, so we're working one on one with those teachers within those methodologies. Based on our monitoring results we know there are two areas that teachers need assistance with: oral conversation and grammar. We've been working with teachers in these areas. We started a program working with administrators to show them what to look for in the SEI classroom, how they can be effective in implementation and instruction for our English language learners. We are developing trainings and assistance for our ILLP teachers to show what happens and how to work those into the classrooms. Beginning next year we will do training on the revised ELP standards. We have a full plate but we continue growing and expanding the opportunities that we can provide for teachers.

Ms. Haver stated that she recommends the new members visit the summer school program. She stated that they are amazing. Ms. Haver asked if they will be in Tucson this year as well as Phoenix. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that she will check.

Ms. Kelly Koenig introduced herself as the Director of Monitoring and Title III in OELAS. She will share information regarding monitoring. She stated that we monitor for state and federal compliance, as well as any administrative code which is our board rule. District selection for the LEAs that will be monitored comes from statute. It requires monitoring of the top 50 districts. "Top 50" refers to districts with the highest population of ELL students. The top 50 are then broken into a four-year cycle. 12 to 13 of these districts are monitored each year on a four-year cycle. The next category, is those LEA with a substantial number of ELLs, but those that are not in the top 50. 10 monitoring visits for this group are required per year. The third category entails LEAs with 25 or fewer ELLs. Again, 10 monitoring visits for this group are required per year. When OELAS does a monitoring, we go to an LEA to ensure that they are properly identifying ELLs. Additional monitorings are based on findings from the prior year. If a district was in corrective action or had some areas of compliance that needed to be adjusted, OELAS staff goes back to the district to follow up and check up on the plan they submitted in order to meet the compliance requirements.

The communication process with the districts starts for us prior to the school year. As soon as we're done with the current year, ADE staff begins to look at who should be monitored. We notify fall monitorings by late August and then spring semester monitoring are notified early in the fall. With the exception of AIMS testing weeks in April, ADE staff is monitoring weekly, sometimes more than one district in a week. We ask for advance information to prepare for the visit. ELL rosters and student schedules show us which components of the models are evident or if SEI groupings are evident. During the desk audit process we look at rosters and schedules, also performance data and if the LEA has made AMAOs, which is the federal accountability system. We look at reclassification rates and FEP studies on how their reclassified students are performing in the mainstream. We review funding and standard data so we have the most information possible going into that district. A number of factors are used to decide which schools to visit, schools that have high ELL populations, but also those with few ELLs to be sure ILLP implementation is effective. We look at the reclassification rate at the school level. Sometimes LEAs will request we visit a specific site and we're open to those requests.

The first monitoring piece is a meeting with the administration prior to going to any school sites. The administration can share any information they think we need. We tell them what we're looking for, go over the model components and ask if there's any information we need. We conduct classroom observations of SEI classrooms, mainstream classrooms for students on ILLP, and any bilingual or dual language classrooms. Teacher interviews are conducted and prior to leaving the LEA we have a final meeting with the administration to share our preliminary findings. Electronic tablets capture all the information from the classroom observations to give more specific information at a later time but we give the general compliance findings before we leave the LEA so they have a full report as to any compliance issues. We conduct examinations of student cumulative files, looking for the enrollment form and the home language survey which

indicates if the child should be tested for services. We also look at student achievement reports such as report cards, AIMS, Terra Nova, and the Stanford Test. We review ELL files for the following: 1) The parent notification pieces, 2) Are they identifying students, 3) Are they placing students correctly, and 4) If they're placing students correctly are they notifying parents of that placement, 5) Are they gathering consent of that placement, 6) If they're being reclassified have the parents been notified, 7) Are they monitoring them for two years as our state law requires, 8) Is there documentation that they're following up with FEP students to ensure their success in the mainstream, and 8) Is there a Written Individualized Compensatory Plan (which is a documentation of the extra services they're providing to ELL students outside of the school day for our FEP students). We issue a written report, and the exit interview and the report are similar. We have 45 days from the end of the visit to complete the written report. If there are corrective action items the district is required to come up with a plan to come into compliance. We work with the districts until we both come to a conclusion that the plan in place will meet the compliance needs. Once that plan is approved, the LEA must implement it the following school year and then we go back the next school year to follow up on the implementation of that plan.

#### **5. Discussion of Possible Changes to Task Force's Models of Structured English Immersion (This is not an action item.)**

Mr. Maguire stated that the next item on the agenda is the beginning of a discussion about changes that we might consider making to the Task Force models. An annual review of the models is one of the requirements of the law. Due to the revised ELP standards, the time allocations may require some shifting to correspond to the new standards. We've learned quite a bit regarding the time allocations, particularly in the high school levels with regard to some of the language arts allocations and making sure that those times are appropriate. We heard today the issue of blending non-English academic content into the ELD process. That is a time allocation question. Another thing we've heard is the need to increase our focus on grammar as the foundation for reading and writing. We've heard from the field that we need additional training with regard to grammar. We've heard a lot about this issue of flexibility with regard to content from Tempe Union.

The law required us to propose a four hour minimum of English language learning ELD on first year students; it did not speak to second and third year students. It did require that students in their second and third years move toward proficiency but nothing specific was required. The Task Force's original position was that it was four hours for all kids until they made it to proficiency. The first revisions of the model allowed students who reach proficiency in certain areas to reduce the number of hours and give them more opportunity for content area. We have the opposite problem with our Basic and our Pre-Emergent/Emergent students. If students stay at the pre-emergent or emergent level it may be something other than an English language learning issue. Mr. Maguire asked if the Task Force should explore the causal relationship of the

models and the relationship that students who get more hours of grammar progress more rapidly. We need to understand completely what's happening and more importantly, why it's happening. Over the next couple of months the Task Force should go through the review process, so that they can implement any modifications in the next school year.

Ms. Dugan stated that over the last four years a lot of changes have happened. There were four tests to choose from and nobody thought that assessment had anything to do with instruction. There was no curriculum for an ELL teacher. There was training for ELL teachers, and the ELP standards were aligned to academic standards. Attitudes are different now about ELLs, and they can learn English quickly. The reclassification rates increased and more students moved to the mainstream, took advanced courses, and graduated from high school. We now have had three years of the four hours of ELD. Ms. Dugan stated that she would like a discussion on the flexibility of the models for second year English language learners to have fewer than four hours. She stated that there should be four hours for ELL students in their first year, and then two hours for ELL students in their second year at the Intermediate level. She stated that she would prefer it if from the field work with OELAS to talk about what those two hours should look like. She would like to see another model for the second year for students at the Intermediate stage. She would also like to explore an alternative model for Basic students and below who have been in the program for two years. The original intention of the law was for the students to be in the structured English immersion program "not normally to exceed one year." We've been doing this for three years, so now it's time to look at flexibility for our second year students.

Dr. Joraanstad questioned if the requirement for second year students was lowered to two hours would the content of those two hours be guided by scores on the various AZELLA composite scores. He also questioned whether it would be more prescriptive, or would vary depending on the proficiency levels within the AZELLA. Ms. Dugan stated that this is a discussion for the Task Force and OELAS; teachers have to teach reading and writing per AIMS. The two hours left over are oral language and grammar; ELLs need a lot of both. Ms. Haver stated individual students might have different abilities and needs, so it might be appropriate to offer more flexibility for certain students.

Mr. Ayala stated that when he took the SEI training there was no component regarding teaching grammar, yet everyone at the training expressed how important grammar is. He asked if there is a plan to make it a component of the SEI training. If the universities are not turning out highly qualified teachers, then they turn out these teachers that have to then become highly qualified somewhere else. I think part of that highly qualified training in SEI should have a discrete grammar component. Mr. Maguire stated that is a great suggestion. Ms. Dugan stated those are the questions they asked Dr. Garcia on the Task Force, and that Ms. Haver questioned him several times to make sure that grammar was being taught through the university. Universities now have that responsibility to do all of the training.

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

No discussion.

## **7. Call to the Public**

No Request to Speak forms were presented to the Chairman.

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

Mr. Maguire commented that future meetings will address changes to the models and what direction to move toward, including research and analysis on some of those topics. He is available to help any member review the PowerPoint slides or any of the information from OELAS. Historically, the Task Force meets on the second Thursday of the month, but for the past year they have had a meeting every other month. The Task Force will probably need to meet every month now through the end of the school year to get some changes in place for the next school year and then back to every other month. The exception would be when the Task Force gets an alternative model in they might have a meeting to go over that. For now, the Task Force will tentatively plan to meet next on March 10.

## **9. Adjournment**

**Mr. Maguire moved without objection that the meeting adjourn.**

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

---

Alan Maguire, Chairman  
English Language Learners Task Force

---

Date