

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

Thursday, March 10, 2011
Senate Hearing Room 1 - 1:30 P.M.

Chairman Maguire called the meeting to order at 1:33 P.M. and attendance was noted by the secretary. Mr. Maguire introduced the Superintendent of Public Instruction Huppenthal.

1. Call to order

Present:

Mr. Hector Ayala

Mr. Jim DiCello

Ms. Margaret Dugan

Ms. Johanna Haver

Ms. Jodi Jerich

Dr. Mark Joraanstad

Mr. Alan Maguire

Ms. Pam Pickard, by telephone

Ms. Dawn Wallace

Superintendent Huppenthal thanked the members for their service and their many hours of intensive work. Mr. Huppenthal has done a rigorous analysis of the quality of work done by the Task Force, and it amounts to one of the public policy tour de forces of the last century. The Task Force brought forth lots of changes. Mr. Huppenthal explained that he wasn't supportive of those changes from local control, which troubled him. He stated that when examining the data, the results are incredible. The academic gains of students has more than doubled and reclassification rates improved, when comparing from before implementation of the four-hour block to after implementation of the four-hour block. When the research is tied into the result, it is easy to recognize that what the Task Force accomplished was an incredible piece of work. The challenge now is to sustain that in terms of an assault that's taking place in the court system and to make sure that we communicate what we've done for these children. He stated that he now realizes that what the Task Force has done something great for these children and created a great education system to deliver quality education to students. We will be able to learn lessons from this to benefit all of education, not just for ELL children. He stated that as he read through a book by Dr. Mike Schmoker that talks about how to improve schools. He stated that it sounded a lot like the four hour model. Superintendent Huppenthal stated that his pledge to the Task Force is to be as supportive as he possibly can within the financial constraints, and to follow through on fidelity of implementation of the model the Task Force created. He stated that we can all have this vision of a great education system, but it's in the organization of it and in the day-to-day inspiration of the teachers by delivering quality in the four-hour model. He asked the Task Force to stay together as a team and to make sure that they are communicating well. He asked that they all stay united to ensure that we persist in faith in the face of this serious onslaught. He thanked the Task Force for the incredible quality of work they have done and that he knows they are going to do and wished them good luck.

2. Elect ELL Task Force Chairman

Mr. Maguire thanked Mr. Huppenthal and introduced the election of the Task Force Chairman as the next item on the agenda. This was done during the first Task Force meeting four-and-a-half years ago but with a new Task Force it is appropriate to do it again. **Mr. DiCello motioned to nominate Alan Maguire as Chairman. The motion was seconded.** Mr. Maguire opened the floor to discussion. With no discussion it was placed to a vote, one nay vote was heard. **Mr. Ayala motioned to nominated Ms. Margaret Dugan as Chairman, which was seconded.** Mr. Maguire opened the substitute motion to vote and the nays took the vote, putting them back on the original motion. **Voting on the original motion took place, ayes carried the motion.**

3. Review of the ELL Task Force's Models of Structured English Immersion

Mr. Maguire stated that the next item is a review of the ELL Task Force models of structured English immersion. We will spend some time going through the actual language of the models. We have a requirement to do an annual review and need to talk about things we need to change. In front of you in your packet is the date 5-14-08. Accompanying the models are the two alternative models from Glendale Union and Phoenix Union. He stated that he wanted to walk through the structure of the models and then afterwards walk through some of the issues the Task Force identified as worthy of more detailed review and discussion. The model overall has three major components: policy, structure, and classroom practice. This corresponds to the process we look at in terms of the policy behind the models, how the models are implemented in the classrooms, and what happens in the classroom. The policy for the Task Force and the models is predicated on law; we had clear direction in the law and we followed that as a Task Force very carefully. In the structure you see that it begins to follow in a logical fashion: what is the content in a structured English immersion classroom, how does the student come into and out of structured English immersion classroom, what are the student groupings, and how do we put students in the classroom and that's different for elementary and middle schools. There's also some language about class sizes and then the grouping process in terms of how we organize the students in order to allow the teachers to focus tightly on subject matter and students of like proficiency. There are also the schedule and time allocations for the elementary, middle, and high schools.

We consider elementary schools as those who have a single classroom during the day and think of middle and high schools organized by grade level and structure. Schools that move from classroom to classroom would be our middle grades and high school. The section on teacher qualifications mimics the rules adopted by the state board. Much of this is from law but it talks about how we have an English language objective inside the classroom. The final part of the model deals with training, implementation training, and the components of training. When we

got through with the models we knew that we made dramatic changes to the classroom practices and as a consequence we needed to help teachers and people in the field understand how to make that transition. Those are the subsets on the structure.

Mr. Maguire stated that based upon a series of discussions over the last couple of years, he put together some notes to guide today's conversation and it follows exactly through the sequential order of the structured English immersion models. He stated that today's goal is to come to a consensus as to areas or specific subjects that the Task Force would like to revise. That's the process we used when we first adopted the models. The Task Force adopted a series of components once we had a sense of what the models would look like it helped structure the process and it was a team effort.

Mr. Maguire stated that when he got to the definitions, he noted a few things there that we might want to look at. With regard to AZELLA, it has changed since we first adopted the models. We need to make sure that we have the current wording. We use that as a reference in other parts of the model. You will see the discrete skills inventory and reference to the proficiency standards adopted by the Board in 2004. Those standards are currently being revised. The changes are being made for the 2011-12 school year and the plan is to have those standards adopted by then. So think of these as not of today but as of next school year, though we need to reference the new standards, which is a cleanup item. There have been discussions about how the proficiency levels are going to be defined, so look at that for any changes that might be made there.

Ms. Jerich stated that in revising the models, she had a couple of statements/questions. One is to provide additional information that doesn't change the substance of the document but provides a more complete picture of where this document is today. So there might be changes in the definition or more clarifying terms or things of that nature. Secondly there might be substantive changes to the model. Mr. Maguire said that that's correct. He stated there are probably a number of cases where we could use better language but we were writing under pressure. There are also things we have learned through the implementation. Ultimately we want to incorporate the alternative models. Ms. Jerich stated it was her understanding that when this program was initially enacted by the legislature and that students were going to be taking the AZELLA test to determine proficiency, that this test was administered on an annual basis. Since then I now know that that's not necessarily the case; the AZELLA can be administered twice a year maybe three times a year and the purpose is you don't want to keep someone in an ELD classroom longer than they need to be. If they achieve proficiency in a semester then they can exit out at that point. She stated that she is not sure if that's an important point to include in this document. Mr. Maguire stated that the comment she made about helping students get to proficiency as quickly as they can and once they reach proficiency move on is something we will come back to repeatedly in this conversation. That is one of the issues that drives the Tempe Union model. It drove Glendale's model and Phoenix Union's model as well. It's a balance, not too little and not

too much and he thinks that's one of the areas of policy work that the Task Force needs to balance at this point, figuring out where that line is and put the line in the right place.

Ms. Haver stated that the election of Chairman is bothering her because it was gone through so quickly. She stated that four people voted in favor of Mr. Maguire remaining as Chair. Two people are absent and she would feel more comfortable if there were five people that voted for this very important position. Mr. Maguire stated that he believes there were five. Ms. Haver said it went so quickly that she didn't even vote, so it was actually four to three. Mr. Maguire said it was 4-3 and 3-4. Ms. Haver states that the new chair person should have at least five. Mr. Maguire said it was five, and Ms. Haver said it was 4-3. Another member pointed out Ms. Dawn Wallace's presence and stated she had voted to bring the total to five. Ms. Haver stated that she understood now that the vote had been clarified.

Mr. Maguire stated that the next section was policy, which is right out of the law. There are a couple of grammatical changes but nothing substantive. Are there any suggestions in the policy section? If not, then the structure section gets more into the substance. The first big issue is structured English immersion classroom content. It states that structured English immersion is a minimum of four hours daily for English language development. There are two points to that end. First, the four hours is a time item not a content item so it doesn't belong in that category. More importantly, the four hours is an issue that is now a variable because we adopted later on authorization for some changes to allocations depending on test scores. So there's 25 or 30 or more places in the models where the four hours is identified and somehow we've got to come up with an alternative mechanism that says that students take the ELD requirement they have so based upon their eligibility if they require three hours then that's three hours it's not four. And so rather than refer throughout the document to the four hours particular it should say something like the students require ELD. That's something we need to talk through quite a bit. This is the first place where this comes up.

Mr. Maguire stated that AZELLA is the gatekeeper; it's what gets a student out of English immersion classroom and into the mainstream classroom. The purpose is not to give every ELL a test in the middle of the year, but to look at the students and make a determination to see if a student is likely to pass AZELLA now, and if they pass AZELLA then they can move into a regular classroom. That is important because we were trying to ensure enough ELD but not too much ELD. The next section is the grouping exercise. If you look at elementary and high school, that is a complicated process that we developed. It is designed to, as much as possible, put students with the same grade and same proficiency together. The challenge there is classrooms. You don't want to have five classrooms of five kids when you might be able to make that two classrooms of 12 to 13 kids, so more reasonably sized classrooms. But you didn't want to reach the point where the students became so heterogeneous in terms of their proficiency that the teacher couldn't stay focused on a narrow band of curriculum and couldn't successfully

communicate with those students, as one of the underlying principles is that grouping by proficiency helps students and that was feedback from the field. The clear preference was as narrow a proficiency band as practical and as narrow a grade level as practical. That seems to have worked pretty well. The new challenge is that as more and more ELLs become proficient those classroom sizes are getting smaller and smaller so you're getting a wider mix in the classroom, so we're moving into a more heterogeneous mix of kids simply by virtue of fewer students. Mr. Maguire stated that he is open to any suggestions anyone may have for this item.

Mr. Maguire stated that the ILLP process is very important. It says if you have fewer than 20 students, you can actually give those students an ILLP, and that was an exercise in pure practicality. He stated that the ILLP is something we might want to look through again. He stated that there are probably a lot more ILLPs than we used to have. So that is an important issue but it seems to be working.

Dr. Joraanstad stated that he wonders about the legal assault on the grouping process. Are there revisions that we could make that could help us defend the models in court? He stated that he is not sure if the grouping process is the focus of that assault. What revisions can we make that would help the legal defense of the models? He stated that he doesn't know if the grouping process is what is going to matter. He would hate to see it overturned if there are things we can do to make the defense more solid.

Ms. Dugan stated that the issue is really the number of years that students are delegated to the four hours. The other issue is not being able to be in the mainstream with other students as quickly as possible. The law stated not normally to last more than one year and the four hours of ELD, so that's why we need to show some movement on the second year.

Mr. Maguire stated that the time allocation is a really big issue that you can see and what drives the structure. We want to make sure that we are clearly aligned with the new standards as they come out. You can see we have class titles in some places. We used language such as, "Academic and English vocabulary" yet used subject matter in the lower grades. We don't care what you call it, we just care about what happens. On a related topic, Mr. Maguire stated that what we've heard from the staff is that we need to more explicitly describe the amount and type of grammar used and make it more implicit in the other version. Mr. Maguire referred the members to the bottom of that page where it talks about the second or subsequent year. This is the beginning of an important provision. The idea is that once students score proficient on a component, they can be excused from the otherwise mandatory four hours. We will try to navigate that line.

This document says is that if a student scores proficient on a subtest, then they are eligible to be exempt from that hour of ELD. The new members will remember that we understood that the

academic and English Language Proficiency Standards all three aligned with AZELLA. If kids learned and could achieve the standards, they made the transition, they would be already prepared for the academic English standards in the regular classroom. Similarly, when you work to realign the time blocks, they will correspond to the components of the AZELLA with an extra piece for grammar. As an example, if a student passes the oral listening portion, that students would stop taking the oral component of that class. This language goes farther than last time although it is hard for me to imagine if there is a composite score. The attempt of the language is to more closely align it with the standards and the AZELLA.

Mr. Ayala asked for clarification of what the current model says. Mr. Maguire stated that the model currently allows students to “test out” of reading or writing by scoring proficient on the AZELLA. And the two we picked are the way we looked at the proficiency standards at the time. Where we realigned the standards and the time, then we can get the subtests.

Ms. Dugan stated that she doesn't see the difference between this and what we've already done. Mr. Maguire stated that this proposal allows students to go down in the number of hours as quickly as their progress allows them. Ms. Dugan stated that at the high school level, you would think oral is the easiest to master, the older you get, you don't have a lot of practice orally. But they seem to test out, though, because the test is not that rigorous. They don't have a lot of people in the outside world correcting their language. The only person that will correct is their teacher. Yet they will test out. It's a little bit contradictory. Ms. Haver stated that makes perfect sense. Ms. Dugan's recommendation is that if they score at the intermediate level and this is middle school and high school, the school should have reduced hours possibly two hours, and let the districts choose which two hours they need, probably oral and grammar. This is because reading and writing are already required through AIMS.

Ms. Haver states that those students would also likely qualify for reading programs. Ms. Jerich stated that in the last meeting there was a slide showing the acquisition of language skills. If under your proposal, students are scoring intermediate (and it's a composite score) it could be they are intermediate in all of the subtests, but they could reduce from two hours to four hours. Ms. Dugan agreed, but stated that they would still get reading and writing in the mainstream. Ms. Jerich asked if the goal of the models is to achieve proficiency as expeditiously as possible. Ms. Dugan stated that it is the law. Proficiency is the ultimate goal, but really, the goal is to give them a good working knowledge of the language without keeping them in the program forever. We are looking at a reduction for these students that have been in the four hours for more than a year. Mr. Joranstand asked if this would answer some of the legal challenges. Ms. Dugan stated yes, that this would signal to the judge that we are going to give the districts opportunity. The department still has to monitor the schools. Dr. Joraanstad stated that he supports continuing to teach grammar because it isn't taught in schools as much as it should be. A lot of our kids are still getting a heavy dose of reading and writing.

Ms. Wallace stated that under Ms. Dugan's proposal, an intermediate student would be freed up of two hours for content. She stated that she is concerned about putting non-proficient children into content classes before they've achieved proficiency in English. Ms. Wallace stated that she understood that was one of the components and a strong theme of HB2064 where there was a desire and intent to get children proficient before the content was emphasized. Ms. Dugan stated that we don't want to say we don't teach content in the four hours, because content is taught within the four hours, but it is taught very structurally. HB2064 refers to the first year a student is in an English language program and there is the intent that they would remain in an English language program for one year. At that point, we didn't have everything aligned. But now, we have standards and assessments and there are schools out there that are asking about the second year. I don't believe the intent of HB2064 was to keep students in four hours for the second or third years. At the intermediate stage students can acquire enough language so that they can stay in the mainstream. It's not necessary that all school should give Intermediates two hours, but we need to give that latitude to the school districts to allow them to give Intermediates two hours of ELD on a case by case basis.

Ms. Haver stated that the ideal situation is regarding what was going on at Tempe Union High School. She stated that she liked combining an hour of grammar with the social studies curriculum. The problem students have is with large sentences and figuring out how to navigate through those. The only way to teach that is through grammar.

Ms. Wallace stated that from Tempe Union she gathered that they had a four hour model that was very structured and the same teachers were part of all four hours. She stated that she is concerned about these two hours because they are mainstream and these teachers are not necessarily trained to integrate language with content. She stated that she remembered that when she worked on the bill, the intent was to require intensive English acquisition. She stated that she feels like it is a fairly big reversal.

Ms. Dugan stated that now there has been training, the standards are aligned to the assessment. Ms. Wallace stated that training is nice but the issue is applying that training. If the teachers don't have to work with these kids every day, she wonders whether their instruction is as good as one versus that in an English Language Development classroom. She stated that she feels that if the students are not proficient, that is allowing them to regress a little bit. She also questioned to what degree reading and writing needs to be kept up to elevate the oral side of learning. It seems like a holistic program where they are equally weighted. So in the absence, one may go down from being intermediate because they don't have the emphasis of the reading and writing.

Ms. Dugan stated that the ultimate goal is to get them into the mainstream. She stated that one hour of the four hours was extended and there are some students who can take two hours. These

students would do well in the mainstream and they will flourish and they will blossom. The department of education wants them to achieve. But to keep these students in four hours and not to show forward motion is not in the best educational philosophy of practice.

Ms. Jerich stated that it was good for Superintendent Huppenthal to step in and address the Task Force. He was a legislator when this bill was created that created the Task Force was created and it was nice to hear him talk about fidelity to the model and the work the Task Force is doing. In the spirit of fidelity, we need to be respectful of the intent of the legislation. In my opinion, working on that legislation, proficiency is the goal. Achieving an intermediate composite score is not the goal. When you exit out of the ELL program it is because you received a composite score of proficient. I am confused by the thought that if you achieve proficiency on the subpart of oral, you should still stay in the ELL program because the bar is too low. And yet, the alternative proposal being debated is that if you are still intermediate you get to exit out of 50% of the program. I think it is important to show flexibility to the court. Mr. Maguire stated that we should move away from the composite score and focus on the subparts. If you move out of those subparts, then you no longer need the proficiency for that subpart and are able to move out of the ELL program.

Mr. Maguire stated that one of the big challenges the Task Force faced was overcoming any attempt or effort through the legislative process to do anything but ensure these students are given the opportunity to succeed in the mainstream classroom. I am troubled by the question of the appropriate standard. Is the standard proficiency or is the standard intermediacy? We've always been committed to proficiency because that is what got the students into the classroom with the greatest possibility of success. It would be very discouraging to students to move into the mainstream classroom, and then drop on the AZELLA score and then end up in the ELL classroom again. I think that would hurt their academic progress. Ms. Dugan stated that from her experience students didn't reach the proficiency level but they were strong enough motivational wise and after a year, she would have made the educational decision to put them in a mainstream classroom with two hours of structured English immersion for scaffolding. And she would watch the student's progress. She believes that some students would be able to succeed with less than four hours in the second year.

Ms. Haver stated that perhaps it would be beneficial to allow students to have two years the second year. Generally I had students that were at the basic level, and there were ones who were good at grammar, others had trouble expressing themselves. There were so just many variables, so as a teacher, I would appreciate having choices as to what classes the students can take. Motivation is so important. If students are kept for four hours for multiple years, then they become fatigued such as the boy from Tempe Union that talked about his experience in content ELD classes. Mr. Maguire stated that what the boy told us that he didn't understand history until it was in the context of his ELD class.

Dr. Joraanstad stated that having intermediate is abandoning proficiency as an ultimate goal. Some students who have had four years and then they have two English credits and at the end of their two years they are very far behind for graduation. Even with working very hard in summer school, these students are a long shot from graduation. Having that earned flexibility allows students a better chance to graduate. If we give earned flexibility based on getting to Intermediate status, he advocates for that.

Mr. Ayala asked if passing AZELLA equals proficiency. He stated that AZELLA is not proficiency. Proficiency is better measured by a standardized test. Mr. Maguire stated that the AZELLA is the way we measure. He stated that there are three issues. He stated the issues are whether it should be based on testing at intermediate or proficient level, and then what ELD should continue to be. Earlier today, we talked about how important grammar is and how we have to put specific requirements for that in the model. We have more requests for help in terms of how to teach the grammar. He stated that he is a little anxious about making the choice of the two hours completely discretionary. His sense is that grammar is really important and oral is really important, and the only way to correct this is from the teacher in that classroom. That pronunciation is so important to being successful. Everything else comes from getting the word right in your mind. Mr. Ayala stated that he is nervous about using the two hours minimum. But there should be a relationship between where the student is and what he achieved. He stated that he would like thoughts on how students should be scored. We have been concerned about those students not being immersed in the mainstream classroom. Mr. Ayala is very concerned about not holding them too long, but also not exiting them too soon. He stated that we need to go halfway now and further later. He worries that we will end up with all our intermediates getting two hours of reading and writing. Those classes are most likely to be replicated in the mainstream classroom. It is important that the students speak properly and understand their grammar. All of that is all about structure.

Ms. Dugan stated that in an English class the middle and high school level have to take those classes to graduate. Mr. Maguire stated that once these kids move out of ELD, they won't take many more English classes because they need to "catch up" with their peers. Dr. Joraanstad stated that ELD likely does not meet the grade-level English class. Ms. Dugan stated that depends on the district. Ms. Dugan stated that we don't want students to graduate without their language credential. Mr. Maguire stated that we should say that. So what we are saying, is that if you pass the reading you're out of reading, and if you pass the writing you're out of writing. The big question is proficient as the standard. Maybe it isn't that different for intermediate reading and writing. He stated that he is worried whether the intermediate standard is high enough.

Ms. Dugan stated that unless the AZELLA is drastically different than the other assessments, sometimes it's a hint. There are sometimes kids that are on the cusp and need simply a portion of ELD. She stated that the students that she would move would be talking like crazy. She would

say not all kids get two hours. They should have the option to get four. Dr. Joraanstad stated that there are high and low intermediates. Ms. Haver said she trusts the teacher over the score of the test. But more times than not the test is not correct. We have to put importance on it to a certain degree but if it is on the line—she would go to the test. Ms. Jerich stated that a composite score puts them on the cusp and some of those subscores put them on proficiency. She stated that she sees a lot of consensus that the Task Force is we can be flexible with the four hours, but how much movement should we do and what should be the criteria. She has a legal concern about deviating from proficiency, though. In the original Nogales lawsuit, the claim was there was no educational access to the students because the schools failed to teach them English. If the Task Force moves away to a reduction in ELD are we opening up for a new lawsuit similar to the Nogales suit. Mr. Maguire stated that is what makes him nervous. He stated there is a big difference between high and low intermediate. You can talk me into nearly proficient which means you're almost there but not quite. That's really different than just drawing the line at intermediate. We had all these students before the models that were stuck in intermediate. That was the whole reason for the summer school. He stated that the models and the rigor of the models helps those kids go across the line because it gives them a high probability to succeed in the mainstream classroom. He stated that he is nervous about intermediates because he thinks as a group they can agree that they need to get to near proficient standards. We need to decide as a Task Force where we are going to put our energy. He stated that he would feel a lot more comfortable with nearly proficient. Dr. Joraanstad stated that maybe we can ask for a presentation on AZELLA from ADE and some guidance regarding Intermediate because it is such a broad category. If you are a teacher you know that student who is just about there. They have barely just missed proficiency. Those tests are accurate and as a teacher your intuition is good regarding the level of the student.

Ms. Dugan stated we should say they *may* have a reduction to two hours. There are other variables to look at to see where they fall. All these students take AIMS. If they pass AIMS that's another assessment that you might want to take into consideration before you make the determination of the two hours. That's why she stated she would use the word "may." This is only for the second year and beyond. The first year there should be fidelity to the four hours. Ms. Haver stated that they should require the grammar teacher to team up with the social studies teacher. She stated as an example, that she is a grammar teacher. She would have a schedule set up so they are all either in science or social studies with mainstream students, but they get a lot of extra help with the grammar in the content class rather than teaching grammar in isolation. She stated that she knows this works because she's done that. Mr. Maguire stated that good teachers could do that but that is a big burden to put upon districts. Ms. Haver stated we should encourage districts to partner up because that would work better. Ms. Haver stated that when you have a textbook with sentences that are thirty words long, then you show them a system to read those sentences and that system is grammar. It becomes repetitious and students become more proficient in grammar. She thinks it is better to integrate the content into teaching grammar

rather than teaching straight grammar. Mr. Maguire stated that he agrees. He stated that this was a large component of the Tempe Union alternate model. Ms. Haver stated that she does not want to teach grammar in isolation. Mr. Maguire stated the idea of preserving the grammar hour is so that the focus of the class is on grammar. Ms. Haver stated that without the textbooks then the motivation isn't there. Mr. Maguire stated that grammar teachers want the students to be successful. Ms. Haver stated that it's better to use the text to teach grammar rather than teaching it in isolation. Mr. Maguire asked if we can move forward with language and protecting oral grammar. Ms. Dugan stated she wanted to see movement on the reduction of the four hours in the second year. She wants to see how the schools "may" reduce. She wants to look at individual students rather than applying this exception across the board. Ms. Jerich asked for clarification of nearly proficient. Mr. Maguire stated that if you're proficient in reading you're out of the reading hour, and if you're proficient in writing you're out of the writing hour. Essentially, you've allowed them to go to two hours for earned achievement and appropriate the school district to make that decision. Perhaps we need to discuss what "nearly proficient" means. The purpose of today's exercise is to do some research into changes that we need to make and to do some drafting of changes.

Ms. Jerich stated that from her point of view she does not support moving away from the standard of proficiency. She stated that it is important to remain consistent to the intent of the legislation. She is not comfortable with this new made up term of newly proficient. She asked what are the qualms about a proficiency score on a sub part and why is that not a good idea. Ms. Haver stated that is done already. Mr. Maguire asked how many districts actually do that. Ms. Laura Monson stated that the exception is only from 7-12 grade. Ms. Mary Gomez stated that teachers are making a sound decision based on other factors. Mr. Maguire stated that this whole question is much more complex at the elementary level. Dr. Joraanstad stated that yes it is more complex because when a student becomes proficient at the elementary level, they wouldn't be moved into another classroom. Often the student is bonded with the classroom so you wouldn't want to move him to another classroom in the middle of the year. Mr. Ayala clarified that nearly proficient is for students in the second year and would be used to help them transition. Mr. Maguire stated that if a student scores nearly proficient on the writing portion they are out of the writing hour for the second year. The hope is that they will pick up reading and writing in their other content classes. And hopefully, at the end of that year then they will be proficient. Ms. Jerich asked about a student who takes the AZELLA mid-year and they become proficient. Does that exempt them from the spring semester? Mr. Maguire stated that the intent is that the student is out of the program at that point and the student would go into the mainstream classroom. Ms. Jerich asked that if they are on the cusp will they be tested in another semester. Ms. Dugan stated that most districts do not test at the semester. Dr. Joraanstad asked if there is a lot of movement at the semester for testing AZELLA. Ms. Mary Gomez from Tempe Union HSD stated that in her district they have eliminated any testing in December for the reason that it is difficult for these students to go into the second semester of a mainstream classroom. There are exceptions,

but typically students are not tested at the semester. Ms. Haver asked if she likes that the option is there. Ms. Gomez stated that she likes having that option.

Mr. Maguire asked if the Task Force is okay with the four categories of the four hours: reading, writing, oral language, and grammar. Mr. Maguire stated that they can work through the elementary time allocations. Ms. Dugan stated we should use the word “may.” Mr. Maguire stated he d be happy to look into the elementary piece. Dr. Joraanstad stated there are some sixth grades that move. He thinks we should write “may”. Ms. Dugan stated there are schools doing a lot with differentiated instruction and are using Galileo. Mr. Maguire asked the Task Force to remember that there is no differentiation between middle and high school levels. Again I’m totally comfortable moving ahead with the high school kids. We spent quite some time on this one issue and I’d be more than happy to work on the elementary classroom but I’m not there yet. Personally, even though it makes me nervous, I’d be willing to accept nearly proficient and then we will figure out what that means. Ms. Dugan stated that when we revisit this issue, we can look at the scaled score. Dr. Joraanstand stated it would be more defensible if we use the psychometrician’s recommendation. Mr. Maguire stated that as an example, we might look at students’ test score progressions. He stated the pretend range is 75 to 100. We would be worried about the kid at 76, but not the kid at 99. We want to see that when you just remove the reading and writing, then you’re not putting the overall progression of the student at risk. Ms. Jerich stated that is a very good suggestion. She stated Superintendent Huppenthal is driven by data and that students are plateauing at intermediate. If she sees the data that students are clustering near the sample score of 100 and then moving on the next year, that would be highly persuasive. Mr. Maguire said he is suggesting the following language: in their second or subsequent years as ELL, students who have scored composite intermediate, and nearly proficient on either the reading or writing subtest of AZELLA, may be excused at the discretion of the school district from the one hour of ELD directly corresponding to that subtest. So in other words, if you score nearly proficient then are out of the reading or writing hour. It will just be for those two hour blocks protecting the blocks of oral language and grammar. We will get more data down the road and then he can start writing something for the members to look at. Mr. Maguire stated in the beginning, we went through the models line by line. Then we adopted the draft models, went through a review process, and then we finally adopted that model. This is just the beginning of the process. Ms. Dugan stated that there is no difference in this proposed language from what is already in the law. She stated that if you pass the reading you don’t have to take it. Mr. Maguire stated that you get there backwards because if a kid does well in reading then you take him out of the reading class. Dr. Joraanstad stated that he thought in our discussion there would be a nearly proficient composite score. Mr. Maguire clarified that the student must be a Composite intermediate and nearly proficient on the subtest. Ms. Jerich asked if the student can be excused from all four hours or only the two. Mr. Maguire stated that they would only be excused from the two hours of reading and writing. Mr. Maguire stated the amendment again: “In their second or subsequent years as ELL, students who have scored composite intermediate, and nearly

proficient on either the reading or writing subtest of AZELLA, may be excused at the discretion of the school district from the one hour of ELD directly corresponding to that subtest.” Ms. Jerich asked about the student who has composite intermediate who does not achieve nearly proficient in reading or writing, but does score proficient on oral proficiency. Ms. Jerich stated that she does not want to make an arbitrary decision on why students are able to be exempted from these two hours. Mr. Maguire stated that both reading and writing will get adequate coverage in the regular classroom to the extent that all students have to take an English language arts class in the mainstream classroom. However, they will not receive the grammar and oral pronunciation classes in the mainstream classrooms. Ms. Jerich asked if there is data to support that. Ms. Haver stated that there is no evidence that English learners needed to learn different than the non learners. Mr. Maguire stated with respect to the oral language skills, there is evidence that proper pronunciation leads to better word recognition. We have had multiple non-native speakers who are currently teachers in Arizona come and testify to us and they took great pride in their proper pronunciation of their words. Ms. Haver stated that in Canada there was a problem because they weren’t teaching grammar. And at the end of their education they complained that they were not grammatical in either language and there is plenty of research to back that up. Dr. Joaraanstad asked if students routinely test proficient in grammar and not reading or writing. Ms. Santa Cruz stated that grammar is not tested as a unit the way reading, writing, and oral conversation are tested.

Mr. Maguire stated that the next section is classroom practices. Much of that comes from the law. In the classroom objectives it talks about the specific skills in the discrete skills inventory. This will need to be changed because the DSI has now been embedded into the standards. The next portion is classroom materials and testing. That’s basically what’s used in the classroom. He is suggesting a new subsection that discusses SEI classroom content. This is essentially the Phoenix Union model. We want to bring it into the model rather than having it be a separate component. His goal is to get rid of the alternative model and incorporating it into the models.

Mr. Maguire stated that he added a new section about assessment of ELL students that are “stuck” as ELLs. His language states, “It is recommended that in the third or subsequent years as ELLs, students who have a composite score of pre-emergent, emergent, or basic shall be assessed by their school or school district and that based on that assessment an appropriate plan of ELD instruction be developed provided that it is at least two hours.” He stated that he is not sure if this should be part of the model, but it’s on the table. He stated that he also doesn’t know which two hours should be required. Ms. Haver stated that these students should be involved in the oral language class. Ms. Dugan stated that as a practitioner, after three years of no progression, she may make a different decision regarding this type of student. She recommended that the language Mr. Maguire recommended remain as is. Mr. Maguire stated that a student like this needs special attention. Ms. Dugan asked what the difference between this language and the

previous language discussed was. Mr. Maguire stated the difference is between the “almost there” kid and the “stuck” kid.

Mr. Maguire stated that the “nearly there” kid would have a reduction in the two hours in the second year. Ms. Dugan stated that a student in their third year or more who is Pre-Emergent, Emergent, or Basic may receive at least two hours in their third or subsequent years. Ms. Jerich asked what will be in place of the two of the four hours they are not getting. Mr. Maguire stated that he is not sure at this time what will fill those two hours. Perhaps it will be a special program or training. The key here is to develop an appropriate plan for that student. Ms. Jerich stated the intent of this language is so that this student receives supplemental instruction other than in language. Ms. Dugan reiterated that if a student is learning disabled, then ELL is trumped. Ms. Jerich stated this is written so loosely and that a school district could just put the kids in non-ELL regular classrooms for two years because there is no definition of what the plan is. Dr. Joraanstad stated that if a student has had two years of four hours, it’s time to try something else to untie the district’s hands and try something else. Ms. Haver stated that if you gave the AZELLA to non-ELLs, 40% of the non-ELLS would not score proficient. So, you would put them in there and do with them as you would with the non-ELLs. Mr. Maguire stated that there is a period after students. He stated the intent of this is to say, “You shall assess them.” But, when a specialized program is developed, that student will still have two hours, unless they become Special Ed. Ms. Jerich asked if this is a loophole. Mr. Maguire stated that yes it is, but it is a pretty small one. We need to do more research but everybody that he has talked to believes that there is something else going on in this case. Dr. Joraanstand stated that we don’t want students to spend two years in the four hours. Mr. Maguire stated that he has confidence in the efficacy of the models and that they work. With both of these chunks of language, it will be an area for extra scrutiny with the monitors to see if they are doing okay. We don’t want to see wholesale “dumping” of kids at the Basic level. Ms. Dugan stated that it will likely be more of an exception than the rule, for students who have high absence rates. Ms. Jerich stated that a segment of the population does have high absence rates, and their inability to increase in level of proficiency has nothing to do with their intellectual ability—it’s due to their absences. It’s not that they are unable to grasp the material they are just not in the classroom for the correct period of time. Mr. Maguire stated that you could put a period after the word “students.” This would force the discovery of this issue. Ms. Jerich asked if this is still an issue. Ms. Dugan stated that it’s not as much of an issue because there are not as big of gaps in attendance anymore and the standards are unified now. Ms Haver stated lots of ELL are misidentified as Special Ed., but noted that this does not happen as much anymore. Mr. Maguire stated one reason the Task Force came to a more prescriptive model is because they heard repeatedly that these students change districts a lot. That mobility led us to be more uniform in the application of the models. There is also a historical concern about the under identification of special education students who happen to be English language learners. Ms. Jerich stated can the Task Force just not recommend an assessment instead of creating this exception. Mr. Maguire stated that this is designed to be a

backstop. He stated that he believes that there are some learning disabilities that don't kick you into the full special education. For example, speech therapy is a special ed. program that but doesn't make you a special ed. kid. Sometimes it's used to just catch up a student in a certain area. This language is clearly predicated on the good faith belief that the schools make this decision based on a good faith decision. This is similar to what we do with the ILLPs. It is an act of faith, but so far it's working well. This is a solution for a problem that has been largely solved, but not entirely solved. Ms. Jerich stated the plan is to come back with some draft language and then stakeholders will talk about their reactions to that. Mr. Maguire stated that when we started this we had lots of people come and share with us. There are people who have views on these questions and they will bring their experience to us. When we had testimony last summer we learned a ton from them. They have been doing this in the classrooms for a couple years now.

Mr. Maguire asked if there was unanimous consent to come back with a draft. Ms. Jerich stated that she is still uncomfortable with the "nearly proficient" designation. Mr. Ayala stated that the language geared toward a student with a learning disability doesn't necessarily look like that nor will it always be interpreted that way. Mr. Maguire stated the reason the assessment in the language is so vague is because he doesn't know what that assessment should be. Perhaps it is a speech assessment or some other assessment. We are counting on the teacher in the school to determine what the problem is. Mr. Ayala said this is just an opportunity to try something different. Ms. Dugan stated that could be the case, or they could still use the AZELLA. Dr. Joraanstad asked if it should be more explicit. Ms. Dugan stated the students being tested in this case, could be students from Somalia, or those with lots of absences, but let the schools make the determination of what assessment they should use. Mr. Ayala asked from which two hours these students will be exempt. Mr. Maguire stated that oral language and grammar should probably be protected. He would be very uncomfortable saying we want these kids tested to see if they are Special Ed. kids because he doesn't want to link the concept that because you are a Basic in your third year that you are a special ed. student. The district and the teacher will know which assessment is appropriate. Dr. Joraanstad stated we should give more flexibility to the districts to determine which two hours the kid needs. Ms. Jerich stated that the law is four hours. The point is that the four hours will maximize their ability to get proficient as quickly as possible. This section addresses students where it is not working. Mr. Maguire stated it is unusual to be stuck for three years at the same level without some other issue. It is not impossible though. We are putting the burden on the schools so that they can check and make sure that the plan is appropriate for each individual student. Dr. Joraanstad stated when everything goes well, Intermediate is usually where they often plateau.

Mr. Maguire stated that we are unanimous to move forward on these topics. **Ms. Dugan made a motion that the Task Force directs staff and the Chairman to move forward with the**

preparation of the proposed changes to the models which reflect the discussion we just had. Ms Haver seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion of Revisions and Refinements to ELL Task Force's Models of Structured English Immersion

No discussion.

5. Discussion and Possible Action on Adoption of Conceptual Revisions and Refinements to the English Language Learner Models to Be Incorporated into Draft Amendments to the Models

No discussion.

6. Presentation and Discussion of Upcoming Task Force Activities

Mr. Maguire stated that a presentation on the standards will probably be at the next Task Force meeting and can show how the DSI is incorporated into the standards. We also would like an update on the AZELLA revision. My hope is to get these revisions done before the beginning of the next school year. We will stick with the second Thursday of the month. We will try to do it every month for a couple of months. The next meeting will be April 14th. We will also address Tempe Union at the next meeting.

7. Call to the Public

No Request to Speak forms were presented to the Chairman.

8. Discussion of future meeting dates

We will meet the second Thursday of the month for the next few months and then go every other month.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Dugan moved and Ms Haver seconded, without objection, that the meeting adjourn.

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 2:56 P.M.

Alan Maguire, Chairman
English Language Learners Task Force

Date