

ELL Task Force of the Boston School Committee  
ELSWD (name change from SPED-ELL) Subcommittee Meeting  
**April 24, 2018**

Bolling Building  
Action Minutes

Subcommittee Members present: Maria de Lourdes B. Serpa, John Mudd, Cindie Neilson, Ivonne Borrero, Ellen Kelleher

**1. Approval of Minutes**

The draft Minutes from the meeting of March 20, 2018 were approved unanimously.

**2. Review of Agenda**

John suggested adding a review of the Opportunity and Achievement Gap Implementation plans for SPED and ELL to ensure that the ELSWD population is included.

There is also a question about the provision in the SPED implementation plan that has a goal of reducing ELL referrals to SPED by 15%. Is this a goal the subcommittee supports or has it been confused with the goal of reducing referrals of Black and Brown males to SPED?

**3. Future Meeting dates**

The subcommittee confirmed its future meeting dates of May 22 at 4:00 and June 19 at 2:00. Given the confusion about the meeting time of the meeting today, each member was asked to be sure to check their calendars and to warn others well ahead of time, if any problem arises.

**4. Review Draft Guidance Document on Native Language Access**

It was suggested that language learning needs of ELSWDs must be addressed as a matter of policy and there should be a section on the long-range (North Star) goal See *Instructional Model C & PD* in table 1.

And then a section on a proposed pilot project that would involve BPS taking steps to deal with language access for ELSWD students that is within reach, given the current dispersion of students as well as budget and staffing constraints. BPS already uses Instructional Model A (see Tab11 1)

Phase I – ELSWD focus schools

1. Select 10 schools where there is currently a high number of ELSWDs with the same language.  
Each of these schools would select one of a set of approved instruction models for ELSWDs: Bilingual model, Coordinated Services model, Integrated Bilingual Special Education Model and Bilingual Special Education Model. See Table 1.

Table 1. Instructional models for ELSWDs

<b>A. Bilingual Support Model:</b>	<b>Bilingual paraprofessionals</b> are teamed <b>with monolingual English-speaking special educators</b> and assist with the IEP implementation. The teacher assistant provides native language instruction in areas specified in the IEP as requiring L1 instruction. <i>This model of Instruction is already being used at BPS</i>
<b>B. Coordinated Services Model:</b>	ELSWDS students are served by a team consisting of a <b>monolingual English speaking special education</b> teacher and a <b>bilingual educator</b> .
<b>C. Integrated Bilingual Special Education Model</b>	This model is used when a district has teachers who are trained in both <b>bilingual education</b> and <b>special education</b> . These dually certified teachers provide special education instruction in the native language, provide ESL-English as a second language.
<b>D. Bilingual Special Education Model</b>	This is an integrated model in which the entire personnel and school focus on bilingual special education instruction and services. All professionals have been previously trained in bilingual special education. The ELSWDs receive all services needed to accomplish their goals and objectives established in the IEP.

Source: Ortiz (1984)

2. The central SPED, ELL, Budget, Human Capital, and Schools division would help each school develop a restructuring plan to implement the selected model in the Budget Collaborative and Probable Org meetings.
3. Professional Development would be developed for each school.
4. Central departments would continue to provide focused support during implementation

Phase I – Other Schools

Other Schools would receive support on curriculum suggestions, technology, and professional development.

Phase II – Evaluation and future plans

During the 3-5 year period of implementation, there would be annual progress assessments to determine lessons learned and necessary changes in plans.

After 3-5 years, there would be an in-depth evaluation of the 10 focus schools and the other schools to determine how BPS should proceed in taking the next steps towards realizing the long-term goal of language access for ELSWD students systemwide.

Ivonne will write up a description of this strategy and distribute it so that there can be a fuller discussion at the next ELSWD subcommittee meeting on April 24.

Cindie expressed support for this more realistic approach but was particularly concerned with the timelines.

#### 5. Update on the IEP Pilot Project

Ellen and Ivonne reported that their review of the IEPs showed that they had nothing about native language; nothing about adapting to the cultural aspects of student needs; and nothing about second language objectives.

A write-up of this IEP pilot project updates would be distributed soon.

#### 6. Review and Update on BPS planning under the LOOK bill

Maria expressed concern about LOOK bill changes not being implemented in SY18-19.

Plans for how to incorporate native language into classrooms, curriculum, and materials need to be developed, along with its relation to the current SEI classrooms. Changes must be taken to DOJ. It was unclear whether DESE would have to approve of changes. Ellen said she would ask Priya for clarification.

Members raised the question of what is the plan for closing the achievement gap for the group of ELSWD students, with MCAS as the accepted metric in MA along with WIDA ACCESS. Cindie suggested the need to look at alternate assessments.

#### 7. Impact of Reorganization

There was a preliminary discussion of the impact of the proposed reorganization of central support for schools on the ELSWD students. There will be a division of schools into new groupings with some smaller Transformation Learning Networks with more intensive support and larger Learning Networks.

How schools will receive support to deal with the needs of ELSWD students is still unclear to the subcommittee. It needs to be addressed in the reorganization planning.

## 8. Hiring and Language competence

There needs to be more guidance to schools in what to look for in ELL, SPED, and ELSWD teachers. What guidance and what training are school leaders and their personnel subcommittees now receiving, what do they need, and how will they get it? All of these questions need more attention. Lemma Garudi could do a draft. (What follow-up???)

Maria has continued to raise the issue that teacher applicants are still not using the self-assessment of language competency rubric used by LinkedIn and emailed to HC.

## 9. A World Language Department

Foreign language and English Language Learning should be combined in one central department of World Languages. Everyone in BPS should receive a seal of biliteracy! (No follow-up to this recommendation was discussed.)

## 10. Revision of SMART Goals

The SMART Goal document needs to be updated to reflect the recent direction and concerns of the subcommittee. For example, UDL is an important concept, but there must be ways to ensure that it includes cultural diversity.

[ELL Task Force ELSWD subcommittee 4-24-18 Minutes draft]