

# Bilingual Education Recommendation Committee

Board Update #3  
February 7, 2017



# Why is this work critical?

- We must increase the performance outcomes for our non-English speaking students. The district's Hispanic/Latino students continue to struggle in English proficiency attainment as they mature through school, lagging behind both their non-Hispanic WWPS counterparts as well as Hispanic state averages in state testing, college entrance exams, and post-secondary remediation rates.
- The “traditional” (e.g. non-dual classrooms at Edison and Sharpstein) continue to be highly problematic as reported by staff and parents due to factors such as larger class sizes, high number of special population students, inability to separate and/or move students, and long-term student "tracking" drawbacks.
- There are an increasing number of "Heritage" Hispanic/Latino students who are struggling in the current program. Often 2<sup>nd</sup> and/or 3<sup>rd</sup> generation students, these are pupils entering kindergarten who may struggle in both English and Spanish, or who demonstrate stronger English than Spanish skills despite their Hispanic/Latino heritage.
- Modest numbers of native English speaking students on the "English side" of dual are struggling to meet and/or maintain grade-level academic standards in English as they progress in age.
- Student performance/success varies between bilingual programs at schools due to differences in program delivery, student entrance criteria, and student demographics, creating discrepancies in program outcome when students exit elementary school.
- With current programming spread across four of the six elementary schools to varying degrees, lack of program continuity/alignment, curriculum, collaboration, and professional development continues to be problematic.

# *Review of Current Charge*

Walla Walla Public School's Board of Education requests the BEREC to complete the work necessary to provide PreK-8 program recommendation to the Board on or before March 7, 2017.

## **Must,**

- be financially sustainable and programmatically feasible
- be research-based to best support the needs of English learner students
- ensure optimal learning environments for non-participating students

## **If feasible,**

- attempt to capitalize on the opportunity to expose second language acquisition skills to native English language speakers

# This is tough work...

But critically important...

It is our moral, ethical, and social obligation that we **MUST...**

- Improve English language proficiency for our non-native speaking population
- Develop the best possible bilingual program (in delivery, efficiency, coordination, and support) to ensure we meet this critical mandate

*Our kids deserve the best possible programming for their success.  
It is our responsibility to provide it for them.*

# Accomplishments

## September 14-

Reviewed the history of the bilingual program in WWPS

## September 28-

Reviewed applicable state and federal laws, requirements, and mandates associated with bilingual education programs

## October 12-

Reviewed the current model being offered in Walla Walla Public Schools in addition to the outcomes, findings, and "White Paper" summary developed by the 2015-16 Bilingual Steering Team

## October 26-

"Date dive" – Reviewed student performance data associated with bilingual ed and Latino students

## October 28-

Committee performed site visits to schools/classrooms

## November 1-

Board update at regular Board Meeting on progress to date

## November 2-

Deep review of current data, programming, other bilingual models across the state, and school/classroom visit feedback

## End of November-

Surveys administered to staff for feedback. Web survey administered to elicit parent input

## November 30-

Parent listening session (English and Spanish) followed by additional Spanish parent outreach via paper/pencil surveys sent home with students

## December-

Student interviews of current and former bilingual students

## January 6-

Review of staff, student, and parent input. Initial concepts proposed

## January 12-

Continued review and refinement of concepts

# Committee Work Since January 17 Board Update

- Staff survey administered on the two initial concepts
- Parent sessions held in English and Spanish to elicit feedback on the two initial concepts
- Parent survey in English and Spanish administered
- A third concept emerged for review and consideration
- Meeting with transportation, facilities, finance, food service, and building leadership to identify challenges and cost-out the three initial concepts
- Met with diverse representation from Blue Ridge staff regarding current and historical programming and reviewed input related to the third concept

# Summary of Input on Concepts

# 1-School Snapshot

Dual Ele School				Elementary			Elementary		
KD	KD	KD	KD	K	K	K(T+)	K	K	K(T+)
1D	1D	1D	1D	1	1	1(T+)	1	1	1(T+)
2D	2D	2D		2	2	2(T+)	2	2	2(T+)
3D	3D	3D		3	3	3(T+)	3	3	3(T+)
4D	4D	4D		4	4	4(T+)	4	4	4(T+)
5D	5D	5D		5	5	5(T+)	5	5	5(T+)



# 1 School Concept Feedback

## **Primary Strengths:**

- Level of EL support (Traditional+ and/or ELD support) offered at non-dual schools
- More consistent programming for students
- All aspects of school contribute to a total dual environment
- A “slow roll out” option is viable to minimize impact to students, families, and staff
- Addresses single strand challenges

## **Primary Concerns:**

- Uncertainty about Traditional+ concept. Would standard ELD program better meet student needs?
- Loss of a “neighborhood feeder school”
- Modest reduction of seats in dual programming
- Assumption that this would increase segregation of Latino students (However, analysis shows only a slight reduction in Latino diversity at non-dual schools)
- Likely lead to a larger concentration of higher-achieving Caucasian students at the dual school

# Split-School Snapshot

<b>K-2 Dual School</b>	KD	KD	KD	KD	K	K	K(T+)
	1D	1D	1D	1D	1	1	1(T+)
	2D	2D	2D	2	2	2(T+)	
<b>3-5 Dual School</b>	3D	3D	3D	3	3	3(T+)	
	4D	4D	4D	4	4	4(T+)	
	5D	5D	5D	5	5	5(T+)	
<b>Ele School</b>	K	K	K(T+)				
	1	1	1(T+)				
	2	2	2(T+)				
	3	3	3(T+)				
	4	4	4(T+)				
	5	5	5(T+)				

# Split School Concept

## **Strengths:**

- Level of EL support (Traditional+ and/or ELD support) offered at non-dual schools
- Maintains partial “neighborhood feeder school” access
- Groups students more by grade level and developmental needs
- Addresses single strand challenges

## **Concerns:**

- Uncertainty about Traditional+ concept. Would standard ELD program better meet student needs?
- Splitting families
- Too many transitions for students
- Cost of transportation
- No slow roll out option-Requires significant shifting of students and staff in one summer
- Consolidation of 2-3 different dual program sites into one would be highly problematic for students and staff

# **Third Concept**

## **Blue Ridge + Another Elementary**

# Why wasn't Blue Ridge considered in any of the original concepts?

Some of the considerations:

- Lack of classroom space (only 15-16 rooms) made Blue Ridge not feasible as a stand alone dual school (e.g. 1-school concept)
- If Blue Ridge were to implement a two-way dual model, a significant number of Blue Ridge students (between 1/3 to 1/2) would likely need to attend another elementary school to make room for the English side of dual programming.
  - First concern: is there enough interest from non attendance area families to enroll their students in the English side of dual (this has historically been problematic)?
  - Second concern: by relocating historical attendance area students to other campuses, how would that:
    - Affect Health Center access to Blue Ridge student/family clientele?
    - Affect the coordinated community and family services already in place (e.g. C2C, parent outreach, comprehensive support for Spanish-speaking families, concentration of poverty/Title 1 supports, afterschool programming)?
    - Impact the Blue Ridge attendance area families that participate in pre-school programming at Blue Ridge?
    - Access to the fruit and vegetable food program.

# Two Dual Schools

## Blue Ridge

K K K  $21 \times 3 = 63$   
 1 1 1  $20 \times 3 = 60^*$   
 2 2 2  $19 \times 3 = 57^*$   
 3 3  $27 \times 2 = 54^*$   
 4 4  $27 \times 2 = 54$   
 5 5  $27 \times 2 = 54$

\* Considers attrition. Total  $\approx 342$

## Another Building

K K K K  $21 \times 4 = 84$   
 1 1 1 1  $21 \times 4 = 84$   
 2 2 2  $27 \times 3 = 81^*$   
 3 3 3  $27 \times 3 = 81$   
 4 4 4  $27 \times 3 = 81$   
 5 5 5  $27 \times 3 = 81$

Total = 492

Total = 834 / 35 classrooms (dual prog)  
 Current  $_{16-17} = 780$  / 36 classrooms

With a 60% Latino/Native Spanish ratio = 501 Students  
 Current  $_{16-17} = 473$

With 40% Native English ratio = 334 students  
 Current  $_{16-17} = 307$

# Why is Blue Ridge identified for a concept now?

- Parent and stakeholder inquiry has led to the current review of our initial “let stand” thinking
- A concept involving Blue Ridge might provide an opportunity to revisit the historical concentration of poverty and ethnicity at the campus
- An intentional review of current programming will provide either an affirmation of the current one-way dual programming, or present an opportunity to modify the current model to improve outcomes for students
- Presents an opportunity to expand dual programming to more Latino and English speaking students.

# Blue Ridge's Prior Experience with Two-Way Dual in the last 8 years

## General Findings:

- A majority of Blue Ridge students do not present strong enough English skills to be placed in a two-way dual model
  - It was difficult to match students as “language buddies,” for example
- Lack of “English” side of dual enrollment from non attendance area families left multiple open seats and students without English language partners.



# Why is one-way dual currently programmed at Blue Ridge

- More phonemic awareness in Spanish for K-1 students
- Maximizing native language instruction with fewer transitions
- English introduced ~ mid year 2<sup>nd</sup> grade when Spanish foundations are stronger
- Mixing students for math, specialists, recess and lunch.
  - Mix for interventions in the upper grades
- Common planning time each day for staff
- 50/50 Spanish/English instruction by third grade. As students increase in grade level there can be more mixing of students as they increase their English proficiency

## Blue Ridge staff wonderings re: possible program modifications

- Many of the Blue Ridge attendance area students lack strong enough English skills to serve as English models in a two way dual program.
- Bringing in non-attendance area students to Blue Ridge might serve problematic to current school culture
- Blue Ridge recently started the one-way dual model as a result of their current school makeup and student need. The building is currently working with outside consultants for “turn around” schools and has changed their building schedule and delivery. Many staff request additional time to implement and evaluate success.

# What We Have Learned from Parent Input

- Families have strong connections to current schools
- Desire for equitable entrance requirements into dual
- Desire for Blue Ridge to be considered
- Split input on a focus in one school vs. increasing seats
- With shifting demographics the priority needs to be on acquisition and attainment of English proficiency, for current and future demographics
- Student needs and what's best for them must come first
- Concerns about Traditional+
- Desire for language access for after school and in middle school, outside of dual programming
- Concerns about students currently in programming not being able to finish at their current school

# Next Steps

- Feb 8: Utilize all data, input, and feedback to date to solidify top(or top two) models for consideration that best meet committee charge. Models announced will include program locations and potential implementation options.
- Feb13-24 Stakeholder input on recommended models
  - Parent night at each of 4 bilingual elementary schools, followed by survey
  - Staff presentations and/or opportunities for feedback
- Feb 28: Board presented with draft models and input
- March 6: Committee reviews feedback and makes final revisions to model(s)
- March 7: Board reviews committee recommendation and asked to make final decision on programming starting in the 2017-18 school year

# Questions

