

Bilingual Program Updates and Concepts for Consideration

Bilingual Education Recommendation Committee (BERC)

January 24, 2017



Objectives

- Provide a review of the Bilingual Education Review Committee's (BERC) work.
- Discuss two concepts which meet the school board charge and address top strengths and concerns from staff and parent input.
- Provide parents an opportunity to discuss two concepts.
- Learn about next steps.



Review of Current Charge

Walla Walla Public School's Board of Education requests the BERC 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



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

What We Have Learned

Student Performance/Makeup

- Latino students continue to struggle in English proficiency attainment as they mature through school, lagging behind both their “White” WWPS counterparts as well as “Hispanic” state averages (SBAC, ACT, and post-secondary remediation rates are all below state Hispanic averages)
- There are an increasing number of “Heritage” students (Latino students entering kindergarten who may struggle in both English and Spanish, or who are actually stronger in their English than Spanish skills, e.g. 2nd/3rd generation students)
- Modest number 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 dual schools. We suspect that this can largely be attributed to the student makeup/demographics at the dual schools in addition to differing entry criteria used to enroll students into dual programming

Clarification of Heritage Learner

As defined in the 2015-16 White Paper:

Heritage Learners: Another subset of ELLs is heritage speakers. These students are from homes where a nonEnglish language is spoken, and they can speak or understand some of it, although English may be their native language (Wright, 2015). Heritage students can have little or no proficiency in their heritage language. Wright (2015) explains that “most have some proficiency in their heritage language but can’t read or write it” (p. 5). They are commonly second and third generation immigrant students.

What We Have Learned

Programming

- A lack of consistency in programming, curriculum, and entrance criteria is evident between dual schools as pointed out by both staff and parents
- Current makeup at Sharpstein, Edison, and Green Park allow for limited collaboration between in-building staff, isolate the dual programming across campuses (limiting collaboration between dual teachers), and result in varying levels of student skills/outcomes when entering middle school
- Due to the student demographics, building size constraints, and community-school supports at Blue Ridge, the one-way dual model compliments their current efforts/delivery
- The “singleton”/traditional (e.g. English only) strands at Edison and Sharpstein continue to be highly problematic as reported by staff and parents (e.g. behavior, large class sizes, high # of special population students, inability to move students, “tracking” of students)
- Without the ability to combine dual class sections as students age, dual classes often result in far smaller classes sizes than their traditional counterparts across the district creating inequity and inefficient staffing/use of space
- Students moving into the district after KG/1st grade who need EL support most-often lack the Spanish and English skills to be placed in dual programming
- Latino students not served in dual have little to no exposure to their native language (Spanish)

Snapshot of Our Current 2-Way Dual Model

Grade	Sharpstein (two-way)	Grade	Green Park (two-way)	Grade	Edison (two-way)
K	Dual (22)	K	Dual (22)	K	Dual (22)
K	Dual (24)	K	Eng only (21)	K	Dual (24)
K	Eng only (16)	K	Eng only (21)	K	Eng only (23)
K	Eng only (15)				
1	Dual (12)	1	Eng only (19)	1	Dual (20)
1	Dual (16)	1	Eng only (19)	1	Dual (20)
1	Dual (20)	1	Eng only (19)	1	Eng only (20)
1	Eng only (23)	1	Dual (16)		
2	Dual (24)	2	Eng only (26)	2	Dual (27)
2	Dual (24)	2	Eng only (26)	2	Dual (27)
2	Eng only (24)	2	Dual (18)	2	Eng only (26)
3	Dual (25)	3	Eng only (24)	3	Dual (22)
3	Dual (27)	3	Eng only (25)	3	Dual (22)
3	Eng only (26)	3	Dual (22)	3	Eng only (24)
4	Dual (22)	4	Eng only (20)	4	Dual (20)
4	Dual (22)	4	Eng only (22)	4	Dual (19)
4	Eng only (26)	4	Eng only (21)	4	Eng only (28)
5	Dual (20)	5	Eng only (24)	5	Dual (23)
5	Dual (19)	5	Eng only (23)	5	Dual (22)
5	Eng only (25)	5	Eng only (24)	5	Eng only (23)
		4th	Dual (18)		
		5th	Dual (14)		

Total Students served in dual:
~825 (including Blue Ridge)
~697 (2-way model as shown)

Latino learner % in 2-way dual programs: ~53%
~329 ("English" side)
~368 ("Spanish" side)

*Note "singleton" class challenges

**Note class size inequities

Framing the Possible Concepts

- In order to address the “singleton” traditional and bilingual sections, consolidation of programming is necessary
- In order to provide better coordination, collaboration, and consistency, consolidation of programming is necessary
- Programming must allow for adjustment/narrowing of sections as students age to ensure equitable class sizes
- Programming must be flexible to account for Heritage speakers and/or new students entering the district who require EL services but who do not have language skills to be successfully placed in dual classrooms
- Maintain Blue Ridge one-way model to support current student demographics, community school support, and delivery
- Continue to provide as many opportunities as possible to expose native English speakers to Spanish

Concepts that Didn't Meet Criteria

1. Leaving programming the same as it is now
2. Keeping at least a dual programming strand in each of current buildings with bilingual
3. Expanding dual programming to greater than current sites.
4. Eliminating dual programming



Two Concepts for Consideration Tonight

Elementary Initial Concept (1-School Approach)

- ✓ Maintain Blue Ridge one-way dual model
- ✓ Consolidation of two-way dual programming from three schools to one, creating a comprehensive “wall to wall” dual school
- ✓ Develop a “flexible” strand of “Traditional Plus” programming at one or both of the non-dual schools to support Heritage learners in addition to providing Spanish language/culture exposure to native English speakers
 - Current Program (825 total students served, 329 native English students)
 - Concept Program w/ 2 Traditional Plus strands (Over 900 students served, ~380 native English students (Dual and Trad +) and ~170 Heritage learners in Trad +)

Concept Benefits

- Addresses programming criteria identified as problematic during input sessions, meets board charge expectations, provides expansion of program access (dual and Trad +) to Latino students, maintains most English-side dual seats (75%), incorporates Heritage language support, creates a beginning Spanish language program for native English speakers who may not desire and/or be successful in a comprehensive dual program, does not significantly affect ethnic diversity at elementary campuses, implementation may allow for a “gradual/rollup” approach to minimize impact/transitions to staff and students, maximizes staff collaboration

Concept Challenges

- Dissolves “neighborhood” school boundary for the dual-identified school (e.g. entrance criteria and likely lottery-based process would not guarantee attendance-area family admission)
- May result in drawing a higher percentage of high-performing students to the dual campus and yield larger special populations at the non-dual sites
- Additional research required to identify best delivery model for the Traditional Plus strand(s)



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+)

Elementary Initial Concept (Split-school Approach)

**NEW
IDEA**

- ✓ Maintain Blue Ridge one-way dual model
- ✓ Consolidation of two-way dual programming from three schools to be split between two.
- ✓ One elementary school converted to a K-2 school, and another to a 3-5 school.
- ✓ K-2 school would have 11 dual strands and 9 “English”/traditional strands. 3-5 school would have 9 dual strands and 9 “English”/traditional strands. (Same number of dual classrooms as the “1-School Concept.”)
- ✓ Develop a “flexible” strand of “Traditional Plus” programming at the remaining non-dual school and at the two dual schools to support Heritage learners in addition to providing Spanish language/culture exposure to native English speakers
 - Current Program (825 total students served, 329 native English students)
 - Concept Program w/ 2 Traditional Plus strands (Over 900 students served, ~380 native English students (Dual and Trad +) and ~170 Heritage learners in Trad +

Concept Benefits

- Same core benefits as the 1-School Concept in addition to the following:
- Minimally impacts “neighborhood” school boundaries, creates enough traditional classrooms per grade to address “single strand” concerns from parents and staff, provides for a better “mix” of overall student makeup at the campuses

Concept Challenges

- Possible facility and transportation considerations (need to be investigated)
- Possible K-2/3-5 implications with support programs (e.g. special education, title, LAP) will need to be investigated
- Transition would not permit a “gradual” rollup, requiring a more significant shifting of students and staff when implemented in addition to coordination between programs when consolidated
- Additional research required to identify best delivery model for the Traditional Plus strand(s)
- Additional school may split families between two elementary schools

Split-School Snapshot

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

Discussion Process

In small groups discuss strengths and challenges of each model:

- From the lens of a student
- From your lens as a parent/guardian

Facilitators will share out summary of discussion points for each group at the end of the meeting.

Next Steps

- Jan 25-31: Parent survey on district website
- Jan 25: Committee meeting to refine suggested models based on input
- Feb 8: Refine models for Board recommendation
- Feb 13-24 Staff and parent input on models
- Feb 28: Board presented with draft models
- March 6: Committee reviews feedback and makes final revisions to models
- March 7: Board makes final decision on accepting programming recommendations