

From: Glowski, Marie
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 10:47 AM
To: Donnelly, Kelly
CC: Kowalski, Karen;Cohn, Ellen;Roberge-Wentzell, Dianna;Demsey, Kathleen
Subject: RE: Bilingual report

Colleagues,

The interpretation has never been clear. The guidance that I was provided 11 years ago by my managers was that the bilingual evaluation reports would suffice. That way a report was being provided to the state by each district that received the grant and had a bilingual education program. I was told that it was not required to summarize the results of the 30 plus reports and provide a formal report to the state board of education.

The data bulletin also provides information on the bilingual programs and students, however, this bulletin does not come out annually. Ideally, this is the hope/expectation, but it just does not seem possible for Michael to be able to get the bulletin out annually given other work demands. Even this year's bulletin has been edited by me, with input and it has almost been ready for months and it is still not finalized.

And to provide a detailed report of how each district is doing and whether or not their programs are effective with test data and scores from each bilingual eligible student in each bilingual program (over 100 programs) throughout the state with a clear explanation of the differences of each program throughout the state would be IMPOSSIBLE. As I have tried to explain to many who will listen and process what I am sharing: due to the teacher shortage and the difficulty for districts to provide well researched bilingual education programs and the weakness of the statute which mandates a full well researched bilingual program the following year after the students are reported to the state (which makes NO educational sense), and also requires a school to provide this high quality program to a group of in some cases 15 or less bilingual students in a K to 8 school - well it is just not possible, so the next possible solution to meet the mandate is to provide native language instruction which is a nice support but it is NOT bilingual education and there is no bilingual education teacher available in cases like these.

If people understood the dilemma of providing bilingual education which by the way is an minimally funded state mandate, then the recommendations for statute changes would be far different than what I believe is going to be recommended (based on what I heard yesterday at the LPRAC legislative forum) than what is practical and/or based in sound educational practices. I can't tell you how often I have shared this dilemma to many, many individuals, groups, etc. And yet, the solution seems to be just mandate more - extend the time from 30 to 60 months, reduce the 20 student threshold so ALL districts would end up being obliged to provide bilingual education - in 140 languages????, allow bilingual education for grade 11 and 12 students which is not permitted under the statute at this time (I actually believe that native language support would very appropriate, but NOT a bilingual education program - these youngsters only have 2 or 3 years to get the credits necessary to graduate with a US high school diploma not a GRE and maybe actually get into a college), etc. when we cannot even do it right for 30 months.

Do you hear frustration in my email - you are correct. I just don't know how to get the message out and clear. My bilingual education colleagues also agree with what I am sharing but are afraid to saying too much because they are always afraid that when this topic comes up at the legislative level, someone will say the solution is to eliminate bilingual education entirely. And I am limited in how much I can say as a state department of education employee - I am not a citizen with my own personal or professional opinions, I represent the entire department. So I have to be guarded and totally professional every time I speak about bilingual education. And there is absolutely no room for personal opinions. Of course, I am totally in favor of bilingual education. But I know there are many "English only" advocates who are passionate about their view and are totally against bilingual education. For this reason and many more, I always try to remain extremely impartial and not passionate and only give the facts when asked. Yesterday Ann Anderberg's presentation was far more practical, reasonable and educationally sound. She said allow districts to extend the 30 month limit if they felt it was educationally sound for a child.

There are some solutions that I think would please all people, but again, it seems I am rarely asked and when asked, people listen politely but move along their own personal agenda. I heard yesterday that there is talk of developing a Legislative EL Task Force or committee. It amazes me that one of the first individuals they would want to appoint would not be at least ONE state department of education person to attend. Even if it was upper management who may not be that familiar with the issues, if it was one of our people, then we could confer before and after each meeting. And I will be bold and dare to say that Marcus Rivera is not the individual I would think is the best representative of the facts simply because he is so politically involved. I am dealing with bilingual education dilemmas as part of my work all year long.

This legislative session has been all consuming for me these last months. And it is actually impacting my ability to keep up with my work responsibilities. I am trying so hard to affect the outcome of legislative changes from a looong distance but honestly, it feels futile. I was for a brief moment energized to hear Ann's presentation yesterday and also was very warmed to receive a warm welcome from so many individuals who were present at the forum from LPRAC to legislators to colleagues and yet, now that I receive this email, it reminds me once again of what seems like such an impossible task - how to ensure that we are doing what is right for our ELs - all ELs not just bilingual eligible ELs in CT.

By the way, LPRAC's underlying agenda is clearly Spanish support for their Latino and PR ELs but politically in order to get as many stakeholders as possible, they have to present their legislative language to be bilingual education for all ELs who speak all other languages. I also feel at times the LPRAC may feel that I am not open to their "thinking" when I remind them of the FACT that there is a bilingual teacher shortage already and to extend the time would only put a further drain on the shortage, or that it would be impossible to implement an educational sound bilingual education program in a K - 8 school with only 15 bilingual eligible students because some parents moved or refuse bilingual education after the student count was submitted the previous October 1 and the state then used those figures to mandate the district/school to provide a program. I am only stating the harsh reality and facts and hoping that if this is really understood, other solutions will be considered. It will be an interesting battle because on the panel there were two legislators who tried to agree with each other but it was apparent one was clearly NOT sure about bilingual education although she was guarded in how she communicated this.

I would be more than pleased to brainstorm on whether there is anything I could do or we could do to help the process along. Regarding submitting a bilingual education report to the board, it would be very challenging and would take months to do it properly. I would need Michael's data analysis expertise and I think in order to be fair I would have to visit schools and with all of that, if I were to be transparent and fair, I would have to report that there are several schools that are NOT providing solid educational well researched bilingual education for these students and that I would anticipate the student scores in some cases would be very dismal and oddly for others, they would be excelling. There are so many variables and factors that one has to take into consideration when determining the effectiveness of a program - you need to look at everything before you make a judgment.

I have presented formally to LPRAC and met with them informally in a small group (one of our board members was present), I try to give them any and all the information they request which often comes from Michael Sabados and most recently from Renee Savoie). This is extremely time consuming and at times felt like a part-time job trying to help their legislative analyst from LPRAC. I have also brought Miguel Cardona the principal writer of the Closing the Gap Action Plan to a CAPELL bilingual subcommittee to explain their recommendations for ELs and the committee also wrote a response to their recommendations trying to be supportive but also trying to explain what is practical, what is already being done and what might not be a good idea. I have been invited to meet this Friday afternoon with members of task force, Miguel and other stakeholders to discuss bilingual and ESL education. Yesterday, Nancy Pugliese was at the forum and spoke to me after the forum indicating that she was asked to present to LPRAC commissioners to explain the "draft" legislation on bilingual education certification next Wednesday. I have a previous commitment and more than likely will not be able to attend but I am more than confident that Nancy can far better than I explain the legislative proposal.



Salazar-Glowski0000352

As you can see, this topic has been truly all consuming these last months. On the one hand I get very excited and hopeful that there will be changes for the better but more often than not I am discouraged and also realize that it is highly likely there will be NO change at all as was the case last year - lots of work, time, energy, etc. and for no change, what a shame.

Please keep me informed on how you would like me to proceed. I apologize for the length of this email but at least it is now in writing, and I know that my concerns and thoughts have been documented. I can't tell you how dedicated and passionate I feel about the work that I do and the commitment I feel toward representing the best educational interests of over 32,000 students in CT. Some days it feels like a totally overwhelming responsibility that I feel as one person who is supposed to be overseeing all matters related to ELs in CT.

Additionally, as I mentioned to ELLEN there seems to be a lot of communication coming from the federal level regarding ELs to all states and I just feel that the spotlight is really shining on doing what is right and accelerating at all costs the academic success of ELs. I am sure it is in response to the immigration status changes and the realization that with this change, we now will face more challenges educating more students who speak other languages and if the US does not get on top of this - we will fall further behind other nations in educational outcomes for all of our students. If a larger portion of our student population is struggling, then, it will dynamically affect the education of other students as well. These changes for political reasons "may" in the end result in better support for ELs. We shall see! Once again for saying so much, but I guess I am on a roll! Thank you for listening.

Regards, Marie

From: Donnelly, Kelly
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 9:06 AM
To: Glowski, Marie
Cc: Kowalski, Karen; Cohn, Ellen; Roberge-Wentzell, Dianna; Demsey, Kathleen
Subject: Bilingual report

Hi, Marie.

OLR received the reports we sent over—thanks for providing those. However, they need further clarification. The statute says that in addition to the local districts' annual report that we, the SBE, must also produce an annual report. (Please see the highlighted section below.)

- 1) Is the data bulletin meant to satisfy this requirement?
(http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/PDF/EvalResearch/ELL_Data_Bulletin_2012.pdf) If so, can you please send us 2013 and 2014 if available?
- 2) Based on their interpretation of the statute, they thought that the report was intended to provide more narrative analysis/evaluation of the different programs, even going as far as providing policy recommendations, than is currently contained in the data bulletin. Any further insight you can offer regarding this would be greatly appreciated. Thanks!

C.S.G. Sec. 10-17g. Application for grant. Annual evaluation report. Annually, the board of education for each local and regional school district that is required to provide a program of bilingual education, pursuant to section 10-17f, may make application to the State Board of Education and shall thereafter receive a grant in an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying the total appropriation available for such purpose by the ratio which the number of eligible children in the school district bears to the total number of such eligible children state-wide. The board of education for each local and regional school district receiving funds pursuant to this section shall annually, on or before September first, submit to the State Board of Education a progress report which shall include (1) measures of increased educational opportunities for eligible students, including language support services and language transition support services provided to such students, (2) program evaluation and measures of the effectiveness of its bilingual education and English as a second language programs, including data on students in bilingual education programs and students educated exclusively in English as a second language programs, and (3) certification by the board of education submitting the report that any funds received pursuant to this section have been used for the purposes specified. The State Board of Education shall annually evaluate programs conducted pursuant to section 10-17f. For purposes of this section, measures of the effectiveness of bilingual education and English as a second language programs include mastery examination results, under section 10-14n, and graduation and school dropout rates. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2009, to June 30, 2015, inclusive, the amount of grants payable to local or regional boards of education under this section shall be reduced proportionately if the total of such grants in such year exceeds the amount appropriated for such grants for such year.

Kelly Donnelly
Director of Communications and Community Partnerships
Connecticut State Department of Education
Phone: 860-713-6525
Mobile: 860-983-1550
Email: Kelly.Donnelly@ct.gov

From: Glowski, Marie
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 3:20 PM
To: Labas, Gladys; Angeli, Robert
CC: miguel.cardona@meridenk12.org; Meriden Fernando Tiago BE Dir.
Subject: RE: Education Committee Public Hearing Agenda, Wednesday, Feb 25th, 12:00 P.M.

I am not convinced that you can have a bilingual program for 1 or 6 or even 20 in a K - 8 setting. But native language support where possible for all ELs and not necessarily from a bilingual certified educator, I am OK with that, but I also would like to see some high quality, well researched, bilingual programs in CT as well.

What will districts do if they cannot provide a quality bilingual education program and honestly, I don't see how a RESC can do it across many districts. But a RESC certainly can provide embedded PD and/or even ESL services with the right personnel.

Marie

From: Labas, Gladys [labasgl@southernct.edu]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 3:11 PM
To: Glowski, Marie; Angeli, Robert
Cc: miguel.cardona@meridenk12.org; Meriden Fernando Tiago BE Dir.
Subject: RE: Education Committee Public Hearing Agenda, Wednesday, Feb 25th, 12:00 P.M.

I support the Bilingual Legislation regardless of the threshold (1 or 6), the shift is important for ALL students in Ct to receive Bilingual Education, the quality of the programs are addressed in the accountability measures under CGS10-17g I also like the flexibility to use RESC for low incident languages

Gladys

-----Original Message-----

From: Glowski, Marie [mailto:Marie.Salazar.Glowski@ct.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 10:02 AM
To: Angeli, Robert
Cc: miguel.cardona@meridenk12.org; Labas, Gladys; Meriden Fernando Tiago BE Dir.
Subject: RE: Education Committee Public Hearing Agenda, Wednesday, Feb 25th, 12:00 P.M.

Colleagues,

I completely agree with Bob - the 6 student threshold as the legislation is written would be a burden on districts and might result in putting together a bilingual education program that is not up to research based standards.

Regards, Marie

From: Angeli, Robert [robert.angeli@meridenk12.org]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 8:51 AM
To: Cardona, Miguel; Benigni, Mark; Giard III, Thomas; Grove, Michael; Haeffner, Barbara; Larson, Al; Mik, Donna; Lehman, Lois; Tiago, Fernando; Gladys Labas; Glowski, Marie; Orlando Rodriguez
Subject: RE: Education Committee Public Hearing Agenda, Wednesday, Feb 25th, 12:00 P.M.

Thanks, Miguel. The bill about charter schools you asked about in an earlier email is in the list. Edits include defining charter school management to non-profits, a requirement that charter schools incorporate a plan in their applications to share student learning practices and experiences, and a requirement to set achievement goals. Seats in the charter school can be limited if the charter school is not meeting its goals. There is also a provision that the SBE can adopt a provision calling for criminal background check of charter school governing board members starting in 2016.

The bill on ELL lowers the number of students from 20 to 6. If this goes through, we may find we have to offer a bilingual program for speakers other than Spanish. Fernando will have to check. I like that the 30 month timeframe is recommended to be lengthened to 60 months.



Disappointing that there is nothing yet on secondary ed reform, e.g. student-centered initiatives and graduation requirements.

From: Cardona, Miguel
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2015 5:39 PM
To: Benigni, Mark; Angeli, Robert; Giard III, Thomas; Grove, Michael; Haeffner, Barbara; Larson, Al; Mik, Donna; Lehman, Lois; Tiago, Fernando; Gladys Labas; Marie Salazar; Orlando Rodriguez
Subject: Fwd: Education Committee Public Hearing Agenda, Wednesday, Feb 25th, 12:00 P.M.

Fyi

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Calabrese, Chris" <Chris.Calabrese@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Chris.Calabrese@cga.ct.gov>>
Date: February 19, 2015 at 3:53:16 PM EST
To: "Abercrombie, Kyle" <Kyle.Abercrombie@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Kyle.Abercrombie@cga.ct.gov>>, "Adams, Debra" <Debra.Adams@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Debra.Adams@cga.ct.gov>>, "Bergin, Tim" <Tim.Bergin@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Tim.Bergin@cga.ct.gov>>, "Bourne, Sarah" <Sarah.Bourne@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Sarah.Bourne@cga.ct.gov>>, "Calabrese, Chris" <Chris.Calabrese@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Chris.Calabrese@cga.ct.gov>>, "Carson, Jim" <Jim.Carson@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Jim.Carson@cga.ct.gov>>, "Cordima, Christopher" <Christopher.Cordima@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Christopher.Cordima@cga.ct.gov>>, "Cosme, Carlos" <Carlos.Cosme@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Carlos.Cosme@cga.ct.gov>>, "Daly, MaryAnn" <MaryAnn.Daly@cga.ct.gov<mailto:MaryAnn.Daly@cga.ct.gov>>, "Davis, Zachery" <Zachery.Davis@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Zachery.Davis@cga.ct.gov>>, "Driscoll, Sue" <Sue.Driscoll@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Sue.Driscoll@cga.ct.gov>>, "Falvey, Joe" <Joe.Falvey@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Joe.Falvey@cga.ct.gov>>, "Flores, Josh" <Josh.Flores@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Josh.Flores@cga.ct.gov>>, "Furlow, Andrea" <Andrea.Furlow@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Andrea.Furlow@cga.ct.gov>>, "Genovesi, Alexander" <Alexander.Genovesi@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Alexander.Genovesi@cga.ct.gov>>, "Griffin, Molly" <Molly.Griffin@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Molly.Griffin@cga.ct.gov>>, "Grimes, Lindsay" <Lindsay.Grimes@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Lindsay.Grimes@cga.ct.gov>>, "Guilbert, Kellie" <Kellie.Guilbert@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Kellie.Guilbert@cga.ct.gov>>, "Johnson-Martin, Luwannia" <Luwannia.Johnson-Martin@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Luwannia.Johnson-Martin@cga.ct.gov>>, Kyle Thomas <KThomas@commnet.edu<mailto:KThomas@commnet.edu>>, "Larkins, Casey" <Casey.Larkins@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Casey.Larkins@cga.ct.gov>>, "Lippencott, Adam" <Adam.Lippencott@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Adam.Lippencott@cga.ct.gov>>, "Lockett, Dorian" <Dorian.Lockett@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Dorian.Lockett@cga.ct.gov>>, "Marcolini, Alycia" <Alycia.Marcolini@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Alycia.Marcolini@cga.ct.gov>>, "Meadows, Michael" <Michael.Meadows@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Michael.Meadows@cga.ct.gov>>, Meg Green <meg.green@ct.gov<mailto:meg.green@ct.gov>>, "Merisotis, Emanuel" <Emanuel.Merisotis@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Emanuel.Merisotis@cga.ct.gov>>, Mike D'Agostino <michael.dagostino@morganlewis.com<mailto:michael.dagostino@morganlewis.com>>, "Moran, John D." <John.D.Moran@cga.ct.gov<mailto:John.D.Moran@cga.ct.gov>>, "Navarrete, Leslie" <Leslie.Navarrete@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Leslie.Navarrete@cga.ct.gov>>, "Neelon, Chelsea" <Chelsea.Neelon@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Chelsea.Neelon@cga.ct.gov>>, "Olechowski, Marcin" <Marcin.Olechowski@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Marcin.Olechowski@cga.ct.gov>>, "Osuba, Luz" <Luz.Osuba@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Luz.Osuba@cga.ct.gov>>, "Palladino, Danielle" <Danielle.Palladino@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Danielle.Palladino@cga.ct.gov>>, "Paquette, Joe" <Joe.Paquette@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Joe.Paquette@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Ackert, Tim" <Tim.Ackert@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Tim.Ackert@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Baker, Andre" <Andre.Baker@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Andre.Baker@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Belsito, Sam" <Sam.Belsito@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Sam.Belsito@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Berthel, Eric" <Eric.Berthel@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Eric.Berthel@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Bolinsky, Mitch" <Mitch.Bolinsky@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Mitch.Bolinsky@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Bumgardner, Aundre" <Aundre.Bumgardner@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Aundre.Bumgardner@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Candelaria, Juan" <Juan.Candelaria@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Juan.Candelaria@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Carter, Dan" <Dan.Carter@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Dan.Carter@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Cook, Michelle" <Michelle.Cook@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Michelle.Cook@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Currey, Jeffrey" <Jeff.Currey@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Jeff.Currey@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. D'Agostino, Michael" <Michael.D'Agostino@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Michael.D'Agostino@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Fleischmann, Andrew" <Andrew.Fleischmann@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Andrew.Fleischmann@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Genga, Henry" <Henry.Genga@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Henry.Genga@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Johnson, Susan" <Susan.Johnson@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Susan.Johnson@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Kokoruda, Noreen"

<Noreen.Kokoruda@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Noreen.Kokoruda@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Lavielle, Gail"
<Gail.Lavielle@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Gail.Lavielle@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. LeGeyt, Timothy"
<Timothy.LeGeyt@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Timothy.LeGeyt@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Lemar, Roland"
<Roland.Lemar@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Roland.Lemar@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. McCarthy Vahey, Cristin"
<Cristin.McCarthyVahey@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Cristin.McCarthyVahey@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. McCarty, Kathleen"
<Kathleen.McCarty@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Kathleen.McCarty@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. McCrory, Douglas"
<Douglas.McCrory@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Douglas.McCrory@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. McGee, Brandon"
<Brandon.McGee@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Brandon.McGee@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Miller, Patricia"
<Patricia.Miller@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Patricia.Miller@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Mulligan, Gayle"
<Gayle.Mulligan@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Gayle.Mulligan@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Rojas, Jason"
<Jason.Rojas@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Jason.Rojas@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Sanchez, Robert"
<Robert.Sanchez@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Robert.Sanchez@cga.ct.gov>>, "Rep. Staneski, Pam"
<Pam.Staneski@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Pam.Staneski@cga.ct.gov>>, "Romanowicz, Alexander"
<Alexander.Romanowicz@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Alexander.Romanowicz@cga.ct.gov>>, "Saylor, Alex"
<Alex.Saylor@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Alex.Saylor@cga.ct.gov>>, "Schaeffer, Edward"
<Edward.Schaeffer@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Edward.Schaeffer@cga.ct.gov>>, "Schuetz, Jason"
<Jason.Schuetz@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Jason.Schuetz@cga.ct.gov>>, "Schweitzer, Marie"
<Marie.Schweitzer@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Marie.Schweitzer@cga.ct.gov>>, "Sen. Boucher, Toni"
<Toni.Boucher@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Toni.Boucher@cga.ct.gov>>, "Sen. Linares, Art"
<Art.Linares@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Art.Linares@cga.ct.gov>>, "Sen. Slossberg, Gayle"
<Gayle.Slossberg@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Gayle.Slossberg@cga.ct.gov>>, "Sen. Winfield, Gary"
<Gary.Winfield@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Gary.Winfield@cga.ct.gov>>, "Shepard, Alan"
<Alan.Shepard@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Alan.Shepard@cga.ct.gov>>, "Shortell, Patrick"
<Patrick.Shortell@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Patrick.Shortell@cga.ct.gov>>, "Stratton, Catriona"
<Catriona.Stratton@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Catriona.Stratton@cga.ct.gov>>, "Sullivan, Marybeth"
<Marybeth.Sullivan@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Marybeth.Sullivan@cga.ct.gov>>, Susan Kopochus
<susan.kopochus@morganlewis.com<mailto:susan.kopochus@morganlewis.com>>, "Urso, Maureen"
<Maureen.Urso@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Maureen.Urso@cga.ct.gov>>, "Williams, David"
<David.J.Williams@cga.ct.gov<mailto:David.J.Williams@cga.ct.gov>>, "Zane, Ashley"
<Ashley.Zane@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Ashley.Zane@cga.ct.gov>>, "Zavagnin, Christopher"
<Christopher.Zavagnin@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Christopher.Zavagnin@cga.ct.gov>>, "Zelaya, Ciro"
<Ciro.Zelaya@cga.ct.gov<mailto:Ciro.Zelaya@cga.ct.gov>>

Subject: Education Committee Public Hearing Agenda, Wednesday, Feb 25th, 12:00 P.M.

Legislators & Staff,

Pasted below is the agenda for the Education Committee Public Hearing which will be taking place Wednesday, February 25th at 12:00 PM in Room 2E of the LOB.

Have a nice day!

Education Committee

PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

12:00 PM in Room 2E of the LOB

I. COMMITTEE BILLS FOR REVIEW

1. S.B. No. 942<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB00942&which_year=2015> AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOVERNOR CONCERNING EDUCATION. (ED)
2. S.B. No. 943<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB00943&which_year=2015> AN ACT CONCERNING CHARTER SCHOOL MODERNIZATION AND REFORM. (ED)
3. S.B. No. 944<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB00944&which_year=2015> AN ACT ESTABLISHING A FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN REQUIREMENT. (ED)
4. H.B. No. 6837<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB06837&which_year=2015> AN ACT ENCOURAGING A GRADUATED RESPONSE MODEL FOR STUDENT DISCIPLINE. (ED)
5. S.B. No. 963<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB00963&which_year=2015> (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING A LABOR AND FREE MARKET CAPITALISM CURRICULUM. (ED)
6. H.B. No. 6835<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB06835&which_year=2015> (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS. (ED)
7. S.B. No. 962<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB00962&which_year=2015> (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING THE MIDDLE SCHOOL CURRICULUM. (ED)
8. H.B. No. 6834<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB06834&which_year=2015> (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING COLLABORATION BETWEEN BOARDS OF EDUCATION AND SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS. (ED)
9. H.B. No. 6836<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB06836&which_year=2015> (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING THE TIMING OF CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS CHECKS FOR SCHOOL EMPLOYEES. (ED)
10. S.B. No. 964<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB00964&which_year=2015> (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONERS' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO THE EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD STATUTES. (ED)
11. S.B. No. 965<http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB00965&which_year=2015> (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING EDUCATION ISSUES. (ED)

LEGAL NOTICE: Any communication and/or document received by or sent from this electronic mail account may be subject to public disclosure under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act, Sec. 1-200 et seq., except as otherwise provided by any federal law or state statute.

From: Schuster, Terri <Terri.Schuster@nebraska.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2015 12:02 PM
To: Glowski, Marie
Subject: LEP State Funding-Nebraska

Marie,
I have the response from our Director of Finance on the LEP funding question you asked. See below. If you have more questions, please email Bryce Wilson at bryce.wilson@nebraska.gov.
Hope this is helpful,
Terri Schuster
Title III/ELL Assessment
Nebraska Department of Education

-----Original Message-----

From: Wilson, Bryce
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 10:52 AM
To: Losh, Mary Ann
Cc: Schuster, Terri
Subject: RE: LEP State Funding

The 2015/16 State Aid we just certified includes just under \$43 million for the LEP allowance. A basic description of our plan is we require districts to submit a plan including a dollar amount needed to fund their plan. We then do a calculation based on the number of LEP students in their district. The district receives the lesser of the amount they submit or the amount we calculate. Districts are required to spend 117.65% of what they receive for the LEP on LEP. Basically the state has taken the position they will pay for 85% of the LEP costs at the district level and the district is required to pay the remaining 15%. I included the actual formula below. Let me know if you have any questions.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP) ALLOWANCE The lesser of:
Maximum Limited English Proficiency Allowance designated by the school district
-Or-

25% of the statewide average general fund operating expenditures per formula student (2,520.07) multiplied by (the number of limited English proficient students + (limited English proficient students - 3 year average of limited English proficient students)) if greater than 0.
If the number of limited English proficient students is greater than or equal to 1 but less than 12, the number of limited English proficient students used in the calculation is 12.

Bryce Wilson, MPA, CPA
Director of Finance and Organizational Services Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Ne 68509
Phone: (402) 471-4320
Fax: (402) 471-2486

-

-----Original Message-----

From: Glowski, Marie [mailto:Marie.Salazar.Glowski@ct.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 5:29 PM
To: Castellon, Martha Inez
Subject: RE: Smarter Balanced Slides

Colleagues,

It was great seeing many of you. CT is in the middle of its legislative session and for the first time, ELs are getting lots of attention. In fact, there is even talk about providing funding from the state to support our students. Presently, and for the last several years, we get \$1.9 Million for bilingual education programs. But the legislators may be willing to provide a significant increase but for all ELs.

I felt that there were many states that do a far better job supporting ELs with state funding. If there are any of you that can give me an estimate of what your state provides to support for ELs if it is more than our \$1.9M, I would love to know. This is information that I think would really help CT moving forward.

**PLAINTIFF'S
TRIAL EXHIBIT**
No. X07 HHD-CV14-5037565-S
1066

Salazar-Glowski0016696

Thanks so much and I look forward to seeing you at the next CCSSO meeting.

Best Regards, Marie

CT English Learners 2014 - 2015 Status Update

Submitted by Marie Salazar Glowski, ESL-Bilingual Consultant – February 10, 2015

EL Identification & English as a Second Language Support - Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) governs education legislation for ELs at the federal level. All students are entitled to be identified and to receive ESL services and supports if they have a native language other than English and meet the identification criteria. The type of support varies by district but the determination is based upon the student's language level and prior education. English language instruction does not require the use native of language support. The state uses reporting codes that describe the type of programming that is being provided. The United States Department of Education (USDOE) mandates that all ELs receive a state approved English language proficiency assessment annually. ELs are entitled to receive ESL services until they meet the exit criteria and demonstrate English language proficiency as measured by the LAS Links ELP assessment.

Bilingual Education - In CT, schools are mandated to provide bilingual education to bilingual eligible EL students. Sec. 10-17(b) of the general statutes governing Bilingual Education states: "Whenever it is ascertained that there are in any public school within a local or regional school district twenty or more eligible students classified as dominant in any one language other than English, the board of education of such district shall provide a program of bilingual education for such eligible students for the school year next following. Eligible students shall be placed in such program in accordance with subsection (e) of this section." Bilingual education programming may not exceed 30 months. Only high school students who are freshman are eligible for bilingual education. The other ELs in a high school are eligible for English as a Second Language supports. There are primarily two types of programs in CT - Transitional Bilingual Education and Dual Language Programs. In 2014-2015, 28.4% of ELs participated in a bilingual education program.

Funding to support ELs come to districts in two primary ways. The bilingual statute allows for a district to apply for the bilingual grant. The allocation is based on the number of students that are reported as eligible, but the total amount allocated for the state is set by the General Assembly. Federal funds are given to districts through the Title III Grant application process. The total amount for Title III is determined by Congress and is based on the number of ELs that are reported by the state. The bilingual or Title III grant application and budget are submitted by the district. The Title III funds must be used to supplement programs and supports and not supplant them. Districts may use no more than 2% of funds for administrative expenses.

EL – Bilingual Student Counts and other ESL Current Data

Data Bulletin Overview: Top Languages are Spanish – 48% of ELs, Portuguese – 36.8%, Mandarin – 28.8%, Polish – 24.2%, Arabic – 52.1% , Creole-Haitian – 42.6%, and Vietnamese – 31%. 4 year cohort graduation rate was 62.7% compared to 85.9% for non-ELs. LAS results: 83.3% made progress from their prior assessment while 43.7 demonstrated English proficiency as measured by the LAS Links.

Other CSDE EL State Updates

Committees/Organizations to support ELs: Connecticut Administrators of Programs for English Language Learners (CAPELL), CAPELL Bilingual-Subcommittee, ConnTESOL, RESC EL PLC Committee, English Language Proficiency Standards Committee, RESC EL Roundtable Consortia Committees, CT Association of Schools, Achievement Gap Task Force Committee

Bilingual – TESOL teacher shortage – CSDE will be submitting a proposal to help address the shortage

English Language Proficiency Standards Committee expects to present updated ELP standards for adoption to the State Board of Education this spring.

Principal Survey has been developed and administered at CAS to help principals determine their knowledge regarding legislation and supports that are required to educate ELs. PD will be developed based on analysis of responses.

Administrator's Guidance Manual and other CSDE resources are available on the state website for teachers and parents

Professional Development Offerings – RESCs, SERC and Public Consulting Group

Unfunded mandates put an undue burden on districts at the local level.