

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON



**Minutes of the English Language Learners (ELL) Task Force Meeting
November 8, 2018**

The English Language Learners Task Force of the Boston School Committee held a meeting on October 9, 2018 at 9:00am at Bruce Bolling Building. For more information about any of the items listed below, contact Jen Douglas, ELL Task Force Coordinator, at bpselltaskforce@gmail.com.

ATTENDEES

ELL Task Force Members present: Janet Anderson, Jen Douglas (coordinator), Bob Hildreth, Lisette Le, Suzanne Lee, Julia Mejia, John Mudd, Ana Solano-Campos, Alexander St. Guillen, Cheng Imm Tan, Miren Uriarte

BPS Staff present: David Bloom (Budget Director), Monica Hogan (Senior Analyst for Performance Data Systems, Office of Data and Accountability), Anu Jayanth (Director, Office of Grants and External Funding, Finance), Nate Kuder (Deputy Chief Financial Officer), Colin Rose (Assistant Superintendent of Opportunity Gaps, Office of Opportunity & Achievement), Kim Tsai (Director of Legal Compliance, Office of English Learners), Priya Tahiliani (Assistant Superintendent, Office of English Learners)

Other attendees: Roger Rice (META), Jonathan Rodrigues (BTU)

Handouts

From ELLTF

- Minutes of the ELLTF Meeting on September 13, 2018
- Minutes of the ELLTF Meeting on October 9, 2018
- “English Language Learners Task Force: Report to Boston School Committee,” November 7, 2018

From Office of English Learners

- “OEL DOJ Reports Update for EL Task Force,” Priya Tahiliani, November 8, 2018.

From Office of Finance

- “Enrollment Projections: Overview for the ELL Task Force,” Nathan Kuder, November 8, 2018.
- “BPS ELD Level Projections FY12–FY19.” (as of October 30, 2018)

From Office of Opportunity Gaps

- “Opportunity Index,” Colin Rose, Eleanor Laurans, and Monica Hogan.”

1. **Welcome**
2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

- **September 13, 2018**
- **October 9, 2018**

Mudd: Would be helpful to have the follow-up items highlighted. We could keep a running list of the action items and cross them off as we do them. To fix on page three: change \$10 billion to \$1 billion.

Minutes approved with no objections.

3. **Chairs’ Report**

Our focus today is, “How do programs get funded?”

We gave the ELLTF report to the School Committee yesterday.

Lee: The committee members had read the presentation ahead of time and asked several important questions. Particularly about why so much data is self-reported and isn’t there a way to get data from principals. We emphasized several times that ELLs are 50% of the district and responsibility for their education has to spread throughout the district, not just the OELs office.

FOLLOW UP Get data from Principals, instead of being self-reported, on language capacity etc.

Mudd: Please also provide a summary of follow-up items coming out of that meeting, “levers to follow-up”.

Anderson: Having sat through 10 of those presentations, I thought the slides were a nice complement to Suzanne’s commentary and gave enough information that they could make sense of it before hand. There was confirmation of the ongoing value of the group. The crowd had thinned but all the BPS folks were still there so they heard the importance of being cognizant of the importance of ELLs.

Uriarte: In the middle of the presentation I began to get texts from Carolyn Cain, co-chair of the SPED-PAC , may be good to invite her into the conversation about SPED-ELLs. She is a powerful person here and at the state level and she was surprised by what she was seeing.

Mudd: I have spoken to her occasionally and asked her to get a parent to come on to our subcommittee, she was overwhelmed. Yes, we will invite her.

FOLLOW UP Invite SPED PAC into the conversation about ELSWD students

Lee: Regina Robinson also suggested that we make that link.

Anderson: I was just into the Parthenon report for something else, and saw that they actually do have ELSWDs called out. It's a data point we should be using, referencing that report.

FOLLOW UP Get and use data on ELSWDs from Parthenon Report

Tsai: It was good to hear you reinforce the message that it can't be done by OEL alone, that was compelling last night.

Uriarte: There was some concern that we didn't highlight the best spots. Did you have any concerns?

Tsai: I think that was because we usually co-present, but when we do our presentation later we will talk about the accomplishments.

4. Office of English Language Learners Director's Report

- **Department of Justice Update**

See "OEL DOJ Reports Update for EL Task Force," Priya Tahiliani, November 8, 2018.

Tahiliani: In 2010, we entered into a DOJ agreement. The Dept of Justice and Office of Civil Rights came in and saw several problems, one of the first being that we were not correctly identifying ELL students. It's a blue book, it has paragraph numbers with requirements, and we report on these throughout the year with reports due pretty much every month. Our big reports are due in October and again in March, when we make sure that we go back to any areas where we fell short October.

Slides 2 and 3

Uriarte: Which paragraphs will you ask not to report on?

Tahiliani: Probably 50 and 52. Others we want to retain, like the 30 minutes we are required to have at the Training Institute, that time is stamped for us and some departments don't have that.

Uriarte: For the meeting we have with the superintendent could you have the areas we'd like to move away from?

Tahiliani: We already have that.

Slide 4

Lee: Is this data you keep?

Tahiliani: It's from Human Capital.

Slide 5. We are only looking here at the teachers who have an ELL in front of them, who are required to be SEI-endorsed.

Lee: The SEI endorsement does not include a language requirement?

Tahiliani: Right.

Mudd: Asked clarifying questions about numbers and percentages.

Tahiliani: Some of the answer has to do with how students are assigned to classrooms, there might be a better grouping of students with a teacher who is SEI-endorsed, so the total number of teachers would go down but the percentage of students served by a certified teacher would go up.

Slides 6–18

“Cohort” refers to the number of classes.

Mudd: What does “opt out” mean?

Tahiliani: It's when a family opts out of the required services. It may be that the student actually speaks English but doesn't test well. If you're asking about the percentage of

Request for data: what percentage of ELL students are in general education versus programs?

FOLLOW UP Report on the percentage and number of ELs in programs v. general education

Rodriguez: Slide 8. When ELLs get their first choice, isn't that sort of a function of them being counseled at the Welcome Centers?

Tahiliani: Yes.

He made a request for that data. Also requests to know how often schools are using translation.

Hildreth: Can you clarify about often not getting a response to these reports?

Tahiliani: It is a few particular paragraphs where we have not received response in 5 years. We would like to negotiate being released from providing those reports, we will still provide those services. It would be paragraphs on LATF trainings, for example, it's massive reports that provide to them.

Lee: A question for all of us. According to this report, since the state does not require native language licensure, Boston is one of the few programs grouped by language group, it creates a lot of problems because a language teacher is not required by the state. We need either for Boston to make that requirement of we will run into it over and over again. As we look to expand programming according to the LOOK Act, we should have picked up on that sooner. The most successful instruction that we know of is for the teacher to understand the native language of the student, so they can use it for instruction and for support, it does not mean that they are teaching in that language. As they hire new teachers it is no longer required that they speak that language.

FOLLOW UP BPS should make it a requirement for teachers to speak/understand the language of their EL students. This should have been/should be part of program expansion under LOOK.

Tan: We have been adding for language-specific rather than multi-cultural.

Uriarte: We need to revisit, yesterday Suzanne talked about looking at how programs are doing before we go into the LOOK Act, in know there was a study, we should take a look at that.

St. Guillen: The SLIFE slide and the enrollment rates, knowing that there are a lot of transients in the school, and the impact of building a budget off low fill rates for SLIFE classes, could that have a negative impact. Are the classes more full at the end of the year?

Tahiliani: Our SLIFE classes are always fully funded because of the unpredictable nature of SLIFE.

FOLLOW UP Issue of the low fill rates and slide in enrollment in SLIFE classes

Uriarte: Could you clarify how you're counseling parents, I get asked all the time by parents about how to identify their child.

Tahiliani: Technically we can't advise them, that's part of the reason the DOJ came in. There can be a number of reasons why a student will be misidentified, maybe the parent put bilingual because they learned to count to 10 in a bilingual preschool, we don't get involved in advising because we want to capture the most possible.

Uriarte: I'm shocked by the green box on slide 11, these outcomes. Are we targeting students at ELD levels 1, 2, and 3?

Tahiliani: Yes.

Uriarte: Make sure that gets into the slide. Also would like to have some comments about the questions raised related to the distribution of funding using the opportunity index. What was the impact in your opinion on the partnerships using the OI?

Tahiliani: Much of ours is funded using Title 3, which was not distributed according to OI, so we didn't see an impact.

Uriarte: Is that money consistent, can you use it through time?

Tahiliani: Yes, although we did not get the Title 3 summer grant, but that comes out of leftover money anyway.

U: It seemed like a lot of schools with high ELL populations were not receiving as much funding. Also is this the only data you have on SLIFE? What about outcomes?

Tahiliani: We figured that since this is the biggest DOJ reporting cycle and because we will have more grades information on SLIFE later on that we would share that at a later date.

Anderson: I would like a level up, above the details, a summary of the 4–6 things the DOJ was concerned about a year ago and how we've addressed them. That would help us to help you stay on top of what those concerns are.

FOLLOW UP Summary of the 4-6 things that DOJ was concerned about a year ago and how BPS has addressed them.

Tan: I want us to follow up on Suzanne's suggestion that we make a recommendation that SEI teachers should be language specific. Slide 14: how is this information about advanced learning opportunities made available to parents? This is a list of materials but we don't know how much, to whom, etc.

Tahiliani: I can get you that.

5. Budget Planning (Nate Kuder)

The basic element of money in BPS is enrollment , and Nate is our enrollment guru.

- **Review of estimated versus actual SY2019 enrollment.**
- **Initial projections for SY2020 enrollment.**

See "Enrollment Projections: Overview for the ELL Task Force," Nathan Kuder, November 8, 2018 and "BPS ELD Level Projections FY12–FY19." (as of October 30, 2018)

Kuder: We present our budget to the SC the first Wednesday in February. We start projections in early November in order to meet our first deadline in November. Page 3 outlines the key parts of the process. Everything in our enrollment projections is based on an October snapshot. We use historical district enrollment to project for next year. Tomorrow we will release our projections to schools. We take a two-fold path. One is bottom up, from schools. The best prediction of your second grade enrollment is your first grade enrollment. We are using current first graders, the latest data that we have. We look at it by school, grade, and program, what we call the high water mark, how full do you get throughout the year. This is particularly important for ELs, because we have a number of groups that will continue to increase throughout the year. Special education is the other area where we do high water mark. Our general education population tends to peak in October almost throughout the district. We are trying to understand our overall district trends.

We have started a partnership with the BPDA to do neighborhood-level enrollment projections. The biggest portion is tying this to the mayor's housing plan to see where enrollment will grow. He mentioned that one of the people on the team is Salvadoran, we are excited to have her on the team.

Schools will receive their projections tomorrow and will almost immediately start giving feedback.

See BPS EKD Level Projections

In General Enrollment, we See K1 and K2 enrollment down, hard to predict why that is. 6-8 enrollment up, but we still lose a lot of that cohort. The other big shift, high school enrollment is lower than projected, 400–500 student decline. The current senior class is the last of a big cohort and the current 8th grade class is smaller. This is very difficult to talk about publicly, for example in East Boston we are seeing a decline of 200 students.

We do see a large SEI Spanish population graduating this year not be to replaced by a smaller 8th grade cohort. This is a table we provided last year, I've just updated it with SY19 enrollment. We don't think we will enroll SEI to capacity, we do find that they are enrolling earlier in the year (perhaps because of less students exiting from the prior year). You will see a slight decrease for ELL students, that's not a decline in their numbers but a correction to an over-projection.

Mejia: Do you have any mechanism to track parents that exit, to determine why?

Kuder: No. I want to develop some sort of exit interview process and some sort of on the spot research for choice. E.g., ask "why" questions about rankings parents pick. We don't have a lot of qualitative information now, we do rely heavily on the large numbers for insights.

FOLLOW UP Exit interviews of EL students' parents about why they are leaving BPS.

Mejia: I know there are a lot of East Boston families very unhappy with schools, wondering if you know what is going on with undocumented families and why they are exiting.

Kuder: I've certainly heard concerns about undocumented students. A big problem is gentrification. We still need to invest in schools in East Boston where we have smaller schools and inadequate spaces. But we are seeing low K1 and K2 students and know there is an opportunity to rethink our programming there as well.

FOLLOW UP Track whether EL decline in East Boston (or South Boston or Columbia Point, etc.) reflects moves to other parts of the city or not. This is connected to the issue of gentrification and has important implications for BuildBPS.

Tan: What is the typical response from schools about your projection?

K: We tried to build a process where schools have the right incentives to give feedback whether they think we are over or under projecting. If the error is 3% or under there is no budget impact, but if it is greater either they have to give the money back or we owe them money. We want to send the message that there is an incentive to get this correct. I often say, "We are never going to be right, we just hope to be useful." In some of our schools, if you assign 100 kids, 95 show up. In other schools if you assign 100 kids, 60 show up. We are trying to do a better job so that more get their first choice.

Tan: Do you use Census data?

Kuder: Entry grades are the hardest to predict. It's really watching the cohorts move through our system, watching the retention rates. All our cohorts dropped last year, we're not keeping as many kids.

Uriarte: I note that even though here's a decline overall it doesn't seem to be as soft among ELLs, is that correct?

Kuder: Yes, overall the ELL numbers are fairly stable. We are anticipating an increase for next year.

Uriarte: What I want people to understand is that even though the trend overall is one of decline, that is not the case for ELLs. That means that ELLs will take up more and more of the BPS space. Reactions to your observations about East Boston and Dorchester — you didn't give the data on ELLs. Are we talking about declines in ELLs? All kids? What?

Kuder: It's both. We are seeing a decline in K1, K2 ELL students in East Boston.

Uriarte: Are we seeing people moving from East Boston to other areas of the city?

Kuder: We don't track data in that way at the student level. We theoretically could put that together, we just don't have it yet.

Uriarte: That's going to be a critical piece of information for BuildBPS. If enrollment for ELLs is equal, they have to be going somewhere. We are at a time when immigration is slowing down because of the national picture. We are not talking about large influxes of immigrants into the city, these are immigrants who are moving around. That population is becoming bigger and bigger for your interests in terms of predictions than ever. In terms of your statement about South Boston and the area around Columbia Point, don't say this when you're talking to the folks, because you're arguing for the gentrification of that area, which is the absolute panic of the folks in the McCormack School. If you are predicting gentrification in that area, we need to figure out where are those kids going. We've had enough indicators in the past year that there is interest in that area on the part of the city, that really says something about how the BuildBPS process moves forward and how it impacts ELLs because of the large numbers of ELLs in that school. The importance of the steady numbers of ELLs and the importance that has for the district was sort of swept under the rug and it shouldn't be.

6. Funding ELL Programs and Services

- **Weighted Student Formula Discussion (Nate Kuder and David Bloom)**

Bloom: Weighted funding is built around the idea that we are funding students based on their instructional needs and the classrooms that are provided. Every student gets a grade-level weight, ELL, ELLSWD, SPED, SLIFE. Every student gets a general education weight to which these other supplements are added. For example, a third grade class would have 25 gen ed students with a teacher and no para, but there is a supplemental weight for several ELLs, so that might bring the class size from 25 to 20. The idea is that student need is driving the funding. In terms of what we can go into today, I'm happy to answer questions about the formula and the high-level understanding. In the next meeting we will dig into the impacts on the schools and specific populations.

St. Guillen: I'm very concerned about what Nate said about East Boston, that we don't end up here in 10 years again with the situation we have in East Boston where it's an emergency.

Bloom: We partner very closely with the enrollment projections team. Two things can happen. One would be a situation where a school requires fewer classrooms with roughly the same number of kids in each room. Maybe there is a school that would go from two classrooms to one for a grade. If you think about the experience of children in a school, it may be difficult to lose a teacher, but everything else in the school can stay the same even while the school goes through a budget cut. The other thing we see is when we're not able to close that classroom. You can't just reduce it and you're losing some of those wraparound supports. We have some safeguards to help schools in that situation. One is called soft landing. The idea is that some of the changes you experience would be just one year, or say that over two years you might be able to close that classroom. None of those conversations are easy, but some are better for kids than others.

Speaker: The logic of 87% full for a classroom of 25 comes out to 22, 21, but a classroom with 18–19 students is still quite full and cut means that the school can't afford an art instructor or other expense. It's such a high threshold. Is there any talk of changing that logic. Every year you see that some schools are winners and others lose.

Bloom: The core of your point is one I agree with. But if we made a change to the 87% full it would go evenly to every student, but in a time when we have more limited resources our focus is to identify based on need and push out in that way.

Kuder: The other thing we often hear is that we should increase the foundation budget to pay for more core services. That also has significant equity issues. For some schools that means it's a \$5k per pupil supplement and for other schools \$900 per pupil. One of the things that's coming out in BuildBPS is the costs of small schools, they are more vulnerable to enrollment shocks.

Mudd: Could you talk about if and how you evaluate the effectiveness of the weights?

Bloom: Weighted student funding on its own doesn't improve student outcomes. It is just a method of distributing funding that hopefully is more equitable than other ways. It allows you to hopefully more easily have transparent conversations about what you value. What we say is that "if you can give us the data that explains the need then we can fund it" [to the extent that data reflects attributes reflected in the weighting formula].

Mudd: But how do you evaluate?

Bloom: The baseline is for sufficiency.

Mudd: So if there is no instructional model for ELSD students you don't have a base for that.

Bloom: Correct.

FOLLOW UP Evaluation of Weighted Student Funding. It is based on sufficiency in funding program models not on the effectiveness of student learning.

Bloom: We have not yet been put in a position to try to "save money" as a result of declining enrollment. We have been able to reallocate funds for certain purposes, like a program for homeless students. In other cases we have been able to use new money.

Kuder: We have a strong commitment from the City and from the mayor to continue to invest. This is not something we should take as a given. In my first two years as budget director we were closing schools for financial reasons (not what we are doing now) and making other cuts. Fundamentally the charter assessment is now much we spend divided by the total number of students. If the number of charter students goes up it has an impact. It's entirely possible that declining enrollments helps us pay for other investments, but that will not continue. Our school infrastructure looks like the streets downtown—no set pattern, no coherence.

Anderson: One of the questions that has come up here is around dual language programs. My understanding is that historically some of the weighted student funding didn't cover their costs.

Bloom: Two challenges with dual language. This is pre- the current and the last OEL administration. We didn't do a good job separating out the ongoing operating costs and the [something] costs. When the dual language schools started we might have said "great, just swap out your SEI classroom," and that's not really how it works. The other thing is that we have a lot of problems at those schools related to enrollment and a pattern that we changed last year of not accepting students after the second grades. As those schools have opened up their enrollment they're starting to see some of that demand coming through. We need to be thoughtful about whether we want to weight native English speakers in dual language programs over students who are not in English language programs and is that the commitment the district wants to make. If it is, I can do it, but there might be other ways to implement dual language inside our current formula.

FOLLOW UP Question of weighting for Dual Language programs, especially start-up costs and whether English-speaking students in DL programs should receive a supplemental weight.

Mejia: Student outcomes. I hear about arts, physical education, a robust educational experience. When you allocate are you also talking about those?

Bloom: Generally our approach is to put that money in the hands of the school community, with minimal requirements such as for physical education, and let them decide.

Mejia: Why are IEP services often not being rendered, if the funding is part of the formula?

Bloom: It can be because some of the services provided aren't coming out of the school budget, it's coming out of the central office. We look at IEPs, see how many physical therapists are needed, and service them throughout the district. We can certainly talk about how every school is budgeting for their special education needs. We also have a budget collaborative process, special education is in that meeting and they are reviewing and signing off. In terms of the concerns with Special education needs not⁴ being met I think the SPED department would like to hear directly, their goal is to have every student's IEP needs met. If there are gaps it is good for them to know.

Lee: It would be helpful next time when you show us the weighted formula it would be helpful to know what that means, show us some examples so we can see how much is weighted for ELL. Otherwise we are asking questions but we are talking about different things. Also in terms of the overall budget I know in the past when we did not use the WSF way of budgeting you came out with similar results with some schools having less funding. [Some specifics about impacts of charter enrollment.]

Bloom: We are actively working on a project right now to improve our communications about the budget. We have done a good job making things transparent as in visible, but not as in understandable/relatable/have enough explanation/breaking things down in the right context. I'll provide more about that next time.

Uriarte: We've talked a lot about how the WSF is a very blunt instrument and in order to serve the needs of this population it needs to be more nuanced. I'm wondering if you could explain the differences in funding for different ELD levels, different programs.

Bloom: It's a tough question because we want to be nuanced without being subjective. We are keeping the formula pretty technical for now. We are continuing to investigate other measures of need besides our traditional measures. For example a student with autism is assessed to need a separate setting—that could mean a wide range of things. If you have ideas about what we should use instead of ELD level...

Uriarte: Really what I mean is about the difference between level 1 and level 5.

Bloom: At the moment our nuance is to group students at levels 1–3 and 4–5. If the group felt strongly about reviewing and changing that, it's certainly something we could share information about.

Uriarte: With the LOOK Act we can think about many different things that will require nuance on your part.

Bloom: We do our best to fund not based on program but based on student need. If we've misidentified the need then we try to correct that and then align the programming to that. We've done some look at what might be possible under the LOOK Bill and what might be possible, say student groupings. And also some things that wraps around, where we've tried to understand what the rules are, so that we can be consistent across schools. Often a school leader will come to us and say "you are missing my schools nuance." That's where the funding came from for the homelessness program. A leader came to us and said that the weight for poverty didn't reflect that his school had the highest number of homeless students in the district.

FOLLOW UP There is a need for more nuanced weights for EL students in WSF formula, especially with the new opportunities under the LOOK legislation. BPS/Budget is open to ideas.

Uriarte: At the SC meeting last night there was a strong side conversation on the Budget Collab and the role of the district in providing guardrails for the process. The issue here is that the funding for the school is really a conversation between the school and David/whomever David sends. For example there was concern about the level of importance that a principal gives to parent engagement, or to having bilingual teachers, and that there was no way to guide that apart from the Budget Collabs.

Bloom: We aspire to that, to the Collabs and Probable Org providing those guiderails. At the moment that includes the school leader and whomever they bring, me or a member of my team, ELL, a few others he named.

Uriarte: But they wind up with teachers with the wrong language, with all kinds of things. I think the guardrails need to be tighter.

FOLLOW UP There is a need for stronger guardrails in the budget process to guide/understand/evaluate the importance principals place on bilingual educators and parent engagement—right now its negotiated between principals and Budget staff without many guidelines.

- **Opportunity Index: Explanation, Impact on Schools with high ELL Enrollments, Timeline for Implementation (Colin Rose)**

See “Opportunity Index,” Colin Rose, Eleanor Laurans, and Monica Hogan.”

The why – our poverty measures are too blunt. They are basically on “are you on some time of assistance or not?” Populations that are very different from each other but appear very similar in these measures.

“Neighborhood” means Census tracts. The three variables we use are the result of a lot of experimenting with every data point but the kitchen sink. Those factors that were found to be significant were academic attainment, custodianship, safety, physical disorder in the neighborhood, and physical disorder in the Census tract.

The Partnership fund is an application of the OI. It had a steep slope around student need at a school and a cut-off line. The school Support Fund was not such a steep slope and it covered more schools. The higher the score the greater the concentration of need at your school

Committee requests: disaggregated data on ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged by race/ethnicity and language. (Note as well that Latinos will overlap with racial groups.)

We have students in neighborhood that are rapidly gentrifying but they are mostly serving kids from BHA housing while million dollar condos are built around. We looked at Census tract data. In some instances the concerns weren’t reflected in the data. Other concerns had to do with student immigrant status. For people who are living in the shadows, how do you represent those students.

Uriarte: We don’t have the means to do that well. The data isn’t there. We are directed to a way of identifying folks that really excludes immigrants.

Rose: maybe there is a way to do it outside the OI, like with homeless students. Another misunderstanding about the philosophy of OI was that it didn’t include ELL and SPED, and it’s because the intent was to pull in student criteria that we don’t normally fund. I think there’s a

usefulness of using the OI with those other variables. Our vision is for the OI to be a better measure of need than the current WSF. Right now it's been additive not a replacement.

Changed chronic absenteeism and suspensions from binary to continuous variables.

Uriarte: If you're using DESE's measure it is only three years old, I would call it "new immigrant". I have a problem with the median household income because among immigrant families household means many people working. You need individual income here somewhere. Otherwise you will consider the kids in the households as richer than they are.

FOLLOW UP The Opportunity Index needs to consider individual not household income; how long families have been in the US; unaccompanied minors.

Le: Would also like to see data about how long the family has been in the US, there are important differences.

Solano-Campos: In the case of unaccompanied minors, that's a different challenge than a family.

Rose: It's a composite index that's never going to get to a satisfying nuance.

St. Guillen: The funds come from where? General funds, ok.

Lee: You might be helpful next time to show a concrete example. Show a regression analysis and how it applies to a particular school.

Mudd: Would be useful to better clarify purposes, just understood today that this is intended to be a supplement to the WSF, and the funds that you were applying it to. You're just testing a portion.

Bloom: What we take away is there are many differences among people in poverty. The current OI funds are about 2% of the formula. Poverty measure \$22 mil, OI is about \$10 mil, go from 2% to 6%. The vast majority of what we spend our money on is core, not supplemental. So we are talking about the percentage of core funding and it's small. 2% of full funding, but 22% of supplemental. Next step is to examine difference between OI and other measures of need in formula, e.g., high-risk 9th graders, high-risk 10th graders, poverty, more.

Rose: This concept of redistributing funds according to need is fairly radical. Just to get there I did a lot of work with principals for 2 years, talked about what this did in terms of equity, and had people willing to come and testify even who were losing dollars. I'm hoping at the end we can all come out for this, it's quietly revolutionary for me.

- **Report on use of Title 1 Funds for ELLs (Nate Kuder and David Bloom)**

Postponed until next time.

FOLLOW UP Title I funds for ELs to be considered at the next meeting.

7. Subcommittee Concerns/Updates -- Ongoing focus of the Budget and Data Subcommittees

Cancelled for today.

8. Public Comment

Roger Rice, META: The structure for the meeting is a little bit like Trump's press conference and I feel a little bit like a CNN reporter. You've set up a situation where the public has minimal input here in your thinking. One: doing good job – pointing to Priya – sometimes we don't give credit where it's due. The question is can she bail the water faster on the sinking ship, she didn't put the ship in the harbor. Couple points. Enrollment and demographics. I would like people to think about the fact that what BPS does with kids in schools has a lot to do with enrollment, it's not just demographics. Some examples, SEI native language. Parents are told at the welcome center we recommend SEI for your child, the kid gets to school and the teacher doesn't speak your language, that's a disincentive to come to BPS.

FOLLOW UP SEI students where the teacher does not speak the language of the students

SLIFE, for whatever reason BPS hasn't followed guidance and that pushes kids out of the BPS program.

The true number who are drifting around in SEI and dropping out of school is exponentially higher than that. What BPS does at East Boston HS where the principal rats out a kid to ICE who was deported. So if you are a kid at EBHS, maybe have a shaky immigration problem. Another issue, we read IEPs we talk to kids and the team, many who need native language support don't get it. Karla said you know why it's not in there, it costs too much. That has an impact if you can't get the services for your kid, like the girl who sat at the Edison for a year, no one could talk to her, she doesn't speak Chinese. BPS has to look at itself when it's counting kids.

FOLLOW UP SPED students who need native language support and don't get it

When we get to the Title I discussion, Anu and I are going to have an interesting discussion. We sent a letter to Perille last year, sent a similar one earlier, we agree that a similar amount would settle a shortfall. We see progress going forward, but there is \$8 million and BPS can't say that it was equitably spent to meet the needs of ELLs. We sat down with the superintendent to see what could be done to make whole the population of ELL students. We've had one meeting, Eleanor was there and was not pleased with this part of the discussion, either apoplectic or doing a great job of acting it, she was pissed. The only people who have not gotten it are the Globe and the Herald. Otherwise we have to sit around here for 3 hours so we can wait for the public comment period and tell you this in a rush. Not cool.

FOLLOW UP Issue of whether Title I funds were equitably spent to meet the needs of ELLs and responsiveness of district to this concern being raised.

We also sent a letter about SLIFEs. Their SEI teachers don't know what to do with them, they need lots of stuff. To give you an example, we see, kids are supposed to have reached 9th grade level before they are exited from the program, but we see kids exited who are nowhere near. Now they're in pre-algebra and they're failing. The kid is years and years and years behind and we need to do that as a school community.

FOLLOW UP

Lee: We will take your comments into account at our future meeting. I have not seen those letters.

Rice: We can provide them.

9. Adjourn