

Immersion Stakeholder Committee



19 April 2021 / 4:30 PM / Zoom

ATTENDEES

Amy Grundy, Harold Shaw, Helen Yung, Missy Brady, Jen Lougheed, Barb Silber, Ashley Sabo, Matthew Jenkins, Christopher Jackson, Fay Kennish, Cherry Gupta, George Peart, Dayan Knox, Jessica Annand, Rosalind Chang, Paul Woodland, Meghan Bell

AGENDA

- The Way We Will Operate
- Review Our Overall Goals
- Revisit Our Interests
- Survey Status
- Program Assurances
- Generate Options: Showcase Possible Models
- Q and A
- Next Meeting

NOTES

Shaw reviewed agenda

Amy revisited norms/Zoom engagement. Group will address each other using first names.

Meeting minutes reviewed by the steering committee. The goal is to capture the essence of the talking points. Minutes posted weekly on the LHE Immersion web page on Wednesday after the meeting.

Shaw reviewed overall goals

- **Review and discuss sustainability challenges**
- **Understand the strengths and challenges of the program from the perspective of LHE stakeholders.**
- **Review potential delivery models for immersion at LHE. (Bulk of meeting)**

- **Create consensus around a sustainable path forward for immersion at LHE**

Amy reported back Interests Revisited

- **Children having more opportunities/pathways**
- **Ensure equitable resources**
- **Grow peer relationships**
- **Program sustainability**
- **Program growth**
- **Bridge gap between program design and expectations of parents**
- **Build program as resource for community**

Shaw shared summary of Data

13 responses from exit survey and 91 responses from current immersion families

Discussion surrounding surveys -

Shaw - the goal is to share summary results of surveys at the next meeting. Goal of survey of current families to give voice to the larger group helps guide us to choose a model.

Fay - How many families received surveys(19) vs how many left the program (67). Numbers provided by Missy. Secretaries looking back at past families possible to gather more data from families that left. Exit survey questions would families be able to return if allowed. Shaw/Amy - may not be applicable/appropriate depending on grade level when left vs returning.

Helen - possible for students to enter past 1st grade. Shaw - can look at that possibility down the road

Fay - commitment questions were left out of the survey for current families. Shaw- can add as we revisit down the road.

Cherry - Completed current survey some questions not applicable. Design of the survey made it difficult to answer some questions and be able to move on with the survey. Still had to respond to some questions even if it didn't apply.

Jessica - Only 1 option for each column could only pick "other" once.

Fay - Once all info back can we see the comment section w/o parent names? Shaw - yes.

Fay and others had the same concerns as Cherry with the survey.

Shaw reviewed State Immersion Model (Grades K-5) and DLI Program Assurances. #2 for LHE being important. Need to explore options to get back to 2 teacher models. #6 Collecting data between programs immersion and non immersion.

Discussion

Cherry - question the design of the program for students across the district or for the feeder pattern.

Amy - At the time the program came about intent was to help grow enrollment at LHE. Now it needs to be more supported by feeder pattern students. Goal to increase participation of feeder families

Cherry/Amy - Discussion of feeder pattern vs choice

Fay/Amy - Planning? During the planning stages was potential growth at Linden Hill accounted for? LHE was the right fit for the program at the time. LHE had space available as Cooke opened. However, LHE "bounced back" from their lower enrollment after Cooke opened.

Shaw - Challenge to balance feeder vs choice students. Looking at options here to how we ensure students who have begun the program at LHE can continue and what that looks like.

Helen - Capacity issues can be solutions. After capacity we can look at other avenues. After capacity challenges are addressed and efforts are underway to increase feeder families choosing into the Chinese immersion program, then we could consider some of the more robust options.

Helen reviewed Current DLI and World Language models in the US. There are programs in the US that have full or total immersion that have 100% of the day or 90% of the day being taught in the target language starting from KN. DE's program offers 50/50 models, where 50% of the day is in the target language (Chinese or Spanish) and 50% of the day is in the partner language (English). The DDOE DLI model goes from 50% of the day in the target language in ES, to 30% in MS, and to 15% by HS. DE's DLI programs are mostly strand programs, with some schools in the state having a whole school DLI program. By 8th grade students should be at an intermediate/ high level, being bilingual and biliterate and be able to read texts at a high/Advanced low level is the target by the time our learners get to high school ready to take the AP exam by 10th grade. DE has models that include 2 way DLI and 1 way DLI. 2 way models ensure 50% of the students are heritage learners or have students who have more fluency in Mandarin, and the other 50% are usually non-heritage language learners. DE has largely 1 way programs, with less Chinese speaking heritage learners in the community. Given that there is a lower participation in the current Chinese DLI strand programs at LHS, Helen informed the committee of some other DLU and FLES programs in the US, some DDOE approved and others not recommended by the DDOE. Helen reviewed the Delaware DOE K-5 Dual Language Model (pie charts).

Helen walked the committee through 6 models in total including current DDOE Recommended Models and others that exist in the US and are not DDOE approved through the following:

- **DDOE approved model - 2 teachers, 2 languages, with 50% of the day instruction in the content areas(see pie chart). One way DLI Strand Program.**
- **1 Teacher, multi grades, 2 language - One Way DLI Strand Program (DDOE approved short-term model)**

- **1 Teacher model, 2 languages - with Chinese DLI instructor teaching both languages. One Way DLI Strand Program (Not DDOE recommended model as there is less fidelity to the target language)**
- **Other DLI Models - One Way DLI Strand Program - 2 Teacher Model no KN with possible FLES enrichment program in K. Not a DDOE recommended model due to lower language proficiency by the time they reach HS.**

Discussion

Shaw - possible KN pause to increase enrollment to begin in 1st grade

Fay -2021-22 Choice numbers are 73 KN and 17 1st grade. As lower enrollment and interest in the program are referenced I am pointing out the numbers of students in the district interested in the program.

Chris - not an interest problem. It's a feeder pattern interest problem. With so much interest can there be an additional location to accommodate the interest?

Shaw - Goal was to consider options to keep the program @ LHE. Some choice students attended the program for the purpose of coming to LHE.

Fay - not a lot of marketing to feeder pattern families, understanding some of this due to COVID

Helen - Currently focusing on sustainability to LHE and grow feeder pattern enrollment

Amy - goal to learn about options and evaluate options

Meghan - Understanding capacity issues and filling w/feeder pattern families.

Chris - Why not find a location that can accommodate all that want to attend

Helen reviewed 2 more options FLES(world language program K-5) and STEAM/FLES. Exposure based on content areas. FLES/STEAM FLES Program (Foreign language in the elementary school) in ES and FLEX Program in the MS programs. Helen mentioned that this is not a DDOE recommended program for DLI as students would only be able to reach NoviceHigh/Intermediate level in 8th grade, with 90 minutes of instruction each week.

Discussion

Fay - Additional data points for these programs and options? What schools? Where? More examples for each option? How are these options going to account for facilities and concerns? Also, please include program outcomes.

Amy - Some options are 1 teacher/1 classroom or 2 grade levels/2 classrooms instead of 4 room, requiring less space

Helen - teachers rotate across grade levels and teachers may move not students.

Cherry - None of these models are acceptable. Not to reduce time for children in the program. Why not continue the model as is? It seems that you are not willing to negotiate and it's not fair.

Shaw - these options give us an opportunity to build back to a 2 person model. We have identified the challenges. We hope to identify a path for next year and try to keep it going for now.

Amy - Looking forward to finding a sustainable model.

Q&A

George-It's an enrollment issue but for the feeder pattern vs non feeder pattern. Is next year hybrid or in person?

Amy - We will plan as if in person for next year. (no final information on this topic at this point in time)

Meghan/Amy/Missy - Staffing? We are currently staffed the same as we were this year, if we move forward with two teacher model we will need to hire an additional Mandarin teacher and an additional 4th grade English teacher. Staffing considerations for this program can impact staffing for the rest of the school.

Jessica - Teachers teaching multiple grades is a huge ask. The math of providing the required amount of minutes for each subject, planning and PLC considerations for 2 grade levels by one teacher. It's a lot.

Helen - This would be a temporary measure not preferable. In Colonial 1 teacher to teach in 2 languages.

Rosalind - That is not sustainable for teachers, the fidelity would decrease, there is lost time and scheduling issues.

Dayan - We represent the parents, can we discuss tailoring options or how to keep the current model?

Shaw - Participation issue - we can be creative with the options. The goal is to get back to 2 teacher options. Need to find options for the upcoming school year and work back to 2 teacher models.

Fay - When will incoming KN students be notified about the program? Parents want the opportunity to promote programs. Parents are requesting a letter on commitment, what model? When will it start? Indication that this is a temporary change? Some kind of communication regarding a timeline. How many more meetings?

Shaw - We can look to make a sketch of a timeline. Also indicate the plan as temporary and help develop a message. Share and generate options.

Amy - Needs to be in the next couple of weeks.

Meghan - how many kids on KN waitlist.

Missy - 4 Feeder pattern. 4 siblings. Need to generate authentic interest. Calls over summer, commitment letter. 29th event is a chance to generate interest.

Meghan - Kids can choice in KN into a program but 1st grade?

Missy - Up to 1st MP of 1st grade or later if native language speaker.

Helen - Set aside a percentage for the strand program but need to make a commitment. If you leave the program you have to go back to feeder pattern school.

Rosalind - Have to authentically advertise programs. Huge involvement is needed from parents who's children are involved. It's both a commitment from parents and the students. It's a lot. The children are pushed and challenged.

ACTION ITEMS

Dig deeper - Both into the survey feedback and also into the options.

Formulate a time-line to communicate to parents.

NEXT WEEK'S PROPOSED AGENDA

- The Way We Will Operate
- Review Our Overall Goals
- A Data Discussion
- Review Possible Models/Evaluate Options
- Q and A
- Next Meeting

