CONCISE EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

In accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act, Section § 42-35-2.6 of the General Laws of Rhode Island, following is a concise explanatory statement:

AGENCY: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

DIVISION: *(If any)*

RULE IDENTIFIER: *200-RICR-20-30-3*

RULE TITLE: Regulations Governing the Education of Multilingual Learners

REASON FOR RULEMAKING: The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) has undertaken the revision of regulation 200-RICR-20-30-3 governing the education of Multilingual Learners (MLLs) in order to ensure that these regulations are updated to conform to best practices, federal regulations and federal guidance. The regulations were last updated in 2007 and do not currently comport with changes in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

ANY FINDING REQUIRED BY LAW AS A PREREQUISITE TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE RULE: *(if any)*

TESTIMONY AND COMMENTS: See attached public feedback.

CHANGE TO TEXT OF THE RULE: Please see attached summary of public feedback and RIDE's rationale for changes.

REGULATORY ANALYSIS: Provide the text of the regulatory analysis prepared under § 42-35-2.9.

Benefit-Cost Analysis

Rhode Island Department of Education | November 2024

Introduction

The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) has undertaken the revision of regulation 200-RICR-20-30-3 governing the education of Multilingual Learners (MLLs) in order to ensure that these regulations are updated to conform to best practices, federal regulations and federal guidance.

Multilingual Learners deserve effective and high-quality education that complies with federal and state regulatory requirements.

From 2010 to 2020, the percentage of MLL students in Rhode Island grew more than in any other state in the nation, and as of 2020, Rhode Island also has the 5th highest percentage of MLL students across all states (12.2%). This growth has impacted both urban and non-urban schools across the state.

Given the growing student population, RIDE created the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and its accompanying Strategic Plan to help provide local education agencies (LEAs) a clear roadmap to improve services and outcomes for MLLs. Part of the statewide strategy outlined in the above blueprint called for the forthcoming revisions to RIDE's MLL regulations.

RIDE has developed these proposed regulation revisions with input from MLL education stakeholders and experts and by examining education policy best practices. Additionally, these proposed regulations were created with consideration of federal regulation and guidance governing the education of MLLs to ensure consistency of requirements, expectations, and rights to MLLs and their families.

Scope/Summary

This analysis considers regulatory provisions where RIDE exercised discretion and includes the provision mandated by state or federal law. These regulations incorporate aspects of federal guidance and updated federal regulatory language into Rhode Island regulations to maintain consistency and ease implementation for Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). This analysis reviews the following key relevant sections within the regulations:

1.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30- 3.1)

Costs

There is no cost associated with this change.

Benefits

All Rhode Island endorsed academic standards are approved by the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education through the same process.

Alternative 1

Maintaining *status quo* with the inclusion of the English Language Proficiency standards within the state regulations, updating only the reference to the standards' edition. This will require that the MLL state regulations are reopened for revision should the standards or their edition change.

Alternative 2

Determine a different process for the English Language Proficiency standards to be adopted by the state if removed from the MLL Regulations. This would be a new process to constitute and approve, creating longer timelines and a parallel inefficient process.

Determination

Both alternatives do not reflect efficiency, on the contrary they add more time, capacity, and effort to a process that is already established for the endorsement of all other state academic standards. It has been determined that the benefits outweigh the costs of this proposed change.

2) District Categorization

Proposed Regulatory Change

This proposed section redefines how LEAs are categorized by MLL incidence to better reflect the growth in MLL student population across the state and updated federal guidance. RIDE is proposing updating the categorization to high, medium, and low. LEAs will be considered high incidence when their MLL student population is either equal to or greater than 250 MLLs or when the MLL population is equal to or greater than 20 percent of the LEA's total student population. LEAs who do not meet either one of the high-incidence criteria, and whose MLL population is either between 100 and 249 MLLs or the MLL population is equal to or greater than 5 percent but less than 20 percent of the LEA's total student population, will be considered medium incidence. Finally, LEAs with the MLL population that is less than 100 MLLs and the MLL population that is less than 5 percent of the total student population will be considered low incidence. To be considered low incidence, the LEA must meet both qualifying criteria.

Regulatory Citation

20-30-3.2

Costs

There are no direct costs to LEAs for the categorization change. Regardless of the change, RIDE will provide support to the LEAs. The purpose for an LEA categorization is to allow for differentiation in the supports provided.

Benefits

The proposed regulatory language builds upon best-practices and categorization adopted by the US Department of Education. This codification into Rhode Island regulations allows RIDE to differentiate regulatory requirements, technical assistance, and provide direct support to LEAs based on the proposed incidence categorizations.

Alternative 1

The proposed regulations are enacted without the codification of changes to LEA incidence categorization. Currently, LEAs are categorized into high MLL incidence (if MLL student population is equal to or greater than 150 MLLs) and low MLL incidence (with MLL population below 150 MLLs).

Alternative 2

The proposed regulations are enacted with the codification of LEA incidence categorization based on only the percentages identified in the proposed regulations.

Determination

RIDE's proposed regulation changes positions RIDE to properly identify (and subsequently support) high-incidence LEAs based on overall # and high percentages of MLL students. Neither of the alternatives enables RIDE to capture this nuance. For example, alternative 1 does not account for the increase of MLL population in the state, nor does it account for single-school LEAs that may have fewer than 150 MLLs while having a high percentage of MLLs of the total student population. Alternative 2 may capture some of these low-enrollment, high-percentage single-site LEAs, would not capture some LEAs with over 1000 MLLs as high-incidence LEAs since alternative 2 is based on percentage only.

While either alternative 1 or 2 may result in a lower number of high-incidence LEAs, the subsequent result is that these LEAs would not receive the differentiated supports they likely need due to the increasing MLL student population (either by overall number or percentage). Ultimately, less precise incidence differentiation would limit the effectiveness of how RIDE can best differentiate supports and technical assistance to LEAs, potentially negatively impacting student performance. Therefore, it has been determined that the benefits and costs of the proposed regulation outweigh those of the alternative.

3) Time Requirements

Proposed Regulation

Time requirements in 200-RICR-20-30-3 for the periods of instruction required for MLLS at the Entering/Emerging (3 periods), Developing (2 periods), and Expanding (1 period) performance levels remains consistent with current regulations. The proposed regulation eliminates the requirement for

students at the Bridging level to receive a period of ESOL services. RIDE also is requiring that at least one of the periods for Entering/Emerging and Developing students be provided via the Dedicated English Language Development instructional model.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30-3.7)

Costs

Costs associated with the implementation of this requirement are predominantly aligned to the implementation of Dedicated English Language Development by ESOL certified teachers. RIDE's fiscal forecasting (see fiscal note) anticipates needing an additional 380 ESOL certified teachers to provide dedicated ELD instruction, totaling approximately $3.23M. That being stated, it should be noted that this forecast is based on current ESOL teachers and that is likely insufficient to meet even existing regulations. RIDE monitoring during FY23 indicated that only 23% of sampled students in monitoring districts were receiving the sufficient instructional time required by ESOL certified teachers. Thus, actual costs to meet the new regulations may be significantly less once factoring in costs associated with being in compliance with existing regulations.

Furthermore, RIDE does not anticipate significant increased costs associated with LEAs meeting the maintained time requirements specifically. LEAs may experience some decrease since MLLs at the Bridging levels are no longer required to be taught by an ESOL certified teacher, although given the current shortage of ESOL teachers and students insufficiently receiving services statewide, we expect these associated costs to simply be redirected towards ensuring that all students meet the minimum time requirement, especially for dedicated ELD.

Benefits

Teacher capacity and resources are entirely directed towards students at the lower proficiency levels who are not yet independent to learn academic content and language without the required services from ESOL certified educators. This will primarily benefit existing MLL students and ensure they receive services, while eliminating the need to provide services for students who have already technically exited MLL status (by being identified as bridging). Dedicated ELD instruction will provide daily explicit instruction on academic language, oral language, and disciplinary literacy development. The benefits include increasing students' outcomes, improves school performance, and ultimately the state educational system.

Alternative 1

RIDE maintains that Bridging MLLs still receive at least one period of ESOL services.

Alternative 2

The proposed regulations do not require dedicated ELD instruction as part of the time requirements and provide flexibility to LEAs if they want to incorporate dedicated ELD.

Determination

Both alternatives lack alignment with best practices as understood by RIDE and in federal guidance. Best practices in the field of MLL education expanded the understanding around best practices to support content and language learning in collaborative settings with peers. To this end, bridging level MLLs are most equitably served through integrated content and language instruction. Federal guidance and the recent Department of Justice (DOJ) Settlement Agreement with Providence Public School District (PPSD): English Learner Signed Settlement Agreement (justice.gov) underscored the need to require a dedicated time of English language development for MLL students. Therefore, it has been determined that the benefits outweigh the costs of this proposed inclusion of the proposed new time requirements.

4) Restructuring of Multilingual Learner Programs

Proposed Regulation

This proposed regulatory change would include a restructuring of the instructional approaches based on research on language acquisition best practices. In addition, the restructuring of the program models under two high level approaches is consistent with the alignment and use of the state endorsed standards for Multilingual Learner Programs and in line with the *RI Blueprint for MLL Success* and *Strategic Plan*. The two proposed approaches are Bilingual Education and Content-Based Education, with several clearly defined instructional program models within each approach. All program models will consist of Dedicated English Language Development (Dedicated ELD) and Integrated Language and Content Instruction (Integrated Instruction). The instructional time indicated in the state regulations is therefore further broken down for ease of implementation on the part of the LEAs. These changes will be phased in with full implementation required by the school year 2029-2030, LEAs are at various places in the continuum of implementation, therefore the timeline accounts for staggered implementation.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30- 3.2, and 20-30-3.10)

Costs

RIDE does not anticipate significant costs pertaining to the clarification of program model definitions within the new proposed groupings of Bilingual Education and Content-Based Education. LEAs are already incurring expenses for the development, refinement, and implementation of program models, as aligned to the current regulations. As the current regulations are 17-years old, the regulations also do not align with current best practices.

RIDE does anticipate major costs associated with the personnel requirements to ensure appropriately trained teachers provide both Dedicated English Language Development (ELD) and Integrated instruction. Cost could be associated with the need for more ESOL certified teachers in order to meet regulatory requirements. Costs for providing Dedicated ELD instruction pertain to the hiring and credentialing of appropriately certified English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) educators. Of note, LEAs are already required to hire appropriately certified ESOL teachers to provide services to MLL students, so these costs are potentially *de minimis* if LEAs already have the appropriate amount of ESOL certified teachers to meet the current regulations. Such determination on the cost was done based on

modeling of current need but may be smaller if LEAs currently do not have enough to meet current regulations.

Costs for providing Integrated instruction align to the proficiency and awareness requirements detailed later in this benefit cost analysis.

Benefits

This proposed regulation component more accurately reflects current best practices for Multilingual Learner program design and additionally conforms to existing federal guidance and regulations (ENGLISH LEARNER GUIDANCE AND TOOL KIT (ed.gov), English Learner Tool Kit (OELA) | U.S. Department of Education, Chapter 2. Tools and Resources for Providing English Learners with a Language Assistance Program (ed.gov)). Federal regulations and guidance define instruction based on English Language Development standards as a core content for MLL students. The requirement also aligns to best practices highlighted and required within the Department of Justice (DOJ) Settlement Agreement with Providence Public School District (PPSD): English Learner Signed Settlement Agreement (justice.gov). (Curriculum and Resource Allocation, items 28 and 29.) Streamlining instructional approaches and determining program models allow for a consistent student experience in any district in the state, allowing for RIDE to provide ongoing and *ad hoc* technical assistance to LEAs.

Alternative 1

The *status quo* system, the current regulatory language foresees the provision for districts to choose and implement "components" of program models, a key finding in the DOJ Settlement Agreement in PPSD. Although considering an alternative to provide more guidance for LEAs regarding the implementation of models, the program models outlined within the currently existing regulations do not line up with best practices from other states, current research, or federal guidance (ENGLISH LEARNER GUIDANCE AND TOOL KIT (ed.gov), English Learner Tool Kit (OELA) | U.S. Department of Education, Chapter 2. Tools and Resources for Providing English Learners with a Language Assistance Program (ed.gov)).

Determination 1

This alternative scenario, while potentially saving costs associated with changing program models, lacks alignment with best practices as understood by RIDE and the federal government. Specifically, in relation to the Department of Justice (DOJ) Settlement Agreement with Providence Public School District (PPSD): English Learner Signed Settlement Agreement (justice.gov) the *status quo* would allow for continued instructional practices proven to be deleterious for students. Therefore, this lack of alignment could lead to considerable losses in MLL student achievement which translate into poorer outcomes for all students in the state. As such, the alternative scenario is not less costly than the proposed change.

Alternative 2

The proposed regulations are enacted maintaining the six program models as listed: English as a Second Language, Sheltered Content Instruction, Collaborative ESL & General Education, Bilingual Education, Two-Way/Dual Language, and Newcomer Program. .

Determination 2

This alternative scenario, while potentially not requiring additional investments and maintaining low costs, does not conform with nationally recognized best practices. Specifically, the Collaborative ESL & General Education model, as currently implemented in LEAs does not align to best-practices and requirements highlighted by the DOJ in their settlement agreement with PPSD. As currently listed in the regulations, there would be no framework to support LEAs in implementation, nor specificity in instructional approaches for students with limited and/or interrupted formal schooling. This limits the supportive reach from the agency to the LEAs.

5) MLL Administrator Personnel Requirements

Proposed Regulation

This regulatory section clarifies that high- and medium-incidence LEAs appoint a full-time MLL administrator to manage the MLL program, and low-incidence LEAs without a full-time MLL administrator appoint an MLL Coordinator. Proposed changes include a waiver for LEAs that face operational and fiscal challenges by employing a full-time MLL Administrator. This section also requires high incidence LEAs to employ at least one school and community liaison to support LEAs and parents with two-way communication and engagement.

This section also adds a new recommendation for LEAs to employ MLL coaches to support MLL teachers in the delivery of instruction and a recommendation for high and medium incidence LEAs to employ a school counselor trained in working with MLLs.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30-3.11)

Costs

RIDE does not anticipate significant costs associated with LEAs meeting these MLL Administrator and Personnel Requirements. The existing regulations already require all these personnel – the updated regulations provide clarity on which personnel requirements are required based on the proposed LEA categorization. LEAs categorization changes based on the new incidence criteria may require LEAs to redistribute the existing personnel's time and job assignments to fulfill the revised requirements. For instance, LEAs already employ MLL administrators and coordinators, as required by existing regulations. Similarly, some LEAs already employ family liaisons, and many LEAs already employ bilingual counselors but may need to specify or redistribute these counselors' caseloads to ensure they serve MLLs. Lastly, personnel requirements such as coaches are encouraged recommendations, but not firm requirements, resulting in no mandated specific costs.

Benefits

Revising the regulations to be better framed around LEA categorization and encouraged best practices provides a framework in which RIDE may better support LEAs to ensure they have the correct and appropriate staff necessary, in an operationally feasible manner, to best support MLLs. These proposed changes further aim at ensuring LEAs employ an administrator knowledgeable about MLL program,

research, federal and state regulations and guidance, and other MLL topics, and provide sufficient time for the MLL administrator to appropriately carry out their duties and responsibilities. Additionally, the presence of a family liaison will increase culturally responsive communication with parents and families, as well as ensure their engagement in district and school initiatives and their child's education. The coaching recommendation aims to ensure all MLLs receive quality instruction, leading to greater student outcomes.

Alternative 1

Status quo would allow for the provision of an MLL Administrator only for high incidence LEAs, contradicting best practices.

Alternative 2

The proposed regulations mandate specific personnel requirements (ex: coaches, counselors, family liaisons) aligned to the number of MLLs that an LEA has rather than framed around LEA categorization.

Determination

These alternative scenarios require RIDE to ignore or impose labor practices on LEAs without providing flexibility associated with personnel requirements. This would create possible situations of disservice for MLL students where the MLL Administrator is not present. Given each LEAs own unique MLL population and staffing challenges, RIDE has determined that LEAs are better able to meet the necessary personnel requirements if provided clear supports and flexibility within the guardrails of regulatory requirements.

6) Professional Learning Requirements

Proposed Regulation

This regulatory section proposes new requirements for professional learning for educators and administrators that will support their preparation to instruct and serve MLLs, in line with the RI Blueprint for MLL Success and Strategic Plan. These changes will be phased in with full implementation required by the school year 2029-2030. The proposed changes include a requirement for educators and administrators to demonstrate a minimum level of either awareness or proficiency in the MLL knowledge and practices, dependent on the person's role.

Proficiency Professional Learning: core content educators and special educators responsible for Integrated Language and Content Instruction will be required to meet the proficiency requirement. They may meet this requirement by obtaining an MLL endorsement, a MLL content certification, an ESOL certification, a BDL certification, or by completing proficiency training.

Awareness Professional Learning: all other educators and school and building leaders will be required to obtain awareness level training or hold one of the credentials listed above.

It is proposed that LEAs provide proficiency and awareness training at no cost to their personnel, and when feasible to hold the training during the workday.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30-3.12)

Costs

The costs of this section of the proposed regulation are detailed are approximately $4.9M over five years for awareness level professional learning (10,819 educators and school leaders x $450 p/staff member) and $0.8M for proficiency level professional learning ($3,525 per educator x 221 educators). RIDE has conducted several models on current statewide teacher certifications and distributions at the elementary and secondary levels, teacher assignments, and projected personnel needs. These models are also based off similar assumptions and observed costs for the implementation of the Right to Read regulations, from which the MLL regulation proficiency and awareness professional learning approach are based off of.

Benefits

This proposed change aims at ensuring MLLs receive high quality instruction throughout their day, by all educators and administrators who interact with MLLs. Historically, MLL instruction has been siloed to the responsibility of only ESOL teachers. However, national-best practices and local stakeholder feedback reinforce the collective responsibility needed for all educators to better support and serve MLLs. Research has shown that language is learned in context, so preparing teachers to include language instruction and support as part of their regular instruction will lead to faster and more effective learning and language growth for MLLs. Additionally, administrators have a big impact on students, as they assign teachers, determine schedules, and allocate funding. Having at least an awareness level of understanding of their MLL students and their needs will lead to decision-making based on student needs. Both proposed changes speak to Goals 1 and 2 of the MLL Strategic Plan.

Alternative 1

Require that any teacher who provides ESOL services, be it through Dedicated or Integrated ELD, be required to have a full ESOL certification.

Determination

This alternative scenario would prove to be more costly and possibly cost prohibitive for LEAs to undertake. Ensuring that they have more ESOL-certified teachers would be significantly more costly than ensuring educators obtain proficiency training. The projected cost difference between proficiency level training ($3,525) and ESOL certification reimbursement ($8,500) is $4,975 per teacher. If this were applied the approximately 221 additional teachers forecasted to need proficiency-level professional learning, this would be an incremental cost of $1.1M.

While ESOL certification is appropriate for Dedicated instruction, RIDE's identification of proficiency and awareness requirements does not require full certification. Teachers providing Integrated instruction only would face the cost and time burden of obtaining a certification they may not fully need.

Alternative 2

The proposed regulations are enacted without requiring that Educators Preparation Providers demonstrate awareness requirements as part of their program by 2028.

Determination

This alternative scenario would prove to create timeline misalignment and impact the efficiency of teacher preparation programs. Additionally, it could cause a longer training requirement for new teachers and increasing costs.

Assigning non-ESOL teachers to instruct MLLs, without increased awareness training, may result in a negative impact on student outcomes. Students would continue to receive instruction from under-prepared educators, creating conditions for students to perform poorly on state assessment and graduate at a slower pace than their peers. It will continue to contribute to the achievement gap or increasing the instance in which MLL students at the secondary level drop out of school with higher frequency than non-MLL students. While there would be an elimination of costs associated with the awareness training, the long-term costs of adverse MLL student outcomes and subsequently increased services outweigh the costs associated with the educator awareness training.

Removing awareness training requirements from administrators would result in school administrators not being adequately prepared to support their educators and school environments in supporting MLLs. Further, administrators already participate in professional learning for which the awareness training requirements may be embedded, thus the costs of the original recommendation are *de minimis* and should be maintained.

7) Student Exit from Active Multilingual Learner Status

Proposed Regulation

This regulatory section proposes that RIDE shall consult the Statewide Advisory Council for MLLs, as established pursuant to R.I. Gen. Laws § 16-54-5, on any proposed revisions to the exit criteria that will remove a student from MLL status and shall seek the approval of the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education to implement a change to the criteria.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30-3.15)

Costs

The costs of this section of the proposed regulation are *de minimis* as students are currently exited from MLL status based on nationally normed exit criteria. The proposed language would officialize an additional step to the process with very limited costs.

Benefits

Establishing exit criteria is a process that considers an MLL student's potential to successfully transition to academic education without the need for English language development services. Criteria used

consider the student's post exit academic success and allows students greater flexibility in their schedule to pursue other academic or enrichment opportunities. The proposed regulatory change improves public transparency by engaging the Statewide Advisory Council for MLLs in the process of establishing exit criteria and with approval by the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education.

Alternative 1

The state defined minimum exit criteria cut score is included in the regulations, requiring full regulation revision upon changes to the cut score due to standards setting and/or assessments revisions.

Determination

Adopt the proposed change in the regulations to improve public engagement and formalize the current process in establishing exit criteria. Were the exit criteria cut score to be included in the regulations, a full regulatory revision would be needed in order to make changes in alignment to standards or assessment revisions. The proposed process obligates RIDE to engage in public process through engaging with the State MLL Advisory Council in order to make changes to exit criteria.

8) Family Engagement

Proposed Regulation

This regulatory section proposes that LEAs include representation of MLL families in school improvement teams in accordance with the requirements of the LEA Strategic Planning. The proposed regulatory language removes the mandate to LEAs to create and coordinate MLL Local Advisory Committees, yet allowing flexibility for such committees to remain should this be best practice and an effective way for MLL families to participate in LEA wide initiatives and decisions.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30-3.22)

Costs

The costs of this section of the proposed regulation are *de minimis* as it is removing a requirement for the LEAs and adding flexibility. In addition, the integration of MLL families in LEA wide meetings does not constitute major additional cost as LEAs already are required to conduct family engagement for school improvement and strategic planning process. Rather MLL families should already be integrated in these LEA wide and school initiatives and decisions.

Benefits

Supporting integration and collaboration across student groups and families will reflect the will of the entire community and expand the benefit of diversity in LEA wide decisions. The prior regulations had a cumbersome, overly prescriptive process that no LEA was actually following as it was cost prohibitive. Maintaining parallel processes with similar goals creates a burdensome and time-consuming process for the LEAs, in addition to weakening MLL families' voice. Aligning these processes will ensure families are meaningfully engaged in the state-required school improvement and LEA strategic planning processes, ensuring a clear improvement focus for MLL students and outcomes.

Alternative 1

Retain the current language in the regulations*, status quo*, requiring that LEAs provide assistance to the Local MLL Advisory Committee in developing its structure and bylaws, procedures of functions and responsibilities, provide technical and consultive services, make available appropriate records and data, provide in service training, and coordinate parent notifications between the advisory and new families to the LEA.

Alternative 2

Provide a timeline for LEAs to gradually include MLL families in schoolwide efforts, ultimately increasing family engagement and school improvement team participation.

Determination

Both alternatives present additional costs for the LEA, without positively impacting family engagement towards and inclusive approach, possibility creating disparities. The determination is made to adopt the proposed change in the regulations to improve family engagement in the process of making LEA wide decisions impacting all students. Inclusion of MLL voices in schoolwide decisions will enhance school practices. In addition, the proposed regulatory language retains the flexibility for any MLL Local Advisory Committee to remain in place should it be effective in elevating MLL families' voices to schoolwide initiatives. Finally, the proposed language maintains the requirement for a two-way meaningful communication between families and LEA.

9) Implementation Timeline

Proposed Regulation

These regulatory sections propose the SY 2029-2030 as the target year for full implementation of the regulations – specifically Section 2, Time Requirements, and Section 6, Professional Learning Requirements.

Regulatory Citation

(20-30-3.8 and 20-30-3.12)

Costs

The implementation timeline by SY29-30 does not change the overall costs as required within the Time Requirement and Professional Learning Requirements section but rather provides a timeframe for how long LEAs must meet these requirements. Ultimately, the timeline helps to spread the costs over a reasonable timeframe.

Benefits

Establishing a target year for implementation is necessary to allow for thoughtful planning and efficiency in LEA's and RIDE's distribution of resources. In addition, LEAs are at different stages of readiness for implementation, hence a five-year implementation timeline would position all LEAs to comply with the timeline proposed. An additional benefit to the proposed timeline is the proposed revisions of the MLL Regulations which sets a 5-year term, this would eventually provide RIDE the ability to review the

regulatory language and propose changes as necessary through regulatory review. This timeline was consistent with the Right to Read regulations.

Alternative 1

The proposed regulations require a more aggressive timeline for implementation, hence considerably impacting the uses of resources and investments. In addition, it will diminish the ability for RIDE to support LEAs in the process of planning and implementation. Excessively tasking the LEA on the requirements timeline might also lead to poor implementation due to the nature of the tasks and initiatives at hand.

Alternative 2

Another alternative is to determine a longer timeline, hence impacting efficiency and urgency for implementation. A longer timeline would allow for more planning, allowing for a possible differentiated target year, but this might engender the risk for reduced urgency, hence negatively impacting students' learning.

Determination

Alternatives constitute two extremes, one with a short timeline and unrealistic expectations, the other with a longer or differentiated timeline that could be counterproductive for the success of MLL students. The determination is made to adopt the proposed target year for implementation so that both LEAs and RIDE can plan accordingly the uses of resources and capacity to support MLL students. The timeframe is consistent with the Right to Read Act implementation that has been proven to be effective in training large numbers of teachers.