June 10–14 SEA Feedback and Guidance
on Next Steps for the Next Generation ELP Standards

Type your feedback into this document.

State: Oregon
Your name: *Elizabeth Prusko (Medford school district), her feedback is in italics.* Oregon convened additional stakeholders for an ELP/D Standards Review Panel on June 14, 2013, including Pam Bejerano (Centennial School District), Laura Zinck (Central School District), Michelle McCoy (ODE), and Martha I. Martinez (ODE). Their feedback is indicated in red. Other stakeholders submitted feedback on Activity 4 only via email. These included Jonathon Fost (Newberg school district), Detta Wilson-Hogan (Oregon City school district). Their feedback is also captured in red under Activity 4.

Activity 1: Conduct an initial "close reading" of excerpts from the Proficiency Level Descriptors and from the Grade 6 ELP Standards.

Before you can create refined ELP Standards statements (Activity 3), you'll need to get a sense of where we are in the drafting process. This activity is designed to give your SEA working group the chance to look closely at the old and current drafts of the PLDs and a sample set of standards.

Materials:

- Second draft of Proficiency Level Descriptors, Part 1: Collaboration (Word document #3)
    - Font color key: text with black font is from the original CA ELD Standards PLDs; and text with red font was refined by WestEd staff in June 2013.
- Grade 6 Standards, Part 1: Collaborative, Interpretive, Productive (Word document #5):
    - Font color key: text with black font is from the original CA ELD Standards PLDs; text with blue font is part of the initial ELPA21 refinements made to jumpstart the refinement process; and text with red font was refined by WestEd staff in June 2013.
- Grade 6 CA ELD Standards (PDF document #6)

1. Examine the Proficiency Level Descriptors (PLDs) for Part 1, Collaboration.

    Note: The attached excerpt (Word document #3) provides a sample of how the PLDs are being refined. WestEd will create a final draft for the PLD document once the ELP Standards statements are finalized.

    Refinement notes:
    - Levels
        - Levels 2, 3, and 5 descriptors originated from the CA ELD Standards.
        - Added an early level for students at beginning/most stages ("no English")—Level 1.
        - Level 4 descriptors from the CA ELD Standards indicate full English proficiency. Thus, these descriptors were moved into the new level 5. Analysts worked on adding in a new level 4 set of descriptors.
    - Early/later stages

o   Early stages and later stages are placed within the PLDs. The later stages will be placed in the grade level standards where they will serve as targets.
- Word-smithing work
    o   Analysts added in text to indicate that this set of descriptors described collaborations involving *both* speaking/listening and reading/writing.
    o   Analysts added in text to ensure the descriptors reflected more of the English language development progressions.
    o   *If needed*, here's where you'd find the earlier versions for comparison:
        ▪ To see how CA ELD Standards Proficiency Level Descriptors have been framed, go to "Overview of the California English Language Development Standards and Proficiency Level Descriptors": http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/overviewpld.pdf
        ▪ The first refinement/earlier draft of PLDs (Excel document #4).

---

a)   Analyst comments/questions:

i.   There were 4 standards in the Collaborative section of Modes of Communication (Part 1) in the Standards document. There were four bullet points in the Level 5 descriptor on the PLD document, one that addressed each standard in that section of the Standards document. This was not true of the descriptors of the other levels which had one or two bullet points. **In the PLDs, is it preferred to have a bullet point for each standard or should the bullet points be statements that synthesize the skills in the standards when possible?**

ii. The PLD descriptor in the later stages of Level 4 seemed more like a Level 5 descriptor in that it is describing what would be expected of native-speaking students in a regular classroom. It is important that the expectations for ELL students not exceed what is expected of native-speaking students. For example, the expectation for a native speaking student would be that they could "participate fully in all collaborative conversations in all content areas at grade level with occasional support as necessary**." Isn't it preferred to move the later stages of Level 4 PLD descriptors and Standard statements to Level 5 and develop descriptors and statements that describe behaviors that are nearing proficiency?** (NOTE: That was the assumption used in revising/refining the Part 1 PLD descriptors and Standard statements.) **Is the descriptor for each level, especially Level 5, appropriate?**

iii. Some standards in the Interpretive section of Part 1 require students to speak or write to demonstrate their comprehension of what they have read or heard. This is an overlap with the Productive section. **Is it preferred that these standards be reworded to eliminate or lessen this overlap?**

iv. Some standards in the Productive section of Part 1

i.   I would prefer not to put arbitrary "rules" on a document that aren't required. As long as the description gives a clear picture of what students can do, that's what matters. Also, there may be some "standards" that are not applicable to lower proficiency levels because they require more sophisticated language that is not within their grasp yet.

Synthesize more in the PLDs. Don't repeat what is in the standards document. Also want the "early stages" to be removed from the PLDs. Can preserve this information in supplementary docs/appendices to help inform instruction but don't want it to clutter the PLDs. The PLDs inform what the students have mastered as they proceed through the levels, rather than describing low to high ends of each level. This helps address the question of the gap bw the high end of the previous level and the low end of the next level.

ii. Makes sense to me. Level 5 should reflect native English speakers and already-exited students, which is not exactly the same as "ready to exit" students. There will always be a range of language ability among people, including native English speakers. I see the level 5 as reflecting the "ideal" of what we would expect/hope to see in the "typical" student of that age; whereas, the later stage of level 4 would be what we deem minimally necessary for students to effectively access the general education program without additional ELD instruction.

It seems that you have already done this, at least in terms of the standards.

Literacy row seems out of place, and should not address native literacy (as level 1 refers to). Focus needs to be on English literacy aspects/development, appropriate to grade level and the specific English language skills needed to develop literacy.

reference the need for students to collaborate with a teacher or peers. **Is it preferred that these standards be rewritten so that the collaboration be moved to the Collaborative section?** (NOTE: This was not done in the revising/refining done to Part 1.)	*iii. I feel that the numerous categories presented in the PLD document from early June 2013 were overwhelming and lacked any inherent logic for me to follow. It seemed like 5 different people had been asked to create categorical structures for language use, and that all 5 people's paradigms were just thrown together to make one long, incoherent list. Perhaps there is a logic to it that I just can't see… That being said, I would strongly recommend that all redundancies be eliminated. All it creates is more confusion, more arguments and more work to sort out.*
v. When examples were given in Standard statements, the examples were often the same across levels. **Is it preferred that the examples be different for each level?** (NOTE: The examples differentiated….sometimes by keeping what was there and adding an additional example…..in the revising/refining done to Part 1.)	Seems like the categories are in some ways creating artificial boundaries between some of the different standards. Would like the redundancies across the standards to be addressed, and perhaps rethink the categorical structure. Or if we keep the categories/framing principles, can we develop some cohesion around these and a list of standards that addresses them all holistically rather than starting with each separate category and identifying specific standards within it.
	iv. *If it says "collaborate" right in it, then the "Collaborative" section sounds like a good place for it. (-:*
	v. This statement could mean one of two things: 1) the nature of the example was consistent across levels, with the leveled performance indicators varying from level to level, or 2) there were examples in which even the indicators themselves were so similar that they lacked differentiation. If they meant the former, then I think it's important to keep them consistent across the levels. Otherwise, there is no utility to them. If they meant the latter, then I would hope that details were added to differentiate them.
	The question is unclear. If it means grade levels, then yes, we would want appropriate examples for age/grade levels. However, a caveat should also be added that the example should not be interpreted as the only one to be used/criteria to be met.
b) Is there any other feedback on how the PLDs might be improved?	*I still have a few concerns about the 6a, 6b and 6c examples in the Grade 6 document. For example, for 6a. level 1, there isn't a clear indication about HOW the level 1 students will do all of this explaining of ideas, phenomena, processes, comparing/contrasting, cause and effect and problem/solution when they can barely speak a few words of English. "Substantial visual support and prompting" tells me what the teacher will be doing, but it doesn't tell me what we expect the student to be doing. Will they be using gestures and isolated words?*
	For 6b, how can we possibly expect a newcomer (level 1) to be able to even comprehend a "grade-appropriate" text much less be able to express inferences and draw conclusions based

on it? This is exactly what the native English-speaking students are supposed to be learning to do! Gestures alone are not going to help them be able to comprehend a 6th-grade level text and make inferences about it. This is why in Dutro's SELD framework, expressing cause and effect, predicting and inferring are not included at the Beginning – Early Intermediate level. The same is true of 7a. Evaluate the language used to support ideas and opinions with details? Seriously? Newcomers? It's just totally unrealistic. If the standards have some examples that are this unrealistic, it will undermine the perceived validity of the whole document. Teachers will tend to discount the whole thing if they feel it based in fantasy.

Our group concurred with Elizabeth's comments, and added that these standards for beginning-early intermediate levels are not based in second language acquisition and theory.

7b at least has a more realistic example (i.e. run vs. walk) that would make some sense to an ELL teacher. Perhaps the examples from the other standard statements could be re-worked to present a more realistic and appropriate picture of what these students can and should be doing.

6c could possibly apply to level 1 students, but only to the degree that it matches with their native language, and that the "knowledge of morphology" is understood to be native-language knowledge, not English. So, that will pretty much only apply to speakers of Latin-based languages such as Spanish. It requires, then, that the teacher is proficient enough in the student's native language to explicitly teach and point out how that morphology relates to English words, which is a big assumption. The rest of it – context, reference materials, visual cues, etc. – could be done with level 1s, I think.

Also, in general, I have trouble with the liberal sprinkling of phrases like, "substantial support, basic questions, increasingly complex sentences," etc. Perhaps these standards are only intended to be vague. I tend to be very detail-oriented, and I want specifics. I feel that such vague standards can allow almost anyone to justify almost anything they want to teach, but it leaves the door open for huge gaps and discrepancies because of varying interpretations and priorities.

Not sure how to interpret and use some of the standards to inform assessment and instruction. Not enough differentiation between the levels. Leaves it really broad as to what explicit language we are teaching at each level.

	Is the philosophy that the ELP/D standards reflect the broader picture and that the teachers need to refer to the CCSS to determine the language forms necessary? Doesn't seem that this is the intent. So, can we infuse the language forms in a meaningful and more explicit way within this approach to language development from a "language as action" standpoint? E.g, an attached document for each grade level that includes the functions and language forms appropriate for that grade level. See page 77 of the CCSSO Framework document for another example. If I am asking students to exchange info and ideas, how am I assessing my level 1 student versus my level 4 student? We would need to unpack the grade level content's linguistic demands in order to infuse Part 2 into Part 1. Look at Part 2 descriptors to see if we collapse into Part 1. *One more little thing… The examples for level 5 for 6b and 6c appear to have been cut and pasted incorrectly. They don't match with the rest of the levels.*

2. Examine the (Word document) draft grade 6 standards (Part 1, Collaboration) in conjunction with the PLDs.

    Notes: Compare the two draft documents, the PLDs, and the Grade 6 Standards (documents #3 & #5).

a) Please provide feedback on how PLD descriptors were applied to the Grade 6 ELP Standard statements.	*It seems to me that the PLD descriptors for the Collaboration section delineated the expectations roughly as follows:* *Level 1: non-verbal, single word or chunked, memorized short phrase responses* *Level 2: Short, simple sentence responses* *Level 3: Multiple sentence (paragraph?) responses of a variety of lengths, yet still fairly basic in content and complexity.* *Level 4: Multiple sentence (extended discourse?) responses with content and complexity coming very close to those of native English-speakers, but perhaps without quite the stamina, fluency/automaticity of native English-speakers.* *Level 5: The expectations of native English-speaking peers.* *For the Collaboration section, I think that the PLD and the standard statement examples were closely aligned. As they moved down into Interpretive and Productive, though, the alignment diminished, particularly for Level 1. The delineation then came to rely on vague, unmeasurable adjectives to describe the level of support given by the teacher, such as "substantial, moderate, very little," which does nothing to describe what the student is actually producing, and assumes that a student who is just barely starting to learn English could somehow be MADE to engage in 6th-grade level literacy activities in English if only the teacher would just give more "support".*

3. Examine the additional refinements made to Part 1, Interpretive and Productive Grade 6 Standards.

Notes: Examine the new draft of the Grade 6 Standards (document #5). The old version of the CA ELD Standards for Grade 6 has been included (attachment #6). The current full version of the Grade 6 Standards can be found in the Excel spreadsheet (document #7) "6. NextGenELPStandards_Gr6_061013_v9."

a) Does text shown work for you? (The text in red indicates how the first set of Standards was refined in relation to the PLDs.)	*As I've mentioned elsewhere, the examples for Level 1 are either so totally unrealistic as to be farcical or are so unclearly stated that I am utterly misinterpreting them. I won't belabor the point further, but in terms of a newcomer 6th grader, I would personally choose to completely ignore those descriptors in the same way that I totally ignore the original AYP target of 100% for all subgroups by the year 2014 or any diet that tells me I should never eat another bite of chocolate again. The ravings of a madman… (-;*
	I do, however, appreciate the earlier revisions to the CA standards which broke down numbers 6 and 7 into 2 or 3 discreet chunks. The more targeted and specific the standard, the more likely people are to interpret it consistently and accurately.
	Our group didn't get to this part.

b) Does the layout work for you? In particular, does it make sense to list the 3 sets of Practices at the bottom of each page? The advantage of having them written out here is that it will keep the Practices in teachers' minds as they plan lessons. However, is there a	*By interpreting my own behavior, I think I can answer this question…* *I honestly didn't even bother to give the footers a second glance until I read this question. They had no relevance for me as I read through the main body of the document. So, I think they could just be highlighted boldly at the beginning of the document, and left there. As long as I know where to look for them when I need*

better way to keep the correspondences in mind while saving "real estate" on the page? Could we move them to the footer and make them smaller?	them, I don't think we need to use up so much valuable space repeating them on every page. Better to have a shorter, more concise document. Other than that, I like the layout very much. I think it's easy to follow and has an inherent logic to it. Our group didn't get to this part.

Activity 2: Recommend how to refine the CA ELD Standards by examining possible correspondences with the CCSS and NGSS Practices

Materials:

- Grade 6 Standards draft (document #7, Excel spreadsheet titled "7. NextGenELPStandards_Gr6_061013_v9," second tab "Correspondences with Practices")
- Mathematical Practices Correspondences (Word document #8)
- Excerpt from ELPD Framework showing breakdown of CCSS ELA/Literacy Practices, CCSS Mathematical Practices, and NGSS Science/Engineering Practices (Word document #9)
- Relationships and Convergences Venn Diagram (PDF: "10. VennDiagram_practices_v5 3-8-12 COLOR")

1. <u>Examine the correspondences between the CCSS Mathematical Practices and the ELP Standard statements in the current hybrid version of the CA ELD Standards (Part 1) and the initial refinements (Parts 2 and 3).</u> In the Excel document #7, "6. NextGenELPStandards_Gr6_061013_v9," go to the second tab.

   Notes:
   - This shows what's called a "referential correspondence"—that is, an examination of the correspondences *after* the ELP Standard Statements have been created. It indicates that all of the CA ELD Standards correspond with elements within the CCSS Mathematical Practices.
   - The chart here summarizes the analysts' more detailed description of the ELP-Mathematical Practices correspondences (shown in Mathematical Practices Correspondences Word document #7).
     - [This correspondence analysis will be confirmed after the final ELLP Standard statements have been developed. If you disagree with a current rating, please make a note of that item in the table below. If ELD Standard statement 4 remains in the list, we will have that one reviewed again.]

Describe the types of information provided by this type of referential correspondence. Is it meaningful information? How might it be improved?	*I don't think it's terribly meaningful from an instructional point of view. Rather, I see it as a necessary document to provide evidence of correspondence to CCSS. I would briefly show it to the teachers and say, "See? Someone actually did go over the standards with a fine-toothed comb and you can trust that if you teach to the new ELD standards, you will in fact be supporting student success in CCSS Language Arts and Math standards." To truly understand such correspondence information requires such a deep level of familiarity with all three sets of standards: CA ELD, CCSS LA and CCSS Math, that only a handful of people will ever really get much out of this type of document. Only the people creating it will really understand it, which I think is fine. I wouldn't spend too much time prettying it up or anything, though. It serves its purpose.* Our group did not get to this.

Additional Note on Correspondences with CCSS ELA/Literacy STANDARDS

- We will also include correspondences with ELA/Literacy STANDARDS in the first tab of the Excel sheet. (See Columns O and P.) The CA ELD Standards correspondences have been reframed to focus on primary and additional correspondences here.

2. <u>Examine the ELPD framework tables (Word document #9) and the Relationships and Convergences Venn Diagram (PDF #10), which provide an overview of all of the CCSS ELA/Literacy Practices, CCSS Mathematical Practices, and NGSS Science/Engineering Practices.</u>

   Notes:

   - The problems with the preceding activity is that we need to know if there are any additional practices missing from the ELP Standard statements. To do this, we need to construct "strategic correspondences"—that is, to begin with the Practices themselves and *during* this part of the ELP Standards development process see if there are possible correspondences to be added to the ELP Standard statements.

   - As you read through the ELPD tables,

     i. We recommend you focus on the **productive language functions** descriptors within each of the Practices (i.e., the 3rd set of items in the table for each Practice).

        It might be more strategic to focus here because . . .

        1. Activities requiring the students to produce a linguistic response imply that the teacher has *already* taught activities involving analytic tasks and receptive language functions. (By focusing on productive language functions you also implicitly address analytic tasks and receptive language functions.)

        2. This is a strategy for making ELLs more visible in the classroom. (The teacher will need to focus on what ELLs are doing when evaluating the success of lessons based on this type of ELP Standard Statement.)

     ii. Identify which descriptors would provide the most benefit to improved ELL access to the language of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. (Remember, the spirit of standards is to be strategic; they signal to educators where the greatest instructional "payoff" is located.)

a) To ensure all Practices are addressed, examine whether any ELP Standard statements are missing. List any Practices which need associated ELP Standard statements. [Remember to focus on the **primary, most meaningful correspondences**; do not feel compelled to add items to the list because there might be a _remote_ chance of correspondence.]	_Honestly, this would require a lot more time and work than I can put in within such a short time frame, but I understand what you are asking and agree that it is an important next step. It sounds like that is what is currently being worked on. The structure of the Venn Diagram is, I think, very useful for approaching this process. Once we have the ELD standards "finalized" (or what we think is final...), it would be very helpful to place them within that type of Venn Diagram to see which ones correspond with ELA alone, ELA and Math, Math and Science, all three, etc. Having that information will allow us to prioritize our instruction based on which content areas our students might be struggling in the most and which standards will allow for meaningful participation during the majority of the instructional day._ _I also applaud the desire to focus content-area teachers' attention on PRODUCTIVE language from ELLs. Without this emphasis, many teachers will continue to focus more on their "coverage" of standards rather than actual evidence from the student that he/she understood it. I still see a lot of teachers, even highly-trained teachers, jumping from the graphic organizer (receptive understanding of the content) to "independently write a paragraph explaining the graphic organizer" without any explicit language instruction as to how to turn a graphic organizer into a coherent paragraph. The response of the teacher is then, "Gee, I guess they don't understand the content." I'm hoping that this shift to productive language in the standards will encourage them to provide more opportunities for structured language practice during the instructional parts of the lesson, not just during the summative assessment._ Our group did not get to this part.
b) Based on your reading of the Practices shown in the ELPD framework, can any ELP Standard statements be refined or	_I'm wondering if P1.7a and 7b could be switched in terms of the order in which they are presented. From a Bloom's taxonomy perspective, it makes more sense to me that one would first have to be able to analyze and explain/describe_

combined? List those ELP Standard statements.	*how language choices impact the effect on the reader or listener before one can EVALUATE those choices as being effective or ineffective for various purposes. I know if probably doesn't make much difference what order they are in, but most teachers will, at first anyway, read the standards in a linear fashion, and it could help them get past the overwhelming wordiness of them all if there is a sequential logic to them.*
	Although I'm usually a fan of breaking the umbrella-type standards into sub-standards, I'm wondering if it's worth it for P1.11. We generally discourage students from ever presenting an opinion or attitude without some justification for it. So, 11a would be an overly-simplistic standard to "master". Just ask any 4 year-old: "Broccoli is yucky." Or 12 year-old: "That shirt is ugly." Or 16 year-old: "Romeo and Juliet were idiots." The real meat of the matter is in 11b, in which they are required to provide logical, sound justification for their opinions and attitudes.
	True confessions: I cannot tell the difference between P2.5b and 5c and 5d. In fact, 5b and 5d seem to be almost word-for-word identical. It seems to me that 5c only explains HOW the students would be accomplishing 5b and 5d (i.e. by combining clauses using conjunctions and other linking language). I'm not sure why those are broken down into 3 different sub-standards.
	I have a general concern about the overall inclusion of Part 3. Essentially, most of these are just a repetition of the ELA standards and are not ELL-specific. Aren't ALL of the kids, including native English-speakers, supposed be taught basics concepts about English print and phonics? By putting these directly in the ELD standards, I'm afraid it will provide justification for relegating basic ELA instruction of ELLs to the ELL teacher and decreasing the responsibility on the part of the general education program. Specifically, I'm concerned about P3.1a, 1b, 1c and 2b.
	Regarding P3.2a, I have a separate concern. Having a standard that requires the schools to explicitly teach students to compare their native language to English seems to assume that the teacher would have the prerequisite knowledge of the students' native languages to support this, which is obviously not the case. Medford coincidentally happens to have a large number of ELL teachers who are bilingual in English and Spanish. However, some are not, and bilingualism is not required to receive an ESOL endorsement. Only one teacher is orally bilingual in Chinese, but she does not know how to read or write it. It would be impossible for us to address any of the

	other myriad languages we have represented in our schools. I think it's inappropriate to include a state standard which is impossible to equitably address. It's okay to encourage it when possible, but not to require it as a standard. How on Earth would ELPA 21 ever measure it? Our group did not get to this part.
c) Additional comments:	*Bravo on adding P3.3. This gives us the legal backing we need to include cultural knowledge and awareness instruction for ELLs in an era in which every perceived non-essential has been stripped away. "What? You're pulling these kids out for ELD and all you're doing is teaching them about Valentine's Day? We don't have time for that frivolous stuff!" Or, "Why are you spending time having them read Breaking Through? Is that part of the Freshman English class requirements?" It's very nice having these critical social pieces validated through the standards, although it might be difficult to measure in a standardized test…* Our group did not get to this part.

Activity 3: Create your list of refined ELP Standard statements.

The draft list of Principles has been reframed around the concepts of **access** and **opportunity to learn**. Our thinking about the standards has been focused on an assumption that the 3 communication modes must stay in a separate Part 1. Why not frame the Next Generation ELP Standards as offering ELLs access to 5 meaningful types of opportunities which will *strategically* provide ELLs with high-leverage opportunities in the following areas:

1. Interact with others in culturally and socially appropriate ways
2. Participate in grade-level curriculum and instruction through comprehensive input
3. Create formal spoken and written linguistic output
4. Develop explicit knowledge about the English language
5. Develop foundational literacy skills, if not already developed

Framing the ELP Standard statements around these principles allows the targets within the grade-level standards to be written in a way to influence teachers to provide 5 types of opportunities to ELLs. These opportunities would focus on moving ELLs from being silent to active participants in the classroom.

Please note that this conception starts to move away from the *National Standards for Foreign Language Learning* frame (3 Modes of Communication: Collaborative, Interpretive, and Productive) and more towards how the Understanding Language project is framing ELL access to the language of curriculum and instruction. The benefit of this approach is that it allows greater alignment with the Understanding Language resources that have been made available for this project.

1. Discuss the Core Principles around which you would like the final list of ELP Standard statements to be based. [Refer to #2—the PPT for slide, #15.]	*I don't have the documents for this, but in general, I agree with the intention; however, I don't think that the ELD standards are the proper place for all of this pedagogical philosophy. The standards should be focused on MEASURABLE OUTCOMES we expect for STUDENTS, not INPUTS from the TEACHER. How on Earth would you ever measure whether or not a student is able to "Participate in grade-level curriculum and instruction through comprehensive (sic) input"? (I think they meant "comprehensible".) That belongs in the Professional Teaching Standards as part of the new teacher evaluation system, not something that is laid on the student in the ELD standards.* *Also, I don't think, "Develop explicit knowledge about the English language" belongs in the ELD standards. The purpose of the ELL program is to explicitly teach the English language to students for whom it is not a primary language in order for them to have full, meaningful access to the general education program, which happens to be in English. (In other words, the ONLY reason we really need to require explicit English language instruction for LEP students is because English is the dominant language of instruction and the societally-validated "lingua franca" in the U.S.) Learning English via an ELL (i.e. Title III) program is merely a means to an end, not an end or goal in and of itself. Explicit knowledge of English is a likely outcome of an effective program, but to hold ELLs accountable for it, separately from the general education program, is inequitable. They are already held accountable for the same "explicit knowledge" of English as a language that all other students are held to under the CCSS ELA standards. To layer on top of that a separate requirement just to exit the ELL program would be holding ELLs to a higher standard than is required of non-ELL students. It is possible to USE English correctly and effectively without ever having EXPLICIT knowledge about it. Indeed, although I could speak and write in English nearly perfectly as a high school student, I had little to no "explicit" knowledge about it at all until I studied French and Spanish. Most of our ELLs will likely gain much explicit knowledge in English as a byproduct of ELD instruction, but to require it separately from what the other students must learn in their Language Arts classes is unfair. It's the same reason why we cannot use OAKS scores as part of our exit criteria.* Why would we "blow up" what we have? Don't see these principles as being that different or of adding that much more value to the development process. Our approach instead is to think about embedding parts 2 and 3 of the current

	standards into part 1 so that the standards are better aligned with the "language as action" theory.
2. After this discussion, look through the Standards statements document (Word document #11). Discuss which would best provide ELLs with access to the language of the CCSS/NGSS as they develop ELP. Place your final list of ELP Standard statements in the box to the right.	We didn't come up with a final list, but we do have suggestions for how to revise the standards which we have incorporated into the document that Kansas used. We also noted where we were in agreement with Kansas in that document, which we will submit with this one.

3. Please provide a paragraph *summary* rationale for the ELP Standard statements you selected.	

Activity 4: Discuss and recommend whether the ELP Standard statements should be written by grade levels (K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9–10, 11–12) or grade spans (K, 1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, 9–12).

Pro's of Each Approach

Grade levels (K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9–10, 11–12)	Grade spans (K, 1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, 9–12)
If the CCSS is defined by grade levels, and the ELD standards are supposed to correspond with CCSS, then it might be difficult to accurately convey that correspondence if we are using a different grouping strategy. It will create a lot of redundancies, but they might be necessary. *Also, in spite of all of our efforts, in most elementary settings, at least, actual ELD instruction is broken down into grade level groups (and then, hopefully, broken down further into proficiency levels). So, having grade level delineations at the elementary level would be manageable from an instructional planning point of view.* It is nice to have guidance for individual grades even if they are very similar. From the grade level classroom perspective, they can hone into their grade level and know what are the relevant ELD standards.	*Less wordy* *Would (hopefully) match the grade level bands for ELPA 21.* *Reduces redundancies.*

Write your final recommendation here: _*Whatever matches CCSS, which is grade levels*.__

We would like the standards grade configuration to match both the CCSS and the ELPA21 grade configuration. Why can't we create the standards to correspond to the CCSS by grade, but then also reconfigure/blend the standards to match the ELPA21 grade band configurations?

List the 3 primary factors that influenced your decision:

1. *Consistency with CCSS* (We concur.)

2. ELD classroom teacher experience

3. Feedback from teachers in recent ELPA Standards Verification process

4. ELPA21 assessment design