State Feedback on "Next Generation English Language Development Standards: Supporting Packet for Work on Next Generation ELD Standards Development"

<u>Background information</u>

State name: Oregon

Feedback compiled by: Susan Inman

Reviewer email address: susan.inman@state.or.us

Did other individuals from your state contribute to this review? If so, please describe their role(s).

Yes, Oregon has established an ELP/D Standards Focus Group to serve as key communicators during the ELP/C revision process. Members of this group were asked for feedback, and their feedback is represented in this document. Feedback from groups members is *in italics.* Additional feedback received after April 12, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. will be compiled and considered to be public input in our process

<u>Feedback</u>

1. General design principles (pages 2-9) – To what extent do you agree with these principles as the basis for new English language proficiency standards?

The clarity of the information provided is very helpful for evaluation purposes. The general design principles are sound and provide a foundation for the process of updating the standards.

I agree with the changes

I agree with these changes and feel it helps bring the level of rigor and connection to the mainstream classroom that collaboration will occur at a grassroots level naturally.

These changes will be beneficial to students

In doing a crosswalk of ELP Forms and Functions currently used in Oregon and the Next Generation ELD Standards, every one of the 23 Language Functions used in Oregon are

addressed in this packet. Moreover, Next Generation ELD Standards go above and beyond and address content areas. One thing to mention that often is not addressed in current ELD practices but is clearly addressed here is literary analysis.

The principles seem logical

I like the idea of having these standards updated from the California ones, as they seemed to address California's specific needs.

The following was taken from the ELL Directors review and showed to this team. They agreed with all of the following statements:

- *in general we agree with the theoretical foundations*
- *completely agree with increase in academically vigorous content-embedded student oral production*
  - *emphasis on increasing the rigor of oral conversation*
  - *more student centered versus teacher led conversation*
  - *this area will be a significant area of training for teachers; districts will need support in this*
- *pg 3 – what does 'artfully integrate' mean?*
- *Shift from grammatical correctness to true linguistic interaction is great*
- *Table 2 has recognition that ELD dedicated instruction is critical; this is key in our views, that explicit ELD must continue to be taught, but as stated embedded in CCSS-based contextualized content*
- *Vocabulary – we are in agreement with theory of domain-specific and embedded learning in academic contexts*
- *Literacy – we agree that literacy instruction should be differentiated for all students and it is ideal when we know enough of their L1 structure and background to differentiate based on this*
  - *individualizing literacy instruction for ELLs (Table 3) – what is the concrete application of this, especially in classrooms where there are many languages? Teachers will need significant support and training in this area to learn more of native languages and how to assess/determine native literacy in a language unknown to the teacher*
  - *nice that this is formally recognized that students come with different literacy backgrounds at all ages*
- *Explicit language being taught in the classroom within content areas will require significant training for general education teachers.*

2. Proficiency Level Descriptors (page 11-12) - What feedback do you have on the descriptions and number of levels?

   The PLDs are logical and represent the discussion by members of the recent ELL SCASS small group discussions. The strong language around the value of the student's culture and prior knowledge is a good match with the Oregon Department of Education's consistent emphasis on equity and the acknowledgement of the value of family and community involvement

   Initially the numbers of levels creates some concern that we are limiting our grouping. However, as I continued to read, I felt that the depth at each level and individual variation recognition does not pose a concern. It will be a paradigm shift; but all change is met with resistance initially.

   I was really impressed to see item c in the key findings section that states the following: "...value and build on home language and culture and other forms of prior knowledge." If we do pay attention to these areas and measure them, it is highly likely that the number of dually identified students in ELL and special education will decrease. Too often these extremely additive components of language acquisition are overlooked and staff push students wrongfully push students into special education.

   Distinction between levels is vague
   Three levels are broad; the more we can break down levels the more we can target instruction
   Pro – it gives us more flexibility to move kids within the levels
   How do we know students are making progress with only three levels? Expanding or Bridging could be an ill-defined holding ground for many students for many years.

3. Grade-level standards – What feedback do you have on each of the components of the standards?

   a. Part I: Interacting in Meaningful Ways (pages 13-16)

      Pg 15 – there is an extra space in the middle of the word "with" in section 7

      I like the idea that we are "meeting students where they are at"

      It is encouraging that the organization of PLDs starts with the premise of language development as a continuum that starts with the native language competencies students possess when entering school.

It appears that Emerging level is essentially Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) with some basic Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP).

At the Bridging level, the following question comes to mind: Students often are not ready for grade-level CALP without extra support with at current ELPA level 5. Will this standard be closer to FEP status?

I like how it is proposed to break down by proficiency level is by skills. It is easy to assign a student as certain level and not stress areas of concern that are now or areas of strength that are higher.

The section on the range of social and academic concepts in modes of communication helps connect ELD more directly to the classroom. As a result, mainstream teachers will feel ELD teaching is more aligned to what they are doing in the classroom, which helps drive/inspire collaboration. This is a piece that has been missing with our current program.

One device used frequently in the Continuum, which I find to be vague and unhelpful, is that of putting forth a general skill or standard, then saying that the Emerging students will do it "with substantial support," the Expanding students will do it "with moderate support" and the Bridging students will do it "with light support." Firstly, these adjectives, "substantial, moderate and light" have no concrete definition. Secondly, there are some cognitive tasks which simply cannot be done in a meaningful way at the Emerging level because the linguistic proficiency in terms of vocabulary and grammar are simply not there yet. For example, what kind of "substantial" support could I possibly give to a student who is still speaking at the Emerging level (or is, perhaps, still pre-productive?) that will allow him/her to explain cause and effect relationships? I think it's easier from a standards-writing point of view, and perhaps more politically expedient, to merely set the same standard for students at all proficiency levels, and then just say that we'll give the students at lower proficiency levels "more support," but that point of view is so vague and oversimplified as to be meaningless in terms of actual instruction and assessment.

Balance between introducing new English structures and content is key; teaching new explicit English instruction with familiar content which scaffolds to teach new content once explicit English structures have been introduced.

It appears to be up to the educator to connect the grammatical forms to the functions

Does California have data to support the use of these standards? Is Oregon's ELD model appropriate for use with CA's standards?

English Language Development Level Continuum does not appear to be differentiated enough to necessitate different standards for every grade level

If forms are not strategically laid out within the functional language, kids will have holes in their language that will negatively impact their academic success and add work for teachers in trying to fill the holes.

What is the grammatical path for language for students?

Alignment to CCSS is positive if it is done in a way that takes explicit language into consideration

Like the idea of the collaborative, interpretive, productive outline with the explicit linguistic use. However we are not seeing the linguistic structures that would support this.

b. Part II

This section is not as developed as section I. More details and/or tables would be helpful here as well.

c. Part III: Fundamental Literacy Skills Alignment Charts (page 18)

It seems this section is missing information. I do not see any charts for Part III and the information is extremely general in nature.

4. Is there anything you would want to change about the layout and presentation of the standards (see images on pages 14, 15, 16)?

The tables have very small font. It would be better to increase the font size.
It might be easier to read/interpret the modes of communication standards on a one-page table with the following sections: collaborative, interpretive, and productive.

5. What are your reflections on having grade levels versus grade spans of standards?

Grade levels are not as manageable or feasible as grade bands. This would be asking an ELD teachers to master 6-7 different grade levels of standards, plus three proficiency levels for each of those grade levels.
There are foundational language skills that need to be taught to help students access CCSS that does not need to be differentiated by grade level.

Grade band standards provide too much level variation for students in determining their levels and showing growth from the beginning of the grade band to the end. By having grade level standards, more clarity and understanding of student progress will be evident. Moreover, it will provide less confusion when ELD teachers collaborate and have conversations about levels with mainstream teachers, parents, and students.

6. What are the strengths of the document?

A strength of the document that also could be viewed as a limitation because of its location is the final note section. This provides a clear explanation of what this document is and is not. As a result, it might be better to place this at the beginning so readers have this in mind when reviewing the document.

7. What are the limitations?

How do you assess these standards in a way that differentiates between linguistic levels?

How do we show growth within broad concepts such as 'offering opinions'?
What would leveled growth look like?

There are some sections that refer to ELLs and others as ELs. It would be best to pick one and be consistent throughout the document.

There are also a couple of typos in this document.

8. Is anything missing?

Is it being recommended that it is all in the general education classroom? If so, the fidelity of implementation will be challenging and our fear is that explicit language instruction will be lost.

How would students be qualified for ELD based on these standards?

Proficiency level tables for Parts II and III.

Part II indicates the following: "Part II offers something that has been largely absent in prior ELD standards: Attention to how the English language resources available to students are—and can be—used to make meaning and achieve particular communicative purposes." However, what is missing in this section are specific examples or circumstances of what this looks like.

In reading the PLDs at each of the levels, at first glance it seems that there may be some level of subjectivity in determining if a student moves from expanding to bridging in some of the areas. For example, in section 4. Adopting language choices, moderate versus light support adjusting language support may be different from one educator to another. It may be helpful to provide more examples of what this looks like in practice.

Form-based grammatical structures. We understand the need for the function-based language. However, these standards as is do not help us differentiate what en emergent student would linguistically be able or expected to do versus a bridging student

Minor typo issue on page 11: "English" is spelled "Enlgish" in a couple of places at the bottom.

Page 14: There's an extra space in the middle of the word "communicative" in section A.2.

Page 15: There's an extra space in the middle of the word "with" in section 7.

One device used frequently in the Continuum, which I find to be vague and unhelpful, is that of putting forth a general skill or standard, then saying that the Emerging students will do it "with substantial support," the Expanding students will do it "with moderate support" and the Bridging students will do it "with light support." Firstly, these adjectives, "substantial, moderate and light" have no concrete definition. Secondly, there are some cognitive tasks which simply cannot be done in a meaningful way at the Emerging level because the linguistic proficiency in terms of vocabulary and grammar are simply not there yet. For example, what kind of "substantial" support could I possibly give to a student who is still speaking at the Emerging level (or is, perhaps, still pre-productive?) that will allow him/her to explain cause and effect relationships? I think it's easier from a standards-writing *point of view, and perhaps more politically expedient, to merely set the same standard for students at all proficiency levels, and then just say that we'll give the students at lower proficiency levels "more support," but that point of view is so vague and oversimplified as to be meaningless in terms of actual instruction and assessment.*

Along those lines, I feel there is a need for a rubric or something to help define other vague descriptors, such as "short, longer, more detailed." If you asked 100 experts to define these words in terms of expectations, you would get 100 different answers. There isn't anything "standard" about them.

On the positive side, I appreciate the explicit inclusion of "Collaboration" in the standards. There is a tendency to focus so much on the "end game" of Production that teachers frequently make the mistake of jumping straight into having students do independent writing tasks (especially at the secondary level) without devoting enough time to oral language practice. Putting such a spotlight on the actual process of having conversations and interacting will give me more leverage to enforce this part of instruction, with explicit assessments to go with them. You can't assess Collaboration if everyone is always privately writing in their notebooks.

The constructs presented in Part II, "Language Processes" don't really make sense to me. Perhaps if I saw some examples. The "educationese" jargon of the 3 processes sound like gobbledy-gook. I'm hoping that when I see them fleshed out and explained, it will clarify the schema for me.

Question: From the Citations page, it looks like these are pretty much just California's ELD standards. Is that the case?

<u>State Context</u>

9. Is there anything we should know about your particular state context (i.e., political, historical or educational context) that will shape acceptance of these standards within your state?

   In doing a crosswalk of ELP Forms and Functions currently used in Oregon and the Next Generation ELD Standards, every one of the 23 Language Functions used in Oregon are addressed in this packet. Moreover, Next Generation ELD Standards go above and beyond and address content areas. One thing to mention that often is not addressed in current ELD practices but is clearly addressed here is literary analysis.

   a. Is there anything we might include in the standards that will specifically address the need created by this context? [text explanation, graphics, etc.]

b. Is there a public feedback period that you are required or plan to conduct to gather comment on the draft ELP standards before they can be adopted in your state? If so, please describe that process and the amount of time you need to have for public feedback.

10. Are there any features of your current state standards that you would like carried forward into these new standards? Why?