State: **Oregon**

Reviewers included: Nicole Hilton (Tigard-Tualatin SD), Michelle Mercer (Gresham-Barlow SD), Katy Chase (David Douglas SD), Kim Harrington (Hillsboro SD), Pam Bejerano (Centennial SD), Laura Zinck (Central SD), Pedro Marquez (Woodburn SD), Lise Prusko (Medford SD), Jonathan Fost (Newberg SD), and ODE staff (Martha I. Martinez, Michelle McCoy, and Kim Miller.

Overarching Question: How do we lessen redundancy among the standards and tighten the focus of the descriptors?

Page 1 layout and Content	Consensus was to use something other than "Next Generation." Suggestions included:
What title for the standards should be use? *Feedback: Next Generation label sounds Star-Trekkie, ELPS-21, CC-ELPS, CC-ELP Standards?* Purpose: The information here accompanies each set of standards. Is the right information here? Are there any sentences which need rephrasing? Comments about the layout of the boxes and bullets on the page? Other feedback?	• **ELPS-21** • **CC-ELPS** • **Common Core ELP-21 Standards** • **ELPS 2.0 or ELP 2.0 Standards?** There was also consensus to relabel "components" and "competencies" to "standards". Other feedback about the Intro page: • We like the information on the Overview and think it's critical information to share with stakeholders. The layout is fine. We have some minor wording tweak suggestions that are submitted in our edits. • The phrasing seems appropriate as well as the layout. We would suggest an increase in font size if possible. • The boxing allows you to focus on key points. • Can we change " Key Understandings which Permeate the NGELPS" to "Key Understandings" • Might be good to bold…key understandings 1st bullet point bold and capitalize the word "END" …assessment targets for the END of each level" • The 2nd bullet is confusing when compared to bullets 3 and 4 • The bullets could be indented: receptive, productive, interactive, and linguistic. This way they will stand out a little more. • Bullet points do not seem necessary in the boxes under the following section on the first page: Key Understandings which Permeate the NGELPS • It may make sense to put a disclaimer on this section where/how specifically these standards: integrated in the content areas or a specific content-

	based English language development class. In reading this document, it is unclear if this is in a separate class for ELs or in sheltered format in math, science, and/or language arts.

Page 2: Venn Diagram
 	
Does it make sense to have this diagram here with each set of standards? (Will it help provide a deeper context for the standards?)
 	
Other feedback?
	There was unanimous agreement to keep the Venn Diagram. Reasons included:
	
	• **We think this is an important document. It makes sense to show that there is a clear connection to common core. It feels like ELL is NOT standing alone.**
	• **It makes sense because it helps us see the relationships btw. CCSS practices and how they interrelate w/ each other and w/ standards for EL's.**
	• **Yes; we like this included. It is language that general education teachers and administrators understand. It also helps our ELD teachers understand how our standards relate to common core.**
	• **We agree that this diagram is very useful and important for collaborating with administrators, ELL teachers, content teachers, board members, students, etc. It provides a common reference for CCSS and ELPS. Many ELL teachers are unlikely to have an in-depth familiarity with CCSS in both content areas, so this is a helpful scaffold for them.**
	• **This Venn Diagram is very helpful and visual for everyone. However, it would also be helpful to provide a deeper context for standards.**
	
	Additional feedback:
	
	Practice standards – be consistent in labeling them just M, L and S vs MP, LP and SP.
	It would be clearer if the Venn Diagram labels for the practices and portraits matched the ELPS page with MP1 instead of just M1.
	Suggestion: ADD another page that lists the practices/portraits (for each discipline) vertically
	Math
	   MP1……
	   MP2…..
	   ……
	ELA
	   EP1

Standard Statement framing Does the framing each standard statement with "An ELL can…" ". . . during instruction and assessment involving one or more of the following practices" work? Or is this too much text? For each standard statement, please note where you think correspondences with the Practices are either missing or need to be deleted.	**Feedback re: Standard Statement framing and related practices:** • **Simple, clear and appropriate** • **Definitely….we need this info!** • **'An ELL can' is great.** • **This sentence framing provides clarity and is easily translatable for teachers, students, parents, etc.** • **We like the idea of keeping the content area practices on the same page as the PLDs because it encourages the content area teachers to use the various PLDs in planning instruction and assessment for students at a variety of proficiency levels. It makes the standards document something of a teaching tool for content area teachers. It could also be helpful, though, to have (somewhere else in the document) a cross-walk that shows content area teachers which ELPS match up with their various content area practices.** **Additional correspondences:** • **Standard 4: might want to add MP7** • **Standard 5: might want to add SP1, MP2— quantitatively** **Suggested edits to Standard 6 are summarized below and were incorporated into the attached draft using Track Changes:** • **Eliminate: "with few, if any, supporting…" from level 1** **Change the word: "with"…(supporting statements etc.) to the word: "including" for level 2 and change "with" to "using" for levels 3, 4, 5.**
Receptive Language Competencies Is there a way we might lessen the redundancy in the standard #1 and standard #2 descriptors? Although standards 2 and 3 are similar, the intent of standard 3 is to focus on "evidence" and "close reading and listening." Do the proficiency level descriptions for standard 3 adequately	**See attached draft for our suggestions regarding how to reduce redundancy.** **RE: Standards 2 and 3:** • **Standard 3: Levels 2 and 3 seem very similar and we are unsure of how instruction would differ between levels. Maybe adding the word "context-reduced" would alleviate the problem? Would like to keep Standard 3 but it does need to be further distinguished from Standard 2. Perhaps level 1 is not relevant to Standard 3.** • **The focus with standard 3 has more to do with technology and it does seem to adequately convey**

convey this emphasis? If not, how can this emphasis be strengthened? Other feedback?	**meaning as intended.** **[Several of these and additional edits were incorporated into the attached Grade 6-8 Draft doc.]**
Productive Language Competencies Is there a way we might lessen the redundancy in the standard #4 and standard #4 descriptors?	Some suggested edits are noted below. Additional edits have been incorporated into the draft using Track Changes. **Change "Summarize" in levels 1 and 2 to the word "Retell"** **Define adequate command—put in parenthesis after the word "adequate": eg. adequate (intermediate level) command?, "adequate (understandable) command"? "adequate (functional) command"?**
Should #4 be "Write and speak about complex ideas" or "Write and speak about grade-appropriate ideas"? Also are some parallels between #4 and #6. Need to compare proficiency levels in 4 and 6 to make sure they are parallel. [Tweak 4 to make in alignment with 6 – especially around graphic organizers.] Other feedback?	Feedback Re: Standard 4: **Leave it as "complex ideas"** **It would be better to have #4 be Write and speak about grade-appropriate ideas. This way, the standard's target leaves no room for ambiguity about meeting in this area.** **There is only one common CCSS standard that is to be used in assessing #4 and #6: EP5. Read, write, and speak grounded in evidence. As a result, despite the parallels, they are distinct standards.** **In standard 4 level 1, add "graphic organizers" after the word "illustrations"** **[Several of these and additional edits were incorporated into the attached Grade 6-8 Draft doc.]**
Interactive Language Competencies In Standard #9 – how might we break down the descriptors for the language needed for "analyze the arguments of others"? (Right now, it's the same phrase.) Other feedback?	**General feedback: in the descriptors, make sure the language is similar in each proficiency level across all standards when we are talking about the same linguistic structures. For example , in level 1 descriptors always say 'simple phrases'.** **General Feedback: include the first letter of each component with the letter of the standard in all the labeling. For example, standards 1, 2, 3 would now be R1, R2, R3; 4, 5, 6 would be P4, P5, P6, etc. This would also match the way other standards are written.** **General Feedback: level 4 is really level 5. An intermediary step needs to include a bridge between 3 and 4, specifically with regards to:**

	• **Sentence frames: 3 using them to to complete thoughts and sentences using them to aid in the construction of thoughts and sentences (i.e. 3: The civil war was _____ in the north but _____ in the south.; 4: _____, however, _____. Therefore _____. Level 5 has no sentences frames.**
	Vocabulary in level 3 should include basic academic vocabulary, but in level 4 should transition to complex academic vocabulary.
	[Several of these and additional edits were incorporated into the attached Grade 6-8 Draft doc.]
Linguistic Competencies and Resources Do the descriptors in standard #10 cover the conventions from a ELD perspective? Could something more be added to standard #12? (Is it too general?) If so, what might be added? Other feedback?	**#10 We essentially rewrote the whole thing because of our concerns regarding the fine line between ELA and ELP standards. (i.e. holding ELLs to a higher standard than native English-speakers) The only way we really saw around this issue (other than eliminating #10 altogether) was to look at it via an ELL lens. What do ELLs SPECIFICALLY need to know about English conventions in order to effectively communicate in English? This is a separate issue from the teaching of conventions to native English-speakers. For example, in English our intonation goes down when we end a declarative sentence (i.e. use a period). Non-native speakers of English will likely need to be explicitly taught this intonation convention both for oral and written purposes, whereas native English-speakers only need to be taught the written convention.** **Also, the only qualifiers in #10 were vague, un-measurable adjectives, such as "limited, basic, etc." to describe accuracy levels. So, we added more specifics to what the students would be actually doing. The specifics we added were chosen based on the grades 6-8 band. They would need to be totally different for each grade level band due to developmental levels of children at those various grade levels.** **#11 Other options for the word "chunk" include: clusters, formulaic phrases or rote phrases.** **We do not feel that the reference to native language skills is appropriate for this particular part of the standards. It is not measurable or supportable from an instructional point of view, except in established bilingual programs. Even in bilingual programs, though, the content area standards are**

used, not ELP standards. All students ending stage 1 should be able to produce at least the single words or chunks referred to in the rest of the PLD. We get and support the philosophy behind the reference to L1 (i.e. to explicitly acknowledge and value L1 skills), but the only people who are likely to read the PLDs in such detail are ELL teachers (not content area teachers or administrators), so it's rather an unnecessary preaching to the choir.

#12 Another example of preaching to the choir. We can't figure out how to make this standard feasible at all. Again, we understand and agree with the philosophical idea that L1 should be valued and used as an asset to learning English. However, as a teacher, I am unlikely to know enough about all of the various languages of my students to even know what is similar and what is different. I am unable to assess my students' knowledge of the structure of their L1. I am unable to even talk to my newcomer, non-English proficient student about his/her experiences and linguistic knowledge. So, how am I supposed to implement this standard instructionally? Also, how would it be assessed on ELPA-21?

The piece in levels 4 and 5 about registers is already addressed in standard #5. ELL or content area teachers who have enough knowledge about a student's L1 to even recognize a "transfer error" will already take it into account when assessing other ELP standards. It doesn't seem necessary to have a whole other standard about it.

Perhaps it would make more sense to add something to the Overview page to reinforce the importance and value of L1, since this page is more likely to be seen and read by non-ELL specialists, such as content-area teachers, administrators and board members.

[Following are another reviewer's comments on this section .]

A way to make these descriptors more concrete and help clarify, there could be an example that increases with complexity at each level. E.g. Bear brown; There is a brown bear; etc.

#12 – Maybe add specific examples provide by the student that show the understanding between L1 and L2. For example, word order for nouns and adjectives; third person present tense appears to be plural from the L1 perspective;

	embedded question word order in English versus other languages; use of articles in L2 versus no usage in some L1; auxiliary verbs in English such as "do" in question format; declensions in L1 versus additional word use in L2; etc. [Several of these edits were incorporated into the attached Grade 6-8 Draft doc.]
Other comments/feedback	

The following document you provided us on Qualifiers helped to frame our review of the proficiency level descriptions but we didn't but we didn't use this to capture our feedback on these issues. Our feedback is noted in the standards document itself.

Draft analysis – let me know if I misapplied a descriptor:

ELP Standard + descriptor example	Qualifiers in the Descriptors Examine . . .		
	Frequency – number of times	Measures of accuracy (so many errors)	Complexity
1. Listen to and comprehend spoken communication.			highly contextualized words or phrases in simple oral directions vs. basic, grade-appropriate words and phrases, simple explanations
2. Read and construct meaning from literary and informational texts, and from viewing multimedia.	frequently occurring words and phrases vs. basic words and phrases in written texts		
3. Extract evidence from text through close reading or listening.			key words and phrases as evidence vs. Identify literal statements as evidence
4. Write and speak about complex ideas.		with limited command vs. basic command of academic and discipline-specific vocabulary	
5. Adapt language choices to intended audience and purpose	Respond in varying degrees of appropriateness vs. Make mostly appropriate language choices		
6. Construct a claim and support it with reasoning and evidence	Use high-frequency words and phrases learned as a 'chunk[1],' and illustrations vs. Use a growing number of words, phrases, and sentence frames to write basic claims		
7. Evaluate and communicate information gathered through research clearly and effectively in response to a defined task and			use paralinguistic cues (e.g., gestures), single words, diagrams and illustrations,

---

[1] Note – I haven't yet substituted "formulaic expressions" for "chunk"

	Qualifiers in the Descriptors Examine . . .		
ELP Standard + descriptor example	Frequency – number of times	Measures of accuracy (so many errors)	Complexity
purpose.			and phrases learned as a "chunk" vs. use a growing number of words, phrases, and sentence frames
8. Express information and ideas in discussions and presentations, and respond to participant or audience comments and questions	make minimal contributions vs. make limited contributions		
9. Analyze and critique the arguments of others.			using paralinguistic cues (e.g., gestures), single words, simple phrases, and phrases learned as a "chunk." Vs. using a growing number of words and phrases, and completing sentence frames.
10. Develop command of standard English conventions		with limited accuracy in punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and usage. Vs. with basic accuracy in punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and usage.	
11. Create coherent and cohesive text and speech.	Produce single words and phrases learned as a 'chunk' vs. Use a growing number of words, phrases, and sentences		
12. Apply knowledge of language to support learning of English.			begin to apply this knowledge to communicate in English vs. but with some language transfer errors are evident.