



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
 FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

Aug. 5-6 Review participants: 24 total, including 20 K-12 educators, 1 university professor, and 3 ODE staff
 Comments key: **Kinder, 1st, 2nd-3rd, 4th-5th, 6th-8th, 9th-12th, whole group**
 Aug. 2-11 Survey respondents: 48 total, including 25 teachers/ELD specialists from K-5, 6 from grades 6-8, and 8 from high school. Survey respondents' comments in *italics*.
 1 school district employee emailed feedback to D. Bautista directly. This also appears in *italics*.

LOOK AT	PROVIDE FEEDBACK HERE
<p>Page 1 (found on each set of standards) feedback</p> <p>How might the description of Interactive Language Standards be tweaked?</p>	<p>Could we give examples of these categories, beyond just a description? (i.e. For interactive, perhaps an example could be having a conversation with a peer about a story or presented argument.) Since the document will be used by general ed. teachers as well as ELL teachers, more concrete examples would be helpful.</p> <p>Another possible idea: “coordinated use of receptive and productive language to engage in two-way communication”.</p> <p>How about, “Integrated use of listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills”</p> <p>Is there a way to include a hyperlink with examples for all categories?</p> <p>Consider changing “interactive” to “integrated”</p> <p>We wondered about the term “expressive” versus “productive.”</p> <p>Changed ‘Interactive’ to ‘Integrated’. We felt it needed to be a deeper meaning of the word, and an explicit mention of the integration of all four skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing)</p>
<p>Any feedback on the overall ELP progressions found at the bottom of the page?</p>	<p>We disagree with the inclusion of idiomatic expressions so early in the ELD process, and with the lateness of inclusion of complete sentences (i.e. “simple sentences” at level 4). See edits for our suggestions.</p> <p>From the first grade level perspective, the use of idioms for a level 2 proficiency seems like a stretch.</p> <p>We do understand that this continuum is used K-12, therefore, perhaps adding “age appropriate” within each descriptor would help clarify. (or in the overall heading)</p>



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

	<p>Include an explanation of what this ELP progression is and call more attention to it. Include our sentence structure separated for reading/writing. Also place it on each page? We feel it is valuable to the understanding of the “receptive” category.</p> <p>Throughout the standards, level 3 requires students to include simple and compound sentences. We feel the overall ELP chart should be changed for level 3 to say: using frequently occurring words and phrases, some simple and compound sentences, and an increasing number of idiomatic expressions.</p> <p>We are confused about the chart at the bottom of page 1...is it relating to the final bullet? If it is an example of a function, where is an example of a form?</p> <p>See Grades 9-12 Standards document for suggested edits to ELP progressions.</p> <p><i>Afraid folks will use the limited descriptors as a checklists.</i></p> <p><i>The chart appears to stand alone and needs further explanation.</i></p> <p><i>The forms listed are too vague and broad to be truly considered 'forms'.</i></p> <p><i>The table outlining basic level descriptors is the same for K-12. This is unreasonable. We can expect much MUCH more of our 9-12 than our Kinders, especially at the lower levels.</i></p>
Any additional feedback?	<p>Please clarify the word “problem” in line 5, consider including an example similar to what is included for “visual support” and “multimedia”.</p> <p>In dual language programs, younger EL’s don’t necessarily</p>



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

	<p>progress more rapidly and the statement , “In general, ELLs, especially younger ELLs, tend to progress more rapidly...” in bullet point #5 of the Design Features that begins, “A single ELP level...” may alarm some dual language teachers/program coordinators. Suggestion CHANGE the second sentence to read: Progression may vary depending upon program type, age of entry, initial English Proficiency level, native language literacy, and other factors.</p>
--	--

<p>Page 2 (found on each set of standards)</p> <p>Should we use the heading “We believe that...” Is there a better way to say this?</p>	<p>Again, since this document is for general education teachers as well as ELL specialists, we need to stick to a more research-driven, best-practices intro and avoid opinion-based statements. Something along the lines of “Research demonstrates that...”</p> <p>“Based on research we believe that...”</p> <p>“Guiding Principles” instead of “We believe that”</p> <p>“We believe” seems coercive... we would like to suggest changing this heading to: Guiding Principles</p> <p>Research supports and we believe that... (include citations)</p> <p>‘We believe’ is good.</p> <p><i>Please eliminate the ‘We believe.....’ phrase. It really is insignificant as who are ‘we’ and do stakeholders really care what the ‘we’ believes. Stronger phrase would be “Research supports....”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Should the 6 or 7 We believe statements be consistent in their numbering? Ie We believe statement 4 for 1st grade is not the same as the We believe statement 4 for 2-3. etc.</i>• <i>Should the We believe statements regarding limited or interrupted formal education begin at first grade given that there are countries that begin formal academic studies prior to first grade?</i>• <i>Should the We believe statement regarding social, cultural and linguistic background and resources (#3 1st grade, #6 2-3, 4-5) read: will be used or should be used whenever possible rather than can be used?</i>
--	---



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>And most importantly, should the We believe statement (#5 K, 1, 2-3,4-5,6-8) regarding ELLs with disabilities read: ELLs with disabilities will benefit from English language development services. Educators should be aware that these students may learn English according to slightly different paths, but that they still will make progress.</i>
Any additional feedback?	<p>Number 4, which talks about the fact that the standards don't prescribe a curriculum or program model, teaching methods, etc., should be moved somewhere else. It isn't really a belief statement, nor does it fit under the "Research demonstrates that" heading. Rather, it seems to be a footnote to explain what this document DOESN'T do, instead of describing the document.</p> <p>Put the Venn diagram on its own page to increase size and perceived importance.</p> <p>Due to the fact the words "general academic and subject specific words and phrases" are used over and over, it would make sense to have some definition or a link to a list of academic words.... [see Key Terms to Define in General Feedback below]</p> <p>It might be helpful to have the Relationships and Convergences diagram on its own page.</p> <p><i>It's strange that the belief statements are in a different order on the K & 1 documents than the others. I understand why the limited schooling statement isn't on those, but it's still in a different order.</i></p> <p><i>I am wondering what the expectation is for growth. In the past every child was to advance one level every year. That needs to be addressed somewhere.</i></p> <p><i>Please uniform all the belief statements as far as numbering... and why the omission of two beliefs for younger. Also, what does the dually identified belief mean - no waivers of service for any child??? Please address this more clearly.</i></p> <p><i>it's confusing. there's a lot on there</i></p>



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

<p>Page 3 Practices Matrix</p> <p>Note: In the final version of the Standards, this document will be an interactive PDF, with clickable links on this “map/matrix,” bookmarks, and text that can be copied from PDF to Word while retaining formatting.</p> <p>Comments about the layout of the boxes and bullets on the page?</p>	<p>Looks clean and clear. Thumbs up! The links are very helpful.</p> <p>Looks fine assuming that clicking on the link doesn't take the user away from the original document page, but instead opens up a pop-up window which can be viewed and then closed.</p> <p>Include solid boxes instead of a dot to increase readability.</p> <p>We would like to see the bullets become shaded entirely. This would help display the contrast.</p> <p>Like layout. Important to include this; like that the practice standards are spelled out.</p> <p>Glitchy links from the numbers; perhaps the whole box can be the link versus just the number.</p>
<p>General feedback</p>	<p>Make an App for the ELP standards and the practices as it related to the standards. The increase in technology shows a need for this. Or we can do it for money 😊</p> <p>There was a disagreement regarding when “modeled sentences” gets introduced. The K and 1 groups felt that modeled sentences didn't belong in level 1. For later grades (4-5 and higher), the groups felt that modeled sentences belonged in level 1 for their grade spans as well as for K and 1. This disagreement centered on the oral production of modeled sentences, not in terms of writing.</p> <p>Standard 9: We don't understand the selection of English forms across the grade levels and the proficiency levels. It seems random to us. Do these forms correspond with those referenced in the CCSS? Is there a progression here that could be made more evident to the user? Can the progression that is relevant to an ELL be explained? Can we go back to the CA standards to add some more specificity here?</p> <p>Standard 10: In contrast to standard 9, this one is too</p>



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

	<p>specific. The proficiency descriptions don't match the standard. Can this frame be used instead: Connecting ideas and condensing ideas.</p> <p>In general, the standards do not provide enough instructional guidance for ELD teachers. The correspondence to the CCSS is clear. In fact, they seem more like ELA standards than ELD standards. We need the linguistic scaffold to get us to the CCSS. There seems to be more of this at the lower grade levels, which is also a reflection of language/literacy standards of the CCSS. Oregon's focus has been on forms at the expense of function. This seems like the reverse. Function at the expense of form. We need a balance. Maybe Standard 9 and a better Standard 10 should become the primary standards for ELD teachers, and perhaps these should be Standards 1 and 2.</p> <p>Key terms to define/include in glossary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wh- questions• General academic• Modeled sentences (does this mean sentence frames?)• Shared language activities• "Close listening"• Formulaic expressions• Narrate vs. retell (is there a distinction?)• Simple, compound and complex sentences <p><i>Overall I am in favor of the CCSS and the new ELP standards. My only concern, as an applied linguist and frequent professional development provider for K-12 teachers with ELLs, is that the descriptions of 'forms' at the sentence level treat simple, compound, and complex sentences as a linear developmental progression. While it is true in a most basic way that language learners first produce words then phrases then simple sentences then compound then complex, this ignores the very real fact</i></p>
--	---



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

that syntactic maturity cannot be measured in these terms alone. The length of clauses or T-units is a far more accurate measure of proficiency and fluency. The descriptions of form need to include methods of clause elaboration because any clause can be very long and include a wide range of grammatically advanced modifiers; thus, a 'simple' sentence can be very long and complicated reflecting advanced language skills whereas a 'complex' sentence can be short and easy demonstrating only a very low proficiency level. If the standards do not include an accurate description of developmental levels (meaning that clause modification and the use of elaborate constituents in place of basic noun phrases is included) we will produce English learners who can meet the standards by producing very elementary 'complex' sentences, but not produce the range of elaborated clauses that fluent English users display to a limited degree in speech and extensively in writing.

These standards are trying to do too much in one document. To be truly applicable to ELD they will need a considerable amount of unwrapping.

I have some concern that all forms and functions of language are being met in these standards. I don't necessarily believe that they need to be explicitly taught but I would have to take the current standards and see if there are any major holes missing. With such broad standards, I think there could be a lot of gaps because a lot is left up to the teacher to decide. I agree that students progress through levels quicker at the younger grade levels. We need to make sure that the standards are building enough so that when they do reach 4-5th grade they are not getting stuck. I am not sure who is responsible for these standards if we are saying they are taught by ELD and classroom teachers. Does that indicate that classroom and ELD teachers should work collaboratively?

I have some concerns with the new categories. Parents and classroom teachers are accustomed to listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Will the new ELP standardized test be reported out with the new categories receptive, productive, interactive, and linguistic? Parents and teachers will need some explanation about the new categories so they understand what they are and why we have changed them.



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

	<p><i>For years, we have worked tirelessly in extracting our English Language Development from Language Arts. After years of this effort we have finally arrived at the point where we teach a viable, distinct language-based standardized program. As the leader of the district, I have watched the language in our classrooms shift from basic sentence-framed rout production to intensive, in-depth language use. Last year in a classroom visit I heard an EA 1st grader say, "She is wishing she hadn't fallen off the bike." Four years ago, we were happy if our EA 1st graders could say, "She had fallen." These standards and level descriptors, as written, move us back to language arts will undo years of productive, hard, effective work. To truly teach these standards as written, and to preserve ELD as a distinct, explicit content, we will first have to spend a considerable amount of time and money determining, for each standard, each proficiency level and each grade band, what language the students need to perform the task. Statements such as "Explain the argument an author or a speaker makes..." is a language arts standard; "...using mostly simple and a few compound sentences..." gets nowhere near a linguistically assessable target (Grades 6-8, Standard 8, Level 3). How, for example, would I assess "The author said that the Nicaraguan Contra War started with US money," versus, "The author say US money make Contra war and Reagan politics."? Both fit this descriptor, but I would argue they are, linguistically, not the same proficiency levels. I have been part of the state-wide standards review team for the past two years, and spent two previous years working with a national consultant in unwrapping, pacing and mapping our current ELD standards. I will be the first to admit our current standards are inadequate and do not represent the rigor of CCSS. However, these proposed standards, while increasing the rigor, do an enormous and profound disservice to the linguistic needs of our students. We cannot send our ELL students forward from our K-12 schools without a strong command of our English grammar. Under these standards, a student could, technically, exit still using phrases such as 'I no go,' or 'He didn't went.' We can do better than this. These standards do give us the advanced academic structure to hang the language on. They do not give us the language our students need to perform successfully within that structure. It would be extremely difficult for me to support these standards as written.</i></p> <p><i>Every grade level needs its own set of standards. More clarity with regard to dually identified students.</i></p>
--	---



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

	<p><i>I think the draft of ELP standards is a great improvement over the standards in the past. The goals are more specific, with an academic language focus not just social language focus. I do hope that the evaluation for these new standards also focuses on the academic not just the social as it has in the past. Good job we are heading in the right direction!</i></p> <p><i>Having not seen them from their conception, I believe they reflect a great deal of time and careful consideration. I applaud those who laid the ground work for to view today.</i></p> <p><i>Of concern- acknowledging the differences of ELLs appears to be disappearing as performance expectations are generic across all learners. Of note- the explicit recognition that language acquisition takes place across the content areas will help foster teacher/department collaboration to benefit the learning experiences for ELLs.</i></p> <p><i>Would it be good to add color, examples...?</i></p> <p><i>I would like a section that would describe the type of models of teaching these standards. I see these standards to be much more connected to the classroom (which they should be if they connect with common core). As an ELD teacher, I don't know the common core standards for each grade in Math, Science, and Language Arts. I don't know if I could know all of them K-6 and know my standards as well. To be an effective teacher I wouldn't be able to teach K-6 Pull Out ELD and connect every lesson with classroom instruction. So I need to know how the model would look like if this was not the model to be used.</i></p> <p><i>Do not demand certain texts be read. Teachers (good teachers) know their craft and teach SKILLS. This should not be mistaken for required texts. There are too many different options good teachers can use, that a blanket--"You must teach this book" is NOT in students' best interests.</i></p> <p><i>Are these standards compared to the TOFEL test for college entrance? If a person scores a 5 on the ELPA21, will this be tied to a score to the TOFEL?</i></p> <p><i>Based on observation, experience and action research I find the following to be in line with effective teaching practices that promise acceleration in language acquisition as well as</i></p>
--	---



ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
FEEDBACK on Introductory Pages 1-3 and K-12 Standards Overall

	<p><i>academic learning in general:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Organization of the standards into four categories with descriptors</i>• <i>Clear and consistent format</i>• <i>Specific connections to CCSS practices in multiple areas (Venn Diagram, Grid, Table)</i>• <i>Discipline specific practices adjust with grade level</i>
--	--