



Grade/Grade Span: 9-12
 Table Group: Pam Russell Bejerano, Brad Capener, Esperanza, Pedro Marquez
4 Survey respondents' comments in italics

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
 REVIEW of August 1, 2013 Draft

Additional feedback, including specific editorial suggestions on the Grades 9-12 standards, were inserted directly into the draft ELP standards document on pages 4-8 using Track Changes.

LOOK AT	PROVIDE GENERAL FEEDBACK HERE
Receptive Language Standards, including correspondences	
Standard 1	Visuals added to levels 4 and 5 – especially in science and math visuals are still very integrated into curriculum, but at increasingly complex levels that students will need to be able to access.
Standard 2	
Productive Language Standards, including correspondences	
Standard 3	
Standard 4 The following question is primarily for the groups reviewing grades K and 1 ELP Standards: What to do with Standard 4 for K and 1? We have 2 possible ways to handle it: (1) Not applicable at this grade level or (2) Create very simple descriptors. Please advise.	N/A



Grade/Grade Span: 9-12
 Table Group: Pam Russell Bejerano, Brad Capener, Esperanza, Pedro Marquez
4 Survey respondents' comments in italics

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
 REVIEW of August 1, 2013 Draft

Standard 5	Changed 'substantive' to 'academic' (in 6 also) because we feel it more clearly identifies this as an academic task based on standards versus the ambiguous definition of 'substantive' (especially to a teenager ☺)
Interactive Language Standards including correspondences	
Standard 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsure why the inclusion of 'persuasively' in level 5 when this does not appear to be part of the standard. Being able to articulate well, however, is better than focusing on 'persuasively' and connects with EP5. • Levels 4 and 5 list 'pose and respond to questions' and 'raise and consider questions' – we cannot differentiate skills between these two descriptions. We feel that consistently using the phrase 'ask and answer' is more straight forward and focuses instead on the quality of question versus the way the question is worded. Instead we included Blooms hierarchy words to specify the skill differentiation in the types of questions that students should demonstrate. • Seems this standard should be more differentiated between levels of interaction with the text in terms of Blooms-based use of the information. For example, analyzing versus synthesizing versus evaluating. ***start here tomorrow***
Standard 7	Digital sources are important at every level. We cannot nor should assume level 1 would not access digital resources. This is an imperative component of life in high school.
Standard 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 3 – took out qualifiers. Hard to evaluate 'mostly' and 'a few.' • Level 4 – took out 'U.S.' to leave it open to include other significant documents of the world, especially to incorporate students' cultures into the classroom.
Linguistic Competencies and Resources including correspondences	
Standard 9	
Standard 10	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer standards are definitely better! Challenge will how we get this into



Grade/Grade Span: 9-12
Table Group: Pam Russell Bejerano, Brad Capener, Esperanza, Pedro Marquez
4 Survey respondents' comments in italics

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS
REVIEW of August 1, 2013 Draft

<p>comments/feed back</p>	<p>general education teacher's hands at the secondary level, especially when they have 150+ students in a day and therefore cannot always know the individual levels for each student. We cannot assume a cross-collaboration with core and ELD. This opens the door, but does not, as is, provide the tool to effectively cross collaborate. In ELD this is extremely helpful to cross over our content with some core support. Asking core content teachers to support ELD with this document is challenging with 10 standards and 5 levels each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It would be helpful to include a page with a list of all 10 standards as an overview• Technology should be an assumed integration for all levels all standards. Therefore mentioning it in one specific standard may insinuate that it is only appropriate in specified areas.• Level 1 across all standards need to increase the expectation and rigor. Level 1 students by the end of that level should be capable of producing basic language in oral and written form.• Label the standards R1 = receptive, Standard 1, I6, etc.• General for all standards: use the same qualifiers across levels. For example if we use 'basic' and 'increasingly complex' use this in all 10 standards. Then give us a glossary to define them. <p><i>It is great to finally see modeled sentences at this level. However, the expectations at the lower levels are again too low. My high school newcomers by the end of year 1 were writing and performing dialogues.</i></p> <p><i>Middle and high school entry students pose the greatest challenge, and hopefully levels 1-3 understand and reflect that.</i></p> <p><i>There needs to be more gramatical structures in the standards. Where is the form and function?</i></p> <p><i>Best to get feedback from ELD teachers working with this grade level. Though I don't think it should differ much from say what 5th Graders should know. At some point the ELD standard is the same for many grades because no matter what age you are, you need to achieve all the domains of language in a competent way.</i></p>
----------------------------------	---