

Name: Sandra Brand District: Ashland

Position: ESL Teacher Date: May 27, 2013

Please review the attached Proficiency Level Descriptors and respond in the boxes below to the following questions. ODE will communicate responses with CCSSO and will keep your response as part of the public record in the development of ELP Standards.

Please review to the research provided as background for your response. (on AACC, 2009; Perie, 2008)

Question	Y/N	Comments
1. Does the number of ELP proficiency levels allow for the clear definition of the language skills and knowledge needed to progress toward and ultimately attain proficiency/competency in that level?		5 levels is great
1. Do the proficiency levels both build upon the skills in the earlier levels and lead to the skills in the succeeding levels?		For the most part they do build on succeeding levels, but I don't like when the word "more" is used. There should be specific adjectives, so that one doesn't need to refer back to the previous level in order.
1. Are descriptions of key language competencies as well as of knowledge and skills required for each proficiency level meaningful and clearly provided? (see research)		
a. Are the categories of language competencies (e.g., mode of communication, literacy) appropriate vis-à-vis a description of English language proficiency and levels of proficiency?		For "Collaborative", I'd prefer something more like "Social". Some of the competency labels seem to "flowery", i.e., "Structuring Cohesive Texts". In fact, I think that whole row is vague and repetitive.
a. Are the verbs used (e.g., apply, comprehend) appropriate— Do they make sense?		Whenever it says "more complex" it doesn't provide a specific criteria. It just means "more complex" than the previous level, so the reader, teacher, tester, etc., will need to go back and review all the previous levels in order to make a determination as to what "more" means.

a. Will they be observable/measureable?		The problem with being “measurable” is in the measurer’s understanding of adjectives such as “more complex”, as per my note in the above box. The measurer will need to refer to the previous level’s descriptors in order to make a judgement as to what that means.
a. Are the qualifiers (e.g., substantial, some, minimal, basic) appropriate—Do they make sense? Do they reflect discernible and meaningful distinctions?		These are better than “more”. I think “some”, “minimal”, “basic”, “simple”, “substantial”, etc. make sense and can be easily enough interpreted. However, these terms can be confused; i.e. “basic” and “simple” can mean the exact same thing.
a. Should some of the key language competencies be combined or further differentiated?		I think there are too many, and it should be simplified to make it easier and faster to evaluate a student’s ability.
1. Are the labels for each level meaningful?		Not crazy about the terms “Expanding” and “Bridging”. Any of the columns 2, 3, and 4, could be headed by those terms.
a. ELP proficiency level descriptor labels should be purposeful in terms of their relationship to the purpose of the assessment, the construct assessed, and the intended, supportable inferences arising from the classifications (Cizek & Bunch, 2007).		
a. The labels for the ELP proficiency level descriptors should be clear and reasonable and reflect educational norms and values.		
See Note: in Research		

Here are a couple of phrases I reworded as examples. Some of the categories need more specific adjectives instead of relying on “more”. I guess that is bugging me a bit, though as an ESL teacher, I DO know what the intent is. I just think the phrasing needs clarification.

Collaborative 1 (exit): >use basic conventions to participate in social conversations (rewording)
 Collaborative 3 (exit): >express *somewhat* complex feelings, needs, ideas and opinions using *moderate* oral and written production; respond to questions using *moderate* discourse >participate actively in collaborative conversations in all content areas with moderate to light support as appropriate *to the situation*