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THE NEED FOR STATES

- States are in the process of developing or adopting English Language Proficiency Standards

- These standards will need to align with the CCSS and the NGSS to ensure all students receive the rigorous and systematic education they need to graduate college and career ready

- States must have ELP standards aligned to college and career ready standards to receive an ESEA waiver
TIMELINE

**March 2012:** CCSSO convened the English Language Proficiency Development Framework Committee

- Susan Pimentel, Chair (Lead CCSS ELA/Literacy Writer)
- Mariana Castro (Wisconsin Center for Education Research at UW-Madison)
- Gary Cook (Wisconsin Center for Education Research)
- Amanda Kibler (University of Virginia)
- Okhee Lee (New York University)
- David Pook (educational consultant)
- Lydia Stack (former TESOL president)
- Guadalupe Valdés (Stanford)
- Aída Walqui (WestEd)
**Timeline, continued**

- **April 2012:** Initial draft provided to a Rapid Response Expert Feedback Group
  - Elvira Arma (Loyola Marymount University)
  - Rosa Aronson (TESOL)
  - Alison Bailey (UCLA)
  - Tim Boals (WIDA)
  - Phil Daro (lead CCSS math writer)
  - Richard Duran (UC Santa Barbara)
  - Kenji Hakuta (Stanford)
  - Magaly Lavadenz (Loyola Marymount University)
  - Judit Moschkovich (UC Santa Cruz)
  - Gisela O’Brien (Los Angeles Unified School District)
  - Gabriela Uro and select district leaders (Council of Great City Schools)
TIMELINE, CONTINUED

- **June 2012:** Feedback solicited from CCSSO’s English Language Learner State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)

- **July 2012:** Feedback solicited from stakeholders (NGA, NASBE, NCLR, MALDEF, AFT, NEA, NAEYC, NSTA, Achieve, Council of State Science Supervisors, Alliance for Excellent Education, Hunt Institute, PARCC, Smarter Balanced)

- **August 2012:** Finalized for distribution to states in early September
THE FRAMEWORK’S THEORY OF ACTION

“The theory of action embedded in the Framework does not view the ELP standards as a bridge to first cross before acquiring the CCSS and NGSS, but as partner standards articulating practices, knowledge, and skills students need to have access to the CCSS and NGSS. The vision that informs the Framework conceptualizes the acquisition of state ELP standards as intertwined with learning the CCSS and NGSS.”

Introduction to Framework, page 7
**The purpose and Vision of the Framework is:**

- To communicate to ELL stakeholders in states the language practices that all ELLs must acquire in order to successfully engage the CCSS and NGSS and for second language acquisition more generally.

- To outline the underlying English language practices and uses found in the CCSS and the NGSS.

- To sketch out a procedure by which to evaluate the degree of alignment present between the framework (that corresponds to the language demands of the CCSS and NGSS) and the ELP standards under consideration or adopted by states.
WHAT THE FRAMEWORK **DOES NOT DO:**

- Offer a specific set of ELP standards
- Spell out what ELLs should be taught
- Provide a guide for developing assessments
- Articulate how schools should approach teaching ELLs
OUTLINE OF THE FRAMEWORK

- Section 1: Introduction to the Framework
- Section 2: The Framework
- Section 3: The Alignment Protocol
- Section 4: Sample Models of Selective ELP Standards Aligned to Framework
- Section 5: Conclusion
- Section 6: Supplementary Materials
  - Glossary
  - The Distinction Between Alignment and Correspondence
  - Premises Guiding the Development of the ELPD Framework
  - References for Framework
TODAY’S PRESENTATION WILL FOCUS ON:

- An overview of Section Two, the framework itself, including an explanation of:
  - The Standards Match Section
  - The Classroom Match Section
SECTION 2 OF THE FRAMEWORK:

- outlines expectations regarding four key areas that all successful state ELPD standards should address:
  - Foundations
  - Progressions
  - Standards Match
  - Classroom Match
STANDARDS MATCH SECTION

- **Purpose:** to provide information about the uses of language in the Standards

- **Components:** Two sets of tables
  1. One table for each subject — ELA, Math, & Science — outlining the key practices and disciplinary core ideas
  2. One table for each subject — ELA, Math, & Science — unpacking the key practices by:
     - analytical tasks
     - receptive (listening/reading) language functions
     - productive (speaking/writing) language functions
EXAMPLE — Key Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Disciplinary Core Ideas of the NGSS

**Scientific and Engineering Practices**

1. Asking questions (for science) and defining problems (for engineering)
2. Developing and using models
3. Planning and carrying out investigations
4. Analyzing and interpreting data
5. Using mathematics and computational thinking
6. Constructing explanations (for science) and designing solutions (for engineering)
7. Engaging in argument from evidence
8. Obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information

**Disciplinary Core Ideas**

**Physical Sciences**
- PS 1: Matter and its interactions
- PS 2: Motion and stability: Forces and interactions
- PS 3: Energy
- PS 4: Waves and their applications in technologies for information transfer

**Life Sciences**
- LS 1: From molecules to organisms: Structures and processes
- LS 2: Ecosystems: Interactions, energy, and dynamics
- LS 3: Heredity: Inheritance and variation of traits
- LS 4: Biological Evolution: unity and diversity

**Earth and Space Sciences**
- ESS 1: Earth’s place in the universe
- ESS 2: Earth’s systems
- ESS 3: Earth and human activity

**Engineering, Technology, and the Applications of Science**
- ETS 1: Engineering design
- ETS 2: Links among engineering, technology, science, and society

**Cross-cutting concepts**

1. Patterns, similarity, and diversity
2. Cause and effect: Mechanism and explanation
3. Scale, proportion, and quantity
4. Systems and system models
5. Energy and matter: Flows, cycles, and conservation
6. Structure and function
7. Stability and change
## Unpacking Practice 6 of the NGSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key NGSS Practice 6: Construct explanations (science) and design solutions (engineering)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytical Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop explanation or design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analyze the match between explanation or model and a phenomenon or system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Revise explanation or design based on input of others or further observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analyze how well a solution meets design criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receptive language functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comprehend questions and critiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comprehend explanations offered by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comprehend explanations offered by texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordinate texts and representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productive language functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicate (orally and in writing) ideas, concepts, and information related to a phenomenon or system (natural or designed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide information needed by listeners or readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond to questions by amplifying explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond to critiques by countering with further explanation or by accepting as needing further thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Critique or support explanations or designs offered by others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CLASSROOM MATCH SECTION:

- Explicates how to conceptualize the multiple features of students’ and teachers’ language use in the disciplines.
- Includes a table for each discipline that describes and illustrates some of the ways that language is used in diverse classrooms in order to:
  - break down traditional dichotomies between social and academic language
  - to provide a better understanding of what is currently being referred to as academic language and academic literacy.
## Example — Classroom Match Table for Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of classroom language</th>
<th>Teachers’ language use and associated language tasks</th>
<th>Students’ language use and tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations and presentations (one-to-many, many-to-many)</td>
<td>Whole-class participation (one-to-many)</td>
<td>Comprehension of classroom-based and school-based formal and informal written and multimodal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with small groups (one-to-group)</td>
<td>Small group participation (one-to-group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with individual students (one-to-one)</td>
<td>Interaction with individual peers (one-to-one)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with parents (one-to-one)</td>
<td>Interaction with adults within school contexts (one-to-one)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial + classroom registers + disciplinary language and terminology</td>
<td>Colloquial + classroom registers + disciplinary language and terminology</td>
<td>Science-learner written registers + disciplinary language and terminology +disciplinary discourse conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples of registers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom registers used by teachers for several goals or purposes::</td>
<td>Classroom registers used by students for several goals or purposes:</td>
<td>Classroom, school, and science-learner written texts are of multiple types (and expressed through language in certain registers):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Giving directions</td>
<td>• Comprehending oral directions</td>
<td>• Textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Checking for understanding</td>
<td>• Asking for clarification</td>
<td>• Lab or equipment manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitating discussions</td>
<td>• Participating in discussions</td>
<td>• Writing by other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science discourse registers used by teachers for several goals or purposes::</td>
<td>Learner-appropriate science classroom discourse registers and conventions used by students for several goals or purposes:</td>
<td>• Internet materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describing models</td>
<td>• Describing models</td>
<td>• Science-oriented trade books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constructing and defending arguments</td>
<td>• Constructing arguments</td>
<td>• Science press articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing written or verbal explanation of a phenomenon or system</td>
<td>• Providing oral explanations of a phenomenon or system</td>
<td>• Syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• School Announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal documents (e.g., class assignment, quarterly grades, assessment results)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN SUM

- The Framework document is intended to guide states in thinking about ELP standards in ways that carefully articulate both disciplinary practices and embedded language practices.
- The goal is to ensure that states utilize well-crafted ELP standards so that the developing language needs of ELLs are met and all ELLs receive the rigorous and systematic education they need to graduate from high school as college and career ready.