

Date: 9/12/13, 3:00 p.m.

English Language Proficiency Standards Committee Minutes

Participating online: C. Barney, G. Bates, J. Becker, S. Bird-Hutchins, S. Brantley, Y. Espinosa, M. Flenthrope, K. Graff, G. Johnson, M. LaForte, J. Lexow, S. Musick, K. Nelson, E. Palmberg, L. Wisdom, S. Yoder, P. Farrar.

1. Introductions

- a. Phyllis Farrar hosted the meeting online using Adobe Connect, issues related to audio were resolved. Due to microphone issues of the host, she forgot to record.

2. Summarize the process

- Project partners:
 - Development: WestEd (non-profit public research and development agency)
 - Management: Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
 - Funding: Understanding Language (Stanford University), the Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center (WestEd and CRESST), and others
- Timeline
 - March [late March or early April] - all day, meet in Emporia: review first draft; formulate and submit detailed responses
 - April or May (meet online) - second draft; formulate and submit detailed response
 - August or Sept. (meet online) - third draft
 - October - present to BOE
 - Publish final draft for public comment
 - November or December - BOE vote on adoption
- Essential elements:
 - Correspondence to the Common Core English Languages Arts (Literacy), Mathematics, and Next Generation Science Standards
 - Guided by the *Framework for English Language Proficiency Development Standards Corresponding to the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards (2012)*.
- ELPA21 "Ground-rules"
 - Adopt "as is" in entirety
 - Each state - "15%" - can add an Introduction (before) and other elements (after), but all standards, terminology, explanatory text remains unchanged
 - Each state can rename (shorten) for their own branding, but the credit goes to ELPA21
 - When review is complete, send findings (typos, cut&paste errors) to lead writer

3. Discussion of pros/cons

Edith: Did the writers follow through on KS request to eliminate mention of idioms specifically rather than all forms of figurative speech?

A: After looking at standard 8 through several grade levels, it was agreed that 'figures of speech' was more prevalent at upper grade levels and 'some idioms' appeared appropriately in lower grades. The writers appeared to have made a thoughtful change in response to our recommendation.

Sylvia: The document does a nice job of giving ownership for ELL instruction to both classroom teachers and ESOL teachers and emphasizes collaboration.

Others agreed.

Sherrri: Checked to confirm that they really meant to use the term 'accommodation' rather than 'adaptation' when mentioning assessment.

Sherrri: Found the documents easy to read, easy to understand, well organized.

Several voices: This will really help classroom teachers.

Phyllis: can these standards be used to guide developing Individual Learning Plans?

Several voices: Yes, the standards and specific correspondences to ELA, math, science, will facilitate planning for individual students, collaboratively with classroom teachers

4. Kansas version – what is missing; what else do we need?

After a quick review of what else the 2011 KS ESOL Standards contained in the appendices, etc. the group came to the consensus that we need, if at all possible to revise or develop a new version of PreK ELP standards. Phyllis pointed out that would be a very appropriate use of our right to add 15%; other states in the group have also voiced interest in PreK standards. It is a topic to pursue with other states in the group, but something we need to do, even if other states are not interested in a joint project.

5. Recommendation

Edith Palmberg/Kathryn Nelson recommended that the ELP Standards be adopted by Kansas. There was 100% agreement from all committee members attending.