

State Feedback on “Next Generation English Language Development Standards: Supporting Packet for Work on Next Generation ELD Standards Development”

Background information

State name: _____ Kansas _____

Reviewer name: Phyllis Farrar _____ Reviewer email address: pfarrar@ksde.org

Did other individuals from your state contribute to this review? If so, please describe their role(s).

KS ELP Standards Review committee organized Jan. 2013, met virtually 2/23/13, met face-to-face on 4/30/13 with 19 committee members present.

Feedback

General design principles (pages 2-9) – To what extent do you agree with these principles as the basis for new English language proficiency standards?

Principle 1. Basically agree that integrating the four domains in instruction is important. Although integrated, for the purpose of determining weaknesses, one does need to separate domains. Can it be assessed without separating it? Assessment should be consistent with instruction. (Table showing paradigm shifts ‘from-to’ includes proficiency levels on third row, but discussion of proficiency does not belong in this section).

Principle 2: This is our goal, but it may be oversimplified. Bringing a newcomer, or student with interrupted (or no) formal education to meet this goal by the time they graduate is a formidable task. The title of this principle should be “Learning and using academic English”. Discussion of levels of proficiency belongs here. What does “dedicated instruction in ELD that builds into and from instruction in ELA...” look like? Emphasize the role of all content teachers in third line on chart.

Principle 3

Validates that foundational skills are needed, especially for ELLs at upper grades. Literacy skills need to specifically include oral skills, syntax and not just emphasizing reading skills. Caution that reading fluency may be overemphasized. Language proficiency level discussion here should be moved to Principle 2.

Proficiency Level Descriptors (page 11-12) - What feedback do you have on the descriptions and number of levels?

Proficiency must be defined in more than three levels in order to measure a student’s progress. Five levels are needed for teacher, students, parents, and administrators. Each of the three levels should be divided into entry and exit, or rather entry and transitioning. Descriptors are essential for each level. Where is research for proficiency descriptors? Are there no definitions to reference?

Grade-level standards – What feedback do you have on each of the components of the standards?

It is at this point that the ‘correlation’ process needs to be more precisely mapped. It appears that the Framework and General Design Principles precede the CCSS ELA standards, and have been retrofitted. The more familiarity one has with the CCSS ELA standards, the more challenging it is to figure out how Principle 1 / Part 1 is organized.

Part I: Interacting in Meaningful Ways (pages 13-16) Only those familiar with the National Standards for Foreign Languages will quickly understand the organization of communication by Collaborative, Interpretive and Productive functions, yet no rationale is provided in using that organization instead of using the CCSS organization of Reading, Writing, Speaking-Listening, and Language. Since the “charge” to this effort is correspondence to CCSS ELA, rather than to correspond to standards for learning second languages, an explanation is needed.

Part II: Learning About How English Works (page 17-18)

Principle II discusses the importance of Vocabulary, Grammar, and Discourse Level Understandings, yet only grammar is addressed in Part II.

Part III: Fundamental Literacy Skills Alignment Charts (page 18)

Charts relegated to an Appendix sends the message that they are an afterthought, rather than essential.

Is there anything you would want to change about the layout and presentation of the standards (see images on pages 14, 15, 16)?

The relationship between Section 1 and Section 2 (looking at California samples) is not obvious, because the tables are organized differently. Since the Corresponding CCSS ELA standards are listed in the first column on the left for Section 2, that should be the case in Section 1 also. In Section 2 the Corresponding ELA standard references in left column should be listed **on the same row** as each strand (and each should be a live links to ELA document.)

Move the lists of examples in first column to another row at end of the A. Collaborative standards table.

Section 2, Part III should not be provided separately, because the needs of these students could go unnoticed if separated from the rest. Part III should include the grade level chart now provided in Appendix A: Reading Foundational Skills. The Reading Foundational skills chart contains two extremes and no middle ground. Most students perform somewhere in the middle. Some explanation of the middle ground should appear in the chart.

A chart of specific phonemic comparisons between English/other languages should be provided in Appendix A.

What are your reflections on having grade levels versus grade spans of standards? Our group found equal justification for each, and could not come to a preference of one over the other.

What are the strengths of the document?

- Color coding is essential.
- Based in (recent!) research.
- Proficiency based.
- Responding to input from the field creates a stronger product.

What are the limitations?

- Decide on terminology and be consistent. ELP or ELD. Principle 1, 2, 3 or Part 1, 2, 3
- Definitions of “Interpretive”, “Collaborative” are very confusing
- The description in Principle 2 is not accurately reflected in the California sample for Section 2, Part II. There is more grammar, no vocabulary, “discourse level understanding”
- Inconsistency in whether “discourse level understanding” fit in Part 1 (Principle 1) or Part 2 (Principle 2)

Is anything missing?

- PreK standards are essential to support current practices in our state.
- (Were looking at a California citation) Knowledge of Language (orange/brown) section of PLD chart is missing.

State Context

Is there anything we should know about your particular state context (i.e., political, historical or educational context) that will shape acceptance of these standards within your state?

Our prior ELP standards are quite recent, adopted in 2011. We decided that grade level groupings made most sense at the upper elementary, middle school, and high school levels. We are proud of the fact that California references our standards in their document. Historically low incidence areas in our state are experiencing growth in ELL populations. A useful standards document will be appreciated by content teachers who are dealing with new ELL populations.

Is there anything we might include in the standards that will specifically address the need created by this context? [text explanation, graphics, etc.]

Districts are putting lots of effort into professional development to successfully implement the CCSS. The more ELP standards appear to be organized similarly, the easier they will be to integrate.

Is there a public feedback period that you are required or plan to conduct to gather comment on the draft ELP standards before they can be adopted in your state? If so, please describe that process and the amount of time you need to have for public feedback.

The Kansas ELP Standards Review Committee will need opportunities for input on drafts of the document. We try to provide a draft document to the public for 90 days, before final approval. We will need a final/nearly final version to present to the State Board of Education in October and November in order to have a final vote in December. If standards are divided between ELA and Math, both need to be completed by October, in order to be adopted in 2013.

Are there any features of your current state standards that you would like carried forward into these new standards? Why?

PreK standards are needed for school readiness. By starting earlier, we expect students to exit ELL designation more quickly.

Color coding has become a key piece of navigating our state standards. It is surprising how much it helps simplify a complicated document, especially when looking at it online.