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Flexibility to Improve Achievement and Instruction

- Flexibility on the 2013–14 timeline for achieving 100 percent proficiency
- Flexibility on district and school improvement and accountability requirements
- Flexibility on the use of federal education funds

“This voluntary opportunity will provide educators and state and local leaders with flexibility…to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction.”

—Secretary Duncan
Principles for Improving Achievement and Instruction

1. College- and career-ready expectations for all students

2. State-developed differentiated recognition, accountability, and support

3. Supporting effective instruction and leadership

4. Reducing duplication and unnecessary burden
Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations

- Adopt college- and career-ready standards in reading and mathematics.
- Transition to and implement standards statewide for all students and schools.
- Develop and administer aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth.
- Adopt corresponding English language proficiency standards and aligned assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–12</td>
<td>Adopt CCR standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–13</td>
<td>Implement CCR standards and pilot assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–14</td>
<td>Administer assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations

- Commit to developing and adopting **English language proficiency (ELP) standards** that correspond to college- and career-ready standards.
- Transition to and implement ELP standards statewide for all ELL students and schools.
- Develop and administer aligned, high-quality ELP assessments that measure student growth and reflect the academic language skills necessary to access college- and career-ready standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commit to adopting ELP Standards.</th>
<th>Adopt ELP standards.</th>
<th>Implement ELP standards and pilot assessments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Principle 2: Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

- Develop system to ensure continuous improvement in all Title I schools.
- Set ambitious but achievable performance targets.
- Provide recognition for high-progress and highest performing schools.
- Effect dramatic, systemic change in the lowest performing schools.
- Identify and implement interventions in schools with the greatest achievement gaps and with subgroups that are furthest behind.
- Build state, district, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set new targets</td>
<td>Recognize schools, implement interventions, and build capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

- Teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that
  - **Meaningfully differentiate performance**
    - Multiple valid measures
    - As a significant factor: data on student growth (ELLs)
    - Other measures of professional practice
  - **Use multiple valid measures, including student growth**
    - Alternative measures of student learning such as interim assessments, end-of-course tests, objective performance-based assessments, and ELP assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopt state guidelines</th>
<th>Develop local systems</th>
<th>Pilot local systems</th>
<th>Implement local systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Number of K–12 LEP Students Identified and Number Participating in Title III-Funded Language Instruction Educational Programs, by School Year: School Years 2002–03 Through 2009–10

NOTE: The CSPR did not ask for the number of LEP students identified in school year 2006-07, but the number can be estimated based on the fact that from SY 2004–05 to 2005–06, and 2007–08 to SY2009–10 an average of just above 95 percent of identified LEP students were served in Title III programs.

Number of English Learners in the United States, by County, School Year 2009–10

Data from National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data (CCD) "Local Education Agency Universe Survey" 2009-10
## High LEP Population Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-12 Schools in the CRDC (2009–10)</th>
<th>Percentage of First- and Second-Year Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% or fewer LEP students (52,260 schools)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% or more LEP students (9,360 schools)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% or more LEP students (6,580 schools)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% or more LEP students (2,760 schools)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparation of Teachers to Serve ELLs

• Six states have specific coursework requirements that require all teachers to complete a certain number of credits or semester hours of coursework in instructional techniques appropriate for ELLs (Arizona, California, Florida, New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts).
• 16 states make general reference to special needs of ELLs.
• 14 states have no requirements.

Source: Samson and Collins, “Preparing All Teachers to Meet the Needs of English Language Learners” (Washington DC: Center for American Progress, 2012).
Essential Questions

• How do we better prepare teachers to work with ELLs and why is it important?
• What are promising practices all teachers can employ when working with ELLs?
• How do we improve teacher effectiveness in English language development, including academic language, and content instruction for ELLs?
• How do we evaluate effective teacher preparation programs? What is effective?
• How should evaluation systems determine effectiveness of teachers of ELLs?
Diane August
Managing Director
National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality
American Institutes for Research
Teacher Quality Center Work Related to ELLs

• Summary of TQ Center Expert Forum on the Evaluation of Teachers of ELLs, July 2012.
• Concurrent working session at TQ conference, Systems That Last: Great Teachers and Leaders for America’s Schools, September 5–7
• AIR Pocket Guide on challenges in evaluating teachers with ELLs in their classrooms, and description of state waiver provisions related to teacher evaluation systems inclusive of ELLs, and promising practices
TQ Center Expert Forum Summary on the Evaluation of Teachers of ELLs, July 2012

- TQ Center convened a group of national experts in DC
- Forum summary addresses
  - Current efforts to develop evaluation systems that assess how well teachers of ELLs are educating this group of students
  - Challenges to the development of these systems
  - State and district considerations when designing evaluation systems
• Evaluating Teachers of English Language Learners: Addressing State Challenges
  - Susana Cordova, Chief Academic Officer, Denver Public Schools (DPS)
    - DPS Framework for Effective Teaching
  - Giselle Lundy Ponce, AFT lead on ELLs
    - I3 grant to incorporate effective teaching of ELLs into New York and Rhode Island state evaluation systems
Bob Pritchard, Professor of Education at CSU, Sacramento

- Team member at Center to Support Excellence in Teaching, Stanford University
- Team is developing an observation protocol to identify effective practices for developing academic language (vocabulary, syntax, discourse) in ELLs.
- Protocol: Academic Language Learning in Every Subject (ALLIES)
- Resources available: [www.tqsourse.org](http://www.tqsourse.org)
• Challenges and solutions to addressing the needs and strengths of ELLs
• Survey of state efforts to address ELLs in the waiver provisions
• Topics
  ▪ College- and career-ready standards
  ▪ Differentiated accountability systems
  ▪ Supporting effective instruction and leadership
Evaluating Teachers of English Language Learners: What (and Whom) Are We Evaluating?

Robert Linquanti
Project Director and Senior Researcher
WestEd

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality ELL Webinar
September 12, 2012
Key Points of this brief talk

- In evaluating teachers: Do no harm, recognize and respond to complexity.
- ELs not monolithic, require responsive assessment systems.
- Educators have dual obligation to ELs.
- ELs’ English language proficiency (ELP) affects their academic performance.
- It takes time to learn academic English, and it matters where and when you start.
- New standards change game for all.
Do no harm—address complexity

- Avoid standardized test scores as main basis to evaluate individual teachers—deeply flawed
  - Not valid or reliable for this purpose—even value-added measures too unstable to overcome this
  - Multiple factors influence student learning gains
  - Attribution of outcomes particularly difficult for ELs
  - Unintended consequences likely

- Emergent and promising: Multiple measures within strong theoretical framework
  - Defined teacher expectations
  - Aligned observation instruments, trained observers, multiple observations over time with feedback
  - Student feedback surveys
  - Student achievement gains as appropriate

(Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, Ravitch, Rothstein, Shavelson, & Shepard, 2010; Kane & Staiger, 2012)
ELs are not a monolithic group.

- Diverse in ways important for instruction and assessment:
  - Initial ELP level and grade on entry
  - Current ELP (listening, speaking, reading, writing)
  - Initial/current Level of L1 proficiency
  - U.S.-born versus immigrant/G1.5 (age of entry)
  - Prior formal schooling
  - Ethnolinguistic minority status in home country
  - Sociocultural distance from U.S. schooling
If an English learner performs poorly on academic content assessment...

Is it due to

- Insufficient language proficiency to demonstrate content knowledge?
- Lack of content knowledge? (opportunity to learn content?)
- Construct-irrelevant interference? (Unnecessarily complex language)
- Other sources of bias or error? (Cultural distance, dialectical variation, rater misinterpretation)
Challenges for Assessment Systems

New assessments based on Common Core:

• Must yield valid inferences for EL students at varying levels of English language proficiency.
• Must be unbiased with respect to language, even while language has become part of the new definition of content.

New English language proficiency assessments:

• Must reflect and measure language demands inherent in the content standards.
• Must capture the breadth, depth, and complexity of receptive and productive language uses.
Language Demands of Common Core

• CCSS language-richness better signals general/discipline-specific academic language, but
• Need to distinguish language related versus unrelated to focal construct(s) being measured
• Unnecessary linguistic complexity unrelated to focal construct represents “construct-irrelevant” source of systematic measurement error
• What’s necessary, what’s not?
  • Language uses inextricably related to enacting/demonstrating complex content knowledge
  • How do we help developers measure on a large scale?

Abedi & Linquanti, 2012
Accommodations can improve access and validity when configured correctly.

- Accommodations research findings mixed
  - 10–20% gap reduction using English dictionaries/glossaries
  - Plain language approaches vary in effectiveness
- Hard to disentangle reasons for this:
  - Necessary language complexity of learning strand?
  - Aggregate findings mask which work for which ELs?
- Promising: Assign configurations of accommodations by student profile/need
  - Emerging evidence of increased effectiveness

Kieffer et al., 2009; Kopriva et al., 2007
EL-Responsive Accommodations

**English-language supports:**
- English dictionary/glossary with extra time
- Plain English

(Pennock-Roman & Rivera, 2011)

**Primary-language supports:**
- Primary-language versions (at Low ELP levels or receiving L1 instruction)
- Dual language (parallel bilingual) with extra time
EL-responsive assessment innovations hold promise and risk: Pursue carefully

Multisemiotic approaches:
• Target ELs at lowest ELP levels in math and science
• “Language minimizing” must be seen as temporary

(see Linquanti, 2011)

Computer adaptive assessment:
• Should “tag” language load of construct-equivalent items
• Automated scoring routines should recognize “interlanguage” features
Educators Have a Dual Obligation to English Learners

1. Provide meaningful access to grade-level academic content via appropriate instruction
2. Develop students’ academic English language proficiency

Interconnected, not separate! Simultaneous, not sequential!

(Lau v. Nichols, Castañeda v. Pickard, NCLB)
ELs’ English Language Proficiency Level Affects Their Academic Performance (ELP necessary, but not sufficient)

Figure 1. Distribution of EL student performance on academic assessments in English-language arts and math by English proficiency level, third grade.

Linquanti, 2011 (from Thompson, 2011)
It Takes ELs Time to Learn Academic English

How long it takes depends on where you start!

Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012
English language proficiency growth rates vary by starting point, grade.

Exhibit 20.
Rates of Growth in ELP Scale Score, Grades 3, 4, 5, by ELP Level in Base Year

Exhibit reads: An EL in grade 3, 4, or 5 beginning at ELP level 4 in the initial year of the analysis is estimated on average to grow from an ELP scale score of 361 to 389 over a three-year period.
Source: Adapted from Cook and Zhao (2011).

Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012
Accurate, Meaningful Accountability Requires a Stable EL Subgroup

Students Who Began as ELs (“English Proficient Learners”)

Current ELs
- 1-5 years in state schools
- Should meet grade-level proficiency; Count in subgroup to hold accountable for equity and access

Long-term ELs
- 6 or more years in state schools
- Should meet annual ELP and academic progress goals
- System not serving them well: % should decrease annually

Met state reclass criteria
Should meet grade-level proficiency; Count in subgroup to hold accountable for equity and access

Set timeframes for and report on ELP progress & attainment.

**Expected English Language Proficiency Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial English Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Entry Point (time zero)</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>2 Years</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
<th>4 Years</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IFEP (not ELL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These expectations can reflect individual EL’s AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 progress criteria.
Set and report on academic progress benchmarks (by ELP level, time).

- Progress benchmarking, indexed progress, growth/status models, others
- By expected ELP level (or actual if higher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>50th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELs Level 1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs Level 2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs Level 3</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs Level 4</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>350*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs Level 5</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>384*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ELs</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>377*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELP Level</th>
<th>0 to 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.32*</td>
<td>1.18*</td>
<td>1.06*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18*</td>
<td>1.06*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.06*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline (Starting Point Based on Initial Level at 1st Year)</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELD Standards-based measures (e.g., revised ELD profile)</td>
<td>ELD 1</td>
<td>ELD 2</td>
<td>ELD 3</td>
<td>ELD 4/5</td>
<td>ELD 4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Lang. Arts: CST/CMA, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) (K-3), Core K-12</th>
<th>FBB</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>Basic 1 (low to mid*)</th>
<th>Basic (mid* to high)</th>
<th>Proficient/ Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math: CST/CMA, Core K-12</th>
<th>FBB</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>Basic (low to mid*)</th>
<th>Basic (mid* to high)</th>
<th>Proficient/ Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FBB = Far Below Basic, BB = Below Basic, B = Basic, P = Proficient, A = Advanced. (*Mid-Basic = 325 on CST-ELA.)

^1ELs are expected to meet reclassification criteria within 5 full years. ELs not meeting reclassification criteria at the beginning of their 6th year are considered Long-Term ELs.
Takeaways

- Evaluating teachers of ELs complex—not just one teacher, not just test scores.
- Academic language use is part of the new content.
- Set and measure ELP progress by time.
- Set and measure academic progress by ELP level/time.
Reframing the Teaching of Academic Language and Approaches for Building System Capacity

Susan O’Hara, Ph.D.
Associate Professor | Executive Director
Ann Jaquith, Ph.D.
Senior Researcher

CENTER TO SUPPORT EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING
Academic Language and Literacy in Every Subject (ALLIES)

- Engaging in systematic research to identify core practices for AL teaching
- Designing a model to build capacity across systems to support enactment of these practices
- Testing feasibility of the model

Supported through a 5-year NPD grant from OELA
Academic language is the set of vocabulary, syntax, and discourse strategies used to describe abstract concepts, complex ideas, and higher-order thinking processes.
Challenges for ELs With the CCSS

• Engage in *productive oral and written* group work with peers.
• Engage in effective *oral and written interactions* with teachers.
• Extract meaning from *complex written texts*.
• *Explain and demonstrate* their knowledge *using emerging complex language* and other communicative strategies in different settings.

Understanding Language Project Stanford University:  
[ell.stanford.edu](http://ell.stanford.edu)
Identifying Effective Teaching Practices for Developing Academic Language

- Stems from protocol for ELA with established predictive validity (PLATO; Grossman et al., 2010)
- Comprehensive review of literature
- Coded videos of instruction
- Conducted a Delphi panel study with national experts
- Developed protocol
- Established interrater reliability
High-Impact Core Practices for Teaching Academic Language

Fortifying Academic Output
(ORL) Provide and support multiple and extended opportunities for oral academic language output.
(PCT) Provide meaningful opportunities to produce complex ideas.

Fostering Academic Interactions
(INT) Provide extended opportunities for interactions.
(COM) Build disciplinary communication skills.

Using Complex Texts
(TXT) Analyze the text to develop disciplinary thinking, language, and literacy.
(RCT) Provide extended and rich opportunities for students to read complex texts.
Video Example

Context
◆ Sheltered 9th grade English class—taught by Patrick Hurley
◆ Intermediate and early advanced speakers.
◆ Have read *To Kill a Mockingbird* and *Of Mice and Men*
◆ Focal conversation skill: supporting your ideas with examples from a text
◆ Prompts on the board

Video Clip
◆ Discussing the main theme:
  “What do you think an important theme in this book is?”
  “An important theme of this book is real courage.”
◆ They prompt each other:
  “What does courage mean?”
  “Can you elaborate on that?”
  “Can you give an example from another book?”
  “How does this apply to our life?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Impact Practices</th>
<th>Fostering Academic Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(INT) Teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in extended interactions using target academic language that directly support content learning and are structured to encourage all students to participate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(COM) Teacher uses interaction opportunities to develop students’ abilities to communicate with one another using discourse moves, language, and thinking processes of the discipline and its experts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Cutting Practices</th>
<th>Modeling AL</th>
<th>Making AL input comprehensible</th>
<th>Guiding learning of AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(MOD) Teacher clearly and completely models (and/or provides models of) target academic language that supports content learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEC) Teacher clearly and completely deconstructs the language being modeled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(INP) Teacher uses a variety of communication strategies that are appropriately differentiated for the multiple levels of language proficiency represented in the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CHK) Teacher uses multiple approaches to check for academic language comprehension and appropriately adjusts instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PRO) Teacher consistently prompts for and provides target academic language for the tasks at appropriate times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FBK) Teacher consistently provides specific and helpful feedback on academic language use related to targeted language use; it appears to help students with the language demands of the activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MET) Teacher clearly engages students activities in which they talk about academic language learning and how it accomplishes communicative purposes in the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational Practices</th>
<th>Aligning and Designing Academic Language Development Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(FAS) Teacher effectively and consistently assesses students’ learning of target language; and uses information to inform instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MAT) Teacher uses support materials to make target academic language understandable or more accessible to use; materials are differentiated for multiple levels of language proficiency represented in the class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AUT) Tasks are engaging and require students to authentically use the target academic language to: understand communicate meaningful and purposeful messages; deepen ideas; and share perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OBJ) Teacher clearly communicates language objective(s), which clearly support(s) content objective(s) by addressing the main academic language demands of the texts and tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Levels of Enactment


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Impact Core Practices for Using Complex Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This set of practices focuses on using complex texts to develop academic language. These practices are highly beneficial because they develop students' overall abilities to practice with and process the language of complex texts, which develops students' overall academic language, while also developing their disciplinary thinking skills, comprehension habits, and content knowledge of specific texts. At the high end, the teacher engages students in analysis of how a text's organization, syntax, and word choice combine to create meaning and fosters analytical discussions of authors' use of language to convey certain meanings for given purposes. At the low end, the teacher uses noncomplex texts (too easy) and/or focuses solely on vocabulary. At the high end, a teacher also provides extended opportunities for students to participate in engaging and language-rich tasks that depend on complex texts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Analyze the text's organization, syntax, and word choice to develop disciplinary thinking, language, and literacy (TXT) |
| Teacher does not engage students in an analysis or mention of a text's organizational features, syntax, or word choice. | Teacher engages students in a cursory analysis or mention of a text's organizational features, syntax, or word choice. | Teacher engages students in some analysis of how a text's organizational features, syntax, and word choice combine to create meaning but misses opportunities to build language, thinking, or comprehension. | Teacher engages students in analysis of how a text's organizational features, syntax, and word choice combine to create meaning; uses as opportunity to build disciplinary language, thinking, and comprehension. |

| Provide extended opportunities for students to participate in tasks using complex texts (RCT) |
| Teacher does not provide opportunities for students to participate in tasks that use complex texts. | Teacher provides limited opportunities for students to participate in tasks that use complex texts. | Teacher provides opportunities for students to participate in tasks that use complex texts; but tasks or texts could be more extended or engaging. | Teacher provides extended opportunities for students to participate in engaging and language-rich tasks that depend on complex texts. |
Partnering with researchers at World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) at the University of Wisconsin on a three-year study to

- Establish reliability, construct and content-related validity of ALLIES protocol.

- Test the predictive validity of ALLIES for academic language growth and academic achievement in math and ELA.

Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fostering Academic Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(current) Teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in extended interactions using target academic language that directly support content learning and are structured to encourage all students to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GEM) Teacher uses interaction opportunities to develop students' abilities to communicate with one another using theirs/our language, and modeling processes of the discipline and its experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Crafting ELA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(MOQ) Teacher clearly and completely models (spoken or written) target academic language that supports content learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MCP) Teacher clearly and completely understands the language being modeled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making ALL comprehensible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CMR) Teacher uses a variety of communication strategies that are appropriately differentiated to the multiple levels of language representation in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CMR) Teacher uses multiple approaches to check for comprehension and appropriately adjust instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding learning of ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PGO) Teacher consistently prompts for and provides target academic language for tasks at appropriate times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PGS) Teacher consistently provides specific and helpful feedback on academic language use related to targeted language use. It appears to help students with the language demands of the activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling ALL Comprehensible (MCP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CMR) Teacher uses a variety of communication strategies that are appropriately differentiated to the multiple levels of language representation in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CMR) Teacher uses multiple approaches to check for comprehension and appropriately adjust instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aligning and Designing Academic Language Development Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PAS) Teacher effectively and consistently assesses students' learning of target language and uses information to inform instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MAT) Teacher uses support materials to make target academic language understandable and more comprehensible to all students. Materials are differentiated for multiple levels of language proficiency represented in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ALT) Tasks are engaging and require students to authentically use the target academic language to understand, communicate, and purposefully engage with the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ALT) Teachers clearly communicate language objectives, which clearly support(s) content objectives, by addressing the main academic language demands of the texts and tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Impact Core Practices for: Using Complex Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze the text’s organization, syntax, and word choice to develop disciplinary thinking, language, and literacy (TCT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher does not engage students in an analysis or mention of a text's organizational features, syntax, or word choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher engages students in a cursory analysis or mention of a text's organizational features, syntax, or word choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze the text’s analysis of how a text's organizational features, syntax, and word choice combine to create meaning: but misses opportunities to build disciplinary language, thinking, and comprehension.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze the text’s analysis of how a text's organizational features, syntax, and word choice combine to create meaning: but misses opportunities to build disciplinary language, thinking, and comprehension.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing extended opportunities for students to participate in tasks using complex texts (RCT)
Framing the Complexity

Which dimensions and features of academic language are being taught? Modes (LSRW)?

Which core practices are being used?

How are the practices working together?
  Are there patterns?

How is the teacher using and adapting practices to address different language levels?
Developing expertise of a complex practice requires instructional capacity.

In your grade-level or subject-area team, in your school, and in your district:

• What instructional capacity is needed in schools and districts to support the enactment of these complex teaching practices for ELs?

• How can teachers, schools, and districts get this needed capacity?
What is instructional capacity?

- The resources that a district, school, or team has to support instruction
- The ability or power to use these resources in the most effective manner
Building Instructional Capacity

I don’t have the skills, knowledge, or time to become a teacher of language.

Teaching language is the ELD teacher’s job.
Four types of instructional resources:

- **Knowledge**
- **Tools and materials**
- **Organizational**
- **Relational**

• Need all four

• Interdependence among resources
Instructional resources are developed through use

Context: Teacher Evaluation System for Teachers of ELL Students

Beliefs and expectations about how a teacher evaluation system works, and its purpose

What policymakers, evaluators, and administrators do

• Knowledge
• Tools
• Organizational
• Relational
Resources

- Susan O’Hara & Ann Jaquith

- Robert Linquanti

- All resources will be posted at [www.tqsource.org](http://www.tqsource.org)
Questions?
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
**Phone:** 877-322-8700 or 202-223-6690
**Website:** www.tqsource.org