Building Capacity for a Collaborative ENL and General Education Model

A FIVE-MODULE COLLABORATIVE COURSE FOR SCHOOL-BASED TEAMS

COURSE BOOKLET

Rhode Island Department of Education
225 Westminster Street
Providence, RI 02903
# Table of Contents

**Preface**

- Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................... i
- Introduction ......................................................................................................................... ii
- Getting Started ................................................................................................................... iv
- Team Member List .............................................................................................................. vii
- Schedule for Collaborative Work Sessions .......................................................................... ix

**Module 1 ............................................................................................................................. 1-1**

**Pre-Work Tasks**

- Read Course Overview
- Complete the Pre-Reading Quick Write on the *Active Reading Organizer for Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend*
- Read Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend
- Complete the Active Reading Organizer
- Preview the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol

**Guided Workshop Materials**

- Course Overview .............................................................................................................. 1-2a
- Module Overview .............................................................................................................. 1-2b
- Text: Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend ................................................................. 1-2c
- Active Reading Organizer .............................................................................................. 1-2d
- Module 1 Guided Workshop Agenda .............................................................................. 1-3
- Module 1 PPT Slides ........................................................................................................ 1-4
- PLC Collaborative Commitment ..................................................................................... 1-5a
- Norm Setting Activity ....................................................................................................... 1-5b
- Norms of Collaboration - Sample ................................................................................ 1-5c
- Goal Setting Activity ........................................................................................................ 1-5d
- Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol ...................................................................... 1-6a
- Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet ................................................................................... 1-6b
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions ................................................................ 1-6c
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories ................................................................................ 1-6d
- Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS .......................................................................................... 1-6e
- Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers ............................................................................... 1-6f
- Video Observation Sheet ................................................................................................. 1-7

**Collaborative Practice Tasks**

- Set date and time for practicing the tuning protocol
- Determine presenting teacher
- Prepare copies of materials

**Module 2 ............................................................................................................................. 2-1**

**Pre-Work Tasks**

- Engage in Round 1 of Lesson Tuning
- Complete the Pre-Reading Quick Write on the *Active Reading Organizer for Leadership in Action*
**Read the Leadership in Action briefs** *(What are learning standards?: I want to know more)*

by the New England Secondary School Consortium

*Complete Active Reading Organizer*

**Guided Workshop Materials**

| Text: What are learning standards?                                                                 | 2-2a |
| Text: I want to know more                                                                           | 2-2b |
| Active Reading Organizer                                                                             | 2-2c |
| Module 2 Guided Workshop Agenda                                                                     | 2-3  |
| Module 2 PPT Slides                                                                                | 2-4  |
| Debriefing Tool                                                                                     | 2-5  |
| Sample – Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet                                                              | 2-6a |
| Blank - Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet                                                               | 2-6b |
| Video Observation Sheet                                                                             | 2-7  |

**Collaborative Practice Materials**

| Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers                                                                 | 2-8a |
| Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol                                                               | 2-8b |
| Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet                                                                       | 2-8c |
| Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions                                                             | 2-8d |
| Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories                                                                   | 2-8e |
| Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS                                                                          | 2-8f |

**Module 3**

**Pre-Work Tasks**

*Engage* in Round 2 of Lesson Tuning

*Complete* the Pre-Reading Quick Write on the *Active Reading Organizer* for Focusing

*Formative Assessment on the Needs of English Language Learners*

*Read Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs of English Language Learners*

*Complete* the Active Reading Organize

**Guided Workshop Materials**

| Text: Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs of English Language Learners | 3-2a |
| Active Reading Organizer                                                     | 3-2b |
| Module 3 Guided Workshop Agenda                                               | 3-3  |
| Module 3 PPT Slides                                                           | 3-4  |
| Debriefing Tool                                                               | 3-5  |
| Text-Based Discussion Sheet                                                   | 3-6a |
| “What’ and ‘Why’ Analysis                                                     | 3-6b |
| Video Observation Sheet                                                       | 3-7  |

**Collaborative Practice Materials**

| Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers                                             | 3-8a |
| Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol                                        | 3-8b |
| Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet                                                | 3-8c |
| Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions                                      | 3-8d |
| Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories                                             | 3-8e |
| Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS                                                     | 3-8f |

**Module 4**

**Pre-Work Tasks**

*Engage* in Round 3 of Lesson Tuning

*Download* readings: *WIDA Can Do Descriptors; 2012 Amplification of the ELD Standards; The GO TO Strategies: Scaffolding Options for Teachers of ELLs K-3*
Complete the Pre-Reading Quick Write on the Active Reading Organizer
Read excerpts of texts for Module 4
Complete the Active Reading Organizer

Guided Workshop Materials
Active Reading Organizer...........................................................................................................4-2
Module 4 Guided Workshop Agenda ..........................................................................................4-3
Module 4 PPT Slides ....................................................................................................................4-4
Debriefing Tool ..........................................................................................................................4-5
Strategy Map - Sample ..............................................................................................................4-6a
Strategy Maps ...........................................................................................................................4-6b-d
Video Observation Sheet ..........................................................................................................4-7

Collaborative Practice Materials
Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers ...........................................................................................4-8a
Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol .................................................................................4-8b
Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet ..............................................................................................4-8c
Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions .............................................................................4-8d
Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories ............................................................................................4-8e
Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS ......................................................................................................4-8f

Module 5 ........................................................................................................................................5-1

Pre-Work Tasks
Engage in Round 4 of Lesson Tuning
Complete the Pre-Reading Quick Write on the Active Reading Organizer for Leadership in Action
Read the Leadership in Action briefs (What are professional learning communities?;
I want to know more) by the New England Secondary School Consortium
Complete the Active Reading Organizer

Guided Workshop Materials
Text: What are professional learning communities?....................................................................5-2a
Text: I want to know more............................................................................................................5-2b
Active Reading Organizer...........................................................................................................5-2c
Module 5 Guided Workshop Agenda ..........................................................................................5-3
Module 5 PPT Slides ....................................................................................................................5-4
Debriefing Tool ..........................................................................................................................5-5
PLC Capacity Assessment .........................................................................................................5-6
Strategic Planning Guide .............................................................................................................5-7a
Strategic Mapping Organizer ....................................................................................................5-7b

Collaborative Practice Materials
Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers ...........................................................................................5-8a
Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol ...................................................................................5-8b
Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet ...............................................................................................5-8c
Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions .............................................................................5-8d
Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories ............................................................................................5-8e
Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS ......................................................................................................5-8f
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In 2014, the Rhode Island Department of Education, with the support of the Northeast Comprehensive Center, solicited volunteers to pilot and assist in the design of tools to support teaching and learning for English Learners across the state for whom English is a new language (ENLs). The Segue Institute for Learning, a public charter school from Central Falls, quickly and eagerly responded to this request. Over the past two years, all three partners worked collaboratively to design, pilot, and refine the materials presented in this five-module course.

The materials provided in the modules for this course have been field tested for over a year at Segue. These materials, particularly the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol, helped enhance instructional practices for English Learners, as well as all students at Segue. Additionally, the materials in this course greatly contributed to the collaborative culture as well.

The Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol, the focal point of this course, was initially based on models of lesson tuning protocols that can be accessed from the National School Reform Faculty (www.nsrfrharmoney.org) and the School Reform Initiative (www.schoolreforminitiative.org). However, the tuning protocol presented in this course has been redesigned to use standards as a tool to refine instructional practice for teachers with English Learners in their classrooms.

As mentioned above, many of the materials in this course were piloted and refined by the faculty and staff at Segue Institute for Learning. RIDE extends a huge thanks to all staff involved in this collective effort.

Anyone interested in 1) learning more about how to use The Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol or 2) observing professional learning communities using the protocol to improve their instruction, should contact any of the following individuals at Segue.

Melissa Lourenco, Head of Middle School/Principal
Email: Melissa.Lourenco@SegueIFL.org
Phone: (401) 721-0964

Tag Tanalski, Literacy Coach
Email: Tag.Tanalski@SegueIFL.org

Amanda Larner, Lead Teacher
Email: Amanda.Larner@SegueIFL.org

For additional information, please contact
Jillian Belanger, Coordinator of ELL Education, RIDE
Email: Jillian.Belanger@ride.ri.gov.
INTRODUCTION

Welcome to Rhode Island’s self-guided and team-based course *Building Capacity for a Collaborative ENL and General Education Model: A Five-Module Course for School-Based Teams*. The purpose of this course is to improve instruction for ENLs by enhancing general instruction in all classrooms. This course was created for school-based teams and professional learning communities interested in increasing their capacity to support English Learners during general content instruction. At the same time, this course will also support high quality instruction for all students, including students with special needs.

**Background**

Over the past decade, the number of ENLs in classrooms across Rhode Island has steadily increased. In order to support the teaching and learning of ENLs, Rhode Island endorses a variety of educational models. One model that Rhode Island has embraced is the *collaboration between ENL and general education teachers*, where classroom teachers routinely work with ENL specialists to develop high quality content instruction that not only meets the needs of native English-speaking students, but also meets the needs of non-native speakers as well.

A compelling body of research suggests that routine collaboration around curriculum, instruction, and assessment is a highly effective method of professional development for teachers\(^1\). In schools where such collaboration is successful, small groups of educators meet routinely in professional learning communities (PLCs) to collaboratively plan and refine their curriculum, instruction and assessment. However, it takes time, resources and strong leadership to become effective at using collaboration to improve instructional practice.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this course is to provide a set of resources and tools to help school-based teams learn how to facilitate the collaborative design of high quality general classroom instruction that meet the needs of ENLs. Therefore, this course was created for school and teacher leaders. This course is also designed to help teams develop the knowledge and skills needed to effectively work together to implement a collaborative model of ENL and General Education. In sum, schools can use this course as a tool to help implement a collaborative model of ENL and general education that will support Rhode Island’s regulations for teaching ENLs.

**Benefits**

Beyond using this course to support the implementation of a collaborative model of ENL and general education, educators who participate in this course can expect to benefit in many ways. In taking this course, participants can expect to strengthen their knowledge and skills related to the following:

---

• How to use a structured tuning protocol to enhance instructional practices at the lesson level.
• How to use standards to design high-quality lessons.
• How to integrate effective ENL teaching and learning strategies into content instruction.
• How to support and expand high quality collaboration school-wide.
GETTING STARTED

For schools interested in this course, we recommend they begin by following the steps below.

**STEP 1 – Put Together a Team**
Successful teams will consist of five to seven educators who are teacher leaders that have strong skills in pedagogy and lesson design and who are also interested in improving their instructional practice as it relates to supporting English Learners. In addition, participants should also be willing to use the knowledge and skills they gain through this course, as well as the various tools provided, to facilitate the learning of other colleagues once the course has been completed. Again, please note, this course is designed to support teachers who work with ENLs, not just ENL teachers.

Staff to consider for the team includes the following:
- ENL Coordinators & Teachers
- Instructional Coaches / Leaders
- Classroom Teachers
- Special Education Teachers

A sheet is provided on the following pages to record information about the individuals taking the course together.

**STEP 2 – Identify Team Roles**
Having clearly defined roles is an important element of an effective team. Once members of the team have been established, take some time to clarify key roles. Some roles to consider are the following, but you may think of others: team leader, note-taker and timekeeper. The team leader is responsible for taking the lead around such key tasks as coordinating meeting times and locations, preparing materials, facilitating the work, etc. The note-taker is responsible for keeping track of notes and decisions made during each meeting. The timekeeper’s primary role is to help each meeting run smoothly by keeping track of the time during each session.

**STEP 3 – Schedule Time to Participate**
We encourage teams to develop a schedule for the course in advance of the first module workshop. A blank schedule is provided on the following pages. This course is divided into five modules, with each module having three phases. The first phase is *pre-work* that participants will complete individually. The second phase is a *guided workshop*. And, the third phase is *collaborative practice* using the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol. The pre-work phase should be completed independently. The guided workshop and collaborative practices phases of each module must be completed as a team.

For scheduling purposes, each team should anticipate spending sixty to ninety minutes on each phase of every module. Therefore, each module should take from three hours to four and a half hours to complete. Given the nature of the content and skills in this course, we encourage teams to schedule two 60-90 minute blocks of time for each module. These might occur in the same week, in which case the course would take five...
weeks to complete. Or, they might occur during back-to-back weeks, in which case the course would take ten weeks to finish. Nonetheless, prior to beginning Module 1, we recommend that the team create and clarify its schedule in advance. A scheduling sheet is provided on the following pages to help with this.

**STEP 4 - Prepare Materials in Advance**
Once the team has been created, roles have been determined, and a schedule for meeting established, make sure all participants have this booklet. While many participants will be comfortable using this book electronically, it has also been designed to be easily be printed and put into a binder. To save paper, the booklet is designed to support double-sided printing.

All resources for this course can be found on the Resources for Families and Educators page of the RIDE website located at this link:

[http://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/EnglishLearnerPrograms/ResourcesforFamiliesandEducators.aspx](http://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/EnglishLearnerPrograms/ResourcesforFamiliesandEducators.aspx)

In addition to this booklet, participants will need access to the following materials as well. All are available through the link above.

- The five PowerPoint presentations for each module.
- YouTube channel of videos demonstrating the protocol being used can be accessed through this link: [https://goo.gl/BWCHPt](https://goo.gl/BWCHPt)
- Additional readings for Module 4
  - WIDA Can Do Descriptors
    - Link: [https://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/#](https://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/#)
  - 2012 Amplification of the ELD Standards – Read
    - Link: [https://www.wida.us/standards/eld.aspx](https://www.wida.us/standards/eld.aspx)
  - The GO TO Strategies: Scaffolding Options for Teachers of English Language Learners, K-12

**Step 5 – Prepare for Module 1**
Prior to meeting for the first guided workshop, all participants should complete the pre-work for Module 1. This begins on page 1-1.
# Team Member List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Position / Title</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Module 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Module 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Collaborative Practice</td>
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Module 1
An Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol

Pre-Work Tasks
- Read Course Overview
- Complete the Pre-Reading Quick Write on the Active Reading Organizer for Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend
- Read Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend
- Complete the Active Reading Organizer
- Preview the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol

Guided Workshop Materials
- Course Overview 1-2a
- Module Overview 1-2b
- Text: Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend 1-2c
- Active Reading Organizer 1-2d
- Module 1 Guided Workshop Agenda 1-3
- Module 1 PPT Slides 1-4
- PLC Collaborative Commitment 1-5a
- Norm Setting Activity 1-5b
- Norms of Collaboration – Sample 1-5c
- Goal Setting Activity 1-5d
- Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol 1-6a
- Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet 1-6b
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions 1-6c
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories 1-6d
- Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS 1-6e
- Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers 1-6f
- Video Observation Sheet 1-7

Demonstration Videos (Not In Booklet)
Link to videos: https://goo.gl/oONSzI
- Step 1 – Determining Roles and Setting Norms
- Step 2 – Presenting Lesson Materials
- Step 3 – Identifying Focus Area for Feedback
- Step 4 - Reviewing Materials

Collaborative Practice Tasks
- Set date and time for practicing the tuning protocol
- Determine presenting teacher
- Prepare copies of materials
Course Objective
This course is designed as a collaborative experience for school-based or district-level professional learning communities (PLCs). The course takes a train-the-trainer approach in order to achieve two main objectives. By the end of the course:

1. A team will be able to effectively use a Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol to support collaborative conversations that are intended to enhance lesson-level instructional practices, particularly related to supporting the teaching of ENLs in content classrooms.
2. Each member of the PLC will be able to use the protocol to facilitate PLCs with colleagues who did not take this course.

The Five Modules
The course is divided into five modules in order to provide a gradual approach to exploring and using the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol. Each module provides information and guidance for using the protocol, which is designed to foster discussions intended to provide feedback to a teacher about his or her lessons. Each module explores specific parts of the tuning protocol.

- Module 1 introduces the protocol and explores Steps 1-4.
- Module 2 explores Step 5 of the protocol, which addresses how to analyze a standard to set the foundation for discussing a teacher's lesson.
- Module 3 dives deeper into Step 6, which emphasizes essential elements of a high quality lesson.
- Module 4 focuses on the section of the protocol that emphasizes discussion about integrating support for ENLs into a lesson.
- In Module 5 teams discuss how they can help other teachers learn about and use the protocol to support instruction for ENLs during content lessons.

Phases of Each Module
Each module is also divided into three phases.

Phase 1 - Pre-Work
Pre-work includes readings and other work designed to prepare individuals to participate in the guided workshop phase of each module. Expected time to complete is 60-90 minutes.

Phase 2 - Guided Workshop
Each guided workshop includes a PowerPoint presentation that teams will work through together. Therefore, the team will need to meet in a location where all participants can view the presentation together. As mentioned above, each guided presentation focuses on a specific topic that will increase participants' knowledge of key elements of the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol. Participants will need to bring this booklet and their pre-work to the guided workshop. During the guided workshop phase of each module, participants will engage in a variety of activities,
from text-based discussions to interactive observations of video clips of the protocol being used by a group of teachers in Rhode Island. **Expected time to complete is 60-90 minutes.**

**Phase 3 – Collaborative Practice**
The third phase of each module occurs after the guided workshop. During the Collaborative Practice phase, the group meets to practice using the *Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol*. **Expected time to complete is 60-90 minutes.**

**Anticipated Total time Commitment for Course is 15 to 20 hours.**

On the following page is a table that provides an overview of the entire course.
## MODULE OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE</th>
<th>PRE-WORK</th>
<th>GUIDED WORKSHOP</th>
<th>COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1</td>
<td>Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol</td>
<td>☐ Read Course Overview.</td>
<td>☐ Complete all activities in the Guided Workshop. This includes text-based discussions and video analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete pre-reading activity Quick Write on the Active Reading Organizer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Read Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete Active Reading Organizer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Review the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2</td>
<td>Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson</td>
<td>☐ Read What are Learning Standards and I Want to Know More.</td>
<td>☐ Complete all activities in the Guided Workshop. This includes text-based discussions and video analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete Active Reading Organizer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td>Tuning the Elements of a Lesson</td>
<td>☐ Read Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs of ENLs.</td>
<td>☐ Complete all activities in the Guided Workshop. This includes text-based discussions and video analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete Active Reading Organizer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>Integrating Supports for ENLs</td>
<td>☐ Read The GO TO Strategies document.</td>
<td>☐ Complete all activities in the Guided Workshop. This includes text-based discussions and video analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete Active Reading Organizer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5</td>
<td>Building Capacity for Routine Collaboration</td>
<td>☐ Read What are Professional Learning Communities and I Want to Know More.</td>
<td>☐ Complete all activities in the Guided Workshop. This includes text-based discussions and video analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete Active Reading Organizer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protocols: A facilitator’s best friend

BY LOIS BROWN EASTON

Protocol. Hearing the word makes some people think of formal dinners or White House etiquette. Others might think of the Kyoto Protocol and treaties among countries. For scientists, the term describes an exact procedure, for physicians, a practice they follow. In the field of education, protocols are simply an agreed upon set of guidelines for conversation. They are a code of behavior, a modus operandi, for groups to use when exploring ideas.

Educating students for a complex world requires powerful professional learning, such as action research, lesson study, and tuning protocols (Easton, 2008), that helps educators reach the next level of excellence in their practice. Used within collaborative groups, protocols can help educators change the culture of school so that all adults and students improve their learning.

CHALLENGING CONVERSATIONS

The National School Reform Faculty (NSRF), whose members developed, refined, and share many of the protocols in use today, says that the structure of a protocol permits “a certain kind of conversation ... which people are not in the habit of having” (wedge.nsrpharmony.org).

By following accepted parameters for conversation, group members can have very focused conversations. Protocols help educators look at student work, artifacts of educator practice, texts relating to education, or problems and issues that surface during educators’ day-to-day lives. The result of using protocols to structure the dialogue within these parameters is an increased and shared understanding among group members that can lead to deeper understanding and action. Protocols also may push people into places they

Continued on p. 2
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have avoided: real issues that, resolved, can make the difference between a school that succeeds and a school that fails the students it serves.

The newly released “Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Professional Development in the U.S. and Abroad,” by Linda Darling-Hammond and a team of researchers at Stanford University’s Educational Leadership Institute, says that teachers need in-depth, sustained, coherent, high-quality professional development to be able to address the daily challenges of teaching and improve student learning. The study points out that teachers in nations whose students consistently outperform the U.S. on international standardized exams routinely engage in professional learning that requires them to collaborate to create and review lessons together, observe one another teaching, offer each other feedback, and assist in selecting and developing curriculum and assessments.

The study from the Stanford team is the first phase of NSDC’s “Multiyear Study of the State of Professional Learning in the U.S.,” supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the MetLife Foundation, and The Wallace Foundation. The study’s purpose is to challenge educators to find ways to improve their professional learning. Protocols can be tools that allow educators to do just that.

OUT OF THE CAVE

Protocols can help bring teachers out of isolation. Accustomed to their side-by-side caves, many fear exposing to peers their classroom practices by sharing strategies and student work. Protocols help such educators feel enlightened by providing the structures and support for difficult conversations.

Most protocols are facilitated in some way, either by an outsider or a group member. Group members also may share facilitator responsibilities. The facilitator often structures the conversation so that discussion deepens as participants take turns listening and speaking.

Effective protocols call upon participants to agree to a set of common assumptions. For example, some groups might agree that:

• We all want to get better in the work we do as educators.
• We all want to be kind and courteous, and to accomplish this, we also need to be thoughtful, insightful, and provocative.
• We need to remember that we are “in this together.” Although we may be focusing on one teacher’s work, what we are doing will reach far beyond that one classroom and the work that teacher is sharing. We are exploring our work as educators, and the outcome will be improved learning for all of us and our students.

These assumptions lead to specific behaviors participants agree on so that members do not feel attacked and the conversation is substantive and provocative without being hurtful to any individual.

Protocols allow groups to have a professional conversation, one that might go awry if allowed to proceed either through inconsequential meanderings (Aunt Felicity used to do that very thing when she was a teacher — was that in Ohio or Iowa? What a character she was!) or unfocused battles where one person’s comment is met by another’s objection. What ensues is a verbal pro and con, attack and counterattack, argument and counterargument. No one else can get a word in — nor, after awhile, do they want to. The conversation literally derails, with wreckage everywhere, particularly the ideas of those who never got to speak. Deep understanding seldom occurs when a conversation turns into a wreck.

Some educators may prefer professional development in the form of “show ‘n’ tell” sharing, “make ‘n’ takes” for their next class activity, or speakers with thrilling ideas that may not ever make it to practice. Protocols are effective tools for deepening the conversation so more meaningful professional learning can occur, resulting in changes in practice so that all students learn.

As the study by the Stanford team tells us, meaningful collaboration among teachers is the key to higher student achievement. Protocols give form to educator collaboration.
SOME BASICS OF PROTOCOLS

WHO: Job-alike groups (grade levels, for example) or mixed-job groups (cross-disciplinary groups) can engage in protocols, as can administrators when on equal footing with other participants. Groups can meet regularly, such as in professional learning communities, or form just for a protocol. Groups need a facilitator in early stages; mature groups can facilitate themselves.

WHAT: The protocols in this issue help groups look at a text, such as “Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the U.S. and Abroad.” They also may be used to examine student work and educators’ practices or to understand problems or issues.

WHEN AND WHERE: Most protocols require about an hour. Protocols, like other forms of powerful professional learning, are best when school-based, but can also bring together teachers from throughout a district or across districts.

WHY: Protocols can help individuals calibrate notions of quality, learn new strategies for teaching, become better learners themselves, and plan and revise the work they do. Protocols can help schools focus on excellence, address issues and problems, and improve both the daily work of learning and long-term work related to vision and mission.

HOW: Consider time already set aside for professional learning or meetings, such as faculty, grade-level, or department meetings. Use other means to convey information about traditional business items. Use protocols for learning during district-allotted professional development days, or shorten or extend the school day for professional development time. The study revealed that teachers in high-performing countries have regular time each day for such collaboration.

TO BEGIN: As with most innovations, start small. Start with people who are “early adopters,” the ones who are like scouts for a wagon train, forging new trails. Invite them to read the study, for example, and to react to it using one of the protocols in this newsletter. Provide or ask someone to provide refreshments. Let others know what you are doing, and ask for time to share what your group is learning.
**Text:** Protocols: A Facilitator's Best Friend

**Purpose for Reading**
This article discusses the important role protocols play in supporting collaborative conversations between educators about their professional practices. As you read, your goal will be understand and explain *why protocols are useful* and *ways they can be used effectively.*

1. **Pre-Reading Quick Write**  
   *Before you read, please use your own words to describe what you think a protocol is.*

2. **Active Reading Strategy**  
   Use this organizer to record your thoughts and ideas from the reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas / Main Points</th>
<th>Connections to Your Learning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas for Further Exploration</th>
<th>What Ideas Stretched Your Thinking?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**After-Reading Quick Writes**  
*What similarities and differences did you notice between your original definition of a protocol and the description in the article? What experiences have you had, if any, using protocols like this?*
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Module 1
An Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol

COURSE OVERVIEW

Welcome

On behalf of the staff at the Rhode Island Department of Education, we would like to welcome you and your colleagues to this module-based online course for supporting Collaborative ENL and General Education.

J. David Sienko
Director of the Office of Students, Community & Academic Supports

Jillian Belanger
Coordinator of English Learner Education

Emily Klein
Education Specialist
Purpose of the Course

By the conclusion of this course, school-level teams should be able to use a standards-based lesson tuning protocol to support high quality integration of the CCSS and WIDA standards into general classroom instruction.

Who Should Take This Course?

Educators interested in learning how to...

- INTEGRATE supports for ENL students into daily instruction;
- ENHANCE their instructional practice;
- BUILD CAPACITY to support ENLs across the school;
- FACILITATE collaborative conversations with colleagues.

Who should be on the team?

- Educators interested in developing skills to facilitate conversations designed to enhance instructional practices, particularly practices involved with supporting ENLs.
- Staff to consider
  - ENL coordinators
  - Instructional Coaches and Leaders
  - Classroom Teachers
  - Special Education Teachers
  - ENL Teachers
  - ENL Coordinators
- Aim for 5-7 Individuals
Overview of Modules

This course is designed to support an inquiry cycle that is divided into five learning modules. Over the course of five modules, teams will become increasingly proficient at using the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol.

Module 1 – Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol
Module 2 – Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson
Module 3 – Tuning Lesson Elements
Module 4 – Integrating Supports for ENLs
Module 5 – Building Capacity for Routine Collaboration

Course Expectations

- We encourage participants and teams to agree to the following expectations to help ensure a successful experience.
  1. Complete all assigned pre-work before each module.
  2. Plan enough time for each phase of work. We encourage 60-90 minutes for each.
  3. As a team, participate in all of the activities.
  4. Be fully present during each module.
  5. Engage in the collaborative practice between modules – this is the heart of the work!

Making a Shared Commitment

- If you have not already done so, use the PLC Collaborative Commitment document in your booklet to establish a shared commitment to the work.
Establishing Group Norms Activity

1. Review the Establishing Group Norms Activity in your booklet.

2. Review the Norms of Collaboration from the Center for Adaptive Schools in your booklet.
   - What norms would you change, add or remove?
   - With your colleagues, create and record your own set of group norms for the course.
   - Record your norms on chart paper and in the space in your booklet so you can refer to them in the future.
   - Bring the poster to each meeting.

We Welcome Your Feedback

This course is a new resource being provided by the Rhode Island Department of Education. As you take this course, you may have ideas about how to improve it. We welcome all suggestions, big and small.

To expedite the giving of feedback, please use this link to access an electronic form where you can send us your thoughts.

https://goo.gl/2dst6a

Module 1

INTRODUCTION
Module 1 Intended Outcomes

By the end of Module 1, participants will:
1. Have an introductory understanding of the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol.
2. Be prepared to use the protocol to begin the first round of lesson tuning as a team.

What Rhode Island Colleagues Have to Say

The Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol really helps me organize my lessons.

Going through the protocols helps generate ideas we can use to support all students, not just English Learners.

It is so helpful to have a facilitator keep the conversation focused!

I do not need to be an expert to participate in this protocol. It works for everyone, from novice to veteran teacher.

Goal Setting Activity

1. Open your booklet to the Goal Setting Activity sheet.
2. Consider and record a personal learning goal for this course.
3. Share your goals as a team.
4. Discuss and record a team goal.
Module 1 Agenda

1. Set personal and team goals for this work
2. Participate in a text-based discussion
3. Complete overview of the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol
4. Watch and discuss demonstration videos
5. Schedule 1st round of tuning practice
6. Prepare for Module 2

The Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol

An Overview

Activity: Text-Based Discussion

As part of your pre-work for Module 1, you were asked to

1. Read the article entitled: Protocols: A Facilitator’s Best Friend, and
2. Complete the Active Reading Organizer

As a group, consider and discuss the following prompts:

- What were the big ideas you took from the reading?
- How can these ideas support progress towards your personal and team goals?
- What experiences have you had using protocols?
- What questions are you left with?
The Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol

1. Determine Roles & Set Norms
2. Present Materials
3. Identify Focus for Feedback
4. Review and Clarify Materials
5. Analyze the Focus Standard
6. Tune the Lesson
7. Reflect and Debrief
8. Prepare for Next Tuning Session

These are the main steps of the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol.

- What do you think is the purpose of each step?
- How do you think each step prepares the group to provide kind and thoughtful feedback?

Step 6 is the heart of the protocol.

- What do you think is the purpose of each part of Step 6?
- How do you think each part of Step 6 prepares the group to provide kind and thoughtful feedback?

Activity: Read, Discuss, and Record

1. Please read and review all of the following documents
   - Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol
   - Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet
   - Feedback Organizer 1 – Guided Questions
   - Feedback Organizer 2 – Categories
   - Feedback Organizer 3 – Praise, Probe Polish
   - Presenting Teacher Prep Sheet

2. After everyone has finished reading, share and discuss your observations.
Video Demonstrations

THE TUNING PROTOCOL: STEPS 1-4

Demonstration Videos

1. During the next series of activities, you will be asked to watch short videos demonstrating the initial steps of the tuning protocol.
2. Each video can be found on the course's Youtube channel by clicking on the following link: https://goo.gl/oONSzI
3. Use the Video Observation Sheet to record your thoughts and observations.
4. Be prepared to share and discuss your observations and thoughts after each video has finished.

Step 1 - Determine Roles & Norms

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the Youtube channel video.
**Demonstration Videos**

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything that left you wondering.

---

**Step 2 - Presenting the Lesson**

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the YouTube channel video.

---

**Demonstration Videos**

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything that left you wondering.
Step 3 - Identifying Focus for Feedback

Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything that left you wondering.

Step 4 – Review and Clarify Materials
Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything that left you wondering.

Wrapping Up Module 1

What was accomplished in Module 1

- Overview of the course
- Discussion of the purpose of protocols
- Introduction to the Standards-Based Tuning Protocol
- Discussion of demonstrations for initial steps in the process of tuning.
Activity

Discuss the intended outcomes for Module 1. To what extent do you feel they were met?

By the end of Module 1, participants will:
1. Have an introductory understanding of the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol.
2. Be prepared to use the protocol to begin the first round of lesson tuning as a team.

Preparing for Collaborative Practice - Round 1

1. Clarify the date and time for practicing the tuning protocol.
2. Determine who the presenting teacher will be to bring a lesson to tune.
3. Determine who will volunteer to facilitate.
4. Have the presenting teacher complete the prep sheet prior to meeting.

Preparing for Module 2

1. All
   • Complete pre-work reading assignments for Module 2.
2. Clarify Date, Time and Location
   • Collaborative Practice
   • Guided Workshop for Module 2
3. Materials to Bring
   • Course Booklet, notes from Round 1 of the collaborative tuning practice.
   • Bring copies of, or have access to, examples of national or state standards. You will spend time unpacking standards during Module 2.
The heart of Rhode Island Collaborative ENL and General Education model is for RIDE to provide districts and schools with resources to help build capacity to help all learners succeed—particularly including English Learners and students with disabilities.
By signing this collaborative commitment, I am agreeing to do my best to fully attend and participate in the Rhode Island Department of Education’s five-module course *Building Capacity for a Collaborative ENL and General Education Model*.

As a member of my school or district’s professional learning community, I agree to do my best to fulfill my individual and collaborative responsibilities during any and all group work.

**Individual Responsibilities**
- Complete all pre-work for each module.
- Follow and support the collaborative norms established by the PLC.

**Collaborative Responsibilities**
- Participate in each of the guided workshops with my professional learning community.
- Participate in each practice round of the *Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol* between each module of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participants</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESTABLISHING GROUP NORMS ACTIVITY

Directions
1. Review the Norms of Collaboration from the Center for Adaptive Schools
2. What norms would you change, add or remove?
3. With your colleagues, create and record your own set of group norms for the course.
4. Record the norms on chart paper and in the space below.
5. Bring the chart to each meeting.

Our Group Norms
1. Pausing
Pausing before responding or asking a question allows time for thinking and enhances dialogue, discussion, and decision-making.

2. Paraphrasing
Using a paraphrase starter that is comfortable for you – “So...” or “As you are...” or “You’re thinking...” – and following the starter with an efficient paraphrase assists members of the group in hearing and understanding one another as they converse and make decisions.

3. Posing Questions
Two intentions of posing questions are to explore and to specify thinking. Questions may be posed to explore perceptions, assumptions, and interpretations, and to invite others to inquire into their thinking. For example, “What might be some conjectures you are exploring?” Use focusing questions such as, “Which students, specifically?” or “What might be an example of that?” to increase the clarity and precision of group members’ thinking. Inquire into others’ ideas before advocating one’s own.

4. Putting Ideas on the Table
Ideas are the heart of meaningful dialogue and discussion. Label the intention of your comments. For example: “Here is one idea...” or “One thought I have is...” or “Here is a possible approach...” or “Another consideration might be...”.

5. Providing Data
Providing data, both qualitative and quantitative, in a variety of forms supports group members in constructing shared understanding from their work. Data have no meaning beyond that which we make of them; shared meaning develops from collaboratively exploring, analyzing, and interpreting data.

6. Paying Attention to Self and Others
Meaningful dialogue and discussion are facilitated when each group member is conscious of self and of others, and is aware of what (s)he is saying and how it is said as well as how others are responding. This includes paying attention to learning styles when planning, facilitating, and participating in group meetings and conversations.

7. Presuming Positive Intentions
Assuming that others’ intentions are positive promotes and facilitates meaningful dialogue and discussion, and prevents unintentional put-downs. Using positive intentions in speech is one manifestation of this norm.

From: Center for Adaptive Schools - www.adaptiveschools.com
GOAL SETTING ACTIVITY

Now that you understand a little more about the course, take a few moments to consider your own personal learning goals. Record them in the space below. Be prepared to share.

**Personal Learning Goal**

**Team Goal**
STANDARDS BASED LESSON TUNING PROTOCOL

Purpose
This protocol provides a structured process for collaborative groups of teachers to use standards to tune a content lesson. Please note that the times below are based on a forty-five-minute time frame. Adjust times as needed.

Preparations and Materials
- Copies of the lesson to be tuned
- Copies of this protocol
- Copies of preferred note-taking sheets
- Copies of relevant standards
- Copies of completed Unpacking Sheet for the Focus Standard

Process

1. **Determine Roles and Set Norms (1 minute)**
   a) **Roles:** Facilitator, Presenting Teacher(s), Time Keeper, Note-Taker
   b) **Norms:** Pausing, Paraphrasing, Posing Questions, Putting Ideas on the Table, Providing Data, Paying Attention to Self and Others, Presuming Positive Intentions, Other: ________________

2. **Present Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Provide BRIEF overview and description of the materials.
   b) Provide important background information about specific classes and students' needs.

3. **Identify Focus for Feedback (1 minute)**
   a) Identify question or area of focus to guide feedback.

4. **Review and Clarify Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Read and review presented materials.
   b) Ask clarifying questions about materials that prompt answers with QUICK responses – e.g. yes/no.

5. **Analyze the Focus Standard (5 minutes)**
   a) Clarify the focus standard.
   b) Identify and discuss the stated and implied knowledge and skills in the focus standard. Use the graphic organizer on the back of this sheet as a resource.

6. **Tune the Lesson (25 minutes)**
   a) Select a tool for collecting feedback.
   b) Silently read, analyze, and take notes.
   c) Share observations of effective practice, particularly what is being done to support ENLs and students with special needs.
   d) Discuss lesson elements and share feedback, particularly strategies for supporting ENLs and students with special needs.

7. **Reflection and Debrief (3 minutes)**
   a) Presenting teacher shares main take-aways.
   b) Participants share insights they gained from the conversation.
   c) Facilitator collects feedback about the process.

8. **Prepare for Next Tuning Session (3 minutes)**
   a) Identify the presenting teacher and facilitator for the next session.
   b) Provide presenting with the tuning prep sheet.
   c) Schedule date and time to meet.
Focus Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Language Demands for ENLs

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment
### Lesson Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Lesson:</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Guiding Question or Area of Focus for Feedback

### Lesson Objectives

- Are the **content**, **literacy**, and/or **language** objectives of the lesson clear and easy to communicate to students?
- Do the **content**, **literacy**, and/or **language** objectives of the lesson clearly identify the following: 1) knowledge (the *what*) students need to have, 2) skills (the *how*) they will use to apply the knowledge, 3) evidence (the *proof*) that will demonstrate the extent to which the knowledge and skills have been mastered?
- Do the **language** / **literacy** objectives align with and support the content objective?

### Feedback / Suggestions

#### Formative Assessment

- Is it clear what evidence / materials will be used to determine how each student will demonstrate learning?
- Is it clear how students will receive feedback about their learning?

#### Instructional Sequence

- Is it clear how the objectives of the lesson will be communicated?
- Do all tasks align with the knowledge and skills in the focus standards?
- Are there opportunities for students to establish background knowledge?
- Are students encouraged to predict or set goals for their learning?
- Are all activities logically sequenced?
- Do students have opportunities to apply and/or practice what they learned?

---

Differentiated Supports for English Learners and Students with Special Needs

- Are there opportunities for student to communicate, interact with, and/or receive content through different modalities over the course of the lesson?
- Is there a sufficient number of support strategies provided throughout the lesson to help English Learners who may be at different levels of English proficiency?
  - Are there strategies to support listening to content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support communicating knowledge of content in English through speaking?
  - Are there strategies to support reading content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support writing about content in English?

Feedback / Suggestions

Motivation and Engagement

- Do students have enough opportunities to have voice or make decisions?
- Will it be clear to students how the knowledge and skills they are learning will be valuable or meaningful?
- Are tasks appropriately challenging for all students?
- Does the lesson sufficiently ensure that ALL students will be successful?
- Do students have opportunities to collaborate with others and/or strengthen relationships through the work and learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Summary of Feedback
## Focus of Feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson &amp; Language Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Supports for Students with Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation &amp; Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus of Feedback:

Praise for Effective Practices

Probing Questions

Suggestions
LESSON TUNING PREPARATION SHEET for PRESENTING TEACHER

Presenting Teacher:  

Content / Grade:  

**Presenter Tasks:** To help everyone get the most out of the limited time to collaborate, please complete the following prior to meeting with the group to tune your lesson.

- Make enough copies of any lesson materials (lesson, texts, etc.)
- Complete and make enough copies of this completed document. This should only take 10 minutes to complete!

**Brief Description of Lesson / Context**

**Lesson Objective (If not clear from lesson materials)**

**Focus Standard**
In the spaces below, record the focus standard of the lesson, as well as any stated or implied knowledge and skills in the standard that need to be taught in the lesson, or that students should already have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Knowledge to be Taught</th>
<th>New Skills to be Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Knowledge Students Should Have</th>
<th>Skills Students Should Already Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Demands**

**What type of feedback would you like?**
**VIDEO OBSERVATION SHEET**

Use this sheet to record your thoughts as you observe the video.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Implications / Interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Connections to Your Own Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Thoughts
Module 2
Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson

Pre-Work Tasks
☐ Engage in Round 1 of Lesson Tuning
☐ Complete the pre-reading quick write from the active reading organizer
☐ Read the following Leadership in Action briefs by the New England Secondary School Consortium:
  o What are learning standards?
  o I want to know more
☐ Complete Active Reading Organizer

Guided Workshop Materials
☐ Text: What are learning standards? 2-2a
☐ Text: I want to know more 2-2b
☐ Active Reading Organizer 2-2c
☐ Module 2 Guided Workshop Agenda 2-3
☐ Module 2 PPT Slides 2-4
☐ Debriefing Tool 2-5
☐ Sample – Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet 2-6a
☐ Blank - Focus Standard Unpacking Sheets 2-6b
☐ Video Observation Sheet 2-7

Collaborative Practice Materials
☐ Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers 2-8a
☐ Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol 2-8b
☐ Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet 2-8c
☐ Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions 2-8d
☐ Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories 2-8e
☐ Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS 2-8f

Demonstration Videos (Not In Booklet)
Link to videos: https://goo.gl/oONSzI
☐ Step 5 – Analyzing the Focus Standard

RIDE Rhode Island Department of Education
What Are Learning Standards?

There has been a lot of national discussion recently about “learning standards.” Yet there has been significantly less discussion about what learning standards specifically are, what they are not, how they actually work in schools, or why they even matter.

In brief, learning standards are concise, clearly articulated descriptions of what students should know and be able to do at a specific stage of their educational journey. For example, here is a fifth-grade reading standard taken from the Common Core State Standards, which have been adopted by 45 states: Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative language such as metaphors and similes. And here is a high school writing standard: Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to the task, purpose, and audience.

To varying degrees, educators have been using standards to guide lesson designs and instruction for years. But simply ensuring standards are taught by teachers is only the first step—the next step is to make sure they are being learned by students.

What You Need to Know

- Standards are not a prepackaged curriculum or course of study—although this is a common misperception. Standards are a fundamental set of academic, intellectual, and skill expectations for students, but it’s school boards, administrators, and teachers who decide how they get taught. Learning standards such as “determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative language such as metaphors and similes” do not tell teachers what texts to assign, how to teach students about metaphors or similes, or even how to determine they have achieved the expected standard. Learning goals are consistent and common, but teaching remains a local decision.

- Standards draw a line in the sand. In effect, standards stipulate that students must learn a particular selection of critical skills and concepts before they can be considered prepared for the next step in their education. Teachers can teach students more, even far more, but not less. In other words, standards establish a common baseline for what it means to be an educated person in the United States, regardless of where students live, what school they attend, or how advantaged or disadvantaged their families are. And the stronger the standards the more students will learn.

- Without some form of standards, we end up with no standards—or, at best, widely uneven and unevenly applied standards. Without a common set of learning standards, we have no consistent or comparable way of determining what is being taught in our schools or gauging how well our teachers and students are doing. Before the Common Core State Standards were created, all 50 states had different learning standards. And before states developed standards, there was almost no consistency in learning expectations throughout the country.

- Standards facilitate greater collaboration and innovation. With common standards, teachers can share the lessons they develop, the instructional strategies they use, and the learning materials they create. In fact, there are now several national online exchanges have been launched that allow teachers share their best lessons, ideas, and teaching materials. Common standards also make it easier and less expensive to develop textbooks, learning software, and other educational resources. Standards do not stifle teacher creativity—in fact, they can give rise to even greater innovation through the power of collaboration, sharing, and collective thinking.

Want to Learn More?

Visit the Leadership in Action website and download I Want to Know More, a selection of information and resources for those interested in reading more about how today’s students learn.
I Want to Know More
A Leadership in Action Supplement

I Want to Know More is a selection of information and resources for education leaders, parents, and community members who want to learn more about the teaching and learning strategies taking place in today’s most innovative high schools.

What Are Learning Standards?

Since the second half of the nineteenth century, educators, elected officials, policy makers, and others have been trying to improve the quality of public schools by encouraging or requiring greater consistency in education. In the 1890s, for instance, the so-called Committee of Ten put forward a standard high school course of study that remains largely intact in most schools to this day. In the early twentieth century, the Carnegie unit was introduced, creating a standard definition for the modern course credit, which also remains widely used in schools today. Later on, the “comprehensive high school” became the dominant model for secondary education, and the vast majority of public high schools built in the latter half of the twentieth century followed the same general educational, organizational, and operational template. And the advent of the “standardized test” introduced a new large-scale method to test students consistently across schools, districts, and state lines.

While learning standards are also an attempt to promote greater consistency in education, there is one critically important difference between today’s learning standards and many previous attempts to “standardize” education: learning standards define the goals of education—what students need to learn—not the processes of education—how schools are structured and how they operate.

Thousands of high-performing schools across the country and the world have taught us an important lesson: no two good schools need to look the same. The most effective schools come in a wide variety of sizes, configurations, and philosophies. But successful college students, skilled and reliable workers, and educated citizens share a specific selection of common attributes: they can read, write, and communicate well; they can think critically and solve problems; they understand math and can use it in their lives; they can comprehend and evaluate basic scientific concepts; they know about economics, American history, and how our government works; and they can use a computer and acquire new technical skills.

When it comes to the fundamental knowledge, skills, and dispositions that our students need to succeed in life, there is no mystery: some things are just so important that they are simply not optional. That’s where learning standards come in. By establishing clear educational goals—while not telling schools how to meet those goals—standards establish consistency in learning while still allowing for a tremendous amount of flexibility, creativity, and innovation in teaching.

Something to Think About

In his book Results Now: How We Can Achieve Unprecedented Improvements in Teaching and Learning, the educator and author Mike Schmoker describes—in alarming detail—the unruly randomness of learning expectations in most schools. Citing decades of studies based on thousands of observations of classroom teaching across the country, Schmoker paints a disturbing picture.
“What do we see in the vast majority of classrooms? We find startling amounts of busy work, with no connection to important standards or a common curriculum…most of what we see is at odds with good practice.”

“In most cases, neither teachers nor students can articulate what they are supposed to be learning that day. They can describe only the activity or assignment, which is often chosen because it keeps kids occupied. Irrelevant worksheets and activities often predominate. Catching students learning the most vital reading and writing standards is heartbreakingly rare. And in defiance of what every educator has learned, there is a glaring absence of the most basic elements of an effective lesson.”

“Robert Marzano points to numerous studies demonstrating that two teachers working with the same socioeconomic population can achieve starkly different results on the same test: in one class, 27 percent of students will pass; in another, 72 percent—a life-changing difference.”

“David Berliner’s team of researchers found that within the same school and grade level, chaos reigns. One teacher taught 28 times as much science as a teacher down the hall, and no one knew this until the researchers went in.”

“Similarly, a research group investigated which standards were actually taught in hundreds of schools and compared the list against state-assessed standards. There was almost no correspondence. They found redundancy and inconsistency at every grade level; what did get taught was taught down. By 5th grade, most students were being given 2nd and 3rd grade material.”

While the findings are alarming, the good news is that Schmoker firmly believes these shortcomings can be quickly and effectively addressed in every state and school. He points out that researchers have already identified one of the biggest problems—a lack of consistent learning standards. “Happily,” he writes, “historic advances can result from acting on what we already know.” He also points out that the critical components of effective schools are “not a mystery.” He describes one teacher who dramatically improved the reading and writing skills of his students by doing “nothing unusual—nothing any teacher couldn’t do or hasn’t already learned.” The problem, according to Schmoker, is simply that teachers are not using a consistent set of strong learning standards, they are not applying those expectations consistently in their day-to-day teaching, and they are not intentionally and purposefully using the fundamental instructional techniques they have learned or could easily acquire. In Schmoker’s view, radically improving student learning won’t require schools to do anything radical.

How Learning Standards Work

While standards systems vary in both content and design, most systems—including the Common Core State Standards and the majority of state-required standards throughout the United States—share a lot of common attributes. Perhaps the biggest potential source of confusion, though, is the terminology used to describe certain features of a standards system. While there is a great deal of consistency in design and intention, there is a staggering degree of inconsistency in how various systems are described and presented. While standards systems are generally highly sophisticated, they are nevertheless easy to understand once you get past the technical descriptions and jargon. This section provides a simplified explanation of learning standards and how they work. (Or click HERE to download a single-page, ledger-sized graphic of this section.)
Learning standards are adopted by states through a state board or legislative approval process.

**Learning Goals**

Most standards systems include some form of long-term learning goals—the big important things that students should know and be able to do when they have completed school. These learning goals are the kinds of things that teachers should be thinking about and cultivating in stages throughout a student’s educational journey. The basic idea is that at the culmination of pre-adult education—graduation from high school—students will be equipped with the most important knowledge, skills, and personal attributes they will need to succeed in life. **Examples:** Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. Use technology and digital media strategically and capably. Understand other perspectives and cultures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning standards are concise, clearly articulated descriptions of what students should know and be able to do at a specific stage of their educational journey. Standards describe learning objectives—that is, where students should be at the end of a course, grade level, or grade span, not the methods that should be used to get them there. The following “College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards,” taken from the Common Core State Standards, provide useful examples of standards that have been specifically developed to promote stronger preparation for college, work, and adult life:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reading: | Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining the technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how word choices shape meaning or tone. |
| Writing: | Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. |
| Language: | Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing and speaking. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Progressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In each content area, standards are also organized by grade level or grade span—they establish learning expectations for students at a specific age, grade, or stage of learning. There are two important things to know about learning progressions: (1) the standards described at each level specifically address the learning needs and abilities of students at a particular stage of their intellectual, emotional, social, and physical development, and (2) they represent clearly articulated learning sequences—that is, each grade-level standard is purposefully designed to prepare students to meet standards at the next grade level. Learning progressions provide a road map for schools—the basic idea is to make sure that students are not only learning age-appropriate material, but that teachers don’t inadvertently repeat material that was taught in earlier grades or teach material that’s either too advanced or not advanced enough. The following examples of elementary reading standards show how learning progressions work, and how each standard builds on the previous one, and how they increase in complexity as students advance from one level to the next:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Kindergarten: | Identify the front cover, back cover, and title page of a book. |
| First Grade: | Know and use various text features (e.g., headings, tables of contents, glossaries, electronic menus, icons) to locate facts or information in a text. |
| Second Grade: | Know and use various text features (e.g., captions, bold print, subheadings, glossaries, indexes, electronic menus, icons) to locate key facts or information in a text efficiently. |
| Third Grade: | Use text features and search tools (e.g., key words, sidebars, hyperlinks) to locate information relevant to a given topic efficiently. |
| Fourth Grade: | Describe the overall structure (e.g., chronology, comparison, cause/effect, problem/solution) of events, ideas, concepts, or information in a text or part of a text. |
### Performance Benchmarks
Typically, teachers will develop a system of intermediate or transitional benchmarks—sometimes called indicators—that help them gauge learning growth over time. Since students are expected to meet a selection of standards by the end of a course or grade level, teachers use performance benchmarks as a way to evaluate student learning as they progressively work toward meeting a standard. During a yearlong course, for example, teachers will use scored assignments, tests, and other forms of assessing student learning growth and achievement to determine if students are meeting expected benchmarks and moving closer to demonstrating mastery of a learning standard (a process generally called “formative assessment” in education parlance). At the end of a course or at established intervals during a course, teachers may require students to demonstrate in some way—by completing a project, for example—that they have indeed achieved the expectations and acquired the skills described in learning standards.

### Performance Descriptors
School leaders and teachers may also create a set of descriptions to guide the evaluation of student performance. While learning standards describe what students need to know and be able to do, performance descriptors define the level or quality of student work, learning acquisition, and skill mastery that needs to be attained to be considered proficient. For example, a common performance-descriptor system might have four tiers: not proficient, partially proficient, proficient, and advanced. Schools will develop short descriptions of what students can or can’t do at all four levels. Teachers then use these descriptions—typically called “rubrics”—to guide their evaluations of student work and determine which level of proficiency students have achieved. When they have reached proficient or advanced—performance that is typically comparable to B- or A-level work—students are deemed to have “met the standard.” Performance standards help schools ensure that teachers are evaluating academic performance in a consistent, comparable, and reliable way—i.e., that the same learning expectations and performance standards are being applied to all students.

### Learning Objectives
In some schools, teachers also develop what are sometimes called “learning objectives” or “daily learning targets”—basically, brief descriptions of what the teachers expect students to learn on a given day or during a particular unit of study. Learning objectives are often written on a blackboard or posted on a classroom wall, and they are intended to make lesson expectations completely explicit and clear to students. In effect, they say: By the end of today’s lesson, I expect you to have learned X, Y, and Z. While similar to learning standards, they are much more specific and narrowly focused—for example, if a writing standard requires students to produce clear and coherent writing appropriate to the task, purpose, and audience, a learning objective may stipulate that students will learn how to properly use commas, colons, semicolons, and periods, and be able to explain the differences among them. In effect, learning objectives are the component parts of a standard—that is, they are a big-picture standard that has been broken down into a series of progressive steps and digestible chunks. Learning objectives are also a way to make the educational process more transparent and understandable. When students know precisely what they are expected to learn on a given day, it becomes easier for them to focus on those objectives and feel a sense of accomplishment when they have achieved them.

---

**How Standards Work in Schools**
In schools, educators develop systems to connect what is taught in the classroom to the standards that students need to learn, as well as systems that help them track learning progress over time.

---

2-2b
What Are the Common Core State Standards?

When first announced in 2009, the Common Core State Standards were met with—and still continue to be haunted by—a fair amount of apprehension and misunderstanding. Some worried that the federal government was trying to nationalize what is taught in public schools (not true), while others worried that teachers would be forced to teach in rigidly prescriptive ways (also not true). Still others worried that the content and quality of the standards wouldn’t be strong (a valid concern before the actual standards were created), while some felt that a new set of learning standards simply wouldn’t change schools for the better (to be determined). There are many arguments that could be put forward in response to these concerns, but perhaps the best and surest way to cut through all the talk about the Common Core State Standards is to actually sit down and read them. After a few minutes, it’s likely that any apprehension will evaporate. The standards are easy to understand and they reflect straightforward, commonsense learning expectations that few educators, parents, college professors, employers, or elected officials would not see as vitally important for students to learn. The Common Core State Standards are simply an attempt to keep schools focused on teaching—and making sure students learn—the most important knowledge, skills, and dispositions they will need to succeed in life. Even if they are not perfect, they are a solid place to start if the goal is prepare our young people to succeed in college, thrive in their careers, and lead lives of active, engaged citizenship.

Here are a few important things to know about the Common Core State Standards:

1. The standards were developed by a committee of educators, content experts, researchers, and representatives of national education organizations, and the final versions reflect feedback received from the general public, teachers, parents, business leaders, states, and content-area experts. In other words, they represent a pretty strong consensus about what matters most—at least as much of a consensus as anyone is likely to achieve on an issue as emotionally charged as learning expectations for students.

2. The standards were also informed by (a) the learning standards used in countries throughout the world with relatively high-performing education systems, (b) the standards already in place throughout the United States, and (c) college and workforce expectations—that is, what students will need to know and be able to do to succeed in higher education and modern careers. The research and evidence supporting the standards is, again, as solid as anyone is likely to see in a set of learning standards.

3. While states were incentivized to adopt the Common Core if they chose to apply for Race to the Top funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (to be eligible for a grant, states had to agree to adopt “internationally benchmarked standards”), all the states that adopted the standards did so voluntarily. The process for adoption requires state board or legislative approval, so the standards were adopted in the same manner that state regulations are created and laws are passed.

The following section—What Is Not Covered in the Standards—is taken from the introduction to the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects, and it provides a solid overview of what the standards are and what they are not. For more detailed summary information on what’s in the Common Core State Standards, we also recommend reading Key Points in English Language Arts and Key Points in Mathematics.

What Is Not Covered by the Standards

The Standards should be recognized for what they are not as well as what they are. The most important intentional design limitations are as follows:

1. The Standards define what all students are expected to know and be able to do, not how teachers should teach. For instance, the use of play with young children is not specified by the
Standards, but it is welcome as a valuable activity in its own right and as a way to help students meet the expectations in this document. Furthermore, while the Standards make references to some particular forms of content, including mythology, foundational U.S. documents, and Shakespeare, they do not—indeed, cannot—enumerate all or even most of the content that students should learn. The Standards must therefore be complemented by a well-developed, content-rich curriculum consistent with the expectations laid out in this document.

2. While the Standards focus on what is most essential, they do not describe all that can or should be taught. A great deal is left to the discretion of teachers and curriculum developers. The aim of the Standards is to articulate the fundamentals, not to set out an exhaustive list or a set of restrictions that limits what can be taught beyond what is specified herein.

3. The Standards do not define the nature of advanced work for students who meet the Standards prior to the end of high school. For those students, advanced work in such areas as literature, composition, language, and journalism should be available. This work should provide the next logical step up from the college and career readiness baseline established here.

4. The Standards set grade-specific standards but do not define the intervention methods or materials necessary to support students who are well below or well above grade-level expectations. No set of grade-specific standards can fully reflect the great variety in abilities, needs, learning rates, and achievement levels of students in any given classroom. However, the Standards do provide clear signposts along the way to the goal of college and career readiness for all students.

5. It is also beyond the scope of the Standards to define the full range of supports appropriate for English language learners and for students with special needs. At the same time, all students must have the opportunity to learn and meet the same high standards if they are to access the knowledge and skills necessary in their post–high school lives.

The Standards should also be read as allowing for the widest possible range of students to participate fully from the outset and as permitting appropriate accommodations to ensure maximum participation of students with special education needs. For example, for students with disabilities reading should allow for the use of Braille, screen-reader technology, or other assistive devices, while writing should include the use of a scribe, computer, or speech-to-text technology. In a similar vein, speaking and listening should be interpreted broadly to include sign language.

6. While the ELA and content area literacy components described herein are critical to college and career readiness, they do not define the whole of such readiness. Students require a wide-ranging, rigorous academic preparation and, particularly in the early grades, attention to such matters as social, emotional, and physical development and approaches to learning. Similarly, the Standards define literacy expectations in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects, but literacy standards in other areas, such as mathematics and health education, modeled on those in this document are strongly encouraged to facilitate a comprehensive, schoolwide literacy program.

Still Want to Know More?
If you are interested in the foundational research behind many of the ideas discussed in the Leadership in Action series, we recommend our Global Best Practices Research Summary, which is available on the New England Secondary School Consortium website.
**Texts:** What are learning standards? And, I want to know more.

**Purpose for Reading**
These articles discuss the important role standards play in education. Your goal as you read is to consider the role of standards, as well as their limitations, in supporting effective classroom instruction.

**Pre-Reading Quick Write**
*To what extent do standards influence teaching and learning in your school? What is your evidence?*

**Active Reading Strategy**
Use this organizer to record thoughts and ideas from the reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas / Main Points</th>
<th>Connections to Your Learning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas for Further Exploration</td>
<td>What Ideas Stretched Your Thinking?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**After-Reading Quick Write**
*Standards can play a significant role in driving curriculum, instruction and assessment. What should this look like?*
# GUIDED WORKSHOP AGENDA - MODULE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Suggested Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of Course Modules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Module 2 Intended Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Module 2 Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review group norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Debrief the Tuning Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text-Based Discussion</strong></td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activity: Text-Based Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Process for Analyzing and Unpacking a Focus Standard</strong></td>
<td>20 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Why do we need a process for unpacking?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The purpose of analyzing standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A process for analyzing standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A Guided Walk Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activity - Practice with Unpacking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Videos</strong></td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Video - Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Take notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrap – Up</strong></td>
<td>5 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What was accomplished in Module 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review intended outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preparing for Collaborative Practice Round 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preparing for Module 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Module 2
Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson

Review of Course Modules

- Module 1 – Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol
- Module 2 – Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson
- Module 3 – Tuning Lesson Elements
- Module 4 – Integrating Supports for ENLs
- Module 5 – Building Capacity for Routine Collaboration

Module 2 Intended Outcomes

By the end of Module 2, participants will:
1. Have a deeper understanding of the importance of reviewing and discussing the focus standard of a lesson prior to tuning, and
2. Become familiar with a simple process for analyzing and ‘unpacking’ a standard collaboratively.
Module 2 Agenda

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 1st Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in Text-Based Discussions
4. Engage in Mini-Presentation
5. Watch and Discuss Demonstration Video
6. Schedule 2nd Round of Tuning Practice
7. Prepare for Module 3

Review Group Norms

1. Review the Norms of Collaboration or your team’s group norms.
2. Select a norm to focus on for the day.

Reminder: We Welcome Your Feedback

As mentioned in Module 1, this course is a new resource being provided by the Rhode Island Department of Education. As you take this course, you may have ideas about how to improve it. We welcome all suggestions, big and small.

To expedite the giving of feedback, please use this link to access an electronic form where you can send us your thoughts.

https://goo.gl/2dst6a
Debriefing the Tuning Process

Directions

- Use the Debriefing Tool to reflect on your last tuning session.
- Identify what HELPED or HINDERED the process.
- Share and discuss.
- Revise process for next time.
- Record changes.

Text-Based Discussion

What are Learning Standards?
As part of your pre-work for Module 2, you were asked to:
2. Record your notes on the Active Reading Organizer.

As a team, consider and discuss the following prompts:
- What were the big ideas you took from the reading?
- How can these ideas support progress towards your personal and team goals?
- What questions were you left with?

A PROCESS FOR ANALYZING & UNPACKING STANDARDS
Why do we need a process for unpacking?

In their original form, many standards are...

1. Vague, and
2. Dense

For example, consider and compare the following math standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.OA.A.3</th>
<th>3.OA.B.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use multiplication within 100 to solve word problems in situations involving equal groups.</td>
<td>Understand division as an unknown factor problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In their original form, many standards are...

1. Vague, and
2. Dense

Standard 3.OA.B.6 is much vaguer than 3.OA.A.3. For example, how would a teacher know whether or not a student understands?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.OA.A.3</th>
<th>3.OA.B.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use multiplication and division within 100 to solve word problems in situations involving equal groups.</td>
<td>Understand division as an unknown factor problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discuss: What makes the following standard dense?

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4
Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone

Why do we need a process for analyzing a standard?
A process helps to ensure that...
1. teachers have a common understanding of the focus standard for a lesson,
2. the lesson teaches the knowledge and skills defined by the standard, and
3. teachers involved in tuning a lesson will give accurate and consistent feedback.
The Purpose of Analyzing Standards

The purpose of analyzing the focus standard of a lesson is to clarify the following:
- What students need to be able to DO, and
- What they need to KNOW in order to do it.

The Process for Analyzing a Standard

1. Identify and record the focus standard in its complete and original form.
2. Identify the stated and implied knowledge
3. Identify the stated and implied skills
4. Determine which knowledge and skills should be taught, and which should have already been mastered.
5. Consider implications for instruction and assessment.

Note: Use the Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet to record your thoughts and discussion.

A Guided Walk Through

The following slides provide a sample step-by-step analysis of a focus standard. The thoughts recorded were generated by a group of educators like you. This information is also found on page 2-6a in your booklet.

Take a few minutes to read each slide and discuss the decisions that were made. It is okay to disagree. The objective of this activity is to understand the process of analyzing the standard.
The Process for Reviewing a Standard

The following graphic organizer helps record information as a team reads and analyzes a standard. You have copies in your booklet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus Standard

Knowledge

Skills

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment

---

1. Identify and record the focus standard of a lesson in its complete and original form. The focus standard is the standard a lesson targets or teaches.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4

Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

Knowledge

Skills

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment

---

1. When writing the standard on a lesson, it is recommended to write the standard in its complete form. Strike through parts of the standard that the lesson is NOT teaching.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4

Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

Knowledge

Skills

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment

---
### The Process for Reviewing a Standard

#### 2. Identify the stated and implied knowledge in the standard.

**CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4**

Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figurative Language</td>
<td>Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Simile, metaphor, symbolism, foreshadowing</td>
<td>- Identify figurative language &amp; interpret it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive – e.g. youthful, stunning, etc.</td>
<td>- Identify connotative language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative – e.g. cheap, immature, etc.</td>
<td>- Determine if positive or negative and interpret it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connotative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment

---

#### 3. Identify the stated and implied skills in the standard.

**CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4**

Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figurative Language</td>
<td>Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Simile, metaphor, symbolism, foreshadowing</td>
<td>- Identify figurative language &amp; interpret it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive – e.g. youthful, stunning, etc.</td>
<td>- Identify connotative language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative – e.g. cheap, immature, etc.</td>
<td>- Determine if positive or negative and interpret it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connotative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment

---

#### 4. Determine which knowledge and skills should be background and which should be taught.

In this example, the **bolded** text refers to knowledge and skills a teacher decided students should already have.

**CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4**

Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figurative Language</td>
<td>Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Simile, metaphor, symbolism, foreshadowing</td>
<td>- Identify figurative language &amp; interpret it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive – e.g. youthful, stunning, etc.</td>
<td>- Identify connotative language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative – e.g. cheap, immature, etc.</td>
<td>- Determine if positive or negative and interpret it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connotative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment
The Process for Reviewing a Standard

5. Consider implications for instruction and assessment

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4
Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

Knowledge
- Figurative Language
  - Simile, metaphor, symbolism, foreshadowing
  - Positive - e.g., powerful, amazing, etc.
  - Negative - e.g., cheap, immature, etc.
- Connotative Language
  - Positive - e.g., youthful, stunning, etc.
  - Negative - e.g., cheap, immature, etc.

Skills
- Determine meaning of words and phrases
- Identify figurative language and interpret it
- Identify connotative language
- Determine if positive or negative and interpret it

Implications for Instruction
- Pre-teach types of figurative and connotative language with examples
- Students may need a strategy for gathering info and taking notes
- ELLs may need additional supports, e.g. word banks, example word lists with translations, texts with passages already highlighted, etc.

Implications for Assessment
- Students will need to show they can identify AND interpret figurative and connotative language independently.

The Process for Reviewing a Standard

Now it is your turn.

1. Using a standard of your choosing, collaboratively read and analyze it.
2. Use a blank Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet in your booklet to record your thoughts.
3. You may want to record your team’s ideas on a piece of chart paper as well.
THE PROCESS OF ANALYZING A STANDARD IN ACTION

Demonstration Video

1. Next, you will watch a video demonstrating the analysis and unpacking of a standard.
2. As you watch the video, use the Video Observation Sheet to record the following:
   - Observations
   - Implications / Interpretations
   - Questions
   - Connections to Your Own Work
3. Be prepared to share and discuss your notes afterwards.

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the Youtube channel video.

Step 5 – Analyzing the Focus Standard
Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything that left you wondering.

Wrapping Up Module 2

What was accomplished in Module 2

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 1st Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in Text-Based Discussion
4. Engage in Mini-Presentation
5. Watch and Discuss Demonstration Video
6. Schedule 2nd Round of Tuning Practice
7. Prepare for Module 3
Activity
Discuss the intended outcomes for Module 2. To what extent do you feel they were met?

By the end of Module 2, participants will:
1. Have a deeper understanding of the importance of reviewing and discussing the focus standard of a lesson prior to tuning, and
2. Have become familiar with a simple process for reading and ‘unpacking’ a standard collaboratively.

Preparing for Collaborative Practice - Round 2
1. Clarify date and time for the collaborative practice.
2. Determine who the presenting teacher will be to bring a lesson to tune.
3. Determine who will volunteer to facilitate.
4. Have the presenting teacher complete the prep sheet for presenting teachers prior to meeting.

Preparing for Module 3
1. All
   - Complete reading assignments for Module 3.
2. Clarify Date, Time and Location
   - Collaborative Practice
   - Guided Workshop for Module 3
3. Materials to Bring
   - Course Booklet, notes from Round 2 of the collaborative tuning practice.
The heart of Rhode Island Collaborative ENL and General Education model is for RIDE to provide districts and schools with resources to help build capacity to help all learners succeed – particularly including English Learners and students with disabilities.
DEBRIEFING TOOL

Directions
1. Reflect on the most recent round of collaborative lesson tuning.
2. Individually, use the organizer below to identify anything that HELPED or HINDERED the process of tuning.
3. After everyone has recorded their thoughts, share and discuss as a group.
4. Once the group has discussed the forces that supported or hindered the last opportunity to collaboratively tune a lesson, determine what changes can be made to improve the process next time.
5. Record these changes and have them on hand for the next round of collaborative lesson tuning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forces that HELPED</th>
<th>Forces that HINDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Suggested Changes to Improve the Process Next Time
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.4
Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figurative Language</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simile, metaphor, symbolism, foreshadowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connotative Language</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive – e.g. youthful, stunning, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negative – e.g. cheap, immature, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determine meaning of words and phrases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify figurative language and interpret it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify connotative language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine if positive or negative and interpret it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-teach types of figurative language with examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-teach types of connotative language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students may need a strategy for gathering info and taking notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ELLs may need additional supports, e.g. word banks, example word lists with translations, texts with passages already highlighted, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students will need to show they can identify AND interpret figurative and connotative language independently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Focus Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Implications for Instruction

### Implications for Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use this sheet to record your thoughts as you observe the video.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Strategies and Ideas Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Connections to Your Own Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Thoughts
**Presenter Tasks**: To help everyone get the most out of the limited time to collaborate, please complete the following prior to meeting with the group to tune your lesson.

- Make enough copies of any lesson materials (lesson, texts, etc.)
- Complete and make enough copies of this completed document. This should only take 10 minutes to complete!

**Brief Description of Lesson / Context**

**Lesson Objective (If not clear from lesson materials)**

**Focus Standard**
In the spaces below, record the focus standard of the lesson, as well as any stated or implied knowledge and skills in the standard that need to be taught in the lesson, or that students should already have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Knowledge to be Taught</th>
<th>New Skills to be Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Knowledge Students Should Have</th>
<th>Skills Students Should Already Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Demands**

**What type of feedback would you like?**
STANDARDS BASED LESSON TUNING PROTOCOL

Purpose
This protocol provides a structured process for collaborative groups of teachers to use standards to tune a content lesson. Please note that the times below are based on a forty-five-minute time frame. Adjust times as needed.

Preparations and Materials
- Copies of the lesson to be tuned
- Copies of this protocol
- Copies of preferred note-taking sheets
- Copies of relevant standards
- Copies of completed Unpacking Sheet for the Focus Standard

Process

1. **Determine Roles and Set Norms (1 minute)**
   a) **Roles:** Facilitator, Presenting Teacher(s), Time Keeper, Note-Taker
   b) **Norms:** Pausing, Paraphrasing, Posing Questions, Putting Ideas on the Table, Providing Data, Paying Attention to Self and Others, Presuming Positive Intentions, Other: __________________

2. **Present Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Provide BRIEF overview and description of the materials.
   b) Provide important background information about specific classes and students' needs.

3. **Identify Focus for Feedback (1 minute)**
   a) Identify question or area of focus to guide feedback.

4. **Review and Clarify Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Read and review presented materials.
   b) Ask clarifying questions about materials that prompt answers with QUICK responses – e.g. yes/no.

5. **Analyze the Focus Standard (5 minutes)**
   a) Clarify the focus standard.
   b) Identify and discuss the stated and implied knowledge and skills in the focus standard. Use the graphic organizer on the back of this sheet as a resource.

6. **Tune the Lesson (25 minutes)**
   a) Select a tool for collecting feedback.
   b) Silently read, analyze, and take notes.
   c) Share observations of effective practice, particularly what is being done to support ENLs and students with special needs.
   d) Discuss lesson elements and share feedback, particularly strategies for supporting ENLs and students with special needs.

7. **Reflection and Debrief (3 minutes)**
   a) Presenting teacher shares main take-aways.
   b) Participants share insights they gained from the conversation.
   c) Facilitator collects feedback about the process.

8. **Prepare for Next Tuning Session (3 minutes)**
   a) Identify the presenting teacher and facilitator for the next session.
   b) Provide presenting with the tuning prep sheet.
   c) Schedule date and time to meet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Demands for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lesson Information

Name of the Lesson:  
Teacher:

### Guiding Question or Area of Focus for Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Feedback / Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the <strong>content</strong>, <strong>literacy</strong>, and/or <strong>language</strong> objectives of the lesson clear and easy to communicate to students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the <strong>content</strong>, <strong>literacy</strong>, and/or <strong>language</strong> objectives of the lesson clearly identify the following: 1) knowledge (the what) students need to have, 2) skills (the how) they will use to apply the knowledge, 3) evidence (the proof) that will demonstrate the extent to which the knowledge and skills have been mastered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the <strong>language</strong> / <strong>literacy</strong> objectives align with and support the content objective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Lesson Objectives

- Is the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clear and easy to communicate to students?
- Do the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clearly identify the following: 1) knowledge (the what) students need to have, 2) skills (the how) they will use to apply the knowledge, 3) evidence (the proof) that will demonstrate the extent to which the knowledge and skills have been mastered?
- Do the language/literacy objectives align with and support the content objective?

### Feedback / Suggestions

## Formative Assessment

- Is it clear what evidence/materials will be used to determine how each student will demonstrate learning?
- Is it clear how students will receive feedback about their learning?

### Feedback / Suggestions

## Instructional Sequence

- Is it clear how the objectives of the lesson will be communicated?
- Do all tasks align with the knowledge and skills in the focus standards?
- Are there opportunities for students to establish background knowledge?
- Are students encouraged to predict or set goals for their learning?
- Are all activities logically sequenced?
- Do students have opportunities to apply and/or practice what they learned?

### Feedback / Suggestions
Differentiated Supports for English Learners and Students with Special Needs

- Are there opportunities for student to communicate, interact with, and/or receive content through different modalities over the course of the lesson?
- Is there a sufficient number of support strategies provided throughout the lesson to help English Learners who may be at different levels of English proficiency?
  - Are there strategies to support listening to content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support communicating knowledge of content in English through speaking?
  - Are there strategies to support reading content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support writing about content in English?

Feedback / Suggestions

Motivation and Engagement

- Do students have enough opportunities to have voice or make decisions?
- Will it be clear to students how the knowledge and skills they are learning will be valuable or meaningful?
- Are tasks appropriately challenging for all students?
- Does the lesson sufficiently ensure that ALL students will be successful?
- Do students have opportunities to collaborate with others and/or strengthen relationships through the work and learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Summary of Feedback
### Focus of Feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson &amp; Language Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Supports for Students with Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation &amp; Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus of Feedback:

Praise for Effective Practices

Probing Questions

Suggestions
Module 3
Tuning the Elements of a Lesson

Pre-Work Tasks
- Engage in Round 2 of Lesson Tuning.
- Complete the pre-reading quick write on the active reading organizer.
- Read *Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs of English Language Learners*.
- Complete the Active Reading Organizer.

Guided Workshop Materials
- Text: *Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs ELLS* 3-2a
- Active Reading Organizer 3-2b
- Module 3 Guided Workshop Agenda 3-3
- Module 3 PPT Slides 3-4
- Debriefing Tool 3-5
- Text-Based Discussion Sheet 3-6a
- ‘What’ and ‘Why’ Analysis 3-6b
- Video Observation Sheet 3-7

Collaborative Practice Materials
- Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers 3-8a
- Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol 3-8b
- Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet 3-8c
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions 3-8d
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories 3-8e
- Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS 3-8f

Demonstration Videos (Not In Booklet)
Link to videos: [https://goo.gl/oONSzI](https://goo.gl/oONSzI)
- Step 6c – Praise of Effective Practices
- Step 6d – Feedback on Formative Assessment
- Step 6d – Feedback of Instructional Sequence
Formative assessment has the potential to enhance teaching and learning, especially for those students who face particular challenges, such as English Language Learners (ELL students). In this paper, we examine how formative assessment can enhance the teaching and learning of ELL students in particular. We highlight the opportunities and challenges inherent in integrating formative assessment into instruction for ELL students in the era of the Common Core and other “next generation” standards. We argue that in order to use formative assessment effectively with this student population, teachers must attend simultaneously to the students’ needs both in learning content and skills and in developing the English required to express their learning.

Indeed, it is the extent to which this dual attention to language and content learning is given that distinguishes formative assessment strategies to support ELL students from strategies for non-ELL students.

Much progress has been made over the last decade on understanding how best to teach and assess ELL students, driven in no small part by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Although support for NCLB has been mixed, there is widespread agreement that the Act is responsible for shining an important spotlight on ELL students’ education and the need for fair, valid, and reliable assessment of ELL students. NCLB called for schools and districts to assess all ELL students and to be accountable for their achievement in both English language development and academic knowledge and skills, at a level comparable to that of their non-ELL peers.

This push for accountability persists as the nation ushers in a new era of education reform, driven by development of and widespread support for new and more rigorous learning standards nationwide, such as the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), and commensurate standards for English language proficiency development. The vast majority of states have now committed to weaving the CCSS and corresponding “next generation” assessments into the fabric of their instruction and assessment systems. The vision embodied by the Common Core movement is that instruction and assessment will work hand in glove to support deep, high-quality learning, with career and college preparedness the ultimate goal for all students, including ELL students (Darling-Hammond et al., 2013).

In this context, formative assessment has emerged as a promising teaching and learning strategy.
Efforts to improve the education outcomes of ELL students must take into account that this student population represents a range of different academic and linguistic experiences, resources, and needs.

(Heritage, Walqui, & Linquanti, 2013). Integrating instruction and assessment, formative assessment is a continuous cycle that entails gathering evidence of and judging student learning; providing feedback to students about their learning; and using assessment data to adjust subsequent instruction as needed. (See pp. 3–4 for a more detailed explanation of formative assessment.)

Implementation of the CCSS and of formative assessment practices presents major challenges and opportunities for teachers, who, in each case, must deepen their subject matter knowledge, take on new roles and responsibilities, and newly examine their instructional strategies. For example, a distinguishing feature of the CCSS is the unprecedented extent to which the standards specify the academic language competencies students need within and across different disciplines (Abedi & Linquanti, 2012). Hence, teachers in general, and especially those with ELL students, need to understand the possible sequences in which students may acquire language skills, the language demands embedded in particular texts and tasks, how the different disciplines use language, and how to support or scaffold the development of student proficiency in language competencies. Effective use of formative assessment places similar demands on teachers, and it poses additional challenges. For example, research suggests that teachers struggle with how best to use formative assessment data to revise their instruction (Dunn & Mulvenon, 2009; Kingston & Nash, 2012; Shepard, 2005).

Currently, many researchers are examining different approaches to formative assessment and trying to determine what it takes to effectively incorporate formative assessment into instructional practice generally. However, not much work has been done yet to identify promising formative assessment practices to improve learning specifically for ELL students.\(^1\) As use of formative assessment expands, it is imperative to examine the potential impact of formative assessment practices on both the academic achievement and language learning of ELL students and to explore how formative assessment practices could be tailored to meet the specific needs of these students (Heritage et al., 2013).

Although the body of research on formative assessment of ELL students is quite small, there has been substantially more research done on large-scale, summative assessment of ELL students (Abedi, 2011; Bailey, Huang, & Escobar, 2011), and we argue that this research on large-scale assessment provides an important reference point for understanding and improving formative assessment for ELL populations. The research on large-scale assessment of ELL students examines many of the same kinds of concerns—such as fairness, accuracy, and opportunity to learn—that must be addressed with regard to classroom assessment, including formative assessment.

Although this paper focuses in particular on the use of formative assessment with ELL students, we recognize that this topic is part of the broader field of study of how a wide spectrum of student language-related differences interacts with the demands of instruction and assessment. In this spectrum are differences among the varieties of English used by students’ native-English-speaking families; different languages and their particular varieties; and differences in language abilities, including literacy skills (Adger, Wolfram, & Christian, 2007; Genesee et al., 2006; Rea-Dickins, 2006).

\(^1\) The use of formative assessment practices with ELL students appears to be more established in English as a second language (ESL) and English as an additional language (EAL) classrooms, where observational checklists, portfolios, journals, peer assessment, assessment dialogues, and the like are commonly used on an ongoing basis to assess progress in learning English (Genesee et al., 2006; Rea-Dickins, 2006).
Definition and Principles of Formative Assessment

After many years of confusion and conflicting viewpoints about what constitutes formative assessment, there is emerging consensus about its definition. This is evident from the similarities in definitions provided by different experts on this topic (Learning Point Associates, 2009). The definition offered by Noyce and Hickey (2011, p. 1) is representative of the consensus, describing formative assessment as

“the process of monitoring student knowledge and understanding during instruction in order to give useful feedback and make timely changes in instruction to ensure maximal student growth.”

Although this definition adequately reflects current conceptions about formative assessment, it is important to dig deeper into the key characteristics of this emerging practice. Building from this definition and from current research findings, we propose six guiding principles for effective formative assessment:

1. Promotes student learning. Formative assessment is best characterized by its purpose: to support student learning. Other types of assessment have different purposes. For example, summative assessment is typically intended for accountability purposes, and interim assessment is intended to monitor student progress toward proficiency in standards. Moreover, whereas summative and interim assessments gauge students’ learning after a given period of instruction (e.g., an academic year, a unit), formative assessment is a continuous process that is integral to teaching and learning.

2. Elicits evidence of learning through a variety of tasks. Formative assessment tasks can take many forms: planned and opportunistic; individual and group; brief and extended; as well as informal and formal. Shavelson and his colleagues (Shavelson et al., 2008; Shavelson, 2006) define three anchor points on a continuum of informal to formal formative assessment tasks:

   » **On-the-fly** formative assessment occurs in response to an unexpected “teachable moment.” For example, to address a misconception evidenced by a student comment, a teacher might pose an impromptu question to identify the source of the misunderstanding.

   » **Planned-for interaction** is purposeful; a teacher designs ways to identify the gap between what students actually know and what they should know. For example, a teacher might pose prepared-in-advance tasks to students which are tied to the learning goals.

   » **Curriculum-embedded** formative assessments are inserted at specific points in a unit. For example, a teacher might engage students in the solution of a novel problem that weaves student understanding of concepts introduced in that unit before deciding whether to proceed to the next unit.

3. Changes the roles of teachers and students. Formative assessment places students at the center of teaching and learning, thereby engaging teachers and students in distinctive ways. The teacher sets the stage for each lesson, focusing on clear learning goals and indicators, communicating these to the students, and deciding what evidence of learning to collect, and how. Teachers must create a collaborative and supportive classroom environment for students, in which questioning, constructive feedback, and
self-assessment are perceived as non-threatening (Heritage, 2011). Students also play an active role in formative assessment. Students not only perform tasks that provide evidence of their current learning, but they are involved in self-assessment (and sometimes peer assessment), thus developing and enhancing autonomy as they use feedback to inform their future work (Marshall & Drummond, 2006). This means that the feedback must inspire reflection, be actionable by the student, and be specifically linked to what the student is trying to learn and accomplish.

4. Uses learning progressions to anchor learning goals and monitor learning. Formative assessment begins with learning goals that clearly articulate what teachers expect students will learn through the course of an instructional activity. These goals must be communicated to students—or even co-created with them. Learning progressions constitute a tool for helping teachers set appropriate goals and organize standards-based instruction in a sequence that reflects a learner’s likely developmental path. The goals provide a model or map along which students are expected to progress in a given domain from novice to more expert performance (McManus, 2008; Heritage, 2008). As such, learning progressions help teachers think about student learning development in a content domain and plan related formative assessment strategies.

5. Results in meaningful feedback and adjustments to improve instruction for students. Perhaps what most distinguishes formative assessment from other instructional or assessment methods is that it culminates in immediate action to improve instruction (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Further, formative assessment calls for contingent action that is responsive to specific student needs. Learning opportunities for students are created based on an assessment of what the students have learned, what they may have misinterpreted, and what may be on the cusp of development (Heritage et al., 2013) to advance further development.

Teacher feedback to students is an essential element of formative assessment and a major avenue by which formative assessment promotes student learning (Sadler, 1989). Demonstrated to have a positive effect on learning, feedback is formative when it provides information about the gap between a student’s current level of learning and the expected level of learning, as well as guidance to the student about how close this gap (Sadler, 1989; Trumbull & Lash, 2013). Effective feedback is focused and directive, providing corrective information and offering suggestions for addressing a student’s misconceptions and errors. In regard to timing, feedback has the greatest impact on the students at the point when they are considering strategies for how to do their work (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Learning Point Associates, 2009).

6. Enables students to become self-regulated and autonomous learners. The ultimate goal of formative assessment is for students to attain self-efficacy as learners by developing their agency and exercising power over their own learning. Just as formative assessment calls teachers to action in assessing student learning in relation to learning goals and adjusting their instruction accordingly, it also sets the stage for students to direct and modulate their own actions toward learning goals (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). With such autonomy as the objective, teachers must guide students to develop the metacognitive skills that make it possible for them to assess their own levels of understanding and improvement.

Formative assessment functions as a mirror, reflecting to the student important information about his or her learning even as, at the same time, it reflects to the teacher important information about his or her instruction. Equally important, teacher feedback scaffolds students’ ability to generate their own internal feedback about the state of their learning.
Ball & Farr, 2003; Trumbull & Farr, 2005; Vellutino, Scanlon, & Lyon, 2000). It is important that formative assessment practices and tools be designed with this broader range of language-related differences in mind.

The authors of this paper include experts in both ELL teaching/learning and ELL assessment. Hence, we come at the issues of formative assessment for ELL students—and specifically, the relationship between language development and academic content mastery—from different, and sometimes divergent, perspectives. We began developing this paper from a point of consensus, which we’ve captured in a section (pp. 3–4) that presents a formal definition of formative assessment and offers our perspective on principles for effective formative assessment.

Teaching and Assessing ELL Students in the United States

What we know about the nation’s ELL students

The term English language learners (or ELL students) in this paper refers to students who are not yet proficient in English and need instructional support to fully access the academic content in their class work (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008). A growing number of students in U.S. schools have been designated as ELLs. From the 1997/98 school year to the 2008/09 school year, the number of ELL students enrolled in public schools increased from 3.5 million to 5.3 million, or by 51 percent (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). As of 2010/11, ELL students accounted for 10 percent of the population of public school students in the country. In many states, the proportion of ELL students is much larger; for example, one quarter of California students are ELL students. In the U.S., ELL students include speakers of more than 100 different languages, although 75 percent of them speak Spanish (Editorial Projects in Education, 2009). Recently, the population of ELL students has been growing most rapidly in states that have not historically had many ELL students, such as Delaware, Kentucky, and South Carolina (Editorial Projects in Education, 2009).

Efforts to improve the education outcomes of ELL students must take into account that this student population represents a range of different academic and linguistic experiences, resources, and needs. It includes students born abroad as well as those born in the U.S. Slightly more than one third of ELL students are immigrants, nearly half are second-generation Americans, and another 17 percent are third-generation (Editorial Projects in Education, 2009).

Immigrant students arrive at all ages and with a broad range of education experiences. Some older students may have had little or no access to schooling in their home countries. Others have had excellent formal schooling and may be ahead of age-level peers in certain academic domains. Immigrant students from affluent urban families who have had access to continuous schooling will have had different experiences from those whose families have lived modestly in rural settings, where schooling is not always available, or those who come from war-torn countries where schooling may often have been interrupted.

The ELL student population also exhibits a broad spectrum of individual proficiency patterns, in both first language and English (Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2008). At one end of the spectrum are students who are just beginning to learn English; at the other end are students who might more appropriately be categorized as “fully-functional bilinguals” (Valdés et al., 2005). Between these two points, there are numerous configurations of bilingualism.

Students’ degree of bilingualism is related to their facility with academic language, or the language

Footnotes:
2 For more information, see the discussion of “The Role of Language in Formative Assessment” in Trumbull and Lash (2013).
3 For more information, see National Center for Education Statistics (2013).
There are critical differences between ELL students and their non-ELL peers that can affect ELL students' achievement in school.

of school-based learning, which encompasses the way in which specific academic practices are formulated, the fundamental structure of language, the specific ways in which words are used, and discipline-specific vocabulary (Zwiers, 2008). With respect to bilingualism, some ELL students are conversationally fluent in their first language but have developed academic language proficiency (oral and written) only in English. Older immigrant students may know little English but have academic language proficiency in their first language and, thus, a strong foundation for eventual academic language proficiency in English.

Also noteworthy is the fact that there is a growing percentage of “long-term” ELL students (students who have been classified as English Language Learners or Limited English Proficient for seven years or more), signaling the need to reassess the learning opportunities these students are offered. In California, for instance, statewide language assessments of ELL students reveal that a great many of them appear to progress quickly in the early stages of acquiring English but get stuck at an “intermediate” level of proficiency, where they may remain for years (Linquanti, Crane, & Huang, 2010).

Although all students are developing new uses of language throughout their academic careers, there are critical differences between ELL students and their non-ELL peers that can affect ELL students’ achievement in school (Bailey, 2007; Crosnoe, 2004; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). For example, ELL students typically have limited exposure to a rich and varied vocabulary and other language features and functions in English. Expressions, vocabulary, and other language features that ELL students are likely to know are often more closely linked to friends, neighborhood, and close social contexts than to the academic context—and often are modeled and reinforced in their native language rather than in English.

Because language and culture are so tightly linked, differences in language use are nearly always associated with sociocultural differences (Gee, 2007). Children learn how to use language in social settings among members of certain cultural groups. Thus, they come to school with particular cultural scripts for using language to communicate and to learn (see, e.g., Durán, 2008). Although the surface manifestations of language used by students—such as grammatical forms and vocabulary—are probably most evident to a teacher, it is the differences in the ways people use language to accomplish goals and conduct their relationships that may have the most powerful consequences for student interactions in the classroom, including those associated with assessment (e.g., Greenfield, Suzuki, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2006; Heath, 1983).

For instance, some students will have been socialized to listen much more than speak. Assessments that require them to express opinions or show their learning in front of others—as is typical in formative assessment discourse—may place demands that are more burdensome for them than for other students (Greenfield et al., 2006). Therefore, this type of formative assessment may not be immediately accessible to ELL students, even when they understand the discursive, syntactic, and lexical features of questions or feedback (Leung & Mohan, 2004). ELL students in particular may need time to learn and adjust to the conventions of verbal expression and classroom interaction related to instruction and formative assessment.

The growing understanding of the language learning experiences and challenges faced by ELL students is essential to improving teaching and learning for this population and, ultimately, to closing the academic achievement gap between ELL and non-ELL students. The gap—at least by the time students reach adolescence—is largely due to differences in literacy skills (Snow & Biancarosa, 2003), which are heavily dependent on (and which
reciprocally promote) knowledge of academic language. Hence, any attempt to reduce the gap must focus learning and teaching simultaneously on not only academic knowledge but also development of language and literacy.

**What we know about effective instruction for ELL students**

Because formative assessment is so intimately connected to instruction and serves the express purpose of promoting learning, developing an effective approach to formative assessment for ELL students requires an understanding of how ELL students learn best and how teachers can provide the best instruction for these students.4

*Effective instruction for ELL students begins with a sound theory of language learning*

According to van Lier and Walqui (2012), there are at least three different perspectives on language and how it develops:

1. *Language as form.* In this view, the core of language is grammatical structures, sounds, and vocabulary; content plays a smaller role. A student's ability to correctly use language forms becomes the goal of instruction. Therefore, language learning progressions are built on a sequencing of syntactic structures arranged along a continuum of simpler to more complex,

---

4 Programs that reflect a high regard for students’ home language as a social and intellectual resource, particularly high-quality bilingual and dual immersion programs, result in better achievement than those that focus solely on developing students’ English language skills (see review in Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). However, the majority of ELL students do not have access to bilingual instruction in which their first language is used extensively and developed on a continuing basis in its own right. For that reason, this paper focuses on instructional approaches and strategies that can be provided in settings where students’ first language is not used to a great extent. Nevertheless, to be most effective, ELL instruction should recognize the usefulness of home language as a learning resource and an important source of identity and family connection for students.

filled in with vocabulary that is considered useful for everyday activities. For example, English as Second Language (ESL) courses typically begin with the verb *to be* in its simple present form and progress to present progressive, past, present perfect, future, and so on. Although content may vary from lesson to lesson, lessons seldom involve students in a process of coherent development of creative or critical thinking. As Valdés (2004) points out, a negative outcome of this language perspective is the “curricularization” of ESL language courses, the idea that unless students use the language contained in the syllabus correctly they should not pass to the next-level ESL course. Recent studies in California point to the negative consequences of such a mastery approach and its contribution to students never or only very belatedly progressing from ELL classrooms to join their peers in the general education program (Callahan, Wilkinson, & Muller, 2010; Linquanti et al., 2010; Walqui et al., 2010).

2. *Language as a set of discrete functions.* This perspective conceives of language in terms of individual acts in specific communicative circumstances. For example, teachers might ask students to recognize “Can you pass me the ruler?” as an instance of a request and to respond appropriately “Certainly.” This view of language is based in traditional sociolinguistic speech act theory, which characterizes language in terms of what its users are attempting to accomplish with a given utterance or interchange within a particular social context (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Speech act theory is part of the field of “pragmatics,” or the study of how people use language in social contexts. However, some research indicates that this approach does not lead to discursive competence, where social exchange is accomplished by coherent sequences of interactions that take an idea to a discussion and back and forth to an agreement (van Lier & Walqui, 2012).

3. *Language as action.* This perspective on language is gaining in credibility and influence (see, for example, Nevile & Rendle-Short, 2007). In this perspective, language is an inseparable part of human action, intimately connected to all
forms of action—physical, social, and symbolic. Teachers guided by this approach invite students to participate in meaningful classroom activities (e.g., projects, research, science labs) that engage the students’ interest and encourage language and intellectual growth through the collaborative construction of academic products of various kinds. Teaching and learning do not treat language as an autonomous system but, rather, as a system nested within a larger set of social systems. This approach to language learning and use does not obviate the importance of students’ acquisition of communicative competence at all levels (including proficiency with discourse, syntax, and vocabulary); nor does it negate the value of deliberate functional linguistic instruction focused on specific forms (Lyster, 2004, 2007; Schleppegrell, 2001, 2004)—particularly as embedded within an activity that focuses on language meaning.

A number of researchers who focus on ELL instruction and assessment argue for a move away from the first two of these perspectives in favor of the third, the language as action perspective, consistent with “a redefinition of language as a complex adaptive system of communicative actions to realize key purposes” (Hakuta & Santos, 2012, p. ii). This approach focuses attention primarily on language meaning and the agency of the language user. Language instruction should, therefore, engage students in well-supported, significant, and authentic activity (e.g., creating, discussing, and writing) that develops their academic autonomy over time.

The perspective of language as action, with its emphasis on collaborative construction, complements the rigorous expectations laid out in the CCSS. The standards articulate academic practices in which students will be able to engage with increasing sophistication as they progress through the grades. This engagement requires that students use language as a tool for action, whether in English language arts or in mathematics. And to support them in doing so, educators must rethink the views of language and language progressions that have typically undergirded English language development (ELD) and ESL instruction (van Lier & Walqui, 2012). Only then can ELL students, from the most beginning levels of English and from the earliest grade levels, begin to move toward meeting these challenging standards.

For example, one of the CCSS’s College and Career Ready Anchor Standards states that students will be able to “integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally” (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010). Listening comprehension is essential for meeting the “oral” aspect of this standard, that is, for eventually being able to comprehend extended academic discourse taking place in English. A young ELL student in the primary grades with a very beginning level of English proficiency will clearly struggle to comprehend academic instruction given exclusively in English. However, when provided with visual supports, repeated classroom routines, and other children’s responses as aids for making meaning, this young student can begin to guess intelligently at the meaning of information that is presented orally by a teacher.

To start building the competence necessary to meet the College and Career Ready Anchor Standard cited above, ELL students who are just beginning to learn English need access to a language-rich environment with authentic models of English that contextualize meaning with illustrations and concrete objects, for example, and that allow students to practice focused listening for short stretches of time. As students progress to an early intermediate level of English language proficiency, they are able to identify the topic and details of most presentations with the support of graphics, gestures, advance organizers, or some combination of such aids. They are also able to listen with understanding for longer stretches of time and, with supports and frequent comprehension checks, to gain more from instruction given in English. Intermediate-level ELL students can comprehend the main points and details of most age-appropriate academic instruction in English. As students move to advanced levels of English language proficiency, they typically can follow academic instruction on more abstract
and technical topics appropriate to their grade level (Valdés, Walqui, & Kibler, 2012). For ELL students to successfully advance along this continuum of language development, they need teachers who understand how language proficiency typically develops as well as the kinds of activity and supports that benefit ELL students as they progress.

The CCSS support opportunities to engage students in valuable actions, such as making meaning of complex text and using evidence when interacting with others in English language arts and other disciplines. In mathematics, for example, the standards call for students to achieve both conceptual understanding and procedural fluency, engage in high-cognitive-demand math tasks, and develop the belief that mathematics is sensible, worthwhile, and doable. To meet these standards, ELL students, supported by deliberately constructed scaffolds, need opportunities to actively negotiate the meaning of both math concepts and situations, which is consistent with an action-oriented perspective on language.

**Effective instruction for ELL students integrates rigorous content and academic language**

For all students, learning academic content is inseparable from learning the academic language of the content area, but this is especially true for ELL students (Heritage, Silva, & Pierce, 2007; National Research Council, 2001; Schleppegrell, 2001, 2005; Walqui & Heritage, 2012). Furthermore, research suggests that academic language competencies—which include discursive, grammatical, and lexical features specific to a particular context or content area—correlate with academic success (Aguirre-Muñoz, Parks, Benner, Amabisca, & Boscardin, 2006; Halliday, 1994; Sato, Lagunoff, & Yeagley, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2001). These connections among academic content learning, academic language learning, and academic success suggest that ELL students benefit from structured support for academic English development within a discipline, including explicit instruction that is contingent upon evidence of student learning, and that addresses discursive, grammatical, and lexical competencies (Aguirre-Muñoz, Parks, et al., 2006; Gersten et al., 2007; Francis et al., 2006; Kemp & Chiappe, 2006; National Reading Panel, 2000; Shanahan & Beck, 2006).

As students progress through school, academic content becomes more varied and complex, as do the academic language skills that students need in order to meaningfully engage with and learn content (e.g., Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, 2002; Scarcella, 2003). For ELL students to successfully engage with academic content, they must know enough academic language to acquire new knowledge and skills, and to show what they know and can do in academic subjects. Thus, it is critical that ELL students be provided with appropriate supports to learn the language of the content areas and that these supports be aligned with the more rigorous content demands and higher achievement expectations associated with the CCSS. Only then can students’ construction of content knowledge progress hand in hand with the development of their English (Sato et al., 2011; Walqui & van Lier, 2010).

However, in an effort to make instruction accessible for students with limited English, schools have often placed ELL students in low-level ELD or ESL classes where their access to academic English, rigorous content, and native-English-speaking peers is restricted (Valdés, 2001; Walqui et al., 2010). The emphasis in such classes has traditionally been on the explicit teaching and practice of language forms without meaningful context (e.g., grammar exercises on unrelated sentences). Furthermore, before being granted access to mainstream classes, ELL students have been required to show certain levels of English proficiency, based on mastering such language forms. There is growing recognition among researchers and practitioners that this approach...
limits ELL students’ opportunities to learn grade-level content, as well as to learn academic language and develop literacy. One of the missed opportunities that comes from separating ELL students for the purposes of English language development is interacting with native English-speaking peers who can serve as language models and age-appropriate interlocutors (Wong-Fillmore, 1976).

There is now widespread consensus that, instead of watering down the academic and language learning opportunities for ELL students, instruction for these students must focus on high standards (Gibbons, 2002; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Recent developments in research and practice suggest that ELL students engage and learn better through integrated instruction of rigorous content and related academic language, coupled with specific kinds of support (Derewianka, 1990; Schleppegrell, 2005; Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Four crucial features of effective learning opportunities for this student population are:

- Inviting engagement in rigorous grade-level academic content
- Paying attention to academic language and literacy in the context of subject-matter learning
- Promoting high-quality interactions to develop the use of academic language and new linguistic competencies
- Providing scaffolding that is adjusted as students gain competence with content and language

**Inviting engagement in rigorous grade-level academic content.** According to Walqui and van Lier (2010), ELL students should be engaged in rich, rigorous academic content that reflects expectations for their grade level. Failure to provide a rigorous academic program impedes access and opportunity to learn (e.g., Ochoa & Cadierno-Kaplan, 2004). During the time they are developing proficiency in academic English, ELL students must continue to learn grade-level subject matter if they are to avoid falling behind their non-ELL peers. Teachers can help ELL students learn core academic concepts by engaging them as apprentices in substantive academic work, using modeling, scaffolding, and other learning supports, as detailed below (Olson & Land, 2007).

**Paying attention to academic language and literacy in the context of subject-matter learning.** As students engage in academic work, they need opportunities to acquire competence in oral and written uses of related academic language through integrated content and language instruction (Gibbons, 2002; Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989; Valdés et al., 2005; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). A major benefit of integrating content and language instruction is that academic content provides students with a meaningful purpose and context for language learning, which supports second-language acquisition and engenders motivation for using English (Ellis, 2009). When teachers integrate language development with academic content instruction, it highlights for teachers what aspects of language learning they should focus on to ensure that their students are developing the language competencies needed to participate in the curriculum. Thus, integrated instruction supports language and content learning in a reciprocal fashion (Gibbons, 2002).

Simply placing ELL students in mainstream content classrooms does not constitute integrated content and language instruction. ELL students require specific kinds of support, and teachers must understand the language and literacy demands of their particular academic subjects in order to provide this support (Gibbons, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005). The different types of texts students encounter (e.g., a science textbook, a novel, a historical analysis) pose specific challenges for students’ learning to read and write in English (Schleppegrell, 2004; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). To deliver instruction effectively, teachers must set learning goals for their lessons that take into account the language demands posed by different types of texts in their particular content area(s). In setting these goals, teachers must also bear in mind that learning progressions for students in general may not apply well to ELL students; in fact, the learning progressions of ELL students may differ substantially from those of their non-ELL counterparts.
Research shows that discipline-specific proficiency in academic language plays a critical role in ELL student achievement. For example, greater mastery of academic language supports and enables students to demonstrate and explain their critical thinking in the content area (Schleppegrell, 2005). When teachers systematically focus students' attention on linguistic features and functions of academic language in a specific content area—what has been called a “functional linguistic” approach—it can facilitate student exploration and clarification of technical meanings and concepts in the content areas, thereby facilitating learning (Coffin, 2010; Schleppegrell, 2001, 2004). For example, a functional linguistic approach might be used to help students understand the structure and language of the genre, such as persuasive writing as different from a narrative, in terms of communicative function and form. A persuasive text is intended to convince, to move to action, whereas a narrative is intended to entertain or teach a lesson. Linguistically these genres display different features, organization, and preferred uses of language.

Furthermore, research suggests that purposeful, structured instruction in academic English might help close the achievement gap between ELL students and their non-ELL peers. Some research has shown that instruction in general academic vocabulary has improved the vocabulary learning of ELL students more than that of their non-ELL peers and that this learning translates to improved performance by ELL students on English language arts standardized tests (Snow, Lawrence, & White, 2009). Other research has shown that instruction in academic English benefits ELL students as well as non-ELL students, improving their success on performance assessments, although not closing the achievement gap (Aguirre-Muñoz, Boscardin, et al., 2006). In a study that included English language arts teachers and their middle school students, researchers found that higher performance on the Language Arts Performance Assignment for both ELL students and native English speakers was associated with the teaching of functional grammatical concepts, with a focus on how text is organized in various academic content areas (Aguirre-Muñoz, Parks, et al., 2006).

Because academic content and academic language are best taught together in an integrated fashion, teachers must amplify rather than simplify their instructional communication with students (Walqui, 2003; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). To amplify communication, teachers provide students with a rich linguistic and extralinguistic context during instruction, including multiple cues to support comprehension—what Gibbons (2002) refers to as “message abundancy.” For example, ELL students engaged in reading rich academic texts should be provided pre-reading activities that help them build the schemata and context that will support their reading comprehension. Such activities might involve anticipatory guides, in which students review statements about information or ideas that will be addressed in the academic text and consider whether each statement is true or false. As a way to discuss what they learned from the text, students might then return to the statements after completing their reading. Prior to having students start reading the text, teachers can also engage students in quick writes, in which students respond in 2 to 10 minutes to writing prompts, thus helping them bring to mind prior knowledge and experiences related to the text. Similarly, before reading picture books, teachers can lead students in picture walks, in which the teacher guides students in looking through illustrations and making predictions. During these picture walks the teacher also introduces key concepts or vocabulary so as to establish interest in the story and reinforce the use of visual cues when reading. Alternately, students can discuss and order key illustrations and then present the story they think will emerge in the book.

ELL students should be given access to models of academic genres and to multiple opportunities to engage with and practice using the complex language and concepts they are learning. When students are reading a text over a period of days, teachers should periodically organize structured discussions in which the language and concepts from the text are rephrased and expressed in
different ways. After finishing reading a text, students can engage in activities that require them to return to the text for specific purposes. For example, students can reread the text with particular prompts in mind to prepare for a discussion or to complete different types of assignments.

Promoting high-quality interactions to develop the use of academic language and new linguistic competencies. Along with engagement with text, interaction with other people is the basis upon which language development is largely built. To support both content learning and language development, students must be encouraged to engage in high-quality interactions with peers, teachers, and texts that extend and deepen their understanding of core academic ideas. A recent review of research on effective literacy instruction for Spanish-speaking ELL students revealed that two specific forms of cooperative learning (Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition [BCIRC] and Peer Assisted Learning Strategies [PALS]) were associated with a positive impact on literacy (Cheung & Slavin, 2012).

When structuring such interactions in the classroom, teachers must determine what levels of interaction students are already capable of engaging in independently, and then design instruction to build on and purposefully extend what students know and can do. Through their interactions with students, teachers can help students build on their current level of English language proficiency and understanding of academic content toward more sophisticated academic discourse and understanding of content, as articulated in teachers’ learning goals for their students.

Providing scaffolding that is adjusted as students gain competence with content and language. The systematic support (from modeling to suggesting to prompting) that teachers provide until the student can move independently through targeted tasks is known as scaffolding. Effective scaffolding does not entail simplifying either the language or content used with ELL students; rather, it is a strategy that allows for students to engage in challenging instructional activities while providing them with support that is both strong and flexible. Over time, students require decreasing levels of scaffolding as they gain the skills to appropriate the academic content and language for themselves (Quirocho & Ulanoff, 2009). Walqui and van Lier (2010) describe six key features of effective scaffolding for ELL students:

» Continuity and coherence: Familiar organizing structures and tasks provide a level of stability and predictability that enable ELL students to focus on novel content and language.

» Supportive environment: A safe classroom environment supports students to take risks with new learning and provides the means to do so.

» Intersubjectivity: Teacher and students jointly engage in activity and invest time and effort in comprehending and communicating with one another.

» Flow: Classroom activities are intrinsically motivating and challenging and fully engage students.

» Contingency: Scaffolding is contingent on and responsive to the learner’s immediately preceding initiative and responses.

» Gradual handover/takeover: Support is gradually removed as the learner develops competence and is able to take over pieces of work.

As districts and teachers develop instructional practices in response to the CCSS, scaffolding becomes an especially important strategy for working with ELL students. Under the CCSS, students are expected to read and write various types of texts in history/social studies and science—such as persuasive, analytical, and expository texts—with increasing sophistication, beginning in elementary school and progressing through high school (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010). Students are also expected to engage in interactive academic work, including collaborative conversations about an academic task or problem to be solved, evaluating a speaker’s point of view, and presenting information appropriately for a given
task, purpose, and audience. Engaging students in carefully scaffolded, rich academic tasks that integrate content and language can help them reach these new oral language and literacy expectations.

Implications of effective ELL instruction for formative assessment

What we know about effective ELL instruction suggests a pivotal role for formative assessment, particularly in this CCSS era in which educators need to ensure that students are on track for deeper learning. Formative assessment may be even more critical for the effective instruction of ELL students than non-ELL students. ELL students are learning content, academic skills, and language simultaneously, and hence are more likely than non-ELL students to develop misconceptions in the course of learning academic practices taught in English—misconceptions that need early detection so that the course of learning can be reset (Abedi, 2011; Bailey et al., 2010). Frequent formative assessment of ELL students gives substantive insight into both their language and content learning, allowing the teacher to provide the right type and level of supports that students need as they build their capacity and autonomy as learners. Because ELL students’ English language proficiency is developing, a teacher cannot readily predict exactly what aspects of new content each ELL student will comprehend, and therefore the teacher must rely on ongoing assessment to inform any necessary instructional adjustments (Meskill, 2010).

What we know about effective assessment for ELL students

As yet, there is no accepted set of measurement principles to guide formative assessment for students in general, much less for ELL students (Bennett, 2011; Trumbull & Lash, 2013). What we know about assessing ELL students comes primarily from research and practice on summative assessment. Critical concerns in summative assessment of at-risk student populations, including ELL students, include issues of validity and access:

Do the assessment process and tools lead to valid results for these students? Do these students have sufficient access to the assessment process and content? Similar concerns arise in the use of formative assessment. Thus, this section explores recent developments in the summative assessment of ELL students, with particular emphasis on issues of assessment validity and access.

Validity considerations for assessment of ELL students

Test developers, and those who purchase assessments for schools, must understand that the ELL population is highly diverse, and that the interaction between an ELL student's academic content knowledge and his or her English language proficiency affects the validity, reliability, and fairness of any assessments used with them.

Design and implementation of all assessments, including those developed for ELL students, are driven by validity considerations—the extent to which an assessment measures what it purports to measure, thus providing a sound basis for interpreting scores on the assessment. Appropriate assessment development requires a validity framework, which posits a theory of action that links academic content, population characteristics, and consequences of using the assessment for the purposes and desired outcomes outlined as part of the framework (Kane, 2006). To build a validity framework for the assessment of ELL students, three aspects of validity—content, construct, and consequential—are particularly significant.

Content validity. Because of the interaction between content and language skills, it is critical when assessing ELL students to be clear about whether English language proficiency or academic knowledge and skills are being assessed. For example when the targeted content is language skills, as in an English language proficiency examination, the question is: How well is the assessment aligned to English Language Development (ELD) standards? When, instead, the targeted content is academic knowledge and skills, as in a statewide test of
When the targeted content is math, science, or any content area other than English language arts, a major concern in the large-scale assessment of ELL students is the inclusion of extraneous or needlessly complex language. For example, math word problems with unduly long or irrelevant text introduce unwanted content into the assessment. If a student responds incorrectly to such a word problem, it is not clear if the student lacks proficiency in the targeted math skill or simply doesn’t understand the superfluous language.\(^5\)

To help ensure content validity, assessment developers must not only be aware of the breadth of the content to be assessed but must also target assessment tasks and modules at the proper depth. A common concern in the large-scale assessment of ELL students (and some other special populations) is that academic content assessment items are overly simplified in an attempt to ensure that test items are appropriate for these students, resulting in a test that may lack the proper content depth or complexity (Messick, 1993; Sato, Rabinowitz, Gallagher, & Huang, 2010). The scores resulting from such a test might overestimate an ELL student’s achievement relative to the targeted academic domain.

**Construct validity and the question of access.** Construct validity embraces all forms of validity and is the ultimate test for any type of assessment: Does the assessment measure what it purports to measure for each identified purpose and targeted student population? Research shows that the validity of assessments, particularly those administered to ELL students, requires that these students have adequate access to the academic content on which they are assessed (Gong & Marion, 2006; Herman & Abedi, 2004; Marion & Pellegrino, 2006; Pellegrino, 2006).

The term *opportunity to learn* (OTL) is often used to characterize access to the academic curriculum that students are expected to master. Inequities in OTL have long been documented in less affluent communities, where teachers may be less well prepared and not have adequate resources for teaching (Oakes, 1985). Indeed, ELL students are at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to OTL. Although any students (including ELL students) may lack access to the academic curriculum, ELL students often face additional barriers, such as lack of access to both academic language and basic structures of the English language.

In assessment terms, providing access requires minimizing or removing any source of variance among student test scores that is not related to the construct being tested. In the previous example of a math word problem with unnecessarily complex and lengthy text, language is a potential construct-irrelevant factor that may limit ELL student access to the content of the problem. As a result of this barrier, the test may well underestimate the ELL student’s mathematical problem-solving achievement.\(^6\)

Access can also be limited by the background context in which an assessment question is couched, when that context does not align with the experiences students have had (Kopriva, 2008). For instance, relevant academic language (such as technical terms) that is part of the mathematical concept being measured is appropriate to include in word problems. For example, if the targeted math skill relates to *area* and *perimeter*, it is essential for word problems to include those terms and to expect all students, including ELL students, to understand them and to solve the problems.

\(^5\) Relevant academic language (such as technical terms) that is part of the mathematical concept being measured is appropriate to include in word problems. For example, if the targeted math skill relates to *area* and *perimeter*, it is essential for word problems to include those terms and to expect all students, including ELL students, to understand them and to solve the problems.

\(^6\) We are not advocating simplification of all language during assessment—ELL students should be exposed to and supported in their engagement with and acquisition of rich language tied to rigorous academic content so that they can develop toward extended discourse and proficiency in English within the academic content. Rather, we are highlighting the necessity for assessment developers and users of distinguishing between construct-relevant language and construct-irrelevant language that should be simplified on an assessment so that ELL students can access the assessed content and fully demonstrate what they know.
immigrant students from Mexico may not connect in the way that their U.S.-born peers do with a mathematics item asking them to calculate the cost of materials for a tetherball structure (Trumbull & Solano-Flores, 2011). Furthermore, access is likely affected by students’ ability to understand the test register, the particular variety of academic language used in tests, which has its own vocabulary, grammar, and discourse features. The test register is characterized by concentrated text and limited contextual information (Solano-Flores, 2006). Typical test items require very careful reading, with attention to words such as unless, therefore, but, except, in, and on, and phrases such as which of the following that indicate a relationship between words in a list but have little semantic content in themselves.

Some test item graphics that are intended to set a context for students actually have no substantive value for helping students respond to the assessment item. Research indicates that some ELL students look to a graphic for cues that may not be present, interfering with their ability to solve the assessment problem presented (Kachchaf & Solano-Flores, 2012). In addition, the format of a written item may introduce unnecessary demands on a student who is unfamiliar with that format or is more experienced with another format (Kopriva, 2008). For instance, immigrant students accustomed to assessment items that directly pose a mathematical question may be confused by having the item set in a story context. They may focus more on the story than on the mathematical task at hand (Trumbull & Solano-Flores, 2011).

Linguistic analysis of mathematics, science, and reading comprehension items on the Stanford Achievement Test Series (Ninth Edition) revealed that well over half of the items in all content areas contained unnecessarily difficult vocabulary or syntax that increased the “language load” of the items (Bailey, 2005). Seventy-five percent or more of science and reading comprehension items were judged to have unnecessary language load. That is to say, simpler vocabulary or syntax could have been used without affecting the conceptual demand of the items. This kind of construct-irrelevant linguistic complexity no doubt penalizes all test-takers to some degree, but it is likely to disproportionately affect ELL students and poor readers. In this case, researchers found that the performance gap between ELL students and native English speakers increased as the language load of an item increased (Bailey, 2005). As would be expected, the performance gap narrowed or disappeared for items that entailed only mathematics computation, which is not very language-dependent.

Viewing the issue from another angle, a study of student test-taking behaviors suggests that ELL students may deploy their cognitive resources differently from their non-ELL peers when they respond to an assessment task. Using cognitive interviews with students in an experimental study, Kachchaf and Solano-Flores (2012) found that non-ELL students tended to use significantly more problem-solving strategies than ELL students did to answer a science question. In contrast, ELL students devoted more effort to making sense of the question being asked. Others have reported similar findings (Durán, 2008; Rivera et al., 2006).

Ideally, consideration of student access would occur during design and development of an assessment. By limiting the language load of the assessment in ways that support clarity without significantly altering the targeted academic construct that is being assessed, test developers support students’ ability to demonstrate their academic knowledge and skills. In situations where it is appropriate and possible to design assessments in both English and another language, the same considerations should be applied. Equal attention should be given to modifying assessment language in languages other than English; simply translating from English to the target language can result in an inferior assessment that yields invalid data (Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003; Solano-Flores, 2008).

In addition to design and development strategies or modification of test item presentation to maximize ELL students’ access to assessment tasks, specific accommodations implemented during test administration are often necessary to ensure students’
full access. Accommodations (e.g., extended time for assessment administration; dictation of student answers to the assessment; provision of glossaries) typically are selected to support each student’s access to, interactions with, and responses to test item content (Abedi, Hoffstetter, & Lord, 2004). Historically, accommodations were identified and implemented to support access for students with disabilities. However, not all accommodations appropriate for students with disabilities are appropriate for ELL students (Abedi, 2011). Educators must know how to distinguish between accommodations that are useful and effective for ELL students and those that apply primarily to students with disabilities (Acosta, Rivera, & Shafer Willner, 2008). Although accommodations for ELL students focus primarily on their linguistic needs, those for students with disabilities tend to focus on physical, sensory, and behavioral needs, which are addressed through strategies concerning presentation, response, timing/scheduling, and setting (Acosta et al., 2008).

Research has shown that the use of appropriate, systematically selected accommodations for ELL students results in significantly higher performance on standardized measures (Kopriva et al., 2007). It is important to note that, whereas accommodations are most frequently associated with summative assessments, formative assessment tasks embedded in commercial curricula, which are commonly used across classrooms, may specify accommodations for ELL students. Teachers who use such formative assessment tasks should be prepared to evaluate the appropriateness of these accommodation practices for their ELL students. They may want to offer additional accommodations for particular formative assessment tasks.

Consequential validity. Consequential validity concerns the intended and unintended consequences of test interpretation and use (Messick, 1989): Does the assessment practice lead to or interfere with student learning and achievement? For an assessment to demonstrate consequential validity, it should not result in any adverse consequences for those who have been assessed. Assessments can have negative consequences if they misdirect teaching efforts, deny students’ access to beneficial learning opportunities, or exclude students with particular needs (Darling-Hammond et al., 2013). A concern in large-scale assessment is whether the assessment recognizes ELL students who meet grade-level content standards. For example, a consequentially invalid result of a large-scale assessment might be that ELL students are incorrectly placed in math remediation classes as a result of an assessment that underestimates their math ability.

All assessments, especially classroom-based formative assessments, should inform and reinforce effective instructional practice aimed at long-term student achievement, rather than short-term strategies used to increase test scores (see, e.g., Torrance, 2007). Thus, of the three types of ELL assessment considerations described here, consequential validity is arguably the most directly relevant to formative assessment of ELL students from an instructional perspective (Messick, 1989). A key question for formative assessment is: Does the assessment practice lead to or interfere with proper instruction and enhanced student learning?

Implications of valid large-scale assessment of ELL students for formative assessment

What we know about large-scale assessment of ELL students has several implications for formative assessment of ELL students. In designing formative assessment tasks, teachers must be mindful of the evidence of learning they are trying to elicit—whether it is disciplinary content, academic skills, or English proficiency. Not only must they be purposeful in targeting skills to ensure ELL students’ access to formative assessment, teachers must be sensitive to the variety of demands that their formative assessment questions and tasks can place on students and must know the typical features of tasks that can cause students to slip up. Finally, as with large-scale assessment, teachers must be mindful of unintended consequences of formative assessment, specifically that inappropriate formative assessment practice can lead to inappropriate instructional decisions.
Fortunately, because teachers interact with and observe their students performing on instructional tasks daily, teachers can bring knowledge about students’ language and academic proficiencies to bear upon their interpretation of students’ responses to formative assessment tasks. Thus, teachers can make informed inferences about student learning from formative assessments that cannot be made on the basis of decontextualized summary scores from large-scale assessments. As a result, if a student’s performance on formative assessments does not appear to align with what the teacher thinks she or he knows about the student, the teacher is in a position to ask questions or administer additional tasks of different types to obtain additional data. For these reasons, some theorists suggest that standard notions of how to achieve assessment validity do not fully apply to formative assessment (Brookhart, 2003; Shavelson et al., 2007). Nevertheless, the fundamental concerns are the same: Has every effort been made to ensure that the target constructs and only those constructs are being assessed? Can inferences based on the data gathered be justified? Are the consequences of the assessment practice appropriate for students?

A Proposed Approach to Formative Assessment of ELL Students

Combining what we know about formative assessment for students in general with what we know about effective instruction and assessment of ELL students leads us to recommend a particular approach to formative assessment of ELL students. This recommendation makes use of established stages of the formative assessment process: (1) articulation of the construct—including learning goals and success criteria—being taught and assessed, (2) elicitation of evidence about students’ learning, and (3) interpretation of this evidence for future instruction. Figure 1 depicts the logic model for this proposed formative assessment process. Specifically, it posits that the appropriate use of formative assessment leads to specific desired changes for teachers and students, including: improved teacher understanding of the relationship between content and English language development in the context of instruction; increased teacher knowledge of students’ progress relative to learning goals; and improved ELL student engagement in learning and assessment. In turn, these desired changes ultimately lead to improved student learning in academic content (including development of academic language and literacy concepts) and English language proficiency.

Articulation of the construct being taught and assessed

The first step in formative assessment consists of the teacher (and sometimes students) articulating the learning goals and success criteria. An understanding of learning progressions can help the teacher set appropriate goals and plan out formative assessment for students. Learning progressions undergird formative assessment in that they (either implicitly or explicitly) guide a teacher’s view of what a child is on the cusp of developing and, consequently, the instruction needed to support that development. However, the likely interaction of content and language progressions for ELL students complicates the picture and presents a challenge specific to articulating the learning progressions for ELL students.

When the teacher and students set a learning goal that is focused primarily on content, this does not mean that language demands should automatically be removed or minimized from any formative assessment task related to this goal. Especially when working with ELL students, teachers need to ask: What is the concept I am teaching? Is language and/or literacy part of my learning goals or the success criteria (i.e., what students need to do to show they have mastered the learning goals)? If so, what aspects of language or literacy are relevant?

An important companion to goal setting is defining what success relative to that goal looks like. A key element of any assessment, including formative assessment, is a set of criteria for what counts as...
success. Teachers and testing companies often use rubrics for open-ended assessment tasks. A rubric is an organized set of criteria for judging the quality of a student’s demonstrated learning in some aspect of a domain. A rubric—or any set of criteria—helps teacher and student determine whether something has been learned well or not. It can also be used instructionally, to point students to specific learning goals and help them imagine what achievement of those goals looks like (Andrade, 2000).

Research shows that teachers may not always make learning goals explicit, particularly for aspects of language learning. In a research collaboration with kindergarten teachers of Spanish-speaking ELL students, researchers found that even when teachers had explicit learning criteria vis-à-vis the science content of more than half of their activities, they had such criteria for only 10 percent of the academic language learning (Bailey et al., 2011). This was in a setting where all teachers were bilingual, with Spanish as a first language and English as a second language. However, with feedback from the researchers and joint meetings to develop pedagogical tools, teachers eventually developed success criteria for 91 percent of their instructional activities.

Elicitation of evidence about ELL students’ learning

Once teachers are clear about the role of language in the construct they are teaching and assessing, they can plan for how they will elicit evidence of learning. Eliciting such evidence is done to gain an understanding of where the student is in relation to his or her learning goal. As previously noted, evidence elicited from formative assessment activities can range from responses on formal, curriculum-embedded tasks to data collected on the fly. Depending on the place of language in the relevant learning goal, the teacher can select how language-dependent the formative assessment task will be. If focusing solely on students’ content knowledge, the teacher can tap students’ understanding and skill through tasks that are minimally language-dependent, such as visual or performance tasks.

**FIGURE 1: Logic Model for a Proposed Approach to Formative Assessment of ELL Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Desired Changes</th>
<th>Ultimate Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Articulation of the construct—including learning goals, learning progressions, and success criteria—being taught and assessed</td>
<td>• Improved teacher understanding of the relationship between content and English language development in the context of instruction</td>
<td>Improved student learning in academic content—including development of academic language and literacy concepts—and English language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elicitation of evidence about ELL students’ learning</td>
<td>• Increase in teachers’ pedagogical and assessment knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of evidence to inform ongoing instruction</td>
<td>• Increase in teachers’ knowledge of students’ progress relative to learning goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater instructional focus on integrated academic content and English language development as well as higher-order learning skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Routine use of formative assessment data to make instructional adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved student engagement in learning and assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example, during a lesson about circuits, students can draw a circuit that will work and contrast it to one that will not work. In a literary analysis lesson, students can draw symbols that capture a novel’s theme or the role or emotional state of a particular character (see, e.g., Tellez & Waxman, 2006). Alternatively, if the teacher can comprehend the students’ primary language, he or she can encourage students to use their primary language to show content learning.7

Open-ended tasks that allow for multiple points of entry will allow students at a range of levels to demonstrate their learning, both of content and language. Such tasks can also embed multiple strategies to elicit learning. For example, by asking students to draw an image and explain it in writing, the teacher provides two ways for students to demonstrate learning and the teacher is able to informally triangulate data. Some students may be able to express an idea visually but struggle to explain it in writing.

Formative assessment tasks need not present the language barriers common to formal, standardized tests (Bailey, 2005). However, to the degree that the teacher relies on language to present problems, pose questions, give feedback, and engage students in discussion, formative assessment is vulnerable to the same threat to validity as large-scale summative assessment—meaning that it can become as much a test of language skill as it is of content knowledge. Formative assessment tasks typically require that

7 However, teachers should be judicious about using this strategy because an academic task may be more difficult in a student’s primary language if he or she has been educated solely in English and does not have relevant academic language or literacy competencies in his or her primary language. Determination of which language to use in formative assessment entails consideration of many factors, and any choice will have its limitations for yielding accurate information about student learning (Solano-Flores, 2008). If the learning goal focuses on the comprehension of disciplinary language (either written or oral), the assessment task can allow for multiple ways to express that comprehension, so that students’ limited oral English abilities don’t preclude their expression of learning.
be able to make a decision to engage in one strategy over the other, as the instruction or assessment situation demands. Amplification, as a key instructional support strategy, must take precedence—particularly when the teacher explains, models, and provides feedback to ELL students. However, when the teacher is in the process of eliciting evidence of learning through formative assessment tasks, the teacher must take care that the evidence is of the targeted content/skill that he or she is trying to measure and not evidence of the targeted skill plus something additional and unwanted.

For example, if the teacher wants to simply gauge whether or not his or her young ELL students understand the basic concept of two-digit addition, the teacher should start by asking students to provide an answer to the problem “12 + 15,” rather than asking them to complete a word problem. The latter task may elicit evidence not only of “ability to add two-digit numbers” but also some language skill.

For a student who gives the correct response to the problem “12 + 15,” a next step may be to gauge whether or not the student understands when to use this operation. Thus, the teacher might ask:

“What operation (addition or subtraction) do you use to solve this problem? Jacob had [__] apples; Emma gave him [__] more. Now how many apples does Jacob have?”

Note that the example above uses a word problem structure that conveys, through language, a particular mathematical operation (“gave him [__] more” connotes addition). All students—non-ELL students and ELL students—need to learn the structure of these problems in order to figure out what operation to apply (Carpenter & Moser, 1982).

In summary, to really understand a student’s knowledge of two-digit addition, a teacher can start by posing problems that minimize the language load (as in the pure computation problem of “12 + 15”), then ask if the student knows when to use addition (as in the number-free story problem above), and then finally ask the student to do both (solve a word problem with numbers).

As suggested above, minimization of language load may be of more concern in some formative assessment tasks than others. For example, it may be less important to consider the language load during on-the-fly assessments as compared to more formal, curriculum-embedded tasks. With on-the-fly formative assessment, teachers can use amplification and follow-up questions to better gauge a student’s learning, homing in on the source(s) of a student’s errors.

Interpretation of evidence to inform ongoing instruction

The next phase in the formative assessment cycle is the interpretation of data. Teachers do this, as can students who participate through peer and self-assessment. Interpretation may be done in the moment or over a longer time scale. The process generates feedback on the status of current learning, which should include specific guidance as to how each student can move closer to the learning goal. The interpretation also informs subsequent teaching and learning activities.

The more thoughtful a teacher is beforehand about the learning goal and evidence, the better able he or she will be to provide feedback that builds toward the learning goal. In order to interpret ELL students’ performances on a task, teachers need to understand the task’s linguistic and information processing demands (Durán, 2008). Although language and content are closely interlinked, it can be helpful to analytically separate content and language when looking at students’ work. Teasing apart English language development and academic content achievement is particularly important in analyzing the performances of ELL students on formative assessment tasks—particularly the more formal, planned-for tasks—because it provides the teacher with information about sources of error on a given task and helps the teacher interpret a student’s performance appropriately so that subsequent instruction can effectively target the student’s learning needs.
Because second language acquisition, even in young children, takes time (Valdés, Capitelli, & Alvarez, 2010), teachers must make sure to note both what students understand conceptually and what they can or can’t do linguistically. A student may have a strong conceptual grasp of the material, but may not yet be able to explain his or her understanding in standard, academic English. The teacher’s feedback and subsequent instruction should reflect the learning goals. For example, in a fourth-grade math lesson, a teacher may want to understand students’ grasp of equivalent fractions and might ask an ELL student to explain why she knows that 1/2 and 6/12 are equivalent. In her feedback to the student, the teacher should focus on the content of the student’s contribution, rather than her grammar. In this situation, correcting the student’s grammar would derail the focus on math and possibly confuse the student. However, if an error in usage interferes with correct mathematical expression, the teacher should take the opportunity to make the student conscious of the correct form because of the importance of precision in mathematical communication (see Trumbull & Solano-Flores, 2011). Another strategy for getting at students’ mathematical understanding and proficiency with mathematical expression is to have students write their own word problems and get other students to solve them (Barwell, 2009). Feedback from other students about the items can help hone students’ use of mathematical language.

If the focus of a lesson includes academic or disciplinary language, the teacher should be clear about what aspect of language is the focus and use this to guide his or her analysis and feedback. For example, in a ninth-grade social studies class in which students are learning to write argumentative essays, the teacher might notice that students are not providing evidence for their claims. She could then plan a lesson where they examine model texts, identify the claims and evidence, and create a list of linking phrases that authors use to connect claims and evidence (e.g., therefore, as a result, for instance). Students would then reflect on their drafts and note where they have or have not cited evidence, and how they can strengthen their arguments by citing evidence and using linking phrases to clearly and convincingly connect evidence to claims. At the end of the lesson, the teacher would collect students’ revised drafts. Given the focus of her lesson, her analysis and feedback would focus on their use of relevant evidence and how they link it to the claims. Of course, she may also notice other features of academic English that ELL students are struggling with, and this could serve as a focus for future lessons.8

It is important to note that providing effective feedback to students is not easy. A number of recent studies have found that teachers struggle with providing feedback that is both substantive and actionable by students (Ruiz-Primo & Li, 2011). In addition, although feedback is effective only if and when it’s used to adjust instruction, research has shown that many teachers fall short in implementing such adjustments. That is, although they may be able to gather learning evidence and diagnose a student’s learning gaps, they are often not successful at undertaking specific instructional steps to close the gap (Trumbull & Lash, 2013). Developing the deep level of teacher expertise needed to deliver effective formative assessment requires a school to create a system of support and to provide continual teacher professional learning practice.

What Next?

Formative assessment is a promising strategy for helping ELL students with the formidable challenge of learning rigorous academic content at the same time they are learning English. Building on an evidence-based understanding of effective instruction and valid assessment of ELL students, we’ve argued that formative assessment may be even more beneficial for the teaching and learning of ELL students than of non-ELL students because the continual practice of gauging learning and adjusting instruction is key to addressing the gaps and misconceptions that may prevent ELL students from achieving

---

8 We provide more fully fleshed out examples in the appendix to this paper. ▶
English language proficiency and deep content learning. However, much more research on formative assessment remains to be done before there is a full understanding of how best to help ELL students reap the most benefits of this promising practice. An adequate body of research specifically related to formative assessment with ELL students will be long in the making, no doubt.

Regardless of how research efforts may proceed, the implementation of CCSS and other rigorous standards means that numerous districts and schools are seizing on formative assessment as a key strategy for preparing their students. Therefore, professional development on the effective use of formative assessment with ELL students is widely needed (for an extended discussion of formative assessment professional development, see Trumbull & Gerzon, 2013). Indeed, high-quality professional development is a key factor for the effective implementation of formative assessment with ELL students. The need for teachers to support ELL language development and attainment of the rigorous CCSS requires many teachers to expand their skills and strategies. The needed expertise cannot be expected of either novice or veteran teachers unless ongoing support is provided to help them interpret and evaluate—both contingently and in the moment, as well as for future lessons—where students are, what knowledge and skills they are ready to develop, and how to maximize that development.

Effective professional development for teachers, very much like accomplished teaching, creates robust visions of destinations (long-term goals), starts with learners where they are, traces responsive developmental paths, and scaffolds that development. In the process, all actions of the professional developers point to the same long-term goal, help accomplish intermediate goals, and assess formatively where to go next.

Effective professional development also requires significant structural support. Specifically, a comprehensive professional development plan requires coordinated and complementary roles at the state and local levels. Some components of this plan will support formative assessment strategies for all students; others will be more tailored to the specific needs of ELL students. In both cases, teachers must become familiar with the key principles of effective formative assessment described in this paper and be given the opportunity to hone their skills in a supportive whole-school environment.

At the state level, several effective steps can be taken to support schools’ readiness to engage in effective formative assessment for ELL students and non-ELL students:

» Dissemination of effective, research-based formative assessment strategies, and the conditions under which they have been validated and found to be successful

» Development or adaption of sample formative assessment modules that include standards-based tasks, scoring guides, and key instructional supports (e.g., teacher’s guides)

» Support of statewide or local formative assessment communities (including online) who are charged with collaboratively developing resources for school-based implementation

» Development of webinars and training modules for use by local trainers or directly by teachers looking for real-time resources

At the local level, the following strategies can support professional development on formative assessment for teachers of ELL students:

» Whole-school focus: If only a few teachers in a school receive professional development, there will only be a limited impact on students. What we know about whole-school change suggests that a core group of staff working toward the same goals, engaged in the same practices, using the same vocabulary, and striving for consensus will be better positioned to effectively develop their ELL students’ and other students’ academic skills and language. Whole-school work entails the participation of all administrators and teachers in professional development. If principals,
assistant principals, and heads of departments are aligned under the same vision and practices of teaching and formative assessment, chances are that the school will become more successful in judging and promoting student learning.

» Professional development portfolio: Creating a coherent, powerful professional development portfolio for a school demands that all actions proposed for teacher learning point in the same direction. The same theory of learning and teaching should guide the design and implementation of workshops serving multiple disciplines or grades and workshops specific to a particular grade or subject matter. The same theory of language and how language develops needs to underlie proposed practices. In addition to workshops, there should be opportunities for teachers to get together and discuss their formative assessment efforts. Some of these opportunities can be offered through Teacher Learning Communities, some through common planning times. Another important component is coaching—in which teachers with more expertise accompany colleagues to their classes after having reviewed teacher action plans, and professional conversations afterward focus on the enactment of learning opportunities and formative assessment. Videos and transcripts are very useful artifacts in the joint analysis of formative assessment as well.

» Cohorts of teachers: An organizational structure that is especially productive in middle and high schools is to group students and have a consistent cohort of teachers (covering English Language Arts, English as a Second Language, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Science) assigned to each two or three groups of students. In this way, the teachers in each cohort share the same students, facilitating the teachers’ abilities to focus both on individual student growth and on group development.

» District support: Districts can and should support the kinds of professional development strategies described above. They are in a position to initiate work across schools and can provide both a larger breadth of expertise and economies of scale, as compared with individual school sites (Santos, Darling-Hammond, & Cheuk, 2012). For example, districts can facilitate learning communities where teachers (or administrators) across schools with similar roles can focus on common challenges of formative assessment implementation.

Although research supports the potential benefits of formative assessment for positively impacting student learning, formative assessment is not a panacea, and its effectiveness is dependent on a host of factors, such as professional development. Perhaps the approach and examples included here can help inform the practice of educators who hope to use formative assessment as a means of supporting ELL students’ access and achievement relative to rigorous standards.
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Appendix: Examples of formative assessment of ELL students

The examples in this appendix demonstrate both the power of formative assessment in linking student learning and instruction and the capacities required of teachers to enact effective formative assessment with ELL students. As described in this paper, formative assessment practice can occur along a continuum of different time scales and levels of formality. The examples here include both on-the-fly formative assessment practice, in which teachers provide contingent feedback and adjustments in the moment, to more planned and formal tasks, which teachers use to adjust instruction on a longer time scale. In each case, the teacher elicits evidence of learning in the context of rich instructional tasks and analyzes that information to provide actionable feedback and modifications to instruction that can accelerate student learning. The result is instruction that is more student-centered and responsive to students’ current capabilities and what they need to learn next.

Example 1

This example illustrates on-the-fly formative assessment. The teacher provides feedback and adjusts instruction in the moment, based on her observations of students and their comments or questions. While responding to a specific comment, she also draws from her prior knowledge of that student, including the student’s capabilities and goals for future learning.

Alice Cohen teaches an English as a Second Language (ESL) class at Ridgewood Intermediate, School 93, in New York City. Although her class contains only recent arrivals to the United States, they are very diverse, coming from 12 different countries and representing 10 languages as well as varied levels of prior schooling experiences. Although Ms. Cohen keeps in mind individual needs as she plans lessons, she invites all of her students to participate in the same rich and robust learning experience. As the lesson unfolds, she engages in constant “kid watching” to assess how much each student is understanding, whether students are misunderstanding something, how far they are from the learning goals she set for the lesson, and where to go next instructionally for individual students, and for the class as a whole.

The current lesson was designed to be a week-long focus on Robert Frost and the poem, The Road Not Taken, with the objective of analyzing metaphor and figurative language in poetry. On the first day students read and discuss a biography of Robert Frost. On the second day they listen to Ms. Cohen as she reads the poem aloud to them, and then they read it silently, working on interrogating the text and writing down their reactions and questions. Notes are shared in groups, and similar and different individual reactions are highlighted. On the third day the teacher asks students at each table to read the poem aloud in four voices (she has chunked out the poem meaningfully, retyping each chunk in a different font so that students can take a font each). They are then given the task of constructing a collaborative poster on one stanza of the poem, with each group working on a different stanza. Each group’s poster is supposed to contain one key quote from the stanza, one original phrase summarizing the spirit of the fragment, one symbol, and one picture. As groups work on their posters, Ms. Cohen walks around the class, observing what each individual student does and what each group does. She uses her observations to inform where she may go next.

The students who were assigned the first stanza choose their quote, start drawing their picture, and work on their original phrase. While the group’s two boys (S1 & S4) focus more on the drawing, the two girls (S2 & S3) work on writing their own statement:

S2: How about this, “I’m Robert Frost, I’ve got to decide, which path to take, right or wrong.” No, “right or wrong” ruined it. (Begins writing in a notebook.) “I’m Robert Frost...I’m Robert Frost, I have to choose, but it’s difficult for me, Robert Frost, to find the truth.”

S3: I don’t know, write it, write it. Write all of it, then we can fix it.
S2: “I’m Robert Frost, I have a path to choose. It’s hard for me,”

S3: “Robert Frost,”

S2: “to find the truth.” It’s like a rap.

S3: Let me see (reading from the notebook), “I’m Robert Frost, I have a path to choose,”

S2: “it’s hard for me, Robert Frost, to find the truth.”

Like, “truth” and “Frost” kind of go together...

... Not content with their choice, they keep trying:

S2: Oh, oh! “to choose the good or to choose the wrong.”

S3: Uh, “to choose the right or to choose the wrong.”

S2: Yeah, yeah, “to choose the right or to choose the wrong.”

S3: But he doesn’t know which one is wrong...

S2: Okay, “I’m Robert Frost, I have a path to choose, (writing the new ending) it’s up to me to find the truth.”

S3: Better. I think this one makes more sense and it explains more.

S2: Yeah, but he still needs to choose, “to choose the right or to choose the wrong.”

S3: But he doesn’t know which one is wrong...

S2: Okay, “I’m Robert Frost, I have a path to choose, (writing the new ending) it’s up to me to find the truth.”

S3: (Teacher joins the group, S2 has explained the problem to her.) We think that after the “right” part, it’s right, but we don’t know.

S2: (reading) “I’m Robert Frost, I have a path to choose. I might choose the right, but it might be…”

T: “but it might be wrong.”

S3: (Teacher joins the group, S2 has explained the problem to her.) We think that after the “right” part, it’s right, but we don’t know.

S2: (reading) “I’m Robert Frost, I have a path to choose. I might choose the right, but it might be…”

T: “but it might be wrong.”

S3: But it doesn’t rhyme.

T: You want it to rhyme?

S2: Yeah.
T: Why don’t you use a homophone?
S1: “I might choose the right road so I can write.”
S3: (smiling) “I might choose the right that might help me write.”

This example shows valuable instances of on-the-fly formative assessment, in which Ms. Cohen provides a suggestion based on her observations and knowledge of students that supports the group in successfully completing the task. Ms. Cohen has observed, without interrupting, the first part of the discussion. She knows the students in this team understand what they need to do, they get the key idea of the poem’s first stanza, and their decisions on the quote and picture to be drawn demonstrate their understanding and struggles with making their language increasingly more precise. She then decides to move to observe and assess other groups’ actions. When she is called by S2 to help the team with their impasse, it becomes clear to her that the group has misinterpreted that their phrase must rhyme. She sees that students are keen on their interpretation of the task, which increases its complexity. Rather than disappointing the students by saying that their statement does not need to rhyme, she acts contingently by bringing in a concept the students studied before—homophones. After one boy suggests an answer, S3 polishes it for the poster. During the presentation to the whole class, which is shared by all, it is S4 who explains to the class, “We decided to use a homophone.”

Ms. Cohen’s careful observation of students’ actions serves as formative assessment data that she interprets in order to act contingently and provide feedback that supports the students in completing the academic task. Her observations tell her that students understand and enjoy using rhyme, that they are developing linguistic perseverance (they check the dictionary; they try hard; when everything fails, they look for the teacher’s help), and that they can bring forth resources learned in past classes. She realizes that metalinguistic knowledge (their objective knowledge about language) fosters their autonomy, and more importantly, rather than giving them the answer, she formulates a question that will get students to get the answer themselves. In addition to this in-the-moment feedback she has provided, she now knows how she is going to introduce in the next class other metalinguistic concepts, such as figurative language and metaphor.

Example 2

This example illustrates formative assessment on a longer time scale, as the teacher adjusts instruction over the course of a unit. The teacher has planned a rich instructional task that will allow her to see what students understand about the content they are studying and how they are able to articulate that understanding in written English. In analyzing students’ writing, she realizes that they need to solidify their understanding of the subject matter but also need support developing the disciplinary language to show their conceptual understandings. The class develops criteria for the genre they are learning, which students use to self- and peer-assess, generating feedback that they will use to revise their writing. In this way, the example highlights how formative assessment can support students to develop autonomy and self-regulation as learners.

This is a fourth- and fifth-grade bilingual class in which all of the students are Spanish speakers and have been designated as ELL students. The class is currently studying electricity and magnetism using the FOSS science curriculum developed by the Lawrence Hall of Science. Central to the FOSS curriculum are a series of hands-on activities and investigations through which students build their understanding of electricity by creating and manipulating different types of circuits and electromagnets. The teacher has adapted the science unit to serve as a venue for language and literacy development as well.

In the weeks leading up to this example, students have created circuits to power light bulbs and motors. At the same time, the class has used the content as an opportunity to develop their competence with one genre of science writing: instructions. Students have orally given each other instructions to create different kinds of circuits and have written instructions. Based on her observations of students’
work with circuits and their written instructions, the teacher has concluded that the students have a strong procedural understanding of electrical circuits. That is, they know how to design and build circuits that function. However, she also wants students to understand that a circuit involves the flow of electricity and that it requires a closed connection that allows the electricity to travel through a complete pathway.

She adapts an activity from FOSS in which students are presented with six pictures of complete and incomplete circuits. The students must apply their experience with circuits thus far to determine which of the options shown in the pictures will work to illuminate a light bulb. Although the curriculum intends the activity to be an individual assessment, the teacher uses it as an instructional activity to address both content and language goals and as part of a formative assessment process. First, she gives students time to look at the images individually and consider which will or will not work. Students then pair up and discuss the circuits with a partner, coming to consensus about which will and will not work. If students have different opinions, they are asked to explain and provide reasons to convince their partner. The class then comes back together to discuss each picture. The teacher explains that now they will write explanations of why one of the circuits does not work and how it can be fixed. In this writing, students are asked to give some directions and are asked to explain, which is a different function of science writing. She expects that students’ prior oral explanations, in pairs and in the whole-class discussion, will support their writing. To provide an example of what she expects, the teacher also models writing an explanation for one of the incomplete circuits. Students then write their own paragraphs. At the end of the class, she collects their writing to consider their current state of learning. Students are not done with their study of electricity, and they have just begun to work on explanations. Therefore, her analysis of students’ writing will inform the activities she plans for the coming days.

Table 1 includes two examples of what students write for this task, showing the kind of information the teacher analyzes in a formative assessment process to inform future instruction. Both students, Nicolás and Miguel, write about a drawing labeled “Picture 1,” and both are Intermediate level ELL students in fifth grade. Before analyzing the two examples, it is important to consider the genre students are producing or approximating. They have been asked to produce writing that both explains and gives instructions, as they are to explain why the circuit does not work and direct the reader on how to correct it so that it does work. Derewianka (1990) provides a helpful analysis of many genres that elementary school students are expected to read and write across the curriculum, including instructions and explanations.

TABLE 1: Writing samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicolás</th>
<th>Miguel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this paragraph, I am going to tell you how to make the light bulb turn on. What wrong is that you need to get one more wire because if the other wire is missing the electricity of the battery will not go around to make the light bulb turn on. Instead of get the other wire and put it in the other side of the battery and the light bulb too. Also, see if it turn on if it does is called a circuit because it makes the electricity go like a circle.</td>
<td>In this paragraph, I will tell you what is the problem on Picture 1. Picture 1 is not going to work because it has one wire, instead of use only one wire you need 2 wire’s. Then when you have a other wire instead of connected with other wire connected separate and connected to the other clip of the battery holder and also connected the other side from the wire and connected to the clip from the lightbulb holder and the lightbulb may work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 summarizes the purposes, text organization, and language features of these particular two genres: instructions and explanations.

In terms of the science content, both students correctly diagnose the problem with the drawing and explain how to fix it to make a complete, closed circuit. Nicolás has given more indication that he understands that electricity involves an electric current flowing around a complete circuit. He explains, “because if the other wire is missing the electricity of the battery will not go around to make the light bulb turn on.” At the end he also explains that if it turns on, it “is called a circuit because it makes the electricity go like a circle.” Therefore, it appears that he understands that in a circuit the electricity flows in a circle and that the battery is the source of electricity in the circuit. In contrast, Miguel does not provide an explanation of why it does or doesn’t work, but does provide more specific directions for how to correctly construct a circuit.

In terms of organization, both begin with an orientation that positions the reader and states the goal of the paragraph. Neither student uses subheadings to organize his piece, but both follow a temporal sequence of actions. They use generalized participants and refer to the reader in general terms as well (as “you” or by using command form). In addition, both students provide specific information about where and when the reader should take actions. For example, Nicolás directs the reader to put the wire “on the other side of the battery
and the light bulb too.” Miguel describes how the reader should connect the second wire “separate” from the other wire. He also explains which clips the wire should go into, directing the reader to put them in the “other clip” and the “other side,” meaning the clips not currently used by the first wire. Both students use specific referents to make their directions explicit to a non-present reader, though making sense of the directions requires referring to Picture 1.

Their use of transitional phrases parallels the differences we noted earlier in the content of their writing. Nicolás uses three different kinds of transitional phrases: cause and effect (because, if), contrastive (what wrong, instead of), and additive (also). He uses cause and effect phrases to support his explanation of why the circuit does not work and why the complete circuit would work. His contrastive phrases are tools to contrast the incomplete circuit with what the reader should do (“instead of use only one wire you need 2 wire’s”). Unlike Nicolás, Miguel uses sequential transitions (then, when you...), which support his giving of instructions.

Both students use timeless present tense with some future tense in the introductory sentence. Miguel writes the word connected several times, but it appears he means to say connect it, rather than use past tense. He also uses conditional tense at the end (may work), though the tentativeness expressed is perhaps inappropriate for the genre. Both students use mostly action verbs, though the range of the verbs is somewhat limited (make, need, get, turn on, put, see, use, connect, and work).

Based on going through this kind of analysis of the written responses from these and other students, the teacher decides that not all students have a strong grasp of the concept of circuits, or at least are not yet able to communicate their understanding in scientific terms. Some students, like Nicolás, appear to have a stronger grasp, but others either do not or, at least, did not communicate it given the task. Students like Miguel may have a stronger conceptual grasp than one would assume on the basis of reading their writing. The task may have not been clear to them, or they may need additional support using English to explain the scientific concept. While the scientific content and language demands of this particularly activity were intentionally interlinked, the teacher could have elected to engage students in a task that separates the linguistic from science content demands in order to better identify the possible sources of student struggles with this topic (e.g., whether such struggles are related to content, language, or clarity of task).

Highly interactive and well-structured classes—where all students are active and moving continuously into higher degrees of intellectual autonomy—provide fertile ground for formative assessment. In this type of environment, teachers can observe students in action, working collaboratively through a series of well-designed lessons and assignments. The kinds of assessment activities described above are well suited to revealing students’ misconceptions and gaps in knowledge, and the teacher now has considerable data upon which to plan further instruction.

To address students’ science and language development, the teacher decides to expand her work on scientific explanations over the next several days. She finds several examples of explanations in the science textbook that the class will read and analyze. Reading and working with these examples is intended to support students’ science and language learning. The examples will provide students with more information about electricity and how it functions, which they may not have been able to learn from hands-on activities. Analyzing these models should support students’ use of richer scientific language, including a broader range of action verbs. The class will also focus on the kinds of transitional phrases authors use with the goal of expanding students’ use of cause and effect phrases and sequential phrases. These are formulaic phrases that students can borrow to structure their own scientific writing, and that become generative over time as they...
are appropriated and used when they are needed. After reading several models, the class will develop criteria for scientific explanations. The teacher will model how to use these criteria to assess an example explanation she has written. They will then look back at their initial writing of the explanations and self-assess, with or without involvement of a peer. Finally, individually, students will use this feedback to revise and expand their original explanations. Through this process, students will have gained tools to evaluate and revise their own academic writing, fostering their autonomy as learners.
Text: *Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs of English Language Learners.*

Purpose for Reading
Although this paper focuses on the topic of formative assessment, it also provides a wealth of information about effective elements of lesson planning. As you read, your goal is to identify essential elements of effective lessons discussed or mentioned in the article.

Pre-Reading Quick Write
*Prior to reading, list characteristics of high-quality lessons that come to your mind.*

Active Reading Strategies
1. **Code:** As you read, underline sentences that mention or reference a specific element of an effective lesson.
2. **Annotate:** In the margins, give the element a name if it is not clear from the text itself.
3. **Record:** In the space below (or on the back of this sheet), create a question that one might ask during a lesson tuning session to encourage analysis of the element.

After-Reading Quick Write
*How can the information in this paper inform or support the process of analyzing and tuning a lesson plan?*
**Directions**
Feel free to use this organizer to take notes as you read.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Element</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Question to ask during tuning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of clear learning goals</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td>Does the lesson have a clear objective? And, is it clear how this will be communicated to students?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GUIDED WORKSHOP AGENDA - MODULE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Suggested Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of Course Modules</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Module 3 Intended Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Module 3 Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review group norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Debrief the Tuning Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text-Based Discussion</strong></td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activity: Text-Based Discussion of <em>Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs of English Language Learners</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyzing the Procedures for Lesson Tuning</strong></td>
<td>20 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review and Discussion of the Feedback Organizers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘What’ and ‘Why’ Analysis Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of Feedback Organizers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Videos</strong></td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Watch Video 1 – Praise of Effective Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Watch Video 2 – Feedback of Lesson Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Watch Video 3 – Feedback of Formative Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Watch Video 4 – Feedback of Instructional Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrap – Up</strong></td>
<td>5 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What was accomplished in Module 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review and discuss intended outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preparing for Collaborative Practice Round 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preparing for Module 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Capacity for a Collaborative ENL & General Education Model:
A Five-Module Course for School-Based Teams

Module 3
Tuning the Elements of a Lesson

Review of Course Modules

- Module 1 – Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol
- Module 2 – Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson
- Module 3 – Tuning Lesson Elements
- Module 4 – Integrating Supports for ENLs
- Module 5 – Building Capacity for Routine Collaboration

Module 3 Intended Outcomes

- By the end of Module 3, participants will:
  Be able to apply an understanding of specific lesson elements to analyze a lesson and provide feedback to colleagues.
Module 3 Agenda

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 2nd Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in Text-Based Discussion
4. Review the Feedback Guides
5. Engage in a What and Why Analysis Activity
6. Watch and Discuss Demonstration Videos
7. Schedule 3rd Round of Tuning Practice
8. Prepare for Module 4

Review Group Norms

1. Review the Norms of Collaboration or your group’s preset norms.
2. Select a norm to focus on for the day.

Norms of Collaboration
1. Pay Attention to Self & Others
2. Pause
3. Paraphrase
4. Put ideas on the Table
5. Provide Data
6. Probe
7. Place inquiry at the Center

Reflection

DEBRIEFING THE TUNING PROCESS
Debriefing the Tuning Process

Directions
- Use the Debriefing Tool to reflect on your last tuning session.
- Identify what HELPED or HINDERED the process.
- Share and discuss.
- Revise process for next time.
- Record changes.

Text-Based Discussion

ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVE LESSONS

Activity: Text-Based Discussion

As part of your pre-work for Module 3, you were asked to
1. Read the article entitled: Focusing Formative Assessment on the Needs of English Language Learners.
2. Complete the Active Reading Organizer.
Activity: Text-Based Discussion

Please take out the notes you recorded on the active reading organizer. As a team, consider and discuss the following prompts.

- What elements of effective lessons did you identify through your reading?
- Based on your reading, what are some questions teachers could ask when analyzing a teacher’s lesson plan in order to give constructive feedback?

Collaborative Activity

**ANALYSIS OF THE PROCEDURES FOR TUNING**

Activity: Review of the Feedback Organizers

**Directions**

1. Review the three different feedback guides in your course booklet. These guides provide three different options for taking notes during a tuning protocol. You probably explored these during your last two tuning sessions.
Activity: Review of the Feedback Organizers

Directions
1. As a group, discuss the following:
   • During which step(s) of the tuning process would you use a feedback guide?
   • What similarities and differences do you observe between the three choices?
   • In what situations might you use one guide over the others?

Activity: What and Why Analysis

Directions
1. Open your booklet to the ‘What’ and ‘Why’ Analysis Activity. This is a modified version of Feedback Organizer 1.
2. Review each element / section of the feedback organizer.
3. For each element, record your responses to each of the following questions:
   • What is being looked in the particular lesson element?
   • Why would this element be important to the lesson?
4. After everyone has had time to record their thoughts, discuss each element as a group.

Video Demonstrations

TUNING THE LESSON ELEMENTS
Demonstration Video

1. Next, you will watch three videos of teachers discussing and tuning the elements of a lesson.
2. As you watch the video, use the Video Observation Sheet to record the following:
   - Observations
   - Implications / Interpretations
   - Questions
   - Connections to Your Own Work
3. Be prepared to share and discuss your notes afterwards.

Step 6c: Praise of Effective Practices

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the YouTube channel video.

Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything the left you wondering.
Step 6d: Feedback of Lesson Objectives

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the Youtube channel video.

Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything the left you wondering.

Step 6d - Feedback of Formative Assessment

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the Youtube channel video.
Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything the left you wondering.

Step 6d - Feedback of Instructional Sequence

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the Youtube channel video.

Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything the left you wondering.
Wrapping Up Module 3

What was accomplished in Module 3

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 2nd Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in Text-Based Discussion
4. Engage in Feature and Function Activity
5. Watch and Discuss Demonstration Videos
6. Schedule 3rd Round of Tuning Practice
7. Prepare for Module 4

Activity

Discuss the intended outcomes for Module 3. To what extent do you feel they were met?

By the end of Module 3, participants will:
Be able to apply an understanding of specific lesson elements to analyze a lesson and provide feedback to colleagues.
Preparing for Collaborative Practice – Round 3

1. Clarify date and time for the collaborative practice.
2. Determine who the presenting teacher will be to bring a lesson to tune.
3. Determine who will volunteer to facilitate.
4. Have the presenting teacher complete the prep sheet for presenting teachers prior to meeting.

Preparing for Module 4

1. All
   - Complete reading assignments for Module 4.
2. Clarify Date, Time and Location
   - Collaborative Practice
   - Guided Workshop for Module 4
3. Materials to Bring
   - Course Booklet, notes from Round 3 of the collaborative tuning practice.

Summary Statement

The heart of Rhode Island Collaborative ENL and General Education model is for RIDE to provide districts and schools with resources to help build capacity to help all learners succeed – particularly including English Learners and students with disabilities.
DEBRIEFING TOOL

Directions
1. Reflect on the most recent round of collaborative lesson tuning.
2. Individually, use the organizer below to identify anything that HELPED or HINDERED the process of tuning.
3. After everyone has recorded their thoughts, share and discuss as a group.
4. Once the group has discussed the forces that supported or hindered the last opportunity to collaboratively tune a lesson, determine what changes can be made to improve the process next time.
5. Record these changes and have them on hand for the next round of collaborative lesson tuning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forces that HELPED</th>
<th>Forces that HINDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Suggested Changes to Improve the Process Next Time
TEXT-BASED DISCUSSION ACTIVITY

Directions
Discuss the following questions as a group. Use this sheet to record the groups’ thinking.

What elements of effective lessons did you identify through your reading?

Based on your reading, what are some questions teachers could ask when analyzing a teacher’s lesson plan in order to give constructive feedback?
‘WHAT’ AND ‘WHY’ ANALYSIS ACTIVITY

Lesson Information

Name of the Lesson: 
Teacher: 

Guiding Question or Area of Focus for Feedback

Lesson Objective

- Are the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clear and easy to communicate to students?

- Do the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clearly identify the following: 1) knowledge (the what) students need to have, 2) skills (the how) they will use to apply the knowledge, 3) evidence (the proof) that will demonstrate the extent to which the knowledge and skills have been mastered?

- Do the language / literacy objectives align with and support the content objective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we looking for in this element?</th>
<th>Why would this element be important to the lesson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formative Assessment

- Is it clear what evidence / materials will be used to determine how each student will demonstrate learning?

- Is it clear how students will receive feedback about their learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we looking for in this element?</th>
<th>Why would this element be important to the lesson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Sequence

- Is it clear how the objectives of the lesson will be communicated?

- Do all tasks align with the knowledge and skills in the focus standards?

- Are there opportunities for students to establish background knowledge?

- Are students encouraged to predict or set goals for their learning?

- Are all activities logically sequenced?

- Do students have opportunities to apply and/or practice what they learned?
### ‘WHAT’ AND ‘WHY’ ANALYSIS ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we looking for in this element?</th>
<th>Why would this element be important to the lesson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Differentiated Supports for English Language Learners and Students with Special Needs

- Are there opportunities for student to communicate, interact with, and/or receive content through different modalities over the course of the lesson?

- Is there a sufficient number of support strategies provided throughout the lesson to help English learners who may be at different levels of English proficiency?
  - Are there strategies to support listening to content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support communicating knowledge of content in English through speaking?
  - Are there strategies to support reading content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support writing about content in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we looking for in this element?</th>
<th>Why would this element be important to the lesson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Motivation and Engagement

- Do students have enough opportunities to have voice or make decisions?

- Will it be clear to students how the knowledge and skills they are learning will be valuable or meaningful?

- Are tasks appropriately challenging for all students?

- Does the lesson sufficiently ensure that ALL students will be successful?

- Do students have opportunities to collaborate with others and/or strengthen relationships through the work and learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we looking for in this element?</th>
<th>Why would this element be important to the lesson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Feedback**
VIDEO OBSERVATION SHEET

Use this sheet to record your thoughts as you observe the video.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Strategies or Ideas Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Connections to Your Own Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Thoughts
Presenter Tasks: To help everyone get the most out of the limited time to collaborate, please complete the following prior to meeting with the group to tune your lesson.

- Make enough copies of any lesson materials (lesson, texts, etc.)
- Complete and make enough copies of this completed document. This should only take 10 minutes to complete!

Brief Description of Lesson / Context

Lesson Objective (If not clear from lesson materials)

Focus Standard
In the spaces below, record the focus standard of the lesson, as well as any stated or implied knowledge and skills in the standard that need to be taught in the lesson, or that students should already have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Knowledge to be Taught</th>
<th>New Skills to be Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Knowledge Students Should Have</th>
<th>Skills Students Should Already Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Demands

What type of feedback would you like?
Purpose
This protocol provides a structured process for collaborative groups of teachers to use standards to tune a content lesson. Please note that the times below are based on a forty-five-minute time frame. Adjust times as needed.

Preparations and Materials
- Copies of the lesson to be tuned
- Copies of this protocol
- Copies of preferred note-taking sheets
- Copies of relevant standards
- Copies of completed Unpacking Sheet for the Focus Standard

Process
1. **Determine Roles and Set Norms (1 minute)**
   a) **Roles:** Facilitator, Presenting Teacher(s), Time Keeper, Note-Taker
   b) **Norms:** Pausing, Paraphrasing, Posing Questions, Putting Ideas on the Table, Providing Data, Paying Attention to Self and Others, Presuming Positive Intentions, Other: ___________________

2. **Present Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Provide BRIEF overview and description of the materials.
   b) Provide important background information about specific classes and students' needs.

3. **Identify Focus for Feedback (1 minute)**
   a) Identify question or area of focus to guide feedback.

4. **Review and Clarify Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Read and review presented materials.
   b) Ask clarifying questions about materials that prompt answers with QUICK responses – e.g. yes/no.

5. **Analyze the Focus Standard (5 minutes)**
   a) Clarify the focus standard.
   b) Identify and discuss the stated and implied knowledge and skills in the focus standard. Use the graphic organizer on the back of this sheet as a resource.

6. **Tune the Lesson (25 minutes)**
   a) Select a tool for collecting feedback.
   b) Silently read, analyze, and take notes.
   c) Share observations of effective practice, particularly what is being done to support ENLs and students with special needs.
   d) Discuss lesson elements and share feedback, particularly strategies for supporting ENLs and students with special needs.

7. **Reflection and Debrief (3 minutes)**
   a) Presenting teacher shares main take-aways.
   b) Participants share insights they gained from the conversation.
   c) Facilitator collects feedback about the process.

8. **Prepare for Next Tuning Session (3 minutes)**
   a) Identify the presenting teacher and facilitator for the next session.
   b) Provide presenting with the tuning prep sheet.
   c) Schedule date and time to meet.
Focus Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Demands for ENLs

Implications for Instruction

Implications for Assessment
FEEDBACK ORGANIZER 1 - GUIDING QUESTIONS

Lesson Information

Name of the Lesson:    Teacher:

Guiding Question or Area of Focus for Feedback

Lesson Objectives

☐ Are the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clear and easy to communicate to students?

☐ Do the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clearly identify the following: 1) knowledge (the what) students need to have, 2) skills (the how) they will use to apply the knowledge, 3) evidence (the proof) that will demonstrate the extent to which the knowledge and skills have been mastered?

☐ Do the language / literacy objectives align with and support the content objective?

Feedback / Suggestions

Formative Assessment

☐ Is it clear what evidence / materials will be used to determine how each student will demonstrate learning?

☐ Is it clear how students will receive feedback about their learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Instructional Sequence

☐ Is it clear how the objectives of the lesson will be communicated?

☐ Do all tasks align with the knowledge and skills in the focus standards?

☐ Are there opportunities for students to establish background knowledge?

☐ Are students encouraged to predict or set goals for their learning?

☐ Are all activities logically sequenced?

☐ Do students have opportunities to apply and/or practice what they learned?

Feedback / Suggestions

Differentiated Supports for English Learners and Students with Special Needs

- Are there opportunities for student to communicate, interact with, and/or receive content through different modalities over the course of the lesson?
- Is there a sufficient number of support strategies provided throughout the lesson to help English Learners who may be at different levels of English proficiency?
  - Are there strategies to support listening to content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support communicating knowledge of content in English through speaking?
  - Are there strategies to support reading content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support writing about content in English?

Feedback / Suggestions

Motivation and Engagement

- Do students have enough opportunities to have voice or make decisions?
- Will it be clear to students how the knowledge and skills they are learning will be valuable or meaningful?
- Are tasks appropriately challenging for all students?
- Does the lesson sufficiently ensure that ALL students will be successful?
- Do students have opportunities to collaborate with others and/or strengthen relationships through the work and learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Summary of Feedback
Focus of Feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson &amp; Language Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Supports for Students with Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation &amp; Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus of Feedback:

Praise for Effective Practices

Probing Questions

Suggestions
Module 4
Integrating Supports for English Language Learners

Pre-Work Tasks
- Engage in Round 3 of Lesson Tuning
- Download readings
  - WIDA Can Do Descriptors
    Link: [https://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/#](https://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/#)
  - 2012 Amplification of the ELD Standards – Read
    Link: [https://www.wida.us/standards/eld.aspx](https://www.wida.us/standards/eld.aspx)
  - The GO TO Strategies: Scaffolding Options for Teachers of English Language Learners, K-12
- Complete the pre-reading quick write on the active reading organizer.
- Read excerpts of texts for Module 4
- Complete the Active Reading Organizer

Guided Workshop Materials
- Active Reading Organizer 4-2
- Module 4 Guided Workshop Agenda 4-3
- Module 4 PPT Slides 4-4
- Debriefing Tool 4-5
- Strategy Map - Sample 4-6a
- Strategy Maps 4-6b-d
- Video Observation Sheet 4-7

Collaborative Practice Materials
- Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers 4-8a
- Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol 4-8b
- Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet 4-8c
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions 4-8d
- Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories 4-8e
- Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS 4-8f

Demonstration Videos (Not In Booklet)
Link to videos: [https://goo.gl/oONSzl](https://goo.gl/oONSzl)
- Step 6d – Feedback on Supports for ENLs
Purpose for Reading
The documents for this module provide information and concrete approaches and strategies that classroom teachers can use to support the language development of ENL students during content instruction. These tools will help teachers write language objectives for content lessons. They will also help teachers identify strategies that can be embedded into lessons to support ENLs’ acquisition of English through content learning. The documents can be accessed through the links provided.

Texts:
- WIDA Can Do Descriptors
  - Download and read the entire Can Do document for grade levels you teach.
  - Link: https://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/
- 2012 Amplification of the ELD Standards
  - Read pages 1-9.
  - Link: https://www.wida.us/standards/eld.aspx
- The GO TO Strategies: Scaffolding Options for Teachers of English Language Learners, K-12
  - Read pages 1-20, and peruse the toolbox of strategies.
  - Link: http://www.cal.org/what-we-do/projects/project-excell/the-go-to-strategies

Pre-Reading Quick Write
1. List any strategies you are familiar with that teachers can use to support English Language Learners in content classrooms.

2. On a scale from 1 to 5, with a 1 meaning not familiar at all and a 5 indicating very familiar, how familiar are you with the following concepts as they relate to English Learners and the WIDA Standards?
   ___ Key Uses
   ___ Language Domains
   ___ Features / Levels of Academic Language
   ___ Levels of Language Proficiency
   ___ Can Do Descriptors
Active Reading Strategy
As you read the texts, highlight or underline details that provide information about how to integrate supports for English Learners into content instruction. Use the two-column chart below to record your thoughts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail from Text (Include text &amp; page #)</th>
<th>How might this inform the teaching of ENLs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

After-Reading Quick Write
Consider how each of the following can help teachers determine the language objectives for content lessons, as well as strategies to support language acquisition through content learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Uses</th>
<th>How it helps with language objectives and strategies development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features/Levels of Academic Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Language Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Do Descriptors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GoTo Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GUIDED WORKSHOP AGENDA - MODULE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Suggested Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Course Modules</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4 Intended Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4 Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review group norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief the Tuning Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text-Based Discussion</strong></td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Text-Based discussion of readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENL Strategy Exploration</strong></td>
<td>20 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Exploration Jigsaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Videos</strong></td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Video 1 – Feedback on Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrap – Up</strong></td>
<td>5 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was accomplished in Module 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review intended outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for Collaborative Practice Round 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for Module 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Module 4
Integrating Supports for ENLs

Review of Course Modules
Module 1 – Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol
Module 2 – Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson
Module 3 – Tuning Lesson Elements
Module 4 – Integrating Supports for ENLs
Module 5 – Building Capacity for Routine Collaboration

Module 4 Intended Outcomes
By the end of Module 4, participants will:
Be able to apply knowledge of the following to provide targeted and thoughtful feedback to colleagues about their language objectives and lessons.
- Key Uses and Language Domains of the ELDS
- Can Do Descriptors
- GoTo Strategies
Module 4 Agenda

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 3rd Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in the Text-Based Discussion
4. ENL Strategy Exploration Activity
5. Watch and Discuss Demonstration Video
6. Schedule 4th Round of Tuning Practice
7. Prepare for Module 5

Review Group Norms

1. Review the Norms of Collaboration or your group’s preset norms.
2. Select a norm to focus on for the day.

Charts:

Reflection

DEBRIEFING THE TUNING PROCESS
Debriefing the Tuning Process

Directions
- Reflect
- Use the Debriefing Tool to identify what HELPED or HINDERED the process
- Share and discuss
- Revise process for next time.
- Record changes

Text-Based Discussions

Activity: Text-Based Discussion

As part of your pre-work for Module 4, you were asked to consider how specific features of the WIDA ELDS and the GoTo Strategies can help teachers support ENL students during content instruction. As a group, share the thoughts you recorded on the active reading organizer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Uses</th>
<th>How It Helps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Levels of Academic Language Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Do Descriptors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GoTo Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative Activity

ENL STRATEGY EXPLORATION
JIGSAW

Activity: Strategy Exploration Jigsaw

Directions
1. Identify an unfamiliar strategy for three different principles in the GO TO Strategies document. (3 total).
2. Read the description for each of the three strategies you identified.
3. Complete a Strategy Mapping Organizer (in your booklet) for each strategy.
4. When each person in the group has read and taken notes about the strategies they selected, take turns teaching the rest of the group about each strategy.

Activity: Text-Based Discussion

Discussion Prompt
Now that you are more familiar with the principles and strategies within the GO TO Strategies document, how can this resource be used during a tuning session to guide feedback for classroom teachers looking for thoughtful ideas about how to refine a lesson?
DISCUSSING STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT ENLS

Demonstration Video

1. Next, you will watch a video of teachers engaging in a discussion about how to enhance supports for ENLs in a content lesson.
2. As you watch the video, use the Video Observation Sheet to record the following:
   - Observations
   - Implications / Interpretations
   - Questions
   - Connections to Your Own Work
3. Be prepared to share and discuss your notes afterwards.

Clicking on the video will take you directly to the Youtube channel video.
Demonstration Videos

1. Share and Discuss
   - Anything that stood out to you, and
   - Anything the left you wondering.

Wrapping Up Module 4

What was accomplished in Module 4

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 3rd Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in the Text-Based Discussion
4. ENL Strategy Exploration Activity
5. Watch and Discuss Demonstration Video
6. Schedule 4th Round of Tuning Practice
7. Prepare for Module 5
Activity

By the end of Module 4, participants will:

Be able to apply knowledge of the following to provide targeted and thoughtful feedback to colleagues about their language objectives and lessons.

- Key Uses and Language Domains of the WIDA ELDS
- Can Do Descriptors
- GoTo Strategies

Discuss the intended outcomes for Module 4. To what extent do you feel they were met?

Preparing for Collaborative Practice – Round 4

1. Clarify date and time for the collaborative practice.
2. Determine who the presenting teacher will be to bring a lesson to tune.
3. Determine who will volunteer to facilitate.
4. Have the presenting teacher complete the prep sheet for presenting teachers prior to meeting.

Preparing for Module 5

1. All
   - Complete reading assignments for Module 5.
   - Complete the Active Reading Organizer
2. Clarify Date, Time and Location
   - Collaborative Practice
   - Guided Workshop for Module 5
3. Materials to Bring
   - Course Booklet, notes from Round 4 of the collaborative tuning practice.
Summary Statement

The heart of Rhode Island Collaborative ENL and General Education model is for RIDE to provide districts and schools with resources to help build capacity to help all learners succeed – particularly including English Learners and students with disabilities.
DEBRIEFING TOOL

Directions
1. Reflect on the most recent round of collaborative lesson tuning.
2. Individually, use the organizer below to identify anything that HELPED or HINDERED the process of tuning.
3. After everyone has recorded their thoughts, share and discuss as a group.
4. Once the group has discussed the forces that supported or hindered the last opportunity to collaboratively tune a lesson, determine what changes can be made to improve the process next time.
5. Record these changes and have them on hand for the next round of collaborative lesson tuning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forces that HELPED</th>
<th>Forces that HINDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Suggested Changes to Improve the Process Next Time
Use this concept map to take notes about a GO TO strategy that supports ENL students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Strategy</th>
<th>Principles of ENL Instruction it Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are given a handout with a grid or quadrant of boxes. Students provide their own ideas in the first box. Then they walk around and share ideas. They record ideas from others in the other boxes.</td>
<td>This strategy mainly supports principle 4 - Promoting classroom interaction, but could be used to support Principle 2 by having students use the strategy to link background knowledge to learning task at hand. Also could support Principle 3 by encouraging students to listen, speak, and write.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Levels &amp; Language Skills Supported</th>
<th>Disciplines and Grade Levels It Would Work Best In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This strategy supports writing, speaking, and listening skills. It is appropriate for levels 3, 4 and 5.</td>
<td>This strategy would work well in any discipline and grade level where students had some reading and writing fluency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Observations**

This is a very simple and easy to use strategy. Great way to build background knowledge, and to get students up and moving around.
Use this concept map to take notes about a GO TO strategy that supports ENL students.

Description of Strategy

Principles of ENL Instruction it Supports

Proficiency Levels & Language Skills Supported

Disciplines and Grade Levels it Would Work Best In

Other Observations
Use this concept map to take notes about a GO TO strategy that supports ENL students.

Description of Strategy

Principles of ENL Instruction it Supports

Proficiency Levels & Language Skills Supported

Disciplines and Grade Levels It Would Work Best In

Other Observations
Strategy Map

Use this concept map to take notes about a GO TO strategy that supports ENL students.

Description of Strategy

Principles of ENL Instruction it Supports

Proficiency Levels & Language Skills Supported

Disciplines and Grade Levels It Would Work Best In

Other Observations
VIDEO OBSERVATION SHEET

Use this sheet to record your thoughts as you observe the video.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Strategies and Ideas Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Connections to Your Own Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Thoughts
LESSON TUNING PREPARATION SHEET for PRESENTING TEACHER

Presenting Teacher: ____________________________  Content / Grade: ____________________________

**Presenter Tasks:** To help everyone get the most out of the limited time to collaborate, please complete the following prior to meeting with the group to tune your lesson.

☐ Make enough copies of any lesson materials (lesson, texts, etc.)
☐ Complete and make enough copies of this completed document. This should only take 10 minutes to complete!

**Brief Description of Lesson / Context**

**Lesson Objective (If not clear from lesson materials)**

**Focus Standard**
In the spaces below, record the focus standard of the lesson, as well as any stated or implied knowledge and skills in the standard that need to be taught in the lesson, or that students should already have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Knowledge to be Taught</th>
<th>New Skills to be Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Knowledge Students Should Have</th>
<th>Skills Students Should Already Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Demands**

**What type of feedback would you like?**
STANDARDS BASED LESSON TUNING PROTOCOL

Purpose
This protocol provides a structured process for collaborative groups of teachers to use standards to tune a content lesson. Please note that the times below are based on a forty-five-minute time frame. Adjust times as needed.

Preparations and Materials
☐ Copies of the lesson to be tuned
☐ Copies of this protocol
☐ Copies of preferred note-taking sheets
☐ Copies of relevant standards
☐ Copies of completed Unpacking Sheet for the Focus Standard

Process
1. Determine Roles and Set Norms (1 minute)
   a) Roles: Facilitator, Presenting Teacher(s), Time Keeper, Note-Taker
   b) Norms: Pausing, Paraphrasing, Posing Questions, Putting Ideas on the Table, Providing Data, Paying Attention to Self and Others, Presuming Positive Intentions, Other: __________________________

2. Present Materials (5 minutes)
   a) Provide BRIEF overview and description of the materials.
   b) Provide important background information about specific classes and students' needs.

3. Identify Focus for Feedback (1 minute)
   a) Identify question or area of focus to guide feedback

4. Review and Clarify Materials (5 minutes)
   a) Read and review presented materials.
   b) Ask clarifying questions about materials that prompt answers with QUICK responses – e.g. yes/no.

5. Analyze the Focus Standard (5 minutes)
   a) Clarify the focus standard.
   b) Identify and discuss the stated and implied knowledge and skills in the focus standard. Use the graphic organizer on the back of this sheet as a resource.

6. Tune the Lesson (25 minutes)
   a) Select a tool for collecting feedback.
   b) Silently read, analyze, and take notes.
   c) Share observations of effective practice, particularly what is being done to support ENLs and students with special needs.
   d) Discuss lesson elements and share feedback, particularly strategies for supporting ENLs and students with special needs.

7. Reflection and Debrief (3 minutes)
   a) Presenting teacher shares main take-aways.
   b) Participants share insights they gained from the conversation.
   c) Facilitator collects feedback about the process.

8. Prepare for Next Tuning Session (3 minutes)
   a) Identify the presenting teacher and facilitator for the next session.
   b) Provide presenting with the tuning prep sheet.
   c) Schedule date and time to meet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Demands for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Information

Name of the Lesson:                Teacher:

Guiding Question or Area of Focus for Feedback

Lesson Objectives

☐ Are the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clear and easy to communicate to students?

☐ Do the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clearly identify the following: 1) knowledge (the what) students need to have, 2) skills (the how) they will use to apply the knowledge, 3) evidence (the proof) that will demonstrate the extent to which the knowledge and skills have been mastered?

☐ Do the language / literacy objectives align with and support the content objective?

Feedback / Suggestions

Formative Assessment

☐ Is it clear what evidence / materials will be used to determine how each student will demonstrate learning?

☐ Is it clear how students will receive feedback about their learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Instructional Sequence

☐ Is it clear how the objectives of the lesson will be communicated?

☐ Do all tasks align with the knowledge and skills in the focus standards?

☐ Are there opportunities for students to establish background knowledge?

☐ Are students encouraged to predict or set goals for their learning?

☐ Are all activities logically sequenced?

☐ Do students have opportunities to apply and/or practice what they learned?

Feedback / Suggestions
Differentiated Supports for English Learners and Students with Special Needs

- Are there opportunities for student to communicate, interact with, and/or receive content through different modalities over the course of the lesson?
- Is there a sufficient number of support strategies provided throughout the lesson to help English Learners who may be at different levels of English proficiency?
  - Are there strategies to support listening to content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support communicating knowledge of content in English through speaking?
  - Are there strategies to support reading content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support writing about content in English?

Feedback / Suggestions

Motivation and Engagement

- Do students have enough opportunities to have voice or make decisions?
- Will it be clear to students how the knowledge and skills they are learning will be valuable or meaningful?
- Are tasks appropriately challenging for all students?
- Does the lesson sufficiently ensure that ALL students will be successful?
- Do students have opportunities to collaborate with others and/or strengthen relationships through the work and learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Summary of Feedback
## Focus of Feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson &amp; Language Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Supports for Students with Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation &amp; Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus of Feedback:

Praise for Effective Practices

Probing Questions

Suggestions
Module 5
Integrating Supports for English Language Learners

Pre-Work Tasks
☐ Engage in Round 4 of Lesson Tuning
☐ Complete the pre-reading quick write on the active reading organizer.
☐ Read the Leadership in Action briefs by the New England Secondary School Consortium entitled
☐ What are professional learning communities?
☐ I want to know more
☐ Complete the Active Reading Organizer

Guided Workshop Materials
☐ Text: What are professional learning communities? 5-2a
☐ Text: I want to know more 5-2b
☐ Active Reading Organizer 5-2c
☐ Module 5 Guided Workshop Agenda 5-3
☐ Module 5 PPT Slides 5-4
☐ Debriefing Tool 5-5
☐ PLC Capacity Assessment 5-6
☐ Strategic Planning Guide 5-7a
☐ Strategic Mapping Organizer 5-7b

Collaborative Practice Materials
☐ Prep Sheet for Presenting Teachers 5-8a
☐ Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol 5-8b
☐ Focus Standard Unpacking Sheet 5-8c
☐ Feedback Organizer 1 – Guiding Questions 5-8d
☐ Feedback Organizer 1 – Categories 5-8e
☐ Feedback Organizer 1 – PPS 5-8f

Demonstration Videos (Not In Booklet)
☐ None
“Research shows that teacher quality is the single most powerful influence on student achievement, and yet teachers in the United States receive far less professional development, mentoring, and planning time than teachers in the world’s high-achieving nations.”

—Professional Learning in the United States

What Are Professional Learning Communities?

We know that great teachers can change a student’s life. And every day, we are finding out more and more about what makes great teachers great. Excellent teaching is also the foundation of our best schools, since the quality of our schools cannot—and does not—exceed the quality of its instruction. Yet how can we make sure that every student receives the best teaching possible every day?

The answer is not as simple as we need more great teachers—what we need, it turns out, are strong communities of teachers working cooperatively and productively. When educators discuss what works and what doesn’t, when they share their best lessons and techniques, and when they work together instead of working in isolation, student performance not only improves, but schools become more energized and fulfilling places to work.

What We’ve Learned

A large and growing body of research has revealed that teacher-driven “professional learning communities” may just be the most effective, affordable, and sustainable school-improvement strategy around.

✓ **Effective professional learning for teachers shares four high-impact attributes:**
  1. It is intensive and ongoing throughout a teacher’s career;
  2. It is focused on specialized instructional techniques and academic knowledge;
  3. It is connected to and integrated with other school initiatives; and
  4. It builds strong working relationships and a culture of trust among teachers. The colleague-to-colleague learning that takes place in professional learning communities shares all these characteristics.

✓ **Conferences and workshops can help, but teacher collaboration really works.**

Conferences, seminars, and workshops can be important learning experiences for teachers, but they are often one-off events that are not always relevant to the specific day-to-day instructional challenges teachers face. The most effective professional learning—the kind that really helps to improve critical skills such as classroom management or lesson design—is sustained over time and directly connected to a teacher’s subject area and to the learning needs of individual students.

✓ **More professional learning time for teachers means better outcomes for students.**

Studies have shown that teachers who get close to 50 hours of professional development every year tend to get much better results in the classroom. Unfortunately, teachers in the United States receive far less professional development than teachers in other countries—and rarely 50 hours worth. If we really want to improve student performance, increasing the amount of time teachers are given to learn and plan together would be a great place to start.

✓ **Professional learning communities value the expertise of working teachers.**

Just like students, teachers don’t just want to be lectured to—they want to share what they know and learn practical skills that are relevant to their work and interests. Every teacher brings unique experiences, expertise, and insights to the table, and when they share what works and what doesn’t, they get more confident in their skills and their students learn more.

Want to Learn More?

Visit the [Leadership in Action](http://newenglandssc.org/leadership_in_action) website and download *I Want to Know More*, a selection of information and resources for those interested in reading more about how today’s students learn.
I Want to Know More
A Leadership in Action Supplement

I Want to Know More is a selection of information and resources for education leaders, parents, and community members who want to learn more about the teaching and learning strategies taking place in today's most innovative high schools.

“The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers.”
—How the World’s Best-Performing School Systems Come Out on Top

What Are Professional Learning Communities?

We know that great teachers can change a student’s life. And every day, we are finding out more and more about what makes great teachers great. Excellent teaching is the foundation of our best schools, since the quality of our schools cannot—and does not—exceed the quality of its instruction. Yet how can we make sure that every student receives the best teaching possible?

The answer is not as simple as we need more great teachers—what we need, it turns out, are strong communities of teachers working cooperatively and purposefully. When educators discuss what works and what doesn’t, when they share their best lessons and techniques, and when they work together instead of working in isolation, student performance not only improves, but schools become more energized and fulfilling places to work.

Something to Think About

According to Primary Sources: 2012, a national survey of K-12 teachers, American teachers only spend about 3% of their workday collaborating with colleagues—and yet nearly 90% believe that greater collaboration is critical to retaining good teachers. The survey found that supportive leadership, a collegial school culture, greater collaboration with colleagues, and stronger professional development were the most important factors when it came to retaining effective teachers (in comparison, only 16% of surveyed teachers reported that performance-based pay is important). Another study, The Status of Professional Learning, found that American teachers spend far more time instructing students (more than 1,000 hours a year) than teachers in other developed nations (the average is only 664 hours for secondary schools). Teachers in the United States typically spend about 80 percent of their work time instructing students, compared to about 60 percent in other countries, which gives teachers much more time to collaborate, learn together, and develop effective lessons and instructional techniques. In most countries, about 15 to 20 hours per week is spent on tasks related to teaching, such as preparing lessons, meeting with students and parents, and working with colleagues; in contrast, American teachers generally spend 3 to 5 hours a week on lesson planning, which is typically done independently. And in countries with the highest performing school systems, the amount of time spent on planning, preparation, and professional development can be even higher—in Singapore, for example, the government requires and pays for 100 hours of professional development for every teacher, every year.
The Attributes of High-Impact Learning Communities

A large and growing body of research has revealed that teacher-driven “professional learning communities” may just be the most effective, affordable, and sustainable school-improvement strategy around. The strategy is called many things: professional learning groups, collaborative learning communities, critical friends groups, communities of practice. In Japan, they call it lesson study or lesson research. Regardless of the name, effective professional learning communities share several critical features:

- Teachers work together to improve instructional quality and diversify instructional techniques.
- Time for meetings is built into the school day—in other words, it’s an expected teaching responsibility, not an optional add-on that competes with out-of-school personal time.
- Groups work collaboratively toward common goals and expectations. For example: all professional learning groups will (1) identify and monitor student learning needs, (2) engage in constructive peer observation and feedback, (3) co-develop and refine lessons and instructional techniques, (4) improve support systems to help all students succeed, and (5) ensure that every student receives a personalized learning experience in the classroom.
- Meetings are run by teacher-facilitators who have been trained in effective group-facilitation strategies—in many cases, by an experienced professional learning community trainer or organization.
- Meetings are guided by norms—a set of expectations for conduct that group members collaboratively develop and agree on. A norm might address logistics (Start meetings on time, stick to the agenda, and end on time) or interactions (Listen attentively to colleagues and make sure feedback is respectful and constructive).
- Meetings follow clear, purposeful agendas that are developed by facilitators in response to identified student or teacher learning needs.
- Facilitators use protocols—a set of parameters or guidelines developed by educators to structure professional conversations and help keep them focused and productive.
- Group members look at examples of teacher work (lesson plans, syllabi, assessment materials, etc.) and student work (writing samples, completed projects, scored assessments), and they offer colleagues feedback on how to improve products, practices, and student results.
- Group conversations are respectful, constructive, objective, and goal-oriented. Inappropriate behavior, negativity, complaints, and digressions are not tolerated—facilitators quickly step in and guide the conversation in a more productive direction.
- Conversations are objective and factual—teachers review data on student performance, cite specific examples, and refer to research or other concrete evidence to support their points, rather than falling into assumptions or generalizations.

Teacher Learning: What Matters?

In the February 2009 “How Teachers Learn” issue of Educational Leadership, Linda Darling-Hammond and Nikole Richardson conducted an extensive review of research on professional development for teachers and isolated the attributes that had the greatest impact on teaching quality and student achievement.

Research supports professional development that:

1. Deepens teachers’ knowledge of content and how to teach it to students;
2. Helps teachers understand how students learn specific content;
3. Provides opportunities for active, hands-on learning;
4. Enables teachers to acquire new knowledge, apply it to practice, and reflect with colleagues;
5. Is part of a reform effort that links curriculum, assessment, and standards to professional learning;
6. Is collaborative and collegial; and
7. Is intensive and sustained over time.

Research does not support professional development that:
1. Relies on the one-shot workshop model;
2. Focuses only on training teachers in new techniques and behaviors;
3. Is not related to teachers’ specific contexts and curriculums;
4. Is episodic and fragmented;
5. Expects teachers to make changes in isolation and without support; and
6. Does not provide sustained teacher learning opportunities over multiple days and weeks.

The National Staff Development Council’s Status of Professional Learning Study

In 2008, the National Staff Development Council enlisted a team of researchers from the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education to undertake a three-part, multiyear Status of Professional Learning research study intended to measure the effectiveness of professional learning in education. This comprehensive research project investigated professional learning communities and teacher professional development both in the United States and abroad. Given the utility of this research for schools and educators, several of its major findings and conclusions are worth mentioning in detail here:

- Sustained, intensive professional development for teachers is related to gains in student achievement.
- Teachers need substantial professional development in a given area—close to 50 hours—to improve instructional skills and student learning; most professional development in the United States is significantly shorter than the 50 hours required to transform practice.
- Collaborative approaches to professional development—particularly school-supported professional learning communities—can promote improvement not only in the classroom, but throughout a school.
- Effective professional development shares four high-impact attributes: (1) it is intensive and ongoing; (2) it is focused on the teaching and learning of specific academic content; (3) it is connected to and aligned with other school initiatives; and (4) it builds strong working relationships among teachers.
- Most professional learning in the United States appears to consist primarily of short-term conferences and workshops, which are beneficial, but less likely to lead to significant improvements in school culture, working relationships, or student performance and educational outcomes.
- Teachers in the United States report relatively little professional collaboration on curriculum design and instructional practices, and when collaboration is present it tends to be weak and not focused on strengthening teaching and learning in the classroom.
- The top professional-development priorities identified by teachers are (1) learning more about the content they teach, (2) improving classroom-management skills, (3) teaching students with special needs, and (4) using technology effectively to enhance teaching and learning.
- American teachers, unlike many of their colleagues around the world, bear much of the cost of their own professional development.
The United States is far behind other countries when it comes to providing public school teachers with opportunities to participate in extended learning opportunities and productive collaborative learning communities that allow teachers to work together on instructional planning, learn from one another through mentoring or peer coaching, conduct research on the outcomes of classroom practices, and collectively guide curriculum, assessment, and professional-learning decisions.

Nations that outperform the United States on international assessments invest heavily in professional learning for teachers, and they build time into the school workday for ongoing, sustained teacher development, collaboration, and planning.

Harnessing Teacher Knowledge

Created by the Great Schools Partnership for the U.S. Department of Education’s Smaller Learning Communities Program, Harnessing Teacher Knowledge: A Guide to Developing School-Based Systems for Professional Learning and Planning is a comprehensive suite of resources designed to help school administrators and teacher-leaders engage in a thoughtful self-assessment process as they work toward creating a high-functioning professional learning and planning culture in their school. Intended primarily for practicing educators, the resource nevertheless provides a detailed description of professional learning communities and how they work in a school.

Research on professional learning communities, common planning time, and teacher collaboration over the past few decades has isolated certain characteristics and strategies that appear to have a significant impact on instructional quality and student achievement. Rather than promoting a specific model or program, Harnessing Teacher Knowledge distills a variety of features and practices that can help schools efficiently and effectively build a collaborative, job-embedded, teacher-driven professional development program. The tool also includes several supplemental resources.

Harnessing Teacher Knowledge can be downloaded for free from the Great Schools Partnership (greatschoolspartnership.org/resources/harnessing-teacher-knowledge) and U.S. Department of Education (www2.ed.gov/programs/slcp/resources.html) websites.

Still Want to Know More?

If you are interested in the foundational research behind many of the ideas discussed in the Leadership in Action series, we recommend our Global Best Practices Research Summary, which is available on the New England Secondary School Consortium website.
Texts: Leadership in action: What are professional learning communities? And, I want to know more

Purpose for Reading
The purpose for reading the articles is to define professional learning communities (PLCs) and how they can support teacher learning. After reading this document, you should be able to 1) define key attributes of PLCs, 2) explain how they support teacher learning, and 3) identify ways to support PLCs in your own school.

Pre-Reading Quick Write
Use your own words to define a professional learning community of educators. What attributes do you think effective PLCs would need to have?

Active Reading Strategies
1. Code / Annotate: As you read, use the following codes to identify specific types of information.
   - P = Any information that describes the Purpose of PLCs
   - A = Any information that describes Key Attributes of PLCs
   - S = Any information that provides Strategies for supporting and building PLCs.
2. Record: Use the following organizer to take notes as you read.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas / Main Points</th>
<th>Connections to Your Learning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas for Further Exploration</th>
<th>What Ideas Stretched Your Thinking?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After-Reading Quick Write
To what extent does your school make use of PLCs to support teacher learning? What could be done to support or enhance the use of PLCs?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Suggested Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Review of Course Modules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Module 5 Intended Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Module 5 Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Review group norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Debrief the Tuning Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text-Based Discussion</strong></td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Activity: Text-Based Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLC Capacity Assessment</strong></td>
<td>20 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Complete PLC Capacity Self Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Group Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning</strong></td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Complete Strategic Planning Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Complete Strategic Mapping Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrap – Up</strong></td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ What was accomplished in Module 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Review intended outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Complete course feedback form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Submit plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Send email to receive certificates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Capacity for a Collaborative ENL & General Education Model:
A Five-Module Course for School-Based Teams

**Module 5**
Building Capacity for Routine Collaboration

Review of Course Modules

- **Module 1** – Introduction to the Standards-Based Lesson Tuning Protocol
- **Module 2** – Analyzing the Focus Standard of a Lesson
- **Module 3** – Tuning Lesson Elements
- **Module 4** – Integrating Supports for ENLs
- **Module 5** – Building Capacity for Routine Collaboration

Module 5 Intended Outcomes

- By the end of Module 5, participants will:
  Be able to begin implementing a plan to build school-level capacity for teachers to routinely engage in collaborative discussions around instruction.
Module 5 Agenda

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 4th Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in Text-Based Discussion
4. Capacity Self-Assessment
5. Strategic Planning
6. Course Feedback

Review Group Norms

1. Review the Norms of Collaboration or your group’s preset norms.
2. Select a norm to focus on for the day.

Reminder: We Welcome Your Feedback

As mentioned in Module 1, this course is a new resource being provided by the Rhode Island Department of Education. As you take this course, you may have ideas about how to improve it. We welcome all suggestions, big and small.

To expedite the giving of feedback, please use this link to access an electronic form where you can send us your thoughts.

https://goo.gl/2dst6a
Reflection

DEBRIEFING THE TUNING PROCESS

Debriefing the Tuning Process

Directions

- Reflect
- Use the Debriefing Tool to identify what HELPED or HINDERED the process
- Share and discuss
- Revise process for next time.
- Record changes

Text-Based Discussion

WHAT ARE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES
As part of your pre-work for Module 5, you were asked to:

1. Read the Leadership in Action briefs by the New England Secondary School Consortium entitled What are Professional Learning Communities? and I Want to Know More
2. Complete the Active Reading Organizer

As a group, consider and discuss the following prompts:

• Why are PLCs a powerful way to support teacher learning?
• To what extent have you exhibited the high impact attributes of PLCs when engaging in lesson tuning?
• Why would establishing PLCs in your school be important for supporting the instruction of ENLs in all classrooms?

Collaborative Activity

PLC CAPACITY ASSESSMENT
Activity: PLC Capacity Assessment

Directions
1. Turn to the PLC Capacity Assessment sheet in your booklet.
2. Individually complete the PLC Capacity Assessment.
3. Next, as a group share and come to consensus for each item.
4. Discuss school-level assets and barriers related to PLCs.

Strategic Planning

DEVELOPING A PLAN TO SUPPORT LESSON TUNING IN PLCS SCHOOL-WIDE

Strategic Planning

Use the Strategic Planning Guide and Strategic Mapping Organizer in your booklet to plan next steps.
1. Set a Goal
2. Define Barriers and Obstacles
3. Identify Strategic Steps and Action
4. Clarify Roles and Responsibilities
5. Schedule Times to Check In
Wrapping Up Module 5

What was accomplished in Module 5

1. Review of Group Norms
2. Text-Based Discussion
3. Feature and Function Activity
4. Watched and Discussed Demonstration Videos

What was accomplished in Module 5

1. Review Group Norms
2. Debrief the 4th Round of Collaborative Practice
3. Participate in Text-Based Discussion
4. Capacity Self-Assessment
5. Strategic Planning
6. Course Feedback
Activity

Discuss the intended outcomes for Module 5. To what extent do you feel they were met?

By the end of Module 5, participants will:
Be able to begin implementing a plan to build school-level capacity for teachers to routinely engage in collaborative discussions around instruction.

Course Feedback & Certificate of Completion

Congratulations on completing all five modules of the following course: Building Capacity for a Collaborative ENL & General Education Model!

1. Please take a few moments to individually complete the course evaluation at the following link:
   - https://goo.gl/UaEDfP
2. Once all of the above have been completed, please email Jillian Belanger at Jillian.Belanger@ride.ri.gov to do the following:
   - Send a copy of your team’s plan, and
   - Receive certificates of completion.

Thank you for participating in this course. We look forward to your feedback!

It’s time to celebrate!
Summary Statement

The heart of Rhode Island Collaborative ENL and General Education Model is for RIDE to provide districts and schools with resources to help build capacity to help all learners succeed – particularly including English Learners and students with disabilities.
DEBRIEFING TOOL

Directions
1. Reflect on the most recent round of collaborative lesson tuning.
2. Individually, use the organizer below to identify anything that HELPED or HINDERED the process of tuning.
3. After everyone has recorded their thoughts, share and discuss as a group.
4. Once the group has discussed the forces that supported or hindered the last opportunity to collaborative tune a lesson, determine what changes can be made to improve the process next time.
5. Record these changes and have them on hand for the next round of collaborative lesson tuning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forces that HELPED</th>
<th>Forces that HINDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Suggested Changes to Improve the Process Next Time
PLC Capacity Assessment

**Directions**
1. Have each individual in the group complete the self-assessment below.
2. After everyone has responded, share and discuss the results. Try to come to consensus on each item.
3. Based on the consensus, consider the following questions as a group.
   a. What assets are currently in place to support routine opportunities for teachers to engage in collaborative lesson tuning in PLCs?
   b. What barriers currently exist related to implementing collaborative lesson tuning in PLCs?

**Self-Assessment**

The following are key attributes of high-impact professional learning communities. To what extent does your school have capacity for each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Capacity</th>
<th>Moderate Capacity</th>
<th>Limited Capacity</th>
<th>No Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A culture where teachers work together to improve their instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for teachers to work collaboratively during the school day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common goals and expectations around collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-trained facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-established group norms to support effective collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and purposeful agendas for collaborative work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-defined protocols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high level of comfort among teachers to share and receive feedback about their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to engage in conversations that are respectful, constructive, objective, and goal-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to engage in conversations that are objective, factual, and data-driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assets and Barriers to Establishing and Supporting PLCs in Your School**
Directions
Use this sheet to guide discussion around planning next steps to build and support the use of PLCs to engage other educators in the process of lesson tuning in your school. Use the Strategic Mapping Organizer (next page) to refine your plan.

Goal Setting
Consider your specific context. What is a reasonable goal around building capacity to support collaborative lesson tuning in your school? When would this goal be accomplished?

What obstacles and/or barriers would need to be overcome?

What actions or strategic steps will be needed to overcome barriers and meet the goal?

Who will have key roles in this work and what will be their responsibilities?

Schedule dates to check-in on progress.
**Directions**  
Use this sheet to capture the group’s plan for building and supporting the use of PLCs to engage other educators in the process of lesson tuning in your school.

**Goal:**

**Anticipated Date of Completion:**

**Check-In Meetings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Responsibilities / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LESSON TUNING PREPARATION SHEET for PRESENTING TEACHER

Presenting Teacher:  

Content / Grade:  

**Presenter Tasks:** To help everyone get the most out of the limited time to collaborate, please complete the following prior to meeting with the group to tune your lesson.

- Make enough copies of any lesson materials (lesson, texts, etc.)
- Complete and make enough copies of this completed document. This should only take 10 minutes to complete!

**Brief Description of Lesson / Context**

**Lesson Objective (If not clear from lesson materials)**

**Focus Standard**
In the spaces below, record the focus standard of the lesson, as well as any stated or implied knowledge and skills in the standard that need to be taught in the lesson, or that students should already have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Knowledge to be Taught</th>
<th>New Skills to be Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Knowledge Students Should Have</th>
<th>Skills Students Should Already Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What type of feedback would you like?**
STANDARDS BASED LESSON TUNING PROTOCOL

Purpose
This protocol provides a structured process for collaborative groups of teachers to use standards to tune a content lesson. Please note that the times below are based on a forty-five-minute time frame. Adjust times as needed.

Preparations and Materials
☐ Copies of the lesson to be tuned
☐ Copies of this protocol
☐ Copies of preferred note-taking sheets
☐ Copies of relevant standards
☐ Copies of completed Unpacking Sheet for the Focus Standard

Process
1. **Determine Roles and Set Norms (1 minute)**
   a) **Roles:** Facilitator, Presenting Teacher(s), Time Keeper, Note-Taker
   b) **Norms:** Pausing, Paraphrasing, Posing Questions, Putting Ideas on the Table, Providing Data, Paying Attention to Self and Others, Presuming Positive Intentions, Other: _______________

2. **Present Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Provide BRIEF overview and description of the materials.
   b) Provide important background information about specific classes and students' needs.

3. **Identify Focus for Feedback (1 minute)**
   a) Identify question or area of focus to guide feedback.

4. **Review and Clarify Materials (5 minutes)**
   a) Read and review presented materials.
   b) Ask clarifying questions about materials that prompt answers with QUICK responses – e.g. yes/no.

5. **Analyze the Focus Standard (5 minutes)**
   a) Clarify the focus standard.
   b) Identify and discuss the stated and implied knowledge and skills in the focus standard. Use the graphic organizer on the back of this sheet as a resource.

6. **Tune the Lesson (25 minutes)**
   a) Select a tool for collecting feedback.
   b) Silently read, analyze, and take notes.
   c) Share observations of effective practice, particularly what is being done to support ENLs and students with special needs.
   d) Discuss lesson elements and share feedback, particularly strategies for supporting ENLs and students with special needs.

7. **Reflection and Debrief (3 minutes)**
   a) Presenting teacher shares main take-aways.
   b) Participants share insights they gained from the conversation.
   c) Facilitator collects feedback about the process.

8. **Prepare for Next Tuning Session (3 minutes)**
   a) Identify the presenting teacher and facilitator for the next session.
   b) Provide presenting with the tuning prep sheet.
   c) Schedule date and time to meet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Demands for ENLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Information

Name of the Lesson: 

Teacher: 

Guiding Question or Area of Focus for Feedback

Lesson Objectives

- Are the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clear and easy to communicate to students?
- Do the content, literacy, and/or language objectives of the lesson clearly identify the following: 1) knowledge (the what) students need to have, 2) skills (the how) they will use to apply the knowledge, 3) evidence (the proof) that will demonstrate the extent to which the knowledge and skills have been mastered?
- Do the language / literacy objectives align with and support the content objective?

Feedback / Suggestions

Formative Assessment

- Is it clear what evidence / materials will be used to determine how each student will demonstrate learning?
- Is it clear how students will receive feedback about their learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Instructional Sequence

- Is it clear how the objectives of the lesson will be communicated?
- Do all tasks align with the knowledge and skills in the focus standards?
- Are there opportunities for students to establish background knowledge?
- Are students encouraged to predict or set goals for their learning?
- Are all activities logically sequenced?
- Do students have opportunities to apply and/or practice what they learned?

Feedback / Suggestions

Differentiated Supports for English Learners and Students with Special Needs

- Are there opportunities for student to communicate, interact with, and/or receive content through different modalities over the course of the lesson?

- Is there a sufficient number of support strategies provided throughout the lesson to help English Learners who may be at different levels of English proficiency?
  - Are there strategies to support listening to content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support communicating knowledge of content in English through speaking?
  - Are there strategies to support reading content in English?
  - Are there strategies to support writing about content in English?

Feedback / Suggestions

Motivation and Engagement

- Do students have enough opportunities to have voice or make decisions?

- Will it be clear to students how the knowledge and skills they are learning will be valuable or meaningful?

- Are tasks appropriately challenging for all students?

- Does the lesson sufficiently ensure that ALL students will be successful?

- Do students have opportunities to collaborate with others and/or strengthen relationships through the work and learning?

Feedback / Suggestions

Summary of Feedback
Focus of Feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson &amp; Language Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong> Supports for ENLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Supports for Students with Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation &amp; Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus of Feedback:

Praise for Effective Practices

Probing Questions

Suggestions