

A Framework for Raising Expectations and Instructional Rigor for English Language Learners



About the Council

The Council of the Great City Schools is the only national organization exclusively representing the needs of urban public schools. Composed of 67 large city school districts, its mission is to promote the cause of urban schools and to advocate for inner-city students through legislation, research, instructional support, leadership, management, technical assistance, and media relations. The organization also provides a network for school districts sharing common problems to exchange information and to collectively address new challenges as they emerge in order to deliver the best education for urban youth.

Chair of the Board

Jumoke Hinton Hodge, Board Member
Oakland Unified School District

Chair-Elect

Richard Carranza, Superintendent
San Francisco Unified School District

Secretary/Treasurer

Felton Williams, Board Member
Long Beach Unified School District

Immediate Past Chair

Valeria Silva, Superintendent
St. Paul Public Schools

Executive Director

Michael Casserly
Council of the Great City Schools

A Framework for Raising Expectations and Instructional Rigor for English Language Learners

August 2014



TM

Acknowledgements

English Language Learners are one of America's fastest growing student groups, and their numbers are most concentrated in our Great Cities. In addition, the academic needs of these school children are complex and varied.

Fortunately, the achievement of these students is being taken seriously by urban educators across the nation. They have coalesced around a series of activities to ensure these children learn English and thrive in their studies of all subjects.

This document is one more piece of evidence of how urban school leaders are working to ensure success for all our students. It addresses two critical challenges. One, it outlines a framework for acquiring English and attaining content mastery across the grades in an era when new college and career-ready standards require more reading in all subject areas. And two, it presents criteria by which school administrators and teachers can determine whether instructional materials being considered for implementation are appropriate for English Language Learners and are consistent with the Common Core State Standards. Nothing like this has been tried before.

The intellectual horsepower that was involved in pulling this document together was impressive. Behind every concept and sentence was a team of extraordinarily talented and committed individuals who I thank from the bottom of my heart. They include: Teresa Walter, Maryann Cucchiara, Rebecca Blum-Martinez, Lily Wong-Fillmore, and our own Gabriela Uro and Debra Hopkins. Also contributing their expertise were Farah Assiraj, Nicole Knight, Angie Estonina, and Lynne Rosen. The countless hours this team of amazing people devoted to this task was exceptional. We also thank the school systems, universities, and organizations that permitted these individuals to work collaboratively on such an important initiative.

Finally, we thank The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for their support of this initiative. The work could not have been accomplished without our former program officer Melissa Chabran and our current program officer Sandra Licon. Their guidance was critical to the success of the work. Thank you.

At this point, we hope that school officials and teachers across the country will use this document and the proposals and criteria in it to strengthen instruction for our English Language Learners and ensure they have materials that meet their needs.



Executive Director
Council of the Great City Schools

Table of Contents

A Framework for Raising Expectations and Instructional Rigor for ELLs

A Project of the
Council of the Great City Schools

Preface.....	1
Re-Envisioning English Language Development (ELD 2.0)	2
Program Models & Delivery Options.....	8
Evaluating Instructional Materials: A User’s Guide.....	11
Step One: Overarching Considerations.....	12
Step Two: Non-negotiable Criteria/Considerations for ELLs.....	13
Step Three: Additional Considerations.....	22
Appendix: Matching Instructional Materials to Your Program Design	



This document is an open source document made available to Users by the **Attribution-NoDerivs CC BY-ND** license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>

This license allows redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, with credit to the Council of the Great City Schools.

Preface

The Council of the Great City Schools is a membership organization of 67 of the nation's largest urban public school districts. These districts collectively enroll over 1.2 million English Language Learners (ELLs) or about 26 percent of the nation's total. The Council has a strong track record of initiating and working on policy, research, and programmatic efforts at the national and local levels to improve academic achievement among ELLs. Among other initiatives, the organization has produced groundbreaking reports and studies on how urban school systems improve the academic attainment of ELLs and comprehensive surveys on the status of ELLs in the nation's urban schools. In addition, the Council works directly with its member school districts to improve and support their instructional programs for ELLs through technical assistance, professional development, on-site reviews, meetings, and a national network of practitioners.

In conducting its work, the Council has found that many urban school districts report significant difficulty finding high quality, rigorous, grade-level instructional materials that are written for ELLs at varying levels of English proficiency. This dearth of materials presents a substantial problem for urban districts that enroll sizable numbers of ELLs, and it is particularly acute at the secondary grade levels, where the complexity of content and text is higher than at the elementary grades. The adoption and implementation of the new Common Core State Standards (CCCS), as well as new state-level English Language Development (ELD) standards, have only made this instructional need more obvious. This need was further documented by the Council's own field survey to gauge the perceived quality of instructional materials for ELLs. The results of this survey corroborated what has been common knowledge among urban educators for some time, i.e., quality instructional materials for ELLs are in short supply and the need has been exacerbated by the adoption of the CCSS.

The adoption of these new standards underscores the importance of having rigorous and explicit guidance, both for defining a new instructional framework for ELD and for selecting instructional materials that are complex, standards-aligned and able to meet the specific needs of ELLs within a district's chosen program model.¹

Therefore, the overarching purpose of this document is to define a new vision for English Language Development, to share examples of instructional delivery models, and to provide step-by-step guidance for selecting instructional materials that will accelerate the acquisition of academic language and grade-level content for all English learners in urban school districts. This document may be used alone, or in combination with other evaluation protocols adopted by districts, as deemed appropriate by each district's instructional leadership.

¹It is important to consider qualitative measures of text complexity as reflected in the Text Complexity section in the ACT Reading Between the Lines report, 2006 (p.14) http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/reading_report.pdf and in the numerous resources provided by Achieve the Core achievethecore.org > ELA/Literacy > Curricular Tools > Text Complexity Collection.

Before selecting instructional materials for ELLs, however, districts must have a clear vision of how their instructional program for ELLs ensures attention to the instructional shifts and rigor of the Common Core², providing both the language development and the scaffolded grade-level content required for ELLs to be successful. To aid districts in this task, we have developed a framework for English Language Development (ELD) that is anchored in the language demands of the Common Core; we call this the *ELD 2.0* Framework. The next section describes the underlying pedagogy related to language acquisition, language development, and rigor, and also defines the specific components of the *ELD 2.0* Framework. While the two major components of the framework are defined explicitly, the delivery of the model is described more generally, in order to allow districts to fit the *ELD 2.0* Framework within their own program design.

Re-Envisioning English Language Development (ELD)

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) apply to general education, as well as to any instructional programs specifically designed for and/or targeted to ELLs. So districts and states are not only grappling with how to facilitate implementation of CCSS for all students, but they must also address the specific needs of students for whom English may be newly developing. As they respond to the required shifts within both the general education curriculum and ELL programs, districts need to accomplish two important goals:

- a) **Access to Common Core.** Districts must ensure that ELLs across all levels of language proficiency can access and fully engage with the more rigorous grade-level English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics standards called for in the Common Core and College and Career Ready standards.
- b) **English Language Development.** Districts must ensure that ELLs are developing their English and closing the academic language gap. The ELD/ESL curriculum and instruction for ELLs must be designed and delivered in a manner so that *all students* can meet the language demands of the Common Core.

A number of efforts are underway to further elaborate what the instructional shifts in English Language Arts and mathematics mean for all students, and particularly for ELLs. Parallel efforts are also underway as new state-level ESL/ELD standards are aligned to the Common Core. There are few efforts, however, that explicitly and *in a practical way* connect the changes that need to occur in the design and delivery of ESL/ELD and the language development instruction that must also occur across the content areas for students to fully realize the expectations of the disciplines. For ELLs, this means that both targeted services/instructional programs for ELLs *and* general education must share the responsibility for developing discipline-specific content knowledge and academic language proficiency.

²For more information regarding these instructional shifts, see <http://www.corestandards.org/other-resources/key-shifts-in-english-language-arts/>

Key challenges and factors that must be considered in building a common understanding and guiding principles for ESL/ELD programs include the following:

- **English language learners** are a diverse group of students with varying backgrounds, experiences, cultural contexts, academic proficiencies, and levels of English proficiency. Some may be just beginning to add English to their language proficiencies; others may be nearing English proficiency. Schools must, therefore, take these factors into consideration as they plan and provide instruction that will enable all ELLs to develop and extend English proficiency as they also achieve the academic standards established for their grade levels.
- **English Language Development** may be defined differently across school districts, or may use differing names: English Language Development (ELD), English as a Second Language (ESL), English Language Acquisition (ELA), etc. Despite this diversity of terminology and definitions, districts would benefit from developing a consensus around key components of ELD vis-à-vis the new standards (Common Core or College and Career Ready).
- **Instructional Delivery** varies with regard to how and by whom English language development and/or core instruction is provided. These differences in delivery design across the districts are determined by a number of factors, including state law, resource allocation, and/or particulars specified in district compliance agreements with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) or the Department of Justice (DOJ).³
- **Strategic Use of Native Language** varies among the districts' instructional programs for ELLs, and may be used to support English acquisition and access to grade-level content. If programs include the development of native language literacy as a goal, they must include rigorous academic language development in the native language, providing access to increasingly complex language.

Theory of Action for ELLs and the Common Core

We conceive of a complete language learning experience for ELLs that is grounded in a theory of action that affirms that English Language Learners are capable of engaging in complex thinking, reading and comprehension of complex texts, and writing about complex material. If teachers are given time to analyze the CCSS and plan effective lessons based on the standards and using grade-level appropriate, complex texts, ELLs *will* acquire the reasoning, language skills, and academic registers they need to be successful across the curriculum and throughout the school day. Teachers, in turn, need support and guidance from instructional leaders who understand the important shifts needed to engage ELLs in complex thinking, talk, and tasks anchored in complex, grade-level texts.

Anchored in the language demands of the new standards and following the above theory of action, a redesigned ELD framework — called *ELD 2.0* — has been jointly developed by member district practitioners and ELL experts to assist districts in ensuring that ELD is purposeful and fully integrated into newly adopted content standards. This redesigned framework includes two key components: a *focused language*

³The Office for Civil Rights acknowledges that “Educators have not reached consensus about the most effective way to meet the education needs of LEP (Limited English Proficiency) students” and thus, OCR allows school districts broad discretion concerning how to ensure equal education opportunity for LEP students: “OCR does not prescribe a specific intervention strategy or type of program that a school district must adopt to serve LEP students ...” <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/eeolep/index.html>.

study (FLS) time, where ELLs are grouped together to concentrate on specific elements of the English language that their native English-speaking peers already know, and the *discipline-specific and academic language expansion* (DALE) that is on-going and integrated into the different content areas, which ELLs, along with their native English-speaking peers, must study throughout the school day.

Assisting ELLs with the particular structures of English, as would take place in the *focused language study*, is meant to support their language growth. However, the majority of their *discipline-specific academic language expansion* will occur within their grade-level, content-specific classes. This is where they spend the majority of their time and where language is used for real purposes, namely in the acquisition of concepts and skills within authentic material. It is helpful to remember that ...”language is learned, not because we want to talk or read or write about language, but because we want to talk and read and write about the world...especially for children, language is the medium of our interpersonal relationships, the medium of our mental life, the medium of learning about the world” (Cazden, 1977:42).

ELD 2.0 Framework

In contrast to earlier models of English language development, which were often approached in a decontextualized and/or over-simplified mode, *ELD 2.0* clearly articulates and attends to the development of full and robust English proficiency across all language domains and all subject areas. It lives within — not apart from — overall efforts to raise the rigor of language and content instruction, ensuring that all students achieve the expectations of the Common Core. *ELD 2.0*, therefore, must be embedded in and delivered through effective instructional practices that are guided by the instructional shifts and content standards of the Common Core. Instruction must fully engage ELLs, accelerating language acquisition and learning across the day. The re-designed framework has two critical elements:

- **Focused Language Study (FLS):** This element calls for dedicated time for focused instruction in how English works, providing ELLs with an understanding of the basic structures of language — in all four domains — for a variety of registers, especially the academic register needed to engage in academic discourse across all content areas. FLS would likely be part of what districts call ESL/ELD and may be provided to ELLs in a variety of configurations, for example, as part of the ELA class or as a stand-alone ESL class.
- **Discipline-specific and Academic Language Expansion (DALE):** This element calls for the development and expansion of discipline-specific and academic English across the day by all teachers and integrated into all subjects. The language learning that occurs during a student’s experience with the different content areas (i.e., social studies/ history, science, math, English language arts) is especially valuable for ELLs because it extends and stretches their language development in new and various directions. It also deepens a student’s understanding of how language can be used for diverse purposes and in different ways. This is the only way that ELLs learn to use language in the different academic registers.

The subject area content is embedded in distinct uses of language that convey certain ways of thinking about the important concepts and ideas in that particular field (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010). Within these content areas language is used in distinct ways, not only because each content area deals with different subjects, but also because each subject describes and engages in different processes, concepts and argumentation. (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010)

So, subject area teachers must learn how to assist ELLs in the academic registers and ways of thinking and expressing ideas in their fields. Subject area teachers must also help ELLs with the concepts specific to their field and assist ELLs in paying close attention to *language usage* in each field; for example, how the use of the present tense can often signify a timeless present, not just what is happening right now, as in “Trickles of water flow together to form a brook.” (Dorros, A. 1991), or how the use of modals can signal possibility or uncertainty on the part of the author—“The two processes could well be independent.” (Biber, et al., 2002: 178). This kind of close reading can begin in the content area class and then can be reinforced in the focused language study period.

The table on the following page displays the key elements of *ELD 2.0*, which are interrelated and together form a framework upon which effective ELD can be built.

Theory of Action/ELD 2.0 References

Biber, D., et al. (2002). *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.

Cazden, C. (1977). “Language, Literacy and Literature.” In *The National Elementary Principal*, 57(1): 40-52.

Dorros, A. (1991). *Abuela*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.

Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2010). Disciplinary literacies across content areas: Supporting secondary reading through functional language analysis. In *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 53(7): 587-597.

Shanahan, T. & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. In *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1): 40-59.



Key Elements of the ELD 2.0 Framework

	WHAT	HOW
Focused Language Study (FLS)	<p>a. Focused English Language Development: A dedicated time for very targeted ELD. Instruction focuses on HOW English works — those elements that are already typically known to native English speakers but must be systematically developed by ELLs. (Fillmore & Fillmore, 2012.)</p> <p>b. Focus on functional/purposeful use of language — appropriate to varying language proficiency levels</p> <p>c. In some districts, ESL/ELD serves as the English Language Arts (ELA) course for ELLs. These ESL/ELD courses are aligned to both the Common Core or general ELA curriculum <i>and</i> the ESL standards.</p> <p>d. Instruction is directly linked and applicable to functional aspects of schooling, as well as language needs across the content areas</p>	<p>a. Students may be grouped by English proficiency levels (important for students at beginning levels and best when students are mixed within a limited range of levels, not isolated in a single-level group).</p> <p>b. A specified number of minutes (e.g., 30-60) is allotted in elementary grades, or a class period(s) is allotted at the secondary level, either as a stand-alone class or in combination with ELA, depending upon students' English proficiency levels and other instructional needs.</p> <p>c. Instruction may be provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESL teacher (push-in, pull-out) ▪ Classroom teacher (as a small group) ▪ Co-teachers (each with a small group at similar language levels)
Discipline-specific and Academic Language Expansion (DALE)	<p>a. Language development takes place in an integrated manner within the appropriate grade level</p> <p>b. Instruction for language expansion is embedded in and informed by content across the subject areas</p> <p>c. Content area instruction includes attention to the lesson's language demands, challenges, and opportunities</p> <p>d. High-utility, cross-discipline academic language development is an instructional focus</p> <p>e. Discipline-specific language development supports and benefits all students, beyond ELLs</p>	<p>a. Instruction is in the context of grade-level content and focuses on deliberate language development through Complex Thought, Texts, Talk, and Tasks (Cucchiara, Fillmore & Fillmore, 2012)</p> <p>b. DALE is never decontextualized; rather, it is integrated to facilitate development of discipline-specific language and concepts within grade-level content-area classes</p> <p>c. Instruction may be provided by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Content-area teacher ▪ Co-teachers: Content-area teacher and ESL teacher planning and teaching together



Effective Instructional Practice. Effective instructional practice involves curriculum design, well-defined and organized programs, cross-functional collaboration, and effective teaching and is guided greatly by the demands and shifts of the Common Core and the new standards in various disciplines. The descriptors of ‘how’ *ELD 2.0* is delivered aim to capture the great variability that exists in how Council member districts provide language instructional support and ensure access to the core curriculum for ELLs. Effective instructional practices for ELLs depend on a number of important factors, including:

- a) High quality, rigorous instructional materials that align with your program/delivery model, engage ELLs, and accelerate grade-level content and language development aligned to the Common Core (See the *Appendix* for guidance in matching instructional materials to your program model.)
- b) Attention to the instructional shifts indicated by the Common Core
- c) Provision of scaffolding and other supports as appropriate for ELLs; for example, districts may be implementing SIOP, QTEL, or GLAD as a way to provide comprehensible input; however, these strategies would still need to exist within the context of the district’s *overall instructional design* for development of academic language and grade-level content for ELLs
- d) Supportive school structures, i.e., instructional coaches, professional learning communities, extended learning (before/after school, tutorials), leadership development
- e) Evidence-based and programmatically coherent supplemental support for students
- f) Quality professional development that is timely, effective, sustained, and designed to build district- and school-level capacity

The effective implementation of the *ELD 2.0* framework, alongside effective Common Core-driven instructional practices for ELLs, will be contingent upon how districts and schools create systemic supports that take into account all of the factors listed above, integrating *ELD 2.0* into their own delivery models.

Program Models & Delivery Options

It is critically important that districts clearly articulate program models and delivery options for both English Language Arts (ELA) and English Language Development (ELD) before determining *what* instructional materials are needed, for *whom*, and *why*. (See also the *Appendix*) It is only *after* establishing and articulating the context in which the materials will be used that a district can effectively evaluate instructional materials, determining those that best suit their specific context.

District English Language Arts (ELA) Context: In selecting Core ELA materials, a district will examine its current context to determine what is needed: Is the district creating CCSS aligned units of study, curriculum maps, or frameworks? What is the overarching approach to literacy at various grade levels? Are there systems in place for strong and sustained professional development? Does the district take the stance that instructional materials are used *in support of* quality teaching — or are they intended to *guide* quality teaching? The answers to these questions may help determine whether a district will select a core ELA program that offers a more structured, comprehensive approach or a more flexible ELA program comprised of carefully chosen text sets and resources.

District ESL/ELD Context: In selecting ESL/ELD materials, a district will determine the key elements and objectives of its English language instructional program to ensure that ELLs acquire academic English and achieve grade-level academic standards. How do the ELD/ESL program objectives align to ELA and content standards? When and in what class(es) is the ELD/ESL instruction imparted? Which instructional staff members are responsible for providing ELD/ESL instruction or support? How is native language used to support literacy, content knowledge, and English acquisition?

Districts may organize and structure ELA/ELD instruction in any number of ways, depending on staffing and scheduling resources, and considering first language, proficiency in English, or prior schooling experience. Instruction may be grade-level specific, or may be grouped across grade levels according to language proficiency level. The district approach may also vary by grade level (elementary, middle, and high school may use the same or different approaches) or by typology of ELLs, e.g., students with limited formal education. For example:

Combined ESL/ELD Class (ELD instruction is embedded within/a part of ELA):

Most often designed for ELLs at earlier levels of English proficiency, this class combines both ELA and ELD. The ELD class serves as (replaces) ELA for ELLs. These classes are aligned to grade-level-specific Common Core standards, guided by ELD standards, and may occur at elementary or secondary levels.

- **Elementary:** Scheduled time in which ELLs receive ELD instruction that incorporates ELA standards (and perhaps other content instruction)
- **Secondary:** Dedicated ESL/ELD courses in middle and high school

Separate ESL/ELD Classes (ELD instruction occurs separate from/in addition to ELA):

Students receive grade-level, Common Core-aligned ELA instruction, which may be specifically designed for ELLs or in a heterogeneous class with non-ELL students. In addition, students also receive dedicated ESL/ELD instruction as a complement to (not replacement for) ELA. In this model, students are often grouped by language proficiency for *Focused Language Study* (FLS). Focused ESL/ELD may occur at elementary or secondary levels.

- **Elementary:** Focused ESL/ELD provides for dedicated instruction in FLS through pull-out, push-in, co-teaching, or by the classroom teacher in small group instruction. In addition, students receive standards-aligned grade-level ELA instruction.
- **Secondary:** Middle or high school students have two scheduled classes: one is focused on ESL/ELD, and the other provides standards-aligned, grade-level ELA instruction.



Implementing ELD 2.0 Within Your Delivery Model: Two District Examples

Following are brief examples of how two large urban districts are implementing the *ELD 2.0 Framework* within their program model.

District A has utilized the *ELD 2.0 Framework* to examine how to better address the inherent language demands and discourse patterns of the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards. The Council’s framework delineating Focused Language Study (FLS) and Discipline-specific Academic Language Expansion (DALE) has been formative in the district’s reconceptualization of ELD.

Recognizing that language and content are essential components in both ELD instruction and content instruction, and aligning with its state ELA/ELD Framework, **District A** has determined that students at every grade level across the language proficiency continuum will receive both:

Designated ELD (FLS): A protected time where ELD teachers can zoom in on focused language study connected to core content. During Designated ELD, language is in the foreground, and the focus is on how English works. Instruction is targeted to the three proficiency levels of the state ELD standards (emerging, expanding, bridging).

Integrated ELD (DALE): English Language Development that is embedded in core content instruction across the day and delivered by general education teachers with ELD training. During Integrated ELD, content is in the foreground, and the focus is on interacting in meaningful ways in service to accessing grade-level content.

District B has developed its ELL programs according to the parameters agreed to in the Compliance Agreement entered into with the Department of Justice and the Office of Civil Rights. They are currently re-envisioning their ESL curriculum to better prepare ELLs for college and career pathways, and the key elements of ELD 2.0 establish the conceptual framework for English language development and content instruction. Thus, all ELLs in **District B**, regardless of language proficiency, will receive instruction that centers on complex text and “juicy sentences” delivered by teachers as follows:

Focused Language Study (FLS) will be delivered by English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers and will provide explicit, direct, and systematic instruction in how English works within complex text. The focus will be on building academic English, specifically addressing gaps in language and literacy through grade-level instruction.

Discipline-specific and Academic Language Expansion (DALE) will be provided by state-qualified content area teachers who have received appropriate training on sheltering practices. Delivered via Sheltered English Immersion (SEI), this instruction will also use complex text addressing grade-level content, ensuring that important science, social studies, mathematics, and other content is comprehensible and that ELLs acquire the academic language and registers of each of the content areas.



Evaluating Instructional Materials: A User's Guide

Once you have defined and articulated your delivery model and the type of instructional materials needed to design and deliver effective instruction, you are ready for the next step of the process. As you review the following sections in preparation for the evaluation and selection of instructional materials for ELLs, consider each step of the process to be a gateway. Though you may begin with a daunting number of submissions to consider, you can gradually and efficiently winnow the submissions until you arrive at the instructional materials that best meet the specific needs of your students and of your program model.

Step One.

Evaluate materials based on overarching considerations relative to your ESL/ELD philosophy and delivery model. There may be many sets of materials in consideration at this stage; only those materials that match your overall philosophy & model move to the next stage of evaluation.

Step Two.

Evaluate materials based upon non-negotiable criteria related to ELLs. There should be fewer sets of materials at this stage; only those materials that *meet all non-negotiables* move on to the next stage.

Step Three.

Evaluate remaining options via a close review of additional considerations, using a district-specific or grade-by-grade rubric to identify and select the materials that best meet your specific requirements.

Step One: Overarching Considerations

Districts across the nation are engaged in a range of efforts to implement the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). A key aspect of the implementation is the overhaul of instructional materials so that they are aligned with the new standards and able to support the rigorous instruction called for in the CCSS. Working with ELL experts, linguists, and practitioners from 15 or more school districts, we have developed a step-by-step process to guide the evaluation and selection of instructional materials for ELLs. The process begins with an evaluation based upon general concerns, assumptions, and expectations that serve as a unifying foundation.

Confirm that materials have been designed and validated for use with ELLs.

Publishers often indicate that their materials have been developed with ELLs in mind or for specific use in programs for ELLs. A series of names of writers and/or researchers may be mentioned as having collaborated, but in order for schools and districts to confidently rely on these claims, there is a need for greater transparency on the following:

- Which researchers were included in the design phase of materials, and what was/is their level of involvement (authors, reviewers of drafts, commissioned papers, research)?
- Who are the writers of the instructional materials, and what is their expertise on second language development?
- What is the evidence that the publisher's materials have been validated for use with ELLs? (Were ELLs included in the Beta-testing or pilots? In what districts? Is the typology of the ELLs specified? Was research conducted to confirm the intended design?)

Confirm that the philosophy and pedagogy related to English language acquisition establish high expectations.

Instructional materials must incorporate rich and complex text, chosen through both quantitative measures (readability) and qualitative measures (levels of meaning, structure, language conventionality and clarity, knowledge demands), to promote the development of sophisticated grade-level language and content knowledge for ELLs. Materials must attend to the role of language development in furthering conceptual understanding of content.

Confirm an explicit and substantive alignment of materials to the Common Core.

Correspondence to the new standards does not necessarily mean that there is an alignment of rigor and expectations. Publishers should show exactly where and how their materials align with CCSS, making use of correlation matrices and point-of-use references in their Teacher's Guide.

Once reviewers are in agreement that materials reflect close attention to the above points, the review may proceed to Step Two.

Step Two: Non-Negotiable Criteria/Considerations for ELLs

Using the existing Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET), developed by Student Achievement Partners (SAP) and guided by the Publisher’s Criteria [<http://achievethecore.org/page/686/publishers-criteria>], the Council developed a set of ELL considerations to serve as additional metrics. These considerations, critical for ELLs, have been developed for English Language Arts grades 3-12 and will also be developed for ELA grades K-2 and mathematics.

- For ELLs, non-negotiable criteria revolve around maintaining grade-level rigor, building knowledge while acquiring and building academic language (in English and/or other languages), and cultural relevance.
- The ELL-specific non-negotiable criteria seek to identify materials that
 - ✓ Provide ELLs with the necessary rigor in language development
 - ✓ Provide ELLs with full access to grade-level instructional content
 - ✓ Integrate scaffolding for ELLs without compromising rigor or content
 - ✓ Provide ELLs access to text that increases in complexity, with intentional connections between ESL and ELA instruction, all anchored in the CCSS

Criteria for CCSS-Aligned Instructional Materials for ELLs

(IMET with CGCS-Developed ELL Considerations)

The ELL considerations presented below are all considered non-negotiable for working with ELLs, in order to support rigorous instruction and learning through grade-level content aligned to the CCSS. These ELL-related non-negotiables are incorporated as additional metrics to the criteria in the SAP Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET)⁴; they aim to identify instructional materials (texts, tasks, and talk) that are designed to accelerate development of both academic language and grade-level content for ELLs and present a cohesive and coherent approach to developing and expanding concepts, content, thinking, and language.⁵

The IMET is divided into three distinct sections, each with a set of criteria for the selection of Common Core-aligned instructional materials:

Section I: *Non-negotiable criteria*. Only two criteria are classified as non-negotiable; both must be met in full for materials to be considered aligned to the shifts and major features of the CCSS.

Section II: *Alignment criteria*. This section includes seven additional criteria that play a vital role in the successful implementation of the CCSS with all students. Recommendations for the adoption of instructional materials will primarily rely on total scores calculated from the metrics in Sections I and II.

Section III: *Indicators of superior quality*. These are not criteria for alignment to the CCSS but have been included as examples of considerations that address the general quality of instructional materials.

⁴Based on the version scheduled for release in the second half of 2014.

⁵The criteria in this document deal specifically with grades 3-12; a companion document addressing grades K-2 will also be available.

NON-NEGOTIABLE CRITERIA FOR ALIGNMENT TO CCSS	METRICS	ELL METRICS— Non-negotiable considerations for ELLs
I. ELA Non-Negotiable Criteria – Student Achievement Partners, Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool for CCSS-ELA Alignment <i>Grades 3-12</i>		
<p>Non-Negotiable 1. COMPLEXITY OF TEXTS: <i>Texts are worthy of student time and attention; they have the appropriate level of complexity for the grade, according to both quantitative and qualitative analyses of text complexity.</i></p>	<p>1a) 100 percent of texts must be accompanied by specific evidence that they have been analyzed with at least one research-based quantitative measure for <u>grade-band</u> placement.</p> <p>1b) 100 percent of texts must be accompanied by specific evidence that they have been analyzed for their qualitative features indicating a specific <u>grade-level</u> placement.</p>	<p>1c) The collective set of texts address/support ESL/ELD standards and language progressions in a spiraling and reciprocal manner without sacrificing content or rigor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS. May focus on specific aspects or levels of ELD and/or language progressions across levels. <p>1d) The organization and sequence of texts are aligned to <i>grade-appropriate</i> content/themes/topics and are centered on history, science, and technical subjects to allow for development of grade-level language and content.</p> <p>1e) Materials provide extended and sustained time on the themes and opportunities to reinforce and extend conceptual development and discourse-specific academic language that frames those themes/concepts.</p> <p>1f) Materials include a range of grade-level and age-appropriate independent reading texts along a staircase of reading and linguistic complexity.</p> <p>1g) In order to maximize instructional time focused on reading, materials include pre-reading activities that provide visual support, and other types of knowledge-building support, for new topics/themes as scaffolds for</p>

		visual support, and other types of knowledge-building support, for new topics/themes as scaffolds for building background knowledge on new themes/topics that might be unfamiliar. (Supplemental materials could provide this support but must be explicitly connected to the core text being read.)
<p>Non-Negotiable 2. TEXT-DEPENDENT AND TEXT-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS: <i>At least 80 percent of all questions in the submission are high-quality text-dependent and text-specific questions. The overwhelming majority of these questions are text specific and draw student attention to the text.</i></p>	<p>2a) At least 80 percent of all questions and tasks should be text dependent to reflect the requirements of Reading Standard 1 (by requiring use of textual evidence to support valid inferences from the text).</p> <p>2b) Questions and tasks accurately address the analytical thinking required by the standards at each grade level (Note: While multiple standards will be addressed with every text, not <i>every</i> standard must be addressed with every text.)</p>	<p>2c) Materials provide multiple opportunities for extended academic discourse through richly developed text-dependent and text-specific questions. Materials also attend to the language that frames the concepts/ideas.</p>
<p>Section II: Alignment Criteria (ELL considerations are non-negotiable)</p>		
<p>I. Range and Quality of Texts</p>		
<p>1. RANGE AND QUALITY OF TEXTS: <i>Materials reflect the distribution of text types and genres required by the standards.</i></p>	<p>1a) Materials pay careful attention to providing a sequence or collection of texts that build knowledge systematically through reading, writing, listening, and speaking about topics under study.</p> <p>1b) Within a sequence or collection of texts, specific anchor texts of grade-level complexity (keystone texts) are selected for their quality as being worthy of especially careful reading.</p> <p>1c) In grades 3-5, literacy programs shift the balance of texts and instructional time to 50 percent literature/50 percent informational high-quality text. In grades 6-12 ELA materials include substantial attention to high-quality nonfiction.</p> <p>1d) A large majority of texts included in instructional materials reflect the text</p>	<p>1f) Materials integrate culturally responsive, high quality texts that tap into student assets to deepen understanding and expand knowledge.</p> <p>1g) Texts include sections where text complexity (both qualitative and quantitative) is called out or highlighted, with specific emphasis on linguistic or structural complexity</p> <p>1h) Materials include annotated deconstruction of text that reveals the linguistic complexity and the richness of the language with regard to syntax and use of literary devices across genres, registers, and content.</p>

	<p>characteristics and genres that are specifically required by the standards at each grade level.</p> <p>1e) Additional materials markedly increase the opportunity for regular independent reading of texts that appeal to students' interests to develop both knowledge and love of reading.</p>	
--	---	--

II. Questions and Tasks

<p>2. QUESTIONS SUPPORT STUDENT LEARNING: <i>They support students in building reading comprehension, in finding and producing the textual evidence to support their responses, and in developing grade-level academic language.</i></p>	<p>2a) High-quality sequences of text-dependent questions are prevalent and can address any of the following: sustained attention to making meaning from the text, rereading to gain evidence and clarity, and the acquisition of foundational skills.</p> <p>2b) Questions and tasks support students in unpacking the academic language (vocabulary and syntax) prevalent in complex texts.</p> <p>2c) Questions build to a deep understanding of the central ideas of the text.</p>	<p>2d) Materials provide the opportunity for students to learn to identify whether the text is narrative or expository and, using that knowledge, examine language and text structure to achieve deeper comprehension (e.g., How did the setting impact the story? Which paragraph shows how the problem was resolved?)</p>
--	--	---

III. Writing to Sources and Research

<p>3. WRITING TO SOURCES AND RESEARCH: <i>Written and oral tasks at all grade levels require students to confront the text directly, to draw on textual evidence, and to support valid inferences from the text.</i></p>	<p>3a) Writing to sources is a key task. Students are asked in their writing to analyze and synthesize sources, as well as to present careful analysis, well-defended claims, and clear information.</p> <p>3b) Materials place an increased focus on argument and informative writing in the following proportions. Alternately, they may reflect blended forms in similar proportions (e.g., exposition and persuasion):</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Grades 3-5</td> <td>exposition 35%</td> <td>persuasion 30%</td> <td>narrative 35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grades 6-8</td> <td>exposition 35%</td> <td>argument 35%</td> <td>narrative 30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grades 9-12</td> <td>exposition 40%</td> <td>argument 40%</td> <td>narrative 20%</td> </tr> </table> <p>3c) Writing opportunities for students are prominent and varied.</p>	Grades 3-5	exposition 35%	persuasion 30%	narrative 35%	Grades 6-8	exposition 35%	argument 35%	narrative 30%	Grades 9-12	exposition 40%	argument 40%	narrative 20%	<p>3e) Mentor texts are routinely used across writing genres and registers as the main vehicle of writing instruction.</p> <p>3f) Materials require students to engage, at regular intervals, in mini writing tasks that enable ELLs at all ELD levels to develop the linguistic repertoire needed to perform extended and increasingly complex informative and argumentative writing tasks.</p> <p>3g) Instruction offers routine and systematic practice and opportunities for guided/shared writing events to explore linguistic and rhetorical patterns across genres.</p>
Grades 3-5	exposition 35%	persuasion 30%	narrative 35%											
Grades 6-8	exposition 35%	argument 35%	narrative 30%											
Grades 9-12	exposition 40%	argument 40%	narrative 20%											

	<p>3d) Extensive practice is provided with short, focused research projects. Materials require students to engage in many short research projects annually to enable students to develop the expertise needed to conduct research independently.</p>	
<p>IV. Foundational Skills</p>		
<p>4. FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS: <i>Materials provide explicit and systematic instruction and diagnostic support for concepts of print, phonics, vocabulary, syntax and fluency. These foundational skills are necessary and central components of an effective, comprehensive reading program designed to develop proficient readers with the capacity to comprehend texts across a range of types and disciplines.</i></p>	<p>4a) Submissions address grade-level CCSS for foundational skills by providing instruction in concepts of print, phonological awareness, letter recognition, phonics, word recognition and/or reading fluency in a research-based and transparent progression.</p> <p>4b) Opportunities are frequently built into the materials for student to achieve reading fluency in oral and silent reading, that is, to read on-level prose and poetry with accuracy, at a rate appropriate to the text, and with expression.</p> <p>4c) Materials guide students to read with purpose and understanding and to make frequent connections between acquisition of foundation skills and making meaning from reading.</p>	<p>4d) Materials are connected to grade-level content and incorporate a contextualized approach to teaching such foundational skills as phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary/ syntax/fluency development.</p> <p>4e) Instruction for building foundational skills should attend to comparative linguistics, building on phonological and orthological similarities between English and home language(s), while also highlighting differences.</p>
<p>V. Language</p>		
<p>5. LANGUAGE: <i>Materials adequately address the Language standards for the grade.</i></p>	<p>5a) Materials address the grammar and language conventions specified by the language standards at each grade level.</p> <p>5b) Materials provide the opportunity for students to confront their own error patterns in usage and conventions and correct them in a grade-by-grade pathway that results in college and career readiness by 12th grade.</p> <p>5c) Materials provide a mirror of real-world activities for student practice with natural language (e.g., mock interviews, presentations).</p>	<p>5d) Materials must consider how mastery of language conventions develops along a non-linear progression, and they should support ELLs in engaging with grade-level-appropriate, complex grammatical structures while attending to the language conventions, patterns and usage errors typical of second language learners. By attending to typical error patterns, ELLs develop the ability to recognize and self-correct these errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development for teachers should include theory

		<p>and practice related to language acquisition, in order that they may use grade-level expectations as a general guide and not a fixed rule.</p> <p>5e) Materials pay explicit attention to, and engage students with, academic language, its features, functions, and grammar in service of meaningful academic work.</p>
--	--	---

VI. Speaking and Listening

<p>6. SPEAKING AND LISTENING: <i>To be CCSS-aligned, speaking and listening are integrated into lessons, questions, and tasks. These reflect a progression of communication skills required for college and career readiness as outlined in the standards.</i></p>	<p>6a) Texts used in speaking and listening questions and tasks must meet the criteria for complexity, range, and quality of texts (non-negotiable and alignment criterion 1).</p> <p>6b) Materials provide the opportunity for students to engage effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations by expressing well-supported ideas clearly and building on others’ ideas.</p> <p>6c) Materials develop active listening skills, such as taking notes on main ideas, asking relevant questions, and elaborating on remarks of others in a grade-appropriate way.</p> <p>6d) Materials build in frequent opportunities for discussion and, through directions and modeling, encourage students to use academic language in their speech.</p> <p>6e) Materials require students to marshal evidence when speaking.</p>	<p>6f) Materials offer linguistic frames across language progressions as support for speaking in discipline-specific academic registers.</p> <p>6g) Materials provide frames for conducting accountable academic conversations that require clarification, elaboration, consensus, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions and tasks must remain grade-level appropriate, while considering the student’s spoken English proficiency <p>6h) Materials include multiple opportunities for students to listen to authentic models of academic English across genres and registers, providing insight into disciplinary demands and features across genres while calling attention to the cultural differences in thought and writing patterns.</p> <p>6i) Materials provide substantial support for receptive listening skills, through note-taking and other active listening techniques, while providing ongoing feedback on the comprehension of texts read aloud.</p> <p>6j) Materials incorporate evidence-based approaches, strategies, and resources so that all ELLs (e.g., SIFE, literate in primary language,</p>
--	---	--

		long-term ELL, varying levels of English proficiency, etc.) may attain grade-level standards.
VII. Access to the Standards for All Students		
<p>7. ACCESS FOR ALL STUDENTS: <i>Because the Standards are for all students, alignment requires thoughtful support to ensure all students are able to meet the same standards. Thus, materials must provide supports for English Language Learners and other special populations.</i></p>	<p>7a) The submission provides all students, including those who read below grade level, with extensive opportunities to encounter and comprehend grade-level complex text on a regular basis as required by the standards.</p> <p>7b) Materials regularly include extensions and/or more advanced text for students who read or write above grade level.</p> <p>7c) There are suggestions and materials for adapting instruction for varying student needs (e.g., alternative teaching approaches, pacing, instructional delivery options, suggestions for addressing common student difficulties, remediation strategies).</p> <p>7d) Materials regularly and systematically direct teachers to return to focused parts of the text to guide students through rereading, discussion, and writing about the ideas, events, and information found there.</p>	<p>7e) Teacher resources provide instructional suggestions/recommendations for scaffolding diverse students.</p> <p>7f) Materials provide examples of student work, highlighting potential areas of linguistic challenge and offering related instructional guidance.</p> <p>7g) Materials provide teachers with recommendations and/or links to access additional resources, materials, and texts for diverse student needs.</p> <p>7h) Materials incorporate carefully chosen, age-appropriate visuals and graphic supports to activate prior knowledge and scaffold conceptual development. These graphics should be used to clarify concepts and relationships within the text that are critical to comprehension. All graphics and visuals that are chosen must be culturally respectful.</p> <p>7i) Materials/texts emphasize or repeat a few contextualized linguistic/grammatical structures at a time so that students can access content and gain control over the academic language that frames them.</p> <p>7j) In order to maximize instructional time focused on reading, materials include pre-reading activities that provide visual supports as scaffolds for building background knowledge on new themes/topics that might be unfamiliar. (Supplemental</p>

		<p>materials could provide this support, but must be explicitly connected to the core text being read.)</p> <p>7k) Digital materials and resources are of high quality, and are used as instructional tools to augment and support teacher instruction and student engagement.</p> <p>7l) Materials offer assessment opportunities for all four domains of second language acquisition and attend to ESL/ELD standards and language progressions--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment tools (e.g., diagnostic, formative, unit, etc.) should assist in monitoring student progress in literacy and second language development, including mastery of academic language functions, forms and structures within complex texts. • Teacher resources support the use of assessment data to inform instruction <p>7m) Teacher resources provide guidance to distinguish between simply “meeting ELD standards” and achieving full comprehension of complex text, including guidance on building background knowledge pre-supposed by text.</p>
--	--	--

Section III: Indicators of Superior Quality

I. Usefulness, Design, and Focus

- Do the student resources include ample review and practice resources, clear directions and explanations, and correct labeling of reference aids (e.g., visuals, maps, etc.)?
- Are the materials easy to use? Are they clearly laid out for students and teachers? Does every page of the submission add to student learning rather than distract from it? Are reading selections centrally located within the materials and obviously the center of focus?
- Can the teacher and student reasonably complete the content within a regular school year and does the pacing of content allow for maximum student understanding? Do the materials provide clear guidance to teachers about the amount of time the lesson might reasonably take?
- Do instructions allow for careful reading and rereading of content?
- Do the materials contain clear statements and explanation of purpose, goals, and expected outcomes?

ELL Metrics Scoring Sheet

Non-negotiable Criteria	ELL Metric	Score Point
1. Complexity of Text	1c) The collective set of texts address/support ESL/ELD standards and language progressions ...	1 2 3 4
	1d) The organization and sequence of texts is aligned to grade-appropriate ...	1 2 3 4
	1e) Materials provide extended and sustained time on the themes & opportunities ...	1 2 3 4
	1f) Materials include a range of grade-level and age-appropriate independent ...	1 2 3 4
	1g) In order to maximize instructional time focused on reading, materials include ...	1 2 3 4
2. Text-Dependent and Text-Specific Questions	2c) Materials provide multiple opportunities for extended academic discourse ...	1 2 3 4
Alignment Criteria	ELL Metric	Score Point
1. Range and Quality of Texts	1f) Materials integrate culturally responsive, high-quality texts that tap into ...	1 2 3 4
	1g) Texts include sections where text complexity (both qualitative and quantitative) is called out ...	1 2 3 4
	1h) Materials include annotated deconstruction of text that reveals the linguistic complexity and the richness ...	1 2 3 4
2. Questions and Tasks	2d) Students learn to identify whether the text is narrative or expository ...	1 2 3 4
3. Writing to Sources	3e) Mentor texts are routinely used ...	1 2 3 4
	3f) Materials require students to engage in mini writing tasks that enable ELLs at all ELD levels ...	1 2 3 4
	3g) Instruction offers routine and systematic practice ...	1 2 3 4
4. Foundational Skills	4d) Materials are connected to grade-level content & incorporate a contextualized approach to teaching foundational skills ...	1 2 3 4
	4e) Instruction for building foundational skills should attend to comparative linguistics ...	1 2 3 4
5. Language	5d) Materials must consider how mastery of language conventions develops ...	1 2 3 4
	5e) Materials pay explicit attention to, and engage students with, academic language, its features ...	1 2 3 4
6. Speaking and Listening	6f) Materials offer linguistic frames across language progressions as support ...	1 2 3 4
	6g) Materials provide frames for conducting accountable academic conversations ...	1 2 3 4
	6h) Materials include multiple opportunities for students to listen to authentic ...	1 2 3 4
	6i) Materials provide substantial support for the receptive listening skills ...	1 2 3 4
	6j) Materials incorporate evidence-based approaches, strategies, and resources ...	1 2 3 4
7. Access for All Students	7e) Teacher resources provide instructional suggestions/recommendations for ...	1 2 3 4
	7f) Materials provide examples of student work, highlighting potential areas of ...	1 2 3 4
	7g) Materials provide teachers with recommendations and/or links to access add'l ...	1 2 3 4
	7h) Materials incorporate visuals and graphic supports to activate prior knowledge ...	1 2 3 4
	7i) Materials/texts emphasize or repeat a few contextualized linguistic ...	1 2 3 4
	7j) In order to maximize instructional time focused on reading, materials include ...	1 2 3 4
	7k) Digital materials and resources are of high quality, and are used as ...	1 2 3 4
	7l) Materials offer assessment opportunities for all four domains ...	1 2 3 4
7m) Teacher resources provide guidance to distinguish between simply “meeting” ...	1 2 3 4	
Key: 1 = no evidence, 2 = some evidence, 3 = sufficient evidence, 4 = extensive evidence		Total Score

Step Three: Additional Considerations and Grade-by-Grade Rubrics

The following represent additional considerations that may play a role in the evaluation process. Following a review of those additional considerations that may be relevant to your district, you may proceed to a detailed evaluation of the remaining instructional materials, using a grade-by-grade rubric, such as the one developed by the Council of the Great City Schools.

Additional Considerations: Cultural Relevance and Respect

For culturally responsive teaching, instructional materials selected for English Language Learners must be respectful and inclusive of all students' backgrounds: language, culture, ethnicity, race, gender, refugee, and immigration experience. The materials must pay special attention to cultural implications for ELL students, and must provide appropriate supports for teachers.

- Materials should offer a wide variety of culturally relevant texts, organized in appropriate themes/topics. Carefully selected texts and visuals can foster cross-cultural understanding and collaboration that is respectful of all individuals and groups, including native English speakers. Text sets should offer a range of views and perspectives and be deliberately structured in a sensitive manner to provide opportunities for all learners to engage meaningfully with each text. Texts must take special care to address sensitive subjects with respect, including — where appropriate — carefully chosen images and videos to build background and context.
- ELL students' backgrounds must be valued as assets in classrooms, as they bring rich experience to the learning environment. In order to support the learning environment, texts must acknowledge students' life experiences, and social and emotional development. Texts free of negative misconceptions or stereotypes are better able to support conceptual development, as they encourage students to acknowledge multiple perspectives, rather than undermining individuals' intellectual underpinnings.
- Teachers' resources should include explicit guidance for identifying culturally distinct discourse patterns and linguistic features within texts, highlighting similarities and/or contrasting differences. This guidance should include tasks and questions that are culturally respectful and that draw upon students' metalinguistic awareness and life experiences to guide intellectual exploration and discourse.

Additional Considerations: Student Materials and Support for Language Development

In general, the materials should be based on language acquisition research that supports that language is best acquired when taught through content, allowing students to link language to concepts.

ELLs need to engage in academic discourse with teachers and peers. They should use content and language development to enhance both vocabulary development and comprehension of the structure and function of the language being learned (L2). This concept of academic language expands current thinking around “vocabulary” to attend to the five nested components of language: phonological, lexical, grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse. [Scarcella, R. (2003). *Academic English: A conceptual framework*. University of California, Irvine.]

- Materials must be responsive and accommodate varying levels of English proficiency (or well-targeted for particular levels of proficiency, based on solid research and beta-testing with actual ELLs at those levels). They should highlight instructional practices for working with groups with diverse levels of language proficiency, but must avoid tagging instructional practices to specific levels of English proficiency. Linking specific instructional practices or expectations to specific English proficiency levels creates a very rigid approach to teaching that can lead to ELLs being labeled and taught on one level instead of progressing along a continuum. Materials should give students the opportunity to strive upwards.
- Materials should call out the language demands, challenges, and opportunities along the progression of language acquisition.
- Materials should provide text sets that are connected by an essential question or overarching theme and that ascend a staircase of complexity and include a variety of complex and compelling (“juicy”) texts across a variety of genres.
- Text provided in Spanish (or any other language) should be authentic, high quality, and at a level of complexity that mirrors the language demands of the Common Core.
- Texts should represent the full range of content areas — math, science, social studies, and more — in support of district curricula.
- Materials should have a constant and clear reference to the CCSS, especially the language standards and practices.
- Materials should attend to the needs of students with interrupted formal education (SIFE), newcomers, and other students with specific needs.



Additional Considerations: Intervention

Intervention materials are selected to support specific diagnosed needs. It is assumed that intervention occurs after students have first had opportunities for quality instruction with differentiated support, and students demonstrate that they require additional intervention and focused instruction. Intervention strategies and materials will vary according to purpose, age, and grade level.

- Materials (texts, tasks, and talk) are designed to accelerate (rather than remediate) content learning and language development to present a cohesive and coherent approach to building and developing concepts, content, thinking, and language.
- Suggestions are provided for adapting and extending tasks to *support* and *expand* academic language development.
- Specific intervention materials may focus on particular aspects or levels of ELD and/or language progressions.
- Materials must provide progressions, student practice, and scaffolds that result in student access to grade-level content.
- Intervention materials must be linked to the core ELA materials and curriculum, and must include abundant grade-level content (e.g., texts, tasks, talk, topics/themes).

Additional Considerations: Teacher Materials and Professional Development

- Materials should not have scripted instruction. Publishers' materials should not usurp the district's curriculum, but rather support the district-created one.
- Materials should provide reflection/coaching suggestions rather than a script to follow.
- Materials should support teachers in scaffolding up rather than watering down, encouraging students to strive upwards and ensuring that ELLs are instructed with rigorous grade-level content.
- Materials ideally include samples of *more* structured units as guides for teachers, as well as others that are *less* structured, to allow teachers to take greater command of designing their units, as they feel more comfortable with the instructional shifts.
- Publisher should collaborate with districts to design customized professional development (PD) rather than rely on the publisher's generic PD outline.
- The materials' design should include spaces for collaborative conversations among students and with teachers; the PD should support teachers who need to learn how to do this.
- Ideally, the PD would support a virtual learning community for teaching and reflection, possibly including teaching videos.

Additional Considerations: Instructional Technology

Consistent with the *ELD 2.0* Framework and the language demands of the Common Core, the promotion of academic literacy in ELLs is more than ‘teaching English.’ Promoting academic literacy involves offering “access to the ranges of knowledge, abilities and forms of language” that in turn affords students a “participant status” in academic settings. (Hawkins, 2004) Such promotion of academic literacy acknowledges the social and communicative nature of language learning and literacy development. (Parker, 2007)

New technologies can be a valuable tool to facilitate the process of promoting academic literacy for ELLs. The use of computers and the Internet can provide support for extensive and independent reading and writing, assist with language scaffolding, and provide opportunities for authentic research and publication. (Warschauer et al., 2004) Moreover, the Internet can be an important source for instructional materials in native language and can afford educators substantially greater alternatives for fostering language learning with contextual and cultural depth. (Castek, 2007)

The effectiveness of projects that use technology, however, does not lie in the technology itself, but in the purposeful use of technology to meet the needs of students. (Durán, 2007) Technology can play an important role in the construction of productive learning environments for young English learners. (Parker, 2007)

When selecting digital or technology-based modalities of instructional materials for ELLs, districts must consider how these fit into a larger vision of instruction for ELLs, and how teachers will use technology to extend literacy development and enhance access to rigorous content.

Key considerations include:

- a) Technology cannot be seen as a single factor to transform instruction; rather, technology is used to support students in their development of academic literacy through—
 - promotion of independent reading
 - support for language scaffolding
 - facilitating involvement in cognitively engaging projects
 - student analysis and creation of purposeful texts in a variety of media and genres (Warschauer et al., 2004)
 - simulating different contexts of language use, providing ELLs practice with vocabulary and literary devices across content areas and registers. Technology can help create virtual settings in which students can see how language transforms itself depending on the particular context (like the playground and the classroom), social institutions (like school and home) and practices (like games and lessons). This will counter language instructional practices that are abstract and decontextualized. (Gee, 2004)

- b) Digital materials must provide contextual integration of vocabulary instruction to facilitate reading comprehension and academic language proficiency.
- c) The use of technology in language and literacy instruction needs to extend beyond basic reading skills to higher-level literacy and communication skills.
- d) Digital modalities should not be a stand-alone resource; rather, they should be integrated with teacher tools and delivery methods to create a technology-mediated learning environment. (Rueda, 2007) Teacher resources should include supports and models that demonstrate how to effectively integrate technology to meet the needs of students in the classroom.
- e) Effective classroom integration of digital materials calls for—
 - language input that is of high quality
 - ample communicative opportunities for practice in various social, cultural, and academic contexts (registers)
 - feedback that is timely, meaningful, and of high quality
 - content that is individualized for the student’s unique needs. (Zhao and Lai, 2007)

Instructional Technology References

- Castek, J. et al. (2007). *Developing new literacies among multilingual learners in the elementary grades*, Chapter 4 in L.L. Parker (Ed.) Technology-mediated learning.
- Durán, Richard P. (2007) *Technology and literacy development of Latino youth*, Chapter 2 in L.L. Parker (Ed.) Technology-mediated learning.
- Gee, J.P. *Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective*. In R.B. Ruddell & H.J. Unrau (Eds.) *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed. 2004; pp. 116-132). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Hawkins, M.R. (2004) *Researching English language and literacy development in schools*. *Educational Researcher* 33 (3), 14-25.
- Parker, L.L. (Ed.) (2007) *Technology-mediated learning environments for young English learners*. New York: Routledge.
- Rueda, Robert. (2007) *Literacy and English learners: Where does technology fit?* Chapter 2 Reflection in L.L. Parker (Ed.) Technology-mediated learning.
- Warschauer et al. (2004) *Promoting academic literacy with technology: Successful laptop programs in K-12 schools*, Elsevier Ltd.
- Zhao, Y. and Lai, C. (2007) *Technology and second language learning: Promises and problems*. Chapter 5 in L.L. Parker (Ed.) Technology-mediated learning.



Appendix: Matching Instructional Materials to Your Program Design

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (ELA)	
<p>CORE ELA MATERIALS Collective set of CCSS-aligned materials for Core ELA Instruction</p>	<p>Example 1 District may select a comprehensive/structured ELA program with all key components typically provided by one vendor. These materials may be more prescriptive and offer specific lesson plans and instructional guidance in the context of a planned scope and sequence.</p> <p>Materials typically include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core (“basal”) student text(s) • TE with specific (often prescriptive) guidance for instruction • Related ancillaries which provide for word/language study, foundational skills, and other practice • Formative & summative assessment <p>-OR-</p> <p>Example 2 District may select a comprehensive/flexible set of materials; this set is a less structured collection. Key components may be from one or several vendors and may be selected to support/align to district- developed “Units of Study.”</p> <p>Materials may include a variety of student texts (for guided instruction, independent, etc.) and related student and teacher resources.</p> <p>Both Example 1 and Example 2 will likely provide CCSS-aligned materials and may also provide student-accessible tools and resources for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Word/language study • Foundational skills • Digital resources • Assessment (formative; may also include diagnostic, summative) <p>Core ELA materials for ELLs must also provide for embedded, complementary, or distinct supports for a range of language proficiency levels and other needs, including deliberate academic language development, in both Teacher’s Guide and student materials.</p>

<p>SUPPLEMENTAL ELA Materials to address gaps in Core Materials</p>	<p>District selects supplemental materials for specific purposes:</p> <p><i>To Fill Gaps in Core Materials:</i> Selected Core ELA Materials lack specific components needed for instruction (e.g., word study, ELL resources, etc.).</p> <p><i>To Enrich and Supplement ELA Core Materials:</i> Additional materials may be selected to enrich and expand ELA, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional student texts • Targeted support materials (e.g., writing, language, word study, etc.) • Classroom libraries • Digital resources <p>Supplemental ELA Materials for ELLs may be chosen to fulfill either purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To address ELL-specific needs:</i> filling gaps in core materials (e.g., explicit language support, appropriate texts, etc.) • <i>To enrich and support:</i> Providing additional reading/writing materials, digital resources to supplement language development, etc.
<p>ELA INTERVENTION Materials for Intervention & Support</p>	<p>District selects materials to be used <i>in addition to</i> (not to replace) core ELA materials, for specific purposes:</p> <p><i>To provide targeted intervention for a diagnosed need:</i> May be a component of district’s MTSS/RTI program.</p> <p>ELA Intervention Materials designed for ELLs: These materials must distinguish between language needs and literacy needs and must target specific needs for additional instruction and support.</p>
<p>ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ELD)</p>	
<p>CORE ELD MATERIALS</p>	<p>Selection of ELD materials is dependent upon a district’s approach to ELD and ELA instruction.</p> <p>Combined ESL/ELD Class (ELD instruction is embedded within/a part of ELA): An ELD Class/Course designed for ELLs that combines ELA and ELD, typically with no other core ELA instruction. (In this context, ELD replaces ELA for ELLs.) Core ELD materials must, therefore, be comprehensive (either structured or flexible), providing for both ELA and ELD.</p> <p>Core ELA materials (see above), along with Focused ELD and/or selected supplemental materials, constitute the Core ELD materials.</p>

	<p>Materials are designed for ELLs and provide for grade-level CCSS-aligned ELA (with texts, teacher resources, etc.) Materials may include supplemental texts to support varying English language proficiency levels, reading/writing levels, and ELL needs.</p> <p>Materials promote accelerated literacy and academic language development (e.g., Discipline-specific Academic Language Expansion – DALE) and include a strong language study component.</p> <p>Separate ESL/ELD Classes (ELD instruction occurs separately from/in addition to ELA): Students receive standards-aligned ELA instruction and focused ELD (Focused Language Study – FLS).</p> <p>Materials for Core ELA are provided as noted in ELA Core (above). In addition, materials for Focused ELD (Focused Language Study) target language development.</p> <p>Materials complement selected ELA core materials and provide instruction and support for related language demands. They are designed for ELLs at varying levels of English language proficiency and with varying language and literacy backgrounds.</p> <p>Materials focus on language study and language development and align/build toward CCSS and ELD standards and language progressions. They may include supplemental texts to support varying English language proficiency levels, reading/writing levels, and ELL needs and to promote accelerated literacy and language development (e.g., Discipline-specific and Academic Language Expansion– DALE).</p>
SUPPLEMENTAL ELD	<p>As with ELA, supplemental materials may be for either purpose:</p> <p><i>To Fill Gaps in Core ELD Materials</i> (e.g., explicit language support, appropriate texts, etc.)</p> <p><i>To Enrich and Support:</i> Provide additional reading/writing materials, digital resources to supplement language development, etc.</p>
ELD INTERVENTION	<p>As with ELA, intervention materials are in addition to (not a replacement for) core ELD materials. Districts select intervention materials specifically to <i>provide targeted intervention for diagnosed language development needs</i>. (May be a component of district’s MTSS/RTI program.)</p>
	<p>ELD Intervention materials are designed for ELLs; they distinguish between language needs and literacy needs, and target specific areas needing additional instruction and support.</p>

Contributors

Albuquerque Public Schools	Ana Maria Encinias
	Lynne Rosen
Boston Public Schools	Farah Assiraj
Buffalo Public Schools	Tamara Alsace
Chicago Public Schools	Elizabeth Cardenas-Lopez
Denver Public Schools	Helen Butts
Fresno Unified School District	Maria Maldonado
	Val Hogwood
	Elizabeth Gamino
	Allyson Burns
Houston ISD	Jennifer Alexander
	Dana Enriquez
Los Angeles Unified	Hilda Maldonado
	Maricela Sanchez
New York City Schools	Amy Goldman
	Robin Mallah
Oakland Unified	Nicole Knight
Palm Beach County	Margarita Pinkos
San Diego Unified	Terry Walter
	Mary Waldron
	Debra Dougherty
	Sonia Gagnon
San Francisco Unified	Angie Estonina
Santa Ana Unified	Michelle Rodriguez
	Helen Tross
Seattle Public Schools	Veronica Gallardo

Independent ELL Experts

UC Berkeley, Emerita	Lily Wong-Fillmore
University of New Mexico	Rebecca Blum-Martinez
Independent consultant	Maryann Cucchiara

Albuquerque	East Baton Rouge	Oklahoma City
Anchorage	El Paso	Omaha
Atlanta	Fort Worth	Orange County
Austin	Fresno	Palm Beach
Baltimore	Guilford County	Philadelphia
Birmingham	Honolulu	Pittsburgh
Boston	Houston	Portland
Bridgeport	Indianapolis	Providence
Broward County	Jackson	Richmond
Buffalo	Jacksonville	Rochester
Charleston	Kansas City	Sacramento
Charlotte	Long Beach	San Diego
Chicago	Los Angeles	San Francisco
Cincinnati	Louisville	Santa Ana
Clark County	Miami-Dade	Seattle
Cleveland	Milwaukee	Shelby County
Columbus	Minneapolis	St. Louis
Dallas	Nashville	St. Paul
Dayton	Newark	Tampa
Denver	New Orleans	Toledo
Des Moines	New York City	Washington, DC
Detroit	Norfolk	Wichita
	Oakland	



**Council of the Great City Schools
1301 Pennsylvania Ave N.W.
Suite 702
Washington, D.C. 20004**