

WIDA Meeting Notes

Name of Meeting	Standards Subcommittee Meeting
Date	9/27/18
Time	1:00pm-2:00pm CT
Attendees	SEAs: Barb Marquer (WY), Julie Chi (MN), Flavia Molea Baker (RI), Fernanda Kray (MA), Sophia Masewicz (NV), Adam Pitt (IN), Audrey Lesondak (WI), Ken Bond (NJ), Jacqueline Ellis (GA), WIDA: Andrea Cammilleri, Lynn Shafer Willner, Rita MacDonald, Daniella Molle, Amanda Spalter, Ruslana Westerlund, Jen Wilfrid, Andrea Kreuzer, Elizabeth Cranley
Note Taker	Jessica Davis

Topic # 1: Instructional Framework Feedback
<p>Information Shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Here’s a big picture of changes. • The change in schedule was enacted to allow us to streamline the IF into a single package - all elements aligned with a stronger introduction and more examples.
<p>Discussion Questions</p> <p>Question 1: Front Matter</p> <p>Does this make clear the vision, central concepts, and potential uses of the IF for teachers? Is it teacher-friendly?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adam (IN): first graphic – liked the flow of utilizing the content standards and IF and ideas for using the IF. Into the weeds – what the IF highlights; meaning-making tables useful which to use when? Other parts might be skimmed (and not read closely): high leverage for learning. Wanted clear ideas for using the framework • Audrey (WI): Didn’t go into much detail about the IF. It’s clearer and a little more teacher-friendly than previous iterations. Yet, would a teacher understand the beginning: What to focus on. What are my intentions in relation to language? • Ken (NJ): Like a lot of the language and rationales behind different pieces. Two to think about: lots of blocks of text which disrupt visual flow (more bullets); add quick blurb about shifts from 2012 – this is a progression from our overall standards interpretation and operationalization. • Julie (MN): Agree with understanding and interpreting the document. More clearer and teacher-friendly language overall. Some areas do get theory-filled. Liked the visuals (need more). Less text, more visuals. Flow chart needs more explanation. Why the difference in color coding. The IF is designed to highlight (helpful for understanding purposes for changes). Still has difficulty with Language Practices (does like the name), but what are they and how to use? Ideas for Planning and Instruction: Lots of text. How to separate these out? Subtitles not as helpful (leverage students’ interests) • Flavia (RI): Thinking as a teacher, it’s a lot of reading. Can we use the same content, but provide more visual and connection support? See p. 5: Add teacher and student action

picture for reference. Content wasn't too academic; hit the midway between academic and teacher language.

- Fernanda (MA): Talked with Content Leads and Ed Prep Leads. Vision clearer. Still has a way to go...This still assumes a lot of background for those not in the EL World. The Language Practices continue to require a level of nuance not easily apparent. Use similar words (Express – only when I have unrehearsed communication and common experience vs. Adapt). There are different levels that teachers will get to...Content teachers as primary audience. What is the role of the language specialist?
- Sophia (NV): The IF is more of a teaching tool, not something to send out to small, rural areas. Will take quite a bit of training to be digested. It does express and make more visible language in content. Liked the layout.

1:23

Daniella:

- Audience – In general, we've focused on an audience who has a background in language development. The document for those with less language development background is found in Teacher Toolkit. Appreciated comment addressing district staff role in using this document.
 - Audrey – be more explicit as to who is the audience? One message we've received is the new thinking around meaning-making and the relationship between content and language (with this new lens). This is a development change in language theory. Be more explicit about this based on language teachers with different training histories might receive this differently.
 - Adam – a way to reference the other resources and show it's aligned and the bigger picture (in relation to Can Do Descriptors and Guiding Principles).
 - Daniella: Helpful to hear where can we be more explicit about how others will use this.

Question 2: Glossary

Does this make language more visible? Is this a resource that language teachers might use to collaborate with content teachers? Does it help clarify the language progressions?

- Adam (IN): All in all, like the glossary. It does help clarify terms used by WIDA – e.g., coherence, complexity. Specific examples are helpful. Is this glossary complete at this point? How many terms total? 4-5 big terms and many sub-terms. Be clear about Key Terms and sub-terms for topics.
 - Ruslana: Selected bolded terms and organized them alphabetically. Wanted to contextualize our examples. More terms to be added.
- Audrey (WI): The idea of a glossary is helpful. What is the intent in terms specificity of definitions. Is it a glossary or a general interpretation of the words or specific to this document? Liked examples of demonstrating use in context. Would people look at this like the do the Can Do's? (As specific guidance.) Struggled with language progression – evidence of students doing this will vary by level of content and grade level....Especially: connection and cohesion...
- Ken (NJ): Liked the content of the glossary. Meaning-making, pedagogical shift need to be included in glossary. Audience: Higher education classes. Electronic linking between IF document and glossary and open
- Jaqueline (GA) – see chat box text

- Julie (MN): Agree with previous speakers. Add introduction and link with IF document (maybe in an app)...With progressions, be intentional with terms used to describe the levels in each progression: Coherence?
- Flavia (RI): Like examples to guide teachers. For whom written? Language specialists?
- Fernanda (MA): Liked Ken’s – how will people access this? Once in a while? From within the progressions? Not different from other language reference. How to collaborate?
- Sophia (NV): Liked it. But more for language specialists. How do we move the need for content teacher? Connect it to the PD: How would language teachers use it for content teachers?
- Ruslana: Idea was to hyperlink each word...(Gloss) – how to connect two documents. This is a resource, not a dictionary. Contextualize language use in content areas. Trying to represent language, not a grammar resource, but as a meaning-making resource in different contexts. What does it mean by “expanded range of resources”? We could connect them back to the progressions.

Next Steps/Action Items:

- By October 10, the standards writing team will address the following in the draft surrounding matter:
 - Audience clarified
 - Copy edits based on feedback
 - Document formats and linking; more tightly connect the glossary to progressions so you can flip from one to the other.
 - Provide examples across grade level/content areas

Topic # 2: Instructional Framework Public Input Questions

Information Shared:

Do you feel like we have addressed your areas of concern? Any outstanding areas to address?

- Fernanda (MA): Loved the guiding principles; where the glossary is going? Too dense, too many options involved – fewer details; liked explicit connections but content – more brief explanations of language; too much too hold language; Guiding Practices felt practical...so much for the content teacher to think about in planning. It felt over-whelming to read
- Sophia (NV) – issue of clarity of audiences to be addressed
- Adam (IN) – bulk of changes - more at ease with changes; agrees with Fernanda’s challenges – big PD lift
- Audrey (WI): Would like to draw from examples/models from teacher’s lens; issue of needing a level of detail to understand it (accessibility challenges). Textbook reading vs. materials provided professionally. How to put together complex materials – lot of information to be absorbed and digested. Would like index (opposite of the “click”/hyperlink idea)
- Ken (NJ): Agree with Fernanda’s comments: There’s a lot there that needs to be organized. What extra, helpful information is there beyond the beginner information (which would be found in the document)
- Barb (WY): Wyoming has no areas of concerns, or areas at this time especially since I missed the first part.
- Julie: Liked the change of the contexts to the Language Practices. Contexts for engaged meaning-making was too wordy. LPs are still problematic – how to use them? Still theory-heavy and terminology heavy; interactions (one, one-to-one, one-to-many): Need examples of what language would be used. How does it connect to language domains – if it does? Ideas for planning instruction – sub-points (where did they originate? Are they related to the

guiding principles); Felt overwhelmed by looking at them: If we need to know this, how can we use this immediately?

- Jaqueline: The changes made are representative of our feedback)
- Flavia: no additional concerns

Daniella: Thank Audrey with the big tension to add details, but not too much detail. Need more clarity about audience: What is still missing?

- Sophia: Those with experience and those with little experience. Where does the document live?
 - Writing Group Vision: People with language background could use it. Could we add an introduction to the document? Ask our colleagues in PL to help with this?
- Daniella: We need to really integrate the resources and have them appear at one time and live as a whole. As students develop language, what would change. We need to build connections between the different pieces in the IF.

Topic # 3: Timeline Updates

Information Shared:

- Fall/Winter 2018-Instructional Framework refinements and public comment
- Spring/Summer 2019-Instructional Framework and supporting docs
- Year 2: Fall 2019 through Summer 2020, Year 3: Fall 2020-Summer 2021-Additional resources

Discussion Questions

Do you feel like we have addressed your areas of concern? Any outstanding areas to address?

- Barb (WY), Julie (MN): No issues or concerns
- Flavia (RI): Do states need to do more networking with the Public Comment.
 - Will create resources; Looking for validation because at final point of refinement
- Fernanda (MA): How will the roll it out; needs more pieces to understand the full picture. Will we need to wait until the spring? How to prepare the field?
- Sophia (NV): Timeline looks fine. Right now, they are doing a push with their own instructional document. How to navigate, integrate and clearly explain what each document does?
- Adam (IN): Public comment and release – short period of time. How to get input and apply it? What will this look like on our end?
- Audrey (WI): At next committee meeting, provide parallel schedule with training team resources – what is there to help the SEAs?
- Ken (NJ) and Jaqueline (GA): Nothing to add

Topic # 4: Revisiting Proposed SEA Central Concepts document

Information Shared:

- Proposed Central Concepts document outline shared via email in advance of meeting.

Discussion Questions

Now that you have seen the proposed "surrounding matter" for the instructional framework, how does it relate to this outline?

- Ken (NJ): Still feel like this other document, with a separate purpose, user group, and format.

Comparison of Purpose

- * WIDA Central Concepts fits the whole system together, gives diving-off points for each, and explains connections and rationale for each part of the system

* Front matter focuses on instructional framework only. Still silos can do descriptors, guiding principles, and (to a lesser extent) 5 standards.

Comparison of User Group

* WIDA Central Concepts should be an overarching, 1 document for newcomers to the WIDA system that uses commonly-understood language for outsiders

* Front matter is an introduction to shifts from the 2012 amplification and introduces language and content intended to move the field forward

Comparison of Format

* WIDA Central Concepts should contain enough practical information about each piece of the WIDA system that it is clear how each piece functions

* Front matter Glossary and Language Resource Table, this becomes much too long to be used as a central concepts document.

- Barb (WY) – nothing to add
- Julie (MN) – Language Practices – having trouble with Adapt ...wants new term. Would help to have a central concepts doc
- Flavia (RI) – wordy a lot of reading; central concepts – needs to be brief. Make it easy to read. Not a long document.
- Fernanda (MA): Needs connective tissue – this is a cohesive map to enter WIDA World. Not too separate.
- Sophia (NV): How would this look? A diagram to bridge to other documents? You can ask districts to give us currently-used documents without a bridge to new documents. Visual. How to do to build capacity (as part of PD) – to build capacity around central concepts.
- Adam (IN): Getting close to document overload. Use this document to start. Maybe we briefer and more visual. Specific to Can Do Descriptors. Very intentional. A true starting point. A road map.
- Audrey (WI): nothing to add.
- Julie: Does it have to a completely separate document or an introduction to a main document. Study guide, laminated cheat sheet. Visual to conceptualize how the pieces work together?
- Fernanda: Will we see alignment with Key Uses, Can Do's, Pathways?...[Leadership level question]
- WIDA: Yes, we are doing our best to assure this alignment but more effort is needed this fall to determine the final framing and relationships among these components.
 - How is language being defined? (theoretical foundations)...Is it writing and speaking? Is it language as a tool for meaning-making? How will teachers operationalized? How is language being conceptualized? How might teachers think about teaching language and language development?
- Ken: Shorten to 2 or 3 pages – SIOP bookmarks.

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Andrea and Lynn will share a proposal and/or draft materials incorporating feedback with subcommittee by end of 2018.

Topic # 5: Wrap-up

Information Shared:

Reminder: Guiding Principles feedback

- Reviews needed: Deadline Oct. 2
- Final version to the EC for their review in November

Peer review

- Send out e-mail to subcommittee listserv