# Public Review Comments of the Draft California World Languages Standards

Public Comment Received August 1, 2018–September 30, 2018

This table is a summary list of public comments received during the public review (August 1, 2018, through September 30, 2018). All comments are provided in their original form without editing. Where possible, specific suggested line edits have each been given their own entry in the table. The comments appear in separate tables, in the order that the standards were posted online, with general comments listed first followed by suggestions specific to the text. Where possible, page and line numbers for line references are included in the column labeled “Page.” References were provided by the California Department of Education (CDE), and include the abbreviation “p.” and the word “line,” and should not be considered text from the associated comment.

Starting on page 6, please use the “Recommended Action” column to indicate which of the following applies to each of the submitted public comments.

* **Recommended** = The CDE recommends that the World Languages (WL) Subject Matter Committee (SMC) include the additions, edits, and/or changes as stated in the public comment.
* **Not Recommended** = The CDE recommends that the WL SMC does not include the additions, edits, and/or changes as stated in the public comment.
* **No Motion Recommended** = The CDE does not have a recommendation.
* **Writer’s Discretion** = The CDE recommends that the WL SMC authorize the WL Standards writer and CDE staff to include or exclude the additions, edits, and/or changes suggested in the comment members of the public submitted.
* **Non-Actionable** = The public comment does not include actionable edits that encompass additions, edits, and/or changes that can be applied to the standards, and no action is needed.
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## Table 1. Standards Ratings Table

| Rating Area | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Format and Clarity | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| Facilitating teaching and learning of world languages | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 |

## **Table 2. Input Sources: Includes Survey Respondents**

| Source (Name shortened for easy reference in the table) | Name | Affiliation, Current Position, and Credentials | Input Method |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Buffington | Kelly Buffington | Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential | Survey |
| Beeman | Tom Beeman | Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential | Survey |
| Clyne | Jett Clyne | Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential | Survey |
| Doehla | Don Doehla | Berkeley WL Project, Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential with Other Supplemental Authorization | Survey |
| Fernandes | Kelly Fernandes | Northern Humboldt Union School District, Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential with Bilingual Authorization | Survey |
| Gallegos | Carol Gallegos | Hanford Elementary School District, Curriculum Specialist, Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, BCLAD, Reading Certificate, Administrative Services Credential | Survey |
| Gordon | Courtney Gordon | Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential | Survey |
| Harrell | Robert Harrell | Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential with Secondary Authorization | Survey |
| Jensen | Anne Jensen | San Jose State University, Credentialed K12 Teacher, College/University Faculty, Single Subject Teaching Credential | Survey |
| Juneja | Harmit Juneja | Credentialed K12 Teacher, CTE credential | Survey |
| Panossian | Michael Panossian | Parent/Guardian of K12 Student | Survey |
| Perez | Nancy Perez | Central California World Language Project, Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential with Bilingual Authorization | Survey |
| Salsig | Nancy Salsig | Berkeley World Language Project, College/University Faculty, Single Subject Teaching Credential, Single Subject Teaching Credential with Secondary Authorization | Survey |
| Seh | Cathy Seh | [None entered] | Survey |
| Smith | Michael Smith | Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential | Survey |
| Sparks | Carol Sparks | College/University Faculty, Multiple Subject Teaching Credential | Survey |
| Straus | Todd Straus | Santa Rosa Junior College, College/University Faculty | Survey |
| Wilson | Melinda Wilson | Credentialed K12 Teacher, Single Subject Teaching Credential with Secondary Authorization | Survey |
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### INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAFT CALIFORNIA WORLD LANGUAGES STANDARDS

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Harrell | p. 2, lines 32–40 | Lines 32–40: Why are monolingual English students ignored in this section? Are they not also part of California's Diverse Student Population? | **Recommended** |
| 2 | Gallegos | p. 3, line 42 | Missing word on line 42. | **Recommended** |
| 3 | Gordon | p. 3, line 42 | Line 42 has a typo. Add and "and," in CAPS below. The amount of time it takes to learn another language AND its cultures is linked to the linguistic… | **Recommended** |
| 4 | Sparks | p. 3, line 42 | page 3, line 42: …learn another languages AND its cultures… | **Recommended** |
| 5 | Sparks | p. 3, lines 42–60 | page 3: At the beginning of The Length of Time for Learning section, please include a strong statement with the many valid reasons for students to begin the learning of a language at an early age. The statements in the section titled Calfornia's Language Programs are insufficient. | **Recommended** |
| 6 | Sparks | p. 3, line 49 | page 3, line 49: …Category… does not need to be bold. It makes this confusing when there is nothing else in the paragraph bolded. The following chart will be sufficient. | **Recommended** |
| 7 | Perez | p. 4, lines 87–106 | Category III: Languages with significant linguistic and/or cultural differences from English Lines 87 to 106 sample languages Line 96 names "lao" as a choice. I am wondering why Hmong is not a choice here and if it could be added. There is a significant number of Hmong students around the Fresno area. | **Recommended** |
| 8 | Juneja | p. 4, lines 87–106 | The draft World Language standards is an excellent document. However I request that Punjabi be added in the list of languages in the appropriate category, I.e. Category 3. | **Recommended** |
| 9 | Doehla | p. 4, line 105 | One note on spelling: In line 105, Xhosa is spelled with the H - it is missing in the draft. Xhosa is the spelling used in South Africa to refer to this language, one of the national languages of the country, and the common spelling internationally. | **Recommended** |
| 10 | Sparks | p. 6, line 151 | page 6, line 15 It IS important to recognize,,, | **Recommended** |
| 11 | Harrell | p. 6, lines 151–152 | Lines 151–152: "It important to recognize that that language learners ..." This is one of the more egregious examples of the need for a thorough proofreading of the text since it incorporates two errors in a single sentence (missing copula and repetition of conjunction). | **Recommended** |
| 12 | Salsig | p. 7, line 214 | Line 214: Communication must have a purpose (Bill VanPatten). It takes place... | **Recommended** |
| 13 | Sparks | p. 8, line 240  | page 8, line 240: …increase their knowledge OF numerous areas… | **Recommended** |
| 14 | Straus | N/A | Teaching primarily in the target language is a terrible idea. First, you lose the less gifted and less prepared students who are overwhelmed by the double challenge of learning new content and not understanding some of the explanations of that new content. Second, the result of target language instruction is that the student ends up being very good at understanding only statements like "Take out your pen and fill in the blanks in exercise B" in the target language. So you overwhelm many of the students and the benefits are minimal at best. I guess Krachen et al have pulled the wool of the eyes of the profession. | **Not Recommended** |
| 15 | Wilson | N/A | Within your list of languages and their categories with respect to "closely related to English" I'm shocked to see German is category 2. I've been teaching it for 27 years and have a full program at Folsom High School. My pass rate on the AP exam is equivalent and exceeds that of the French and Spanish program. And we have the same number of hours in the classroom. My students are always seeing the connection between German and their first language, English. English IS a Germanic language. What is the rationale for this placement? | **Not Recommended** |
| 16 | Gordon | N/A | Length of Time for Learning Languages and Cultures: What is the purpose of listing the Foreign Service amount of hours required? How does this relate to elementary/middle school/high school hours with limited or no outside study? Even with the disclaimer in line 56 "one must be cognizant..." it is misleading to write in lines 61-62 "600 class hours are typically necessary for learners to perform within the Superior Range of Proficiency." That is not what it takes CA public school learners to reach Superior. So why are we even citing the 600 hours piece of data? I do not understand the value of this section of the standards. The Ranges and Phases of Proficiency It's fine that we use ACTFL's proficiency ranges. However, they do not appear to have been created for classrooms where students receive comprehensible input from the very first day as opposed to lists of words and phrases to memorize and practice (and master). But that's fine for now; it’s what we have. SLA experts and teacher leaders have written about the limitations of the ACTFL Proficiency Levels. | **Not Recommended** |
| 17 | Harrell | p. 2, lines 14–18 | Substantive issues: Lines 14-18: "The ability to communicate ... demonstrates ... the effectiveness of collaborative international endeavors ..." Not really. The ability to communicate demonstrates nothing about the effectiveness of collaborative international endeavors. This is a "fluff" statement that is simply not true. | **Not Recommended** |
| 18 | Smith | p. 2, lines 24–25 | In regards to page 2 lines 24–25, I am not sure what the relevance of teaching "legal" ways to access culturally authentic materials is, especially considering Fair Use for educational purposes and the fact that culturally authentic materials may be structurally inaccessible to students due to copyright and region restrictions. That should not stop them from engaging with the material. Indeed, it is necessary for them to do so regardless. I would retain the wording of "ethical" but omit "legal," considering the fact that laws can be open to interpretation, change frequently and may be different depending on the setting and jurisdiction, and the fact that world language education retains a particular vested interest in diverging from a certain discourse on the legality of access to information considering our goals of intercultural competence and political realities related to Net Neutrality, etc. | **Not Recommended** |
| 19 | Sparks | p. 5, lines 121–123 | page 5, lines 121–123: Will the CWLP Classroom Oral Competency Interview, etc. be resurrected? If not, this reference is inaccurate and inappropriate. | **Not Recommended** |
| 20 | Gordon | p. 5, lines 132, 134, and 263–272 | One thing to consider is the interpretation by CA teachers of the term "accuracy" in lines 132 and 134. (And lines 263-272.) Take Novice Mid, for example. According to the description of Novice Mid, students would have high accuracy in comprehension and production of “learned words and phrases”. At Novice Mid they would indeed have high accuracy in comprehension of words and phrases that they had been exposed to. However, in production, for features of the language that are “late acquired,” like gender agreement, they would NOT be highly accurate in production. Textbooks teach grammar concepts like gender agreement explicitly early on, and the interpretation by many teachers is that it is an easy concept so students must master that early in Spanish 1. (Same wit [CDE: Character limit exceeded] | **Not Recommended** |
| 21 | Smith | p. 6, line 176 | Additionally, on page 6, line 176, I am not sure how relevant the SAT Subject Tests are for our current educational landscape. I would not agree with the statement that high schools prepare students for performance on these tests, as I cannot think of a single high school that does this now, even if it may have been done in the past. | **Not Recommended** |
| 22 | Harrell | p. 7, lines 214–227 | Lines 214–227: The presence and emphasis (boldface) on technical terms (orthography, phonology, etc.) opens the door to programs that focus on teaching about the language rather than using the language for communication. My own experience provides a case study for the importance of exposure to language over instruction about the language. I grew up attending American schools but read British literature extensively. To this day, British orthography and spelling are more natural to me than American conventions. I must consciously remind myself of the American rules but do not have to think about the British rules. Which had the greater impact on my acquisition, receiving explicit instruction in about the language or exposure to the data embedded in the language? | **Not Recommended** |
| 23 | Gallegos | N/A | The introduction provides a concise overview of the purpose of, and need for, the world Language Standards. In particular, the comparison to adult learners and the length of time often needed to develop language competence in the target language at the superior level is a critical distinction along with the idea that even a high school student may not achieve that level because of the abstract, professional expertise and vocabulary required. Moreover, the including of three sets of complementary standards that examine elements of language and cultural proficiency based on proficiency (given a stage and age) rather than grade level makes sense for language acquisition. Without an understanding of the target culture, learners cannot truly become proficient in communicating with the highest level of success. Finally, the explanations are clear enough for both the language acquisition expert and the school employee that will implement the standards who does not speak a second language and who may not understand the language acquisition process at more than a surface level. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 24 | Doehla | N/A | The introduction is concise and to the point. I especially appreciate that the topics addressed are pertinent and timely. Global competence is at the heart of our vision and mission in WL courses. I appreciate the strong support for all students to have access to language courses. We can, and must, be inclusive of all students! If someone speaks one language, they can learn to speak another, if given enough time, and enough support. We must make the time, and offer the right kind of support. I also appreciate that the author cites the research about how long it takes to become fluent in other languages. We tend to think that 2 years is sufficient to become fairly fluent, when we know from the research that it is only sufficient to reach novice high fluency for most students. I strongly support the move to reference student fluency by the common language we use in connection with the ACTFL World Readiness Standards - novice, intermediate, advanced, superior, low, mid, high, oral and written fluency - these terms are far more meaningful and connect to the wider conversations we have with language teaching specialists across the nation and globally. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 25 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |
| 26 | Clyne | N/A | I would not have had any clue about this had I not attended a meeting yesterday. It would have been nice to get something from the CTC or you directly out to school districts. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 27 | Buffington | N/A | I think this document is a vast improvement over the previous standards and is more in line with ACTFL standards. I think the emphasis on authentic resources and the use of integrated assessments is critical to student success and I am beyond glad to see them incorporated | **Non-Actionable** |
| 28 | Harrell | N/A | There are numerous errors of grammar, syntax, and spelling throughout the section (and probably throughout the document). Since these errors are "passim", it would be ineffective to try to list them. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 29 | Harrell | p. 3, lines 41–161 | Lines 41-161: These are excellent sections and should be retained in the final document. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 30 | Sparks | p. 7, lines 209–212 | page 7, lines 209-212: This explanation for the presentation of the Standards is very well done. | **Non-Actionable** |

### COMMUNICATION STANDARDS

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 31 | Salsig | p. 9, line 246 | Line 246: Communication must have purpose (Bill VanPatten). It takes place... | **Recommended** |
| 32 | Salsig | p. 9, line 256 | Line 256: Should read: text-types to communicate... | **Recommended** |
| 33 | Doehla | N/A | I am delighted to see that the cultures standards clearly state the inseparable connection between language and culture. Culture provides the context for language acquisition. Likewise, I appreciate the nomenclature used to reference the standards in a simple, easily retained structure, making it easy to remember. Once again, the descriptions are parallel making the standards easy to remember. I would like to advocate for including language that highlights the importance of using authentic multi-media resources as an integral part of the WL curriculum, including language that encourages use of these resources to engage in inquiry about the products, practices and perspectives of the communities that communicate in target languages and their cultures. Indeed, I believe that inquiry-based approaches should have a prominent place in all our standards as a means to support how students of other languages become both linguistic and cultural anthropologists of the languages they are learning. We do not necessarily want to proscribe pedagogical practices in WL courses, and yet, among the success skills needed for this century, critical thinking is all the more important, especially given the media saturation of our global community. Infusing inquiry-based approaches using authentic multi-media resources addresses the urgent need to prepare our students for the world they will inherit. | **Recommended****(authentic multi-media resources already included later in the document)** |
| 34 | Doehla | p. 19, line 407 | There is an awkward construction in line 407 - the wording should be altered (in my humble opinion) to avoid confusion caused by the dash at the end of the word "classroom-" which is meant to connect to "world." Perhaps this wording, or a variation of it, could help: Learners use the target language to investigate the relationships between the products cultures produce and use, the practices cultures manifest, and the perspectives that underlie them, both | **Recommended** |
| 35 | Harrell | p. 19, line 407 | Overall, this is a good section. Particularly beneficial is the emphasis on exploring culture through the target language rather than the native language. Line 407: "In classroom- and in real-world contexts, ..." The hyphen is wrong. It implies a connection to "world", i.e., "in classroom-world and real-world contexts, ..." "classroom-contexts" would be equally false. This is simply another example of the numerous grammatical, syntactical, and orthographical errors throughout the document. Any document purporting to set the standards for language instruction ought to use the language correctly. These are not simply typographical errors for the most part. The document needs proofreading! | **Recommended** |
| 36 | Harrell | p. 19, lines 414–420 | Lines 414-420: The first sentence of the paragraph is incomplete. Yes, "cultures come into contact with one another." There should be an insertion of "and influence", i.e., "... cultures come into contact with and influence/affect one another." Why are Native American languages and cultures singled out here? This happens whenever any two or more cultures come into contact. Add "For example" if this is simply illustrative. Also, "where they" is both repetitive and less formal than the document intends. Suggested re-wording: "For example, in the case of many Native American languages and cultures, learners use such experiences to explore the effects of Intercultural Influences in order to discover the origins of products, practices, and perspectives that have been transmitted ..." | **Recommended** |
| 37 | Doehla | p. 24, line 455 | In line 455, this wording includes a typo - 21st Century Skill Map - need to add an S to Skill\_. | **Recommended** |
| 38 | Gallegos | N/A | Establishing for the reader that communication takes place in a variety of contexts and complements the 2012 ELD standards by acknowledging those modes of communication. Further, it makes clear that all three modes are necessary for proficiency in the target language. The concise examples for the ranges make it concrete for all to understand the level being described as well as the idea that even within those ranges, there is a range of proficiency across which language learners will progress. Additionally, the description of language functions is essential to setting instructional objectives for language learning. It establishes for readers that there is a purpose and specific accompanying language for each essential function. It would be beneficial for readers to understand that this is only 10 of many. That is not clear for the reader and could cause misunderstanding. (See any number of publications from Susana Dutro. | **Not Recommended** |
| 39 | Gordon | p. 9, lines 246–247 | Lines 246-247 take a narrow definition of communication. Bill VanPatten’s definition in his book “While We’re on the Topic” published by ACTFL is the “expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning within a given context,” including the classroom context. We absolutely communicate in my classroom in the target language, but according to lines 246-247 of the Draft Standards communication takes place in "culturally-authentic settings." What does that mean? From this definition it sounds like communication does not take place in my classroom. The emphasis here on "culturally authentic [resources]" can limit students from getting the input they need to fill their heads with language (/acquire the language). At the Novice Level and even Intermediate level, students can pull out words or phrases they understand from authentic resources. But this is very limited language. So I would ask, is using authentic resources only the best use of instructional time? For example, in my Spanish 1 class we read a full page of comprehensible text on the "Grito de Dolores" and celebrations of Mexican Independence Day, and discuss the colors of the Mexican flag, etc., in Spanish. The reading was written by a Spanish teacher in comprehensible language for the level and edited by me for my students. Students will acquire much more language and features of the language by reading full paragraphs than if they look at an infograph on Mexican Independence Day and pull out individual words and phrases in a sea of incomprehensible words and phrases. We can do both, but as the teacher I am always asking what is the most valuable use of my instructional time? I have to help my students acquire language and cultural competency. I DO use authentic resources in my classroom, but to exclusively use them would seriously limit my students' language acquisition. There are few to no authentic resources with full sentences and paragraphs that Novices and Intermediates can understand. Even children | **Not Recommended** |
| 40 | Harrell | p. 9, line 246 | Line 246: I am concerned about the restriction of communication to "culturally-authentic settings". [Improprer use of the hyphen, btw] Learners in their first days of instruction are capable of communicating, i.e., expressing, interpreting, and negotiating meaning, Language classrooms in US classrooms will never be "culturally authentic" using the standards' own definition of "authentic materials" (lines 1128-1129). We should not confuse the end with the means. The classroom needs to be recognized as its own authentic setting and context. | **Not Recommended** |
| 41 | Salsig | p. 9, lines 261–262 | Lines 261-262: Drop the Superior Range, since we are aligning with the ACTFL Standards. The Superior Range is not included in the ACTFL Standards. It may be confusing to administrators, teachers, parents and students, who may assume that each Range is equivalent to a year of language. The Superior Range is not attainable in K-12 classrooms. Advanced High is an appropriate goal to strive for. | **Not Recommended** |
| 42 | Salsig | p. 10, lines 282–285 | Lines 282-285: Are these resources still available? I could not find them. If not, they should be dropped from the Standards. | **Not Recommended** |
| 43 | Sparks | p. 10, lines 282–285 | page 10, lines 282-285: Will the CWLP Classroom Oral Competency Interview, etc. be resurrected? If not, this reference is inaccurate and inappropriate. | **Not Recommended** |
| 44 | Harrell | p. 10, lines 296–297 | Lines 296–297: The emphasis on "authentic ... texts" once again disturbs me. The emphasis on "authentic" texts to the exclusion of oral and written texts not "created by native speakers for native speakers of the target language and cultures" (lines 118-1129) once again confuses the goal with the means. | **Not Recommended** |
| 45 | Harrell | p. 10, lines 307–309 | Lines 307–309: The term "simulations" is simply another term for role-playing. Most role-playing is not communication and therefore not useful for acquisition. It would be better to replace "simulations" with "communication". | **Not Recommended** |
| 46 | Salsig | p. 11, line 318 | Line 318: Should read: structures to teach the functions essential...? | **Not Recommended** |
| 47 | Harrell | p. 11, lines 318–321 | Lines 318–321: The inclusion of the teacher's role in acquisition is good but does not address the disjunct with the emphasis on "authentic". | **Not Recommended** |
| 48 | Harrell | p. 11, lines 321–325 | Lines 321–325: This is an interesting interpretation of Krashen's famous i+1; I'm not convinced it is correct. | **Not Recommended** |
| 49 | Salsig | p. 11, lines 324–325 | Lines 324–325: Should target the next phase, not range. Suggestions: For example, if Novice Low, target Novice Mid. If Novice High, target Intermediate Low. If Intermediate High, target Advanced Low, if Advanced Mid, target Advanced High.  | **Not Recommended** |
| 50 | Harrell | p. 11, lines 330–331 | Lines 330–331: Excellent statement. This needs to be emphasized (boldface). | **Not Recommended** |
| 51 | Harrell | p. 12, lines 338–341 | Lines 338-341: Far too many commas here. Also, if we accept the world languages definition of "texts" (lines 1372-1376) and "authentic" (lines 1128-1129), then teacher-student oral communication is excluded from this standard. A teacher who reads these standards and takes them seriously will wonder how he is expected to teach. "... authentic texts that are spoken, written, or signed (ASL)": This standard again confuses ends and means. | **Not Recommended** |
| 52 | Salsig | p. 12, lines 340, 348, 357, 369, 392, 424, etc. | Also drop the Superior Range throughout the document, in lines 340, 348, 357, 369, 392, 424, etc. | **Not Recommended** |
| 53 | Gallegos | N/A | The explanation on structures is concise but could use an example or two for those consumers who have limited knowledge of language acquisition and the relationship to language structures used to convey meaning. In addition, an example to demonstrate the meaning of "...they provide the means for real-world culturally-appropriate target-language use, perhaps even juxtaposed with contrived language to develop the novice reader's understanding. The descriptors make a clear distinction between levels which is useful for educators. One suggestion for Communication Standard 4 would be to explain "transactional" in the goals as it is the one word I believe many educators who lack familiarity will not be certain of the intended meaning including administration who will be supporting implementation. Additionally, since the word appear in more than one of the Communication Standards, it will support depth of understanding across the standards, and, in particular, the Intermediate level. | **Not Recommended** |
| 54 | Smith | N/A | I do not understand the purpose of the "structures in service of the communication standard," (Communication Standards 5 and 6) because it seems obvious that students will need competence in receiving and producing structures in order to communicate across the Three Modes, therefore including these as separate standards seems a bit redundant. If anything, the notions of text-type should be included in descriptions of communication across the Three Modes. It does seem like an excuse to ensure that grammar is included in the standards, although it has been mentioned that we should no longer teach "about" the language and instead students acquire these through comprehension of messages in the language. | **Not Recommended** |
| 55 | Salsig | p. 15, lines 361–365 | Line 361–365, simplify the language, instead of restating what follows in the table. Suggestion: •Students use language in their communities and in the globalized world. | **Not Recommended** |
| 56 | Salsig | p. 15, lines 366–367 | Lines 366–367: Delete Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, Superior, since it is stated in the table below. | **Not Recommended** |
| 57 | Salsig | p. 16, line 371 | Line 371: Delete "and Text-types". | **Not Recommended** |
| 58 | Sparks | p. 16, line 371 | page 16, lines 371: This seems to be a sub-heading for both Communication Standards 5 and 6. It should be followed by lines 380 and 381 and then the Goals (lines 372-379) to follow the established format. | **Not Recommended** |
| 59 | Salsig | p. 16, lines 372–379 | Lines 372–379: Replace with simplified language: Students use structures to support the functions needed to communicate with a purpose. | **Not Recommended** |
| 60 | Salsig | p. 16, lines 380–383 | Lines 380–383: Combine Receptive and Productive Structures. Example: Intermediate: WL.CM5.I: Demonstrate an understanding of and communicate about transactional and informal topics.... | **Not Recommended** |
| 61 | Doehla | N/A | The organization of the standards, with common and incremental references (WL-CM1.N, etc.) are logical and intuitive. I do wonder if the letter I for intermediate might be somewhat confusing - it looks too much like the number one, nevertheless, I imagine that in time we will all grow used to the way it is used, and the confusion will subside. Otherwise, the nomenclature used is simple and straightforward. I appreciate that the benchmark descriptions are parallel from column to column, making it more likely teachers will remember the descriptions because of the way the standards are organized and described. I also appreciate the effort to include ASL along with all other languages. More and more, schools are offering ASL programs in their WL curriculum offerings. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 62 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |
| 63 | Clyne | N/A | This is very clearly written, thank you! | **Non-Actionable** |
| 64 | Perez | N/A | Great | **Non-Actionable** |
| 65 | Harrell | p. 13, lines 342–349 | Lines 342-349: Finally, a section that does not restrict communication to "authentic texts". | **Non-Actionable** |
| 66 | Sparks | p. 17, line 384 | page 17: No Goals are listed for Standard 6. Is it the intention that the Goals on page 16 be considered for both Standards 5 and 6? | **Non-Actionable** |
| 67 | Harrell | p. 18, line 389 | Line 389: Yes! "Students use the target language to" | **Non-Actionable** |

### CULTURES STANDARDS

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 68 | Doehla | N/A | I am delighted to see that the cultures standards clearly state the inseparable connection between language and culture. Culture provides the context for language acquisition. Likewise, I appreciate the nomenclature used to reference the standards in a simple, easily retained structure, making it easy to remember. Once again, the descriptions are parallel making the standards easy to remember. I would like to advocate for including language that highlights the importance of using authentic multi-media resources as an integral part of the WL curriculum, including language that encourages use of these resources to engage in inquiry about the products, practices and perspectives of the communities that communicate in target languages and their cultures. Indeed, I believe that inquiry-based approaches should have a prominent place in all our standards as a means to support how students of other languages become both linguistic and cultural anthropologists of the languages they are learning. We do not necessarily want to proscribe pedagogical practices in WL courses, and yet, among the success skills needed for this century, critical thinking is all the more important, especially given the media saturation of our global community. Infusing inquiry-based approaches using authentic multi-media resources addresses the urgent need to prepare our students for the world they will inherit. | **Recommended****(authentic multi-media resources already included later in the document)** |
| 69 | Doehla | p. 19, line 407 | There is an awkward construction in line 407 - the wording should be altered (in my humble opinion) to avoid confusion caused by the dash at the end of the word "classroom-" which is meant to connect to "world." Perhaps this wording, or a variation of it, could help: Learners use the target language to investigate the relationships between the products cultures produce and use, the practices cultures manifest, and the perspectives that underlie them, both | **Recommended** |
| 70 | Harrell | p. 19, line 407 | Overall, this is a good section. Particularly beneficial is the emphasis on exploring culture through the target language rather than the native language. Line 407: "In classroom- and in real-world contexts, ..." The hyphen is wrong. It implies a connection to "world", i.e., "in classroom-world and real-world contexts, ..." "classroom-contexts" would be equally false. This is simply another example of the numerous grammatical, syntactical, and orthographical errors throughout the document. Any document purporting to set the standards for language instruction ought to use the language correctly. These are not simply typographical errors for the most part. The document needs proofreading! | **Recommended** |
| 71 | Harrell | p. 19, lines 414–420 | Lines 414-420: The first sentence of the paragraph is incomplete. Yes, "cultures come into contact with one another." There should be an insertion of "and influence", i.e., "... cultures come into contact with and influence/affect one another." Why are Native American languages and cultures singled out here? This happens whenever any two or more cultures come into contact. Add "For example" if this is simply illustrative. Also, "where they" is both repetitive and less formal than the document intends. Suggested re-wording: "For example, in the case of many Native American languages and cultures, learners use such experiences to explore the effects of Intercultural Influences in order to discover the origins of products, practices, and perspectives that have been transmitted ..." | **Recommended** |
| 72 | Doehla | N/A | Inquiry is addressed in the connections standards, but I think it must also appear in the communications and cultures standards as well. | **Not Recommended** |
| 73 | Salsig | N/A | Drop the Superior Range throughout the document, in lines | **Not Recommended** |
| 74 | Smith | p. 19, line 406 | In regards to page 19 line 406, I believe that "pride" may be of particular relevance to world language education in order to encourage heritage learners of these languages and members of minority language communities, but without that specific connection it does seem a bit chauvinistic to encourage "pride" in one's own language and culture, especially given recent developments with regards to the spread of white nationalism and English-only initiatives. | **Writer’s Discretion** |
| 75 | Gallegos | N/A | The explanation that accompanies the Cultures Standards is really well-aligned to both the ELA/ELD and History/SS Frameworks for California. The concepts of the culture bearers and considering perspectives complements the message in the other state Frameworks. Moreover, the example of investigating “the relationships between the products cultures produce and use, the practices cultures manifest, and the perspectives that underlie them” moves California’s students into the global community. Through technologies, products, and interpersonal connections, our learners are growing into a different world where we are no longer isolated, and where, to be successful, we must be able to effectively interact and communicate with a variety of people whose own cultures and perspectives can either be a complement to or a contradiction of our own culture and perspectives. In addition, the concept of considering intercultural influences in the global community is essential for the future of California’s learners and educators particularly in light of standard 4—the impact when cultures come into contact, especially long-term and ongoing. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 76 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |
| 77 | Perez | N/A | Great | **Non-Actionable** |
| 78 | Sparks | N/A | Well done. | **Non-Actionable** |

### CONNECTIONS STANDARDS

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 79 | Doehla | p. 24, line 455 | In line 455, this wording includes a typo - 21st Century Skill Map - need to add an S to Skill\_. | **Recommended** |
| 80 | Gordon | N/A | Again, the privileging of authentic materials is problematic. Students can meet the standards through using both materials written for language learners (that are naturally scaffolded because they are written for language learners) AND authentic materials. | **Not Recommended** |
| 81 | Salsig | N/A | Drop the Superior Range throughout the document, in lines | **Not Recommended** |
| 82 | Doehla | N/A | I greatly appreciate the references to the Common Core Standards, as well as to the importance of critical thinking, inquiry, problem solving, creativity, innovation, flexibility and adaptability, and to authentic materials - however, these should not be limited to connections standards only -- they also should be included in the standards for communications and for cultures. | **Not Recommended** |
| 83 | Gallegos | N/A | The brief explanation demonstrates not only the value of teaching content in the target language but the necessity to do so for the benefit of learners as well as compliance with EdGE. Furthermore, it complements the state's returned emphasis on providing effective language learning opportunities K-12 to all students, including supporting native speaker competence and biliteracy particularly when they enter California's schools before that level of language competence has been achieved in the native language. Standard 2 complements the History/Social Science focus on understanding perspectives as well. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 84 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |
| 85 | Perez | N/A | Great | **Non-Actionable** |
| 86 | Sparks | N/A | Well done. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 87 | Harrell | p. 25, line 467 | This section looks good to me. Line 467: The term "authentic" is appropriate in this standard and does not represent a confusion and confounding of the ends and the means. | **Non-Actionable** |

### APPENDIX 1: WAYS THE WORLD LANGUAGE STANDARDS SUPPORT BILITERACY AND MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 88 | Sparks | p. 27, line 510 | page 27, line 510: …content through the language AND its cultures. | **Recommended** |
| 89 | Harrell | p. 29, line 585 | Line 585: "Target-language" should not be hyphenated. | **Recommended** |
| 90 | Harrell | p. 30, line 607 | Line 607: "Through the study of a language other than English, students, acquire ..." Remove the comma after students. (Yet another example of the numerous errors throughout this document) | **Recommended** |
| 91 | Harrell | p. 30, line 609 | Line 609: "Transferable" has only one "r". | **Recommended** |
| 92 | Gallegos | N/A | The explanation makes clear the need for all students to have access to language learning. There is strong research supporting language learning and achievement. Appendix 1 would be an appropriate place to include such research as an additional basis for schools to offer this learning to all students in California. Again the use of the term "transactional" should be defined at least minimally here since it has been used in the past to describe culture activities but is being used here in a similar context but with a different intended meaning. While it is found in the glossary, readers may not take the time to look up the term. | **Not Recommended** |
| 93 | Sparks | N/A | It seems that you will be creating a Standards at a Glance set of charts for this section. Such a set might be better placed in the primary document, rather than in an Appendix. Or eliminate it, since the details are very well given in the primary document. Such a chart could be included in the California World Language Framework. | **Not Recommended** |
| 94 | Fernandes | N/A | In addition to the Seal of Biliteracy I would like to see a certificate for different trades/professions that shows students have demonstrated the mastery of skills to work in a career area. For example, students might master the content and structures to work as in a medical office, business, government agency, etc... Charter schools and language programs could incorporate these learning standards into their curriculum and like the Seal of Biliteracy, there could be some assessment measures to earn the certificate. | **Not Recommended** |
| 95 | Salsig | p. 27, line 516 | Line 516: Drop: should they need it | **Not Recommended** |
| 96 | Salsig | p. 27, lines 525–606 | Line 525–606: The Communication, Culture and Connections Goals: This section should be a separate appendix, instead of being buried in this appendix. | **Not Recommended** |
| 97 | Harrell | p. 27, lines 534–539 | Lines 534–539: One of the purposes of communication is psychosocial, i.e., the initiation, development, and maintenance of relationships. (The other two purposes are cognitive-informational and entertainment.) The psychosocial purpose of communication is almost totally ignored; that is one of the weaknesses of the current education system. As Sir Ken Robinson notes in his TEDTalk "Are Schools Killing Creativity?", the entire tendency and goal of the educational establishment are solely cognitive. This needs to change. I suggest adding something like, "and initiate, develop, and maintain relationships" to this goal. This is a way in which language instruction can supplement and complement other content areas as well as support the whole student (and not just "the head and slightly to the left" - to quote Sir Ken Robinson). | **Not Recommended** |
| 98 | Salsig | p. 28, lines 546–551 | Lines 546–551: Simplify the language, to agree with simplified language in the Communication Standard, lines 361-367. Suggestion: •Students use language in their communities and in the globalized world. Delete Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, Superior. | **Not Recommended** |
| 99 | Salsig | p. 28, line 554 | Line 554: Delete "Text-types" and "Function of" | **Not Recommended** |
| 100 | Salsig | p. 28, lines 555–561 | Lines 555–561: Replace with simplified language: "Students use structures to support the functions needed to communicate with a purpose". to agree with the language in Communication. | **Not Recommended** |
| 101 | Harrell | p. 28, lines 562–565 | Lines 562–565: This statement reads as if the author was trying to accomplish two things - and failed to do so. Are students investigating differences in the target language and differences in those they know, or are students investigating differences BETWEEN/AMONG the languages they know? | **Not Recommended** |
| 102 | Doehla | N/A | I am delighted to see a strong statement about the importance of biliteracy and multilingual education, and their connection to intercultural competencies! I also applaud the statement about the Seal of Biliteracy, which is increasingly more important! We need to encourage the celebration of these skills in the standards document - it lends credence to the efforts of many across our state to showcase students' achievements as they exit the public school system. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 103 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |

### APPENDIX 2: WAYS STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES MAY ACCESS THE WORLD LANGUAGES STANDARDS

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 104 | Salsig | p. 36, line 799 | Line 799: Define "learning profile" | **Recommended** |
| 105 | Gordon | p. 32, lines 661–768 | Is there a way for the Then and Now section NOT to be relegated to the Appendix about Students with Disabilities? It is mentioned that these are good practices for all students. As such, they should be front and center in the standards. Please consider making this a section of the standards, not an appendix. A lot of CA teachers need a push to do the type of teaching mentioned in this Appendix. | **Not Recommended** |
| 106 | Gordon | p. 32, line 689 | Line 689 Again I take issue with the use of "culturally-authentic" for performance tasks. I do not believe that it is practical or necessarily beneficial for every performance task to be "culturally authentic." If students can demonstrate that they comprehend written and spoken text, and can produce Spanish, they will move up on the proficiency scale. A teacher should be able to write a quick story or non-fiction text that students have never seen before using language they have acquired as an assessment. I should not always have to find an authentic resource to create an assessment. We should challenge the privileging of authentic resources for acquisition AND assessment. Which is not to say they should not be used. I just do not see how exclusively using them helps us better achieve our language and culture goals. | **Not Recommended** |
| 107 | Salsig | p. 32–35, lines 661–768 | Move lines 661-768 (Then & Now) to the Framework  | **Not Recommended** |
| 108 | Sparks | p. 32–35, lines 661–768 | I like the "Then and Now" section, lines 661-768, but I feel that it would be more effective to use it in the California World Language Framework. | **Not Recommended** |
| 109 | Salsig | p. 35, lines 773–774 | Delete lines 773-774. They are redundant. | **Not Recommended** |
| 110 | Salsig | p. 35, line 786 | Line 786: Cite reference? | **Not Recommended** |
| 111 | Salsig | p. 36, lines 803–806 | Delete lines 803-806. They are redundant. | **Not Recommended** |
| 112 | Gallegos | N/A | Includes a strong set of suggested scaffolds for a variety of purposes as well as a comparison of then and now that help readers to understand the difference. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 113 | Doehla | N/A | Excellent! | **Non-Actionable** |
| 115 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |
| 116 | Sparks | N/A | I am happy to see that attention is given for students with difficulties learning a language. The accommodations are good but very general. | **Non-Actionable** |

### APPENDIX 3: PROFICIENCY STAGES AT A GLANCE PROVIDE

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 117 | Salsig | N/A | Delete this appendix. It is redundant, and makes the document longer and less teacher-friendly. Replace with Lines 525-606 from Appendix 1. | **Not Recommended** |
| 118 | Sparks | N/A | This section is redundant and not needed here. | **Not Recommended** |
| 119 | Gallegos | N/A | Provides a good at a glance resource for the standards. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 120 | Smith | N/A | This section provides a succinct overview of the standards, and is very helpful for those who have internalized the concepts upon which the standards are built. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 121 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |

### APPENDIX 4: WAYS THE WORLD LANGUAGES STANDARDS SUPPORT COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 122 | Harrell | N/A | Perhaps it would be good to note that Acquisition Level replaces grade level when discussing World Language Standards. | **Recommended** |
| 123 | Gallegos | N/A | For the novice who doesn't fully understand the concept of language functions and forms, some additional explanation of language functions implied and stated in the CCSS and how the goals for World Languages Instruction will support instruction and learning of the CCSS would be helpful. This section is fine as is if you have that basic level of understanding. | **Not Recommended** |
| 124 | Doehla | N/A | Appendix 4 is not about language functions, but about how the WL standards support the CCSS. I believe this draft achieves the purpose of showcasing how WL courses do address the Common Core Standards. I would also love to see an appendix with language functions, tied to how we make learning targets in WL courses, namely, I can + Language function + topic/theme, as in the ACTFL Can-Do document. However, since the ACTFL document already exists, perhaps a better approach is to ensure that document is referenced in a "Recommended Bibliography" list in the appendices of the CA WL Standards. | **Not Recommended** |
| 125 | Wilson | N/A | Terminology is too obtuse. | **Not Recommended** |
| 126 | Sparks | p. 35, line 793 | I did not find Learning Profile suggested on page 35, line 793. | **Not Recommended** |
| 127 | Harrell | p. 48, lines 1128–1129 | Lines 1128–1129: This definition is problematic. If accepted, it means the following, among other things: 1) a non-native speaker cannot produce an authentic text, no matter how much language the speaker has acquired. That would mean that the following authors, among others, have not produced authentic texts despite their quality - Eva Hoffman (Polish writer who writes in Englishy, e.g. "Lost in Translation"), Yann Martel ("Life of Pi"), Vladimir Nabokov ("Lolita"), Jack Kerouac ("On the Road"), Samuel Beckett ("En attendant Godot" - "Waiting for Godot" - written in French although Beckett's first language was English); 2) the teacher and learners can never have an authentic conversation because the learners, at least, are not native speakers; 3) the learners can never have an authentic conversation among themselves because they are not native speakers. Attempts to modify this rather restrictive and arbitrary definition of "authentic materials" have also proven less than satisfying. If we are going to use a term like "authentic", we need to have a definition that is consistent in all applications, at the least. It also needs to be applicable to all settings. As currently defined, for example, the classroom can never be an "authentic" context for target language use. How absurd. | **Not Recommended** |
| 128 | Salsig | p. 54, lines 1355–1364 | Delete: Superior, lines 1355-1364. | **Not Recommended** |
| 129 | Smith | N/A | Note: In the Draft document accessible on the Standards webpage (https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/worldlanguage.asp) as of 08/07/18, Appendix 4 has to do with connections to Common Core, not Language Functions as listed on this survey. [CDE: This oversight has been addressed.] | **Non-Actionable** |
| 130 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |
| 131 | Salsig | N/A | This is now: Appendix 4: Ways the World Languages Standards Support Common Core State Standards This Common Core Appendix is well-done. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 132 | Sparks | N/A | Appendix 4 is Ways the World Languages Standards Support Common Core State Standards and is appropriate to include here. | **Non-Actionable** |

### GLOSSARY

| Comment # | Source | Page | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 133 | Salsig | N/A | Add definitions for: learning profile, tiered lessons | **Recommended** |
| 134 | Sparks | p. 36, line 810 | I did not find Tiered Lessons suggested on page 36, line 810. | **Recommended** |
| 135 | Sparks | p. 36, lines 812 | I did not find Learning Profile suggested on page 36, line 812. | **Recommended** |
| 136 | Sparks | N/A | This is excessively long---8 pages. There are repetitious entries, i.e all of the Literacy entries are redundant. It is not necessary to include Cultural Literacy and Literacy (Culture) as an example. | **Not Recommended** |
| 137 | Gallegos | N/A | Appears that all essential vocabulary is called out and defined. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 138 | Doehla | N/A | As for the last standards, this glossary is an essential tool for helping all WL teachers to define the things we hold in common. We have our own jargon - this glossary defines those words so we hold common definitions for our specialized vocabulary. After all, we are all language nerds -- how à propos for us to have a glossary of terms for our professional discourse! This is a bit like having sub-titles of our conversations so others can follow our conversations! All kidding aside, I applaud once more the inclusion of this list in out standards! | **Non-Actionable** |
| 139 | Jensen | N/A | approve as is | **Non-Actionable** |
| 140 | Clyne | N/A | This section was very appreciated. I think it helps clearly define what is being said within the document. | **Non-Actionable** |

### ADDITIONAL GENERAL COMMENTS

| Comment # | Source | Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 141 | Smith | I think that after reading the standards I understood that the National Standards of Comparisons and Communities have been interwoven with the other standards, but perhaps it is worth mentioning this rationale for anyone who may be searching for differences between our State Standards and the National Standards. | **Recommended** |
| 142 | Harrell | The document needs thorough proofreading and editing. | **Recommended** |
| 143 | Juneja | California, especially the Central Valley is home to the highest density of Punjabi speaking Americans. Kindly update the list of languages in the document to include Punjabi, an important Indo-European language, the 10th most spoken language in the world. Thank you. | **Recommended** |
| 144 | Beeman | I had a chance to read over these and I love them! They tie in with our national standards and ACTFL's new Can-Do Statements. What I like most is that the standards are tied to specific tasks or topics, but focus on having teachers teach skills and broad topic with the goal of communicative competency. It would be nice to see and additional Appendix with how school administrators can support WLG teachers and the standards. | **Not Recommended** |
| 145 | Jensen | I am wondering why there is no mention in the draft document about the other two C's from the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages - Comparisons and Communities. Since this document, published by ACTFL, provides the national umbrella for current pedagogy among all methods instructors, I am surprised that these two standards are missing from the CA version. In all publications from ACTFL these two standards are included. California falls short from the national norm. | **Not Recommended** |
| 146 | Wilson | Titles of the different standards are hoity-toity. We, as educators, should be able to engage with it quicker to better facilitate implementation. We are nine teachers right now in the World Language Department reading this and grappling with interpretation. | **Not Recommended** |
| 147 | Salsig | Like the use of the ACTFL terms for Ranges of Proficiency: Novice, Intermediate, Advanced. Concerned about confusion as a result of including the Superior Range. | **Not Recommended** |
| 148 | Sparks | It concerns me that the Appendices are longer than the main body of the document. Perhaps the Glossary can be shortened and other sections could be considered to be more appropriate for the California World Language Framework. | **Not Recommended** |
| 149 | Harrell | The Communications Standard, in particular, could be improved. | **Not Recommended** |
| 150 | Gallegos | This is the complementary piece to California's 2012 ELD standards that has been missing. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 151 | Doehla | I want to thank the standards committee members for your hard work in producing work-class standards for our professional community! I say, "Well done and thank you" to each and everyone of you! This document is a testimony of your dedication to our profession. Thank you for stepping up to do all you have done on behalf of our students, and our professional family. We are all beneficiaries of the time and effort you put forth to produce such an outstanding document. I look forward to seeing the | **Non-Actionable** |
| 152 | Panossian | Information seems reasonable but I would typically reserve some of the ratings until the execution and results can be measured. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 153 | Clyne | Thank you, I just wish more teachers even knew this existed. Sending out an e-mail blast to districts would be helpful. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 154 | Gordon | Thank you for considering my comments. | **Non-Actionable** |
| 155 | Buffington | I know that some people will disagree with the use of authentic resources but I think they are a key component to being able to use the language in real world contexts. | **Non-Actionable** |

California Department of Education, November 2018