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# Summary List of Approved Edits from the Instructional Quality Commission Approved Edits Submitted during the Second 60-Day Review

The tables in this summary capture the final edits that the Instructional Quality Commission approved to be made to the current draft 2020*World Languages Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* (*WL Framework*), which was posted for its second public review from January 31 through March 30, 2020. Tables 2–11 include comments and recommended edits submitted by members of the public. Tables 12–20 include comments and recommended edits by the California Department of Education (CDE) as part of an internal review process. Finally, Table 21 includes comments and recommended edits by the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC). All comments are presented in their original form without editing. Chapters for which no comments were received are not included in this summary. The comments appear in the order that the chapters were posted online, with suggestions specific to the text followed by general comments. The public comments are organized by chapter, page number, and line number. Where possible, page and line numbers for line references are included in the column labeled “Page.” Where possible, specific suggested line edits have each been given their own entry in the table. References were provided by the CDE and include the word “line” and should not be considered text from the associated comment. The “IQC Action” column is included to indicate the actions the IQC took at its April 2020 meeting.

**The following definitions clarify the recommended actions provided throughout this document:**

* **Recommended** = CDE recommends that the World Languages Subject Matter Committee (WL SMC) include the additions, edits, and/or changes as stated in the public comment.
* **Not Recommended** = CDE does not recommend that the WL SMC include the additions, edits, and/or changes as stated in the public comment.
* **No Motion Recommended** = CDE does not have a recommendation.
* **Writers’ Discretion** = CDE recommends that the WL SMC permit the *WL Framework* writers and CDE staff to determine how to include the additions, edits, and/or changes as stated in the public comment.
* **Non-Actionable** = the public comment does not include actionable edits that include additions, edits, and/or changes that can be applied to the framework, and no action is needed.

All recommended actions were made based on the California *Education Code*; the Guidelines for the California *World Languages Framework for Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve*, approved by the State Board of Education in 2019 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/fl/cf/wlfwguidelines.asp>), and the 2019 *World Languages Standards* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/wlstandards.pdf>). Questions regarding the recommended actions can be sent to [worldlanguage@cde.ca.gov](mailto:worldlanguage@cde.ca.gov).

## Table 1: Input Sources: Includes Respondents Submitting Comments Via Email

| Source (Name shortened for easy reference in the tables) | Name | Affiliation, Current Position, and Credentials (if applicable) | Input Method |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Newsom-Wuertz | Robin Newsom-Wuertz | American Sign Language Teacher, Sage Creek High School | Email |
| Banks | Andrea Banks | [not provided] | Email |
| Pando Solís | Eva Pando Solís, Ph. D. | Coordinator, Learning and Leadership Services; Multilingual Education & Global Achievement; San Diego County Office of Education | Email |
| SAILN | Cecile Nedellec, PhD | SAILN Program Specialist | Email |
| Sieh | Mrs. Sieh | Mandarin Dual Immersion Teacher, Plymouth Elementary School | Email |
| Celle | Rosallyn Celle | School Counselor (G-O), Granite Hills High School | Email |
| Kozuma | Yuki Kozuma | Teacher, Franklin High School, Elk Grove Unified | Email |
| Johnson | Connie Johnson | [not provided] | Email |
| Fritze | Jason Fritze | NBCT-WLOE, Laguna Beach Unified | Email |
| Peterson | Margaret Peterson | Executive Director, California World Language Project | Email |
| Salsig | Nancy Salsig | Co-Director, Berkeley World Language Project, UC Berkeley | Email |
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## Table 2: General Comments from Public Review

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Banks | General | i think that instead of saying scaffolding, that emphasizing comprehensibility should be encouraged.  Scaffolding is such a vague term that doesn't address using the language in class, but it is so important to use comprehensible language throughout which is scaffolding.  or scaffolding should be described as going super slow and using words that are comprehensible.  I don't think I was very clear.... I am a lousy writer, but wanted to comment on what I think is important | Non-Actionable |
|  | Banks | General | Also the proficiency levels are rather vague.  They don't address the different levels of communication.  reading writing speaking and comprehension. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Banks | General | I actually don't agree with most of the draft. As it pushes themes and vocabulary that is not needed for being fluent in a language.  The above is not true for immersion programs as they are in a different category and the scaffolding happens as the students progress through the years.  As long as it is comprehensible the students will learn.  As soon as it is above the students level of understanding, they tune out or ask someone who knows more for help. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Johnson | General | Esteemed Framework Committee:  I am writing to thank you for the volumes of information that you have made available to the World Language teachers of California.  I am hoping that this will be a document that serves the educators well.  It is also my hope that the glaring gaps in the said pages will not continue to be void of certain pieces that most of us find invaluable and essential in providing equitable and accessible presentations to our students.  On first observation, I must caution you.  The sheer volume of this document makes it unattractive and seemingly insurmountable to the average educator.  I predict that very few language educators will even try to crack it open.  A friend printed it out and it filled 2 3-ring binders.  This needs to be considered if this is to be a guide we should all be familiar with.  Some professionals believe that the inclusion of certain items might be construed as prescriptive or bias toward strategies, however, the committee DID see it appropriate to include the strategies of their choosing.  One must remember that the most effective approach we can take is that language must be acquired.  Studies have by multiple researchers, not the least of which are Stephen Krashen and Bill Van Patten, have convincingly argued that acquisition cannot take place without COMPREHENSIBLE INPUT.  The undeniable inclusion of this concept must not be overlooked. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Johnson | General | There is little said about “Communication”, “Communicative Competence”, and the “Discourse Community”.  The secret of the “Discourse Community” is the solution to exclusive use of “Authentic” materials that are ridiculously out of reach for classroom students as to be of no advantage.  “Authentic” materials can be those that are for the “Discourse Community”.  The instructor’s very own classroom and that of the students is a community of value and tremendous importance to those very consumers (students) of the product we provide.  The glossary doesn’t even give a definition of “Communication”.  While output is easy to talk about and is easy to measure, the fact that input lays the foundation for that output cannot be discounted.  Yes, the foundation of providing target language at a level the students can comprehend through a variety of resources must be in the forefront. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Johnson | General | The Core Practices are mentioned, but the definition/explanation given in the document is dubious.  Example:  Student feedback.  Recasts & Corrections are NOT, as studies show, effective and may even be detrimental. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Johnson | General | Additionally,  people in general education cannot comprehend that language acquisition is NOT like Core Subjects and the round peg of World Languages cannot be put in the same square hold as Science, Math, English and the like.  This needs to be FRAMED for what it is.  Language must be acquired.  It requires the instructor to provide comprehensible input.  Input through the instructor speaking or providing reading selections then leads to output.  Simple.  It is my hope that the committee will produce a teacher friendly document which can be of value for all. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Fritze | General | [No chapter provided]  I believe that on page 6, teachers need help here in understanding that HLTP 4 is about grammar (vocabulary - all language for that matter) being “taught” in a communicative context and that PACE (as you mention elsewhere in this document) is a method for doing so. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Fritze | General | I am very grateful for the detail in chapters 9 & 10 on ACTFL proficiency level, benchmarks as assessment examples including practical well designed rubrics. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Fritze | General | [No chapter provided]  On page 65, line 913 I would add to the sentence “… with an understanding that students acquire language and develop proficiency at differing rates.” | Non-Actionable |
|  | Fritze | General | You have defined CBI and PACE.  Just as many state frameworks have defined strategies and methods I would encourage such a table or list to be added for stakeholders: PACE, CBI, TPR, TPRS,, language experience, etc. so that the examples do not come from such an exclusively socio-cultural perspective on language teaching.  There is an excellent example of such an appendix in the NJ framework and in the wonderful book Keys to the Classroom that you have quoted (Clementi and Terril).  As we move forward as a profession I believe we still need reminders from the professional literature that explicit instruction outside of a communicative context is not desirable and counter to SLA research:  I love that so much about the HLTP/Core Practices has been included here.   Would it not be possible to include the entire checklist as originally published  in Glisan & Donato or from the Language Educator article.  This is such a useful document for educators, adminsitrators, parents and students to see what we are doing in the classroom.  I also encourage to use it for self reflection and peer observation & coaching. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Fritze | General | The emphasis in this draft of the framework on the exclusive use of authentic texts while consistent with many voices in ACTFL today seems to be somewhat inconsistent with much of the SLA research.  For a discussion on this see While we’re on the Topic pp 72-73.   “This issue here is to what extent we let authentic text and language drive what we do or we let what we know about language, communication, and the appropriateness of inout drive how we use authentic materials.”   It’s not that Comprehension-Based Communicative Language Teachers are against using authentic materials, we are not.  We use them, often.  But we strive for them to be as comprehensible as possible when we ask students to interpret them. And if these are the ONLY texts that our novice level students see we know that their acquisition and literacy will be delayed significantly.  For further debate, alas.  You have my greatest respect and admiration for the gargantuan efforts of you all on this amazing framework.  KUDOS!!! | Non-Actionable |

## Table 3: Chapter 3: Pathways to Multiliteracy

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pando Solís | 10 | Line 247: Figure 3.3: California World Languages Roadmap  My comment/question has to do with FLES programs and the column for *Elementary Pathway TK/K–5/6* in Figure 3.3.California World Languages Roadmap. I am wondering if there is a specific reason why FLES programs were not included in this column as viable elementary pathways that could be connected and aligned to MS programs and beyond. Was this due to a specific reason or is it an oversight? I can see how FLEX programs might not be regarded as "pathways" due to their nature, although one could argue otherwise. However, FLES programs should perhaps be included in this column.  Thank you for your consideration of this comment. | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends strengthening the discussion around the viability of FLES as an elementary pathway.) |
|  | Fritze | General | Dear WL framework committee members,  I apologize for the messiness of this email.  I've been so busy trying to move all of my teaching online that I've not had the time I would have liked to write a better reflection.  Forgive my brevity and any typos:  Thank you so very much for all of your work in creating this amazing framework to further interpret and help all CA WL teachers implement our new standards.  I am truly in awe of the marvelous document that you have created.  Such an improvement over the past framework, more in-depth, and better representative of where the profession is and is  headed.  KUDOS!!!!  I really enjoyed the first three chapters and learned a great deal from Chapter 2. As I am currently an elementary  educator  I VERY much appreciate your work in Chapter 3 on the pathways in general, but particularly your outlining of the multiple pathways in elementary grades and encouraging more robust models rather than FLES.  However I have a few concerns with phrasing /omissions in the document. | Non-Actionable |
|  | Fritze | 53 | Lines 1307–1308: I was concerned about the statement:  Chapter 3, page 53, lines 1307 & 1308:  “Students who begin language study at the postsecondary level can be expected to reach proficiency ranges similar to those reached in a 9-12 WL pathway.”  I was wondering about the source for this claim.  I don’t recall data from university exams for WL program accreditation bearing this out (despite the claim) and do know that many university programs have had trouble meeting the proficiency targets. | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends the writers support the claim with research or rewrite the statement.) |

## Table 4: Chapter 4: Overview of the World Languages Standards

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Johnson | 8 | Lines 196–200: The Comprehension Checklist (Glisan) alluded to in Chapter 4 should be included in its entirety. | Not Recommended |
|  | Fritze | 8 | Line 206: On the following page, page 8 line 206 the sentence does not reflect communication as we currently understand it due to SLA research.  The sentence reminded me more of the 2003 framework.  I would suggest rather something along the lines of:  “As teachers communicate comprehensibly in the target language in culturally appropriate ways, students naturally begin to acquire language in this authentic communicative context of a classroom and demonstrate gains in proficiency over time.” | Recommended |
|  | Fritze | 178 | Line 178: In Chapter 4, Page 178 - Line  174 Figure 4.1 “Students learn to use the language”.  (Could we use the word "Communicate"?)  I feel here early in this early chapter there is a need for a definition of communication &/or communicative language teaching.  I feel that the phrase “use the target language”  is not sufficient for teachers to understand the complex process (interpreting and expressing meaning and often negotiating meaning in the case of a breakdown in the communication in context for a purpose), unless it is defined.  Or perhaps the word “communication” would be used here and defined in the glossary.  I did not find definitions for “communication” or “communicative language teaching” in the glossary.  Perhaps Bill Van Patten’s definition (Taken from the work of Sandra Savignon):  “Communication is the expression, interpretation, and sometimes negotiation of meaning in a given context.  What is more, communication is also purposeful.”   (Van Patten, While We’re on the Topic, p. 3). This definition is essential to me as it guides my teaching daily.  By the way I particularly loved the examples of an intercultural exploration family traditions on page 9 of this chapter.  There were too many good things to mention, in fact.  So again, for now,, KUDOS! | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends the writers add discussion regarding what communication is and add the term to the glossary.) |

## Table 5: Chapter 5: Implementing High-Quality World Languages Instruction

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sieh | General | To Whom It May Concern,  I'd like to share some of my comments on Chapter 5 regarding different instructions.  Currently, I have been teaching in a Mandarin Immersion program for a few years now. Before applying or using Comprehensible Input, I always had a hard time teaching Mandarin. I'd always found that students had to be forced to recognize the sight words or oral phrases without understanding why they are using. Memorization is the only method they were able to use what they're taught in the classroom. However, in other circumstances, I had noticed they wouldn't be able to carry on a natural conversation. It's hard to assess their proficiency level, especially for non-native speakers. After so many years of learning experience, many of them wanted to quit.  Fortunately, ever since I've learned about comprehensible input, all the learning outcomes of my students have been seen rapidly improving. They've started enjoyed learning the language implicitly. They've been naturally learning it through fun activities and many comprehensible support repeatedly through images, movies, and more. Learning through comprehensible inputs have shown many great factors and benefits for teachers as well as for students. There is no doubt about it!!!! | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends that the writers strengthen the discussion of what language teachers can do to make comprehensible the content in authentic materials.) |
|  | Celle | General | To Whom It May Concern,  My name is Rosallyn Celle and I was a Spanish teacher for 9 years, and am currently a presenter for the California World Language Project.  After reviewing Chapter 5, I do have a concern. I noticed that Comprehensible Input and the Instructional Sequence (Setting the Stage, Comprehensible Input, Guided Practice, Application and Extension, Assessment and Evaluation), are not mentioned. Chapter 5 does a good job of explaining the mode of communication that each sample lesson is focused on, the level of proficiency that it is targeting,  authentic materials, and the use of technology.  Speaking from experience, if the students do not understand what they are reading and listening to, they cannot reach the level of proficiency indicated. Authentic materials are a great tool, but my concern is what is the teacher doing to make sure that the students understand the authentic materials given to them? Are the authentic materials comprehensible? There is no mention of comprehensible input and what that looks like. Without the input step, the students will be lost and it will take away from the value of the authentic materials. But if the students understand and feel successful, it really brings more value to the authentic materials and the language that they are learning. | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends that the writers strengthen the discussion of what language teachers can do to make comprehensible the content in authentic materials.) |
|  | Celle | General | [CELLE, CONTINUED]  The Framework is missing these crucial pieces that lead to language proficiency. The instructional sequence that was included in the 2003 Framework really supports proficiency, and is a very important and effective guide for the teacher to informally and formally assess and make sure that each student succeeds and has mastery of the content being taught. Again, from my experience, the combination of Comprehensible Input and utilizing the Instructional Sequence together, sets both the students and teacher up for success. Students will want to continue with learning the language and there will be a higher possibility that the student will pursue the State Seal of Biliteracy, and the teacher will more likely stay in the classroom as a World Language teacher, because they feel fulfilled from what they are able to do with their students.  Thank you in advance for considering my feedback, and I hope that you will consider including Comprehensible Input and the Instructional sequence in the framework. | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends that the writers strengthen the discussion of what language teachers can do to make comprehensible the content in authentic materials.) |
|  | Johnson | General | In Chapter 5, the UDL is mentioned.  What if the slant were UDA,  Universal Design for Acquisition?  This would put the emphasis on acquiring language and for the instructor to provide comprehensible input in the target language. | Non-Actionable |

## Table 6: Chapter 6: Teaching the Communication Standards

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fritze | General | I think this quote also from the book on HLTPs sums so much up beautifully and would be a great addition to Chapter 6:  "Research and theory indicate that effective language instruction must provide significant amounts of comprehensible, meaningful, and interesting talk and text in the target language for learners to develop language and cultural proficiency.  ...one. high-leverage teaching practice that is essential for all foreign language teachers is the use of the target language during instruction in ways that makes meaning clear and does not frustrate or de-motivate students."  p. 51 Glisan and Donato, Enacting the Work of Langauge Instruction:  High Leverage Teaching Practices" Language Educator Magazine, March/April 2017.  Thanks again for your monumental efforts! | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends this quote be integrated and be highlighted as an emphasis quote.) |
|  | SAILN | 6 | Line 149: Define dialogic | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | SAILN | 6 | Line 164: IMAGE should be bolded | Not Recommended |
|  | Salsig | 8 | Line 215: Dear writers, Nice work! A few suggestions to make it even more clear, I hope:  Page 8: Move or copy the list of functions (thank you) to line 215, from p. 26, line 630-639.  214 To support students in developing communicative proficiency, teachers use  215 language functions to guide students’ thinking processes.  630: The following is a list of some high-frequency functions (Clementi and Terrill 2017; and California World Languages Standards, 2019):   1. Asking and responding to questions 2. Describing people, places, and things 3. Expressing feelings and emotions 4. Expressing preferences and opinions 5. Maintaining a conversation or discussion in person or virtually 6. Telling or retelling stories 7. Summarizing or interpreting authentic oral, signed, or written texts 8. Presenting information orally, by signing, or in writing | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 10 | Line 287: Missing page # | Not Recommended |
|  | Salsig | 11 | Line 300: Page 11, line 300: add: through story-telling  299 target culture in order to provide visual references for students and to scaffold their  300 learning of the new language concepts, through story-telling. | Recommended |
|  | Salsig | 11 | Line 309: Page 11, line 309: add: Use the new material in context, for example, by telling a story (with visuals?). | Recommended |
|  | Salsig | 14 | Line 392: Page 14, line 392: Function: (Add the linguistic function): To demonstrate understanding by (doing the following tasks) | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | SAILN | 14 | Line 392: Maybe change “blank” to “N/A” | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 14 | Line 398: Add page number “page x” | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 15 | Lines 421–433: Provide a sample dialogue between teacher and student to make it clearer, especially to new teachers | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | SAILN | 17 | Line 477: Add page number “page x” | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 18 | Line 497: In the frame, fix the brand Post-it (self-adhesive paper) avoid trademark | Recommended |
|  | Fritze | 19 | Line 498: In Chapter 6 - High Leverage teaching Practice 2: Building a Classroom Discourse Community  The bullets selected here focus mostly on the second half of the chapter of this book and miss much of the emphasis of this chapter on the teacher facilitating the communication in this discourse community getting to know students, and even the the use of humor.  On page 19, line 498  - I would suggest:  “Giving students opportunities to interpret and express meaning as they ask questions and exchange information in communicative tasks with the teacher and one another can support their target language…” | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 20 | Line 511: Add the ranges (low, mid, high), especially for the examples | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 21 | Line 511: Maybe change “blank” to “N/A” | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 21 | Line 511: Maybe add a role-playing example as a possible activity | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 23 | Line 561: Blank line | Non-Actionable |
|  | SAILN | 24 | Line 570: Page number is not the correct one for the WL Standards (page 14 should be page 12) | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 25 | Line 599–600: Missing page # | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 25 | Line 602: Add range to help new teachers | Recommended |
|  | Salsig | 25 | Line 620: Page 25, line 620 (Need linguistic functions)  Add: “Present information by creating” posters, brochures, log, or journal entries.  “Demonstrate” or teach a skill, instead of: Conduct a demonstration  Add: “Present information by designing” infomercials or blogs.  I’m not clear what this example is: Conduct a panel discussion among a group of characters. (It sounds like Interpersonal): | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 29 | Line 670: Define Into-Through-Beyond strategy | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | SAILN | 30 | Line 699: the poem says, ‘here is the tree he liked to climb’]. | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 32 | Line 745: Empty line | Non-Actionable |
|  | SAILN | 32 | Line 754: Define acronym UDL | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 32 | Line 760: Culturally “authentic” activities | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 34 | Lines 799–800: have online order or purchase options, which is an excellent opportunity – add comma | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 36 | Line 879: Bold parameters | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 37 | Line 900: Bold parameters | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 37 | Lines 928–929: Define “left- or right- branching” | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 42 | Line 1020: Maybe change “blank” to “N/A” | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 45 | Lines 1082–1084: A teacher may decide to provide oral CF if the error is the linguistic target of the lesson, IF it interferes with the intended meaning of the message, or IF it is an error the student makes often. – add if to make the sentence structurally correct | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 45 | Line 1087: “uptake” is bolded, but it is not in the glossary | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 46 | Line 1098: Define declension | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 46 | Lines 1102–1104: Rephrase “As they learn a new language, students need to transfer knowledge and use of structures when the languages they know align and learn new patterns when they do not.” | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 46 | Line 1105: “Teachers can facilitate this process by giving students overt practice in comparing the target language to their first or other languages, enhancing their proficiency in both languages.” If “first” primary language? | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | SAILN | 46 | Line 1105: Teachers can facilitate this process by giving students overt practice in comparing the target language to their first or other languages, enhancing their proficiency in both languages.” – put a period after proficiency | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends a revision to this sentence for clarity.) |
|  | SAILN | 46 | Line 1114: “elements” put elements in parentheses | Not Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 47 | Line 1155: Heritage “and native” speakers? | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 48 | Line 1177: Missing “s” at the end of statement | Recommended |
|  | SAILN | 48 | Line 1178–1180: Missing page # | Not Recommended |

## Table 7: Chapter 10: Assessing the Learning of World Languages

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Newsom-Wuertz | 18–34 | Lines 358–522: The Chinese lesson plan in Chapter 10 pgs 21 - 28 is very lengthy. It uses the Chinese Characters that make the lesson unclear to non-users of the language and is not explained clearly how it connects to the Assessment portion of the unit. | Recommended  (CDE Staff recommends the removal of this snapshot, as it lacks sufficient guidance on assessment.) |
|  | Kozuma | 89 | Lines 1373–1374: Mrs. Nakamura teaches a combined class of third - and fourth-year Japanese with students of Advanced Placement Japanese Language and Culture.  \*Consider changing the above to: Mrs. Nakamura teaches a combined class of third year Japanese and Advanced Placement Japanese Language and Culture.  (\*In this example, the fourth-year Japanese is an AP course.) | Recommended |
|  | Kozuma | 89 | Lines 1378–1379: She targets Intermediate Mid for her fourth-year students and those of AP Japanese and Intermediate Low for her third-year students.  Consider changing the above to: She targets Intermediate Mid for her her AP Japanese students and Intermediate Low for her third-year students. | Recommended |
|  | Kozuma | 90–93 | Line 1430: (The 1st and 4th domains of the rubric for AP Japanese)  #1  内容 (content) ないよう (phrases and structures)  \*Change to above to:  #1  内容 (\*To eliminate redundant parts.) ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~  #4  会話力 （かいわりょく）  \*Change to above to:  #4  会話力 (\*To eliminate redundant parts.) | Recommended |

## Table 8: Chapter 11: Professional Learning and Support for World Languages Educators

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Peterson | 16 | Dear CDE Staff coordinating the World Languages Framework effort:  This is a historic moment for language education in California, and the WL Framework document is well-written and comprehensive.  In light of the importance of social emotional learning for teachers as well as students, I have recommended language to insert in Chapter 11, page 16, line 252. Please see attached. I will be happy to answer any clarifying questions about the content of my recommendation.  Thank you for all the hard work you have put into this robust document. Margaret  Dear CDE Staff coordinating the World Languages Framework effort:  This is a historic moment for language education in California, and the WL Framework document is well-written and comprehensive.  In light of the importance of social emotional learning for teachers as well as students, I have recommended language to insert in Chapter 11, page 16, line 252. Please see attached. I will be happy to answer any clarifying questions about the content of my recommendation. | Recommended |
| 69 | Peterson | 16 | [PETERSON, CONTINUED]  Thank you for all the hard work you have put into this robust document. Margaret  Line 252: Chapter 11  Emphasis quote: There is an urgent need for the wellness of educators so that they can be effective for students.  Teacher stress, burnout, and both physical and emotional exhaustion have been widely studied (Atmaca, et al., 2020; Elder, et al., 2014; Stoeber & Rennert, 2008; Mearns & Cain, 2003; Doef & Maes, 2002; Burke, et al., 1996). These adverse physical and psychological states coupled with teacher shortages, attrition, and low enrollment in teacher preparation programs serve as a call to action for the education of California students. Now, more than ever before, is the time to focus energy on the health and well being of teachers so that they can be effective to meet the needs of students. The Integrative Leadership for Educators model of professional learning (CWAE, 2019) provides teachers with foundational content knowledge, experience, and tools to better prepare students to become self-actualized global citizens equipped to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world and contribute to the progress of their community and society. | Recommended |
| 69 | Peterson | 16 | [PETERSON, CONTINUED]  The Intergrative Leadership model begins by cultivating the optimal mind/brain state which is the foundation for mental clarify, centeredness, and alertness. When the mind and brain are calm, teachers have enhanced intrapersonal skills such as strengthening their content and pedagogical knowledge, creativity, critical thinking and resilience. They are introspective, self aware, and better able to plan for effective instruction. Teachers are then able to experience stronger interpersonal skills such as empathy, compassion, collaboration, and conflict resolution. Teachers move from an inner state of calmness, self understanding, relating with others, and finally, to a outer state of effectiveness. Teachers make effective decisions regarding curriculum and instruction, assessment of learning, and methods of teaching. When the teachers take care of themselves, they are able to meet the needs of the whole child and help students develop into globally resilient citizens. For more information on the Integrative Leadership for Educators model, contact the Center for Wellness and Achievement in Education (https://www.cwae.org/).  Atmaca, et al., (2020). An emotion focused approach in predicting teacher burnout and job satisfaction. Teaching and Teacher Education 90: 1-13.  Burke, et al. (1996). Predicting teacher burnout over time: effects of work stress, social support, and self-doubts on nurnout oand its consequences. Anxiety, Stress, and Coping 9(3): 261-75. | Recommended |
| 69 | Peterson | 16 | [PETERSON, CONTINUED]  Doef and Maes. (2002). Teacher-specific quality of work versus general quality of work assessment: a comparison of their validity regarding burnout, (pshcho)somatic well-being and job satisfaction. Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 15(4): 327-344.  Edler, et al. (2014) Effect of Transcendental Meditation on Employee Stress, Depression, and Burnout: A Randomized Conrtrolled Study. The Permanente Journal, 18(1): 19-23.  Mearns and Cain. (2003). Relationships between teachers’ occupational stress and their burnout and distress: roles of coping and negative mood regulation expectancies. Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 16(1): 71-82.  Stoeber & Rennert. (2008). Perfectionism in school teachers: relations with stress appraisals, coping styles, and burnout. Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 21(1): 37-53.  San Francisco Unified School District Research, Planning and Accountability Department (2015). Quiet Time Program Report 2015, San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Unified School District | Recommended |
| 69 | Peterson | 16 | [PETERSON, CONTINUED]  [The submission includes a graphic titled “Integrative Leadership” made up of four rectangular fields. The heading in the top field reads, “Lead Your Life (with Others).” The text under the first heading reads, “Set goals, create action plans, and track progress; gather and evaluate evidence; critical analysis and effective decision making; social environmental responsibility; and integrity and ethical behavior.”  The heading in the second field reads, “Build relationships: Strengthen Interpersonal Skills.” The text under the second heading reads, “Empathy & Social Awareness; Communication; Collaboaration; Conflict Resolution; Active Listening; and Giving and Receiving Supportive Feedback.”  The heading in the third field reads, “Know Myself: Enhance Intrapersonal Skills.” The text under the third heading reads, “Self-awareness (cn describe interests, values, strengths, and limitations); Demonstrate a growth orientation; and Identify and express emotions.”  The heading in the fourth field reads, “Cultivate an Optimal Mind/Brain State.” The text under the fourth heading reads, “Health, Balance, Energy, Alertness, Calm, Happiness, Centeredness.”  Starting with the fourth and bottom-most field, there are arrows three arrows point from the fourth field to the third, from the thrird to the second, and from the second to the first. | Recommended |
| 69 | Peterson | 16 | [PETERSON, CONTINUED]  Integrative Leadership | Recommended |
|  | Fritze | 14 | Line 287: In Chapter 11, line 287. I suggest adding “Teachers need more resources and support to facilitate  comprehensible communication exclusively (or almost exclusively) in the target language to teach language through academic content including author cultural content.” | Recommended |
|  | Johnson | 74 | Lines 1768–1760: In Chapter 11, the guidelines for texts include: “The text offers a comprehensive survey of language teaching strategies anchored in current research on second language acquisition theory and language teaching pedagogy.”  However, the document does little to educate or support SLA, second language acquisition. | Non-Actionable |

## Table 9: Chapter 12: Unique Features of Individual Languages

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Kozuma | General | Suggestion: Cite sources for all Figures in this chapter, including page 21 Figure 12:14, 12:15 and other Figures on the following pages. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | Kozuma | 24 | Line 550: Figure 12:17 Prefixes  Example for Japanese:  おたんじょうび(o+tanjoobi) to refer to someone else’s birthday (for politeness)  たんじょうび(tanjoobi) to refer to own birthday  Chnage the above to:  おたんじょうび(o+tanjoobi) to refer to someone else’s birthday (for politeness)  たんじょうび(tanjoobi) to refer to own birthday or someone else’s (in informal / casual settings) | Writers’ Discretion |

## Table 10: Chapter 13: Instructional Materials

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fritze | General | Chapter 13 - As the framework is a document to guide ALL stakeholders, including publishers, I applaud your call built around themes and topics but we must insist that publishers reflect SLA research and infuse these commercial materials with sufficient amount of comprehensible input both authentic from the target cultures and authentic classroom engagement.  Bill Van Patten reminds us that input is not a technique or modeling language so that it can then be practiced, yet all commercial textbooks still follow this model almost exclusively.  ( Van Patten, p.74 ) | Non-Actionable |

## Table 11: Chapter 14: Glossary

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Johnson | 6 | Lines 164–166: Stephen Krashen may have defined CI at one point as the Input +1, however, this definition can lead one to lean toward INcomprehensible Input.  Perhaps a better explanation in the Glossary could be: providing the language at a level the students can understand or slightly above. | Writers’ Discretion  (CDE Staff recommends a rewriting of the definition for comprehensible input in the glossary.) |
|  | Fritze | 15 | Line 455: Chapter 14 (glossary)  Perhaps add (line 455) 'Input - language that students hear or see in a communicative context.”  (Definition from BVP Chatter 4 p. 58) | Recommended |

## Table 12: General Comments from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | General | Ensure that every figure makes it clear for readers what the figure shows, why it matters, and how the information is aligned to the WL Standards. Make sure the descriptions are clear and brief so the purpose of the figures is clear to those experienced in the content and readers who may be encountering the information for the first time. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | General | Cite specific *WL Standards* anytime there are opportunities to do so. The majority of the figures, snapshots, and vignettes are designed to support the *WL Standards*, yet the standards are rarely mentioned. Make sure they follow the correct format (e.g., WL.CM.1 or WL.CL.2). | Writers’ Discretion |

## Table 13: Comments for Chapter 1 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Line 100: Change “California Education for a Global Economy (CA EdGE)” to “*California Education for a Global Economy* (CA Ed.G.E.) Initiative” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Lines 104–108: Change “Most importantly, Proposition 58 removes previous limitations on the types of programs available to help English Learners develop proficiency in English, so educational leaders, parents and families have choices about the most appropriate program to develop students’ multiliteracy.” to “Most importantly, Proposition 58 removes previous limitations on the types of programs available to help English Learners continue to develop proficiency in their home language, so educational leaders, parents and families have choices about the most appropriate program to develop students’ multiliteracy.” | Recommended |

## Table 14: Comments for Chapter 2 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | General | Use “transitory” instead of “transient” throughout this document | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 25 | Line 356: Change “concern” to “potential teaching challenges”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 25 | Line 357: Change “mitigate their effects” to “leverage the assets and meet the needs of these students”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 25–84 | Lines 359–1306: Revise the headings in Figures 2.9–2.17.   * Use “Potential Teaching Challenge” instead or “Issue”. * Use “Practices that Recognize Students’ Assets” instead or “Practices”.   Use “Classroom Implementation” instead or “Implementation”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 25–84 | Lines 359–1306: Revise Figures 2.9–2.17 to avoid framing potential challenges to engagement and learning as insurmountable in the column currently titled “Issue”. Wherever possible, include an assets-based perspective. An example is included for Figure 2.9.  Instead of “Students living in poverty sometimes have to contend with poorer health and poorer nutrition compared to their middle-class peers. Research shows that poor health and nutrition affect attention, cognition, and behavior.”, revise to frame the issue as a challenge to student learning. Consider: “Students living in poverty may need additional support in accessing the health care system and adequate nutrition. Research shows that without access to health care and nutrition, students’ attention, cognition, and behavior may be affected.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 32 | Line 376: Change “even” to “including”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 33 | Lines 387–388: Phrasing like “the challenges some children face attending school in the Spanish-speaking world” turns this discussion into an unfair generalization about students in the Spanish-speaking “world”. Revise the discussion throughout the snapshot to ensure the portrayal of groups of students does not include disparaging language. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 35 | Line 475: Change “barriers” to “challenges”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 36 | Line 500: Change “They have limited English skills” to “They may have limited English proficiency”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 38 | Line 511: Change “barriers” to “challenges”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 41 | Line 524: Change “lack” to “may not have”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 42 | Line 551: Cite a story that does not include disparaging language. “Bobo” means dopey or dumb. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 43 | Lines 593–594: Change the phrase “While this diversity provides opportunities for Californians to interact within diverse communities from around the world,” to a sentence: “This diversity provides opportunities for Californians to interact within diverse communities from around the world.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 43 | Lines 594–596: Rewrite the following sentence to be assets-focused: “…Many children from these communities begin their schooling without the English language proficiency they need to be successful in an academic setting.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 43 | Line 606: Insert the following language:  In July 2017, the California State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the English Learner Roadmap (CA EL Roadmap) Policy. The CA EL Roadmap Policy recognizes that many English learners represent the newest members of society who bring a rich diversity of cultural backgrounds and come from families with rich social and linguistic experiences. They bring skills in their primary languages that contribute enormously to the state’s economic and social wealth of talented multilingual and multicultural population.  Four principles provide the foundation of the CA EL Roadmap Policy. The principles are intended to guide all levels of the system toward a coherent and aligned set of practices, services, relationships, and approaches to teaching and learning. The principles address the following themes:   1. Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools 2. Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access 3. System Conditions that Support Effectiveness 4. Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems | Recommended |
| 95 | CDE Staff | 43 | Line 606: Insert the following language: [CONTINUED]  Each principle is supported by research and values-based elements, which are built upon California’s academic content and English language development standards, the California ELA/ELD Framework, and other state policy and guidance documents.  Principle One:  Pre-schools and schools are responsive to different English learner (EL) strengths, needs, and identities and support the socio-emotional health and development of English learners. Programs value and build upon the cultural and linguistic assets students bring to their education in safe and affirming school climates. Educators value and build strong family, community, and school partnerships.  Principle Two:  English learners engage in intellectually rich, developmentally appropriate learning experiences that foster high levels of English proficiency. These experiences integrate language development, literacy, and content learning as well as provide access for comprehension and participation through native language instruction and scaffolding. English learners have meaningful access to a full standards-based and relevant curriculum and the opportunity to develop proficiency in English and other languages. | Recommended |
| 95 | CDE Staff | 43 | Line 606: Insert the following language: [CONTINUED]  Principle Three:  Each level of the school system (state, county, district, school, pre-school) has leaders and educators who are knowledgeable of and responsive to the strengths and needs of English learners and their communities and who utilize valid assessment and other data systems that inform instruction and continuous improvement. Each level of the school system provides resources and tiered support to ensure strong programs and build the capacity of teachers and staff to leverage the strengths and meet the needs of English learners.  Principle Four:  English learners experience a coherent, articulated, and aligned set of practices and pathways across grade levels and educational segments, beginning with a strong foundation in early childhood and appropriate identification of strengths and needs, continuing through to reclassification, graduation, higher education, and career opportunities. These pathways foster the skills, language(s), literacy, and knowledge students need for college- and career-readiness and participation in a global, diverse, multilingual, twenty-first century world.  The principles of the English Learner Roadmap Policy and the WL Standards form a solid foundation for the education of English learner students in World Languages classrooms. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 44 | Lines 633–636: Change “California’s EL students bring a wealth of rich linguistic and cultural understandings and experiences, yet some may lack the English language skills and academic competencies necessary to be **reclassified** as **fluent English proficient (RFEP)**.” to “California’s EL students bring a wealth of rich linguistic and cultural understandings and experiences. At the same time, EL students need the English language skills and academic competencies necessary to be **reclassified** as **fluent English proficient (RFEP)**.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 44 | Line 649: Change “assured” to “provided”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 45 | Line 673: Change “issues” to “challenges”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 46 | Line 676: Change “**Limited English Proficiency**” to “**English Proficiency**”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 46 | Line 676: In the column currently titled “Issue,” change “do not yet have” to “need” and “limited” to “yet to develop”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 47 | Line 678: In the column currently titled “Issue,” delete the word “technically”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 49 | Line 682: In the column currently titled “Issue,” change “limited” to “yet to develop”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 50 | Lines 688, 695, 698, 714, and 736: Revise the claim that “bridging is translanguaging,” as translanguaging is an umbrella under which bridging occurs. These two terms are not interchangeable. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 50 | Line 711: Change “half are English only” to “half are native English speakers”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 51 | Line 737–738: Change “an EL with an English only student” to “an EL student with a student who is a native English speaker”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 51 | Line 740: Add a comma after “circulates”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 53 | Line 673: Replace the following sentence with a neutral statement.  “Unfortunately, California’s schools are not currently equipped to meet the needs of the projected number of multiliterate students within the decade to come.” | Writers’ Discretion |

## Table 15: Comments for Chapter 3 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Line 61: Change “by CA Ed.G.E.” to “by the CA Ed.G.E. Initiative”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Line 79: Add “introduced in Chapter 2: Access and Equity for California’s World Languages Students, and” after “which is”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Lines 103–105: Update dates and attribution to the following: “Based on 2018–2019 data from the CDE, there are 1,490 multilingual programs currently offered throughout California (CDE, 2019). Most of the multilingual programs offer a focus…”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Line 260: Add “developmental bilingual, one-way immersion,” after “immersion,”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Line 264: Change “DLI” to “dual language”.  Note: To create alignment with the law and consistency with terms, edits have been suggested to use “dual language programs” as the umbrella term and “dual language immersion” as the applicable term for two-way immersion programs. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Line 266: Delete “Immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Line 264: Change “DLI Two-Way Immersion 50:50” to “Dual Language Immersion (Two-Way Immersion) 50:50”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 13 | Line 264: Change “DLI Two-Way Immersion 90:10” to “Dual Language Immersion (Two-Way Immersion) 90:10”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 13 | Line 274: Change “Dual Language Education programs” to “dual language programs”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 277: Delete “immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 281: Delete “immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 288: Delete “immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 294: Change “Dual Language Education programs” to “Dual language programs”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 296: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 298: Change “traditional ELD” to “structured English immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 300: Add “student” after “an LTEL”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 300: Add “student” after “An LTEL”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 307: Change “DLI” to “Dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 311: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 312: Change “ELs” to “EL students”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 312: Change “LTELs” to “LTEL students”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 316–317: Change “dual language education is not focused on English language acquisition. It is focused” to “dual language programs are”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 321: Change “DLI” to “dual language programs”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 322: Correct the citation “(Olsen 2014)”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Lines 328–331: Revise the sentence for clarity and accuracy. It is not clear how instruction in students’ “subject area curriculum” includes “ELD in their content areas.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Lines 326–335: Change “**Integrated ELD** refers to “the use of grade level […] content standards as the focal standards for content instruction and the use of the CA ELD Standards to ensure that ELs are fully supported to access rich content knowledge and develop academic English across the disciplines” (CA ELA/ELD Framework, 2014, p. 31). **Designated ELD** refers to “a protected time during the school day when teachers use the CA ELD Standards to attend to students’ particular English language development needs.” to “**Integrated ELD** is defined as instruction in which the state-adopted ELD standards are used in tandem with the state-adopted academic content standards. [*California Code of Regulations* *(5CCR)* section 11301(c)]. **Designated ELD** is defined as instruction provided during a time set aside in the regular school day for focused instruction on the state-adopted ELD standards to assist English learners to develop critical English language skills necessary for academic content learning in English. [*5CCR* section 11301(a)]”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 342: Add “languages” after “both”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 343: Add “, optimally three,” after “two”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 346: Change “sixth grade” to “grade 12”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 359: Add “may” after “program”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 362: Change “Two-Way Immersion Program Model” to “Dual Language Immersion (Two-Way Immersion) Program Model”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 363: Change “two-way” to “dual immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 364: Change “instruction” to “immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 365: Change “instruction” to “immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 374: Change “English learner (EL) and English Only (EO) students” to “English learners and native English speakers”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 379: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 380: Add “, dual language immersion,” after “bilingual program”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 383: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 17 | Lines 394–396: Delete “This is done in order to avoid students developing literacy in English (the majority language) and then preferring not to develop literacy in the target language.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 17 | Lines 404–404: The claim that “the 90:10 program model has been shown to create higher levels of bilingualism” is a controversial claim. Revise or cite specific source, not just “(CDE, 2019)”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 18 | Line 413: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 19 | Line 421: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 20 | Line 425: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 20 | Line 427: Change “immersion” to “language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 20 | Line 446: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 505: Correct the citation “(Olsen 2018)”. The full citation is “Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.”  Note that Olsen is not one of the authors. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 507: Delete “immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 509: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 514: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 516: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 24 | Line 524: Change “English only” to “native English speakers”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 24 | Line 524: Change “her English only” to “her native English-speaking”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 24 | Line 525: Add “in Spanish” after “of proficiency”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 24 | Line 529: Change “50 minutes of English Language Development (ELD)” to “50 minutes of designated ELD”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 35 | Line 857: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 35 | Line 874: Add a bullet with “Parents of students from dual language programs” after “World language teachers from middle, high schools”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 36 | Lines 900–901: Explain where the claim that “If only one course per day, then program becomes a ‘developmental bilingual program’” comes from. Also, revise the statement for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 40 | Lines 993–994: Change “DLI programs offer” to “Dual language programs can offer”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 40 | Line 996: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 40 | Line 1000: Change “Exploratory” to “Elementary Experience”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 40 | Line 1011: Change “in the Elementary School” to “in Elementary Schools”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 43 | Line 1084: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 43 | Line 1089: Change “immersion” to “language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 44 | Line 1114: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 45 | Line 1123: Add “of Japanese” after “speakers”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 46 | Line 1166: Change “no English” to “to speak only in Japanese”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 46 | Lines 1172–1174: Change [She tells students you talked with one selected partner, but now you will receive a handout and survey four students in the class about their fast food preferences.] to [She tells students, ”You talked with one selected partner, and now you will receive a handout and survey four students in the class about their fast food preferences.”]. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 49 | Line 1236: Change “DLI” to “Dual Language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 49 | Line 1237: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 49 | Line 1241: Add “or dual language immersion” after “bilingual”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 50 | Line 1249: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 50 | Line 1251: Change “DLI” to “dual language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 50 | Line 1252: Delete “, often by the end of grade 9”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 51 | Line 1267: Change “DLI” to “Dual Language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 54 | Line 1344: Change “is” to “may be”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 54 | Line 1344: Change “limited” to “related”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 55 | Lines 1368–1373: Rewrite these sentences toward an assets-based perspective. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 55 | Line 1384: Change “When listening or viewing” to “When listening to or viewing content in the target language”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 55 | Line 1385–1386: Change “Often, they have difficulty comprehending in formal situations.” to “Formal situations may present a challenge in comprehension for heritage language speakers.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 56 | Line 1393: Add “in the target language may be” after “heritage speakers” | Recommended |

## Table 16: Comments for Chapter 5 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | General | Revise the writing throughout the chapter to ensure the individuals doing the action are named specifically. Two examples:  Page 3, Line 73: “UDL focuses on what students learn…” Consider changing the phrasing to “When they use UDL, teachers are empowered to focus on what students learn…”.  Page 3, Lines 77–78: “…UDL blends whole-class, small group, and individual instruction…” Consider changing the phrasing to “…teachers can follow the principles of UDL when they blend whole-class, small group, and individual instruction…”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 6 | Lines 92–92: Revise the sentence for clarity. Specify what is “intentionally different”. As written, what is intentionally different could be the two snapshots of the components of UDL. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 6 | Line 94: Revise the sentence for clarity. Specify what “they” refers to. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 7 | Line 107: Clarify what a “Key Concept” is in this context. The information in the bullets that follow read like they could be learning objectives. Or is the information in the bullets a description of what students have learned previous to this lesson? It is unclear. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 8 | Lines 130–134: List specific standards addressed in this snapshot under the heading “Targeted Standards”. What is currently shown are areas within each of the three strands, not targeted standards. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 8 | Line 144. Introduce the table that follows. Explain how Mrs. Gautier, or teachers of world languages, might go about considering and selecting the options described in the table. The reader needs guidance. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 10 | Lines 153–156: Revise the sentence for clarity. Consider breaking it up into 2–3 shorter sentences. Provide an example of what “an interesting theme” is. Provide a clear description of the steps the teacher follows to “[unpack or adapt] Can-Do statements that her students can use to assess their own progress”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 10 | Lines 158–159: The statement “Ms. Chen makes the Can Do statements match her unit, rather than matching her unit to the Can Do statements.” seems rather important. Provide a clear description of the steps the teacher follows to adapt Can Do statements, as well as additional guidance to teachers who may wish to do the same in their classrooms or readers who may wish to support teachers in doing this when they plan lessons.  Consider providing this guidance before introducing the snapshot, so that the reader is prepared with this information and can better understand Ms. Chen’s choices in her lesson planning and delivery. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 11–17 | Revise entire Snapshot 5.2 for clarity. The term “life” seems to be used to mean “lifestyle”. Two additional examples:  Lines 193–197: Revise the sentence for clarity, as punctuation seems to be missing and/or the inclusion of the parenthetical takes away from the message. Also, include the translation for the portion in Chinese.  Lines 193–197: The sentence “In the end, Ms. Chen’s students share their answers to two “how-to” as shown below.” is unclear due to phrasing and with the reference to how something is shown below—without being clear how far below the reference is. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14–17 | Line 240: Remove links. Instead of links, provide brief descriptions of the resources a teacher who may be interested in consulting those resources might search for. For example, instead of:  Ms. Chen’s students compare typical exercise spaces and routines in China and the United States.  Ms. Chen’s students demonstrate Wu Bu Quan (Five Step Training Form)   * 晨练大爷大妈(视频) Chinese Elderly Morning Exercise in the Park http://youtube.com/watch?v=UxcD1V2ItEA * 晨练大爷大妈 (图文) Conduct a web search for “Chinese Elderly Morning Exercise in the Park.”) * 五步拳教学 (Five Step Training Form) http://youtube.com/watch?v=qjJ-5tIOw5w   Consider:  Ms. Chen’s students compare typical exercise spaces and routines in China and the United States. To ensure her students have a rich experience, Ms. Chen shows a few video snippets showing elderly Chinese people doing morning exercises in a park. The students also view an exercise called Wu Bu Quan, also known as Five Step Training Form, in practice. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 18 | Line 255: Add a transition between the discussion of UDL and the discussion of how teachers design lessons. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 21 | Line 267: Add a transition between Figure 5.2 and Figure 5.3 that addresses the ideas between the content in each figure. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 21 | Line 272: Add a transition between Figure 5.3 and Figure 5.4 that addresses the ideas between the content in each figure. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 22 | Line 279: Add a transition between Figure 5.4 and Figure 5.5 that addresses the ideas between the content in each figure. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 288: Change “They are not answerable with finality in a single lesson or instructional unit” to “They are not intended to be answered after a single lesson or within an instructional unit”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 303: Instead of ambiguous wording like “(targets a list of words or phrases),” provide clear explanations using complete sentences. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 307: Provide additional context for the reader to understand why the information in Figure 5.6 is included in this framework and how it supports the implementation of the *WL Standards*. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 27–28 | Lines 319–324: Rewrite this paragraph for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 28–29 | Lines 325–382: Throughout Figure 5.7, provide additional context for the reader to make sense of the information included. Currently there are a list of headings and descriptions of activities. What is still needed is direction as to what it means/shows and what the reader is to understand or take away from the figure. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 30 | Line 388: Snapshot 5.7 accomplishes more than just illustrate the role of essential questions. Add language that provides an overview of the other aspects Snapshot 5.7 addresses regarding what the successful implementation of the *WL Standards* looks like. To orient the reader, also describe the organization of the snapshot. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 30–37 | Lines 389–591: Cite the specific *WL Standards* that correspond to the unit objectives (Lines 399–417). Also, throughout Snapshot 5.7, align the language used to reference *WL Standards* with the most current version of those standards. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 40 | Line 655: Change “Snapshot” to “Figure” and renumber as appropriate. | Writers’ Discretion |

## Table 17: Comments for Chapter 10 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | General | Add transitional language between figures and snapshot whenever one immediately follows the other. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | General | Add a conclusion, even if brief, sections so they do not end when a section or snapshot ends. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 1 | Lines 40–43: Revise the sentence to improve readability. Note that “of course” is ungrammatical here. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 2 | Line 57: Mention research that supports claim, “What is assessed communicates what is most valued in learning.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Lines 64–67: Revise the sentence to improve readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Lines 72–76: Revise the sentence to improve readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Lines 76–77: Provide additional context and explanation to the sentence “See Figures 10.3 and 10.4 for proficiency-sensitive components to be included in choice board.” so readers do not need to skip forward 10 pages to understand what “proficiency-sensitive components” and a “choice board” mean. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Line 84: Link to the guidance in and intent of “Then and Now”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Line 97: Bold the term “cloze” and add to glossary. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Line 112: Add an example that illustrates the statement, “It is important to consider that the amount, pace and complexity of tasks often prevent all students from demonstrating their knowledge and skill.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Line 112: Explain who “such students” are. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Line 121: Conclude paragraph (lines 109–121) with a statement about the value or benefits of following this approach. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 4–5 | Lines 128–129: Break up the sentence to improve readability; include an example to illustrate the point. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 5–10 | Lines 132–149: Use complete sentences throughout so that phrases like “Higher, more complex, more abstract levels” or “Complexity is related to the range of learner proficiency” are clear to readers. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 10–11 | Line 152: Add an introduction to Figure 10.2 so that readers know what the figure contains and what guidance it is intended to provide. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Line 163: Bold the term “pre-assessments” and add to glossary. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Line 172: Add a brief introduction to the discussion of achievement, prochievement, performance, and proficiency. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Line 177: Add a transition before the word “Demonstrating”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Lines 178–180: Revise the sentence to improve readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Line 180–183: Revise the sentence to improve readability and follow up with an example to illustrate the what the practice looks like in the classroom. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 253: Change “they” to “a language learner”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Lines 259–262: Revise the sentence to improve readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 274: Cite research that supports this claim: “The most common types of assessment used in language programs are form checks…” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Lines 306–308: Revise statement “Figure 10.7 was designed to assess…” as the figure does not itself assess student learning. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 18–34 | Lines 358–522: CDE Staff recommends the removal of Snapshot 10.1, as it is lengthy and lacks focused guidance on assessment. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 38–44 | Lines 544–558: The possessive (“Mr. Doehla’s”) is sometimes used when no possessive is needed. Please revise. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 39 | Line 544: In the Essential question(s) row, revise the first sentence to: “Mr. Doehla establishes essential questions (also called “driving questions”) from the outset of the unit to guide the work students do.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 46 | Lines 614–615: Revise “thereby bridging gaps and enhancing acquisition of knowledge and development of skill” to improve readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 46 | Line 612: Add a brief introduction to the discussion of formative, interim, and summative assessments. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 48 | Lines 661–663: Cite research that supports claim that “almost everything done in the classroom, at times formally and most often informally, is formative assessment.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 51 | Lines 693–694: Cite research that supports claim that “it is most effective to address gaps within an activity, episode, or lesson.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 53 | Line 743: Add language to transition from Figure 10.8 to 10.9 | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 53 | Line 746: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and to orient the reader to what follows. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 57 | Lines 780–784: Revise the sentence to improve readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 58 | Lines 797–800: Revise the sentence to improve readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 58 | Line 808: Clarify how “results reflect higher and more accurate levels of achievement.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 58 | Lines 816–823: Revise the paragraph to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 58–59 | Lines 826–829: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 65 | Line 914: Revise “The quality of teaching and learning may be assessed based on student achievement.” To “Student achievement can serve as an important indicator of the effectiveness of teaching and learning.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 67–76 | Lines 964–1086: Create an appendix. Move Figures 10.15–10.24 from Chapter 10 to the appendix. Add language in Chapter 10 to encourage readers to consult the figures. Describe the content of these figures as well as the value they potentially have for particular stakeholders.  In the appendix, clearly explain how particular stakeholders might use the figures and for what specific purposes. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 77 | Lines 1103–1105: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 77 | Lines 1108–1109: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 79 | Lines 1174–1175: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 79 | Line 1178: Add translation of the dialogue at the end of this bullet entry. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 80 | Line 1182: Clarify what “entities” can entail by including a few examples. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 80, 84 | Lines 1195, 1271: Clarify what the benchmark is in the statements that include the phrase “Mr. Monroe and his students created the following benchmark.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 80, 84 | Lines 1199, 1275: Currently a rubric follows the heading “Benchmark Prompt Assignment.” Revise the order or the phrasing so that a prompt follows the heading and the rubric is identified as a rubric. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 103 | Lines 1538–1593: Avoid using “you” and the implicit “you” in the directives that start on line 1537. | Writers’ Discretion |

## Table 18: Comments for Chapter 11 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Line 78: Change “is” to “can be”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Lines 87–90: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Lines 90–93: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 4 | Lines 93–95: Revise the sentence to   * improve readability, * remove the assurance that implementation “will” lead to enhancements (this cannot be guaranteed), and * state that what is implemented is the guidance in the framework, not the framework itself. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 4–5 | Lines 96–99: Revise the sentence to improve accuracy and clarity. Currently the statement claims that schools and districts “use the content of the…EL Roadmap…for all students to plan and evaluate world languages programs.”  It might be more accurate to state that instructional leaders increasingly refer to the goals of the CA EL Roadmap to design world languages programs that welcome and serve all students. A separate sentence can address the evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 5 | Lines 107–113: The statements do not convey the true meaning of each principle. Please use the original language to state the principles.  Also, refer to the EL Roadmap Self-Reflection Rubric in this chapter, a self-assessment tool available at: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/resources.asp. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 5–7 | Lines 114–116: Consider moving Figure 11.1: Principles of the California English Learner Roadmap and Applications to World Languages to Chapter 2 as a part of the introduction to the EL Roadmap Policy (in the English learner section). | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 7 | Lines 118–121: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. Consider starting with, “California educators are encouraged to develop opportunities for professional learning that align with the *WL Standards*, the guidance in this framework…” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 7 | Lines 122–129: Expand on the statement that the CSTP “are used throughout the state” by mentioning who uses them, in what contexts, and for what purpose(s). | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 8, 20, 34, 36, 50 | Lines 144, 474, 756, 807, and 1197: For all self-assessment tools, remove the directions from the heading. Instead, introduce the self-assessment tool by providing a brief explanation of who the tool is intended for and directions on how to use it. Explain what the intent and value is for determining next steps and/or developing an action plan. Provide one or more specific suggestions, based on research, about how educators might use the tool and the data they get from it.  The heading should state only “Self-Assessment Tool” for column one and “Next Steps” for column two. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 9 | Lines 122–129: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Line 215: After listing the goals in the *WL Standards*, provide guidance on how “professional development efforts should support student proficiencies reflected in each of the goals” [lines153 154]. Also, discuss the connection(s) between the role of professional development, the goals of the standards, and the practices depicted in Snapshot 11.1. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Line 220: Change “Snapshot” to “Figure” and renumber as appropriate. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Line 221: Write an introduction that provides some background so the reader is informed of the context for the information presented. Throughout this figure, revise to provide further explanation. For instance, clarify who the “members of the department” and “teachers in all programs” are, what the department is, and what work has taken place before the list of accomplishments are laid out. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 13 | Line 272: Add a conclusion reiterating the points the reader is intended to take away from the figure. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 13–14 | Lines 275–279: Convert the sentence into an introductory paragraph to improve clarity and readability. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 282: Change “textbook companies provide materials” to “publishers develop instructional materials”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Lines 284–287: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability. Consider breaking it up into a series of sentences so that each idea is addressed separately and more fully. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Lines 288–291: Revise the sentence to improve clarity and readability and to remove “will”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 291: Revise the sentence to remove “will need”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Lines 295–306: Revise the paragraph to improve clarity and readability. Revise to name the individuals who do the action, as “programs” do not “choose” or “use,” and “schools” do not “choose”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Lines 307–311: Revise writing, as schools and “districts” cannot “explore”; name the individuals doing the action. Also, explain why those individuals are being encouraged to explore those resources. Address what guidance or benefit do those resources offer. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Lines 363–364: Clarify what specific entity in the “State of California” is responsible for world language educator professional development. Keep in mind that in California decisions over such matters are made at the local level. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 378: Add “can” after “schools”. Also revise wording as “schools” do not “assess”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 17 | Lines 398–401: Revise either the title of Figure 11.3 or the introduction to the content in the figure so they are not the same. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 17–19 | Lines 403–446: Revise the content of Figure 11.3. Use complete sentences that provide guidance instead of a series of lists that do not clarify what educators can do or why the elements in the lists matter. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 19 | Lines 452–453: The assertion that “Teachers have multiple entry points and effective professional learning is tailored appropriately.” is not true for all teachers. Please revise to convey that this practice is a goal or something akin to that. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 19 | Line 454: Add “can” after “schools”. Also revise wording as “schools” do not “identify”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 19 | Lines 455–457: Revise wording as “schools” do not “identify,” “assess,” or “determine”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 21 | Lines 499–501: Remove superscript numbers and delete list of definitions on lines 505–514. Instead, bold the terms guaranteed curriculum, high-leverage practices, differentiating content, process and products, and horizontal and vertical articulation and include them in the glossary. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Lines 568–569: Clarify what the misunderstanding was. Reconsider whether it is necessary to mention that the members of the group laughed. It is not clear what is happening or what the relevance is to the proceedings. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 27 | Line 690: Change the word “Stems” in the heading to “Prompts,” as the majority of the prompts provided are questions, not stems. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 28 | Line 696: Reword the heading for column two to “Sample Prompts,” as the prompts provided are questions, one statement, and some stems. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 32–33 | Line 746: Throughout Figure 11.7, begin entries with a verb. Entries like “Induction course” or “School site” do not provide enough context for the reader. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 34 | Line 757: The paragraph that follows a table starts with “However.” A sentence beginning with however is usually closely related to the sentence which precedes it. Revise so that it is clear for the reader what the however refers to. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 37 | Line 823: Revise wording as “Schools and districts” do not “draw” or “recognize”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 38 | Line 846: Add Association for Two-Way and Dual Language Education (ATDLE) after “California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE);” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 40 | Line 928: Add an introductory sentence or two to situate the reader. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 40 | Line 928: Change “Optimal instructional practices are captured in Figure 11.9, derived from” to “The instructional practices captured in Figure 11.9 are derived from”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 44 | Line 1017: Add an introductory sentence or two to situate the reader. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 45–46 | Lines 1068–1081: Revise the wording in this list of practices to align with those in lines 1120–1139, which are complete sentences | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 52, 53, 55 | Lines 1252, 1255, 1262, 1275, 1296, 1344: Change “effective schools/districts/administrators” to “schools/districts/administrators striving to be more effective” or something similar. The current wording hits the wrong tone. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 52–53 | Lines 1238–1282: Revise wording as “schools and districts” do not “administer,” “measure,” “evaluate,” or “recognize”. Additional instances apply that were not captured here. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 53 | Line 1296: Revise “Effective world languages programs,” as the word effective hits the wrong tone. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 55 | Line 1344: Change “administrators ensure” to “administrators can ensure”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 56 | Lines 1380–1382: Revise sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 56 | Lines 1388–1389: Revise sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 56 | Lines 1395–1397: Shorten the title of the snapshot. Move descriptive heading to the body of the snapshot. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 58 | Lines 1442–1473: Revise “administrators keep in mind,” “administrators actively support” (and other, similar claims in this section) or provide research to support them. Consider using qualifiers such as “can,” “may choose to,” or something similar. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 63 | Lines 1637–1639: Change “How can the local community contribute elements of **cultural capital** to empower schools and students (as proposed in the **Community** **Cultural Wealth Model** [Yosso, 2005]):” to “How can the local community contribute elements of **cultural capital** to empower schools and students? The **Community** **Cultural Wealth Model** may offer useful ideas (Yosso, 2005):”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 56 | Lines 1388–1389: Revise sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 73–76 | Lines 1719–1816: Create an appendix. Move section titled Resources for Professional Learning to the appendix. Add language in Chapter 11 to encourage readers to consult the resources. Describe the value they potentially have for particular stakeholders. | Writers’ Discretion |

## Table 19: Comments for Chapter 12 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | General | Throughout this chapter single sentences, and sometimes two sentences, stand alone as if they were paragraphs. Please revise the entire chapter to ensure that paragraphs are made up of three or more sentences. This will aid in providing needed context that will strengthen the content with further explanation. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 1 | Line 20: Delete the colon. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 1 | Line 21: Change “language” to “instructional”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 2 | Line 32: Delete “Yet,” and start the sentence with “According”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Line 42: Revise the writing, as California cannot have esteem. Name the specific individuals who hold language education in high esteem. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Line 51: Revise the sentence to remove the word “will”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Lines 51–52: Change “when they are aware of” to “when they take the time to learn”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 3 | Lines 53–55: Rewrite the sentence for clarity. Also, cite the research that supports this claim: “The diversity of languages studied by California students implies that for many of them the target language may be a native, heritage, or third language.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 3–4 | Lines 55–58: Cite the research that supports this claim, or rewrite the sentence. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 3–4 | Lines 58–60: Cite the research that supports this claim, or rewrite the sentence. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 5–6 | Lines 61–67: After each section, include an explanation to the reader of what the table shows. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 6 | Lines 68–74: Revise the paragraph for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 6 | Lines 79–81: Revise the sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 7 | Lines 92–93: Cite the research that supports this claim, or rewrite the sentence. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 7 | Lines 108–112: Revise the sentence for clarity. Also, provide examples for each of the terms included in the list. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 7 | Line 113: Expand on this sentence. It seems disconnected and cannot stand alone, as it needs to be part of a paragraph. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 8 | Lines 142–143: Rewrite the sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Lines 191–193: Change “Often, within and outside the language-teaching community one may hear the terms “difficult language” and “easy language,” which actually refer to languages that require respectively longer or shorter length of study to acquire specific ranges of proficiency.” To “At times certain languages are referred to as being ‘difficult’ or ‘easy’ to learn. It’s not that one language is easier or more difficult to learn than another—some languages require a longer or shorter length of time to acquire specific ranges of proficiency.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Lines 194–196: Rewrite the sentence for clarity and to remove opinion. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Lines 196–198: Rewrite the sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Lines 202–207: Rewrite the paragraph for clarity. Also, remove the word “effective,” as it hits the wrong tone. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Line 209: Provide additional context about how to read the graphic, what to take away from it, and the implications for world languages teachers. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 13 | Line 226: Follow up figure 12.13 with a discussion of the meaning and implications of the content. Currently it is left to the reader to accurately make sense of the intended conclusions to draw from the figure. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Lines 260–262: Rewrite the sentence for clarity. Also, explain positive and negative transfer. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 262: Revise for clarity. Also, remove the word “typical”; clarify the concept instead. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 277: Provide further explanation for the list of sounds for readers not familiar with French or these sounds. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 277: Revise the phrasing, “As most French teachers will verify,” to remove the opinion. Alternatively, cite the research that supports this claim. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 286: Explain why “(ASL)” is included here. Orient the reader. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Line 289: Provide additional explanation to “Trying to link words.” | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Lines 290–302: Rewrite the as a series of complete sentences that provide further explanation of what each of the practices means. Make sure there is explicit guidance in the rewrite. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 16 | Line 309: Include a transition that sets up the purpose of Snapshot 12.1. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 17 | Lines 357–359: Rewrite the sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 18 | Line 365: Add a conclusion providing guidance to language teachers. What should teachers be aware of and how can they develop students’ capacities to make novel sounds. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 18 | Line 377: Include a transition that sets up the purpose of Snapshot 12.2. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 18 | Line 378: Expand on the explanation of the activity in the snapshot to fully explain to readers what the intent is of the activities mentioned. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 19 | Lines 395–406: Cite research to support these claims. Also, include examples to illustrate each concept and to go beyond a definition. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 19 | Lines 409–412: Rewrite for clarity and ensure appropriate use of “the stress” and “stress”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 20 | Line 435: Revise to clarify what high fall and low fall mean. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 509: Revise to remove the word “effective,” as it hits the wrong tone. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 512: Remove “one and”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 527: Start the sentence with “the”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 529: Change “many a book” to “more than one book”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 23 | Line 530: Clarify what “they” refers to. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 24 | Lines 543–545: Add language to clarify that affixed encompass prefixes, infixes, and suffixes. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 24 | Line 554: Add sample infix for English and fill in entire row. Also, expand with additional examples, as the current version confounds more than it clarifies. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 25 | Line 558: Revise Figure 12.19 for accuracy. The suffix “-ness” does not mean “Nouns from adjective”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 26 | Line 569: Change “; hence” to “. As a result”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 26 | Lines 576–579: Rewrite for accuracy and clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 26 | Line 580: Clarify “more than one stem”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 26 | Line 584: Delete “famously”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 26 | Lines 585–586: Clarify what “tapeworm words” are, or avoid using the term. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 27 | Lines 597–603: Rewrite the paragraph for clarity and accuracy. (Languages do not have genes. The Chinese language has not flooded anything. Arabic has not permeated Persian or Turkish.) Make factual statements. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 27 | Lines 604–605: Cite the research that supports this claim or rewrite for accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 27 | Line 605: Add language to introduce the relevance and value of Snapshot 12.4. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 28 | Lines 636–638: Rewrite the sentence for clarity. Also, explain Nominative and Accusative case, and verify that these two terms need to be capitalized. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 28 | Lines 639–641: Explain how Figure 12.21 illustrates that remnants of case are present in pronouns. The claim is made, but it is not explained. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 28 | Lines 643–647: Cite the research that supports these claims or rewrite for accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 30 | Lines 715–717: Rewrite these sentences for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 30 | Line 717: Explain how readers are to read Figure 12.22. Also, explain why the information in Figure 12.22 is relevant to the topic. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 31–32 | Lines 738–755: Rewrite paragraphs for clarity and accuracy. Make sure the point of the discussion is clear to the reader. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 34 | Lines 780–782: Cite the research. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 35 | Lines 810–819: Instead or listing the challenges in a series of bullets, write complete sentences for each that provide context and guidance. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 35 | Line 820: Add “while” before “others”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 35 | Line 825: Explain for whom languages with different scripts may require more time to acquire and why. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 36 | Line 829: Explain why how cursive is faster and why it matters in this context. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 36 | Lines 840–841: Rewrite sentence for clarity and accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 36 | Line 841: Explain the relationship between vowels and diacritic marks. As written, it appears that they are synonymous. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 37 | Lines 849–850: Rewrite sentence for clarity and accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 37 | Line 860: Explain what Hangul is. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 37 | Line 864: Explain what the standard “reasonably comfortable” refers to, or rewrite the sentence to avoid using this subjective descriptor. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 37 | Lines 865–866: Rewrite sentence for clarity and accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 37 | Lines 869–871: Rewrite sentence for clarity and accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 37 | Lines 872–885: Rewrite paragraph for clarity. In revision, avoid awkward phrasing such as “mutual intelligibility is marginal,” “due to a unifying and uniting presence of common standard language,” and “less than mutually comprehensible”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 38 | Lines 886–887: Rewrite sentence for clarity and accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 38 | Lines 937–939: Rewrite sentence for clarity and accuracy. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 41 | Line 980: Turn this sentence into a paragraph that provides context and guidance for the five different registers listed. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 41 | Lines 981–983: Rewrite sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 41 | Lines 985–986: Rewrite sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 41 | Lines 988–989: Provide the English translations for the terms used. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 42 | Lines 1034–1036: This is an important concept. Rewrite sentence for clarity. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 48 | Line 1224: Revise sentence to avoid using “our”. | Writers’ Discretion |
|  | CDE Staff | 48 | Line 1226: Change “The new California Standards and this Framework” to “The 2019 *WL Standards* and this framework”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 48 | Lines 1231–1232: Rewrite sentence to avoid using “must,” “we,” and “our”. | Writers’ Discretion |

## Table 20: Comments for Chapter 14 from CDE Staff

| # | Source | Page | Line Number and Comment | Recommended Action |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDE Staff | 8 | Lines 224–228: Replace definition with “Instruction provided during a time set aside in the regular school day for focused instruction on the state-adopted English language development standards to assist English learners to develop critical English language skills necessary for academic content learning in English. [5CCR section 11300(a)].” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 8 | Line 229: Review accuracy of phrasing for “developmental language and literacy programs”. The term should be “developmental bilingual program”.  Note: Commissioner Costa Hernandez proposed changing the language to “developmental biliteracy programs”. She requested that the writers ensure that sufficient context be added to help readers understand this term. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 9 | Line 260: Change “Instruction” to “Immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 9 | Line 271: Change “remains” to “may remain”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 9 | Line 275: Change “Education (DLE)” to “Program”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 10 | Line 297: Change “lack” to “need”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 11 | Line 325: Delete “limited-English-proficient [LEP] or”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 12 | Line 372: Add “Department of Education” after “California”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 14 | Line 428: Change “Instruction” to “Immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 15 | Lines 456–461: Replace definition with “Instruction in which the state-adopted ELD standards are used in tandem with the state-adopted academic content standards. Integrated ELD includes specially designed academic instruction in English.” | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 19 | Line 600–601: Change “language and literacy” to “bilingual”.  Amendment recommended by the IQC: Change “language and litercary” to “biliteracy”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 21 | Line 657: Change “Instruction” to “Immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 21 | Line 658: Change “exclusively” to “primarily”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 21 | Line 659: Change “remains” to “may remain”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 25 | Line 771: Change “students” to “seniors”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 28 | Line 879: Change “Instruction” to “Immersion”. | Recommended |
|  | CDE Staff | 21 | Line 659: Change “remains” to “may remain”. | Recommended |

## Table 21: Additional Edits Recommended by the IQC on April 17, 2020

The page and line numbers in the table reference the draft chapters that were posted on January 31, 2020, and may not match the current draft of the posted chapters.

| # | Chapter | Page | Line Number and Recommended Edit |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1–14 | General | Commissioner Costa Hernandez proposed, and the IQC recommends, that the writers fully explain what is meant by “cultural needs”. The suggestion is to try to describe how students benefit or what specific knowledge or skills are developed, instead of relying on the phrase “cultural needs”.  Note: If “cultural needs” cannot be defined in any particular context, the commissioner requested that the term be deleted, as she did not understand what a “cultural need” would be. If the term is left in the document, Commissioner Costa Hernandez requested that it be added to the glossary. |
|  | 1–14 | General | Commissioner Costa Hernandez proposed, and the IQC recommends, that the writers rephrase sentences that use the term “needs”. The suggestion is to make the portrayal of students more assets-based, as the term “needs” connotes a gap or deficiency. Instead, describe how students benefit or what specific knowledge or skills are developed. |
|  | 1 | 2 | Commissioner Tonkovich proposed, and the IQC recommends, that the writers ensure there is parallelism in the way all bullet points begin.  Note: CDE Staff found no parallelism issues in this chapter on page 2. |
|  | 1 | General | The IQC requested that writers add a discussion in Chapter 2 of standard English learners similar to the discussion in Chapter 9 in the *ELA/ELD Framework*. Commissioner Costa Hernandez suggested that the writers review current duscussions in *the World Languages Framework* to determine if there is language in discussions of heritage language speakers that might be appropriate. In addition, the writers are encouraged to add a discussion of the opportunities that both English learners and standard English learners can enjoy in a world languages classroom. In this discussion, the writers can point out that World Languages is an academic area where all students can flourish. |
|  | 8 | 5 | Line 131: Commissioner Renteria proposed, and the IQC recommends, that the writers ensure that the numbering of all figures in this chapter is accurate. |
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