

September 19, 2002

1

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

Speakers:

M/F: Unidentified Male/Female

Tim Shanahan, Chair, Dr. Valerie Reyna, Shelly Spiegall-Coleman,
[Magali Lavandez], Marlene Wilson, Gabriel [Medel], Bobbie [Sidi
Sahouchens], Faye Shin, Rosalia Salinas, Barbara [Flutis], Kim
[Manwinlan], Teresa Gomez, [Dr. Garcia?], Elizabeth Jimenez,
Margaret Mustapha, Marsha [Brectel], Donna Heath, Mary Hernandez,
Delores [Beltran], [inaudible], Alicia Valero, Magdalena Ruis
Gonzales, Carla [Herrera], David [Yaden], Jody Simon, Susana
Dutrot, Sally Thomas

Questionable words and phrases in [brackets].

M: Welcome, everyone. This is the first public outreach meeting
for the National Literacy Panel. The panel is conducting a
comprehensive, evidence-based review of the research literature
on the development of literacy among language minority children
and youth.

Thank you all for coming. We have a good and a long list of
speakers today, so we'll be getting to that very quickly.

The panel will be introduced to you in just a moment by Tim
Shanahan, the chair of the panel. We'll also be hearing this
morning from Valerie [Reyna] from the U.S. Department of
Education. I think it's indicative of the importance of this

September 19, 2002

2

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

work that we have Dr. Reyna with us today to speak on behalf of the departments about the project and what we hope to accomplish.

We'll also be hearing from Donna Christian, the president of the Center for Applied Linguistics, who will give you a brief overview of the work of the panel.

I suppose it's really not necessary for this audience to say too much about need for this panel, for this work, but I would like to remind us all of several points. As you all know, the number of immigrant children in U.S. schools has increased dramatically in recent years. Continues to increase, more than doubling in the period between 1970 and 1995. I just recently looked at the figures for California and saw that since 1993, the number of immigrant children of English language learners in the California schools has increased by 30% in very recent years.

We also know that English language learners lag behind their English proficient peers in terms of reading proficiency. And there's a need for the panel because we have not had many reviews of the research literature conducted in a comprehensive way by a panel, such as this one. So clearly, there's a strong need for the panel.

Just a quick picture of the administrative structure for the panel. The panel is being organized and run by two organizations, SRI International, which is where I'm from, and the Center for Applied Linguistics. You'll see that Diane August

September 19, 2002

3

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

from the Center for Applied Linguistics, is the project director. The real heavy lifting of the panel, of course, is being conducted by the National Literacy Panel itself. Donna Christian is a senior advisor on the Center for Applied Linguistics side. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank some people who are not here who had a lot to do with organizing this work. In particular, my colleague in the Washington, D.C. office of SRI, Marilyn Gelespie, who did a tremendous amount of work to organize this panel. Grace Burkhart, who's at the Center for Applied Linguistics, also in Washington who helped a lot. And of course the LA County Office of Education are hosts who are wonderfully cooperative on short notice to bring this all together.

Let me introduce now, Valerie Reyna, who will be telling you about the charge of the panel. Dr. Reyna is a senior research advisor in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in the U.S. Department of Education. She comes to that position from the University of Arizona where she was the Professor of Surgery, Medicine, Biomedical Engineering, Mexican-American Studies, and Women's Studies. Dr. Reyna.

Valerie: Thank you very much and if anybody wants the story behind all of that, at lunch I'd be happy to talk with you about it. I'm actually a Cognitive Developmental Psychologist too,

September 19, 2002

4

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

just to totally confuse you about my background. Well, buenos dias.

And buen venidos. It's such a pleasure to be here in Los Angeles and I thank you all for coming this morning. And on behalf of Secretary Rod Page, the Assistant Secretary, Russ Whitehurse, and myself, I want to let you know how important we think this meeting is, this first Outreach Meeting to the community, and how grateful we are for your attendance here this morning.

It's very fitting that our first Outreach Meeting be in Los Angeles. You know my father, as a matter of fact, grew up not too far from here, in La Puente. Does anybody know La Puente? Ah! Very good, of course! And he was born in this country and he was raised here. And on his very first day of school, he did not speak English. He came to school speaking Spanish, only Spanish.

And in the 8th grade, he left school. And my father's story is replicated now, all over the country, all over California, all over the nation now. And in fact, today, and I think we got a little snippet of the statistics, today, we're in a situation where large numbers of students come to school and they do not read and write with facility in English.

And I think we all know that the economic success and health of this nation as a whole depends on the success of these

September 19, 2002

5

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

students, of all the students. As a nation, we progress together
or we fall behind together. Our fates are [yoked] together.
Juntos. Una nacion.

And in order to insure that these students are not left
behind, we've convened this expert panel. And their job is to
sift through the scientific evidence and tell us what will help
these children acquire the literacy skills that are necessary to
compete in today's economy. And we were fortunate indeed, to be
able to get some of the nation's most foremost experts in English
language learning and English literacy.

These are individuals who are volunteering their time to
participate in this panel and taking away time from their hectic
schedules and careers to serve the nation. And they have
distinguished records of research. These are really outstanding
people. And I want to thank the panel members who came here
today, in particular, our Chair, as well as the excellent staff
who are our hosts here today. Thank you so much.

You know normally when you have panels, encouraging them,
there are many, many meetings all over the country to go to, and
frankly, I was very impressed by the enthusiasm of the panel
members to be here today to hear your concerns. They're very
intensely interested in what the community has to say. So this
is an outstanding panel along many dimensions.

September 19, 2002

6

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

At our last panel meeting, I mentioned that the goal of our panel should be relevance, without politics. So in other words, the work of this panel should be relevant to policy issues. It should provide the facts on which policy is based. But it should not recommend policy. So the work of this expert panel will not be to state their opinions, but to summarize the facts as we know them today. Again, relevance without politics.

Now some of you might be wondering how can facts or research really help inform policy in a situation such as this. Some of you may even suspect that issues are essentially political. That everyone involved is biased and that science has very little to offer. Obviously, I disagree.

Consider for a moment the highly politicized issue of bilingual education. Excluding the fringe element, there are basically two points of view on bilingual education. On the one hand, the supporters of bilingual education worry that children will be left behind because they can't understand what's being taught in school. On the other hand, the critics of bilingual education worry that children will be left behind because they're not learning English.

I know many of you are thinking, but they are learning English. But this is the worry, the concern, so I'm expressing the concerns of people on different sides. Now this very basic question can be answered by research. It's what we call a

September 19, 2002

7

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

empirical question. Which approach produces higher levels of English literacy as efficiently as possible? Which approach produces higher levels in English literacy as efficiently as possible? That's a factual question that can be answered with evidence.

So this panel will tell us whether there's an objective scientific answer to that question and if not, what studies need be done to get a clear answer to that question. So that's the charge to the panel is really simple. Summarize what we know based on scientific research and what we need to know.

So what are the crucial gaps in knowledge about educational progress for English language learners? Despite the challenges and despite the obstacles, which are surely there, how can students achieve literacy. What does science tell us that brings us closer to the goal of leaving no child behind?

Thank you very much.

Donna: Good morning, I'm Donna Christian from the Center for Applied Linguistics and I'm going to give you a quick overview of the work of the panel. I've organized it as kind of a time line because I thought probably you have a handout that describes the overall work of the panel and Valerie has just told you of the kinds of issues that the panel is dealing with and the fact that we're reviewing the research.

September 19, 2002

8

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

So what I'm going to do is quickly narrate the way in which the panel will undertake its work. As you know, a panel was constituted in the Spring of 2002. And you'll hear about them in a minute. This is kind of we're revealing things a little at a time, but it's all in your handouts as well.

The panel was constituted and the first meeting of the panel was held in May. At that meeting, there was a broad discussion of the research issues, as well as a very deep discussion of the search tools and procedures that would be used to survey the research and collect the research that's of the highest quality, to address the questions that are being asked.

There was also a consideration of how the entire review would proceed, in addition to searching and compiling the research then the review and synthesis of what is found. A second meeting was held in July. And here the review procedures were considered in much more detail. The panel will also be operating, via some sub-committees, several sub-committees, that will particularly focus on the various research questions that they have decided to pursue.

An initial search of the literature has been conducted. And the abstracts of research articles, and the articles themselves, are being collected and the analysis is beginning of those.

Number two meeting will happen in October. And in between panel meeting two and three, we're having this set of Outreach

September 19, 2002

9

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

Meetings. As part of the work of the panel, it's very important that the process be open and that there be ample opportunity for input from the public and the various constituencies that have a concern with the issues that the panel is dealing with.

So we are having two Outreach Meetings at this point in the panel to talk about the general concerns that might exist around the work of the panel. The one today here in Los Angeles, and we're having another Outreach meeting next Tuesday in Washington, D.C. where we have a similar distinguished list of people of who will be speaking.

We're also encouraging people to submit written testimony. And if you don't have an opportunity to speak today, or even if you do and you have more to say than there's time for, we encourage you please submit written comments to us. And if anyone isn't clear on how to do that, please see one of us at the end of the meeting, or at any point. But at the Center for Applied Linguistics Web site, there is a place for the National Literacy Panel and a way to submit comments via the Web. We also welcome, if that's a problem, you can send us e-mail, any of us here.

So at the third meeting, the panel will be hearing about the results of the Outreach Meetings, particularly from those panelists who are personally present. We will be summarizing the information that we obtained from the Outreach Meetings. And

also, beginning to look at the research coming in from the initial reviews of what's been found so far.

Then the fourth panel meeting will be next Spring, in March. And between the October and March meeting, they'll really be getting in depth into all of the research articles that we can find and reviewing what can be obtained from those research articles.

And by March, the goal is have a draft, an early draft of the research summary, looking across the articles and documents that have been found. So that the panel will be able at that point, to look for gaps and areas needing clarification as we continue the work.

They'll also consider how the report should be organized at that point, seeing what's available in the research, they'll be able to consider how to organize the research.

The final panel meeting will be next Fall in October. So we have about 18 months from first panel meeting to last panel meeting. And then there will be some additional time after that, as you'll see.

As we have early drafts of the research summary, those will be available and we'll have another set of Outreach Meetings prior to the final meeting. So about this time next year, we'll have another set of Outreach Meetings to talk about the early drafts of what the panel is finding. The panel at that meeting

then will consider the results of the Outreach Meeting, the comments that we've received, as well as comments that will be solicited from expert reviewers.

At that point, the complete draft will be considered and plans for revisions that are needed will be made. And the whole process we intend to have wrapped up in February, when the actual report will be submitted. In addition, one objective of the project is to construct a searchable database that will be available to the public.

The research that is included in the synthesis will be presented in the database so that that will be available so that anyone who is interested in looking at the research themselves, can search the database and find articles and documents of interest.

That's an overview of the process. We'll have five meetings. We have two points in the process at which we have these formally convened Outreach Meetings but we are hoping that we'll receive feedback on an ongoing basis. We will be posting documents on the Web at the Center for Applied Linguistics Web site. And we welcome your visiting the Web site, look at the documents and send us your feedback, as well as any recommendations you have for research that should be considered.

And now I will turn it over to, I'd like to turn it back over to the Superintendent, who is now here.

Superintendent: Good morning. I apologize for being late, but [on] the new kid on the block, they send you in different directions, so I've got my [welcomings] mixed up. I was supposed to be at the welcome of a [CBO] and I saw a friend and I told him I'm going where the money is, but didn't know the timing was backwards for me. So I apologize.

But I truly am excited about having the panel here in Los Angeles County. It really is a panel that I believe is going to guide the direction of our language acquisition, and more important assessment issues when it pertains to language minority students.

And on behalf of Los Angeles county, where we have close to two million children, and I would venture to say close to 50% are English language learners at the primary grades. This discussion is sorely needed and probably long overdue. But do appreciate [OER ite] beginning this process and making sure that the field has the best knowledge and research from practitioners and from school officials and others to really guide this discussion.

Just a little bit about my background, I began as a teacher in a middle school. Was a bilingual educator and bilingual coordinator. Worked my way up the ranks through Superintendent and I guess my latest claim to fame in language-minority issues is when two years ago, in Utah, the state office allowed me to

make the decision on who would be able to be assessed in the SAT
9.

And so I did the right thing. Kids can read and write in English, then they can take it, if not, they can't. Well then they got all upset because they said my scores were wrong. So it was really an interesting process because at that point, the state office did not have clear guidelines.

And truly many of our children should not have been assessed. And I wasn't worried about the scores so much as what it was doing to children. And fortunately now I'm in a state where they have clear guidelines. So I don't know whether I'm better off there or here [laughter], but so sometimes ambiguity helps [laughter] for our children.

But truly, I am pleased to have you here in our county and look forward to being part of the listening. I probably won't be part of the discussion later this morning, but I see many distinguished educators here that will give this panel lots of good information. I see many colleagues too in the research field.

So again, on behalf of LACOE and on behalf of the students and administrators and teachers in the county, thank you for this discussion and this opportunity and I look forward to a great morning. Thank you. [applause]

Tim: Good morning, and welcome. Thank you for being here today, whether you've come to inform us, or whether you have come just to watch because of your commitment to this important subject and to these important children. One of the things I want to point out to you is that several of the panelists aren't with us today. That is not out of disrespect, or lack of interest. That is really pretty common with these kinds of hearings. So the panelists sort of take turns in these roles and it's difficult and expensive to get them all in the same place at the same time. So they are, the group that's here is really representing everybody. At times, some of us up on the chair will have to step out our chair for a moment and the same thing goes. We don't have time for breaks today. We really want to hear as many people as we possibly can.

The information that you provide, whether somebody is in the room or not, will be provided to them. So all of that information will be collected and shared. So whether the panelists are here today to hear it directly from your mouth, or whether it's given to them, it will be part of our deliberations.

It is my distinct pleasure to get to introduce the members of the panel. It is really an impressive collection of scholars. They have an impressive array of accomplishments and contributions that they've made. I could really take most of the morning just going through that.

September 19, 2002

15

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

I was actually told to keep this at a very high level of generality in the introduction. And I tried one out, we have a lot of really good people and they're from impressive places. They told me that was too high a level of generalization. So let me try something in between.

I'm just going to take you through of each of these. Dr. Isabel Beck is a Senior Scientist with the Learning and Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Margarita [Calderon] is a Senior Research Scientist with the Center for Research on Education of At-Risk Students at Johns Hopkins University, Dr. David Francis is a Professor of Psychology at the University of Houston, Dr. Georgia Garcia is an Associate Professor in the College of Education of the University of Illinois at Urbana, Champaign, Dr. Ester Giva is Associate Professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies and Education at the University of Toronto, Dr. Fred [Genesy] is a Professor of Psychology at McGill University in Montreal, Dr. Claude Goldenberg is Professor in the Department of Teacher Education at California State University, Dr. Michael [Camille], and Michael is with us. Michael would you please stand up? He is a professor from School of Education, Stanford University, Dr. Kiko Koda is Professor in the Department of Modern Language at Carnegie Mellon University, Dr. Gail McCoon is Professor of Cognition Psychology and Psycholinguistics at Northwestern

September 19, 2002

16

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

University, Dr. Robert Rueda, and Robert is with us, is a Professor in the Division of Learning and Instruction in the College of Education at the University of Southern California. Dr. Linda Seigal, and Linda is also with us, is Professor in Educational and Counseling Psychology and Special Education at the University of British Columbia, Dr. Robert Slaven is Co-Director of the Center for Research on Education of At-Risk Students and CEO of Success for All Foundation at Johns Hopkins, and Dr. Fred Erickson, and Fred would you please? He is a Chaired Professor of Education at UCLA and he is the panel's methodologist, and so I wanted to cite him,

I am Tim Shanohan, I'm a Professor of Urban Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago and I am serving as Panel of the Chair. The panel as a difficult challenge ahead, as you heard in terms of reviewing and synthesizing the research. They look forward to hearing what you have to say today. The panelists are both erudite and eloquent, but their role today is not to inform you, but actually to listen. And so we won't be making many comments from our chairs today. We're really here to hear what you have to say.

There have been a number of introductions done and I want to do one last one, and that is Mary Beth Donnelly, who is going to be very important to this process. Mary Beth has the very difficult job of trying to hold people to their five minutes.

September 19, 2002

17

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

We certainly know that you have more than five minutes worth of information to tell us. We hope that you will cut to the chase, get the kernel of the most important things that you want us to hear directly. And anything else that you want us to hear that you don't feel like you've had enough time to tell us, please submit in writing in some of the ways that have suggested. Mary Beth will be sitting over here and she will be signaling folks so that they know when their time up and so she's going to be very important and we certainly appreciate her role.

Thank you very much for taking part in this process. We look forward to hearing you. Thanks.

M: What we'd like you to do is start with your name and your affiliation and then you can make your statement.

Shelly: Great. Good morning, my name is Shelly Spiegall-Coleman and I'm the consultant in charge of English Learners Services here at the Los Angeles County Office of Education. I would like to add my welcome to all of you here and how wonderful it is to have the room filled with so many people concerned about the same issue. Dr. Reyna, panel members and colleagues, I'm honored to be able to present to you on one of the most important issues to our county, literacy for children who come to school not speaking English. In our county, 49% of the kindergarten through 2nd

grade children, are English learners. And kindergarten through 12th grade, 33% of the children speak a first language other than English.

With policies changing so quickly at the state and federal level, with very direct mandates, on explicit literacy programs, it has been extremely difficult to engage leaders in these efforts to look at the needs of language minority students. And what effects these policies have had on their achievement.

The 30 years of reading research by NICHD, was very honest in their publication, stating that none of their studies included English-learners. The National Reading Panel, like NICHD, did not address English-learners in a comprehensive, clear fashion.

Yet the conclusions of these major documents, and many others, have shaped the criteria and the content of textbooks, staff development and reading policies for all students, including English-learners. With this as our context, I want to pose two questions for the panel to consider in their deliberations.

One, what is the role of English language development standards and instruction for young students who are learning to read in their first and second language?

Two, what assessment instruments can be administered to show progress in student literacy and language development? As for the first question, it's clear to the teachers in LA County with

classrooms filled with English-learners that we're asking our students to learn to read and to learn English at the same time. Having said this, it's almost incomprehensible that current policy directs teachers to teach the same lesson to all students no matter their proficiency level in English with little, if any consideration for English language development.

Currently, the two language-arts textbooks in kindergarten through 5 in California, call for two and half hours of a language-arts block where all students receive relatively the same lessons. Teachers of English-learners are given a supplemental teachers guide that calls for an additional 30 to 45 minutes of pre-teaching or re-teaching language skills presented in the language-arts block.

The questions often asked by teachers is, if all my students in classroom are English-learners, then why shouldn't the program and the curriculum in the two and half hour block been developed for English-learners? And why does one rely on a mere 30 to 45 minutes to try to translate what occurred earlier?

Drs. Margarita Calderon and Robert Slaven, members of your panel have already addressed this issue with their research on the implementation of Success For All with English-learners. The modifications of their curriculum and instruction for their revised program, what they looked at, what they chose to modify

should be examined and used to give directions to the field,
policy-makers, and publishers.

In addition, later this morning, you'll be hearing about
academic achievement results of students throughout California,
including our county, who've worked with curriculum and
instructional programs such as GLAD and RIGHT, both in English-
only and in bilingual settings.

These programs were specifically developed for English-
learners. Their accomplishments should help develop a research-
based framework for future work.

My second question referred to appropriate assessment. NCLB
and Title One states that English-learners should be assessed in
a valid and reliable manner and provided reasonable
accommodations on assessments, including to the extent
practicable, assessments in the language and form most likely to
yield accurate data.

In California, our accountability system is built upon
results of statewide assessments that were developed for and
normed on native English-speakers. Investigating what is meant
by assessment in a form that would yield valid and reliable
results would be extremely helpful to the field.

The research of Dr. Jamal [Ahbadi] from Crest on assessment
and accommodations for English-language-learners helps to
translate what this might mean for test-developers and teachers

working to construct curriculum-embedded assessments. Without reliable instruments for programs and classroom application, English-learners at the lower levels of proficiency, will never be able to demonstrate the tremendous amount of growth they make in their early years.

Finally, we at the Los Angeles County Office of Education, are pleased to host you today. And would welcome the opportunity to work with you in the future. School has just begun and it's our children and our teachers who will benefit from what you learn and how you disseminate it to us. Thank you very much.

F: Good morning esteemed panelists and colleagues in the audience. My name is [Magali Lavandez], I'm Associate Professor from Loyola Marymount University, on leave with the West Ed, and also the President-elect of the California Association for Bilingual Education.

I'm going to address academic literacy development for secondary language minority students. In the past, schools have typically responded to the increased diverse linguistic and academic needs of secondary language minorities students, by taking a reductive approach of lowered expectations oversimplified content and a focus on isolated basic skills, ensuring that the minority academic achievement gap will continue to persist.

There is a compelling need to better understand the acquisition of content-specific academic literacies across the curriculum as a requisite for reversing the achievement chasm in language-minority students. Additionally, we need to better understand the language demands of content-area classes at the secondary level and to simultaneously address the ways in which teachers can accelerate both language and content learning for secondary students.

Research has begun to examine the relation between general language skills, content-specific literacies and content learning, as well as learning issues facing older students about whom our knowledge is more limited. [Grubens and Cummins], [August and Acouda], Short, and [Solem and Rose] begin to conceptualize academic language development in one such way.

One example of academic literacy development, is that it extends beyond a discreet set of linguistic features that can be taught, such as functions and structures, and includes academic discourse and register, a term adapted from [Halliday].

According to this conceptualization, academic language can be seen as a register of English and that can be documented empirically through analyzing the ways in which teachers and students construct conversations and learning in classrooms. Similarly, the National Academy of Education and the National Education Research and Policy Priorities Board, highlighted three

research priorities that are critical transitions in the development of academic literacies for bilingual as well as bidialectical students.

And these include the transition from first language to English, the transition from oral language to literacy, and the transition from literacy to the academic discourse of specific disciplines.

These research priorities should include both quantitative large-scale analyses and qualitative analyses based on the teaching and learning for secondary language minority students. One example of large-scale study is the results from [Collier and Thomas], who concluded that when middle-school students arrive as immigrants to this country, on grade level literacy in their first language, they need two years to acquire enough English to be on grade level with their peers.

That is to say, that they need to make more gains than the average native English speaker makes for every year to catch up to be on grade level. Although this is a very difficult task to accomplish, it's not impossible. And I'm going to give you an example from two research sites that we have been involved with, in which student's academic literacy attainment is accelerated through systematic rigorous and additive approaches.

One site is International High School in New York City. International High School was established in 1985 as an

alternative public high school in New York City. Entrance requirements include that students must have immigrated to this country within the previous four years and have failed the state language proficiency examination in English.

Ninety percent of the students at International High School passed the regents competency exam and go on to post-secondary education. As a model for an additive approach in development of academic literacy for recently-arrived adolescents, International High School has a professional culture which promotes academic achievement through high school, with high expectations by a caring, well-prepared staff.

One such example of how this is done, is through the scaffolding of first and second language. In one example, in our observations, students prepare a report on language development and what is language, is the research question. And the teacher asks a Chinese immigrant student to first translate and then explain the differences between what their report is in Chinese and English.

Secondary students are encouraged to write academically by using their first language as a bridge to writing in their new language across the curriculum. This type of instructions occurs school-wide.

A second example is Project [Write Aspire] from San Diego County Office of Education. In which, academic writing is

achieved through an additive approach. You will hear more longitudinal data from this project elsewhere today. But what the data is beginning to reveal is that students who are immigrant students at the secondary level, and participated in Spanish, or Spanish-speaker's courses, and English language development, and whose teachers' participated in professional development, but performed better than their counterparts who did not participate in this program.

I'm going to give you a couple of examples of students thinking through this process in terms of how they were able to accomplish well. Antonio was a 16 year-old high school student in this area. He was able to articulate how the use of writing rubrics had helped his development in English and influenced him in other subjects.

"My writing has gotten so much better," he said, "I even won a contest and got to shake hands with Miss California." When asked how he won the contest, he said, "I got good grades in Algebra and wrote about my learning to write better in English." When probed about how his good grades, how he got good grades in Algebra and what that had to do with learning how to write in English, Antonio responded, "I learning how to break things down step by step in writing. Then when I had a word problem in Algebra, I could do the same thing."

So my two questions are, how can academic language acceleration take place effectively for secondary language minority students, and in Antonio's case, in what ways do meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic development foster English literacy achievement for English-learners?

Additionally, there is also a need to develop a body of research that informs teacher professional development communities about effective instruction for English-language learners. The converging needs for accelerating academic literacy attainment for secondary English-learners, and the development of a practitioners knowledge space are inextricably inter-related.

Secondary teachers of language minority students need to expand their knowledge and skills in content area pedagogy and knowledge augmented by a commitment to accelerate and engage students in learning. According to [Walkie], teachers need to adapt and amplify language and learning for English language learners.

Therefore, my third question is what are the characteristics of quality teaching and learning for academic literacy development for language minority students?

Thank you very much.

Tim: Thank you.

Marlene: Good morning, my name is Marlene Wilson, I'm the Deputy Superintendent for the Lennox School District, a very small district in Los Angeles county where we have 95% of our population is Latino and 85% are English language learners. So we only teach English language learners for the most part. We're also in a 1.1 square mile right on the flight path of LAX. So we're right below the airplanes.

I would like to begin my comments by giving you a profile of two Lennox students. Maria came to this country when she was 11 years old, literate in Spanish, but not speaking a word of English. She enrolled in our middle school as a 6th grader, received language arts, math, science, social studies in Spanish, and ELD, initially, but quickly, moving to English only.

She graduated from 8th grade with honors, attended high school, was the valedictorian of her class, and is now in her second year of MIT, on a scholarship. Maria is one of five children, with no dad in the home. Mom works all day to support the family. Now let me give you a picture of another student.

Juan was born in Lennox. Attended our schools since kindergarten. He worked through a transitional bilingual program in his early elementary years. Then Proposition 227 came around and his parents chose English as his language of instruction. Then came the ELD standards from California and English language-

arts standards from California and one couldn't tell whether Juan was in English reading or he was in ELD instruction.

He trusted the adults around him to make the right choices for him. He went to the middle school and he had five different teachers at the middle school. Some of which, most of which, just told him to read a book, answer the questions, at the end of the chapter. And there were no pictures in the book. And he started getting absentee assignments because he did not understand his teachers. He couldn't understand the text in the book. He didn't know what he was supposed to do. No one at home could help him because they didn't speak English. After a few [abs] he was put on academic probation. Whatever that means.

His parents would call to see the counselors and then Juan started skipping school. He was very artistic, so he joined a tagging group and had a lot more fun. He was successful in something. He barely graduated from 8th grade and in his first year of high school, he dropped out.

Both of these stories, I think can be looked at from the literacy perspective, of both L1 and L2. I see that your mission is to look at the relationship between first and second language literacy and how it affects the success or failure of the English language learners.

I think one of the obvious differences is these children in these stories are between Maria's solid background in her primary

language and Juan's move over to different literacies at crucial different points in his life. And I think that that research has proven over and over.

Unfortunately, in states like California, we are not able to practice the best, use the best practices in the field. Because what drives us are political issues, not educational issues. Juan, on the other hand represents a large number of English language learners. Born in this country, they are victims of political, social and legislative changes that occur for them on a regular basis.

227 in California has created a generation of 'Juans.' What I call "literacy tragedy" manifests itself very, very much in the middle schools. We have a middle school of 2200 students. 75% of them are at a beginning to intermediate level of proficiency in English, because of all of these changes that have occurred.

And at that level, students are responsible for so much of the contextualized text, that before the first month of school, some turn off. They can only stand to fail so much and then they give up. Secondary teachers teach their content. They don't teach students. Secondary teachers teach what they want the school to teach, algebra, science, social science.

So the questions that I ask you to deal with, have to do with instructional practices and [staff] development. How do we differentiate English literacy instruction based on levels of

English language proficiency? One program does not meet all these needs. There needs to be an intentional development of resources and strategies to teach literacy to ELL students both in primary and secondary settings.

As you look at instructional practices, I ask you to look at strategies for secondary language-arts content area teachers to deal with complex text. Strategies to help teachers differentiate instruction based on proficiency levels. Strategies to chunk text so it becomes comprehensible to students. Strategies to teach how to go beyond facts and to teach students how to think and problem-solve.

Something else to look at is what is the right time to introduce literacy in L2? Is it in pre-school, is it kindergarten? Is it when a student reaches a certain level of proficiency in English? Is it proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing?

But my call to you is to look at instructional practices in the middle schools setting or secondary settings where there is a crisis at this point. Thank you.

Tim: Thank you very much.

Gabriel : Good morning Dr. Reyna, members of this national panel. My name is Gabriel [Medel], I'm not an educator, I'm a

parent. I'm director of [Parents] For Unity, it's a volunteer grass-root community-based organization that acts as a liaison between school, local, state and federal government fostering information and support to the community.

We promote the general welfare of low-income and immigrant families by endeavoring to maximize academic success for all children. And by improving our neighborhood. Making them a clean and safe place to live. Our goal is to empower parents, and community members, by providing information and legal knowledge as they seek quality education for their children. Disseminating information regarding the impact of new legislation pertaining to education and communication, promoting the creation of true partnership to our educational community to achieve educational equity for all children.

We provide training sessions for parent and community members at various local sites. We provide technical assistance to parents on leadership roles and individual support to parents on school-related issues. We also help to organize the community to their own advancement. Our involvement with parents across California for the last 7 years, gives us the determination to testify today.

Parent's voice is rarely heard. As you can see on the speaker list, and that is not by accident. It is a result of how

the system works. And it is part of the kind of issue that needs to be addressed in the educational reform for the next century.

Low income and minority language parents are highly concerned about the future of their children. And for us, it is very difficult to penetrate the system and dedicate the time required to be assertive and monitoring and improving public education. Despite our parent groups have been assertive at local and state level working in an organized way to secure educational regulation and legislation that will open the door of opportunity to our children.

We need to undo the myth that Latino parents are not interested in the education of their children. The fact is that, I never met a parent that did not want a better life and access to opportunity for their children that would allow them to more fully participate in our democratic process.

I can certify to you that parents want high level of literacy for their children. It is important that the issue of literacy for English-learners be given the attention that it deserves. Given the number of students that attend public education, and are failing under English immersion without a scientifically-proved literacy program as proscribed under No Child Left Behind.

The research needs to pay attention to role parents play, and in particular, the role of the development of the first

language. Parents want a high level of bi-literacy. They see the critical role that bi-literacy professional can play in many different fields. Education, international business, communication, health, etc.

Most parents who communicate with Parents For Unity, express interest in programs that promote bi-literacy. This is not only because they believe that their children should be able to communicate in two languages, this request is often made because parents want desperately to help their children learn to read and make academic progress. But they themselves are not literate in English. If children are taught to read in their primary language, while also learning English, parents will become very actively involved helping their children with their schoolwork and the children prosper as a result.

Our parents are ready, willing and able to help their children. Reading levels soar in their primary language. In most cases, however, the request of parents have been denied. This has been our experience. Today parents who opt for bilingual education program are still having to overcome barriers at the school site and district are not allowing them to exercise their legal rights.

And the energy is spent by parent groups to insure access has been extensive and that could have been directed toward literacy. We would like for you to include in your research a

study on whether to let parents become more involved when their children have access to bi-literacy programs. And whether this involvement leads to better academic results in reading.

The research needs to address the issue that English learners require additional instructional strategy that take into account that they are learning a second language and also a student may arrive with prior literacy experience in their own language.

Our children don't come to school with empty minds. They have experience that the school needs to use. Educators and politicians are making decisions about reading without consulting at all with parents. Yet in many articles about the gap in performance, parents are blamed.

Parents want choices and information necessary to make informed decisions. Parents are left out in terms of getting information on good leadership programs. Parents of children who are in English-only programs also desperately want language materials available for them. Which explains how they can help their children at home.

We would like research on whether primary language material provided to parents of [inaudible] children in English-only program improves their academic success of those children in learning to read.

We also believe that research needs to be done in the area of assessment of academic performance for English learning and differentiate assessment tools for primary language academic success to allow us to monitor the access to the core curriculum for our English-learner children.

There is an urgent need for research on English immersion [levels] as if really is one of the scientifically proved teaching methods and if language-arts and phonics reading curriculum are really appropriate English-language development methods, that our English-learner children need to learn English and acquire the standard academic proficiencies.

As President Bush declared in No Child Left Behind, we also believe that education is a national priority and a local responsibility. Only research-based curriculum may turn a failing school into a successful one.

We honestly believe that every child can learn. What we need is to develop appropriate culturally diverse and scientifically proved teaching methods and research-based curriculum for English learner students. Thank you.

Tim: Thank you very much.

Bobbie: Good morning. My name is Bobbie [Sidi Sahouchens]. I am currently a high school ESL and English language-arts teacher

at Arroyo Valley High School in San Bernardino, California, about 60 miles east of here.

I first have to say not all secondary teachers teach just content. I definitely teach students and make sure they understand the content I'm responsible for teaching. I've been teaching ESL and English since 1971. I've worked in the migrant labor camps in South Florida in the public schools in Washington, D.C., and for the past 16 years, in San Bernardino.

As a teacher, and the voice of teachers, and a teacher who's very concerned about English learners, I look at the research all the time in order to inform my practices. And I have to say that the research on effective practices for secondary students is very inadequate. Most of our practices are based on research done with elementary and specifically primary grade level English learners, or for English-only students who are having difficulty reading.

These methods are not the best ones to use with adolescents. Also at high school, time is short and it's become it seems even shorter, and even more critical for us to be using the most efficient practices. With high-stakes testing, the student who enters high school with no English must pass very inappropriate examinations in order to receive a high school diploma. And in order to help them reach success on those tests, we must be using

the very best practices available, and we don't know what those are.

The complexities continue to increase at high-school because they need higher level cognitive skills and being able to express themselves in higher-level academic language, the higher level of literacies demanded. The safety nets are looser because parents and many teachers believe that the kids don't need backup and that they are ready to take on the world, and that's not true, definitely not true. Especially for English learners.

And in addition, the expectations of students who speak English with an accent tend to be lower, despite the claims of many teachers that their expectations are high. All we have to do is walk into their classrooms and look at worksheets and see that that's not true. Or we can look at the gifted classes and count the number of English learners that happen to be in those classes. They're not there.

Another complexity are the groups of English learners that are in high school. The smallest group, but a group that most people worry a lot about are recent immigrants with little or no education. The literature on how to work with adolescents who have high levels of oracy but very minimal literacy is sparse. I know that in about four months I can teach them literacy skills in their primary language and then make the transition, and I know that I can get them to minimal levels of literacy, but

certainly not 12th grade levels of literacy in four years.

Sometimes I feel like I'm a General in a war, against the system in order to help the students. And I don't want to be a warrior, I signed up to be a teacher.

But that group is small. It's very small. It causes a lot of concern, because we don't know what to do with them. Another group of students that receive attention are recent immigrants who arrive with some education and some levels of literacy. And I know how to help them. I know that they need rich, rich ESL classes, that they need at least two hours of that a day, that they need sheltered high levels of content at their grade level with varied instructional strategies. Those teachers, the content-area teachers need to work as a team in order to build academic literacy while the students are learning basic social literacy. And I know this works. I have many of my students who arrive in 9th or 10th grade speaking not a lick of English, graduate from high school, go on to college. I have two of them who work with me teaching mathematics. They're teaching AP calculus, honors geometry, and one arrived in 9th grade, one arrived in 10th grade speaking not any English at all. And I have lots of students out there who are teaching in San Bernardino, who arrived in 9th or 10th grade without any English skills.

The largest group that seems to be the most ignored however are those kids who were born here, or those kids who entered in primary grades speaking a language other than English. We know that their dropout rate nation wide is at least 48%. I know this is tied to literacy. How many times can you feel stupid in a classroom and continue to return? I get the survivors at high school.

Their discipline problems are high, the majority have never been in bilingual education, they're not literate in their primary language, they know their culture is not valued, their language is not valued and by extension of that, they are not valued in school, and the system continues to reinforce that.

We cannot continue to try to serve them by teaching them phonics with scripted programs, because they know how to make the sound of words. What they don't have is fluency, what they don't have are strategies to attack higher-level academic tasks. And some of them still continue to come, even though they know there's now way they're going to be able to pass those high school exit exams and receive a diploma.

So if you could address those issues, just a little bit, the teachers in the classroom would be highly appreciative. Thank you.

Tim: Thank you very much.

September 19, 2002

40

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

Faye: Good morning. My name is Faye Shin, I'm an Associate Professor at Cal State University, Long Beach and I'm also the President of the California Association for Asian Bilingual Education.

At this time I would like to briefly highlight two areas that I believe the panel needs to consider for literacy development for English language learners. They are heritage language development and the measures for assessing the rate of development of literacy among English learners.

First of all I would like to emphasize the importance

[Side A ends/Side B begins]

Fay: ...it is becoming more apparent that literacy development in the first language benefits English language development for English learners. In several studies involving Asian-Pacific American students and communities, the conclusions support the research on the cultural, social and linguistic benefits for heritage language development.

The participants in several of my studies included Vietnamese, [Mong] and Korean immigrant children. The studies found that the students overwhelmingly were in favor of developing their heritage languages. A strong majority, over 90%

of the students stated in interviews and surveys that they would like to learn how to read and write in their own, heritage language.

The studies also showed students have positive attitudes towards their heritage language and culture, and more importantly, they wanted to develop the literacy in their first language.

In addition to positive student attitudes on heritage language development, contrary to what the media likes to portray, there is also strong support from parents in the Asian-Pacific American community.

The second issue I'd like to address is about the best measures for assessing the course and rate of development of literacy in English learners. I believe this is a very important question because of the current emphasis on content standards and reclassification of English learners.

The California ELD standards are essentially based on the California English language-arts standards, developed for native English speakers. More importantly, we need to consider whether these grade-level content expectations consider the impact of students who are in the process of developing English language skills upon the rate at which the content standards could be acquired.

First of all, we do not know how long it takes to reach the specific benchmarks. Despite the interest in this question, the existing data is insufficient. Previous studies have focused on when children reach reclassification standard. The issue of how long it takes to acquire English has always been debated in education. California as you know, Prop 227 allows only one year for students to acquire English. However, several large-scale studies have found that an average of five years is required for English learners to obtain grade norms for academic levels of English proficiency.

In addition, grade level is 50 percentile, which by definition means half of the students will fail. This research data on the length of time required for English learners to catch up in English academic achievement, have implications for both assessments and benchmarks. Although this is useful information, it refers only to how long it takes, [acquires] to reach high levels of proficiency. It does not give us an idea of how long it takes to reach intermediate stages along the way.

The federal and state requirements for programs for English learners require that ELD instruction must be differentiated according to the levels of each student's English proficiency. In addition, all our English learners must receive a defined ELD program until redesignated, and ongoing assessment of students' progress in English proficiency must take place.

Although specific benchmarks in English language development standards are defined, there is no assessment or markers indicating what specific benchmarks have been reached or needs to be emphasized for instruction. The California English Language Development Test [or CELDT] only indicates proficiency levels in the areas of writing, reading, listening and speaking.

Second, the goals of English language development and the benchmarks and performance standards are crucial as to why students are classified as English learners to start with, and their academic achievement is the basis to their reclassification as fluent English proficient.

First of all, school districts have not reached a consensus on a system of reclassification for English learners. Reclassification is based on multiple measures. [Linguati] found reclassification criteria for seven school districts in California, included varying components, such as grades, the SAT9, the [CELDT], more cognitive academic language dimensions and parent consent.

In addition to the inconsistencies and arbitrary choice of criteria, the component of reclassification based on standardized norm reference tests needs to be reexamined. Academic English criterion is complicated and usually measured with a standardized English reading achievement test, such as the SAT9. These tests are norm referenced to a national sample of largely English

speakers and usually a criterion around the 36th percentile is used for redesignation.

It does not make sense to use a criterion based on a norm-referenced test developed for a different population. Another problem is that the collection of frequency of assessments used to reclassify students are insufficient.

In conclusion, the methods used to calculate reclassification rates distorts the reality of achievement for English learners. Since reading development is one of the most fundamental skills that English learners must acquire if they are to be successful in school, establishing clear, developmentally appropriate and rigorous benchmarks for growth in reading is critical. There is a need to examine how long it takes children to reach intermediate stages, known as benchmarks. One of the central goals for this panel should be to determine an average rate of achieving benchmarks, including the stage of reclassification as fluent English proficient.

In conclusion, I hope that this panel will consider the importance of heritage language development and the best measures for assessing the rate of development of literacy in English learners needs to be considered for the development of literacy among language minority children. Thank you.

September 19, 2002

45

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

Rosalia: Good morning, I'm Rosalia Salinas, San Diego County of Education. Sylvia Reyes was not able to be here today, so I'm forwarding her message.

For the past five years, our county office has been very closely involved with something, a program you've been hearing a bit today, and that's the WRITE Institute. The WRITE Institute, Writing Reform Institute for Teaching Excellence.

As I mentioned, five years ago, we started collaborating with this particular institute that had already been identified as a dissemination national project through Title 7, in the area of staff development. We approached one of our largest districts in the county and I believe it is the largest secondary district in the state, the Sweetwater School District, to look at a model that would promote English language development, but to add a parallel rigorous Spanish language-arts under the auspices of the Spanish for Spanish Speakers. We knew that at secondary, there were very few models that were addressing English language learners and that looked at both language areas.

We wanted to see if in fact, if we provided this parallel program, if we could see increase in the area of English language development. The project ASPIRE, as this was called, accelerated the acquisition of written and oral language skills of middle and high school English language learners, through explicit, systematic, direct instruction of academic language skills within

a standards-based curriculum that focused on literacy and the effective transference of writing skills from the primary language to English.

Our preliminary data for the past five years, and I brought some data to share with the panel, shows that we have significant student achievement in the following areas: increased student achievement in reading and writing, improved writing scores on multiple measures, increased enrollment in preparatory courses, and decreased dropout rates.

Over the five years, we have seen a sustained growth and see a closing of the achievement gap. At this point, this is preliminary data, and we would like to forward to the panel our findings that show more comprehensive data as it becomes available. Some of the issue that we would like to leave, or the questions for the panel, are the following.

What are the effects of primary language instruction on second-language acquisition, particularly when addressing middle and high-school students? What are the effective methodologies for the transference of literacy skills from Spanish to English? How does access to content area knowledge in the first language impact the acquisition of literacy in both first and second language?

In the area of assessment, what is the role of primary language assessment in the development of literacy in the primary

September 19, 2002

47

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

language, and the development of literacy in English? And what is the role of primary language assessment to inform content area instruction for English learners?

Later this morning you will be hearing from Donna [Hee] who will address some of the other issues as far as the systemic reform.

Barbara: Hello. My name is Barbara [Flutis] and I'm a Professor at California State University, San Bernardino. I know a couple of you on the panel. And I'd like to address my comments to five points. Since this is a review of the literature, I would like to propose that the committee, the panel honor and include the different reading paradigms that are currently competing for what's the best reading paradigm.

But I believe historically, socio-historically, there are three. Proponents of phonics only, proponents that view reading as skills, that is an accumulation of hierarchical skills, and then more recently the socio-psycho-linguistic, socio-cultural, and socio-psychogenesis group that has emerged in the last 20 years.

This research is both quantitative and qualitative and since we live in America, and voices are to be heard, I hope that you exercise our democratic right as researchers to include all three competing paradigms in the review of the literature.

I would strongly suggest that we go back 50 years, 50 years that mark the genesis of the types of research that is historically there. Number two, I would like to focus the panel on making visible the legacy of the deficit view for English language learners in this country. It is rampant, it is pervasive, it views English learning as a problem. It does not acknowledge that first language as an asset, and I hope that the panel makes those studies visible.

Number three, I hope that when you review this literature, especially in the experimental research, you apply strict internal and external validity criteria, because even though your charge is for a review of literature, I believe that this will be used for policy. And I hope that this is taken seriously.

Number four, I hope that you not only include quantitative studies, but also qualitative studies. We have an enormous area of qualitative studies, for example the learning record. They have been in operation for 12 years, they have data on thousands and thousands of kids throughout the United States in different languages. And that's very important research.

Reading recovery for emergent literacy, they have thousands of data. Also miscue analysis. Miscue analysis has been around for 38 years and there are bodies of research that capture the complexity of the reading process and all the cueing systems, not just the graphophonic cueing system. And how both dialect

speakers and second-language speakers acquire reading proficiency.

And lastly, I'd like to recommend that studies that propose that programs and methods teach are erroneous. Programs and methods do not teach. Teachers teach. And we need to include studies that focus on teachers' pedagogical knowledge, teachers' beliefs, especially about ability and their knowledge about how reading works. And I believe that those studies are in the qualitative area. In fact, doctor Rueda is a large proponent of that. He has done tremendous studies in that area, and I hope that you acknowledge that.

I want to end by saying that these are millions of children that we're dealing with. It's a crises. And people are screwing around as my colleagues have mentioned, that they believe programs teach. It's not true. There's a diversity of types of kids, it's just not one size fits all, there's tremendous differences, many languages, there's immigrants, there's second-generation, there's third generation, and we have to acknowledge the complexity, the enormous complexity of this area.

Language learning, we have tremendous data, not just in this country but from the Australians, from the English, from the Latin Americans, from all over the world, and we, and Europe. We should be also examining that research as well. Thank you very much.

September 19, 2002

50

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

Good morning, I'm Kim [Manwinlan] with the Center for Language Minority Education and Research at Cal State Long Beach. And I also represent NAFEA, the National Association For Education and Advancement of Cambodian, Laotian, and Vietnamese Americans.

Learning to read is essential for every child, especially if that child is not to be left behind. Realizing the significance of literacy as a cornerstone for academic success, Congress approved the Reading Excellence Act in 1999, develop a national comprehensive research based on effort to realize this goal. However, this act drew exclusively from studies of bona lingua English speakers, and so [Obambala] at that time commissioned a set of papers to draw together research on how best to support literacy development in bilingual students.

Consequently, Dr. David Ramirez was given the charge to synthesize all of these papers in order to provide guidance to provide bilingual students with optimal teaching and learning opportunities. Dr. David Ramirez's paper titled, 'Bilingualism and Literacy: Problem or Opportunity?' is available through the office of [OALA], and because of the time limit, I will only present a couple of key points from the work that he did for the purpose of highlighting issues and concerns from the language community that I represent, the Vietnamese, which is not included explicitly in any of the research on literacy development.

The data that I will share came from the Southern California Association of Vietnamese Language Schools and Centers, representing 70 schools and 900 heritage language teachers, serving over 12,000 Vietnamese students in community-based language schools throughout the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside and San Diego.

We also network with over 300 schools in other states throughout the United States. Wherever there's the Vietnamese community of 20 families or more, sooner or later a Vietnamese language school is established. This summer I learned that a new school, a Vietnamese language school is established in Bronx of New York. At a recent institute for heritage-language teachers, we drew over 350 teachers from all over the United States.

When I examined Dr. Ramirez's findings regarding reading and literacy and development for bilingual students, primarily those with Spanish language backgrounds, I concurred with a number of points that he stated. Currently I'm also teaching the bi-literacy method readings, Vietnamese and English at Cal State University of Fullerton.

Point number one, extensive review by Dr. Ramirez shows strong evidence of increased phonological awareness in the native language improves literacy in English. And that phonological or phonemic awareness provides a strong foundation for literacy development, not only for monolingual English speakers, but for

monolingual non-English speakers. Because phonemic or phonological, one is such a fundamental literacy development, it should be developed in the language that children possess the greatest comprehension. When phonemic awareness are taught to English learners in English, the students are faced with double burden of having to identify both sounds and meanings in any of the learning activities.

Additionally, since the English language follows the phonetic principle only 50% of the time versus over 90% of the time correlation in Spanish and 100% correlation in Vietnamese, this fundamental concept is best taught through the English learner's native language, which will be transferred easily to English at a later phase.

In the past, most Vietnamese parents wait until their children learn how to read and write in English before enrolling them in Vietnamese language schools. However, as they see first hand the benefit of Vietnamese literacy to English reading development, more and more parents are enrolling their children in Vietnamese language schools before they enter Kindergarten, first grade.

The popularity of these language schools attest to the Vietnamese parents' practical knowledge of the power of primary language literacy and its correlation to school achievement.

The second point that I want to make is academic literacy development. Literacy development goes beyond phonological awareness and connection between sound and print. A higher level of literacy or academic literacy is central to English learners' ability to achieve sustained academic success beyond K-12.

Dr. Ramirez [revealed] the research in bilingual students indicates that the levels of proficiency in students' native language determine the level of academic literacy in English. He differentiates novice bilinguals, those who find it easier to translate from English to the native language, from full bilinguals, those who can translate easily from L1 to L2 as from L2 to L1.

Novice bilinguals have lexical links between two languages, while truly bilingual students can draw both on lexical and conceptual links. Based on the data we collected from our community, a majority of Vietnamese students fall into the category of novice bilinguals. Although they show greater academic achievement compared to other minority groups, they remain limited in academic literacy.

Over 50% of the Vietnamese-American students do not meet the entrance English language requirement for college. Many of them are forced to take remedial English courses in their freshman year. 40-60% of the Vietnamese students at Cal State Long Beach do not pass the exit writing proficiency exam each year, or

according to the data shared by the Vietnamese Students Association, there are hundreds of Vietnamese graduates who have yet to receive their diplomas for not having passed this exit writing proficiency exam.

I bring up this point because when literacy issues are discussed, too often we stay at the emergent or beginning literacy level and do not go past basic reading and writing skills.

Academic literacy in English is a great concern for our population that has not been addressed adequately because the negative impacts show up after students have left high school, the K-12 arena.

In conclusion, I urge the panel to be more inclusive in your effort to gain better understanding in literacy development, by commissioned studies of literacy development in languages other than English and Spanish, and most importantly to expand the notion of literacy to go beyond K-12. Thank you.

Teresa: Good morning, I'm Teresa Gomez. I'm a member of the Education Commission for the California State PTA. The California State PTA is the oldest and largest state-wide volunteer organization working on children, youth and family issues. The state PTA serves more than one million members. On behalf of the PTA, I would like to express our thanks and

appreciation for being included in the National Panel's first public Outreach Meeting.

The California State PTA believes that literacy is vital to every person and to the welfare of our country. PTA believes English language learners must be offered an education that will provide them with the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to realize their full potential and to enable them to become productive citizens.

PTA further believes and constantly works toward programs for limited and non-English speaking students to make successful transitions into English so that they may progress well in their regular education program.

The accurate assessment of each student's English and native language skills necessary to ensure placement in programs that best meets a student's educational needs, is something else that the PTA works toward. Appropriate staff development opportunities, including multi-cultural components, is another area of our focus.

Development of policies in local school districts, we're achieving the above-mentioned goals and financial resources to support them, so that all students may achieve proficiency in English, is another one of our focuses.

Additionally, PTA supports regular evaluations by local school districts, of their English language acquisition programs, as well as reporting those findings to the community.

What PTA would like the panel to address in your further research is the value of increased parent and family involvement in the success and achievement of English language learners.

The school and the home cannot have separate pathways toward literacy success. Parents not only have the right and the responsibility to be informed and to participate in all decisions regarding their children. But they must be encouraged to participate in literacy partnerships with their children's schools.

Since the area of education of English language learners is currently a very high-focus, priority item for the PTA, we welcome the panel's further study, research and dissemination of findings on the effects of parents as partners in their children's educational success.

With this knowledge, PTA can continue to effectively inform and educate their membership and their communities about the problems of illiteracy and also to provide them with information about local resources and literacy programs. We can encourage and support the development of reading and literacy programs within their schools and communities. We can support and

encourage consideration of the needs of the immigrant population in all areas of literacy.

We can assist local libraries to secure volunteers trained to help teach basic literacy skills. And we can support legislation that will provide funding to assist communities to secure adequate literacy education services and programs. In advance, I thank you for your attention to this area of concern and the opportunity to speak today.

M: Good morning. I come to you as a representative of the California Reading Association, currently the Vice President of the California Reading Association. I happen to work for Houghton-Mifflin Company, that's my full-time job and I'm also a member of the Governing Board of the Rollin Unified School District, which is to the east of this Los Angeles County Office of Ed.

I come to you with a set of questions that reflect essentially my understanding of the field, and questions that I certainly would like to have answers for that I'm sure that you're seeking as well. Some of it redundant, because many of these questions have already been asked. But risking the redundancy that certainly English learners need in their own instruction, I'm going to just proceed with these questions.

How do we facilitate moving from a deficit model to one that focuses on funds of knowledge, that English learners bring to each learning activity? How do we make our roots, that is the rainbow of cultures, the [poliphony] of voices in our classrooms more evident, more prominent and integral part of our literacy instruction?

What must we do to connect children, culture, the curriculum and the texts that we ask our children to read? How do we reduce the numbers of English learners assigned to special education classes? And conversely, how do we increase the number of identified gifted and talented students among our English learners?

Do the existing numbers in either category reflect accurate designations? How extensive is the scaffolding of literacy instruction delivered to English learners? Are accommodations being made by the teacher, such as jump starting before the lessons are delivered, making accommodations during delivery, and providing interventions for special needs? Or is the delivery of this instruction the same for all students, essentially a one-size-fits-all delivery system?

Do we have evidence that simultaneous English literacy instruction and English literacy acquisition required of most English learners in California is producing competent English readers who can demonstrate that they can sustain that reading

competence beyond the primary grades, especially into the middle school and into the high school.

How can we compare the achievement of students in waived - - that is waived classrooms here in California are essentially where parents choose to have the primary language used for instruction in these -- classrooms to the achievement of students in structured English immersion classrooms in longitudinal studies, beyond the primary grades that make comparisons of cohorts through at least the middle school, and after a transitional English reading phase has been completed by the waived students?

Are teachers in California implementing the State of California's English language development standards? What is actually happening in classrooms in the name of ELD instruction? Are teachers teaching in English and calling that ELD? Or is this critical fifth instructional block, given the time it requires, and is it implemented in a manner that reflects sound pedagogical principles?

What percentage of students who have failed to pass the California high school exit exam are also English learners? What percentage of English learners have now passed the California high school exit exam? And this is the, I have a daughter who is in her third year of high school. She's a junior. She took that high school exit exam as a freshman, so we're looking at a large

September 19, 2002

60

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

number in our district, 600 students at one of our high schools, that still have not passed that exit exam. So that's the group that I'm really referring to at this point.

What percentage of students that came from a full bilingual program in the elementary grades that have now taken the California high school exit exam have passed it? What is the comparison of the percentages of those English learners who have passed the exam, who came from an English immersion and a bilingual education elementary instructional program?

We have looked closely at the reading achievement of English learners. Have we critically looked at the writing ability of English learners?

What learning opportunities outside the classroom would have the most impact on closing the achievement gap for the majority of English learners? We need to identify and implement effective programs that augment the learning that begins in the classroom, whether they are preschool, after school, Saturday school or completely away from school.

Alternative ways of closing the achievement gap must be sought and implemented.

Because of my involvement with the International Reading Association, I chaired the Multilingual Classroom Committee for two years, that work with that committee led to the publication of a volume that will be out in probably very late October or

early November, published by IRA. And it is entitled, 'English Learners Reaching the Highest Level of English Literacy'. There are five contributors to that volume that are present here, one on your panel today, and I simply will leave this information related to that literature. Thank you.

Elizabeth: Dr. Rueda, Dr. Garcia didn't mention he got his Ph.D. from UCLA but I hope you will still listen to what he had to say. Good morning, my name is Elizabeth Jimenez, I'm the CEO of [Hemos] Consulting which is a consulting and advocacy firm in California. That means that I lobby for companies that produce instructional materials and education software.

In California, proposition 227 was put in place and they claimed that English learners would be in structured English immersion for only one year and then would be placed in regular English classrooms. But after several years' test scores, it shows that that is not happening.

However, we see an alarming achievement gap between English speaking students and English learners that persists, and we're now beginning to hear policy makers in California try to explain that the achievement gap will always be there, because the best students, presumably those that are most proficient in English, reclassify and new students are always arriving in the category of limited English proficient.

So today I'm going to pose two questions for you to look at regarding the role of instructional materials in closing this gap. Publishers hear that research-based materials are required under No Child Left Behind and here in California as well. However, in California, the publishers were puzzled at how this is applied to limited English proficient students.

It would seem that in a state that has pretty much discarded bilingual instruction, it would be important to further intensify the focus on comprehensibility of English instruction. However, without any research base that we can tell, California has done away with ESL, English as a Second Language, or ELD, English Language Development in grades K through 3. And instead, called for a reading component for English learners with no research base that we could find.

As publishers, we need that direction if it's supposed to be research based, then where do we go for this? I want to give you a few examples that we found in one of these components that is designed specifically for English language development in grade 1, unit 1, lesson 1, it calls for the English language learner to blend syllables and it has [hah-in] and the kid is supposed to sound that out. And the direction to the teacher says, "Tell the students that you will say some words one sound at a time. Then they should listen carefully, blend the sound together and tell

you what the word is. After blending each word, have volunteers use it in a sentence."

If I'm a first grader, and this is my first lesson in English language development, I'm not sure that kids who sound out [hah-in] know what it is and can in fact use it in a sentence. So this is puzzling to us that this is one of two programs that were adopted in this era.

The next exercise calls for listening for vowel sounds, long A and then students are told to listen to these sentences: "The town is little. Wolf is a good story. The alphabet has letters." None of them have a long A in them. And so that's further puzzling, not just to the teacher, but to the students.

In the workbook for English learners, pupils are told to match up pictures of things that rhyme. However if a pupil doesn't possess basic English vocabulary, then they don't know the picture of tree is pronounced tree, and the picture of bee is pronounced bee. And further if you're a Spanish speaker, arbol y abeja empiezan igual. Those two words start with the same sound, so that English speaker might in fact get confused and think rhyme means beginning sound.

I'll finish this little example here, but here's one other vocabulary strategy in the English language development manual in Grade 1, unit 8. The teacher is to read the sentence and the students are to use their vocabulary strategy to figure it out.

"It is the opposite of in front of and starts with [buh]."

That's asking an awful lot from a student. I kind of have to sit there and think about what that is and what it means.

In any case, we're struggling as an industry to try to be very, very responsive and at the same time, not clear about what that research is.

Quickly I'll finish the second question that I have is-, or the question that I have is, is achievement accelerated when students are directly explicitly taught English, which is what we've traditionally done. In California we've done away with that in Kindergarten through grade 3.

My second question on a brighter note is that I work with several companies that have shown outstanding results with English learners using technology. It appears that the patient repetition, the clear audio sound capability, visual support and individualization and infinite leveling capacity of instruction combined with the fun of working on a computer, maximizes results when there's solid curriculum content.

I brought with me recent results of a study with the Waterford Early Reading Program as an augmentation to classroom instruction and their incremental results are outstanding. I guess the other group that shows some exciting results is in the area of cognitive science.

I work with a group in Oakland, it's a group of neuroscientists who had done about 25 years of research, brain research and made some astounding discoveries regarding the way the brain learns oral language and its role in successful reading. They created a practical application from their research.

However, because-, let's see, the program has been peer-reviewed in peer-review journals and yet because it doesn't look like traditional curriculum approaches and doesn't rely on traditional reading research, some in the reading field declare a wait-and-see approach. As with many innovations, the reading community calls into question their research because it comes from a company.

This discourages pure university research from being taken to the practical application. Schools have been very slow to embrace technology for a variety of reasons, but I would urge you to seek out studies that have been done with English learners. Many of these studies have in fact been done by companies and a few of them have been done well in conjunction with recognized researchers.

This may be part of the solution to accelerating achievement of English learners. Thank you.

September 19, 2002

66

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

Margaret: Good morning. Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you today. I'm Margaret Mustapha and I'm a reading commissioner for the National Council of Teacher's of English. The immediate past President of the California Professors of Reading and Language Arts and a Professor of Education at California State University, Los Angeles.

As a literacy educator, I am keenly aware of the central role language plays in reading and writing. Because of this, and because of what is happening here in California now as we speak, I hope your research will examine three points. One, the inclusion of language minority children in federal and state assessments of reading achievement in English.

Two, scripted and/or force-paced reading programs for English language minority children. By force paced, I mean the teachers are obliged to teach all part of so many lessons within so many days. For example, eight lessons within 10 days, regardless of children's needs or whether they need the lesson or not, whether they can benefit from the lesson or not, whether they can understand the lesson or not.

And third, to examine decodable or contrived language texts for language minority children.

To elaborate on those three points, in the area of federal and state assessments of reading achievement in English, I hope you will investigate what happens to public policy when the

reading scores of limited English children are combined with the scores of English-only children. And what happens to public policy when the scores of limited English children are reported undifferentiated by years in U.S. schools and by undifferentiated by levels of economic advantage or disadvantage.

When we know from Colliers work that on average it takes five to seven years under ideal circumstances for non-native speakers of English to achieve in English at levels equal to their native English-speaking peers. The [NAPE] assessment of reading achievement combines the scores of limited English speaking children with those of English-only children, once the children have been in U.S. schools more than three years.

Consequently, as the state that serves more limited English speaking children than any other state that participates in the NAPE, California's NAPE scores are at the bottom of the NAPE state-by-state comparisons.

It's impossible to understate the impact of this practice on policy in California. In the 1996 and '97 legislation relating to policy in California, all the bills that I read or happened to read began with quoting California's placement on the NAPE scores, and of course they were looking at 4th grade scores where children had been, by NAPE, been-, the limited English proficient speaking children had been aggregated with the English-only

children. And that impacted our scores and then consequently led to phenomenal impact in policy.

Similarly when the scores of limited English speaking children are combined with the scores of English-only children on the SAT9 reading test used in California, the scores are significantly lowered, as I've demonstrated in a paper that I've cited in this paper.

Sadly, this in turn, through California's academic performance index has been a tool for withholding money from schools that serve large numbers of limited English speaking children and awarding money to schools that serve fewer numbers of English-speaking [sic?] children. Kind of a reverse Robin Hood type of effect.

Additionally, when scores of limited English speaking children are reported undifferentiated by years in U.S. schools, in an environment with continuous new immigrants, policy makers in the public have no way to tell how well children are progressing in acquiring English language skills over time. And this fact may have led to Proposition 227 is it?

Okay, my second area of concern, in the area of scripted and/or force-paced reading programs, I hope you will investigate what happens when language minority children with limited English are [inscripted] and/or force-paced reading programs. Programs where teachers are required to forego matching instruction to

children's instructional needs and instead are required to teach a commercial program as it is written by the authors of the program, regardless of the children's instructional needs in the classroom.

In my research, done with Dr. Robert Land, we found that the SAT9 scores of English-only children are significantly lower in schools using scripted and/or force-paced reading programs than in schools using unscripted reading programs where teachers are allowed to exercise their professional judgment and match instruction to instructional needs.

Feedback from teachers in the field suggest that the different outcomes by programs may be even greater among limited English speaking children.

And my third area of concern, the area of decodable text or contrived language texts, I hope you will investigate what happens when language minority children with limited English acquisition are provided with contrived language texts in English.

Research with English-only children has found that English-only children learn better with texts with familiar language than texts with unfamiliar language.

My own classroom experience and that of my colleagues has found the same phenomenon among children in the process of learning English.

September 19, 2002

70

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

These questions on assessments, programs and texts, have great real-world implications for children here in California, and we look forward to learning about the results of your investigation. Thank you.

Tim: Marsha [Bretelle], please come forward.

Marsha: My name is Marsha [Brectel] and I'm currently Director of Training for Project GLAD out of Fountain Valley School District.

Project GLAD is a U.S. Department of Education academic excellence project as well as a California exemplary project. And as such, it fits what was mentioned in a recent IRA article about the same issue that we're discussing research-based practices.

It has reliable, valid, it's objective, it's been refereed and that background plus my own personal background that started I don't want to tell you how far back in Afghanistan in the Peace Corps, and onto Japan and Indonesia, as well as my Masters Degree, shall I say at UCLA in reading, led me to a lifelong interest in literacy for our English learners here at home.

As director of Project GLAD, I have been involved with teacher training since 1991. And we go out to districts and train teachers who we have found very frustrated at not having

the tools to work with English learners, which often results with our English learners sitting at the back of the room, and pretty much being ignored except for the 30 minutes of ELD that they are required to do.

The other thing that was mentioned in this IRA article that I thought was very important when we discuss research base, it said many of the acceptable proven practices that we all agree work in reading have not -- and you heard this before -- have not been normed on, have not been referenced with the English learner in mind.

And as an academic excellence project out of [Oh dem wa], Project GLAD was designed for and the data has been derived from English learners in particular. And in that context, I'd like to suggest two areas for research study with this as well as some reflection.

And the first is in the area of content methodology. We, in education, tend to put things in boxes. And we tend to say we should do it only at this hour and only at this time. And in fact to move ELD out of a deficit model, what we have to see is it needs to permeate the entire day. The idea of accessing background information, building a schema is something that should not be considered for the 30-minute block of ELD, or indeed, the 90-minute block of literacy. But in fact, something that teachers are able to do all day long.

We can read a script for 30 minutes, we can even read a script for 90 minutes, but if the teachers are not trained and not able to use those same structures all day long, then what you have is a very limited sense of empowerment and a limited sense of successful teaching and learning.

Academic discourse and academic language is the cornerstone of Project GLAD and always has been. For us, academic language and academic discourse do many things. They're the cornerstone for academic literacy, we feel very strongly. They allow students to negotiate for meaning, to clarify ideas, and incidentally provide phonemic awareness at all grade levels.

But what happens usually is teachers may take great pains to make themselves comprehensible to the students when introducing new subject areas. But how often is that continued scaffolding of allowing the students to use new concepts and new vocabulary with somebody they understand, put into practice in ways such as the [10 2] lecture, cooperative learning or small group practice?

These are practices that help provide that scaffolding for academic discourse.

I have a quote from one of the journals that one of our 6th graders said, when we were doing prehistoric people out of the history, social-science standards. And he wrote in it on day 4, "I never thought I would be able to think about

[Australopithecus] even to say it. Now I think I could do this thing. I want to be an archeologist. I want to go to Africa."

Our students need to see themselves as not being part of the voiceless few. But rather having the academic discourse and the ability and the capability of using this academic language. And this is possible, and we have seen it over and over in classrooms, trained in Project GLAD.

Immersion in print is a part of this. Walk with me on this. If we have students who do not read, speak or write English, if they go home to parents who do not read, speak or write English, if there are not books at home in English, and they come back to school and the only literacy they see when they are being taught reading are the little books that are very good for the teaching of beginning reading, but what do they do for academic literacy, for academic discourse and indeed for literacy itself?

They need to be immersed in print. Our walls need to reflect the language that is being taught and the language of the students. And that brings us to the last, and I feel, most crucial area. However fantastic those proven practices are, if our teachers are not trained in how to use them, in other words, in a research-based training model as well, then we will not have teachers who are empowered to use them. And Joan Wink and Jim Cummins both mention we cannot empower others until we ourselves feel empowered.

And teachers are feeling many times as frustrated technocrats and script readers, then surely they do not have the skills to be able to pass this on, pass a feeling of empowerment on to their students.

So we feel that the training that goes into the training of teacher must be long term, and it must reflect, if we truly want them to be able to use these proven practices, then we must have knowledgeable administrators as well. In fact there must be a complete systematic way of ensuring that these teachers are able to us this, not just in their literacy block.

Thank you for your attention.

Donna: Good morning. My name is Donna Heath and I'm the Director of the WRITE Institute with the San Diego County Office of Education. Thank you for your attention today and thanks to the LA County Office Staff for hosting this.

You heard earlier a little bit from Rosalia Salinas and Dr. [Lavendez] who are both mentioning and working with the WRITE Institute and ASPIRE Projects. We talked a little bit about how those projects have fostered the development, particularly in the Sweetwater Union High School District of both primary language and English language development.

I'm going to address just the specific need right now for English language development in the area of secondary English

learners. The WRITE Institute, as it relates to systemic reform is the topic of the questions that I've brought before you today.

Currently our Institute, which is an academic excellence model, as well as a California exemplary program, is currently providing curriculum that is standards based, and aligned to both the English language development standards of California and the English language-arts standards.

We also have correlation and alignment to the California High School Exit Exam. Because again our mission is to provide academic success and academic achievement for English learners at the middle schools and high schools.

Our curriculum currently focuses on addressing both reading and writing as a complex and multi-faceted process. Our skills are taught in context, we work with the meta-cognitive, the cognitive and the social learning strategies in a student-centered environment. Part of the training also focuses heavily on the values and the cultural and linguistic backgrounds that the students bring to the classroom.

This dissemination project is over 12 years old now, but ultimate in the last five years, has built a contingency of trainers across the state that work with nine county offices of education, 65 school districts and over 250 schools. The preliminary data that we are bringing in, as was mentioned

earlier is indicating progress in the acquisition of academic English skills that we measure through writing.

From the field and from the teachers, the trainers, the administrators, parents and community that we work with across the state, I thought it would be appropriate and helpful for me to bring to you today some of the concerns that they have voiced in the area of the education of English learners, particularly at the middle school and high school.

The questions that I have brought center around the idea of how we can promote not just academic English learning, but also systemic reform at the secondary level, which is so sorely needed. And in order to accomplish this, we believe that the question of how to best improve academic achievement of our English learners needs to be investigated in the context of reform.

So I'd like to leave you with a few questions that focus on this systemic reform area in assessment, programs and policies. A couple of assessment questions and it may be a little bit redundant but I am calling out for some more focus on that area of 6th through 12, where we really feel there's not enough research.

What constitutes equitable assessment for middle school and high school English learners, and how can this equitable assessment for English learners then improve our teaching and

September 19, 2002

77

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

learning? A question regarding programs and policies. What are the factors that promote the adherence to policies that promote proficiency in two languages, for English learners? And what are the systemic factors such as counseling, placement, reclassification, and the assessment and the whole accountability system in California. What are these factors that impact secondary students' access to a rigorous curriculum?

Thank you for your attention on this crucial matter, and I look forward to further collaboration.

[End of Tape 1/Tape 2 begins]

Mary: Hello, my name is Mary Hernandez. I am an education-rights attorney with Multicultural Education Training and Advocacy, also known as META. Our only clients are students and their parents. I am also a mother of two young children whom I've taught to read and a former member of the San Francisco Board of Education.

The California Department of Education reviews the programs and services offered to students with limited English proficiency in every school district in California, at least once every four years. In my capacity as an education-rights attorney, I monitor the reviews performed by the Department of Education. META performs CCRs on the state, if you will.

I review the files, their checklists, their findings. I'm sad to report that over 100 districts -- I couldn't get the exact count for you but it was well over 130 -- reviewed by the California Department of Education during 2001-2002 were found to be out of compliance with the very basic requirement that they provide limited English proficient students with an effective program of English language development.

Indeed, out of more than a dozen compliance items, I found at least during one period, this was the non-compliance item most often found during the review. There were over a dozen items, about 16 items they look for compliance. And the requirement to provide children with a program of English-language development is one of the items most frequently found in non-compliance.

And believe me, we often pressure the Department of Education, telling them the reviews are not thorough enough, etc. But even the reviews as they are have this level of findings of non-compliance in this area.

Now these non-compliance findings are based both on districts that don't have an ELD program at all, and on districts that have a wonderful ELD curriculum that they have adopted, but it sits on a shelf. They have not trained their teachers to implement it, they have not provided materials so that those teachers can implement it, or they don't place their limited

September 19, 2002

79

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

English proficient students in classrooms where they have trained the teachers and do have the materials.

It is evidenced to me that California is in a state of crisis with respect to developing language minority youth [inaudible] strong literacy skills with that group of students.

In my capacity as an education-rights attorney with META I also do workshops up and down the state and meet with parents and educators. And what I also see, and I wanted to discuss as a preface, as a context for my questions, is a pervasive pattern of districts denying program choice to parents on the basis of "research". And that's why I have a number of questions for you that I hope will be addressed.

One, will limited English proficient children become literate in English simply by being exposed to English in an English language-arts class designed for native speakers? Or do they need a structured English language development program designed for them?

This is actually the situation in my review of the files of districts in this state. This is the situation for a significant number of limited English proficient students in hundreds of districts who were placed in mainstream English language-arts classes and are receiving now special program designed to meet their English language development needs.

Another question, is it effective to use the same materials and methodology designed to help native English speakers learn to read with children who have little or no ability to speak English? A previous speaker, Elizabeth Jimenez addressed this issue very well, so I won't dwell on it. But I would like to see are educators currently constrained in the materials provided to them, that impacts their ability to do an effective job.

Another question, when children with limited English proficiency learn to read in their native language first, do they become literate in English at the same rate as limited English proficient children who have never been taught to read in their native language, although all other variables being equal.

This is a critical question to answer. If you come to school, children with the same level of proficiency in their native language, all other things being equal, will one who is taught to read in their native language first learn to be literate in English? Will it hurt them over children who are immersed immediately only in English.

This is critical because parents throughout California every year for the past four years have been discouraged from exercising their right to choose an alternative program that teaches limited English proficient students to read in their primary language while at the same time, learning English. They have been told that their children will acquire English literacy

skills much faster if they are taught in an English-only environment, and indeed parents in some districts have been told they cannot volunteer in the classroom on that basis, because they will be speaking in Spanish and it will be disruptive of the English-only program that meets their needs.

We need research to tell us whether or not this is true. We need research to show whether positive results from granting parents their choice and empowering them to help their children will help them in literacy.

Are teachers who receive professional development training focused specifically on English language development for EL students, more effective in helping students become literate in English? I have heard from teachers in some districts who have been told to do just the same thing for their LEP children as they do for their English learners and that's the extent of their training. And I want to know is that sufficient? Do we need more to help our children?

Your investigation could have a significant positive impact on placement of LEP children in classrooms with appropriately qualified teachers, with appropriate materials, with specially designed programs to meet their needs, in a way that supports the positive role of parents and it's greatly needed. Thank you.

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

Delores: Well, good morning to you. My name is Delores [Beltran] and I'm an English learner specialist working here at the LA County Office of Education.

By now, lots has been said and a lot has been restated, repeated and at the risk of repeating some of the things that have been said, I've been thinking about what would be the lens or the framework to share what I've been hearing in the field.

About four years ago I left the classroom, myself an upper-grade bilingual elementary teacher, to work with teachers to negotiate meaning and understanding about services, about the instruction that they deliver to English learners. And coincidentally, I left the classroom at the time that Proposition 227 passed. Coincidentally, I left the classroom just at the time that these dramatic shifts in literacy were occurring in our state.

So as I've engaged teachers and engaged with teachers, and joined teachers in long-term staff development, primarily focused on English language development, some questions have emerged that teachers have presented to me, and so that's what I'd like to do, is I'd like to present their voices and what are the questions that they've raised.

They've characterized their experiences providing English language development instruction to English learners as us standing or teaching in a bed of quicksand. They felt that

they've been caught in a muddle of competing messages, openly contradictory policies and conflicting messages. And they have become themselves conflicted by what to do.

So what I speak to you about is to search for support or initiate research that's grounded in practice, to inform practice for teachers and that's sort of the framework within which I'd like to present these questions that teachers are asking of themselves in their practice of English language development.

First, what is the role of English language development? As I interact with teachers and dialog with them, the questions that they ask is, is English language development a tool for academic achievement or is it an end unto itself that the language proficiency should be a target to achieve high levels of language proficiency.

Teachers are conflicted or confused about English oral language development and its relationship with second language literacy. So what is the role? If there are no assessments that really require or enable teachers to take a look at oral language development with respect to reading and writing progress, then does that mean then that teachers don't have to pay a lot of attention to oral language development in their instructional programs?

Teachers are asking, well what are those research-based practices that accelerate second language proficiency? And

they're asking regardless of program. We've heard a wonderful testimony and represented in this room are some wonderful practices that certainly are worthwhile for teachers to employ. But what teachers are asking is what are those features? How can I be the most effective in the shortest or briefest period of time? And I think that a question that needs to be asked is what is informing the teacher's decision making?

Teachers are making decisions about how they're teaching English learners, so what is informing that? And we have successful teachers. And there are successful teachers of English learners within English language development and other components of the program across programs. Regardless of program, they're finding success, so how do we identify, or how does research identify the success of the teacher who teaches ELD all day long? The teacher who teaches explicitly in a self-contained ELD block? How does research capture what's effective about the teacher who relies on L1 transfer, the transfer of the primary language, or the teacher who just engages in good teaching.

So how can we gain from the breadth and depth of all these programs of successful English language development instruction.

A major question that teachers are asking is what constitutes proficiency? What does it mean, learning English and how do you know you've learned it? Is it just enough to access

the language-arts lesson as a simple framework for looking at proficiency? Or is it more complex? Is the ability to communicate content knowledge and understanding effectively, this complex look at language proficiency or what's called for, and is it based on sound research?

A good question then to ask is our lens for examining effective English language development instruction that leads to proficiency, is the lens too narrow or is it too wide? And I'm referring to why, because I think that we need to, going back to the issue of effective instruction and efficient instruction so that teachers have a finite period of time that they're with students and at all levels of education.

And finally a question that teachers are asking is how do we measure it? So once we know what proficiency is, once we know what the research based, or the effective practices are based on research, then how do we measure it and how do we measure it on an ongoing way, what is the formative assessment that will contribute to monitoring progress, and in particular looking at classroom embedded instruments and benchmark assessments that provide us more information beyond just a standardized test measure? Thank you.

F: Good morning. I hope you're not hungry yet. My name is [inaudible] I'm with Chapman University. I want to hit on some

key points, one is to broaden the concept of literacy to literacies as my friend Tom Wilson says, beyond decoding and simple comprehension, beyond one language, beyond one domain. Also to focus on the role of the teacher and not on teacher proof programs, and to focus on comprehension and the academic demands of today's society in our schools.

Literacy is the use of language for the purpose of communicating thoughts and ideas, desires and fears, joys and disappointments. It's a way of learning new information, or providing it. It's a creative and powerful forum as well as a functional one, which liberates us from simply using voice with the few to sharing volumes with the masses.

It is engaging in critical thought and reflection to not only comprehend what is read but to interact with it and evaluate its relevance to one's own life and the life of others. While it is most import-, and appropriate in a language we know, we can also learn to do it well in various languages, given the right conditions.

For children who represent such an important segment of the population in our schools, it is of utmost importance that we not limit literacy to something only done in English and relegated to a mere activity where children are automated into parroting sounds they may not fully understand.

If indeed the goal is to balance literacy, then let us begin with the premise that a literate individual has many more skills and abilities than what can be contained in a boxed program. Let us broaden the meaning of its multiple levels and uses so that we begin to speak of literacies. Some that are print related and ritualistic skills, others are oral and interactive, others are silent. The most critical literacies are those which engage the intellect and inspire the human spirit in a variety of languages.

We know a great deal about what elements make a difference for children in becoming literate. And the teacher is a key factor. And yet we hear about teacher-proof programs that are supposed to make readers, no matter who the teacher is.

The program tells the teacher what to do. In the December 10th, Washington Post article by Valery Straus, "Phonics Pitch Irks Teachers, U.S. Denies its Pushing Commercial Products." Educational leaders said, "We're distressed that you expect us to mandate a one-size fits all prescribed program of scripted professional development. What the children and their teachers bring to the task, their talents, knowledge and abilities appear to have taken a back seat to what programs dictate. Politics, rhetoric and big business have taken over the classroom domain where teachers are not trusted and are relegated to positions of impotence."

What we know about how children learn and acquire language and literacy is not respected or recognized. Assessments are far removed from the reality of the classroom and pressure child and teacher alike into unnatural situations that deprive children of educational opportunities.

If we are truly to meet the needs of our language minority students and their ability to read, write, dialog, recite, debate and create, then we must entertain the idea that languages and all their glories, have various forms and dimensions that come from different lands as well as our own. They come in different shapes and make different sounds. They're intrinsically human and beautiful and we should respect every single one.

We should empower the children with the strength that a language brings and build upon it, not destroy it. Focusing on comprehension and connections with real experiences and print can make all the difference for a child who may not only be struggling to learn English but who really just wants to understand what is going on.

Once that connection is made, it is the skilled teacher who nurtures and facilitates the knowledge and abilities needed to further develop language and academic literacies. It is the teacher who guides and stretches the student in the dynamic and reciprocal teaching-learning process who assesses performance and

redirects, selects, and modifies materials and instructional approaches befitting the needs of students.

Therefore an increased effort should be placed on the recruitment and formation of well-qualified bilingual and English language development and literacy teachers, not yet another packaged program because that's the human thing to do.

I'm afraid that simplistic solutions for these complex processes, such as the one-size fits all mental model that we have been forced to deal with in the teaching of English, seems to have permeated every aspect of education.

Could it be that the rich and powerful have exhausted every other business endeavor and are now in the public domain to become more rich off the backs of the most vulnerable of our society, the children? Are some convinced that they can manipulate society to the point where what experts in the field say doesn't really matter as much as how well a product could be marketed? What do we really want?

Do we really want a nation of readers or simply those who can follow orders? In the article "Reading Between the Lines" by Steven Metcalf, published in The Nation in January, it states, "The new Bush testing regime emphasizes minimal competence along a narrow range of skills with an eye toward satisfying the low end of the labor market."

It hurts all of us when we invalidate what a child knows and brings to school. It debilitates all of us when we displace their language and potential literacies by imposing only one. It negates our own national character when we silence the voices of our children, their teachers and their communities, stripping them of their rights as Americans.

It shames us when financial gain takes precedence over human development. We can expect little change in improving the literacy in language minority students until we embrace our many potential literacies, be honest about our efforts in the area of research and development and teacher education, and recognize and respect the complexity of our nation.

F: Good morning. My name is Alicia Valero, Dr. Alicia Valero as of two days. So I'm very tired. [laughter]. I work for the Migrant Optimal Learning Environment Project housed at California State University, Sacramento. I work as a teacher trainer and I want to, this morning what I want to do is to discuss some of my findings based on the work that I did in a preschool classroom the last two years where the children were from Spanish-speaking backgrounds, Latino children, low income. And they were all immersed in rich early literacy experiences.

Historically, low income Latino students have not had access to early literacy instruction. Consequently, there is a dearth

of knowledge available on emergent literacy development among Latino preschool students.

My study is an attempt to add to this limited knowledge base. And what I would like to do is to begin by boasting about one of my preschool children, that taught me much about the incredible potential that Latino children have to become successful readers and writers. And at this time, I would like to show you a few transparencies, if that's possible.

This is a preschool student, her name is Yamitza and she participated in preschool for two years, and one of the literacy experiences that she was part of is a literacy event called Interactive Journals. Many of you might be familiar with the strategy and what Yamitza did is that she sat down with the teacher on a regular basis almost every single day she was in preschool where she learned a whole lot about literacy, and let me share with you some of her journal entries.

This is Yamitza, and she knows that she begins her journal entry by drawing. So what she does is that she attempts to write her name and she's drawing a picture of herself. But what is significant about the interactive journal entry is that she is having a communication between her and the teacher. So the teacher responds to Yamitza after she's heard about the journal entry. "Yamitza que juguete te compró tu mami?" Yamitza wrote, she attempted to write her name because that's one of the first

developmental steps in early literacy, is that children communicate by using their name. The teacher asked her, Yamitza, but her intention was to say that her mother bought her a doll. And the teacher asked, "Es pequeña?" And of course Yamitza responded by using some characters of her name.

I'm going to forward, this was in October, the year before starting Kindergarten. I'm going to forward on to March, and this is one of her journal entries, her picture, and Yamitza was drawing a picture of room in her house. And the teacher asked her, "Yamitza, quien está en el cuarto?" Yamitza wrote, "Mi mami." The teacher asked her, "Esta sola?" "Si." Yamitza did this with minimal scaffolding. Let me show you another.

And here's another picture about her experience going to, this is a swap meet in Roseville, and Yamitza wrote, and the teacher asked her, "Yamitza, quien fué a Roseville?" And Yamitza wrote, "Yo y mami y papi." And not only that, she ended her sentence with a period.

This is the incredible potential that preschool children have, Latino preschool children have to become successful readers and writers if they are immersed in an optimal learning environment.

Can you tell I'm I student? I'm so used to sharing my work. Okay, now these journal entries reveal that Yamitza will enter Kindergarten with a strong foundation in early literacy. Yamitza

has learned that writing is communication and that is powerful. She has learned some letter identification skills, letter-sound correspondence, she is phonemically aware, she knows the concept of a letter, a word, and is beginning knowledge of a sentence. And she did all this within a meaningful literacy environment, no direct instruction there.

Most importantly, Yamitza has appropriated literacy. I believe that disparities and access to literacy begin at the preschool level for low-income Latino children. The structures, practices and beliefs in early childhood education programs have historically disadvantaged low-income students.

Currently, the State Department of Education has proposed as a goal to provide all children access to preschool education. The state also is recommending that preschool programs incorporate an early literacy component. However, the state is not recommending a specific methodology.

Preschool desired results, not standards, have also been established for preschool children. Yamitza I'm happy to say that Yamitza exceeded all of the desired results posed by the State Department of Education.

Based on my work with Spanish-speaking Latino children, I want to suggest some educational implications of my work. Preschool should serve as a bridge between the home and formal school environments where students can develop important emergent

literacy concepts correlated with later success in reading. And early literacy curriculum should take into account children's background knowledge in primary language.

And third, we need to prepare more preschool educators on effective pedagogy to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse preschool students. Thank you.

F: Good morning. My name is Magdalena Ruis Gonzales and I'm the language-arts literacy and bi-literacy coordinator at San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools. It's about 60 miles from here. And my previous positions have seen me in the classroom working with preschool children and primarily in early childhood. So a lot of the questions I will be posing is focusing on early childhood.

The San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools in Southern California is very much interested in the task that SRI International and CAL are embarking on. A summary of the state of research and research-based practice in the field of English learners will generate an agenda for future research that will inform the practice in this nation.

Given the demographics which we have seen, it is critical that such an important document reflects the unique cultural, language and literacy needs of our students. We would like to

see strides to close that literacy gap, and this document has the potential.

An important aspect of framing this document will be the criteria definition of relevant literature. Our current national research agenda, or scientifically-based research has narrowly defined what is acceptable. As a result, important findings for English learners has been excluded as we have heard from people who have research that shows promising practices. There are brief instances whereby mention is made of EL research in well-defined documents such as the report on the National Reading Panel, Handbook of Reading Research, and Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children.

Therefore, our suggestion is to broaden the criteria so that peer-review research conducted outside of the U.S. be included, so that qualitative research studies are examined and not just eliminated because of small size sample. And that research done the last 20 to 50 years be included, instead of narrowing the span to 10.

How will SRI and CAL define scientifically-based research for English learners? In almost all cases of research of English learners, descriptions of language measures and/or proficiency levels are sorely lacking. In some cases, findings are generalized to the entire population of English learners. How

will the research team determine inclusion in the study, given the lack of language specificity?

We will assume the research team will focus on the five areas of early reading instruction, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. We would like to see specifically how using different program models influence the English learners literacy development in these five areas. These are the questions that will help determine the best program and improve literacy for English learners.

What must a teacher know and be able to do in order to teach beginning reading to English learners in these different program models: transitional bilingual program, dual-language immersion, structured English, or ESL, with primary language support, ESL with no primary language support, and we can go on and on.

What are the significant differences in how we teach across these types of programs? Can students obtain third grade level reading and writing skills given the various models? What is the relationship and effect on learning to read in English within an ELD/ESL setting?

Is "good reading instruction" the same for all students regardless of their proficiency levels in English? What is the relationship between comprehension and English levels of English proficiency? What is the impact of students who have developed primary language fluency in literacy on their attainment of

English reading? How does a literacy-rich preschool environment in both languages impact oral language and literacy development? How do bilingual programs promote meta-linguistic awareness?

What is the literacy attainment in the third grade in English if early literacy instruction was in the first language? Are some languages phonetically easier to learn to read in and what are the implications for literacy development? How do bilingual special needs children within this research agenda? These are critical questions that should frame the research, provide information on literacy practices, and highlight those areas that are lacking research. Thank you.

F: And welcome to California, those of you that are coming from out of state. My name is [Carla Herrera]. I'm a professional development specialist for the Center for Language Minority Education and Research, Cal State University Long Beach.

My areas for assisting teachers are in differentiating instruction in ELD, bi-literacy and multilingualism, technology integration in multilingual settings and international online collaborations. I'm on a special leave from ABC Unified School district by invitation of the center and today I am representing Dr. Catherine Lindholm Leary of San Jose State.

My research question for you, for your consideration is, which effective and efficient approach to English literacy closes

September 19, 2002

98

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

the achievement gap and offers sustained positive results for English learners when they reach the secondary level and beyond?

I have been invited to represent Dr. Catherine Lindholm Leary, Professor of San Jose State. I will be submitting her written testimony to you, entitled, "Promoting Language and Literacy for EL Students, Results from Research on Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Education."

My direct collaboration began in 1991 with Catherine in her role as evaluator, in evaluator of dual-language programs. She evaluated the ABC District's Spanish and Portuguese two-way immersion programs where I served in three distinct roles. First as bilingual, district bilingual resource teacher who is a contact for both programs, one year as a Portuguese site facilitator, and thirdly and maybe most importantly, a parent of a Spanish-speaking EL student who successfully participated in the Portuguese-English immersion program.

I have both a professional and parental vested interest in these questions. I would like to highlight brief portions of Dr. Lindholm Leary's paper.

It reads, "We have used norm referenced standardized achievement tests in reading as well as language proficiency ratings in both English and Spanish to assess students' proficiency and reading achievement. There is a solid research base with consistent research results."

She outlines five important points on issues and correlations of language and literacy in both target language and English proficiency. She discusses specific positive achievement for both English learners and English language background students.

These results suggest that the two-way bilingual program provides the academic preparation in language proficiency, literacy and the content areas, in addition to schooling attitudes that enable the two-way students to be more successful in high school and prepared for college, than the average at-risk EL and low socio-economic students described in the literature. Thus, these results demonstrate that EL students benefit from an educational program that is additive, enables students to maintain and further develop their first language while adding the second, integrates language minority and majority students for content instruction through both languages. Provides a strong foundation of language-arts literacy in the student's first language and is maintained over a long period of time to enable students to develop a richer language base across the two languages.

We look forward to the results of your study and thank you very much for your consideration.

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

David: It's still good morning. Buenos Dias. My name is David [Yaden], I'm an Associate Professor of learning instruction at the University of Southern California and also a second language learner at the mid-century point and then some. Estoy aprendiendo hablar Español pero muy lentamente.

I'd like to address two things today. Number one is the criteria for selection of research that you do as well as the focus of where the beginning point is. I think one of the things that has been evident in the last several panel reports from different views from the language, improvement of language-minority children to the National Panel of Reading report and others, there's been some concern in the field that the research base has been relatively narrow.

I'm struck by some of the comments of some of the government officials and also some of the official documents that says that the term research-based evidence, subjective research or scientific-based evidence is mentioned over 100 times in some of the documents. It kind of reminds me that that's the tactic I would use if I didn't understand the language. I would just speak louder to someone, thinking that they would understand.

I really think, and I can thank my colleague Michael Camille for this, for pointing me to some literature early on in the middle of the century, philosophers of science like [Amory LCATOSE], [Fearaband Popper], Thomas Cune where there's been

extensive discussion of the epistemological basis of scientific inquiry. And I'm concerned that some of the modern statements represent a philosophical point of view of what is scientific research, that has actually been philosophically disparaged and said it's untenable.

So I think I would like the committee to take a look at some of that research in the sense of really looking at research that's powerful theoretically, that has theoretical cohesiveness and explanatory power. As opposed to research that may have methodological rigor, either quantitative or qualitative, but basically lacks any kind of real research-based substance.

And I think that this, there is of course some published things by Jim Cummins and Jill Fitzgerald that came out in the *Educational Researcher*, and also in the *Journal of Literacy Research*, speaking to these issues, related to that some research may not have all of the bells and whistles, but nonetheless it answers more provocative questions. So consider that in the research criteria selection.

Secondly, as people have mentioned here, we are not at square one in our research in this. In 1997, we had the book by August and [Hakuda], "Improving Education for Language-Minority Students". Every National Research Council publication since then, including "Eager to Learn", "Neurons to Neighborhoods",

"Preventing Reading Difficulties", has at least touched on some of the areas of second language learning.

We have extensive reviews done by members of the panel, like Georgia Garcia, Elizabeth Burnhardt, Sara Huddleston, Jill Fitzgerald, research that has done, pointed us in certain directions. So I would hope that the committee would take these reviews and begin at a point at which we know, instead of going to research or going back over areas where we've been. I'm struck by the fact that Elizabeth Burnhardt has said there's only one extensive model of second language reading. She said that in 1991. She said that 12 years later, and I'm wondering why isn't somebody looking at that?

And so I would rather that the committee took a narrow, limited, in-depth view of the research, than widening the scope and dealing with some of these very provocative questions that keep on coming up year after year after year, decade and decade, and try to take us beyond into through the areas that are provocative and complex.

I'm struck also by a comment by a researcher in the "Neurons to Neighborhood" book, which goes over the base for preschool education, where he basically says that no longer we are at the place, that it's consensus in the scientific community that research in human learning is highly complex and there is no place for simplistic solutions.

And I think that the research community would look forward to a report that challenges both intellectually, theoretically and methodologically into a more complex research arena in the next 10 years, as opposed to something that suggests that these things can be simply done. Thank you.

Jody: Hello. My name is Jody Simon from [Sopras West] Educational Services. I'm the Director of Research and Evaluation and we specialize in providing programs for students at risk of school failure, and providing professional development.

I'm going to cut to the chase and share with you the questions that I would like to see addressed in your literature review.

First I'd like to know what we know about effective instruction to teach standard English to students who use African-American vernacular English. I'd like to know how do methods of effective instruction for teaching literacy to language-minority students differ for children of differing levels of proficiency in their own native language.

Some of these are redundant to what's been said before, but for the sake of emphasis. What reliable and valid assessments exist for tracking progress of language minority students, and

what are the benchmarks for tracking whether a student is on track for academic success?

Independent to maintaining whether a teacher is maintaining fidelity to an instructional program, I'd like to know what knowledge do teachers need to be effective with language-minority students, what beliefs they have and what are the qualities of an effective teacher for language-minority students?

How does instruction in a student's native language affect development of English fluency and literacy? Is English fluency and literacy necessary and sufficient for academic success? In particular, what other factors, in addition to proficiency in English fluency are required for a student to be successful in an academic setting?

And in particular, I was thinking about the impact of incorporating a student's own culture and their native language in the school culture. Thank you for considering my questions.

Tim: Is there anybody else in the room who may be not previously scheduled, but who wanted to give testimony? Please come forward.

Susana: Good morning. I'm Susana Dutrot and I'm with the California Reading and Literature Project and also with the

Monterey County Office of Education, where I do language-arts and bi-literacy work.

One of the fundamental questions I think that I'd like to see addressed is what is that, what are the linguistic proficiencies that kids need to be able to have academic success? I think we've talked a lot in professional development about methodology, about fabulous instructional practices that we know work. So we've talked a lot about the how. My concern is whether we have a clearly-defined picture of the what.

It seems obvious that in order to become proficient in a language, you need to have engagement and interesting interaction and lots of practice. But when we probe under the service in my experience in teaching teachers about language development, there is a lack of specificity about what exactly that means. What does it mean to be proficient in a language?

So one of the kind of paradigms that we're trying to put forth, looking at how do we define a blueprint for teaching English language, not only in an ELD program, but also across the curriculum. If we are going to be examining what it takes to become proficient in English, we have to have first of all a clear scope and sequence of what that means. How do we teach English for the purpose of developing language proficiency, as its own subject? And we believe firmly that that continues to be needed.

What we see happening in K-3 programs where ELD is being taught within the reading program, and those examples that people have given about students being asked to read and explain and talk and write about things that they have never been taught, clearly we know that language as a second-, languages have to be taught, explicitly. So clearly we need to do that.

When we look then at what are the proficiencies that we can develop with English as its own subject, we also have to ask ourselves how do we teach English for the purpose of content teaching and learning?

So I'd like to suggest some research questions around how do we promote the development of language as its own subject related and complementary to reading instruction, yet distinct? How do we do that so we pay attention to teaching English and the scope and sequence of its own that provides for adequate output, a range of applications, and lots and lots of practice. So that students become truly proficient and own the language.

Then how do we look at a vertical slice, if you will. Oh, that would be a vertical slice, of the curriculum. And then how would we look if you will at a horizontal slice of the curriculum where we encourage teachers to analyze the linguistic demands of the content that they're about to teach so that before they actually provide the instruction, they've analyzed what kinds of sentence structures are necessary to do this cognitive task.

What's the linguistic function here that allows me to think about mathematics, to draw comparisons, to persuade, to understand the relationships between and among ideas in ways that are not concrete, but that are abstract? Because that's where our kids fall apart.

So often they have fluency that judged by what I call bus-stop assessment, where your principal goes to the bus stop and visits with the child for a few minutes when the bus is late. Yeah? And comes back into your classroom and says, "Why is this child in ELD? They're completely fluent." And until you see a writing sample that shows an utter lack of complexity of sentence structure and a very truncated vocabulary, we don't begin to analyze that, the complexity of it.

So looking at, from a cognitive perspective, what are the linguistic demands of content instruction that are going to drive teachers to anticipate those demands and pre-teach them? So I would just suggest questions around how do we teach ELD as its own subject in a vertical slice of the curriculum? How do we teach ELD in a horizontal slice of the curriculum by front-loading for the linguistic demands that the content's going to require? And doing that explicitly so that we're teaching English throughout the instructional day, not just teaching in English throughout the instructional day, which is what we see happening in many, many secondary schools where the content is

taught, we're using some instructional strategies to try to scaffold. Maybe we're building background knowledge and teaching some content vocabulary, which we call the brick vocabulary.

And yet, we're not teaching the mortar. So our kids end up with a pile of bricks, and maybe they're organized into a nice [ven] diagram so they have three piles of bricks, but they don't know how to put it together in a way that's going to articulate the relationship between and among those ideas so that they truly can do that cognitive work of expressing cause and effect, for instance.

So those are some questions I'd like to see addressed. What's the scope and sequence of language skills for the cognitive academic work required for academic success? Thank you.

Tim: Please, you may come forward.

Sally: My name is Sally Thomas and I'm a Co-Director of the Center for Language and Learning. We work on the learning record, which is a classroom-based approach to assessment and I wasn't sure I was going to get a chance to speak, so I don't have a prepared piece.

But in a way, this offers me the opportunity to kind of pull together some threads of what I've already heard this morning which is kind of my favorite modus operandi.

I do think, I guess one of my questions is what could be the role of classroom assessment in really better supporting the academic, the outcomes for English language learners? I think classroom-based assessment is particularly important, because teachers are in a position to draw on, for example, hearing this morning the cultural funds of knowledge of the students, draw on their linguistic strengths, not just their deficits.

That classroom teacher is in the position to know individual students and their unique learning journeys. And I think we've heard that throughout the morning. In my own many, many years in teaching in a variety of roles, I've thought of assessment as kind of the enemy. I've seen that what I view as some of the negative consequences of the kinds of testing, especially the kind of testing that we have now, and the way that that kind of testing, I think, promotes low expectations. That's my interpretation.

But what I came to in my own graduate studies in my own work in a variety of different contexts, was understanding that assessment is at the heart of teaching and learning, and that what classroom teachers need are tools so that they can see a wider range of strengths and knowledge, funds of knowledge, ways

of knowing. And that when they can identify those strengths, they can then build the bridges that we've been hearing about this morning. And their expectations are not lowered.

In my own dissertation research and for classrooms with teachers using classroom assessment, in particular the learning record, but that wasn't the main emphasis, the findings were that those teachers' expectations changed. That they had much higher expectations for students.

One teacher said, "Sally, if you'd said did I know students? I would have said of course I do. But what I realized is that I've always looked at students through the eyes of what I needed them to accomplish. And that was always the Kindergarten checklist, the report card. Contrary to what I would hope I would have believed about myself."

The learning record and there are probably other approaches like it, that is an approach to classroom assessment that allows teachers to document learning in a variety of languages, to integrate cultural knowledge. We have evidence, we have a system and evidence research that shows that we have valid and reliable results. There's a system of moderations. The learning record's been studied extensively. We have reports and evidence that show that we can document success for English learners, not just monolingual students.

So I invite you to look at the role of classroom-based research in supporting. I would also like to invite that you consider the role of that kind of research or various research paradigms in terms of your own research as a panel, that if we're only measuring success by one kind of assessment, we're not really tapping the potential of what can be found. Thank you.

Tim: Thank you. Anybody else? Barring that, let me move to a microphone if I may.

I'm certain I speak for the entire panel when I express our appreciation for your willingness to come forward today to share your thoughts and your concerns with us. We also would like to thank you for your thoughtfulness in keeping your remarks cogent and certainly pertinent and brief. Your brevity I know has to be difficult under these circumstances, but it is that brevity that actually allowed so many voices to be heard this morning. And so we certainly appreciate that.

We certainly want to thank the LA County District for being such gracious hosts and the Cal and SRI International staff for really making it possible for us to hear your voices today. It's evident that each of you brings your own individual perspective to these issues. However, as Valerie Reyna stressed this morning, it is equally evident that no matter what the differences in your focus today or in your approach, each of you,

September 19, 2002

112

Regional Meeting of the National Literacy Panel on Language
Minority Youth and Children
Los Angeles, CA

like the members of the panel, are deeply committed to the ultimate success of these children, and to the educational enterprise for these children, and for that we thank you as well.

I hope you find the reports that emanate from this process to be sound, informative and helpful. I certainly would never promise you that it will address every issue that we heard today. Simply not just because the amount of work that that would entail, but most importantly, we have to stay to the research that has been done, not necessarily to the studies that you hope will be done in the future in our determinations.

Good luck to you, today and in your future work. And certainly if you did not feel like you got sufficient opportunity today to tell us what you thought or possibly some of your colleagues haven't, please send forward additional testimony to us. We would certainly like to have that.

With that, good luck to you and this hearing is adjourned.
Thanks.