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ABSTRACT
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (2001) was a tipping point for the requirement of academic and English language proficiency standards. Yet, there continue to be variations among English language proficiency standards linked and aligned to academic content standards across states, districts, and schools (Golden, 2011). The purpose of this research was to examine how the requirement of only linking language proficiency standards to academic content standards has impacted the quality of Arizona English Language Proficiency Standards with the Common Core English Language Arts State Standards and WIDA Standards at grades 2, 7, and 9. A modified version of Cook’s (2007) method was used to determine the standards alignment as well as common and uncommon knowledge between the sets of standard. Results indicate no alignment and limited linkage. Findings also showed absence of grade-level academic content and academic language.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is a report of my qualitative, content analysis of the Arizona English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards compared to and analyzed alongside two sets of standards: the Common Core State Standards and the World Class Instructional Design Assessment (WIDA) Standards. In this chapter, I discuss my background and experience with standards and the findings of the correlation guide that led me to this study. I then discuss my experiences with students learning English and my experiences with ELP and English Language Arts (ELA) Standards. In my discussion of how these standards may negatively affect education for English learners (ELs) in Arizona I describe the purpose of this study and provide an overview of the methodology and its significance.

Each chapter has embedded terminology to provide the reader with the context for the terms used throughout. In addition, tables and figures are also part of each chapter to present the complexity of this study in a visual means. Overall, the purpose of this study is to call attention to the knowledge and skill/verb of standards for ELs within Arizona as compared to other standards. More importantly, I hope this study influences the development of standards in order to provide an equitable, effective, and rigorous well-rounded education for ELs in Arizona.
Introduction

I first began to see and question discrepancies between language arts standards for mainstream students and for students learning English when I worked with a colleague to develop a correlation guide for grade specific ELA Standards and ELP Standards for teachers of EL students in elementary grades. This endeavor originated when we used the standards to develop the scope and sequence for non-English speaking students in high school English courses in the district where we were employed. For two years, we worked during personal hours on a pilot study to align the Arizona ELP Standards with the corresponding Arizona ELA Standards. At the same time, we consulted and conducted workshops for teachers of ELs to teach teachers how to utilize the correlation guides for lesson development and we also taught teachers how to scaffold daily lessons.

We developed grade-specific correlation guides titled *The Language Bridge Model* for teachers and district personnel to use for scaffolding daily lessons. A scaffolded lesson provides a temporary support mechanism similar to utilizing training wheels when one learns how to ride a bike. A lesson that is scaffolded might use a graphic organizer to break down large concepts into its component parts. Additionally, lessons also need to be scaffolded up just like one would remove training wheels from a bike to develop independence. An example of scaffolding is the five proficiency levels in the Arizona standards for ELs (see Figure 1). When teachers scaffold a lesson, the standards inform the teachers of
the knowledge and *level of knowledge* they are expected to teach as well as what the students are expected to learn. One would expect complexity or depth of knowledge to increase as students advance and as the breadth of academic content widens in higher grades.

*Figure 1.* Increase of scaffolding within the EL stages of proficiency.

In the process of developing this guide and working with teachers, we identified two discrepancies. The first discrepancy was between the standards for students learning English and the corresponding Language Arts Standards for mainstream students. The second discrepancy involved gaps within some of the ELP Standard proficiency levels. The level of proficiency for students learning English varied from the proficiency level required of mainstream students. We discovered that many of the ELP Standards did not match the corresponding ELA Standards (see Table 1). For example, 56% of the ELA Standards for mainstream students were not required for fourth grade ELs. This meant that teachers who were required to use ELP Standards to develop curriculum for ELs were not likely
to teach fourth grade English comprehension standards such as “(1) Predict text content; (2) Confirm predictions; (3) Generate clarifying questions; (4) Connect information and events in text to life; and (5) Use reading strategies” (Arizona Department of Education, 2003, p. 2).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Correlation to Arizona ELA Standards</th>
<th>Non-Correlations to Arizona ELA Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. See McNeil, 2009.
ª All numbers reported are in percentages.

This level of knowledge (comprehension) was not present within the ELP Standards when compared to the ELA Standards for mainstream students. An example of level of knowledge is displayed in Figure 2.

5. Know and use various text features to locate key facts or information in a text efficiently.

*Figure 2. An example of descriptor of knowledge and level of knowledge.*
Furthermore, additional language arts skills were omitted from the ELP Standards for students learning English as students progressed through the grades and into high school coursework as illustrated in Table 1. The gap between the correlation of ELP Standards and the standards for mainstream students increases as ELs advance into high school and increased content requirements.

The second discrepancy involved gaps within some of the ELP Standard proficiency levels. For example, a standard increased in difficulty for the beginner, early advanced and advanced EL proficiency levels; yet, this same standard was eliminated from the early intermediate and intermediate EL proficiency levels, as displayed in Figure 3.

![Figure 3: Lack of scaffolding within the English language stages of proficiency.](image-url)

When descriptors of knowledge and levels of proficiency are omitted from standards for a body of students, that group of students does not have access to the same education as other students. This signals serious issues for teachers of
students learning English and for the students themselves. Teachers are not provided with standards for language arts knowledge at all levels of proficiency for students. Subsequently, students who are not in the mainstream education track suffer not only a neglect of parallel grade level knowledge of ELA, but also a lack of grade level content knowledge such as science, math, and social studies.

**Previous Background**

My first experience with students learning English was early in my teaching career within an inner-city Phoenix high school, where I taught Biology I and Biology II. I was confident in my teaching abilities, but I quickly realized that I lacked the training and skills to teach ELs effectively. This experience was a turning point in my teaching career because I could see my lecture based-instruction and detailed notes reflected ineffective instruction for all students but especially those with limited or no English. I promptly sought assistance from the curriculum coach on site, and I was presented with the opportunity to return to school at Arizona State University for a Master’s degree and endorsement to teach English as a Second Language (ESL).

This two-year Master’s program focused on second language acquisition theory, levels of language development, lesson design, effective teaching strategies, and assessment processes. After I completed my program, I accepted an administrative position at another local inner-city high school to mentor novice teachers and to support English Language Development (ELD) teachers with lesson design and strategy implementation. Throughout this experience, I
observed and learned how students learning English were perceived as less intelligent than mainstream students. Some teachers requested that ELs be removed from their content classes and reassigned to electives such as gym, art, and computers because of their limited means of communication with English. These teachers believed ELs could not learn content material such as Biology I, Algebra I and II, Geometry I, Remedial Math, and History I, because they were not as capable as the mainstream students. This perception of ELs signaled that students who could not speak and write English adequately should not be registered within their classes.

I had learned throughout my Master’s program that effective teaching for ELs requires assistance through means of scaffolding instruction, providing visuals, and utilizing graphic organizers. Because these techniques entailed additional work they were often not easily accepted by teachers. I could relate to teachers’ frustration because I, too, once lacked knowledge about how to support and assist ELs.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001 brought increased attention to non-English speaking students in classrooms, and then the Arizona Task Force, created by House Bill 2064 in 2006, developed the Structured English Immersion (SEI) model for all schools. This model altered how ELs were taught, as well as determined they were separated from mainstream students. Although the primary component of NCLB mandated that “states develop standards in the crucial content areas of math, science, language arts and reading, and ELP”
Arizona’s SEI model comprised a prescriptive and restrictive approach to be used to teach ELs to become proficient in English within one school year. I will discuss this context and studies documenting this in chapter two.

This SEI model transformed instruction for ELs into daily four-hour blocks that encompassed reading, writing, listening, and speaking with specified time allocations. ELs identified as pre-emergent were to be taught more English through conversation, and as they progressed through the language levels they were to be exposed to more reading and writing in English. I initially thought that the ELP Standards used in the four-hour SEI model were in the best interests of ELs to acquire English and academic content; however, I later changed my perspective.

In my role as a coach I could see ELD teachers who taught the four-hour SEI model were not prepared to teach students with the ELP Standards. The prescriptive nature of the four-hour SEI model implementation required that I view education through a lens that was different from the one I used to teach Biology I and Biology II in my previous classrooms. My coaching experience with ELD teachers was challenging because these teachers were expected to teach four hours of English every day focused on reading, writing, listening and speaking, without providing a context such as academic content. Furthermore, I believed in the critical connection of the “descriptors of knowledge” and “level of knowledge” that I described previously in Figure 2. Teachers utilized the
standards to develop their daily lessons, but overtime I realized the majority of them struggled with how to scaffold lessons so students could master the level of knowledge identified in the standards. Scaffolding among some of the standards and academic content was missing (see e.g., Figure 1) and compounded by the absence of math, science, and social studies contexts.

My engagement with standards for teaching and teacher professional development increased at the school and district level because of my Master’s degree in curriculum and instruction and my ESL Endorsement. I joined two ELD teachers and the EL director at the district office to develop a scope and sequence that utilized the Arizona ELP Standards for high school English ELD courses. These courses for students learning English counted as English credit for ELs to meet Arizona’s high school graduation requirements. This district project with a team of other educators and my previous experiences in the pilot study with my colleague led me to question the consistency between the descriptors of knowledge in Arizona’s ELP Standards and the ELA Standards.

**Purpose of Study**

One of the NCLB objectives identified the improvement of English language education in order to prepare all students to meet state academic content standards. This implied, but did not require, the alignment of ELP standards to content standards. NCLB is based on improved student outcomes through the alignment of standards with assessments, and this alignment is the critical connection between the standards and subsequent knowledge assessment. I have
focused my research on Arizona, SEI, and the ELP Standards that became the sole source of instruction for ELD teachers as they were required to eliminate all content areas from the four hours of daily SEI instruction (ADE, 2008). In other states, academic content was embedded within ELP standards\(^1\) to provide a bridge for ELs to develop English proficiency as well as academic content. Various alignment strategies have been utilized (Council of Chief State School Officers, CCSSO, 2002) to measure the alignment between standards and assessments. One of the strategies developed by Webb (1997) affiliated with the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, evaluates match, depth and breadth on state assessments and academic standards for math and ELA. A study on WIDA alignment used Cook’s (2007) adaptations of Webb’s (1997) alignment methodology to examine the alignment between states’ ELP standards and Common Core State Standards. Cook’s (2007) adaptation reflects the linguistic and cognitive complexity and breadth among standards. A 2011 study by Chi, Garcia, Surber, and Trautman, utilized Cook’s method and identified a strong alignment between the WIDA and the Common Core ELA Standards.

My research will use a modified version of Cook’s method (described in detail in my methods chapter) to explore the alignment of ELP and ELA Standards for 2\(^{nd}\), 7\(^{th}\), and 9\(^{th}\) grades in two phases. Phase I addresses the state level and Phase II focuses on the national level. At the state level, I will analyze

---

\(^1\) WIDA standards; also note that when referring to standards at large, the word standard is not capitalized. The ELP Standards and ELA Standards to which I refer with a capitalized letter are those from Arizona.
the alignment of the Arizona ELP Standards with the Common Core ELA Standards. The Venn diagram in Figure 4 provides a visual representation of descriptors of knowledge with the Common Core ELA Standards and Arizona ELP Standards. Dark blue indicates alignment and the light blue shaded areas located on the outer area of the diagram indicate non-alignment of the descriptors of knowledge specified. It is important to identify this alignment because standards determine what content to teach as well as the level of difficulty the students are required to reach.

![Venn diagram showing alignment and non-alignment of standards for ELP and Common Core](image)

*Figure 4. Alignment and non-alignment of standards for ELP and Common Core.*

**Research Questions**

**Phase I.** The following questions are related to the first phase of my study. They include:

1. Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, and 9\textsuperscript{th} grade Common Core ELA Standards?
(2) What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards? and;

(3) What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?

My research will analyze the descriptors of knowledge within language arts standards and corresponding ELP standards. This analysis will illustrate the alignment between these two sets of standards. I will also analyze the vertical correlations between elementary, middle and high school grade levels. I selected second and ninth grades because the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) assessment is given to the grades immediately following these grade levels. AIMS assessment measures students’ academic progress in math, reading, and writing in relation to the grade level standards. Students in third through eighth grade and tenth grade take spring assessments, and passing the tenth grade assessments is a requirement for high school graduation. The vertical and horizontal alignment is important because the standards are the foundation of instruction for all students. If this alignment is absent, one group of students will be at a disadvantage. I also selected seventh grade because it is the grade level prior to the grade in which students exit middle school.

**Phase II.** I am further interested in the alignment at the national level because the Arizona ELP Standards focus on language development and acquisition as compared to standards from other states that include academic language such as math, science, and social studies embedded within their ELP
Standards. In the second phase of my study, I will analyze the Arizona ELP Standards and compare them to the 2007 WIDA Standards. A consortium of 27 states, WIDA developed its own ELP Standards with embedded academic language. WIDA Standards “encompass both social contexts associated with language acquisition and academic contexts tied to schooling in general” (Gottlieb, Cranley, & Cammilleri, 2007, p. 6). It is important to identify the commonalities between these two sets of ELP standards to understand similarities and differences of knowledge in addition to the level of knowledge identified within the two sets of standards. This will be a significant contribution to the knowledge base about the effectiveness of the Arizona ELP Standards. Figure 5 displays the alignment of descriptors of knowledge of the Arizona ELP Standards and 2007 WIDA Standards in dark blue. The light blue area indicates the non-alignment.

![Figure 5](image)

*Figure 5. Alignment and non-alignment of standards between ELP and WIDA Standards.*

Therefore, my research questions for Phase II of my study are the following:

1. Are the Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th and 9th grade 2007 WIDA Standards?
(2) What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards? and;

(3) What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?

**Hypothesis**

My hypotheses are that there will be gaps of alignment between Arizona ELP Standards and Common Core ELA Standards. Also, that the 2007 WIDA Standards will embrace higher levels of the knowledge descriptors as compared to the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Significance of the Study**

I completed this comparison of standards study to learn about and to inform Arizona districts, schools, and classroom teachers of the alignment between Arizona ELP Standards with the Common Core ELA State Standards and WIDA Standards for 2nd, 7th, and 9th grades. My goal was to determine the alignment between two sets of standards (Arizona ELP Standards, Common Core ELA State Standards, and WIDA Standards), the common descriptor of knowledge and the different descriptor of knowledge between these two sets of standards. Furthermore, I also looked at the alignment from a vertical perspective to consider the implications of the degree of change, if any, of the alignment of standards.

This study’s meaningful result would seem to be of value to standard developers, administrators and practitioners. This contributes to knowledge of the
importance of integrating English language acquisition, academic language and grade level academic content into standards for ELs. This study is especially pertinent because 47 states, including Washington D.C., will be implementing the Common Core State Standards within their schools this coming Fall 2012. This undertaking is the first time in history that standards are being adopted by a large number of states and it will impact various elements of education. Some elements that will be affected are teacher preparation, teacher professional development, content material, and resources. These school improvement changes specifically impact the development of college and career-ready standards for ELs as well as mainstream students.

Summary

I have addressed the organization of this dissertation, my background and experience with standards, the problem, overview of the methodology, and the professional significance of the problem in this chapter. In chapter 2, I discuss and review related literature. I will first provide an overview of this chapter, then the knowledge base for standards, and then examine the development and components of three ELP standard frameworks. Next, I discuss who ELs are and how reforms such as NCLB of 2001 impacts standards overall as well as the impact on ELP standards. Finally, a discussion regarding the importance of an intersection of academic content, academic language and English acquisition will be discussed.
Chapter three is the description of my methodology, the two different phases (eight steps for each phase), as well as how the data was analyzed. In chapter four, the reader is provided an in-depth look into each phase of the study in order to have a deeper understanding of how linkage, as well as the alignment of the standard sets, impact shared knowledge and higher order thinking skills for one group of students. Furthermore, each grade level (2nd, 7th, and 9th) is dissected to highlight knowledge common and not common within the standards. The final chapter includes the discussion of the findings specifically in relation to academic content, academic language and verb/skill level. Additionally, the implications of the study are discussed and the three overarching themes (equality, effectiveness, and globalization) will be explored in this last chapter.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I review the literature for the multiple contexts of my dissertation and develop the context for my research. My focus is on descriptor of knowledge and verb/skill level in sets of standards. First, I will discuss how standards have been developed starting with The Nation at Risk report through the development of the Common Core State Standards. Next, the types of standards will be shared and how they are part of No Child Left Behind (2001) guidelines. The three ELP standards frameworks (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment, and Arizona ELP Standards) will be examined next followed by the federal definition of ELs. In addition, the various language programs used to instruct ELs will be reviewed along with how second language acquisition is related to academic language. Finally, the importance of aligning ELP standards and grade level academic content standards provides a framework that intersects English acquisition, academic language, and grade-level academic content for providing significant and positive outcomes for students. Models for standards to assessment alignment and models for standard to standard alignment to validate the relationships between standards to assessments and standards to standards will also be discussed.

History of Standards: 1980 - 2005

The ideology, structure, and content of curriculum have been altered throughout the years in response to national and political pressures. Some of the
past curriculum theories focused on productivity and efficiency using *scientific management* (Taylor, 1949); others on providing the space for students to learn through their own experiences (Dewey, 1997); and yet another on learning through the visual and performing arts (Barone & Eisner, 1997). However the curriculum was defined, the topics to be taught in the classroom and school subjects were once heavily influenced by parents and local communities but changes in the national economy and a pervasive belief that education is linked to employment and the health of our national economy fueled a national debate about content and assessment (Berliner & Biddle, 1995). Over the last 30 years in particular, there has been a paradigm shift in curricular guidelines toward the integration of standards into both state and national curricular frameworks. Standards are intended to articulate and inform teachers what to teach along with the level of skill children are to attain. They define what teachers are required to teach (Porter, 1989) which is very different from how teachers develop their lessons. This paradigm shift and the resulting educational reforms are illustrated in Figures 6 and 7.
A National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) report entitled *A Nation At Risk* revealed that students across the U. S. were academically underachieving when it was issued in 1983. This report on public
education created a deep concern among Americans regarding the future and quality of a U.S. education. One report recommendation highlighted the value of a second language and stated that learning a foreign language should start in the elementary grades to introduce “students to non-English-speaking cultures, heighten awareness and comprehension of one's native tongue, and serve the Nation's needs in commerce, diplomacy, defense, and education” (NCEE, 1983, p. 23).

Two events were a result of the Nation at Risk report: (1) the development of math standards and (2) national educational goals and pressure for a common curriculum. Math standards were created and developed by a group of teachers and mathematics experts from the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) through a consensus process. These standards served as a model for replication by other professional organizations such as the International Reading Association (IRA), the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), and the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in the early 1990s (STANDARDS, 2007).

The second event in response to the Nation At Risk report was an initiative to establish national education goals by the year 2000 (http://goo.gl/66yCA). Part of this reform focused on developing standards that would provide a road map for content to be delivered by teachers and “drive the curriculum” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 205). Goals 2000 originated in the 1989 summit organized

2 Full link is accessible at http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_essay_bush_ghw_edsummit.shtml
by President George H. W. Bush whereby governors agreed to set national goals and also pledged support for state reform initiatives. The Goals 2000 initiative provided a means for “improv[ing] student learning through a long-term, broad-based effort to promote coherent and coordinated improvements in the system of education throughout the Nation at the State and local levels” (http://www2.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/sec302.html). This initiative provided states with resources to ensure that all students reached their full academic potential, and it encouraged the development of standards for academic content areas. The underlying assumption of this outcome-based education framework was that students would achieve more if more was expected of them.

Goals 2000 was a framework for outcome-based education to demonstrate, through test results, that students were learning; and its policies served as the precursor to the NCLB Act that was part of the second President Bush campaign (Mathis, 2010). NCLB, signed into law in 2002, was the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) enacted in 1965 as a component of President Johnson’s “War on Poverty” (http://www.k12.wa.us/ESEA/default.aspx). ESEA reform focused on compensatory funds and emphasized high standards and accountability in addition to an equal education for all learners. Part of its focus was “aimed at children who were both poor and ‘educationally disadvantaged because of their inability to speak English’” (Crawford, 1999, p. 40).
Components of NCLB included: (a) accountability to educate all students through standardized assessments; (b) increase the quality of education by requiring schools to demonstrate higher improved test scores and overall performance; and (c) devote more attention to minority students by creating common expectations (NCLB, 2001). Guidelines for developing standards and assessments were provided to states through Title I and III of NCLB. Title I required standards in reading, math, and science content for all students, including ELs; whereas Title III recognized ELs must have different means to “attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic competence in English, and meet the same challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards that all children are expected to meet” (U.S. Department of Education, 2003, p.5).

**Common Core Standards**

The movement for standards-based education reform was accelerated by the momentum for national state standards started through the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in 2008. The Common Core State Initiative began in 2009 when work groups comprised of “representatives from 41 states met with CCSSO and NGA representatives in Chicago and agreed to draft a set of common standards” (Mathis, 2010, p. 5).

The English language arts and mathematics Common Core State Standards were released in June 2010 as a result of the Common Core initiative.
Representatives from higher education, K-12 education, researchers and teachers participated in writing the Common Core State Standards (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2011). The initiative was supported by several major national organizations including the Alliance for Excellent Education, the Hunt Institute, the National Education Association, and the Business Roundtable (Ritter, 2009). Most recently, the Obama administration’s Race to the Top required states to meet specific criteria such as adoption of the Common Core State Standards in order to receive stimulus grant funds. Even though the U.S. Department of Education was not directly involved in this initiative, the Race to the Top program favored states that embraced the Common Core State Standards initiative (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

The Common Core State Standards identified what “American students need to know and do to be successful in college and careers” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, p. 1). These standards provided the benefits of national standards that included shared expectations and a focus for a national curriculum. Efficiency was also implied in that individual states would not need to develop their own content standards, assessments and curriculum guides. Furthermore, there was an expectation that assessments might be computer adaptive (Porter, McMaken, Hwant, & Yang, 2011). The process for writing the Common Core State Standards ensured the standards were informed by:

- the best state standards;
the experiences of teachers, content experts, states and leading thinkers; and

feedback from the general public

(https://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/process)

Yet, there were concerns about the Common Core State Standards regarding their quick development process, minimal input from school personnel, and neglect of their field testing (Mathis, 2010). Just recently, the Brookings Institution (Loveless, 2012) issued a report addressing similar concerns and stated, “the Common Core will have little effect on American students’ achievement [and] the nation will have to look elsewhere for ways to improve its schools” (p. 14).

**Types of Standards**

Use of the term *standards* in education evolved in part due to an article in the 1980s entitled *Systemic School Reform* (authored by Marshall S. Smith and Jennifer-O’Day). The authors asserted that education was disorganized, states needed to require specific goals for students and align them with curricular materials, assessment, and professional development. This assertion reinforced the *Nation At Risk* report that recommended action to implement “more rigorous and measurable standards” (NCEE, 1983, p. 23). Furthermore, this “idea of educational standards began as a foundation to education reform” (Rothman, 2011, p. 16). Moreover, one of the authors, Marshall Smith, forged his specific goal of curriculum framework into practice in 1993 when he was the
undersecretary of education in the U.S. Department of Education. Smith guided President Clinton in his education policy (Rothman, 2011), and his goal aligned with Mr. Clinton’s prior educational reform of providing an equitable education for all children while serving as Arkansas Governor.

**Opportunity to learn standards.** Although there were initially three categories, or types, of standards (the Opportunity to Learn Standards, Content Standards, and Performance Standards), the 1994 version of ESEA eliminated the Opportunity to Learn Standards as a requirement (Crawford, 2011); and these particular standards became voluntary to states and school districts. The Opportunity to Learn Standards ensured all students, including those who were disadvantaged, the means and resources necessary for an equitable education. These standards also conveyed specific conditions within the school and classroom that must be present for all students such as resources, learning materials, and facilities (e.g., [http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/opptolearnstandards](http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/opptolearnstandards)). They also ensured on-going professional development for teachers such as support for teachers to learn about variation among languages, and the educational backgrounds and experiences of ELs in addition to established principals of second-language learning (de Jong, Arias & Sanchez, 2010).

**Content Standards.** There are two types of student learning standards: content standards and performance standards (see Figure 8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Content Standards</strong></th>
<th><strong>Performance Standards</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflect the ideas, skills, and knowledge in each discipline that are important for everyone to learn</td>
<td>Define “excellence” and how good is “good enough”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8.* The two types of student learning standards. Adapted from Anderson, Riester, Gonzales, & Pechman, 1996.

Content standards have “broad descriptions of the knowledge and skills students should acquire in a particular subject area” (National Education Reform, 2010). They encompass math, language arts, science, social studies, technology, as well as areas such as art, music, physical education and foreign languages. Content standards may be grade level specific or address “more than one grade if grade-level content expectations are provided for each of grades 3 through 8” (U.S. Department of Education, 2007, p. 2). An example of a second grade Common Core State Standard in ELA within the language domain is “Use a known root word as a clue to the meaning of an unknown word with the same root (e.g., addition, additional)” (Common Core, 2011, p. 27). Content standards define the minimum expectation for all students, including those who are linguistically and
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3 From this point forward, any time I am referring to the Common Core ELA Standards, I will simply refer to them as *Common Core*. This is not to be confused with the Common Core State Standards (in full), as that will remained referenced to in that way.
culturally diverse. Additionally, Ravitch (1995) believed content standards should be written in a way for teachers to understand what is expected of students and measurable so students could demonstrate mastery. Yet, her perspective and others’ on standards has evolved into a frenzy over testing and educational accountability (Popham, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Taubman, 2009).

**Performance Standards.** Performance standards are markers of a desired performance and distinguish what students must know and be able to do. They determine the levels of attainment and demonstrate how well a student demonstrates knowledge for the teacher (Ravitch, 1995). An example of a 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade performance standard is use “a demonstrative adjective and a noun in a complete sentence” (p. 19)\textsuperscript{4}. The following example meets the above performance standard through a written sentence: *Robin’s extended family traveled to California for the celebration.*

**Three ELP standards frameworks in the U.S.**

Educational standards was part of the foundation to NCLB educational reform, yet, most ELs were “receiving a second-class education” (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2004, p. 149). Even though NCLB (2001) was intended to shed more light on how ELs were identified, taught, and assessed, states were not required to align grade level academic standards with grade level ELP standards. This neglect of ELs shifted once Teachers of English Speakers of Other Languages,

Inc. (TESOL) created a framework that stated educational personnel within the schools must take responsibility for ELs. Six years after the development of the framework in 2002, NCLB required states to develop standards for ELs in order to receive federal funding. This new requirement prompted the development of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Standards funded through a federal grant; currently 27 states apply these standards for educating ELs. However, individual states such as Arizona developed their own standards for ELs.

I selected the TESOL, WIDA and Arizona ELP Standards because they are all different English language proficiency frameworks and next will review these frameworks. TESOL was chosen because it was the pioneer of creating standards specifically for ELs and its committed role towards professional development in English language teaching and learning has continued. I selected WIDA and the Arizona ELP Standards for two reasons; their frameworks are completely different and WIDA was a collaboration of 27 states in contrast to the Arizona ELP Standards that were developed for and by a single state.

**TESOL.** TESOL developed the first framework for ELP standards as a result of the Goals 2000 initiative. This initiative was an opportunity for all students to reach their full academic potential, and the standards created were intended for all students, including ELs. However, at this time, the federal government did not require states to develop ELP standards, and this inattention prompted TESOL’s first task force that encouraged professional organizations to
develop content specific standards to accommodate ELs. This prompted the TESOL task force to produce *The Access Brochure* for educators to use as they developed standards to ensure ELs were provided the opportunity to for a quality education (TESOL, 1993).

TESOL was the first professional organization to develop standards specifically for ELs in the U.S. TESOL recognized the educational neglect towards ELs and its goal was to “create a conceptual framework for setting standards for ESL” that would increase equitable education (TESOL, 1997, p. v). These standards were developed to allow students to acquire English proficiency in addition to academic content in order for students to receive the same quality of education as proficient English speakers. The “nature of language, language learning, human development, and pedagogy” laid the foundation for the TESOL standards (TESOL, 1997, p. 6).

In 1997, TESOL published *ESL Standards for Pre K-12 Students* and identified four needs prompting the necessity of ELP standards:

(a) linguistic and cultural diversity has increased in schools and communities in the United States;

(b) English learner English proficiency levels and academic needs vary;

(c) standards describe necessary language skills for social and academic purposes; and

(d) the ESL standards are a bridge to academic content standards rather than having the standards in isolation. (p. 2-3)
The TESOL standards were based on eight general principles of language acquisition that stemmed from research and theory:

- Language is functional, language varies, language learning is cultural learning, language acquisition is a long-term process, language acquisition occurs through meaningful use and interaction, language processes develop interdependently, native language proficiency contributes to second language acquisition, and bilingualism is an individual and societal asset. (1997, p. 6-8)

These principles emphasized three broad goals for ELs: (a) to communicate in social settings, (b) to achieve academically in all content areas, and (c) to use English in socially and culturally appropriate ways. Each of these three broad goals embraced the standards within. For example, see Goal 2 and its standards illustrated in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2. Using English to achieve academically in all content areas stress that English Learners speak and write in English and learn academic content material by using the English language.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1:</strong> To interact in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2:</strong> Obtain, process, construct, and provide subject matter information in spoken and written form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3:</strong> Use appropriate learning strategies to construct and apply academic knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 9. ESL standards. Taken from Short, 2000, p. 1.*

The 1997 TESOL standards were revised to become the revised 2006 PreK-12 ELP standards. The revised standards (1) “expanded the scope and
breadth of the ESL content standards”, (2) focused on the child’s primary language and culture for the development of academic language, and (3) provided structure aligned with the federal legislation. The revised 2006 PreK-12 ELP standards were built on and augmented the 2004 World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Standards (WIDA).

WIDA Standards. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction was awarded a federal Enhancement Assessment Grant in 2002 to develop ELP Standards. The original grant partners, Wisconsin (the lead state), Delaware, and Arkansas formed WIDA and later changed its name to the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment. Later that year, the District of Columbia, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Illinois joined WIDA. Then in 2009, the WIDA Consortium expanded to 22 states that included: Alabama, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. International schools and schools within the U.S. utilized WIDA standards and materials to ensure the best resources for educating ELs (see e.g., http://www.wida.us/aboutus/mission.aspx).

The grant was aligned with NCLB and had four objectives:

(1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of state academic assessments;
(2) measure student academic achievement using multiple measures of student academic achievement from multiple sources;
(3) chart student progress over time; and
(4) evaluate student academic achievement through the development of comprehensive academic assessment instruments, such as performance and technology-based academic assessments. (e.g.,


The WIDA Standards met the requirements of Title I and Title III of NCLB. WIDA’s framework was created to plan for curriculum and instruction that included the following elements: (a) ELP standards, (b) language domains, (c) grade level clusters, and (d) language proficiency levels (Gottleib, 2004). The first version of the proficiency standards addressed kindergarten through twelfth grade and it encompassed both “social contexts associated with language acquisition and academic contexts tied to standards, curriculum and instruction” (Gottleib et al., 2007, p. 6). The WIDA Standards utilized academic language proficiency as a theoretical base to address linguistic difficulty and intellectual involvement along with context in the domains of language. For example, WIDA Standards addressed the language of math and ideas and concepts essential for academic success in math.
The second edition of the WIDA Standards, published in 2007, expanded the social and academic contexts of language acquisition. The intent of this edition was to “guide the development of test blueprints, task specification, and ELP measures” (Gottleib et al., 2007, p. i). The classroom and large-scale state assessment frameworks from the first edition were revised to include both formative and summative frameworks to be used as guides for planning curriculum instruction as well as the assessments. This edition encompassed four purposes enhanced by TESOL’s national model:

- Facilitate English Language Learner (ELLs) English proficiency attainment, access to content knowledge and ultimately, their academic success.
- Provide a curriculum/assessment resource anchored in academic language standards.
- Establish a common yardstick to define and measure how ELLs require language across the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing.
- Comply with federal law, NCLB, requiring English Language Proficiency standards to English Learners standards-based assessment. (Gottleib et al., 2007)

Figure 10 illustrates the differences between the two editions (2004, 2007) of WIDA. There are two significant changes in the second edition. PreK was added to the kindergarten cluster because there are significant differences in how
PreK and kindergarten students function linguistically as compared to first and second grade (Gottleib et al., 2007). Also, the literacy development of children in these age clusters (PreK – Kindergarten and grades 1 and 2) are very different. The second change, Level 6 Reaching, was added to the ELP levels to enhance the accommodations for students who were near transition into the mainstream classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative and Summative Frameworks for Assessment and Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Classroom and Large-scale State Assessment Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 grade level clusters: <strong>PreK-K</strong>, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12</td>
<td>4 grade level clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged by <strong>language domain</strong>; listening and speaking, reading and writing</td>
<td>Arranged by grade level cluster, displaying all grade levels on the same page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example topics, drawn from state and <strong>national</strong> academic content standards, <strong>listed for each language domain and presented in the left-hand column of the matrices</strong></td>
<td>Example topics, drawn from state academic content standards, embedded within the strands of model performance indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example genre strands of model performance indicators</strong> drawn from state and national academic content standards, <strong>listed for each language domain and presented in the left-hand column of the matrices, alternate with topic strands in Standard 2.</strong></td>
<td>Genre strands not systematically treated in Standard 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory, graphic and/or interactive support present in model performance indicators through language proficiency level 4</td>
<td>Sensory and/or graphic support present in model performance indicators no higher than language proficiency level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10. Differences between WIDA’s PreK-12 ELP standards in 2007 and 2004 editions. Taken from Gottleib et al., 2007, p. 8.*
**Design of WIDA ELP standards.** WIDA’s Standards bridge the development of English language with content specific academic language. These standards encompass five proficiency standards, each addressing a different context for language acquisition. The contexts for these standards (social and instructional, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) are intended to ensure ELs become successful in school. Each context includes four language domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in addition to five grade level clusters: PreK-K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12 (WIDA Consortium, 2007). Language proficiency levels and performance definitions are embedded within each of the five WIDA ELP standards (WIDA Consortium, 2007).

Each language proficiency level indicates what students must demonstrate (or are required to learn) within each domain of the standards at each grade level cluster. For example, a performance definition at the Entering level of English language proficiency indicates a student must be able to process pictorial or graphic representation of the language of the content areas; words, phrases, or chunks of language when presented with one-step commands, directions, WH-, choice or yes/no questions, or statements with sensory, graphic or interactive support; oral language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that often impede meaning when presented with basic oral commands, direct questions, or simple
statements with sensory, graphic or interactive support. (WIDA Consortium 2007, p. 45)

Alternatively, a student who is at the Reaching Level 6 of English language proficiency must be able to understand and produce all of the following:

(1) specialized or technical language reflective of the content areas at grade level;

(2) a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in extended oral or written discourse as required by the specific grade level; and

(3) oral or written communication in English comparable to English-proficient peers. (WIDA Consortium 2007, p. 45)

Each ELP standard incorporated language support for students through Model Performance Indicators (MPI) and developed *CAN DO descriptors* that provided examples of ELs’ development for teacher guidance and instructional support.

WIDA is one of the entities collaborating with other states to improve education for students who are not proficient in English. Another is the Southwest Comprehensive Center (SWCC). SWCC is part of 16 Regional Comprehensive Centers, such as the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center and the New England Comprehensive Center. These centers assist groups of states and individual states on increasing their capacity for implementing NCLB provisions. The SWCC is comprised of five states, including Arizona.
**Arizona ELP Standards.** The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) hired a consultant, Susan Pimentel, to develop the first set of ELP Standards. She was a main contributor to the development of Arizona’s K-12 standards and a lead consultant for the Common Core. The design of the Arizona ELP Standards addressed the language development needs of ELs to achieve social and academic language proficiency and provide the curriculum for non-English speakers in a four-hour block of **Structured English Immersion (SEI)**. The intent of the program was for ELs to have an intense focus on English instruction in order for them to exit out of the language program and into the mainstream classroom as quickly as possible (Arizona Revised Statute, 2000).

**Design of Arizona ELP standards.** ADE asserts its language proficiency standards provide ELs with the appropriate “skill, ability and knowledge to access content in math, science and social studies” and the standards address the three language domains of reading, writing, listening and speaking (ADE, 2011, slide 50). The four components of each language domain are an introductory statement, performance condition summaries, five stages of proficiency, and five levels of performance (see Figure 11). The introductory statement describes how ELs develop language proficiency through structured lessons. Summaries at the beginning of each domain inform teachers of performance expectations for student skills and abilities in each stage of proficiency.

---

Figure 11. Overview structure of the Arizona ELP Standards.

The third component of each domain is the five stages of proficiency that are displayed in Figure 12. These increase in cognitive demand as students progress through the stages. Each proficiency stage encompasses five levels of proficiency that correspond to grade levels.

- ELL I is correlated to Kindergarten
- ELL II is correlated to grades 1-2
- ELL III is correlated to grades 3-5
- ELL IV is correlated to grades 6-8
- ELL V is correlated to grades 9-12

Figure 12. Stages of proficiency within each domain (ADE, 2007).
The fourth component is the five levels of performance that increase cognitively as a student progresses: Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced, and Advanced. These five levels of performance each encompass a performance standard depicting what the student should achieve.

Arizona contracted with WestEd in 2005 for the second revision of the Arizona ELP Standards. WestEd is a nonprofit research and service agency, headquartered in San Francisco, California, that was selected by the U.S. Department of Education to operate the SWCC and work collaboratively with five states: Arizona, Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, and Colorado (WestEd, n.d.).

The SWCC English Language Learner collaborative is focused on three purposes. The first purpose is for states to use a framework that “ensure[s] that their English Language Learners achieve English proficiency and achieve academically at high levels” (ADE, 2011, slide 8). The second purpose is to “assist with expert linguistic education personnel for support and facilitation” and the third purpose is to “revise and create the highest quality English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessment” (ADE, 2011, slide 7).

This collaboration began in June 2009 and occurred over a year-long project; gap analyses were conducted, and small group work sessions and revision committee meetings were scheduled (ADE, 2011). The revised standards changed four elements in the original Arizona ELP Standard framework. The first element included adding a language strand to the listening and speaking domain, reading domain, and writing domain. The second transformation
occurred with proficiency level labels as they were changed to match the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment labels. The third modification resulted in separating the Intermediate Proficiency Level into two sections, Low Intermediate and High Intermediate. The fourth adjustment incorporated the Discrete Skills Inventory as part of the ELP standards’ Proficiency Level Descriptors (ADE, 2011). The revised standards were released in late summer of 2011 for implementation to occur that fall.

There were ten principles that guided the Arizona ELP revision process:

- the ELP foundation stems from the proficiency level descriptors;
- instruction varies through the various stages and proficiency levels;
- complexity indicators should increase vertically and horizontally access levels and stages;
- progression/alignment should be evident within proficiency levels and stages;
- ELP standards encompass language prerequisites to academic standards;
- purposeful overlap of ELP and ELA skills and knowledge;
- proficiency level descriptors and indicators should clearly “define” differentiation vertically and horizontal among levels and stages;
- ELP and ELA organization and structure should be similar;
• recommendation for change should be based on evidence (e.g., from the 3-part standards review, theory, research, training, teaching experience); and

• the language of content areas of science, social studies and math will be addressed. (ADE, 2011, slides 15-17)

The ADE states the revised standards are all-inclusive and reflect the language skills of the Common Core and encompass three domains and one strand: the (a) writing domain, (b) reading domain, (c) listening and speaking domain, and (d) a language strand (see e.g., http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2012/02/guidance-doc-finalized.pdf) (refer back to Figure 11). The first domain, writing, focuses on conventions, writing applications, and writing process, in addition to writing elements and research. However, the writing elements and research within the writing domain were omitted in the first stage of proficiency. The second domain, reading, is comprised of print concepts, phonemic awareness and decoding, in addition to comprehending text and fluency. Fluency is addressed in stages two through five. The third domain entails listening and speaking which concentrates on comprehension and delivery of oral communication. The language strand addresses conventions and vocabulary (http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2012/02/guidance-doc-finalized.pdf).
Models for Standards to Assessment Alignment

Educational accountability through NCLB reform focused states, school districts, and schools on curricular alignment and the relationships between standards, instructional activities and assessments, as displayed in Figure 13.

Alignment models are not new and have been used to evaluate the alignment between assessments and standards in addition to providing test validation. However, alignment measures are more prevalent as a result of NCLB accountability systems that hold schools more accountable for educating subgroup populations such as ELs and Special Education students as compared to prior NCLB.

The alignment between assessments and standards is critical for understanding what students know and do not know regarding the content. States
and schools need to validate assessments through alignment models to ensure the assessment questions measure the standards. There are various alignment models such as the Achieve Model developed by Achieve Inc., a non-profit educational leadership organization, and two models that have been used specifically by the Council of Chief State School Officers. These latter two are the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC) Model and Webb’s Model (CCSSO, 2002).

The first model, Achieve, provided an in-depth review and analysis of assessments and standards. This model measured the degree of alignment through five criteria: (a) content centrality, (b) performance centrality, (c) challenge, (d) balance, and (e) range. There were a high number of inference judgments made by the reviewers and this model was deficient in a cross state comparison (CCSSO, 2002). The second model, SEC, was created by Andrew Porter and John Smithson, and it utilized a common content academic matrix to produce alignment of standards, assessments, and instructional content. This model utilized two subject content categories, Content Topic and Cognitive Demands. The SEC model was field tested, in eleven states and schools in four large urban districts and utilized across schools, districts and states for comparisons (CCSSO, 2002). The third model, Webb, was created by Dr. Norman Webb from the University of Wisconsin. It provided an intersection of state assessments and standards through the use of low inference judgments, coding, and statistical analysis. This method had been applied in alignment studies in the content areas of language arts, math, science, and social studies in ten states.
Webb (2002) defines alignment as “the degree to which expectations and assessments are in agreement and serve in conjunction with one another to guide the system toward students learning what they are expected to know and do” (p. 2). Webb utilized five criteria for alignment: (a) content focus, (b) articulation across grades, (c) equity and fairness, (d) pedagogical implications, and (e) system applicability. The first criterion for alignment, content focus, is different for each subject: science, math, social studies and English language arts. The second criterion, articulation across grades, identifies alignment within each grade and also between grade levels. The third criterion is equity and fairness for areas such as special education. The fourth criterion, addresses pedagogy and last, the alignment process needs to take into consideration the resources needed for alignment (Webb, 2005).

Webb’s (1999, 2002) studies utilized four specific criteria from the content focus area to address the alignment between state standards and state assessments. *Alignment of Science and Mathematics Standards and Assessments in Four States* (Webb, 1999) verified criteria that were an effective means of identifying the alignment between standards and assessments. The 2002 study conducted by Webb, *An Analysis of the Alignment Between Mathematics Standards and Assessment for Three States*, advanced the development of this systematic method and the tools for alignment between standards and assessments. In each of these studies, Webb highlighted four criteria: (a) categorical concurrence, (b) depth-of-knowledge consistency, (c) range of...
knowledge correspondence, and (d) balance of representation of the alignment between standards and assessments.

The first alignment criterion Webb identified is categorical concurrence. Categorical concurrence entailed addressing the same content between standards and assessments. Webb said the “criterion of categorical concurrence between standards and assessment are met if the same or consistent categories of content appear in both documents” (Webb, 1999, p. 15). Webb recommended that an acceptable level of reliability have at least six items per content standard. For example, if measurement was a standard within a 2nd grade mathematics class there would need to be six assessment questions related to the measurement topic.

Even through categorical concurrence is the most apparent aspect of alignment the degree of knowledge level is equally important. The second alignment criterion is depth of knowledge. Webb (1999) defined depth-of-knowledge as “consistency between standards and assessments [that] indicates alignment if what is elicited from students on the assessments is as demanding cognitively as what students are expected to know and do as stated in the standards” (p. 15-16). Webb identified four depth-of-knowledge (DOK) levels (Level 1 recall; Level 2 skill/concept; Level 3 strategic thinking; and Level 4 extended thinking) to provide descriptions for clarification. The depth-of-knowledge definition and labels vary somewhat as a result of different content areas (see Table 2 and Table 3). According to Webb, a satisfactory level for the
DOK is 50% or more of the assessment items are at or above the content standard DOK level.

Table 2  
**Depth-of-Knowledge Levels for Language Arts Reading**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Recall of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Basic Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Complex Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Extended Reasoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from [http://wat.wceruw.org/Tutorial/LangArtsDOKDef.aspx](http://wat.wceruw.org/Tutorial/LangArtsDOKDef.aspx).

Table 3  
**Depth-of-Knowledge Levels for Mathematics**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Skill/Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Extended Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from [http://wat.wceruw.org/Tutorial/MathDOKDef.aspx](http://wat.wceruw.org/Tutorial/MathDOKDef.aspx)

The third alignment criterion is breadth of knowledge or range-of-knowledge. The criterion of range-of-knowledge “is used to judge whether a comparable span of knowledge expected of students by a standard is the same as, or corresponds to, the span of knowledge that students need in order to correctly answer the assessment items/activities” (Webb, 1999, p. 16). According to Webb (2002), “the criterion for correspondence between span of knowledge for a
standard and the assessment considers the number of objectives within the
standard with one related assessment item/activity” (p. 6). Fifty percent or more
of the objectives of the standards had to have a related assessment item in order
for the criterion to be acceptable. The range-of-knowledge identifies the number
of objectives within a standard that correspond to an assessment item, but it does
not take into consideration the emphasis of objectives throughout the assessment.

The fourth alignment criteria, balance of representation “indicates the
degree to which one objective is given more emphasis on the assessment than
another” (Webb, 1999 p. 17). An index of /0/ through /1/ is used to identify the
acceptability of the distribution of assessment items. A /0/ indicates an
unbalanced representation whereas a /1/ represents a balanced representation.
Values greater than .7 are identified as acceptable whereas values from .6 to .7 are
considered a weak, but acceptable balance (Webb, 1999, 2002).

There is a relationship between standards, instruction, and assessments
(Anderson, 2002); furthermore, the alignment between assessments and standards
is a critical component to understand what the student knows and does not
understand regarding the content. In the next section I will describe who ELs are,
their increase in enrollment in schools, how NCLB has impacted standards and
assessments, and characteristics of programs for ELs.

**Who are English Learners?**

ELs according to the federal government are “those whose native language
is not English and who have difficulty reading, writing, speaking, or
comprehending English such that it limits success in the classroom” (Davenport, 2011, p. 5). All of these factors impact acquisition of the English language (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2010) especially since many ELs do not develop their native language beyond conversational language, and subsequently their native language is lost. Wong-Fillmore (1991) found the younger a child learned English the more the child’s discourse changed at home and that these children were at a higher probability of losing their native language. There are a variety of characteristics of ELs. Many ELs embrace a native language other than English and adhere to differences in culture, native language, religion, education, socioeconomic status, and various English language acquisition levels (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008).

ELP standards through NCLB (2001) were intended to address the needs of ELs with the acquisition of the English language and access to academic content in schools and classrooms. An EL is defined by NCLB as

(a) age 3 through 21;
(b) enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary or secondary school;
(c) not born in the United States or whose native language is not English;
(d) a Native America, Alaskan Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas;
(e) from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on an individual’s level of English language proficiency;
(f) migratory and comes from an environment where English is not the dominant language; and
(g) has difficulties in speaking, reading, writing or understanding the English language that may deny the individual the ability to meet the state’s proficient level of achievement and the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where English is the language of instruction, or to participate fully in society. (Cawthon, 2010, p. 1)

The need for English instruction is greater than ever before as a result of the increase in ELs’ enrollment in k-12 schools. The non-English speaking population has expanded throughout the country from the East to the West coasts. The enrollment population in schools more than doubled from the 1989-1990 school year to the 2004-2005 school year and overall the EL population increased seven times the number of total school enrollment (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). California’s K-12 school enrollment in 2008-2009 (1,512,122 EL students) is just slightly under the following states’ EL enrollment combined: Texas (713,218); Florida (257,776); New York (229,260); Illinois (208,839); and Arizona (149,320) (NCELA, 2011).

Even though this enormous increase of EL enrollment in schools poses challenges for states, schools and classroom teachers who are teaching ELs (Calderón, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011), NCLB was a turning point for students who did not speak English. Title I required standards in reading, math, and science content for all students, including ELs; whereas Title III recognized ELs must
have different means to “attain English proficiency, develop high levels of
academic competence in English, and meet the same challenging state academic
content and student academic achievement standards that all children are expected
to meet” (U.S. Department of Education, 2003, p. 5). This provision said “States
are encouraged, but not required, to align English language proficiency standards
with academic content and achievement standards” (U.S. Department of
Education, 2003, p. 9). This allowed states to link ELP standards to academic
content standards. Title III provisions aligned with Title I provisions in that ELs
must attain both English language acquisition and academic content; however, the
provisions for standards and means of assessing students were not required to be
aligned as a result of the word encouraged in the provision (Ramsey & O’Day,
2010). Consequently, the relationship between academic content standards and
English language proficiency standards varies from state to state (Golden, 2011).
For example, some states focus only on learning the English language such as
Arizona where the ELP Standards narrow the curriculum to language instruction
(ADE, 2011); while other states, such as Illinois ELP standards (WIDA), embed
academic language with English acquisition (Gottleib et al., 2007).

**English Learner Programs**

There are two over-arching program model umbrellas for English learners:
ELD programs and bilingual education. ELD programs are the most common
(Peregoy & Boyle, 2008) and they are delivered in various ways with English
used for instruction. Bilingual education programs promote academic and
linguistic development in two languages and embrace two goals: (1) to teach English and (2) to provide access to the curriculum through the students’ native language while they are acquiring English (Lessow-Hurley, 2005). Types of EL program models contrast from English submersion, to two–way bilingual education, to structured immersion programs that embrace varied goals are illustrated in Appendix A. ELs placed in SEI programs, such as in Arizona, are focused on learning English and not content (Gándara & Orfield, 2012), because the ELP standards determine what teachers are required to teach (Porter, 1989) but not how to teach English in the context of content studies.

Restriction of receiving the same opportunities to obtain an education as other students within that school from non-English speakers was contested by *Lau vs. Nichols* (1974) and further enforced through NCLB (2001). Furthermore, the *Lau Remedies* which followed were created as a result of The Civil Rights Act, which provided the federal government authority over state and local educational decisions to ensure ELs were provided access to grade level academic content in addition to acquisition of English through methods students could understand. The *Lau vs. Nichols* (1974) case ruled that under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, children who have limited English proficiency are entitled to special assistance to allow them to participate within their classrooms. This lawsuit, filed on behalf of non-English speaking students of Chinese ancestry in the San Francisco School System, was the only ruling by the U. S. Supreme Court which overruled the lower court.
In Arizona, the passage of Proposition 203 “English for the Children”, changed Arizona’s educational policy options for ELs when it passed in 2000. This law mandated bilingual education programs be dismantled and replaced with SEI programs (Mahoney, Haladyna & MacSwan, 2009). The SEI program consists of four-hours of English-only immersion for the first year in which students are classified as ELs, and it requires ELs to be grouped based on their English language proficiency (Arizona Revised Statute, 2000). Each domain of language instruction is allocated a specific number of minutes (Gándara et al., 2010). The impact of this segregation begins the first day of school for children within their local neighborhoods because many ELs are separated from mainstream students as a result of the SEI policy in Arizona (Gándara & Orfield, 2012).

Limited resources and funds have placed increased demands on schools across the nation at the same time NCLB (2001) increased accountability requirements. In Arizona, funding for kindergarten was cut in half and required districts to find additional funding for all-day kindergarten. Also, funding for books, computers and support for disadvantage students in preschool to third grade were diminished (Johnson, Oliff, & Williams, 2010).

The various program models used to educate ELs are informed by knowledge of language learning identified in Appendix A. In the next section, I will review the importance of Krashen’s (1985) input hypothesis that is focused on the development of English acquisition, specifically academic language. Next,
I will describe how language (social and academic language) is an important vehicle for content learning (Genesee, 1994). Finally, I will describe models for standard-to-standard alignment. This alignment, including the implications, is an important aspect that may be overlooked. My research questions are focused on the intersection of English acquisition, academic language, and grade level academic content for ELs that are described in this chapter.

**Relationship of Acquiring a Second Language and First Language**

Everyone has experienced and participated in acquiring a first language even if they cannot recall specific events. The first and second language acquisition is parallel to the perspectives of behaviorist, innatist, and interactionist theories (Peregory & Boyle, 2008). Behaviorist teaching involves imitation, repetition, and reinforcement of the correct grammatical form. The innatist theory is based on a universal language and aligns with Krashen’s (1982) five hypotheses which will be discussed later in this chapter. This theory embraces an unstructured instruction practice; however, it is made comprehensible by the teacher as well as students acquiring the grammar once they are exposed to it and not through direct instruction. Lastly, the interactionist theory focuses on communication for language acquisition which provides the opportunity for language used within communication to be corrected naturally through meaning making.

Language acquisition is a subconscious process where one develops a second language alongside a first language through contact with speakers of that
When children play with each other on the playground they begin to acquire the words and phrases of their playmates. Another way of developing a second language is through learning. Learning is through an individual being conscious of the knowledge being learned such as through following a recipe to cook (Krashen, 1981).

Acquiring a first and second language is similar, through trial and error; for example, grammatical mistakes, not knowing words and phrases, relying on corrected pronunciation, and assistance with comprehension (Collier, 1989). Individuals with an extensive vocabulary in their native or first language may develop a second language more quickly (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010), and individuals who have previous knowledge in their native language, or academic capital, can tap into this previous knowledge to accelerate the acquisition of a second language.

Additionally, individuals who are acquiring a first or second language pass through stages toward proficient use of the language (Brown, 1973; Pinker 1994). Krashen and Terrell (1983) identified language proficiency stages in order to provide guidelines for teachers of second language learners. These are: Pre-Production, Early Production, Speech Emergence, Intermediate Fluency, and Advanced Fluency. The stages provide guidance for teachers to identify how a child may answer as in a one or two word response, and the suggested indicators for each stage assist teachers with teaching methods and expectations for children acquiring a second language. This assistance, or guidance, permits a teacher to
work within a student’s *zone of proximal development* (Vygotsky, 1978), the area between what the student knows and what the teacher wants the student to learn.

Since language learning is not a linear process (Larsen-Freeman, 1997), language proficiency stages can overlap with one another as each individual has different language strengths and needs. The language proficiency stages illustrate how language learners progress through a language by using and expressing language in more complex ways. All languages are equally complex (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2010) and a language learner’s progress learning a second language can be more complex than an individual learning their first language. Part of this complexity is the similarity of one language structure to another such as Spanish to English as compared to Japanese to English.

Since the process of acquiring a second language can be more complex than acquiring a first language, it is critical for teachers to be aware of each student’s strengths and areas of refinement needed within each language domain; reading, writing, listening, and speaking. In order to provide appropriate support in the classroom a teacher must know a student’s strength to scaffold the learning process through strategies such as graphic organizers and modeling (de Jong & Harper, 2005). An EL my know how to multiply, but the same student may struggle in writing. An EL might speak fluently using simplistic English with his or her teacher; yet, this student could be deficient in English, specifically in reading and writing (Herrera, Murry, & Cabral, 2007).
A student’s vocabulary and academic capital, previous knowledge, in the first language are directly related to successful acquisition of a second language. Quality schools and classrooms, teachers trained to work specifically with second-language learners, and extra-curricular academic opportunities within a neighborhood and school all provide a rich context for language learning. When students do not have these resources and this foundation, it takes more time to build background knowledge and make connections with newly acquired material. These resources are tied directly to previous education, the length of time in the U.S., and socio-economic status. These combined factors make each individual unique (Fernandez & Nielsen, 1986; Nielsen & Lerner, 1986).

Under or overestimating ELs’ skills is easily overlooked by teachers who are not prepared. Some ELs are unable to demonstrate their level of content knowledge on standardized assessments and tests when these are given to students in the unfamiliar language of English. It is possible the students are knowledgeable about the academic content, yet the language barrier may prevent them from performing well. As a result, poor test results may lead to low teacher expectations for those students.

Since each child encompasses diverse strengths and areas for refinement, it is essential for states to have English language proficiency standards that identify specifically what students need to know and do related to English acquisition and grade level academic content. There is a critical shortage of teachers prepared to educate and respond to the needs of ELs (Wong-Fillmore &
Snow, 2002), and current research indicates mainstream teachers are ill-equipped to effectively teach ELs and have limited access to professional development focused on what to teach and how to teach ELs (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). States cannot assume that all teachers who are teaching ELs are knowledgeable of the specific levels of language acquisition and grade level academic content.

ELP standards can provide the structure required for teachers to identify and scaffold where students are located on the continuum of language proficiency stages in the domains of reading, writing, listening and speaking (Gottlieb, 2006). Proficiency standards identify specific skills the teacher can work with to improve students’ reading and writing skills in English.

Cummins (1980) and Krashen (1981) have each contributed to our understanding and knowledge of language acquisition and language learning with terminology and descriptions of the processes involved. I will now describe each scholar’s theories and then discuss academic language and content. My research hypothesis is that ELP standards need to be aligned to grade level academic content standards and this knowledge provides the context for that research.

Alignment ensures ELs and teachers are provided a standard framework that intersects English acquisition, academic language, and grade level academic content. These three intersection elements are essential for ELs to acquire English proficiency in tandem with grade level academic content. The parallel alignment structure of ELP standards and grade level academic content standards
provides three significant positive outcomes: (a) equitability, (b) effective standards-based education system, and (c) globalization.

**BICS and CALP**

Cummins (1980) identified two distinct areas for language use and proficiency: basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and academic cognitive language proficiency (CALP). Cummins believes BICS is the foundation to language interactions and that this interpersonal communication capacity is required to comprehend conversations that are sometimes referred to as *playground talk* or *conversational language* because the language is often simple words and phrases. Cummins identifies CALP as *academic language* because it is more cognitively demanding than playground language. CALP allows a student to access and use language that is tied to classroom requirements such as reading academic texts or writing on a topic after reading about the topic.

However, over time, other researchers have disagreed with Cummins language proficiency conceptualization. Baker (1993) believes language is more complex and multifaceted, and other critics agree that Cummins’s language proficiency model was overly simplistic for a complex language process (Frederickson & Cline 1990). Bailey and Butler (2002) also disagree with the dichotomy between social and academic language in relation to language proficiency, and they view proficiency as a developmental continuum for ELs in schools.
The complex process of learning a second language is long-term. This long-term process is not a cookie cutter one in which Larsen-Freeman (1997) sees “many striking similarities between the new science of chaos/complexity and language and SLA [Second Language Acquisition]” (p. 141). She presents arguments for understanding the complexity of language and second language acquisition as a result of non-linear growth and change. The various language developmental stages are important to take into consideration because they identify for the teacher what the students can produce and understand at each stage in the process. Research shows that it may take five or more years to demonstrate competence with academic language in settings with native speakers (Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002).

ELs at all stages of acquiring English will need additional support to make connections and comprehend new material (de Jong & Harper, 2005). This additional support will enable students to learn and demonstrate their comprehension of academic content material through the English language (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2007). Krashen (1985) has enhanced Cummins’s two language distinctions by focusing on the development of second language acquisition.

**Input Hypothesis**

Krashen (1985) developed five hypotheses that comprise the foundation to second language acquisition. These are the following: (1) acquisition-learning hypothesis, (2) natural order hypothesis, (3) monitor hypothesis, (4) input
hypothesis, and (5) affective filter hypothesis. The first hypothesis, acquisition-learning, is the two-way development of a second language through acquisition and learning processes that I described earlier. Acquisition is a subconscious process and learning is deliberate and purposeful. Krashen’s second hypothesis is the natural order; how one acquires a second language is predictable in similarity to acquiring one’s first language.

The third hypothesis is monitor which takes into account acquisition and learning. The monitor hypothesis proposes that language fluency is a result of acquisition while learning applies to being an “editor” or monitor. For example, a student may self-monitor his or her language by checking for grammatical errors within writing or listening closely and monitoring pronunciation while speaking.

Krashen’s fourth hypothesis, input, shows us that for an individual to acquire a second language he or she must learn just a little more than what is already known. This is an example of learning within the zone of proximal development. Scaffolding language just above a student’s level requires comprehensible input. This increase just above the individual language stage is more effective than a target further beyond the individual’s current ability level. Krashen’s (1985) input hypothesis is drawn from Chomsky’s theory of a Language Acquisition Device (LAD) that postulates “humans acquire language in only one way – by understanding messages, or by receiving ‘comprehensible input’” (p. 2) and they learn structures just a little beyond what they already know. This is accomplished with contextual support such as visual aids or
linguistic information that assists the individual with understanding what is heard and read.

Affective filter is the last hypothesis in Krashen’s (1985) foundation to second language acquisition. Sometimes emotions impede the amount of input a learner is able to use and this is due to the affective filter. Emotions such as anxiety can be reduced in low anxiety environments that are safe and secure, free of intimidation and violence, and comfortable environments that invite learning. These are characteristics of quality and teacher knowledge that are no longer monitored for accountability due to the elimination of the Opportunity to Learn Standards described previously.

All five hypotheses are important; however, in my research I will be focusing on the input hypothesis. The input hypothesis is focused on how the acquisition of English develops the processes and contexts by which an individual acquires a second language. The input hypothesis assumes the more comprehensible input provided; the greater the chances an individual will acquire proficiency in a second language. Alternatively, when comprehensible input is removed or absent, it will delay an individual’s acquisition of a second language. When academic content such as math, science, and social studies are not included in the curriculum, comprehensible input – contexts for learning – are also absent.

**Academic Language**

One of Krashen’s hypotheses, when applied to classroom teaching, suggests in order for students to obtain a second language, which includes
academic language, students need to partake in a language rich classroom with speakers of that language. Long (1981) claims conversations between native and non-native speakers provided modifications in interactions that were successful towards second language acquisition. Academic language embraces various meanings depending on who is defining the term.

Scarcella (2003) defines academic language as “a variety or register of English used in professional books and characterized by the specific linguistic features that are used in a particular situational context” (p. 10-11). She developed a framework to analyze academic language which includes “multiple, dynamic, inter-related competencies” while rejecting views that did not consider “personal, social, and cultural factors” (p. 7). This framework encompasses three dimensions: linguistic, cognitive, and socio-cultural/psychological. The linguistic dimension, “critical in learning academic English” (p. 11), is comprised of five components: (1) phonological, (2) lexical, (3) grammatical, (4) sociolinguistic, and (5) discourse. The cognitive dimension of academic English provides student the opportunity to “create and transform knowledge” (p. 22). This dimension includes four components: (1) knowledge, (2) higher order thinking, (3) strategic, and (4) metalinguistic. Scarcella asserts “knowledge is just not facts; it provides a means to evaluate experiences, as well as the physical world, critically” (p. 22).

The socio-cultural/psychological dimension addresses five attributes: (1) norms, (2) values, (3) beliefs, (4) attitudes/motivation/interests, and (5) behaviors/practices/habits.
Krashen and Brown (2007) define academic language as “complex syntax, academic vocabulary, and a complex discourse” (p. 1). Yet, Zwiers (2004/2005) asserts academic language is a “set of words and phrases that (1) describe content-area knowledge and procedures, (2) express complex thinking processes and abstract concepts, and (3) create cohesion and clarity in written and oral discourse” (p. 60). Gottlieb (2006) agrees academic language is pivotal in learning academic content; however, she describes academic language proficiency as “refer[ing] to the language patterns and concepts required in processing, understanding, and communicating curriculum-based content” (p. 25).

Academic language is essential for school success (Scarcella, 2003); however, it is the most challenging that ELs encounter (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010). This language is complex because it includes content specific vocabulary, grammar structures, conversational mechanics, and relationships to content. Academic language is located within textbooks and classroom discussions; however, it normally is more abstract as compared to concrete topics (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010, p. 62). Additionally, academic language becomes more challenging as language demands increase and complex vocabulary is required as students’ progress through the grades (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010).

Acquiring academic language is a key element towards academic success in the U.S. educational system because as Crawford and Krashen (2007) state:

Academic language refers to the decontextualized, cognitively challenging language used not only in school, but also in business, politics, science,
and journalism, and so forth. In the classroom, it means the ability to understand story problems, write book reports, and read complex ... texts.

(p. 17)

Many times academic language is thought of only in the academic setting; yet, it is also utilized in workplace registers such as in professions of accounting, marketing, and sales (e.g., Zwiers, 2007, p. 94). More importantly, students must learn and begin to acquire academic language within school to allow them the opportunity to further their education after high school or access this language within their profession.

Academic language cannot be acquired by just being enrolled in school; it must be explicitly taught. Many students can understand oral language through interaction; however, this is not so with academic language that is featured in classroom textbooks (Schleppegrell, 2001). There are two genres, fiction and non-fiction texts, that possess different organizational structures. The different organizational structures of text are important elements to assist students with the comprehension of content. The organizational structure of a novel is structured very differently from a math text. Additionally, teachers must have the skills and knowledge to scaffold and teach the academic language of each genre in order to break down concepts and model or demonstrate terms or phases for students to assist them with understanding what is being asked of them (Echevarria et al., 2007).
Academic language is the bridge for students to access academic content (Gottlieb, 2006). This should not be seen as just acquiring academic language, but rather as “a functional diversifying, an expansion of the learners communicative repertoire” (Baynham, 1993, p. 5). It provides the meaning behind concepts; it requires students to think deeply and make connections between previous knowledge and to other academic content areas; it is the gateway into academic content. Academic language and academic content complement one another and contribute to academic achievement (Lyster, 2007).

**Academic Content**

Every grade within U.S. public school classrooms has academic content subjects: math, science, social studies and English which embrace specific discourses and set parameters for practice (Goodson & March, 1996). Some of this discourse crosses over into other subjects through higher-order thinking skills; however, academic content has specific discourse tied to each subject. Complex characters connect with English whereas integers are associated with math. Overall, language [social and academic language] is an important vehicle for content learning (Genesee, 1994). Lager (2006) found both English speakers and ELs had difficulties with words that were not normally associated with the math register, for example, “extension” and “previous”. This example illustrates why math teachers must be aware that language is a pivotal aspect of teaching. Students need to develop language to be able to take part in classroom activities and discussions within every school subject.
Content lessons focus primarily on the *descriptor of knowledge* identified within the standards. The intent is for students to master the descriptor of knowledge at the identified verb or skill level through classroom activities: lecture, reading, research, or group collaboration on a project. Students within these classrooms are listening, speaking, reading and writing to acquire the knowledge and content of academic language. Yet, the Arizona ELP Standards focus on a “linguistic foundation in English” (ADE, 2011, slide 50), phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and semantics. Tumposky (1984) asserts this second language curriculum could be harmful if one is “focusing almost exclusively on the minutiae of language’s building blocks” (p. 303) in addition to removing grade level academic content. Furthermore, Wedin (2010) and DaSilva Iddings (2005) have shown that remedial pedagogy restricts ELs’ opportunities of school success due to restricted access to advanced curriculum. Wedin (2010) asserts the lack of abstract thinking and extended reading and writing use denies students the chance of developing in schools.

These points demonstrate the critical need for academic content integrated with English language acquisition. Lyster (2007) conducted a review of second-language immersion studies that supported the value of incorporating meaning and communication in the context of language acquisition and this aligns with Krashen’s (1985) input hypotheses. However, Lyster (2007) points out that there is a need to understand how to balance language and content in regard to language acquisition. Additionally, academic content provides “students the opportunity to
think critically, to test and question ideas, to interact fully with the content, to learn to understand the perspectives of others, to discriminate among ideas, and to form and defend their own point of view” (Miramontes, Nadeau, & Commins, 1997, p. 150).

The alignment between grade level academic content standards and ELP standards should not be a one-to-one correlation (Cook, 2007). There are four major goals that provide guidance on decision making for merging academic content and language:

1. fully understand and interact with content;
2. learn new content through the second language;
3. develop second language academic proficiency; and
4. cross-cultural interaction. (Miramontes et al., 1997, p. 156-157)

The first three goals focus on a balance between linguistics and aspects of academic development; the last goal focuses on cross-cultural interactions. The first goal is for ELs to understand and interact with content. This requires the teacher to arrange and deliver the material in methods understandable for students. The teacher will need to determine the appropriate background, links to previous learning, adaptation of content (graphic organizers, outlines, jigsaw text reading) methods of scaffolding (modeling, comprehensible input) and how the students will apply the learned material in addition to assessing their understanding (Echevarria et al., 2007).
The second goal is for students to acquire English through academic content, and this lends itself to opportunities for acquiring proficiency in the academic language while learning the content. The teacher needs to identify the academic words for the lesson then identify how students can continue to apply the words throughout the lesson with peer assisted and student-centered strategies (Muth & Alvermann, 1999). Goal three focuses on clearly articulating knowledge through speaking and writing. This provides the students opportunities to express themselves in a manner that can then assist them with their writing skills. The fourth goal focus is to increase cross-cultural interactions within the classroom. Cooperative learning provides structures necessary for students to interact by ability grouping; however, these learning sessions must be well developed and planned for effective use (Kagan, 1986).

These three intersections: English acquisition, academic language, and grade level academic content are essential for ELs to acquire English proficiency in tandem with grade level academic content. The parallel alignment structure of ELP standards and grade level academic content standards provides three significant positive outcomes: (a) equitability, (b) effective and (c) globalization.

**Alignment: ELP Standards and Grade Level Academic Content Standards**

Alignment ensures ELs and teachers are provided a framework of standards that intersect English acquisition, academic language, and grade level academic content. These three intersection elements are essential for ELs to acquire English proficiency in tandem with grade level academic content. This
parallel alignment of ELP standards and grade level academic content standards provides three significant and positive outcomes: (a) equitability of curriculum for all students, (b) effective standards-based education system through having ELP Standards be “grade-and content-area specific” in addition to an appropriate assessment for ELs (Working Group on ELL Policy, 2010, p. 7) and (c) globalization.

The parallel alignment structure between ELP standards and grade level academic content standards is one component to ensure an equitable education for all students (NCLB, 2001). Alignment ensures all students will be taught from the same or similar grade level academic content standards; at the same time, students who are not yet English proficient will have the opportunity to acquire English as suggested by the Work Group on English Language Learner Policy (2010). One of their recommendations was to require states to set content area performance expectations for students at each level of English language proficiency. These achievement expectations should be grade and content-area specific. At the end of the timeframe established by the state for acquiring English language proficiency, the achievement expectations for ELLs and non-ELLs should be identical. (p. 7)

This equitability would prepare all students with the choice to continue on to higher education or to enter the work force. Students could determine their future short and long-term goals.
The second element that demonstrates the importance of aligned ELP standards with grade level academic content standards is the effectiveness of a standards based education system. Alignment creates a common language and common expectations for states, school leaders, teachers, and students. This encourages collaboration between schools and among grade level teachers and grade clusters. This collaboration can focus on lesson design, effective instructional strategies, and classroom theme projects that provide support and opportunities for teachers to improve their overall teaching to impact students’ academic achievement.

The third element of importance for the alignment between the ELP Standards with grade level academic content standards is viewing the ELs as an investment (Rolle, 2012) that in turn will contribute to a better society or globalization. ELs can provide and enhance classrooms instruction through their content knowledge and discussions by tapping into their previous experience, knowledge, and culture (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). For example, some ELs may have been taught a different method for division than what is taught within their current classroom. These students could present to the class the method of division they were taught and demonstrate there is more than one way to solve for the answer. And, some students in the class may understand the process of division with the method provided by the EL. More importantly, ELs most likely embrace knowledge that neither the teacher nor other students have and that enhances everyone’s knowledge of different cultures. This sharing of
knowledge and experiences among students helps bridge knowledge of rituals, food, language, customs and beliefs that contribute to understanding and living in our rapidly growing globalized society.

Yet, the opposite is also true. When there is no alignment present within the ELP standards and grade level academic content standards ELs are denied the following: (a) grade level academic content in areas such as math, science and social studies; (b) opportunities for academic language acquisition which Scarcella (2003) refers to as diverse sub-registers; and (c) a means to fully acquire the English language due to the absence of Krashen’s (1985) comprehensible input theory. Non-alignment of proficiency standards and academic standards also alienates a group of students and places them in a viscous cycle of remedial work. Additionally, ELs will likely fall behind their grade level peers, and they will not have the academic knowledge and skills required to achieve as they move up the grades and into high school.

The federal government has not, to date, defined aligned or linked and states are write their own definitions. Definitions from other sources are those by Webb (2005) and Cook (2007). Webb (2005) defines alignment as “the degree to which expectations and assessments are in agreement and serve in conjunction with one another to guide the system toward students learning what they are expected to know and do” (p. 2). However, as it relates to standard-to-standard alignment, Cook & Wilmes’s (2007) definition of alignment is the “combination of linking and correspondence” (p. 7). Linking describes the match between two
standards while correspondence is comprised of depth and breadth. Depth refers to the cognitive complexity of the standard and breadth to the dispersion throughout a particular content. Additionally, Cook (2007) interprets the term linked to mean, “at least one aligned content standard in each assessed subject must be represented in the ELP standards” (p. 9).

The absence of a federal definition for linking allows individual states to determine their own definition as it relates to ELP standards linked to academic content standards (Golden, 2011). For example, one state may define linked as one grade level academic content standard addressed in the parallel grade of ELP standards; while a neighboring state may define linked as having 90% of the grade level academic content standards addressed in the parallel grade of ELP standards. This means an EL in one state will receive comparable grade level academic content and ELD while an EL in a neighboring state will receive only ELD and minimal grade level academic content.

There are three negative outcomes in the requirement for ELP standards to be at a minimum linked to grade level academic content standards: (a) there is no guarantee that both sets of standards address the same descriptor of knowledge within a grade level and also between grades; (b) there is a failure to address the equity of education for all learners; and (c) students are treated as a commodity versus an investment such as valuing their knowledge and culture.

The descriptor of knowledge is the specific knowledge identified within a standard. The first negative implication of ELP standards not linked to grade level
academic content standards is the failure to guarantee that both sets of standards address the same descriptor of knowledge in a grade level, but also between grades. Some states may include only one concept or descriptor of knowledge in an academic content standard and omit the rest of the academic content standards from the ELP standards. As a result, this increases the chances of ELs being further behind mainstream students academically. In contrast, when the descriptors of knowledge between two sets of standards are similar, each group of students is provided with comparable academic content knowledge. This also provides ELs with the opportunity to stay in the EL program until they are English proficient because they would still be learning academic content parallel to their peers.

The second negative implication of the ELP Standards being minimally linked to grade level academic content standards is the improbability of providing an equitable education to all students. Even if the ELP Standards and parallel grade level academic content standards are linked it will not ensure that all students receive the same high grade level academic content in the education system; however, when language proficiency standards are not linked with academic content standards one group of students will receive a quality education while the other student group receives a basic and remedial education. This education inequity inhibits the potential for the latter group to become college graduates with “have a significant income premium over those with only a high school degree” (Afxentiou & Kutasovic, 2010, p. 124).
The third implication of the ELP Standards linked to grade level academic content standards is viewing ELs as a commodity as compared to an investment (Rolle, 2012) and this directly affects the quality of education the students receive. Furthermore, not investing in students’ education will continue the epidemic of students dropping out of school. Students who drop out of school are more likely to need government assistance and more likely to cycle in and out of prison. However, if states invest in the education of all students our nation will benefit from high school graduates purchasing power and higher levels of worker productivity (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2011).

**Model for standards to standard alignment.** Of these three alignment approaches, the most prominent model today is that created by Webb (Chi et al., 2011). Webb’s model evaluated the alignment components (match, depth, breadth) yet, this model only focused on state assessments and state academic standards rather than the alignment between two sets of standards. However, Cook’s (2005) method is a modified version of Webb’s model focused on the relationship between two sets of standards. Cook’s purpose with the use of this alignment was to publicize the relationship between state standards and standards for assessments. The alignment between two similar items like science in one third grade compared to another set of third grade science standards should display a high extent of overlap such as in Figure 14.
Cook asserts the alignment for ELP standards to academic content standards is not a one-to-one relationship, but the standards should be linked. These linked standards should be at least 40% of the Depth of Knowledge that corresponds with Scarcella’s (2003) cognitive dimension of her academic English framework, in addition to a moderate breadth of goals across domains which is best demonstrated through Figure 15.
Summary

This chapter has reviewed the literature for the multiple contexts of my Comparison of Standards study. In the next chapter I will present my methodology used in this qualitative, content analysis study which used three sets of standards: Arizona ELP, Common Core, and WIDA in three grade levels (2nd, 7th, and 9th).
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Arizona is one of the top six states in the U.S. with a high enrollment of ELs in the K-12 education system (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011b). ELs are placed in Structured English Immersion (SEI) classes that are focused on teaching the ELP standards. The intent of the program is for ELs to have an intense focus on English instruction in order for students to exit out of the language program and into the mainstream classroom as quickly as possible (Arizona Revised Statutes, 2000). The policy restricts the interweaving of students’ culture, native language, grade level academic content (Gándara & Orfield, 2012), and subsequently, the cognitive development of the learners. This impact begins the first day of school for children as they are separated from mainstream students due to this SEI policy.

Students’ academic progress in math, reading, and writing is measured by the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) assessment. Students take spring assessments in third through eighth grade and again in tenth grade as a requirement for high school graduation. AIMS assessment results for ELs in grades four, eight and ten in reading and math indicate the percentage of ELs who performed at or above the proficient level is low; however, more disturbing is the majority of grade level percentage scores have declined from 2007-2008 through 2009-2010. For example, the percentage of students who performed at or above the proficient level over a three-year period in fourth grade math declined 19 percentage points whereas the high school reading scores decreased by two
percentage points. This decline suggests that Arizona is not meeting grade level academic content needs of ELs (see Table 4).

Table 4
AIMS Assessment English Learner Results, 2007-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Performance</th>
<th>Percentage of Students[^b]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Reading</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Math</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Reading</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Math</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Math</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^Note]: All numbers reported here are percentages and are from (NCELA, 2011a).

[^a]: LEP stands for limited English proficient.

[^b]: These are only those students performing at or above proficient level.

I focused my dissertation research on this decline and I analyzed the descriptors of knowledge and the verbs/skill levels for three sets of standards at three grade levels. There are content standards and performance standards and the NCLB (2001) act requires states to implement ELP standards that are linked to academic content standards in order to receive federal funding. In chapter two,
I described the different types of standards and two elements which make up standards: descriptor of knowledge and verb/skill. I limited my study to the comparison of the Arizona ELP Standards in grades 2, 7, and 9 to two sets of standards: the Common Core State English Language Arts Standards, and the 2007 World-Class International Design and Assessment (again, WIDA) Standards.

Each state embraces standards required by NCLB (2001) in its own unique way, and in reality this means that students’ grade-level expectations vary from state to state. The Common Core State Standards were designed and released on June 2, 2010 to “prepare all students to be college and career ready, including English Language Learners” (http://www.corestandards.org/assets/application-for-english-learners.pdf) and to provide clear and consistent expectations for students who are enrolled in kindergarten through grade twelve. I selected the Common Core for my research because 47 states have adopted these standards including the District of Columbia, and some of these states will implement these standards starting Fall 2012. These standards were selected additionally because of the work Arizona accomplished with connecting the states’ ELP standards and the Common Core (ADE, 2011). My research looks at the quality of Arizona ELP Standards alongside the Common Core.

The purpose of my qualitative research was to perform a content analysis using three sets of standards across three grade levels. A content analysis is a

---

7 As mentioned in Chapter 2, when referring to the Common Core ELA standards these will be known simply as Common Core. If referring to the entire Common Core initiatives, this will remain known as Common Core State Standards.
research method that permits the researcher to sift through data in a systematic fashion for “making replicable and valid inferences from texts to the contexts of their use” (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). I want to know how or if the NCLB requirement of linking language proficiency standards to academic content standards has impacted the quality of Arizona ELP Standards to others in the nation. In this chapter, I describe the methods to be used in this study with special emphasis on the analysis of data.

**Research Problem**

The requirement of only minimally linking ELP standards with academic content standards is problematic because ELs may be denied full access to grade level academic content while they are learning the English language because the standards may not be as rigorous. If this is the case, this minimal linking requirement of these two sets of standards may be a contributor to the perpetuation of the achievement gap evident in the data from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) illustrated in Table 4 above. The percent of ELs performing at or above proficiency levels on AIMS scores on average decreased through the past years.

**Revisiting the Research Questions**

Again, this study seeks to answer research questions divided into two phases. Each phase has three questions.

**Phase I.** Three questions are addressed in this phase, specifically in regard to the Common Core and Arizona’s ELP Standards. These questions are:
1. Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th, and 9th grade Common Core ELA Standards?
2. What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?
3. What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?

Phase II. There are also three questions in this phase regarding the ELP Standards in Arizona and WIDA. They are:

1. Are the Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th and 9th grade 2007 WIDA Standards?
2. What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?
3. What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?

Sample

I analyzed standards at the 2nd, 7th, and 9th grades. I chose second and ninth grades because they precede the grade students are required to take the AIMS test. Seventh grade was selected because it is the grade level prior to students’ exiting from middle school. These three grade level standards were analyzed to capture a vertical snapshot that crosses elementary, middle, and high school grade levels. A timetable of the two phases of my research along with their stages is located in Appendix B.
The Phase I analysis focused on the Arizona ELP Standards compared to the Common Core. I focused on Arizona standards because it was the first state to revise the ELP Standards to correspond to the Common Core. Additionally, Arizona proposed their revised ELP Standards “provide[s] a purposeful overlap of the E[nglish] L[anguage] P[roficiency] [Standards] and the Common Core language skill” (see e.g., http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2012/02/guidance-doc-finalized.pdf). It is important to note and keep in mind that Arizona is the most restricted English-only state in the U.S. in relation to education (Del Valle, 2003).

Arizona’s ELP Standards framework is organized in stages (grade-bands: K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12), domains and language strands, standards, performance indicators and English proficiency levels. The domains are organized by listening and speaking, reading, and writing in addition to a language domain. Performance indicators are “statements of the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities expected to be learn[ed]” by the EL (ADE, 2011, slide 2). It is important to note that content areas integrated in the Common Core, described next, are not included in the Arizona standards.

The Common Core are composed of two strands. The first strand is for kindergarten through grade five (K-5) and the second strand is for grades six through twelve (6-12). Both the K-5 and 6-12 strands address reading, writing, speaking and listening, as well as a language strand and specific features within each standard as illustrated in Table 5.
Table 5

Common Core Strands and their Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Complexity and growth of comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Text types, responding to reading, and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking &amp; Listening</td>
<td>Flexible communication and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Conventions, effective use, and vocabulary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* See, e.g., [http://www.corestandards.org/](http://www.corestandards.org/)

Each standard in the grades follow Common Core Reading anchor standards and the latter provides more specificity for the Common Core Reading in reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language as illustrated in Appendix C.

The standards for literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects in the Common Core were embedded within these strands for K-5. However, grades 6-12 have a separate section focusing on history/social studies, science and technical subjects that focus on reading and writing. This additional section allows students in 6-12 to utilize their reading and writing skills to learn about history/social studies, science and technical subjects (Common Core State Initiative, 2011). This additional section was omitted from this study since it is meant to guide instruction on those subject areas. I also omitted the foundational skills standards from grade two to provide a more accurate vertical comparison across grades 2, 7, and 9.
In Phase II, I examined the Arizona ELP Standards compared to the 2007 WIDA Standards for both formative and summative frameworks. I selected these standards because they focus on bridging language acquisition and academic content (Gottlieb, 2006) and because they are the only set of standards for ELs developed by an extensive collaboration of 27 states (WIDA, 2011). Arizona focuses on teaching English and did not collaborate with other states (ADE, 2011).

The WIDA Standards include five ELP standards with four language domains (listening, speaking, reading and writing), in addition to five grade level clusters including: PreK-K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12 (WIDA Consortium, 2007). Each standard addresses a different context for language acquisition: (1) social and instructional - put your books on your desk; (2) language arts - write a book report; (3) mathematics - patterns and relationships; (4) science - elaborate on change; and (5) social studies - write about historical artifacts (Gottleib et al., 2007).

**Design Methodology and Data Collection**

There were eight stages for both of my analyses, and each of these is described herein with some examples. These stages led me to the analysis of my final data in stage seven (Correspondence of the Standards, part A and part B), which refer directly to my research questions.

**Stage 1: Research alignment methodologies.** In stage one, I searched for a qualitative methodology that would illustrate alignment between two sets of
standards: the Common Core with the Arizona ELP Standards and the WIDA Standards with the Arizona ELP Standards. A qualitative content analysis was the best method to illustrate alignment between two sets of standards because it provided a means to focus on the actual content; the presence of particular words in each set of standards. The qualitative content analysis I used for my research is a modified version of Cook’s (2007) method. Cook’s content analysis method has been used in various studies (Chi & Lin, 2010; Chi et al., 2011; Cook & Wilmes, 2007) to focus on the alignment between two sets of standards.

In my research, I refer to alignment as the composite of all three elements of (1) linking or matching, (2) depth, and (3) breadth. The first element, linking, is determined by the *descriptors of knowledge* which must be identical between two standards. This descriptor identifies what knowledge is taught such as academic content. Depth is the second element for alignment, and this is indicated by linking 40% of the verbs/skills at the same or higher levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy. The third element for alignment is breadth and this is indicated by the coverage, usage, of standards. Alignment has various definitions. Webb (2005) defines alignment as “the degree to which expectations and assessments are in agreement and serve in conjunction with one another to guide the system toward students learning what they are expected to know and do” (p. 2). Cook (2007) defines standard-to-standard alignment as the “combination of linking and correspondence” (p. 10), as illustrated in Table 6. Linking describes the match between the two standards where correspondence is comprised of depth
and breadth. Depth refers to the cognitive complexity and breadth to the
dispersion across subject areas.

Table 6
A Standard-to-Standard Alignment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least one aligned content standard across skill domains, as agreed upon by a majority of raters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>At least a 40% DOK across skill domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least moderate coverage of goals across domains where: (a) Limited: ≤ 1 goal aligned for each standard; (b) Moderate: &gt; 1 goal aligned for each standard; and (c) Strong = a majority of goals aligned for each standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I was the single coder for all data sets to establish quality control throughout this study. I have a Master’s degree in education, an endorsement in ESL, and I am familiar with the Arizona ELP Standards and academic content standards. I have also worked extensively with teachers to understand the content of knowledge and skill/verb relationships within standards while designing daily lesson plans. My process to code the standards was validated by two individuals.
with doctorates and K-12 teaching experience. Both of these individuals were knowledgeable about the components of standards, ELA content, and ELP standards. They both verified the unraveled standards as defined in stage four, coded the descriptor of knowledge with the Bloom Taxonomy levels, and confirmed the linked or non-link of knowledge between the two sets of standards.

The process to educate each individual began with how to unravel standards, assign a Bloom Taxonomy level to the verb, and link the standard descriptor of knowledge to the other set of standards. The next step of the process was random spot-checking each grade level. I selected a minimum of three standards to be verified by the reviewer within each of the grade levels. I then informed the reviewer of the standard who then identified how she would unravel the standard (Common Core and WIDA Standards only) using the guidelines of my research. Once the unraveling was verified, the reviewer identified the verb, assigned a Bloom’s Taxonomy level to the verb/skill, and verified their findings with me. Finally, the reviewer linked, or did not link, the descriptor of knowledge of the unraveled standard to the other set of standards. Again, this linking or non-linking of the standards was verified by me. Depth and breadth was not validated because these two processes were part of the analysis and I was the researcher for this study.

**Stage 2: Pinpoint standards.** In the second stage of the study, I located and downloaded the Common Core, Arizona ELP Standards, and 2007 WIDA Standards for 2nd, 7th, and 9th grade. Tables 7, 8 and 9 display the total number
of standards prior to unraveling per grade level. For example, a standard with four sub-standards identified as a, b, c, and totals four standards.

Table 7
*Number of Common Core ELA State Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Literature</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Informational Text</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking &amp; Listening</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The dash symbol (-) stands for n/a.
Table 8
Number of Arizona ELP Standards Within the Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listening &amp; Speaking</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Number of WIDA ELP Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Social &amp; Instructional</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>F S</td>
<td>F S</td>
<td>F S</td>
<td>F S</td>
<td>F S</td>
<td>F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. F represents standards for Formative Framework; S represents standards for Summative Framework.

**Stage 3: Populate database.** In the third stage of the study, I transferred the standards to a template for a total of six data bases, as illustrated in Figure 16. The first three databases in Phase I were developed for the Common Core and the Arizona ELP Standards. The last three data bases in Phase II were developed for
the WIDA Standards and Arizona ELP Standards. Once each data set was completed, I completed a line-by-line analysis of the data set to confirm accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>ELL Proficiency Stage 1</th>
<th>ELL Proficiency Stage 2</th>
<th>ELL Proficiency Stage 3</th>
<th>ELL Proficiency Stage 4</th>
<th>ELL Proficiency Stage 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 16. Database template example.*

**Stage 4: Unravel the standards.** In the fourth stage of analysis, I unraveled the standards (Common Core and WIDA Standards only) that included the word or phrases *and, as well as, including,* and *semicolons;* however, if the standard had *and/or* I defaulted to *or.* Some standards were written with multiple verbs and descriptors of knowledge and I separated these elements in order to make the expectations for each standard clear. To illustrate the original standards from the unraveled standards for my analysis, I placed the original standard in bold font and each sub-standard is not bolded and in blue (see Figure 17). I treated each of the sub-standards as a separate standard. For example, a standard which was unraveled into two sub-standards became two standards for my analysis. A complete number of the ELP and Common Core as unraveled are in Appendix D.
Stage 5: Code the standards. In the fifth stage of analysis, I determined the descriptor of knowledge and skill/verb within each standard and assigned a color code to the skill/verb in relation to Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) as illustrated below in Figure 18.

I replaced Webb’s Depth of Knowledge with Bloom’s Taxonomy because it is the most universally applied model within education (Pohl, 2000, p. 7-8). The
Bloom’s Taxonomy levels with the corresponding verbs for each skill level are included in Appendix E.

Figure 19 shows an example of a standard and the process I used to code the data. I first had to determine the skill/verb within each standard and once I identified that, I cross-referenced the skill/verb to the skill level of Bloom’s Taxonomy. I read the entire standard as many times as it was necessary to determine the accurate Bloom’s Taxonomy skill level. After the skill/verb was identified, I coded the word in relation to Bloom’s Taxonomy as illustrated in Figure 19.

![Figure 19. An example of coding the standards.](image)

**Stage 6: Match the data.** In stage six, I matched or linked the data between a standard in Phase I and in Phase II. According to Cook (2007), linked
means “at least one aligned content standard in each assessed subject must be represented in the E[nglish] L[anguage] P[roficiency] standard at each grade band” (pg. 6). I used the terms *match* and *link* interchangeably in my findings and discussion chapters. The descriptor of knowledge within the two sets of standards had to be similar to indicate a match as shown in Figure 20.

![Figure 20. Example of a match.](image)
Once a match was confirmed, the matching standard was copied to the far right of the corresponding standard as illustrated in Figure 21. The high intermediate/proficient Arizona ELP Standard was placed to the far right of the seventh grade writing standards to demonstrate these two standards matched.

Figure 21. Entering matched standards within the database.

The remainder of the ELP standards that corresponded to the matching high intermediate standard were displayed as illustrated in Figure 23. The remaining additional proficiency levels that progressed to high intermediate/proficient were developed by Arizona. In addition, if a standard clearly addressed two different descriptors of knowledge that standard was matched to more than one standard, as shown in Figure 23. However, the other standards descriptor of knowledge had a one-to-one ratio of standards matching.
Stage 7: Correspondence of the standards part A & B. In the seventh stage, correspondence of standards was used to determine alignment in two parts: depth (part A) and breadth (part B). According to Cook & Wilmes (2007) alignment is defined as, “the combination of linking and correspondence” (p. 7). Correspondence encompasses depth and breadth. Once I determined that the standards matched, I then determined the depth, part A, of alignment. Cook (2007) applied a 40% criterion for depth that corresponds with Scarcella’s (2003) cognitive dimension of her academic English framework elaborated in chapter 2. Cook (2007) asserts cognitive dimension as a combination of (a) higher order thinking, (b) strategic competence, and (c) metalinguistic awareness. The 40% criterion of depth requires “40% of linked E[nglish] L[anguage] P[roficiency] standards at or above the Depth Of Knowledge (DOK) level of the content standards to reflect strong cognitive correspondence between standards” that provide attainable yet challenging expectations for ELs (Cook & Wilmes, 2007, p. 7). The depth analysis is part of the alignment determination between two sets of standards. Moreover, it is important for the standards to have the same depth of knowledge (DOK) level or the standard must be a higher DOK level than its comparison standard. This is important to determine the cognitive correspondence between the standards.

For my study, the DOK level was replaced with the skill level from Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), but I continued to use the 40% criterion of depth from Cook. For example, as illustrated in Appendix F, the
WIDA Standard 1 for second grade reading is comprised of ten standards. In order for this set of standards to meet the 40% criterion of depth there needs to be at least four Arizona ELP Standards that match with the same or higher skill level of Bloom’s Taxonomy. As displayed in Appendix F, the 40% criterion of depth was met for WIDA’s Standard 1, which demonstrates the Arizona ELP Standards are linked. However, to determine the alignment of this set of standards, breadth would also need to be determined.

The second part of stage seven is breadth (part B), and according to Cook (2007), criteria for breadth is related to the number of goals aligned to the standard. WIDA (2010) defines breadth as “how well ELP standards cover the range and balance of content standards” (http://www.wida.us/Research/agenda/Alignment/). Breadth is indicated by the coverage of standards across a set of standards. For the Common Core, a set of standards is reading literature and reading information; however, a standards set for WIDA is social and instructional purposes and language arts. The Arizona ELP Standards set of standards includes only reading, writing, listening and speaking, and language. Once the set of standards met the depth (part A) of alignment, then the breadth (part B) was determined for each grade level.

**Stage 8: Analyze the data.** In the final stage of analysis, I looked for patterns and themes that were present throughout the three sets of standards (Arizona ELP, Common Core, and WIDA) as well as between the comparisons of
the two data sets of standards (Arizona ELP Standards with the Common Core and Arizona ELP Standards with the WIDA Standards).

First, I went through both phases, Phase I and Phase II, for each data set such as reading literature and reading information for the Common Core. In WIDA Standards the data sets were language arts and mathematics. Then at each grade level, I identified the descriptor of knowledge that was linked or not linked for each standards section within each language domain such as reading, writing, and such. Next, I took each descriptor of knowledge and identified an overarching category for the groups of standards such as narratives, expository, and persuasive writing and the words or phrases were categorized as writing application. I also compared each descriptor of knowledge category within each language domain to the other two grades to determine if the same category was present or not through all three grades. For example, the category conventions was present in all three grades within the language domain. Finally, I compared all of the common categories of common or not common descriptors of knowledge to determine the overarching themes.

Summary

This chapter has described the methods used in this qualitative, content analysis study which used three sets of standards: Arizona ELP, Common Core, and WIDA in three grade levels (2nd, 7th, and 9th). In the next chapter, I will present the results for Phase I and Phase II of the study.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

In this chapter, I will discuss the findings of my qualitative, content analysis study which used three sets of standards: Arizona ELP, Common Core, and WIDA in three grade levels (2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, and 9\textsuperscript{th}). This chapter is organized in two sections: Phase I and Phase II. Phase I focused on the Arizona ELP Standards compared to the Common Core. The findings for this phase are organized by the Common Core domains (reading, writing, listening and speaking, and language). Phase II focused on the Arizona ELP Standards compared to the WIDA Standards. The findings for Phase II are organized by the WIDA Standards (language of social and instructional purposes, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies). Each section will address the alignment between the two sets of standards and identify common and non-common descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards.

Phase I

Reading Domain

Question 1: Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, 9\textsuperscript{th} grade Common Core ELA Standards?

Second grade. My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade Common Core in the reading domain. They are linked to 15\% of the standards for literature and 21\% of the information standards within the Common Core. This is illustrated in Table 10.
Table 10
Analysis between the Common Core and the Arizona ELP Standards for 2nd Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 2 Domains&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Alignment Statistics</th>
<th>Alignment Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Breadth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Literature</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Information</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. <sup>a</sup>These all represent the Common Core domains.

<sup>b</sup>These should be read as, for example, 0 out of 9.

Forty percent of the linked standards in literature met the 40% criterion for depth and 86% of the 21% linked standards met for depth; however, ELs are receiving only about one-fifth of the knowledge required of mainstream students in the Common Core. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona does not represent 85% of the literature standards and 80% of the information standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core. As a result, the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona includes only 15% of the literature standards and 20% of the information standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core.
**Seventh grade.** Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 7th grade Common Core in the reading domain, either. These standards are linked to 26% of the literature standards and 14% of the information standards within the Common Core as illustrated in Table 11.

Table 11
*Analysis between the Common Core and the Arizona ELP Standards for 7th Grade*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 7 Domains*</th>
<th>Alignment Statistics</th>
<th>Alignment Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Literature</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Information</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking Language</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *These all represent the Common Core domains.

*These should be read as, for example, 0 out of 9."

Both of the reading standards met the 40% depth criterion: 88% of the 26% linked literature standards and 40% of the 14% linked information standards. This indicated the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is only 26% of the literature standards and 14% of the information standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core. Not represented are 74% of the literature standards and 86% of the information standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core. The 2nd grade literature percentage standard
(15%) about doubled from the 7th grade percentage (26%); yet, the reading information standards decreased by seven percentage points from 2nd grade to 7th grade.

**Ninth grade.** Arizona ELP Standards were not aligned to 9th grade Common Core in the information domain. However, they were aligned to the literature standards; yet, the literature standards had limited breadth with only one of nine sections meeting the criterion of breadth as illustrated in Table 12.

### Table 12
**Analysis between the Common Core and the Arizona ELP Standards for 9th Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment Criteria</th>
<th>Alignment Statistics</th>
<th>Alignment Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 9 Domains</strong></td>
<td><strong>Link</strong></td>
<td><strong>Correspondence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domains</strong></td>
<td><strong>Depth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Breadth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Literature</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Information</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking Language</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. <sup>a</sup>These all represent the Common Core domains.  
<sup>b</sup>These should be read as, for example, 1 out of 9.

The 9th grade standards are linked to 32% of the literature standards but zero percent to the information standards within the Common Core. The linked literature standards increased by six percentage points from the 7th grade to the 9th grade but the information standards decreased by 14% from the 7th grade to the
the 9th grade. The literature standards were 100% of the 32% linked standards that met the 40% criterion of depth; however, the information standards did not meet the 40% criterion of depth due to the zero percent linked. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona represents about one-third of the literature standards and none of the information standards that mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core.

Question 2: What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?

Second grade. My analyses of the data demonstrated common knowledge such as identify the main idea, the characters, sequence of the story, and locate information between the two sets of standards. However, the Arizona ELP reading standards were at times written in isolated simplistic tasks as compared to the Common Core. For example, an Arizona ELP Standard requested students to “describe characters from a literary section”\(^8\), but the Common Core required students to “acknowledge differences in the points of view of characters” (Common Core, 2010, p. 11). Description is a lower level skill while acknowledge differences requires distinguishing between viewpoints of characters.

The remainder of the Arizona ELP Standards in this domain that were not linked to the Common Core were written at the lower level of the revised Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) skill levels (remember, understand, understand, understand, understand, understand).

\(^8\) Taken from the ELP Standards, grades 1-2; retrieved from http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2011/09/stage-ii-reading-domain.pdf
and apply) as compared to the higher skill levels of analyze, synthesize, and create. Some examples of Arizona ELP Standards at the high intermediate reading level are “read multi-syllabic words, using syllabication rules”, “identify the differences between fiction and nonfiction”, and “identify words that the author selects in a literary selection to create a graphic visual image”\(^9\). These standards demonstrate the lowest skill level (remember) in Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Also within this domain there was repetition among the levels of language proficiency. Examples such as “making connections to text while reading (text-to-text, and text-to-self)” (p. 13) and “located information from a completed graphic organizer” (p. 16) are identical for basic, low intermediate and high intermediate standards.\(^{10}\) This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for students across these levels.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data exposed words used in persuasive text and purpose of organizational features on a page as common knowledge between the two sets of standards. Yet, the Arizona ELP Standards were written at the Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) lower skill levels. For example, the standards stated, “identifying words used in persuasive text to affect


the reader” (p. 25)\textsuperscript{11}; and the Common Core (2010) asks students to “analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning” (p. 39). Identifying a word or pointing it out is very different from analyzing the impact a word has on meaning.

Most of the remainder of the Arizona ELP Standards within this domain that were not linked to the Common Core were written at the lower skill levels of the Bloom Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), which was similar to the findings of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade. Some high intermediate level reading standard examples are “read contractions”, identifying forms of literature”, and “retelling a literary selection” (p. 13, 10, 14)\textsuperscript{12}. Also within this domain there was the same repetition across the range of language proficiency levels that I identified within the 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade standards. This repetition of identical standards was in the basic, low intermediate and high intermediate levels. Two examples are provided: “retelling a literary selection by sequencing events using transition words” and “locating signal words in text that indicate comparison/contrast” (p. 14 & 16)\textsuperscript{13}. There is no change in the level of difficulty required for students across these three levels.

\textbf{Ninth grade.} My analysis of the data demonstrated common knowledge such as determine the author’s point of view, summarize the main idea, and read

\textsuperscript{11} Taken from the Reading domain, grade 6, found within \url{http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2011/09/stage-iv-reading-domain.pdf}

\textsuperscript{12} Taken from the Reading domain, grade 6, found within \url{http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2011/09/stage-iv-reading-domain.pdf}

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ibid.}
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grade-level text with 90% comprehension between the two sets of standards. However, some of the Arizona ELP standards were identical between the low intermediate and high intermediate proficiency levels. These examples demonstrate identical standards at the two proficiency levels: “summarize the main idea and supporting details in text” and “comparing, contrasting, and describing the connection between two characters within a fictional text” (p. 14, 19). This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for students across the three levels.

**Question 3: What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as text complexity, informational text, and the comparison of similar texts as absent from the Arizona ELP standards. This excluded knowledge also illustrates how academic language is not present, as a range of texts is not used. Another piece of knowledge excluded was reading a diverse array of stories from various cultures.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text absent from the Arizona ELP Standards, and they were also excluded in the 2nd grade standards. Also, knowledge such as analyze how two or more authors writing about the same topic shape their presentations and compare and contrast a written

---

14 Taken from Reading domain, grade 9, found within [http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2012/04/stage-v-reading-domain.pdf](http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2012/04/stage-v-reading-domain.pdf)
story to its multimedia version was missing within the 7th grade Arizona ELP Standards.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as analyze seminal documents of U.S. history and literary significance, “delineate and evaluate the arguments and specific claims in a text” and “analyze a particular point of view or cultural experience reflected in a work of literature from outside the United States” was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards (Common Core, 2010, p. 38, 40). Another knowledge component not present in the Arizona ELP Standards was “analyze the representation of a subject or a key scene in two different artistic mediums” (Common Core, 2010, p. 38).

**Writing Domain**

**Question 1: Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th, 9th grade Common Core ELA Standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data highlighted Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 2nd grade Common Core in the writing domain. These standards are linked to 32% of the Common Core (refer to Table 10). This domain is the highest linked percentage as 91% of the 32% linked standards met the 40% depth criterion; however, this finding indicates Arizona ELs are only receiving about a third of the knowledge represented within the Common Core writing domain.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 7th grade Common Core in the writing domain. These standards
are linked to 14% of the Common Core, as was illustrated in Table 11. This
domain percentage is less than half of 32% of the 7th grade linked standards
however, 85% of the 14% linked standards met the 40% depth criterion. This
finding means Arizona ELs are only receiving about one seventh of the
knowledge of the writing domain mainstream students receive in states that apply
the Common Core.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are
aligned to 9th grade Common Core in writing; yet, the writing standards had
limited breadth with 1 of 10 sections meeting the criterion of breadth as was
illustrated in Table 12. These standards are linked to 14% of the Common Core
which was the same linked percentage for 7th grade. Even though 100% of the
14% linked standards met the 40% depth criterion, this finding indicates Arizona
ELs are only receiving about one seventh of the writing standards knowledge
mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core.

**Question 2: What are the commonalities in the descriptors of
knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data revealed applications of writing
such as opinion, information and explanation, and narratives as common
knowledge between the two sets of standards. Yet, the opinion writing piece for
Arizona ELP Standards did not require students to provide reasons to support
their opinion. Moreover, the Arizona ELP Standards in writing for types of texts
indicate less rigorous knowledge such as create a response to a literary selection,
classroom rules, directions, labels, and poetry focusing on a beginning, middle, and end with details as compared to the expectations of the Common Core. For example the Common Core require, “write opinion pieces in which they introduce the topic or book they are writing about, state an opinion, supply reasons that support the opinion, use linking words to connect opinion and reasons, and provide a concluding statement or section” (Common Core, 2010, p. 19).

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed applications of writing such as arguments, informal/explanatory, and narrative pieces and provide relevant evidence as common knowledge between the two sets of standards. Yet, the standards for Arizona ELP Standards were less rigorous requiring students to write directions, procedures, a business letter, and one or more narrative paragraphs as compared to the Common Core which require students to write informative text to examine a topic and convey their ideas through analysis of relevant content.

Repetition was present across the range of basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate level of language proficiency in the Arizona ELP writing Standards. For example within the grammar and parts of speech section the following two standards were written identically for the basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate proficiency levels: “using noun, adverbial and/or prepositional phrases in sentences” and “using imperative sentences in a variety
of writing applications” (p. 12, 14). This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for students across basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate proficiency levels.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed persuasive text, an expository essay, and narrative paragraphs as common knowledge between the two sets of standards. Other common knowledge components were planning, revising and editing. However, some of the linked Arizona ELP Standards were the same. The following three examples illustrate identical wording across the range of basic, low intermediate and high intermediate proficiency levels, “using a prewriting plan to develop the main idea(s) with support”, “using a variety of organizational strategies to plan writing”, and “summarizing information from 2-3 resources in a report” (p. 15, 16, 29). This indicates there were no changes in the level of difficulty required for students across basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate proficiency levels.

**Questions 3: What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as collaboration with peers and adults and the use of digital tools to produce and publish writing was not present within the Arizona ELP Standards.

---

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as the use of domain specific vocabulary to inform about the topic, narrative techniques, and precise phrases to capture the action was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards. Furthermore, the use of technology to produce and publish writing was also not present within the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as “use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic” and “develop claim(s) and counterclaims” (Common Core, 2010, p. 45) were absent from the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Listening and Speaking**

**Question 1: Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th, 9th grade Common Core ELA Standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data demonstrated that the Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to the 2nd grade Common Core in the listening and speaking domains. These standards are linked to 11% of the Common Core, and of this 11% all of the standards met the 40% depth criterion. This suggests ELs receive about one tenth of the listening and speaking standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core. Additionally, this domain had the lowest linked percentage among all of the domains.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 7th grade Common Core in the listening and speaking domains. These standards are linked to 10% of the Common Core and of this 10%, 86% of
these standards met the 40% criterion of depth. This suggests ELs receive about one tenth of the listening and speaking standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core. Furthermore, this domain had the lowest linked percentage of all of the domains for grade seven.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are aligned to 9th grade Common Core; yet, the listening and speaking domain had limited breadth with one of six sections meeting the criterion of breadth. These standards are linked to 4% of the Common Core listening and speaking standards and of this four percent, 100% of the four percent linked standards met the 40% criterion of depth. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is only four percent of the listening and speaking standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core.

**Question 2: What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data revealed ideas with supporting details from read aloud and the expectation to ask and respond to questions as common knowledge between the two sets of standards. The knowledge of technology was present; however, it was limited in the Arizona ELP Standards as it did not encourage the creation of audio recording of stories or poems as indicated within the Common Core.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed common knowledge such as answering and responding to questions, producing sentences with accurate
pronunciation, and presenting a report with support evidence between the two sets of standards. However, repetition was present among this domain in the Arizona ELP Standards which was also displayed within the 2nd grade standards. For example, the following standard is identical across the range of basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate levels: “sequencing events from information presented in read-aloud, presentations, and conversations” (p. 4)\textsuperscript{17}. This standard is word-for-word at the basic, low intermediate and high intermediate proficiency level for students acquiring English.

\textit{Ninth grade}. My analysis of the data revealed common knowledge between the two sets of standards such as asking and responding to academic questions, generating clarifying questions, and reporting detailed information on a topic. Yet, repetition of Arizona ELP standards was also frequent within this grade level. These two examples demonstrate standards that were identical across the range of basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate proficiency levels: “report detailed information on a topic supported by concrete details, commentary, and examples in complete sentences”, and “generating clarifying questions” (p. 11, 13)\textsuperscript{18}. This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty


required for students across basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate proficiency levels.

**Question 3: What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as collaboration and participation was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the standards within the listening and speaking domain focused on social and personal communication such as expressing one’s thoughts and survival needs. Furthermore, repetition within these standards was also common. Some examples of identical standards across the basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate levels were “articulating the 44 phonemes accurately” and “expressing personal/survival needs and emotions in complete sentences” (p. 7)\(^\text{19}\). This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for students across basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate proficiency levels.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as engaging in collaborative discussions with diverse partners and evaluate the reasoning and relevance of the evidence was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards. Furthermore, multimedia is another set of knowledge that was not included within the Arizona ELP Standards; however, the Common Core requires students to “include multimedia components and visual displays in presentations

to clarify claims and findings and emphasize salient points” (Common Core, 2010, p. 49).

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as “initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions on grade 9-10 topics, texts, and issues”, “evaluate a speaker’s point of view”, and “integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse media or formats” absent from the Arizona ELP Standards (Common Core, 2010, p. 50). Technology was also not present in the listening and speaking standards. The exclusion of technology in the listening and speaking domain was not present at any of the three grade levels: 2nd, 7th and 9th.

**Language**

**Question 1: Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th, 9th grade Common Core ELA Standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of data indicated that the Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 2nd grade Common Core in the language domain. These standards are linked to 24% of the language standards and 95% of the 24% met the 40% criterion of depth. This indicates that the curriculum Arizona ELs receive represents only 24% of the language standards mainstream students receive in that apply the Common Core.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 7th grade Common Core in the language domain. These standards are linked to 37% of the language standards and 96% of the 37% linked
standards meet the 40% criterion of depth. The linked percentage increased by 13% points from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade. Even so, this shows that the curriculum Arizona ELs represents only about 37% of the language standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core.

\textit{Ninth grade.} My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 9\textsuperscript{th} grade Common Core in the language domain. These standards are linked to 42% of language standards and 100\% of the 42\% linked standards met the 40\% criterion of depth. However, this indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is only 41\% of the language standards mainstream students receive in states that apply the Common Core.

\textbf{Question 2: What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?}

\textit{Second grade.} The analysis of the data revealed conventions, specifically using adjectives and adverbs, producing simple sentences and using resources to spell words as common knowledge between the two sets of standards.

\textit{Seventh grade.} My analysis of the data revealed conventions, determining figurative language, and using references, print and/or electronic for specific purposes as common knowledge between the two sets of standards.

\textit{Ninth grade.} My analysis of the data revealed conventions, using various phrases and clauses, and use reference materials as common knowledge between the two sets of standards. Yet, some of these linked standards were repetitive across the range of basic, low intermediate and high intermediate language
proficiency levels. For example, “using reference materials, print and/or electronic, to identify meanings, spellings, pronunciation, and usage of words”, “identifying the meaning/usage of high frequency words and applying them in context”, and “using capitalization at the beginning of sentences, proper nouns, the pronoun ‘I’, and proper adjectives, titles, and abbreviations” (p. 7, 68, 74)\(^{20}\) were all duplicates of standards across the proficiency levels of the Arizona English Proficiency Standards. This indicates there was no change in the level of difficulty required for students across basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate proficiency levels.

**Question 3: What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** The analysis of data demonstrated knowledge such as determine words or phrases and their relationships absent from the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as compound sentences, choose language that expresses ideas precisely, and use a comma to separate coordinate adjectives absent from the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as “apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts”, “write and edit work so that it conforms to the guidelines in a style manual”, and “demonstrate understanding of figurative language in word

meanings” absent from the Arizona ELP Standards (Common Core, 2010, p. 54-55).

**Summary**

Overall Arizona ELP Standards grades 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, and 9\textsuperscript{th} are not aligned with the Common Core. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is inequitable when compared to that students receive in states that apply the Common Core. My analysis indicated limited common knowledge with these two sets of standards among all three grade levels as illustrated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Arizona ELP Standards linked to Common Core.](image)

For example, the writing domain linked at 32% was the highest at the 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade; the language domain linked at 37% was the highest at the 7\textsuperscript{th} grade; whereas the language domain linked at 41% was the highest at the 9\textsuperscript{th} grade. This indicates the
Arizona ELP Standards are at most linked to 41% of the Common Core. Furthermore, culture was one of the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards in all grades, as it was not included. This indicates ELP Standards do not provide or require opportunities for ELs in Arizona to expand understandings of their culture as well as other cultures on a local, national and international level.

**Phase II**

**WIDA’s Standard I: The Language of Social and Instructional Purposes**

**Question 1: Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th, 9th grade WIDA Standards?**

*Second grade.* My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are aligned to 2nd grade WIDA’s Standard 1: English language learners communicate for Social and Instructional purposes within the school setting. Yet, the reading literature had limited breadth with only one of four sections meeting the criterion for breadth as illustrated in Table 13. These standards will be referred to hereafter as the WIDA’s language of social and instructional purposes. The Arizona ELP Standards are linked to about 50% of the WIDA’s standards for language of social and instructional purposes and 80% of the 50% linked standards met the 40% criterion for depth. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is about 50% of the language of social and instructional purposes ELs receives in states that apply the WIDA Standards.
Table 13
Analysis between WIDA and Arizona ELP Standards for 2nd Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 2a</th>
<th>Alignment Statistics</th>
<th>Alignment Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Breadth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Instructional</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. aThese all represent the WIDA Standards for this grade level.

bThese should be read as, for example, 1 out of 4.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are aligned to WIDA’s 7th grade language learners communicate for social and instructional purposes. Yet, this standard had limited breadth with only one of four sections meeting the criterion of breadth as illustrated in Table 14. The Arizona ELP Standards are linked to about 40% of the WIDA’s Standards for language of social and instructional purposes and 100% of the 40% linked standards met the 40% criterion for depth. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is about 40% of the language of social and instructional purposes ELs receives in states that apply the WIDA Standards.
Table 14
Analysis between WIDA and Arizona ELP Standards for 7th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Alignment Statistics</th>
<th>Alignment Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Breadth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Instructional</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. <sup>a</sup>These all represent the WIDA Standards for this grade level.
<sup>b</sup>These should be read as, for example, 1 out of 4.

Ninth grade. My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are aligned to WIDA’s 9<sup>th</sup> grade language of social and instructional purposes. Yet, this standard had limited breadth with only one of four sections meeting the criterion of breadth as illustrated in Table 15. The Arizona ELP Standards are linked to about 33% of the WIDA’s Standards for language of social and instructional purposes and 75% of the 33% linked standards met the 40% criterion for depth. This suggests the curriculum ELs in Arizona receive is about 33% of the language of social and instruction purposes ELs receive in states that apply WIDA Standards.
Table 15
Analysis between WIDA and Arizona ELP Standards for 9th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment Criteria</th>
<th>Grade 9a</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Correspondence Depth</th>
<th>Breadth</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Correspondence Depth</th>
<th>Breadth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Instructional</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1/4ᵇ</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ᵃThese all represent the WIDA Standards for this grade level. ᵇThese should be read as, for example, 1 out of 4.

Question 2: What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?

Second grade. My analysis of the data revealed common knowledge such as to follow directions, main idea, and compose narratives between the two sets of standards. However, within these linked standards there was repetition within the low intermediate and high intermediate level such as “follow multiple-step directions which include preposition” (p. 5) and “following multiple-step positive and negative written directions which include prepositions” (p. 17)²¹ in the

²¹Taken from the ELP Standards; p. 5 from the Listening and Speaking (http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2011/09/stage-ii-listening-and-speaking-domain.pdf) and p. 17 from the Reading domain
Arizona ELP Standards. This indicates there is no change in the level of
difficulty required for students in the low intermediate and high intermediate
proficiency levels.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed common knowledge
such as respond to social conversations, write functional texts, and write an essay
on a clear position between the two sets of standards. Also, there were
similarities between the low intermediate and high intermediate level in these
linked standards such as “responding to social conversations by
rephrasing/repeating information, asking questions, offering advice, sharing one’s
experiences and expressing one’s thoughts” (p. 5)\(^22\) and “writing a variety of
functional text (e.g., directions, procedures, graphs/tables, brochures) that
addresses audience, stated purpose and context” of the Arizona ELP Standards (p.
5)\(^23\). This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for
students in the low intermediate and high intermediate proficiency levels.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed common knowledge such
as draw conclusions, interpret information, and write business documents between
the two sets of standards. Also within these linked standards there was repetition

\(^22\) Taken from the Listening and Speaking domain, grade 7,
and-speaking-domain.pdf

\(^23\) Taken from the Writing domain, grade 7, http://www.azed.gov/english-
across the basic, low intermediate and high intermediate levels such as “drawing
conclusions from information implied or inferred in a literary selection” and
“interpreting information within functional documents” (p.17, 23)\footnote{24} of the
Arizona ELP Standards. This indicates there is no change in the level of
difficulty required for students in basic, low intermediate, and high intermediate
proficiency levels.

**Question 3: What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge**
**between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analyses of the data revealed knowledge such as
compose illustrated stories and provide reasons for usefulness of everyday objects
absent from the Arizona ELP Standards. An example of knowledge not present
within the Arizona ELP standards that was identified in the WIDA Standard
within the social and instructional purpose standard section states, “match oral
descriptions of school areas, personnel or activities with individual needs or
situations” (WIDA, 2007, p.15).

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as
“confirm or rearrange information after re/reading of topics of choice gathered
from multiple sources” was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards (WIDA,

\footnote{24} Taken from the Reading domain, grades 9-12, http://www.azed.gov/english-
language-learners/files/2012/04/stage-v-reading-domain.pdf
**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as infer subtleties, discuss changes in personal preferences over time, and integrate information from multiple sources was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards.

**WIDA Standard 2: The Language of Language Arts**

**Question 1:** Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th, 9th grade WIDA Standards?

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 2nd grade WIDA’s Standard 2: English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Language Arts. These standards will be referred hereafter as the WIDA’s language arts. The Arizona ELP Standards are linked to 42% of the WIDA’s language arts standards and 75% of the 42% linked standards met the 40% depth criterion. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is about 42% of the language arts ELs receive in states that apply the WIDA Standards.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 7th grade WIDA’s language arts. The Arizona ELP Standards are linked to 50% of the WIDA’s language arts and 91% of the 50% linked standards met the 40% depth criterion. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is about 50% of the language arts ELs receive in states that apply the WIDA Standards.
**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to 9th grade WIDA’s language arts. The Arizona ELP Standards are linked to 43% of the WIDA’s language arts and 50% of the 43% linked standards met the 40% depth criterion; furthermore, this was the highest percentage linked of all of the ninth grade WIDA Standards. However, this indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is only about 43% of the language arts ELs receive in states that apply the WIDA Standards.

**Question 2: What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of the data revealed applications of writing such as writing rhymes, and writing text to self as common knowledge between the two sets of standards. Yet, some of the linked standards among the Arizona ELP Standards were repeated within the English language proficiency levels. For example, “making connections to text while reading (text-to-text and text-to-self)” (p. 13) was identical across the range of basic, low intermediate and high intermediate levels and “describing characters from a literary selection” (p. 15) was repeated between the low intermediate and high intermediate levels. This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for students across proficiency levels. Repetition was also present: “connect events, characters or morals in illustrated folktales to self” (WIDA, p. 17, 19) in the WIDA’s Language Arts Standards. However, this standard is the same within the summative and

---

formative frameworks at the fifth level, Bridging. This indicates there was no level of difficulty or knowledge required for students in level five, Bridging for the formative and summative frameworks in WIDA.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of the data revealed common knowledge such as cause and effect of events, write editorials and correct spelling between the two sets of standards. Yet, some of the linked standards among the Arizona ELP Standards were repeated within the ELP Levels. For example, “determine the cause and effect relationship between two related events in a literary selection” (p. 18) and “identifying forms of literature (e.g., poetry, novel, short story, biography, autobiography, drama) based upon their characteristics” (p. 13) were identical between the low intermediate and high intermediate levels. This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for students in low intermediate and high intermediate proficiency levels. Repetition was also present among the WIDA’s language arts standards such as “make inferences from main ideas and details of recited grade-level poetry or free verse” (WIDA, 2007, p 44, 46.). This standard was identical within the summative and formative frameworks at the fifth level, Bridging. This indicates there was no level of difficulty or knowledge required for students in level five for the formative and summative frameworks in WIDA.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of the data revealed a focus on author’s point of view and write expository and narrative essays as common knowledge in the two

---

sets of standards. Yet, some of the linked standards in the Arizona ELP Standards were repeated within the ELP levels. For example, “recognizing the language nuances of a speaker (e.g., a subtle difference in tone, expression, meaning, etc)” (p. 7)\textsuperscript{27} and “determine information that is relevant, irrelevant, or missing in functional text (e.g., legend, illustrations, diagram, sequence” (p. 23)\textsuperscript{28} were identical across the range of basic, low intermediate and high intermediate levels. This indicates there is no change in the level of difficulty required for students in low intermediate and high intermediate proficiency levels. Repetition was also present among the WIDA’s Language Arts Standards such as, “discuss how different views in multicultural literature represents global perspectives” and “predict people’s reaction to living in different time periods or circumstances using grade-level text” (WIDA, 2007, pp. 58-61). However, these standards were identical within the summative and formative frameworks at the fifth level. This indicates there was no level of difficulty or knowledge required for students at level five, Bridging for the formative and summative frameworks in WIDA.

**Question 3: What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

\textsuperscript{27} Taken from the Listening and Speaking domain, grades 9-12, \url{http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2011/09/stage-v-listening-and-speaking-domain.pdf}

\textsuperscript{28} Taken from the Reading domain, grades 9-12, \url{http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2012/04/stage-v-reading-domain.pdf}
Second grade. My analysis of data revealed knowledge such as draw conclusions about main ideas and create stories about word families was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards.

Seventh grade. My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as apply learning strategies and give reviews of information from multimedia were not present in the Arizona ELP Standards.

Ninth grade. My analysis of the data revealed knowledge such as discuss different views in multicultural literature and predict people’s reaction to living in different time periods as absent from the Arizona ELP Standards.

WIDA Standard 3, 4, & 5: The Language of Mathematics, Science and Social Studies

Question 1: Are Arizona ELP Standards aligned to the 2nd, 7th and 9th grade WIDA Standards?

Second grade. My analysis of data demonstrated that the Arizona ELP Standards were not aligned or linked with the 2nd grade WIDA’s English language learners to communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content areas of mathematics, science and social studies standards illustrated in Table 13. These sets of standards will be referred to hereafter as WIDA’s mathematics, science and social studies standards.

Seventh grade. My analysis of data demonstrated that the Arizona ELP Standards were not aligned or linked with the 7th grade WIDA’s mathematics, science and social studies standards illustrated in Table 14.
**Ninth grade.** My analysis of data demonstrated that the Arizona ELP Standards were not aligned or linked with the 9th grade WIDA’s mathematics, science and social studies standards illustrated in Table 15.

**Question 2: What are the commonalities in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of data indicated zero common knowledge among the 2nd grade WIDA’s mathematics, science, social studies standards and the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of data indicated zero common knowledge among the 7th grade WIDA’s mathematics, science, social studies standards and the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Ninth grade.** My analysis of data indicated zero common knowledge among the 9th grade WIDA’s mathematics, science, social studies standards and the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Question 3: What are the differences in the descriptors of knowledge between the two sets of standards?**

**Second grade.** My analysis of data demonstrated mathematics knowledge such as interpret data on graphs, explain basic operations involved in problem solving, and explain the importance of everyday math applied in real-life situations as absent from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, Arizona ELP Standards identified specific standards and indicated correspondence to math; however, specific math standards were not present.
My analysis of data showed science knowledge such as identify chemical or physical change in properties, validate weather forecasts, and evaluate usefulness of goods made from renewable and nonrenewable resources was absent from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the Arizona ELP Standards have specific standards that indicate a correspondence to science; however; specific science standards were not present and science is not taught during the SEI block.

My analysis of data showed social studies knowledge such as construct or complete neighborhood maps, differentiate land forms, and predict impact of community workers absent from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the Arizona ELP Standards have specific standards that indicate correspondence to social studies; however, specific social studies standards were not present.

**Seventh grade.** My analysis of data demonstrated mathematics knowledge such as apply ways of using percentages or fractions, select reasons for uses of perimeter and area, and explain and give reasons for likely probabilities missing from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the Arizona ELP Standards have specific standards that indicated correspondence to math; however, specific standards for math were not present. My analysis of data demonstrated science knowledge such as infer uses of scientific instruments, interpret impact of natural disasters, and evaluate uses of different forms of energy missing from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the Arizona ELP...
Standards had specific standards to indicate correspondence to science; however, specific standards for science were not present.

My analysis of data demonstrated social studies knowledge such as monologues simulating historical events, interpret economic trend data, justify effectiveness of organizations of government missing from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the Arizona ELP Standards had specific standards that indicated correspondence to social studies however; specific standards for social studies were not present.

Ninth grade. My analysis of data demonstrated mathematics knowledge such as transform geometric figures, analyze functions of one variable in relation to another, and predict the impact of changes in data missing from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the Arizona ELP Standards had specific standards that indicated a correspondence to math; however, specific standards for mathematics were not present.

My analysis of data demonstrated science knowledge such as analyze processes involving atomic structures, engage in ecology debates, write narrative lab reports missing from the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead, the Arizona ELP Standards had specific standards that indicated a correspondence to science; however, specific standards for these standards were not present.

My analysis of data demonstrates social studies knowledge such as evaluates the impact of economic trends, critique federal U.S. rights, and interpret features of periods in world history as missing from the Arizona ELP Standards.
Instead, the Arizona ELP Standards had specific standards that indicate correspondence to social studies; however, specific standards for social studies were not present.

**Summary**

Overall Arizona ELP Standards grades 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, and 9\textsuperscript{th} are not aligned with the WIDA’s Standards. This indicates the curriculum ELs receive in Arizona is inadequate and inequitable when compared to that ELs receive in states applying the WIDA’s Standards. My analysis of data indicates limited common knowledge with these two sets of standards among all three grade levels as illustrated in Figure 23.

*Figure 23. Arizona ELP Standards linked to WIDA Standards.*
For example, the social and instructional purposes standards linked at 50% at 2nd grade was the highest; the language art standards linked at 50% at 7th grade was the highest; whereas the language arts standards linked at 43% at 9th grade was the highest. This indicates the Arizona ELP Standards are at most linked to the WIDA Standards 50% or half of the time. Furthermore, specific grade level academic language for mathematics, science and social studies is not included in descriptors of knowledge for Arizona’s standards and the WIDA standards in all three grades, and this is a major difference between the two sets of standards. For example, the Arizona ELP Standards for the language domain at all three grade levels indicates the content areas to be included in parentheses following the standard: “producing declarative, negative, and interrogative sentences using simple present tense verbs with subject-verb agreement (math, science, social studies)” (p. 7)\(^{29}\).

A reading example is written in the same manner: “interpreting signs, symbols, and labels in the environment (math, science, social studies)” (p. 21)\(^{30}\). A listening and speaking is written in the same manner, “summarizing the main idea and key points/details of a presentation using complete sentences (math, science, social studies)” (p. 4)\(^{31}\). Lastly a writing example is written in the same


manner, “use verb tenses (simple, progressive, perfect) in a variety of writing applications (math, science, social studies)” (p. 11)\(^2\). This indicates academic content areas in the Arizona ELP Standards do not have specific standards and they will need to be connected to the content areas by teachers at all grade levels. This is an issue since the content areas of mathematics, social studies and science are not included in Arizona’s SEI program, and it is an even further indication students will not be at grade level with mainstream students when the exit the SEI program.

In addition, each grade level includes many ELP Standards to be learned: 192 standards at the 2\(^{nd}\) grade; 274 at the 7\(^{th}\) grade; and in 9\(^{th}\) grade, there are 317 standards. This indicates ELP Standards provides only limited opportunities for ELs in Arizona to develop and expand understandings of academic language and academic content. This chapter has described the findings for Phase I and Phase II of my dissertation. In the next chapter I will discuss my findings, interpretations, implications, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

My research study was a qualitative, content analysis that used three sets of standards: Arizona ELP, Common Core, and WIDA in three grade levels (2nd, 7th, and 9th). I wanted to know how or if the NCLB minimum requirement of linking language proficiency standards to academic content standards, specifically the Common Core, impacted the ELP Standards in Arizona. My first research question focused on the alignment between the Arizona ELP Standards with the Common Core. This question was important because Arizona asserts their “ELP Standards reflect the language skills of the Common Core State Standards” (ADE, 2011) and the Common Core Standards are scheduled to be implemented in Arizona starting Fall of 2012. My study revealed the Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to the Common Core at grades 2, 7, and 9.

I further wanted to analyze the alignment between the Arizona ELP Standards and the WIDA Standards because WIDA’s ELP Standard framework focuses on bridging academic language with academic achievement. This relationship is important because Arizona’s ELP Standard framework centers on English acquisition. WIDA’s standards were developed by a consortium comprised of 27 states whereas Arizona hired a consultant, Susan Pimentel, to develop its first set of ELP Standards. She was a main contributor to the development of Arizona’s K-12 standards and a lead consultant for the Common Core (Coleman & Pimentel, 2012). These standards were then revised to correspond to the Common Core with guidance from the SWCC. My study
revealed the Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned with the WIDA Standards at grades 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, and 9\textsuperscript{th} either.

In addition to analyzing these sets of standards for alignment, I further wanted to know what the common and uncommon knowledge was between the sets of standards. I continued to find disparities, and I will discuss these along with educational implications.

**Unforeseen Elements**

My analysis of data uncovered a disparity regarding the number of standards and the repetition of standards. I discovered significant disparities in the total number of standards and repetition of standards across the proficiency levels of the Arizona ELP Standards. Although these additional findings did not directly relate to my research questions, both are important to address.

The Arizona ELP Standards have up to six times the number of WIDA Standards and three times the number of Common Core as shown in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
<th>Number of 2\textsuperscript{nd} Grade Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ ELP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This raises a concern that students may be learning surface knowledge rather than depth and complexity of knowledge. Additionally, repetition across proficiency levels and duplication of standards across different grade levels in Arizona ELP Standards is also a concern. My research findings demonstrated standards across proficiency levels such as basic, low intermediate and high intermediate were identical multiple times within 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, and 9\textsuperscript{th} grade. This was described in my findings.

Standards are to guide and scaffold knowledge for the teacher; yet, scaffolding is not present in many of the Arizona ELP Standards. Instead the
standards frequently include identical standard requirements across grades 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7\textsuperscript{th}, and 9\textsuperscript{th} and I will discuss this later in this chapter.

Today’s classroom curriculum is significantly influenced by standards that, “are an essential step toward ensuring equity and high-quality learning for all children everywhere” (Richardson, 2010, p. 1). Standards identify the knowledge, and depth of knowledge, teachers are required to teach as well as what students are to learn. What I have learned in my research is important in order to understand and critique the impact standards have on curriculum, teachers, and students. My research has provided a means to analyze and critique, from one state to the national level, the alignment between two different types of ELP standards.

Throughout the years, curriculum has been altered regarding its ideology, structure, and content. In the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century school’s intent was on assimilating immigrants towards social norms that aligned with Anglo-Saxon “superiority” values. These social norms encompassed a means of a common language and shared civic values from society as a whole. Then the social norm curriculum focus of the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century was reformed to a \textit{factory model} of curriculum. This new curriculum focus was accompanied by \textit{Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction} (Tyler, 1949/1969) that provided an increase toward the productivity and efficiency of curriculum to align with work force formulation, organization, and evaluation. Standards evolved from this new framework to provide a streamlined method for efficient and effective instructional curriculum,
and they are one element of many that influence the equality, effectiveness and globalization of education.

In the next section of this chapter I will discuss my data as it relates to the three themes of my study referred to in chapter two: equality, effectiveness, and globalization. Lastly, I will discuss my recommendations and suggestions for future research.

**Equality**

The *Nation At Risk* report (1983) revealed students were academically underachieving. This uncovering of public education created a deep concern in America regarding the future and quality of public education in the U.S. The development of standards was a result of this report and the standards first developed by mathematics educators were later used as a model for the development of other content standards. Goals 2000 encouraged the development of standards for academic content areas; however, NCLB of 2001 was the tipping point for the requirement of academic content standards as well as ELP Standards. The components of NCLB included: accountability to educate all students through standardized assessments; increase the quality of education by requiring schools to demonstrate improved test scores and overall performance; and devote more attention to minority students by creating common expectations (NCLB, 2001).

Title III of NCLB was the turning point for ELs as it brought attention to the educational needs of students who were not proficient in English. This reform required states, districts, and schools to identify, educate, and assess ELs in order
to receive federal funds. NCLB also required that ELs attain proficiency in English as well as academic content achievement. Even though NCLB broadened the attention on how ELs were identified, educated, and assessed it was also flawed in that it left qualitative aspects of standards and alignment up to individual states.

NCLB only requires ELP Standards to be minimally linked to content standards. My research data shows these standards have zero percent linkage with WIDA’s mathematics, science, and social studies standards. This indicates Arizona ELP Standards do not include content specific academic language in math, science and social studies. This absence of content specific academic language is pivotal for learning academic content. Most interesting is Arizona identified ten principles to guide its revision process for the current ELP Standards. One of these principles states “the language of content areas of science, social studies, and math” will be addressed (ADE, 2011, slide 14); however, my findings do not support this claim of specific academic language.

In chapter two, I described academic language as a “set of words and phrases that (1) describe content-area knowledge and procedures, (2) express complex thinking processes and abstract concepts, (3) create cohesion and clarity in written and oral discourse” (Zwiers, 2004/2005, p. 60). It also refers to the decontextualized, cognitively challenging language used not only in school, but also in business, politics, science, and journalism, and so forth.
WIDA’s Standards bridge ELP with academic achievement while scaffolding the standards. WIDA’s Standards also embed content specific academic language and context within their standards; such as, explain the importance of everyday math applied in real-life situation (2nd grade) and interpret the impact of natural disasters (7th grade). These examples show grade level academic language within the context of math and science. This context provides students the opportunity to make meaning of the knowledge identified in the standards which connects with Lyster’s (2007) research on the importance of incorporating meaning and communication in the context of language acquisition. It is also an example of Krashen’s (1985) input hypothesis.

Academic language provides students the opportunity to make connections to previous knowledge, build cognitive skills, and provide the foundation for academic content. Yet, my data indicates this context of grade-level academic content and content specific academic language is not present within the Arizona ELP Standards. This is evidence by my analysis of the common and uncommon knowledge between the sets of standards (Question 3). This absence of context and grade level academic language from the Arizona ELP Standards means Arizona EL students do not have the opportunity to grapple with complex concepts such as to justify and interrogate through language related to academic content such as math, science and social studies. Arizona ELP Standards only included content areas by indicating math, science or social studies in parentheses after specific standards. For example: “producing declarative, negative, and
interrogative sentences using simple present tense verbs with subject-verb agreement (math, science, social studies)” (p. 7). A writing example is written in the same manner: “use verb tenses (simple, progressive, perfect) in a variety of writing applications (math, science, social studies)” (p. 11). These examples illustrate how the academic content areas are general and repetitive in the Arizona ELP Standards.

Additionally, this absence of grade level academic content and grade level academic language from the Arizona ELP Standards limits the teachers use and the ELs exposure to a variety of textbooks because the SEI program does not include content studies. This implies ELs do not have access to knowledge learned in those content area texts which is inequitable for ELs. These textbooks and books are tools that provide students with the opportunity to explore the world through science, social studies and math, and they are used in mainstream classrooms but not in SEI classrooms.

Schleppegrell (2001) asserts students can comprehend oral language through interaction; however, this is not so with features of classroom textbooks. Fiction and non-fiction texts have different organizational structures and these are important components for comprehension. Because Arizona ELs are not provided with the opportunity to use a variety of textbooks and books in the SEI program, their knowledge of organizational features as well as comprehension of material


could be considerably less that of the mainstream students who have access to these materials (Lillie et al., 2010). This is not an equitable curriculum.

Arizona ELP Standards are solely focused on the linguistic dimension of Scarcella’s (2003) framework as evident through my data analysis. Scarcella’s academic language framework encompasses three dimensions: linguistics, cognitive, and socio-cultural/psychological. The Arizona ELP Standards do not include the higher skill levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) that develop depth and complexity. This means two components, the cognitive and socio-cultural/psychological, of Scarcella’s (2003) framework are missing. Scarcella asserts the cognitive aspect of academic language provides students with the opportunity to “create and transform knowledge” (p. 22). However, the Arizona ELP Standards omit grade level academic language as well as cognitive aspects, depth, for learning as illustrated in tables 19 and 20.

Arizona ELP Standards are written at the lower level of Bloom’s Taxonomy. One example is the Arizona standard “determine the author’s point of view” as compared to the Common Core that require students to determine the author’s point of view then expand this new knowledge through: “analyze[ing] how the author distinguishes his or her position from that of others” (Common Core, 2010, p. 39). This critical analysis of an author’s position compared to another author requires students to reconsider information they read. These higher-order thinking skills can then be transferred into other subject areas such as math, science and social studies as well as students’ personal lives. It is common
sense that the depth and complexity of knowledge increase as students’ progress to higher grade levels. Arizona ELs will not be as prepared as mainstream students who have had multiple opportunities and experiences with academic content and academic language as they progressed through the grades. This is not equitable.

Table 19
Linked 7th Grade Arizona ELP Standard with Reading Information Common Core Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AZ ELP Standards</th>
<th>Common Core Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Emergent</td>
<td><strong>RI.7.6. Determine an author’s point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author distinguishes his or her position from that of others.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>PE-12: NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-12: identifying the author's main purpose (e.g., to inform, to persuade, to entertain). (ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>B-12: identifying the author's main purpose (e.g., to inform, to persuade, to entertain). (ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Intermediate</td>
<td>LI-12: determining the author's main purpose (e.g., to inform, to persuade, to entertain). (ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intermediate/Proficient</td>
<td>HI-12: determining the author's stated or implied purpose (e.g., to inform, to persuade, to entertain). (ss)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Taken from Common Core, 2010, p. 39.

The absence of grade specific academic content and academic language in Arizona ELP Standards is a problem. If teachers implement these standards, as they are written into their classrooms, ELs will be excluded from grade-level
academic content and academic language until they exit out of the four-hour SEI model. This exit is determined by the Arizona English Language Learners Assessment (AZELLA). Once students exit out of SEI they are placed into mainstream classrooms and Arizona expects ELs to achieve at the same level as their peers in mainstream classrooms. The ELs are expected to be at grade level academic proficiency for math, science, and social studies even though grade level academic content has not been included in the curriculum. ELs may stay in SEI classrooms for three or four years or more.

ELs are tested starting in third grade on the AIMS test that includes academic content such as math, reading, and writing even though Arizona has excluded grade level academic content from their ELP Standards. This may be a contributor to the underperforming English Language AIMS test results from 2007 through 2010 illustrated in Chapter 3. Only 22% of high school ELs scored at or above proficiency level in math during 2007-2008 school year and this decreased to 12% in 2009-2010. This indicates the math performance for ELs decreased over time. It seems to me this could be related to the absence of academic content and academic language within the Arizona ELP Standards.

**Effectiveness**

The absence of grade level academic content and grade level academic language also impacts educational effectiveness. My data analysis indicates many of the Arizona ELP Standards are identical, word for word, across proficiency levels illustrated in Table 20.
Table 20
*Examples of Remedial and Repetitive Proficiency Level Standards at H.S. Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELP Standards</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Low Intermediate</th>
<th>High Intermediate/Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Intermediate/Proficient</strong></td>
<td>HI-5: alphabetizing a series of words. (math, science, social studies).</td>
<td>HI-8: reading contractions.</td>
<td>HI-5: generating clarifying questions. (math, science, social studies).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Another principle Arizona used to guide its revision process for the current ELP Standards states “complexity indicators should increase vertically and horizontally across levels and stages” (ADE, 2011, slide 14); however, my
findings do not support this claim that complexity indicators will increase vertically and horizontally.

This tells me there is absence of scaffolding for depth of knowledge in the Arizona ELP Standards for both teachers and students. Standards are guides for teachers; they inform what knowledge and depth of knowledge needs to be taught at a specific grade level as well as the proficiency level for language learners. However, if the teacher has various proficiency levels within her classroom there is no guidance for how to teach the various levels. This leads to ineffective teaching. To compound this, ELs who progress through the English proficiency levels of basic, low intermediate to high intermediate levels are taught the identical knowledge as well as the same depth of knowledge (see again, Table 20). Furthermore, the absence of scaffolding the depth of knowledge in the standards disregards Scarcella’s (2003) cognitive dimension of her academic language framework. The linguistic knowledge of the Arizona ELP Standards is remedial and ineffective when compared to the Common Core and WIDA Standards. It does not challenge students’ knowledge (i + 1) (Vygotsky, 1978) There is another layer of ineffectiveness, with the standards that are repeated (verbatim) in grades 2,7, and 9: “producing declarative, negative, and interrogative sentences using simple present tense verbs with subject-verb agreement (math, science, social studies)” (see e.g., http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/files/2011/09/stage-ii-language-strand.pdf).
This creates redundancy for both teachers and ELs because the standards progress students to the next proficiency level, as well as grade level, while the identical (word for word) standard is taught and re-learned in grades 2, 7 and 9. If a student knows or previously learned this knowledge, he or she will be drilled with the same knowledge and depth of knowledge until he or she exits out of the SEI program. Furthermore, teachers are not provided an instructional ladder for scaffolding; instead the standard framework guides teachers towards a simplified, repetitive, meaningless and ineffective curriculum void of context and academic content.

To even further compound this complex issue, data from phase I indicates the Arizona ELP Standards vertical linkage from 2nd grade to 7th and then 9th decreases in percentage points when compared to the Common Core for the reading information and listening and speaking domains. The writing domain decreased from 32% in 2nd grade to 14% in 7th grade and stayed at the same 14% from 7th to 9th grade. This is a problem because the percentage gap between the ELP Standards link with the Common Core increases as students move up to higher grade levels. These figures show that ELs are not effectively prepared to work alongside mainstream students who have had multiple opportunities and experiences with academic content and academic language as they progressed through the grades. I think this indicates ELs at the middle school and high school levels are likely to achieve less than their mainstream level peers and be placed even further behind.
Arizona ELP Standards “teach language as if it were disconnected from the context in which it is used and the topics it addresses are therefore a highly artificial and ineffectual pursuit” (van Lier & Walqui, 2012, p. 5) for children who are acquiring English. These missing contexts of knowledge in the standards could demonstrate to teachers and students that the curriculum and even school is irrelevant and meaningless (Moll et al., 1992). When Arizona is compared to the Common Core there are few opportunities to connect to real world applications by addressing student diversity, collaborating with peers, or embracing a high-tech society.

Globalization

Globalization is “the discussion of ideas, practices and technologies in a seamless way throughout the world” (White, n.d.). Today, students need to be “able to communicate, function and create change personally, socially, economically and politically on local, national, and global levels” (http://www.21stcenturyschools.com/What_is_21st_Century_Education.htm). My data revealed the Common Core imbed the use of “. . . technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products, taking advantage of technology’s capacity to link to other information and to display information flexibly and dynamically” at the ninth grade level (Common Core, 2010, p. 66). This knowledge provides students with opportunities to reinforce and enhance reading, writing, listening and speaking through the use of the Internet for shared writing projects. Further, students can reinforce and
increase their knowledge by bridging what they learned in the classroom with technology tools. Moreover, the Internet provides opportunities for students to navigate and find information connected to their topic. These learning experiences further provide students with the opportunity to determine credible resources and independent learning.

This knowledge and use of the Internet is not included in the Arizona ELP Standards, which is a concern and shows that there are differences between these standards and the Common Core and thus answers question 3 of my research study (Phase I). Arizona ELP Standards, at the ninth grade writing standard indicates: “present writing in a format (e.g., oral presentation, manuscript, multimedia*) appropriate to audience and purpose. *Technology (PowerPoint, Word, etc.) (s, ss)” (p. 22)\(^{35}\) which simply requires students to use technology for the final product instead of requiring students to learn through multiple literacies. This indicates ELs are not provided with the same opportunities as mainstream students to enhance their learning experiences and expand their knowledge with the Internet.

We live in a multicultural society with a variety of cultures that embrace their own native language and adhere to particular religions, foods, and dress, as well as other distinctions. Respecting others differences and cultural diversity is present in the Common Core. A 2\(^{nd}\) grade standards states: “Recount stories, including fables and folktales from diverse cultures, and determine their central

message, lesson, or moral” (Common Core, 2010, p. 11). This standard asks students to identify the lesson or central message of stories through culturally rich literature. Cultural diversity is knowledge which needs to be explored at school through such means as books, short stories, video clips and discussions. Yet, cultural knowledge is not identified once in the 2nd, 7th, and 9th grades of the Arizona ELP Standards. Arizona standards ignore student diversity and this sends an underlying message to the ELs from a range of other cultures.

Conclusion

Standards are a critical component for educating students including ELs. Title III of NCLB recognized ELs must have different means to “attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic competence in English, and meet the same challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards that all children are expected to meet” (U.S. Department of Education, 2003, p. 5). Furthermore, standards guide teachers on what to teach (knowledge) as well as the depth of knowledge at specific grade levels in order to provide all students with the opportunity for an equitable education.

The Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned to the Common Core or to the WIDA Standards for 2nd, 7th, and 9th grades. The common knowledge that these sets of standards do share is minimal and even these linked standards are at the lower level of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) indicating a lack of depth. This suggests the Arizona standards are not equitable because there is an absence of knowledge and they are ineffective because they do not require
higher cognitive abilities. Moreover, the abundant (or excessive) quantity of standards (192 at the 2nd grade, 274 at 7th, and 317 at 9th) are structured for a factory model education that is based on a fragmented, linguistic curriculum with low expectations that does not relate to the cultural diversity of students.

I think that ELP standards need to be aligned to grade level academic content standards. This alignment could provide an ELP standard framework that intersects English acquisition, grade level academic language, and grade level academic content. These three elements of intersection are essential for ELs to acquire English proficiency in tandem with grade level academic content and grade level academic language which might assist with closing the current achievement gap.

Arizona penalizes students for knowing a language other than English through its requirement of the current Language Proficiency Standards as the curriculum for non-English speaking students. As my research data indicated, Arizona ELP Standards are not aligned with the Common Core nor are they aligned with the WIDA Standards at 2nd, 7th, and 9th grades. Furthermore, this suggests ELs are restricted from an equitable education based on the absence of the intersection of English acquisitions with grade level academic content and grade level academic language. These missing elements from Arizona’s ELP Standards impact the classroom (micro) and society as a whole (macro) with educational inequalities, ineffectiveness, and barriers to skills for globalization.
In my professional experiences, I often experienced the ways standards impact practices of teachers within their classrooms. I frequently heard the phase “Well, that is common sense with scaffolding” at teacher trainings but common sense was not common practice in these teachers’ classrooms. The Arizona ELP Standards do not provide this necessary scaffolding to teachers as can be seen in the repetition across the English Proficiency levels discussed in my findings chapter.

Common sense is not common practice in relation to the development of ELP Standards. These standards should be developed in tandem with mainstream standards with the interweaving of academic content, academic language and higher level skills like those in Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Unfortunately, this is not common practice and ELs are penalized for their lack of English proficiency through the use of the ELP Standards in Arizona.

So why is this acceptable and tolerated for students who are acquiring English? Standards are one element of many that impacts the knowledge and depth of knowledge that students learn and all students including ELs need to have the opportunity to learn as oppose to not learn.

**Future research.** Additional research seems needed on how to intersect grade level academic content and language with English acquisition in the ELP standards in Arizona. This need is also indicated by Lyster (2007). In addition, future research needs to inquire how the Common Core and Arizona’s ELP Standards affect students’ short-term and long-term outcomes for both academic
achievement and ELP on a local, national, and international level. This would further demonstrate how standards influence the short-term and long-term effects of academic achievement and the English proficiency of ELs.
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APPENDIX A

TYPES OF ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRAMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of English Learner Program</th>
<th>Goal of Program</th>
<th>Methods for English Language Development</th>
<th>Methods for Second Language Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Elementary Schools</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in both English &amp; a foreign language</td>
<td>Gradual introduction of English for reading in latter half of elementary; interactions with fluent, English-speaking peers; use of English by students’ families at home</td>
<td>Immediate use of a second language for reading; second language taught as a subject area; content area instruction in the second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Bilingual Education</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in both English &amp; native language</td>
<td>ESL (pull-out or within class); gradual introduction of English for reading in latter half of elementary; gradual introduction of English for content area instruction</td>
<td>Immediate use of native language for reading; interactions with fluent, native-speaking peers; content area instruction in the native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Immersion/Two-Way Bilingual Education</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in both English &amp; a second language</td>
<td>Systematic increase of English for content area instruction; gradual introduction of English for reading in latter half of elementary; interactions with fluent, English-speaking peers</td>
<td>Immediate use of second/native language for reading; interactions with fluent, native-speaking peers; content area instruction in the second/native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in English</td>
<td>ESL (pull-out or within class); gradual introduction of English for reading in latter half of elementary; gradual introduction of English for content area instruction (4-6 years)</td>
<td>Gradual diminishing of native language for reading; gradual diminishing of native language for content area instruction; interactions with fluent, native-speaking peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in English</td>
<td>ESL (pull-out or within class); prompt introduction of English for reading in first half of elementary; prompt introduction of English for content area instruction (1 – 3 years)</td>
<td>Prompt diminishing of native language for reading; prompt diminishing of native language for content instruction; interactions with fluent, native-speaking peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Immersion Education</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in English</td>
<td>ESL (pull-out or within class); immediate introduction of English for reading from first day; immediate introduction of English for content area instruction</td>
<td>No attempt to promote a second or native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language - Pull Out</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in English</td>
<td>Intensive and/or individualized instruction of English as a content area; immediate use of English for content area instruction in regular classroom</td>
<td>No attempt to promote a second or native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submersion Education</td>
<td>High academic achievement &amp; language proficiency in English</td>
<td>All subjects taught in English in a mainstream classroom immediately; peer support and/or tutoring</td>
<td>No attempt to promote a second or native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured English Immersion Program (AZ)</td>
<td>English language proficiency</td>
<td>Systematic increase of English language development; focused on reading, writing, listening and speaking</td>
<td>No attempt to promote a second or native language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Cuevas, 1996, p. 42-43.
APPENDIX B

TIMETABLE OF TWO PHASES
## Phase I: Common Core State Standards and Arizona English Language Proficiency Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 – Research Alignment Methodologies</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 - Pinpoint Standards</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 – Populate Database</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 – Unravel the Standards</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 – Code the Standards</td>
<td>February &amp; April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6 – Match the Data</td>
<td>February &amp; April 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stage 7 - Correspondence of the Standards  
Part A – Depth  
Part B – Breadth | April 2012 |
| Stage 8- Analyze the Data | April & May 2012 |

## Phase II: WIDA Standards and Arizona English Language Proficiency Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 – Research Alignment Methodologies</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 - Pinpoint Standards</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 – Populate Database</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 – Unravel the Standards</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 – Code the Standards</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6 – Match the Data</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stage 7 - Correspondence of the Standards  
Part A – Depth  
Part B – Breadth | April 2012 |
| Stage 8- Analyze the Data | April & May 2012 |
APPENDIX C

COMMON CORE READING ANCHOR STANDARDS
English Language Arts Standards, Anchor Standards, College and Career
Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading, Grades K-5th

Key Ideas and Details

1. Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

2. Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.

3. Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.

Craft and Structure

4. Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.

5. Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the whole.

6. Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.

Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

7. Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.¹

8. Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.

9. Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.

Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

10. Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently.

¹ Quantitative analysis of text, including visual aids and statistical data.
English Language Arts Standards, Anchor Standards, College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing, Grades K-5th

Text Types and Purposes

1. Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.

2. Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.

3. Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences.

Production and Distribution of Writing

4. Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.

5. Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.

6. Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.

Research to Build and Present Knowledge

7. Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.

8. Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.

9. Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

Range of Writing

10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.
Comprehension and Collaboration

1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

2. Integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.

3. Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric.

Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas

4. Present information, findings, and supporting evidence such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning and the organization, development, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.

5. Make strategic use of digital media and visual displays of data to express information and enhance understanding of presentations.

6. Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and communicative tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate.

Conventions of Standard English

1. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.

2. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing.
Knowledge of Language

3. Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening.

Vocabulary Acquisition and Use

4. Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases by using context clues, analyzing meaningful word parts, and consulting general and specialized reference materials, as appropriate.

5. Demonstrate understanding of word relationships and nuances in word meanings.

6. Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level; demonstrate independence in gathering vocabulary knowledge when encountering an unknown term important to comprehension or expression.

English Language Arts Standards, Anchor Standards, College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading, Grades 6th-12th

Key Ideas and Details

1. Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

2. Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.

3. Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.
Craft and Structure

4. Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.

5. Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the whole.

6. Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.

Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

7. Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse formats and media, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.¹

8. Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.

9. Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.

Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

10. Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently.

English Language Arts Standards, Anchor Standards, College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Listening and Speaking, Grades 6th – 12th

Comprehension and Collaboration

1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.
2. Integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.

3. Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric.

**Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas**

4. Present information, findings, and supporting evidence such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning and the organization, development, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.

5. Make strategic use of digital media and visual displays of data to express information and enhance understanding of presentations.

6. Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and communicative tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate.

**English Language Arts Standards, Anchor Standards, College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing, Grades 6th – 12th**

**Text Types and Purposes**

1. Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.

2. Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.

3. Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences.

**Production and Distribution of Writing**

4. Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.
5. Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.

6. Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.

**Research to Build and Present Knowledge**

7. Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.

8. Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.

9. Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

**Range of Writing**

10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.

**English Language Arts Standards, Anchor Standards, College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Language, Grades 6th – 12th**

**Conventions of Standard English**

1. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.

2. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing.

**Knowledge of Language**

3. Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening.
Vocabulary Acquisition and Use

4. Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases by using context clues, analyzing meaningful word parts, and consulting general and specialized reference materials, as appropriate.

5. Demonstrate understanding of word relationships and nuances in word meanings.

6. Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level; demonstrate independence in gathering vocabulary knowledge when considering a word or phrase important to comprehension or expression.

Common Core State Initiative, 2012
APPENDIX D

COMPLETE NUMBER OF COMMON CORE (UNRAVELED)
### Number of Unraveled Common Core ELA State Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Literature</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Informational Text</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking &amp; Listening</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Unraveled WIDA ELP Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Instructional</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* F represents standards for Formative Framework; S represents standards for Summative Framework.
APPENDIX E

BLOOM’S TAXONOMY (VERBS AND SKILL LEVELS)
APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE OF WIDA STANDARD 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIDA Standards Grades 1 &amp; 2: Standard 1</th>
<th>AZ ELP STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LISTENING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Entering</td>
<td>Level 2: Beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow oral directions according to complex commands using manipulatives or real life objects (e.g., “Show me your paper.”)</td>
<td>Follow oral directions by comparing them with visual cues, nonverbal cues or modeling (e.g., “Fold the paper in half. Turn it over on your table the long way.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LISTENING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summative Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify symbols, objects or people associated with classroom or school areas, personal or activities from pictures and oral statements (e.g., “Office” or “Exit”)</td>
<td>Locate school areas, personal or activities from pictures and oral descriptive phrases (e.g., “Turn around to the corner of the room, &quot;washroom down the hall.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING</td>
<td>Formative Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer yes/no or choose questions about likes or dislikes with a partner in L1 or L2</strong> (e.g., “Do you like school?”)</td>
<td><strong>Share likes, dislikes or needs with a partner in L1 or L2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paraphrase or combine likes, dislikes or needs with a partner</strong> (e.g., “She likes cake and ice cream”) in L1 or L2</td>
<td><strong>Give reasons for likes, dislikes or needs with a partner</strong> (e.g., “I like because...”) in L1 or L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convince a partner to share your likes, dislikes or needs in L1 or L2</strong></td>
<td><strong>PE 3: repeating personal survival needs and emotions in complete sentences with instructional support.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E 3: expressing personal survival needs and emotions in complete sentences.</strong></td>
<td><strong>B 3: expressing personal survival needs and emotions in complete sentences.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L 3: expressing personal survival needs and emotions in complete sentences.</strong></td>
<td><strong>H 3: expressing personal survival needs and emotions in complete sentences.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKING</th>
<th>Summative Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name everyday objects depicted visually in real-life content (e.g., “paper” in a classroom scene)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tell primary function or use of everyday objects depicted visually (e.g., “You write on it.”)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relate multiple functions or uses of everyday objects depicted visually (e.g., “I do homework on the table and eat dinner there.”)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Compare contrast uses of everyday objects depicted visually (e.g., “I wash myself with soap. I dry myself with a towel.”)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate and give reasons for usefulness of everyday objects (e.g., “Pencils are better than crayons for writing. You can write neater with pencils.”)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluate usefulness of everyday objects (e.g., “Pencils are better than crayons for writing. You can write neater with pencils.”)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>Formative Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match icons or pictures to name on board games or other leisure activities with a partner</td>
<td>Match illustrated words with a word bank about cooperation or sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place labeled pictures with corresponding pictures on board games or other leisure activities by carrying out actions with a partner</td>
<td>Identify illustrated pairs of sentences reflective of cooperation or sharing (e.g., &quot;I give her my book. She gives me hers.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to words or phrases on board games or other leisure activities by carrying out directions with a partner</td>
<td>Identify titles or main ideas illustrated of cooperation or sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out directions according to a series of sentences for board games or other leisure activities with a partner</td>
<td>E-7: Identifying the topic/main idea and key details from text read (math, science, social studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow grade-level written directions for board games or other leisure activities</td>
<td>F-16: Following one- or two-step written directions accompanied by visual cues to complete classroom routines (math, science, social studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE-16: Following one- or two-step written directions accompanied by visual cues to complete classroom routines (math, science, social studies)</td>
<td>E-16: Following two- or three-step written directions accompanied by visual cues to complete classroom routines (math, science, social studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-16: Following multiple-step written directions for classroom routines and academic activities (math, science, social studies)</td>
<td>LI-16: Following multiple-step positive and negative written directions which include prepositions (math, science, social studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>Formative Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draw or easily dictate</strong> personal experiences involving feelings and emotions in L1 or L2 from pictures or photographs</td>
<td>Label personal experiences involving feelings and emotions in L1 or L2 using pictures or photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compose illustrated stories based on personal experiences involving feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compose illustrated stories based on personal experiences involving emotions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRITING</th>
<th>Summative Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trace, copy or produce words about self-using models and pictures</strong></td>
<td>Make lists for varying purposes using models and pictures (e.g., school supplies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>