

ECS 5645/6645: ASSESSMENT OF LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE POPULATIONS

Hybrid Course Model: Tuesdays 4:35-7:05pm (face-to-face [F2F] meetings)

Department of Education, Culture, & Society

College of Education; University of Utah

Spring 2014 COURSE SYLLABUS

BUC 211 (face-to-face [F2F] mtgs)

Emphasis: Elem/Secondary, Spec. Ed & ECS 6645

Instructor: Verónica E. Valdez, Ph.D.

Office Hours: *Online* by appt. in Canvas chat OR *F2F* Tues. 2-4 or by appt in MBH 101

Phone: 801-587-7814 (leave message)

Email: veronica.valdez@utah.edu

Teaching Assistant:

Josephine Amoakah

Office Hours: *Online* by appt. in Canvas chat OR *F2F* in MBH 305 Tues. 2-4 or by appt.

Phone: 801-587-7814 (leave message)

Email: Josephine.Amoakah@utah.edu

Course Description (3 hours of credit):

The assessment of linguistically diverse students is fraught with complications regarding the intervening effects of culture, primary and second language proficiency, and students' actual content knowledge. This course will focus on the most pressing needs for teachers of linguistically diverse students in an English dominant context. Additionally, this course critically explores policies, procedures, and formal and informal measures used to assess the language proficiencies and academic achievement of linguistically diverse students in U.S. public schools. Included in this are the areas of English and native language competence; program placement, progress, and exit; and classroom-based assessments, as well as other forms of alternative assessments. Students enrolled in 6645 will be expected to meet a higher standard of performance and may be assigned additional assignments. Meets Utah State Office of Education ESL Endorsement Standard IV on Assessment. **Prerequisites:** (ECS 3150 OR 5715/6715) & EDU 5200/6200 & SP ED 5021

Course Objectives:

Students will be able to:

- Identify their own attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs related to assessing linguistically diverse student learning and how they may contribute to or hamper their ability to gather and evaluate evidence of these students' learning.
- Acknowledge, critically evaluate, and follow local, state, and federal laws and policies as they pertain to linguistically diverse students and their assessment (e.g. Utah ELP Standards)
- Articulate issues of assessment as they affect linguistically diverse students' development of English language skills, students' access to the Utah core curriculum, and students' placement in appropriate programs.
- Critically evaluate standardized language proficiency instruments and their uses to include analyzing them for issues of accountability, reliability and validity associated with the standardized assessment of linguistically diverse students' language proficiencies and academic achievement.
- Build and demonstrate knowledge, construction, and use of a variety of on-going, authentic, classroom based assessments that appropriately utilize the strengths and meet the language and academic learning needs of linguistically diverse students
- Use assessment data to plan, adapt, and implement instruction for linguistically diverse students according to their level of English language proficiency (as defined by the Utah ELP Standards) that appropriately utilizes students' strengths and meets their language and academic learning needs.

Required Texts:


1. [Gottlieb] – Gottlieb, M. (2006). *Assessing English Language Learners*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
2. [O'Malley & Valdez Pierce] – O'Malley, J. M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English Language Learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
3. [Fairbairn & Jones-Vo] – Fairbairn, S. & Jones-Vo, S. (2010). *Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.
4. Additional required readings will be available through Canvas

Recommended Text:

1. Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association 6th Edition (APA Manual).
2. Additional recommended readings will be available through Canvas

Course Requirements:

The course is designed to be highly interactive; therefore, participation is not only expected, but it is required. Assignments and activities are intended to help students develop a comprehensive knowledge base of the assessment of linguistically diverse students and the complex issues impacting their assessment, as well as encourage the development of skills in: critical thinking, reflection, writing, and cooperative learning. Students enrolled in 6645 will be expected to meet a higher standard of performance.

Technology Requirements and Technical Support: You will need the following to participate online: 1) Regular use of a computer with Internet access (**For online weeks you are expected to log in at least three times a week and spend at least 12 hours each week online and completing the readings.**); 2) A web browser such as Internet Explorer or Firefox; 3) Access to your university e-mail account and Canvas (you can log into the course Canvas site from your University CIS page); 4) completion of the course orientation module on Canvas, and 5) completion of the Canvas orientation module (if unfamiliar with Canvas). **For technical assistance with Canvas**, you have 3 options: 1) click on the  button in the top right corner of your Canvas browser window, 2) send an email to classhelp@utah.edu, or 3) call the support team at **801-585-5959** (M-F 8am-5pm). For problems with class content/assignments, contact the instructor.

Grading:

Weight of Assignments

- 30%--Participation (ECS 6645 students are required to develop for one class a video podcast or narrated PowerPoint with an interactive element related to a special topic to receive credit for participation). Participation includes completion of discussion questions, peer reviews, quizzes, and classroom activities embedded within F2F and online learning.
- 10%--Readers' Note (in pairs)
- 30%--Critical Comparative Review of Language Assessment Measures (in pairs)
- 30%--Final Project: Group Project, Presentation, and Individual Reflection (ECS 6645 students are required to lead and coordinate group to receive full credit for this project)

Grading Scale - Grades are assigned based on the following scale:

94-100 A	73-76 C
90-93 A-	70-72 C-
87-89 B+	67-69 D+
83-86 B	63-66 D
80-82 B-	60-62 D-
77-79 C+	Below 60 E

Paired Readers' Note (10%) There will be one readers' note response this semester to be conducted in pairs with the person you are completing your CCR Paper (described later in the syllabus). The readers' note will allow you to demonstrate your understanding & critical engagement with the reading, and practice the writing and collaborative skills expected in the upcoming course assigned papers. This is considered a group assignment that requires submission on behalf of the pair from only one member. Assignment of pairs and the reading will be made the first day of class.

Readers' notes are an excellent way to begin developing your academic library in the Endnote software. I highly recommend that you get into the practice of writing reader's notes for yourself for each reading in the course (and in other courses). Each entry should follow the format below.

- **Title** – Use the full citation of the reading (in APA format)
- **Summary** – Provide a summary of key points in narrative format and note **specific** details, key concepts, etc. which particularly struck you. [200 words]
- **Response** – Use the following questions to guide your response (you do not need to address all of these questions, but you are expected to **utilize academic sources, such as readings from this class, or other classes, and cite them using the APA format**). Your reaction to the reading. Did you agree or disagree with the author? Why? Did you gain any new insights from the reading? Why or why not? Did you gain any ideas you want to try out in your class with your own students? How does it relate to other things you have read for this class or other classes? What does this reading contribute to the question posed for the week? Did this remind you of something from your own experience? [200 words]

DUE: Paired Readers' Note: JANUARY 28th (Canvas)

Participation (30%): Your grade in this area is based on your online and face-to-face participation in discussions, activities, quizzes, and interactive assignments. Be prepared to participate having completed all weekly reading assignments. In addition, class sessions will include short interactive lectures, reflection questions, partner or small-group conversations and activities, and whole-class discussions based in part on the readings. It is important to not only have visible participation in class, but also to not dominate discussions but rather demonstrate active listening skills toward others.

Students enrolled in ECS 6645 will be expected to create a video podcast or narrated PowerPoint/Prezi to post on Canvas reviewing the key points related to a topic and an interactive follow-up element (blog, Canvas discussion board, quiz, game, activity) that helps reinforce, extend or illustrate the topic in order to receive full credit for participation. Combined, the video podcast and interactive element focused on a special topic on ELL assessment should take no more than 30 minutes for your colleagues to complete. Students will choose from one of the topics below (readings will be provided):

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Value-added assessment and ELLs | 7. ELL accommodations for classroom-based assessment |
| 2. Common core standards and ELL assessment | 8. Classroom-based assessment of ELLs: Grading – (Gottlieb Ch 9) |
| 3. Assessment of ELLs and tracking | 9. Technology & Language Arts Assessment for ELLs |
| 4. DIBELS implications for ELLs | 10. Technology & Math and Science Assessment for ELLs |
| 5. Standards-based classroom assessment of English proficiency for ELLs | |
| 6. Selecting culturally valid assessments in the classroom | |

Please choose a week in which you will post your link to video podcast and follow-up activity. You should plan on having images/visual aids besides yourself talking on the video podcast that help organize and/or illustrate your ideas. The first 10-15 minutes of your time should be devoted to the video podcast where you present the key points from your assigned topic readings. The next 15-20 minutes should be used to provide your classmates with an application activity for both elementary and secondary emphasis (e.g., what does this look like in a classroom, using discussion questions, written reflection on practice to be shared, pop-quiz, designing assessment tasks, grading a short test, etc.). Factors to be considered when assigning a grade

include: time management, quality of podcast and application activity, and ability to engage the audience/viewer. **DUE: Ongoing**

Critical Comparative Review (CCR) of Language Assessment Measures (30%): Each student will be paired with another student. The pair is required to complete a comparative critical analysis of WIDA ACCESS and one additional assigned published language test used with linguistically diverse students (LAS Links, IPT, or Woodcock-Muñoz). If your pair has access to another form of assessment used with linguistically diverse students and would like to use that tool, please contact your instructor. Refer to the criteria adapted from Gottlieb (2006, pp. 60-61) for evaluating assessment instruments that will be posted on Canvas for this assignment. Your pair's review should provide details about each test, including their intended audience and use, technical information related to reliability and validity, norming samples, etc. To assist with this review, test kits with official materials from the test publishers for the IPT, WMLS, and LAS across grade levels (include the test, administration manual, technical manual, and training materials) will be available to be viewed online on Canvas with instructor access code or by appointment only between Jan. 27-Feb. 21, 2014 from 1-5pm in MBH 101 (Appointment Sign-up sheet posted on Canvas). Additionally, when conducting your review please address the linguistic aspect the tests assess and their construct/content validity in this case. In addition to official materials (test kits) from the test publishers, reviews should incorporate information from published reviews of your pair's selected testing instrument. Papers should be 10-12 pages (ECS 5645)/12-15 pages (ECS 6645), in 12-pt font, double-spaced with 1-inch margins, and in narrative form. A grading rubric will be posted on Canvas. This is a collaborative project. As such, each member of the pair is expected to contribute equally to the accomplishment of the CCR paper. To measure your participation, members will individually be completing a collaboration grading rubric evaluating themselves and their partner's level of collaboration on the CCR paper.

CCR Paper Section	Due Dates Tuesdays (Pairs)	Peer Review Due Dates Sundays (Pair²)
Schedule CCR Paper Pair Meeting with Teaching Team Representative	1/28	n/a
Draft of Introduction	2/4	2/9
Draft of WIDA ACCESS Narrative	2/11	2/16
Final CCR Paper & Collaboration Scores	2/21 (Friday)	n/a

Final Project: Classroom-Based Assessment for ELL students (30%)

Details of all aspects of this assignment are posted on Canvas with the corresponding grading rubric.

Part 1: Group Practical Classroom Application: The purpose of this project is to engage with the ELL assessment material on a practical level. How would your group apply what you've learned about ELL assessment to the classroom? Students will:

- 1) Adapted Lesson Plan and Assessments for ELLs: adapt a pre-developed lesson for two English language proficiency levels (between 1-entering and 4-expanding) [lesson plan template is posted on Canvas] and using Gottlieb's 4-phase process for classroom assessment (pp. 90-94), design formative and summative classroom assessment based on your group's selected grade level, content area, and language proficiency levels. **Use of authentic assessment measures to measure and guide language development (listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension) and academic achievement of ELLs must also be an integral part.** The final document should include an introduction and an explanation of your group's lesson and assessment plan.
- 2) Narrative Paper: In the introduction, your group should introduce the topic (i.e. students' grade level, content area, the particular form(s) of classroom-based assessment you will be using, and if you are focusing on a particular type of ELL student, such as long-term ELL, newcomer ELL, special education ELL student, gifted ELL student). Second, groups will describe their plan and assessment in narrative format. This should also describe the academic sources that have informed your lesson

plan and assessments (ECS 5645: minimum of 4 references; ECS 6645: minimum of 6 references). Next, provide a conclusion in which you will explain what are some of the advantages/disadvantages/challenges/issues (such as reliability and validity) of these classroom-based assessments for this population of ELLs in this content area and grade level and state a summary of what your group learned through this process, including any questions that emerged. Finally, include a Reference list of any readings, articles, books used in your paper using an **accurate** citation in APA format (6th edition)

Part 2: Presentation: PowerPoint/Prezi overview of your group's lesson plan and assessment adaptation.

Part 3: Individual Reflection Papers: A 2-page individual reflection on the material covered this semester (including large-scale and classroom-based assessment) will be submitted by each individual member of the group. This reflection will be guided by the following prompts: a) Describe the attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs related to assessing ELL student learning that surfaced for you. b) How may they contribute to or hamper your ability to gather and evaluate evidence of ELL student learning through these measures? c) Have any of your assumptions about the language development of ELLs and their assessment changed after learning about language assessment measures? Is so, what changed and why? d) Can these measures help inform your instruction? Explain why or why not.

Part 4: Collaboration Rubrics: This is a collaborative group project. As such, each member of the group is expected to contribute equally to the accomplishment of the group project paper and final presentation. To measure your participation, group members will individually be completing a collaboration grading rubric evaluating themselves and each of their fellow group member's level of collaboration on the group project.

Group Final Project	Due Dates Tues.	Group Peer Review (PR) Due Dates - Sundays
Draft Group Topic Outline with Reference List	3/18	3/23 (PR)
Draft Group Paper Introduction and Adapted Lesson (Include Adapted Assessments)	3/25	3/30 (PR)
Draft Group Paper Discussion & Conclusion	4/1	4/6 (PR)
Schedule Group Debrief Meeting with Teaching Team Representative	4/1	n/a
Post & Present Group Final Proj. Presentation	4/14* (post Mon.) 4/15 (present Tues.)	4/18 (by Friday) (PR)
Group Final Project (Part 1, 3, & 4) (Canvas)	4/25 (Friday)	n/a

Expectations:

Reading Assignments

Students are expected to prepare for weekly discussions and activities by completing assigned readings **PRIOR** to weekly participation. Such preparation will help them understand the content matter more effectively and prepare them for weekly discussions, activities, and assignments. Therefore, if a student does not read the required readings, s/he will not be able to participate and points will be deducted from the final grade for repeated lack of preparedness. When completing the online modules, have your readings readily available to facilitate your progress through the interactive elements.

Attendance

Attendance and online participation are essential for the completion of this course. Attendance will be checked at the beginning of each face-to-face class session and your online course access and participation statistics will be monitored. More than 1 face-to-face session absence or more than two weeks of online work left uncompleted for any reason will reduce your final score ONE LETTER GRADE (e.g. "A" becomes a "B.") Tardiness or an early departure of 30 minutes will be considered an absence. Excessive absences or lack of online participation (a total of more than four weeks) can result in an E in the class. Please email your instructor ahead of time if you will not be able to attend a particular class session or participate online.

Quality of Assigned Work

A standard of written English appropriate for undergraduate and graduate level students will be expected. All written work submitted must be of professional quality, neatly presented, grammatically correct, and free of spelling and punctuation errors. To improve readability of assignments, standard print styles should be used (e.g. Times New Roman, Arial, Times, New York). **Font size must be 12 point.** Title pages, including your name, course, assignment topic, and date are required for ALL written assignments. Pages should be numbered. ***Full credit cannot be earned for work that does not meet these professional standards.***

Submission of Assignments

Assignments must be submitted on Canvas on or before the specified due date. No late work will be accepted unless delay is unavoidable and the student has discussed the situation with the instructor **PRIOR** to the due date. Assignments must be complete upon submission. No incomplete assignments will be accepted.

Student Professional Behavior:

All students are expected to maintain professional behavior in the classroom online and face-to-face settings, according to the Student Code, spelled out in the Student Handbook. It is available on the web (www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-10_pdfs/8-10_section_1.pdf). Students have specific rights in the classroom as detailed in Article III of the Code. The Code also specifies proscribed conduct (Article XI) that involves cheating on tests, **PLAGIARISM**, and/or collusion, as well as fraud, theft, etc. Students should read the Code carefully and know they are responsible for the content. According to Faculty Rules and Regulations, it is the faculty responsibility to enforce responsible course participation behaviors, and I will do so, beginning with verbal warnings and progressing to dismissal from class and a failing grade. Students have the right to appeal such action to the Student Behavior Committee. In addition, in order to minimize distractions, students should not leave the room during face-to-face meetings unless an emergency arises. A ten-minute break during the middle of each face-to-face session will be scheduled to help with restroom and hydration issues. Students should also refrain from engaging in individual conversations during face-to-face lectures or class discussions. **PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES** during face-to-face sessions unless you are the only caregiver that can be reached during class time.

Students with Disabilities

The University of Utah seeks to provide equal access to its programs, services and activities for people with disabilities. If you will need accommodations, reasonable prior notice needs to be given to the Center for Disability Services, 162 Union Building, 581-5020 (V/TDD). CDS will work with you and the instructor to make arrangements for accommodations.

Accommodation Policy:

Please review the syllabus carefully to see if the course is one that you are committed to taking. If you have a concern, please discuss it with me at your earliest convenience. For more information, please consult the University of Utah's Accommodations Policy, which appears at: www.admin.utah.edu/facdev/accommodations-policy.pdf.

Course Structure and Schedule:

This course is designed to provide a hybrid experience, including face-to-face and online activities. Contact time will be divided in the following way: 40% face-to-face 60% online. **Online sessions** will be a blend of self-paced and group activities using Canvas and other Web sites. Activities will consist of chat, discussion boards, email, journaling, demonstrations, and online interactive video & lectures. **Face-to-face sessions** will be held on the University of Utah campus in BUC 211. The following is a proposed schedule of face-to-face/online meetings as well as associated readings, activities, and assignments. This outline is intended to be flexible to accommodate time limitations and class dynamics. If you miss face-to-face meetings, please contact classmates and/or consult the Canvas course site to determine what you missed and what adjustments may have been announced in the schedule. It is your responsibility to check Canvas daily to keep updated

with course changes.

ONLINE PREPARATION BEGIN PRIOR TO FIRST DAY OF CLASS – ORIENTATION MODULES – January 1, 2014 HYBRID COURSE/SYLLABUS ORIENTATION & CANVAS OVERVIEW		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access online class orientation module • Access online Canvas orientation module 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Learning Readiness Questionnaire with results saved in Word/PDF • Take Course Orientation-Syllabus Review Quiz • Read Module 1 Readings 	<p>1/7</p> <p>1/7</p> <p>1/7</p>
MODULE 1 FACE-TO-FACE (F2F) – January 7, 2014 INTRODUCTION/ELL ASSESSMENT BASICS		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coombe, Folse, & Hubley (2007). Introduction to issues in language assessment and terminology. In <i>A Practical guide to assessing English language learners</i> (pp. xiii-xxx). Ann Arbor, MI: Univ of Michigan Press. • Gottlieb, M. (2006). Assessment of English Language Learners: The Bridge to educational equity. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (CH 1 pp. 1-6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. • Wright, W.E. (2010). Assessment. In <i>Foundations for teaching English Language Learners: Research, theory, policy and practice</i>. * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assign CCR Pairs & Readers Notes • Read Module 2 Readings • Welcome/Opening Assignment 	<p>1/7</p> <p>1/14</p> <p>1/12</p>
MODULE 2 F2F – January 14, 2014 ELL ASSESSMENT BASICS: 2nd LANGUAGE ACQUISITION & WIDA		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colombo & Furbush (2009). Second Language Acquisition: What Mainstream Teachers Need to Know. In <i>Teaching English language learners: Content and language in the middle and secondary mainstream classrooms</i> (p. 25-50). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.* • (2010). Stages of second language development. Praxis preparation manual (pp. 55-58).* • Gottlieb, M. (2006). Standards and assessment: The bridge from language proficiency to academic achievement (CH 2). In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (pp. 23-40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. • WIDA CONSORTIUM (2007). ELP Standards PK-12 • WIDA CONSORTIUM (2007): Can Do Descriptors • WIDA CONSORTIUM (2012): WIDA 2012 Amplified ELD Standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take Quiz on Assessment Basics & 2nd Language Acquisition* • Take Online WIDA Quiz • Read Module 3 Readings 	<p>1/14</p> <p>1/19</p> <p>1/21</p>
Module 2 Recommended Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utah State Office of Education (2013). Utah State Core Curriculum Standards. Retrieved from http://www.schools.utah.gov/CURR/imc/Reviewer-Portal/State-Core-Standards-by-Subject.aspx • Moss & Ross-Feldman (2004). <i>Second language acquisition in adults: From research to practice</i>. The National Center for ESL Literacy Education. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/caela/esl%5Fresources/digests/SLA.html • Gottlieb, M., Cranley, M.E., & Camilleri, A. (2007). Understanding the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards: A Resource Guide. 		
MODULE 3 ONLINE – January 21, 2014 ELLs & THE ELL ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (OVERVIEW OF ELEMENTS OF THE FRAMEWORK & PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT)		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gottlieb, M. (2006). Assessment of English Language Learners: The Bridge to educational equity. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (CH 1) (pp. 10-14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. • McMillan, J. (2007). The role of assessment in teaching. In <i>Classroom assessment: Principles and practice for effective standards-based instruction</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Online Asynchronous Module 3 Interactive Lecture • Work Online on Module 4 Paired Readers Note • Read Module 4 Readings 	<p>1/20</p> <p>1/28</p> <p>1/28</p>

<p>(4th Ed.) (pp. 1-23). Allyn & Bacon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solano-Flores, G., & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-Language Learners. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 32(2), 3-13. • Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Relevant student factors. In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 6-30). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. 		
<p>Module 3 Recommended Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shohamy, E. (2004). Assessment in multicultural societies: Applying democratic principles and practices to language testing. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), <i>Critical pedagogies and language learning</i> (pp. 72–92). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. • Federal Definition of an English Language Learner. Retrieved from http://ell.pccs.k12.mi.us/sites/ell.pccs.k12.mi.us/files/shared/2011-2012/Federal%20Definition%20of%20ELL.pdf 		
<p>MODULE 4 F2F – January 28, 2014 ELL ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK: SYSTEM FOR IDENTIFICATION, PLACEMENT, EXIT, AND MONITORING OF ELLs</p>		
<p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gottlieb, M. (2006). Assessment of English Language Learners: The Bridge to educational equity. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement (CH 1)</i> (pp. 6-9 & 15-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. • Ragan & Lesaux (2006). Federal, state, and district level English language learner program entry and exit requirements: Effects on the education of language minority learners. <i>Educational Policy Analysis Archives</i>, 14(20), 320-338. • Hellman, A. B. (2011). Types of assessments with English language learners (p. 4-6) & Sample timeline of assessment activities with ELLs (p. 13). In <i>Assessment with P-12 English language learners</i>. Retrieved from: http://mssu.academia.edu/AndreaHellman/Papers [ELEM – SEC] • Xiong, Y. S. & Zhou, M. (2006). Structuring inequity: How California selectively tests, classifies, and tracks language minority students. UC Los Angeles: UCLA School of Public Affairs. Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/98d66346 • Utah State Office of Education. Home Language Survey Guidelines & Established Protocol Exit Criteria 2008-2009 and USOE website. 	<p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Online Asynchronous Module 4 Interactive Lecture • Submit Module 4 Paired Readers Note on Canvas • Schedule CCR Paper Pair Meeting with Teaching Team Representative • Read Module 5 Readings 	<p>Due Dates</p> <p>1/28</p> <p>1/28</p> <p>1/28</p> <p>2/4</p>
<p>MODULE 5 ONLINE – February 4, 2014 NCLB, LARGE SCALE ASSESSMENT OF ELLS FOR LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, & ASSESSMENT ACCOMMODATIONS</p>		
<p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act & English language Learners: Assessment and accountability issues. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 33(1) 4-14. • Gottlieb (2006). Supports for student, classroom, and large-scale assessment: The bridge to student understanding (CH 7). In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (pp. 133-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. • Gottlieb (2006). Standardized testing and reporting: The bridge to fair and valid assessment (CH 8). In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (pp. 151-168). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. 	<p>Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Online Asynchronous Module 5 Interactive Lecture • Draft Intro to CCR Paper with assigned Pair • Conduct & Submit Peer Review of Draft Introduction using rubric • Read Module 6 Readings 	<p>Due Dates</p> <p>2/4</p> <p>2/4</p> <p>2/9</p> <p>2/11</p>
<p>Module 5 Recommended Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crone, T. M. (2004). What test scores can and cannot tell us about the quality of our schools. <i>Business Review</i>, Q3, 5-21 • Abedi, J., & Lord, C. (2001). The language factor in mathematics tests. <i>Applied Measurement in Education</i>, 14(3), 219-234. • Abedi, J. (2002). Standardized achievement tests and English language learners: Psychometric issues. <i>Educational</i> 		

<p><i>Assessment</i>, 8(3), 231-257.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenyon & Van Duzer (2003). <i>Valid, Reliable, and Appropriate Assessments for adult English language learners</i>. Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from www.cal.org/caela/esl%5Fresource/digests/langassessQA.html • Public Education Network & National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education (2002). <i>Programs of English Language Learners: NCLB Action Brief</i>. Retrieved from http://www.ncpie.org/nclbaction/english_language_learners.html 		
<p>MODULE 6 ONLINE – February 11, 2014 LARGE-SCALE ASSESSMENT OF ELLS: TRAINING ON ADMINISTRATION OF WIDA ACCESS AND UPCOMING CHANGES TO STATE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT</p>		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [ACCESS Overview] Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (2013). ACCESS for ELLs developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics [website]. Retrieved from http://www.wida.us/assessment/access/ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make sure and check out the following tabs: About ACCESS for ELLs, Preparation, Administration, and Scores and Reports • [ACCESS Technical Report]. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (2013). Annual Technical Report No. 8, Series 203, 2011-12 [website]. Retrieved from http://www.wida.us/assessment/access/TechReports/index.aspx 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Online Asynchronous Module 6 Interactive Lecture on WIDA ACCESS • Take online WIDA ACCESS Quiz • Draft Narrative for WIDA ACCESS with assigned Pair Partner • Conduct & Submit Peer Review of Draft Narrative • Read Module 7 Readings 	<p>2/11</p> <p>2/16</p> <p>2/11</p> <p>2/16</p> <p>2/18</p>
<p>Module 6 Recommended Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WIDA Consortium (2013). ACCESS for ELLs: Guidelines for accommodating ELLs with disabilities. Retrieved from www.wida.us • Kenyon, D. M., Merow, K., Wright, L. & Gabel, D. (2012). <i>The ASSETS Consortium English Language Proficiency Assessment Framework</i>. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. 		
<p>MODULE 7 F2F – February 18, 2014 EXAMPLES OF LARGE-SCALE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENTS OF ELLS: WMLS, LAS LINKS, & IPT</p>		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pray, L. (2005) How well do commonly used language instruments measure English oral-language proficiency? <i>Bilingual Research Journal</i> 29 (2) 387-410. • Coltrane, B. (2002). English language learners and high-stakes tests: An overview of the issues [ERIC Digest]. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. • Wendling, B. J. (2005). Woodcock-Muñoz language survey-revised administration and scoring training package (video and Microsoft PowerPoint presentation). Rolling Meadows, IL: Riverside Publishing. • Ballard-Tighe Publishers (2003). IPT online in-service training. Retrieved from http://www.ballard-tighe.com/IPTOnlineInserviceTraining/ • CTB/McGraw-Hill, LLC. (2006). LAS Links: Staff Development DVD. Monterey, CA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-Class Scavenger Hunt of Language Tests and their technical facts • Submit Final Paired CCR Paper (Canvas) • Submit CCR Collaboration Scores (self & pair) • Read Module 8 Readings 	<p>2/18</p> <p>2/21</p> <p>2/21</p> <p>2/25</p>
<p>Module 7 Recommended Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Porter & Vega (2007). Overview of Existing English Language Proficiency Tests. In J. Abedi (Ed.) <i>English Language Proficiency Assessment in the Nation: Current Status and Future Practice</i>. Technical Report published by the UC Davis School of Education. • Willner, L. S., Rivera, C. Acosta, B. D. (2009). Ensuring accommodations used in content assessments are responsive to English language learners. <i>The Reading Teacher</i>, 62(8), 696-698. 		

MODULE 8 ONLINE – February 25, 2014 CLASSROOM-BASED ASSESSMENT OF ELLS: AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENT AND EXAMPLES		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gottlieb (2006). CH 5 Classroom assessment: The bridge to educational parity. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (pp. 85-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. [ELEM – SEC] Hellman (2011). Guidelines for Standards-based Classroom Assessment (p. 14). In <i>Assessment with P-12 English Language Learners</i>. Retrieved from: http://mssu.academia.edu/AndreaHellman/Papers [ELEM – SEC] O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Types of authentic assessment/Technical qualities of authentic assessment (In CH 2). In <i>Authentic Assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i> (p. 12, 19-31). [ELEM – SEC] O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Portfolio assessment (CH 3, pp. 33-56). In <i>Authentic Assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i>. [ELEM – SEC] Valdez Pierce (2002). Performance-based assessment: Promoting achievement for English language learners. <i>ERIC/CLL Newsbulletin</i>, 26(1), 1-3. [ELEM – SEC] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Online Asynchronous Module 8 Interactive Lecture Read Module 9 Readings 	<p>2/25</p> <p>3/4</p>
Module 8 Recommended Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> García, S. B. & Tyler, B. (2010). Meeting the needs of English language learners with disabilities in the general curriculum. <i>Theory into Practice</i>, 49, 113-120. [SPEC-ED] Gottlieb (2006). Documenting performance assessment: The bridge from teachers to classrooms CH 6. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (111-132). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. [ELEM – SEC] Spinelli, C. G. (2008). Addressing the issue of cultural and linguistic diversity and assessment: Informal evaluation measures for English language learners. <i>Reading & Writing Quarterly</i>, 24(1), 101-118. (3) [ELEM – SEC] 		
MODULE 9 F2F – March 4, 2014 CLASSROOM-BASED ASSESSMENT OF ELLS: BACKWARD DESIGN LESSON PLANNING: DEVELOPING LANGUAGE AND CONTENT OBJECTIVES & DIFFERENTIATING CLASSROOM BASED ASSESSMENT FOR ELLS		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colombo & Furbush (2009). Assessing Content and Language. In <i>Teaching English language learners: Content and Language in the Middle and Secondary Mainstream Classrooms</i>. Los Angeles, CA: Sage [SEC] Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Steps for differentiating (In Ch. 1). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 30-33). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. [ELEM – SEC] Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). General Assessment Strategies (In Ch. 2). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 54-61). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. [ELEM – SEC] Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Differentiation strategies for level 1 students (In Ch. 3). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 77-100). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. [ELEM – SEC] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in class demonstration of adding language and content objectives to lesson plans/classroom based assessment Complete and submit online self assessment of individual authentic assessment class assignment in Module 9 Read Module 10 Readings 	<p>3/4</p> <p>3/9</p> <p>3/18</p>

Module 9 Recommend Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Content Area Assessment (CH 7, pp. 163-187). In <i>Authentic Assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i>. [ELEM – SEC] • O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Readings listed on page 262 of index for “self-assessment” topic is the assigned reading for this week. [ELEM – SEC] • Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Differentiation strategies for level 2 students (In Ch. 4). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 127-138). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. [ELEM – SEC] • Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Differentiation strategies for level 3 students (In Ch. 5). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 163-174). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. [ELEM – SEC] • Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Differentiation strategies for level 4 students (In Ch. 6). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 195-206). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. [ELEM – SEC] • Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Differentiation strategies for level 5 students (In Ch. 7). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 225-232). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. [ELEM – SEC] 		
SPRING BREAK – NO CLASS ON March 11, 2014		
Enjoy your Spring Break!		
MODULE 10 ONLINE – March 18, 2014 CLASSROOM-BASED ASSESSMENT OF ELLS: ASSESSMENT OF ORAL LANGUAGE AND READING		
Required Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Oral Language Assessment (CH 4, pp. 57-92), Reading Assessment (CH 5, pp. 93-134). In <i>Authentic Assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i>. [ELEM – SEC] • Gottlieb (2006). Assessing oral language and literacy development: The bridge from social language proficiency to academic language proficiency. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (pp. 41-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. [ELEM – SEC] • Lenski, et. al. (2006). Assessing English language learners in mainstream classrooms. <i>The Reading Teacher</i>, 60(1), 24-34. [ELEM – SEC] 	Assignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Online Asynchronous Module 10 Interactive Lecture • Draft group final topic outline with reference list in groups • Conduct & Submit Group Peer Review of Final Topic Submission of partner group • Read Module 11 Readings 	Due Dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3/18 3/18 3/23 3/25
MODULE 11 ONLINE – March 25, 2014 CLASSROOM-BASED ASSESSMENT OF ELLS: ASSESSING 1) WRITING & 2) CONTENT AND LANGUAGE IN SOCIAL STUDIES		
Required Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Writing Assessment (CH 6, pp. 135-161). In <i>Authentic Assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i>. [ELEM – SEC] • Schulz, M. (2009). Effective writing assessment and instruction for young English language learners. <i>Early Childhood Education Journal</i>, 37, 57–62. [ELEM] • Gottlieb (2006). Assessing academic language proficiency and academic achievement: The bridge to accountability: <u>The language and content of social studies</u>. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (pp. 75-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. [ELEM – SEC] • O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Social Studies in Content Area Assessment (CH 7, pp. 192-199). In <i>Authentic Assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i>. [ELEM – SEC] • Misco, T. & Castañeda, M. (2009). “Now what should I do for English Language Learners?”: Reconceptualizing social studies curriculum design for ELLs. <i>Educational Horizons</i>, 87(3), 182-189. [ELEM – SEC] 	Assignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Online Asynchronous Module 11 Interactive Lecture • Draft Group Introduction & Lesson Plan in groups • Conduct & Submit Group Peer Review of introduction and lesson plan of partner group • Read Module 12 Readings 	Due Dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3/25 3/25 3/30 4/1

Module 11 Recommend Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case, R. & Obenchain, K. M. (2006). How to assess language in the social studies classroom. <i>The Social Studies</i>, 41-48. [UPPER-ELEM – SEC] Schleppegrell, M. J., Achugar, M., & Oteiza, T. (2004). The grammar of history: Enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. <i>TESOL Quarterly</i> 38(1), 67-93. [SEC] Romova, Z. & Andrew, M. (2011). Teaching and assessing academic writing via the portfolio: Benefits for learners of English as an additional language. <i>Assessing Writing</i>, 16, 111-122. [ADULT - HIGHER ED] 		
MODULE 12 F2F (with ONLINE lectures) – April 1, 2014 CLASSROOM-BASED ASSESSMENT OF ELLS: ASSESSING CONTENT AND LANGUAGE IN SCIENCE AND MATH		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gottlieb (2006). Assessing academic language proficiency and academic achievement: The bridge to accountability: <u>The language of content of mathematics & The language and content of science</u>. In <i>Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement</i> (pp. 65-75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. [ELEM – SEC] O'Malley & Valdez Pierce (1996). Science and Math sections of Content Area Assessment (CH 7, pp. 187-194). In <i>Authentic Assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i>. [ELEM – SEC] In addition to the two readings above, choose 1 math and 1 science reading from the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lee, F. Y., Silverman, F. L., Montoya, P. (2002). Assessing the math performance of young ESL students. <i>Principal</i>, 81(3), 29-31. [ELEM] Irujo, S. (2007). So just what is the academic language of mathematics. <i>ELL Outlook</i>, [ELEM-SEC] Cox-Petersen, A., & Olson, J.K. (2007). Alternate assessment for English language learners. <i>Science and Children</i>, 44(6), 46-48. [ELEM] Lee, O. (2005). Science education with English Language Learners: Synthesis and research agenda. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 75(4), 491-530. [ELEM-SEC] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Online Asynchronous Module 12 Interactive Lecture Draft group conclusion & assessment modification in groups Schedule Final Project Group Debrief Meeting with Teaching Team Representative Conduct & Submit Peer Review of conclusion & assessment modification of partner group Read Module 13 Readings 	<p>4/1</p> <p>4/1</p> <p>4/1</p> <p>4/6</p> <p>4/8</p>
Module 12 Recommended Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lopez, O.S. (2010). The Digital Learning Classroom: Improving English Language Learners' academic success in mathematics & reading using interactive whiteboard technology. <i>Computers & Education</i> 54, 901–915. [ELEM MATH] Bunch, G. C., Shaw, J. M., Geaney, E. R. (2010). Documenting the language demands of mainstream content-area assessment for English learners: participant structures, communicative modes, and genre in science performance assessments. <i>Language and Education</i>, 24(3), 185-214. [ELEM SCIENCE] Lee, O., Quinn, H., & Valdés, G. (2013). Science and Language for English Language Learners in Relation to Next Generation Science Standards... <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 42(4), 223-233. [ELEM-SEC] 		
MODULE 13 ONLINE – April 8, 2014 SPECIAL EDUCATION, ELLs, AND THE ASSESSMENT OF LANGUAGE DIFFERENCES VERSUS DISABILITIES		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brown, C.L. (2004). Reducing the over-referral of culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD) for language disabilities. <i>NABE Journal of Research and Practice</i>, 2(1), 225-243. Chu, S., & Flores, S. (2011). Assessment of English language learners with learning disabilities. <i>The Clearing House</i>, 84, 244-248. Litt, S. <i>Learning disability or language development issue?</i> Retrieved from http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/special_education.php Rodriguez, D. (2009). Meeting the needs of English Language Learners in urban settings. <i>Urban Education</i>, 44(4), 452-464. Haley & Austin (2014). Working with gifted students in second-language classrooms (pp. 284-285). In <i>Content-based second language teaching and learning: An interactive approach</i> (2nd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Online Asynchronous Module 13 Interactive Lecture Group Work on Final Group Project 	<p>4/8</p> <p>4/8</p>

MODULE 14 FACE-TO-FACE – April 15, 2014 – GROUP PRESENTATIONS - BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER		
No Readings or Class:	Assignments	Due Dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2010). Bringing it all together in elementary, middle, and high school classrooms (Ch. 8). In <i>Differentiating instruction & assessment for English Language Learners: A guide for K-12 teachers</i> (p. 251-257, 284-292, & CHOICE OF: Elem [257-266], Middle [266-275], or High School [265-283]). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post link to PowerPoint/ Prezi file of Final Group Presentation on Canvas 	4/14
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Class Group Presentation Q & A 	4/15
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit Peer Review of the group presentation your group was assigned to review (Canvas) 	4/18
April 22, 2014 – ONLINE - LAST WEEK OF CLASSES - INDEPENDENT GROUP WORK & SUBMISSION OF FINAL GROUP PROJECT MATERIALS		
Required Readings:	Assignments	Due Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Group Project Work! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Group Wk 	4/22
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Project Paper and supporting materials (Canvas) 	4/25
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual Reflection Paper (Canvas) 	4/25
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration Scores (Self + group members) 	4/25