

Needed Perspectives and  
Key Opportunities in E.L.D. :  
The G.L.A.D. Connection

Teaching *language practices*  
in content-rich environments

vs.

Teaching **Language** as  
*structures & functions*

Quoted from “*Educational Standards and the Problem of Error*”

By Noel Wilson,

School of Education, The Flinders University of South Australia

“Negating notions of truth and reality does *not* necessarily lead to chaos or alienation, but may presage a search for greater clarity of assumption, for greater precision of value, and hence for greater wisdom in action.”

# Modeling & Assessing Second Language Acquisition

by Kenneth Hylthenstam & Manfred Pienemann

“There is *no* reason to assume that ... [ language ] acquisition proceeds ... from zero proficiency to full target form or use, ... (*structures, notions, functions*), presented one at a time in linear, additive fashion. Indeed, for naturalist and instructed *second language acquisition, (SLA)*, there is a wealth of evidence to the contrary.”

(For review, see e.g. Anderson, 1983; Felix, 1981; Gass, 1983; Hatch, 1978; Wode, 1981.)

Most of today's ELD teaching & learning is:  
Grammar focused, systematic, sequential-  
linear, & *discrete-skill* E.L.D.

- An example of a discrete skill: [U-tube @ \\_\\_\\_\\_\\_](#)
- A “micro-level linguistic feature”: The correct pronunciation of “nein” = “nine”
- The ability to create grammatically correct utterances, has dominated language teaching and learning for generations.

# The Audio-lingual Method

modern teaching methodology

- “In audio-lingualism there is **no** explicit grammar instruction—everything is simply memorized *in form*. The idea is for the students to practice the particular construct until they can use it spontaneously. In this manner, the lessons are built on static drills in which the students have **little or no** control on their own output; the teacher is expecting a particular response and **not providing that** will result in a student receiving negative feedback. This type of activity, *for the foundation of language learning*, is in *direct opposition* to [communicative language teaching](#).”

There is a place for grammar teaching and correct utterances, “***but only*** in the service of the other seven standards.

Standard 9: Create clear and coherent grade-appropriate speech and text.

Standard 10: Make accurate use of standard English to communicate in grade appropriate speech and writing.

- *Standards 8, 9, & 10* “hone-in on some of the more micro-level *linguistic features* that are undoubtedly important to focus on, ***but only in the service of the other seven standards.***”

# Modeling & Assessing Second Language Acquisition

by Kenneth Hylthenstam & Manfred Pienemann

- “Where methodology is concerned, there is *no* reason to assume that presenting the target language as a series of discrete linguistic or socio-linguistic teaching points is the best or even a way to get learners to synthesize the parts into a coherent whole ... this is what most teaching methods do assume. It is reflected ... in the demand for immediate, forced production by the learners, of native-like sentences, from the earliest stages of instruction, and the prescription of teacher “correction” for anything less.”

“The psycholinguist *Martin Braine* once tried for several weeks **to stamp out** one of his daughter’s **grammatical errors.**”

- Child: *Want other one spoon, Daddy.*
- Father: *You mean, you want THE OTHER SPOON.*
- Child: *Yes, I want other one spoon, please, Daddy.*
- Father: *Can you say, “the other spoon”?*
- Child: *Other ... one ... spoon.*
- Father: *Say ... “other”.*
- Child: *Other.*
- Father: *“Other ... Spoon.”*
- Child: *Other ... spoon. Now give me other one spoon?*

From **Steven Pinker’s** best-selling book, “*The Language Instinct, How the Mind Creates Lanugage*”



# The recommendations & assertions in this presentation

are based on the premise that,

- the “*Challenges ...*” paper is correct, (i.e. the paper corroborates & confirms other recent language research), &
- the CCSS, NGSS, & New ELD Standards *drive* ELD instruction.

# Next Generation Science Standards

- <http://www.nextgenscience.org/4e-energy>

Please note from this one example of the NGSS, a 4<sup>th</sup> grade NGSS on “Energy”, that language is **deeply** embedded, with the content; showing that there are some good things about the standards movement:

- 1.) their focus on ***content***,
- 2.) their focus on ***language*** skills!
- 3.) *“Stated standards take me out of my corner, my community, even my state, and remind me what kids out there in the wide world are doing.”*

Quote by Barbara Stengel, Professor at Vanderbilt University’s Peabody College of Education

# A Seminal Paper

**“Challenges and Opportunities for  
Language Learning in the Context  
of Common Core State Standards  
and Next Generation Science  
Standards”**

By Kenji Hakuta, María Santos & Zhihui Fang

## Important ideas in the “*Challenges ...*” paper:

- “Three parallel *shifts in perspective* on how language is learned are needed:
  1. “From an individual process to a more socially engaged process;”
  2. “from a linear building of structures and vocabulary aimed at correctness and fluency to a non-linear and complex developmental process aimed at comprehension and communication; ...”
  3. “from teaching language *per se* to supporting participation in activity that simultaneously develops conceptual understanding and language use.”

## Recommendations in the “*Challenges ...*” paper:

- “1. Move away from defining language primarily as form or even as function, and toward a redefinition of language as a complex adaptive system of communicative actions to realize key purposes.”
- “2. Recognize that language learning occurs more effectively through indirect intervention where learners can acquire language experientially rather than through a structural syllabus of language forms.
- “3. ...Literacy and learning ... as “participation in a range of valued meaning-making practices” both in and out of school.”

# From the “*Challenges...*” paper, What should *E.L.D.* look like?

“Language development occurs in subject area classrooms when teachers carefully scaffold language and content learning, and where students work and talk together.”

“ELLs learn language as they engage in meaningful content-rich activities (*projects, presentations, investigations*), that encourage language growth through *perception, interaction, planning, research, discussion, argument and co-construction* of academic products.”

# Implications for Assessment?

From the “*Challenges ...*” paper:

*Guadalupe Valdés* suggests “instead of the usual “content-free” tasks found on most language tests assessing the ability to speak, listen, read, and write, emphasizing accuracy, complexity, and fluency, She challenged content assessment experts to develop ways to assess students’ ability to ***participate in the classroom discourse & practices*** as suggested by *the new Standards.*”

## The implications for *Once-a-year Assessments* mandated by the federal government ...

Quote by Rich Lehrer, professor at Vanderbilt University's Peabody College of Education:

“If we want to engage children and older students in the production of mathematics and science knowledge, then there are severe limitations of one time tests to do that. .... once a year tests mandated by the federal government *can't* assess that kind of nuanced learning and don't help teachers improve instruction. We have to broaden what we think of assessments.”



Guadalupe Valdés suggests:

*Implications for Instruction* from the “Challenges ...” paper:

“She questioned the value of what is too often done in the name of *teaching language*, when its primary stress is on grammar and sentence structure, at the expense of *pragmatic participatory competence*.”

Guadalupe Valdés suggests:

Implications for *Instruction* from the “Challenges ...” paper:

“... that time devoted to *explicit and direct language instruction* tends **to isolate ELLs** from opportunities to learn subject content and to hear and learn the language more naturally from examples of content- and age-appropriate language produced by other students and by teachers in content-rich and discourse-rich subject-area classrooms.”

*Language and the Common Core State Standards,* (by Liel & Walqui), from the O.D.E. ELS website

Studies carried out in California (Waqui, Hamburger, Koelsch, et al 2010; Linqanti, Crane & Huang, 2011), point to the devastating consequences of the *mastery approach*, to its contribution to **the “intermediate plateau”** and to the increasing numbers of *long term ELLs students* who have been classified as Limited English Proficient for seven years or more (Olsen, 2010).”

## *Language and the Common Core State Standards,*

(by Liel & Walqui), from the O.D.E. ELS website

“Casting language in a contextualized and action-based way”:

1.) “Form & function are subservient to action.”

2.) “Language learning becomes usage based rather than grammar-based (Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2010).”

3.) “Language ceases to be an autonomous system, but is part of larger systems of meaning making.”

\* “These changes have far-reaching consequences for the language curriculum ...”

“There's No Such Thing as a Reading Test: Real literacy involves learning about the world, not just letters and sounds”

By E.D. Hirsch and Robert Pondiscio, 2010

“Research also tells us that familiarity with domain knowledge increases fluency, broadens vocabulary (you can pick up words in context), and enables deeper reading and listening comprehension.”

“Researchers have consistently demonstrated that in order to understand what you're reading, you need to know something about the subject matter. Students who are identified as *“poor readers”* comprehend with relative ease when asked to read passages on familiar subjects, **outperforming** even *“good readers”* who lack relevant background knowledge.”

# “There's No Such Thing as a Reading Test: ...”

## Implications for K-12 School Curriculums

By E.D. Hirsch and Robert Pondiscio, 2010

*“Poor readers with high content knowledge **outperformed good readers** with low content knowledge. Such findings should challenge our very idea of who is or is not good reader ...”*

*“A study sponsored by the *National Institute of Child Health and Human Development* found that only **4 percent** of first-grade class time in American elementary schools is spent on *science* and only **2 percent**, on *social studies*. In third grade, about **5 percent** of class time goes to each of these subjects. Meanwhile a whopping 62 percent **in first grade** and 47 percent **in third grade** is spent on *language arts*.”*

“There's No Such Thing as a Reading Test: Real literacy involves learning about the world, not just letters and sounds”

By E.D. Hirsch and Robert Pondiscio, 2010

“**You** have probably experienced the uncomfortable sensation of feeling like *a poor reader* when struggling to understand a new product warranty, directions for installing a computer operating system, or some other piece of writing where your lack of background knowledge left you feeling out of your depth. **Your** rate of reading slows. **You** find yourself repeating sentences to make sure you understand. If this happens only rarely to *you*, it is because you possess a broad range of background knowledge - - the more you know, the more you are able to communicate and comprehend. The **implications** of this insight for teaching children to read should be obvious: **The more *domain knowledge* our children receive, the more capable they will become as readers.**”

# The blow back from the over-emphasis on Reading Fluency

*Reading First* proponents quoted research claims that *fluency* is the biggest determiner of academic success for beginning reading students. [the difference between Automaticity & Fluency.]

Then, is the idea true that *fluency* must be established so that the student's cognition would be more free to learn? As in the old adage, "Learning to Read, Reading to Learn". Hirsch and Pondiscio (2010), contradicts such ideas!



“There's No Such Thing as a Reading Test: Real literacy involves learning about the world, not just letters and sounds”

*from E.D. Hirsch and Robert Pondiscio, 2010*

"The mistaken idea that reading is a skill -- learn to crack the code, practice ***comprehension strategies***, and you can read anything -- may be the single biggest factor **holding back** reading achievement in the country," *Daniel T.*

*Willingham*, professor of psychology at the University of Virginia, recently wrote in *The Washington Post*.

"Students will ***not*** meet standards that way.  
**The *knowledge base problem* must be solved.**"

Quote by Ann Sullivan, Helen Keller's teacher

“I *never* taught language for the purpose of teaching it; but invariably used language as a medium for the communication of thought; thus the learning of language was coincident with the acquisition of knowledge. In order to use language intelligently, one *must* have something to talk about, and having something to talk about is the result of having had experiences ...”

# The Future of E.L.D.

depends on:

- how well **E.L.D. & Content** are joined in the classroom,
- how well **E.L.D.** curriculum & instruction are **aligned with** the new ELD standards, the CCSS, & the NGSS.

# My principle assertion:

- GLAD implementation is important and necessary because **G.L.A.D.** strategies dovetail perfectly with the new direction of *language research* & the newest standards.
- Link: to [GLAD video](#)

# Project GLAD®

- has been recognized as a model reform program by Calif. Dept. of Education, (CDE),
- identified as a training model for multiple Achieving Schools and Distinguished School award winners,
- recommended as a K-8 project by the California State Superintendent of Schools for teachers of English learners, &
- highlighted as a “Best Practices” program for Title III professional development by CDE.

# What is G.L.A.D. ?

- *Project GLAD*® is a model of professional development dedicated to building academic language and literacy for all students, especially English language learners.
- For over 20 years, *Project GLAD*® has provided exemplary training for educators both nationally and internationally resulting in students' access to quality instruction and high-levels of success.

# Pictorial Input Charts





“The most powerful influence on teachers is the one most beyond our control ...”

- “... The sociologist Dan Lortie calls the phenomenon *the apprenticeship of observation*. Teachers learn to teach primarily by recalling their memories of having been taught, an average of 13,000 hours of instruction over a typical childhood. The *apprenticeship of observation* exacerbates what the education scholar Suzanne Wilson calls education reform’s double bind. The very people who embody the problem — teachers — are also the ones charged with solving it.”

Quote by ELIZABETH

GREEN



# Paragraph / Sentence Strips



# Project GLAD® Training

## Demonstration lesson in the classroom:

- \* Participants observe the power & the magic as certified trainers deliver 4 to 5 days of classroom instruction with a single group of students.
- \* Adults spend afternoon sessions debriefing, collaborating, planning and preparing for immediate implementation.
- \* Trained teachers receive access to a variety of free resources: online professional learning communities

# Observations about G.L.A.D. Guided Language Acquisition Design

*If* you haven't seen GLAD in the classroom, then you need to.

G.L.A.D. is *not* just another set of, or *more*, **instructional strategies**; it provides & motivates teachers with the *language practices* necessary for implementing the CCSS, NGSS, & ELD standards.

GLAD happens to dovetail perfectly:

- 1.) with C.C.S.S. implementation,
- 2.) for wedding content w/ E.L.D. in the classroom.
- 3.) for E.L.L.s' learning E.L.D. across the various disciplines.

# Observations about G.L.A.D.

## ***Guided Language Acquisition Design***

*If* you haven't *seen* GLAD in the classroom, then you need to.

- Why does GLAD fit the bill ? ...
  - GL.A.D. & S.T.E.M. both go hand-in-hand, both use pictorial input charts, use of data-taped-on-a-wall
  - students' often work in teams on structured assignments,
  - mandated responses & scaffolding options,
  - high-level academic discourse is constant,
  - Small groups, A/B partners, & centers allow for much less lecture-style teaching,
  - accountability & responsibility for individual class assignments,
  - GLAD consistently engages students in ***language practices across the curriculum***,
  - GLAD can be used by the poorest school districts.

# Curriculum Issues: mixed groups?

“... One reason teachers teach a diluted curriculum to mixed-ability classes is that they do not know what else to offer besides the standard college-preparatory curriculum. This is precisely the technical problem: teachers lack pedagogical strategies and curricula designed for mixed-ability classes—nowhere is this more true than in E.L.D.—and most do not believe such a curriculum is possible.”

# “Information Gap” Tasks: Do They Facilitate Second Language Acquisition?

Research by CATHERINE DOUGHTY<sup>†</sup> and TERESA PICA

- “ ... *current theory*, which argues that *conversational modification* occurring *during interaction* is instrumental in *second language acquisition*. Furthermore, the finding that *group and dyad interaction patterns* produced more modification than did the teacher-fronted situation suggests that participation pattern as well as task type have an effect on the conversational modification of interaction.



From: “*E.L.D. Framework*, Section 1.4: ”  
(from O.D.E. website)

## Implications of the Framework :

- “While *the* [ E.L.D. ] *Framework* does ***not*** address **specific** issues related to **pedagogy**, it should be noted that creating state ELP standards using the Framework will have ***significant implications for current instructional arrangements, . . .***”

# From: “*ELPD Framework*”

(from O.D.E.’s E.L.D. new standards website)

My observation & conclusion is that **GLAD fits the bill, *not* sequential, systematic, discrete-skills E.L.D.**

- “students moving *from* language as structures and/or functions, *to* Language Practices.”
- “There is an underlying supposition that teachers will use developmentally appropriate pedagogy to create *content-rich* environments in which students acquire language *by participating in meaningful activities*.”
- “ELLs must be able to engage in language practices **across the curriculum** ... to meet CCSS & NGSS.” (NGSS = Next Generation Science Standards).



## From: “*ELPD Framework*”

(from O.D.E.’s E.L.D. new standards website)

My observation & conclusion is that **GLAD fits the bill, *not* sequential, systematic, discrete-skills E.L.D.**

- “the implication is that **all teachers (content & ESL/ELD)** will be **responsible for the language & literacy** practices that the ELLs need to acquire to perform the activities of the various disciplines.”
- “At present, second language development is often **seen as the primary responsibility of the ESL teacher**, while **content development** (particularly in grades 6-12) **as that of the subject area teacher.**”

# From: “*ELPD Framework*”

(from O.D.E.’s E.L.D. new standards website)

My observation & conclusion is that **GLAD fits the bill**, *not* sequential, systematic, discrete-skills E.L.D.

- “Given the diverse range of program design and explicitness in the CCSS and NGSS regarding how language must be used to enact disciplinary knowledge and skills, *such a division of labor is no longer viable.*”
- “ESL teachers *must* cultivate a deeper knowledge of the *discipline-specific language and literacy practices* that ELLs need in order to perform the activities germane to those disciplines.”

# Task-based Language Learning & Teaching

VS.

## Sentence-Frames & Discrete Grammar Skills

“the ERIC database shows over 50 articles on this issue , [TBLLT], since the beginning of this third millennium.”

- **From “Challenges ...” paper:** The “Acceptance, of “flawed” language, supports growth in communication and participation in disciplinary learning.” “ The *native speaker norm* [as a goal] is increasingly being questioned in the fields of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics.”

# Are ELD educators in **a Paradigm Shift** ? Or experiencing **a Pivot**? Or neither ?

- The **transition away from** the E.L.D. of discrete, systematic, sequential, language skills, **towards** the teaching & learning of the E.L.D. of ***“specific language & literacy practices across the curriculum.”***
- ***Criticisms*** of the above paradigm shift: “It’s way too general & unspecific”, “What do we hang our lesson plans on?”, “It’s been tried already, but content trumps language!”, “Most ELLs have too many grammar gaps, who’s going to teach those?”

Will “**the pendulum**” really “**swing**” away from a discrete skill / grammar focus?

- Susana Dutro & Lori Helman, founders of *E.L. Achieve* & C.M., (“Constructing Meaning”), argue for **both** an ESL pull-out model, together with “explicit language for content” in the classroom, **because** Content-ELD “*does not provide sufficient language instruction to ensure a solid foundation because it does not follow a scope & sequence of language skills and may leave gaps in language knowledge.*”

# Will “the pendulum” really “swing” away from a discrete skill / grammar focus?

- A strong bias toward ELD instruction & curriculum that’s discrete-skill based, sequential, & grammar-focused.
  - Tradition, beliefs, & habits die hard.
  - Investment in E.L.D. curriculum already made, & direction already decided, (see next slide).
- The **old** paradigm vs. the **new** paradigm.
  - Can we find a compromise, a hybrid?
  - Not a matter of “ability”, or capacity, but of willingness.

# The way forward for ELD Programs is:

- “integrated content & language goals within the classroom.”
- Scope & sequence, discrete-skills should *not* drive instruction, because it is *not* viable w/ new approach / paradigm.
- **assessment** of discrete, scope & sequence grammar skills *not* viable inside the classroom w/ new approach / paradigm.
- “students moving *from* language as structures and/or **functions**, to Language Practices.”

**Why does it *have to be* “either - or”**

between implementing Content-ELD or ELD-pullout

for discrete-skill, systematic-sequential ELD instruction?

**Can ELD Programs have both?**

- **NO, “Given the diverse range of program design and explicitness in the CCSS and NGSS regarding how language must be used to enact disciplinary knowledge and skills,...”**
- **If YES, then all systematic/ sequential grammar skills, forms & functions must be intentionally mapped onto a K-12 Content-ELD curriculum;**
- **If NO, then no longer use the linear-sequential curriculum model, where the same scope & sequence grammar functions & forms are taught yearly.**



**Why** does it *have to be* “**either - or**” between implementing Content-ELD or ELD-pullout for discrete-skill, systematic-sequential ELD instruction?

- How can we ensure that ELL students get exposure to rare forms of grammar ? (irregular verbs, modals, etc.)
- How can we prevent Content instruction from trumping English Language instruction?  
[research from Sanders & Foreman]
- How can we avoid current ELD Program designs from constraining and even limiting the new direction for English Language Development?

**Why** does it *have to be* “**either - or**”  
between implementing Content-ELD or **ELD-pullout**  
for discrete-skill, systematic-sequential ELD instruction?

E.L.D. Teachers /Facilitators must: **1.)** become backward - mapping curriculum planners, **2.)** become GLAD-coaches, **3.)** refuse to be *glorified-Instructional Assistant’s* that help ELLs complete, &/or translate, class assignments. **4.)** fulfill their *true* roles as language Facilitators, & **5.)** not be too busy teaching pull-out ELD classes to be able to facilitate, to coach, to observe, co-teach, & to help content classroom teachers teach English through **content**, (language practices across the curriculum).

What do we hang our E.L.D. lesson plans on?

G.L.A.D. aligned with the New Standards!

- G.L.A.D. is *not* a silver bullet, but it provides us with teacher-friendly, content/ academic domain-focused routines and strategies, that are proven & effective use of mixed-groups, to motivate both students and teachers to excel in the classroom.
- The New Standards are not perfect, far from it, but they focus educators on content-specific goals, & the language needed to ...

## A Major Stumbling Block?

from: *Language and the Common Core State Standards*,  
(by Liel & Walqui), from the O.D.E. ELS website

“The reason for the difficulty in implementing ... a cross-curricular approach may at least partly lie in the existence of strongly *classified* and *framed* subject matter boundaries, ... *Whether or not* the CCSS can weaken entrenched boundaries and achieve more linguistic and cognitive depth across a school, and across entire school systems, is an open question.”

# Time for Questions & Answers

- Time for Questions & Answers/ Discussion:
  - I do not know all the answers, but I can, together with you, begin to formulate, analyze, and ask the right questions, to work towards stepping into this new opportunity!