World Language Public Feedback Survey Responses

FORMAT QUESTIONS

Is the format of the proposed World Languages Standards clear and easy to navigate?

Yes – 20    No - 1

Does combining Interpretive Listening/Reading and Presentational Speaking/Writing into one standard statement effectively streamline the World Language Standards?

Yes - 18    No – 3

Comments on Combining:

- Speaking and writing are acquired at different rates. Learners shouldn't be expected to be at the same level for each.
- It does to me, but I could see how it could be confusing. Listening/Reading and Speaking/Writing are different and a student's proficiency level could vary. Combining them might imply that these ratings could also be combined. I hope that makes sense.
- Combining the standards makes the standard more succinct.
- This is so much easier to read and to convert to an understandable format for students.
- I don't think it works well to combine for presentational mode. Speaking and writing are really quite different in terms of how they are evaluated. When I look at ACTFL standards I find the separation to be helpful. The proficiency descriptors are very different among Novice levels in speaking vs. writing.
- I think it is more effective and the format is more accessible. The only thing I might add, not in way of criticism, but simply noting it, is that the "I" in the standards abbreviations denotes both Interpersonal and Interpretive. This will not be a huge issue since the "L" for listening and the "R" for reading are only associated with the Interpretive mode, and the "S" for speaking and "W" for writing are only associated with the Interpersonal mode. Nonetheless, it might create one extra reference check step if one does not recall which mode "I" refers to. But, this is minor in the scheme of things.
- This is a huge step forward.
- It makes the standards clearer.
- I like how it's formatted. It looks very streamlined and easy to follow.
- This makes the document much easier to read and understand even at a glance.
- Better alignment with 2017 Can-Do Benchmarks, and also much easier to scan through document and process it with the streamlined format.
Does combining Interpretive Listening/Reading and Presentational Speaking/Writing into one standard statement have any impact on applying the standards to the language you teach?

Yes - 9  No – 12

Comments on Impact

- Combining the expectations makes them more clear.
- If we are teaching to the standards, then we could theoretically skip half of it and still be teaching to the standard. It could theoretically lessen what we are required to teach.
- If, for in a particular unit, the goal of the teacher is to include each element within, it makes that process more manageable.
- I feel like we already do this.
- It's how I already am teaching.
- Because the three modes are still broken out below the standard statement I can still readily use this for planning instruction.
Does the addition of “Writing” to Interpersonal Speaking/Writing help to clarify the Interpersonal Mode?

Yes – 13  No -6

Clarify Interpersonal comments

- I think it actually makes it more confusing. Although interpersonal communication does happen through writing (text messages for example), a person can always take time to really review and edit this interpersonal writing. If that's the case, it's immediately presentational because it's not spontaneous.
- I wanted to click 'depends' for this one. It depends on what kids are writing about. If they're writing personal responses, or types of correspondence, then certainly this does help. But, if they are responding to some factual elements of a given topic that is not necessarily interpersonal, then it doesn't seem to apply. But, I'm fine with organizing it in this way.
- It is still the same type of communicative acts, the medium is what differs.
- Many don't understand what Interpersonal is. However, for those who know, then they don't need to have the writing. It could just be Interpersonal.
- Especially in today's world where much interpersonal communication takes place via cell phone text message or other text-based real-time communication device this is a good and timely addition.
- Especially considering the way that people use texting and other digital written communication! This is a much-needed change.
Are any problems created by adding “Writing” to the Interpersonal Mode?

Yes – 4 No – 17

Comments on adding Writing

- Again, if we add combine writing and speaking then we aren't giving scores for the separate tasks.
- How would this be assessed? See my comments in previous question.
- Does this mean writing must always be communicative?
- I'll simply copy and paste what I've written in the previous box: It depends on what kids are writing about. If they're writing personal responses, or types of correspondence, then certainly this does help. But, if they are responding to some factual elements of a given topic that is not necessarily interpersonal, then it doesn't seem to apply. But, I'm fine with organizing it in this way.
  Interpersonal writing includes the way most students use writing.
- Because of the use of the language "exchange" the interpersonal nature of the communication is retained.
CONTENT QUESTIONS

Is anything about the new World Language Standards unclear or confusing?

Yes - 6  No - 15

What revisions would you recommend?

- none
- Stop combining separate skills.
- The only thing that stands out to me is that I'm unsure what a "signed text" would be. I'm not an ASL teacher but that seems quite confusing.
- They mirror ACTFL standards. ACTFL standards are straight-forward, clear and highly familiar. Important pieces of ACTFL standards were left out (need for extralinguistic support for example) and organizationally, it is much more confusing.
- I think it is more effective and the format is more accessible. The only thing I might add, not in way of criticism, but simply noting it, is that the "I" in the standards abbreviations denotes both Interpersonal and Interpretive. This will not be a huge issue since the "L" for listening and the "R" for reading are only associated with the Interpretive mode, and the "S" for speaking and "W" for writing are only associated with the Interpersonal mode. Nonetheless, it might create one extra reference check step if one does not recall which mode "I" refers to. But, this is minor in the scheme of things.
- Ambiguous
- For NOVICE HIGH, I don't think "attempts at" creating original sentences is a clear as it could be. Maybe "some simple, original sentences." Then for INTERMEDIATE LOW, "consistently creating simple, original..."
Are the introductory Benchmark Standards at each level clear and accurate?

Yes - 19  No - 2

For clarity and accuracy, what would you change?

- There are so many ways one might tweak them. I'm fine with this style of organization.
- I'd keep it as it is.

Do the revised standards statements accurately reflect the Novice, Intermediate, and Advanced levels in each Mode?

Yes - 18  No – 3

What would you revise for accuracy?

- nothing
- 1. Novice level--need for extralinguistic support (per ACTFL) . 2. Novice level--Learners provide information about themselves in everyday context. It seems very limiting to put such a focus on self or first-person form. Why not approximate ACTFL's language to include everyday topics that include them?
- There are so many ways one might tweak them. I'm fine with this style of organization.
- The transition was very clear and accurate to what the Modes and the levels are.

Do the combined standards for Interpretive Listening/Reading accurately reflect standards for both Listening and Reading?

Yes - 19  No – 2

If no, what do you recommend we change?

- Do not combine them

Do the combined standards for Interpersonal Speaking/Writing accurately reflect standards for both Speaking and Writing?

Yes - 18  No – 3

If no, do you have any suggestions?

- Do not combine them. They are not acquired at the same rate.
Do the combined standards for Presentational Speaking/Writing accurately reflect standards for both Speaking and Writing?

Yes - 19      No – 2

If no, what needs to be added or changed?

- Don’t combine

Would you recommend separating the standards for Interpretive Listening/Reading?

Yes - 11      No – 10

Separate Interpretive comments

- While they are similar (comprehension of input) they are different and are assessed separately.
- Aligns better with ACTFL. Simpler to use/follow. Very different criteria for evaluation required of each. Combining makes it more complicated.
- Although I enjoy the streamlined aspect a lot, in the spirit of honesty I think every world language teacher knows that listening and reading are two different skill sets, so in terms of organizing units, and using differentiation with the same content, it might be more accurate to keep them separated for goal setting purposes, but in terms of streamlining the material and planning, as long as a teacher bears this in mind, it might not have any negative effect.
- I already have my rubrics designed to have listening and reading together because they address the same issues--how well one can understand words, main idea, and details of something presented.
- Although reading is often easier than listening for students, many of the same strategies apply to both and it makes sense to keep these together. I like to emphasize that a "text" can be a written document with or without pictures, an audio recording with or without visuals/text, or even a video with or without text. We can use the same interpretive skills for all of these "texts".
Would you recommend separating the standards for Interpersonal Speaking/Writing?

Yes – 8        No – 13

Why or why not?

- They both have to do with interactions.
- The standards are clear and the objectives are equally achievable.
- They are two separate skills that should be measured separately.
- While they are similar (demonstration of output) they are different and are assessed separately.
- Speaking and writing require much of the same skills. The student is still having to come up with the information from what they have learned.
- It is clearer for both teachers and learners to focus on the communication itself more than on the mode that is used to communicate.
- Aligns better with ACTFL. Simpler to use/follow. Very different criteria for evaluation required of each. Combining makes it more complicated.
- For the same concept that I've expressed regarding separating listening and reading...but, I think it is still manageable.
- Again, speaking and writing address the same thing--can the student produce words, attempted sentences, sentences, and paragraphs.
- If any addition is needed perhaps putting emphasis on the fact that interpersonal communication is more impromptu and involves negotiating meaning and responding in the moment, whereas presentational communication is typically rehearsed, edited, revised and only then presented to the intended audience.
Would you recommend separating the standards for Presentational Speaking/Writing?

Yes - 7  No – 14

Why or why not separate Presentational?

- They naturally combine.
- The standards are clear and the objectives are equally achievable.
- They are two separate skills that should be measured separately.
- While they are similar (demonstration of output) they are different and are assessed separately.
- One might separate them because they are two different skill sets, but if the instructor knows this and keeps this in mind it should not detract from the overall quality of his/her class.
- Presentational speaking and writing are intricately tied together. The National Standards do not separate them, so why should the state standards?
- Whether spoken or written, it is still presentational. The speaker/writer has the benefit of time and resources to polish and perfect the communication before presenting it to the intended audience.
- I do pull from the other 4 Cs of the national standards, but I appreciate the stream-lined nature of the OWLS. (Oregon World Language Standards)
Is there any information you would recommend adding to the standards document?

Yes - 4          No – 17

If yes, what would you recommend we add?

- Can a recommendation be made that teachers should communicate 90% of the time in the target language as is recommended by ACTFL? Also that a heavy focus on grammar instruction is NOT recommended by ACTFL? It's time to move world language teaching into the 21st century!
- Perhaps a linked doc to each mode with concrete examples of what is described in each mode, in the varying levels.
- If anything, maybe when students should be at the different levels. That would be all. I like the simplicity and conciseness of the document.
- I think that you should consider explicitly including interculturality standards.
Is there any non-essential information that could be removed from the standards document?

Yes - 0  
No - 21

If yes, what would you remove?

Please use this space to give us any general comments, or feedback not already addressed in this survey.

- I would be willing to talk further about anything I've submitted here. Please don't hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your time.
- The new standards look very succinct. It is less wordy, and thus, easier to understand.
- Overall this document looks like a solid alignment with national standards and is simplified enough to be useful to both teachers and learners. It looks like a good improvement.
- Please make standards mirror ACTFL for simplicity sake. These standards appear to be a more complicated version of what already exists.
- Overall, I like the format more, because I do believe it is more streamlined and more easily accessible. Thanks! I simply think that it would help a lot of language instructors not only to have written descriptions of what is contained in each mode, at each level, but perhaps some video or lesson plan examples to give further concreteness to the standards. I understand, this might influence or steer lesson/unit planning in a less creative or more uniform manner, but an example but be useful nonetheless, as sometimes creativity is wanting.
- Thank you for reaching out to COFLT teachers for feedback! Great work on these revisions!
- I really like how streamlined they are, and how well they align with ACTFL standards, guidelines, and benchmarks.