A committee of K-12 educators, administrators, ESD representatives, and post-secondary faculty convened to review and revise current CCSS for English Language Arts, in accordance with ORS 329.045 and OAR 581-022-2030. ODE is submitting these revised ELA standards to the Board for adoption.

BACKGROUND

The Oregon Department of Education has the responsibility for revising the state’s academic content standards (ORS 329.045, OAR 581-022-2030). ORS 329.045 states, “the State Board of Education shall regularly and periodically review and revise its Common Curriculum Goals, performance indicators and diploma requirements.” Included in these Common Curriculum Goals are the standards for English Language Arts. The State Board of Education adopted Oregon’s current English Language Arts Academic Content Standards in October of 2010. The English Language Arts Advisory Panel, Revision Panel, stakeholders, and an internal ODE team have reviewed and revised these standards as scheduled, and ODE asks the State Board of Education to adopt these revised English Language Arts Academic Content Standards. Additionally, ODE will ask the Board to adopt instructional materials that will support these standards in 2020.

Overall, 63% of the standards remain the same as previously written. The 37% of standards that experienced revision had changes fall into these categories: revision in technical language, removal of microaggressive language, deletion of redundancies, and addition of new standards to create cross-grade-level alignment. New to the standards in 2019 is the addition of foundational reading skills standards at grade levels beyond second grade, like standards K.RF.2a-c, which add more explicit skills to reading foundational skills in second grade. K.RF.2a now says, “Substitute medial vowels in 1-syllable words,” where that was not an existing standard prior to this revision work. These foundational skills are key in developing children’s reading ability, and in closing reading gaps that prevent development of strong reading skills in later grades.

The revised standards also address concerns around clarity and intent of the original standards, so changes were proposed in the technical language of the standards. For example, one change that was requested was to delete the use of non-specific language, and use the technical terms, instead, like in K.RF.2, which now says, “Demonstrate understanding of spoken words, syllables, and phonemes.” Previously, this standard read, “Demonstrate understanding of spoken words, syllables, and sounds (phonemes).”

Changes have also been made to eliminate white normative language that marginalizes historically under-represented students. In standard 9-10.RI.9, the standard originally read, “Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington’s Farewell Address, the Gettysburg
Address, Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech, King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”), including how they address related themes and concepts.” In an effort to create standards that are inclusive of all Oregon’s students, the proposed revision reads, “Analyze documents of historical and literary significance, including how they address related themes and concepts.” This revision eliminates white normative language, in order to allow the study of more diverse perspectives.

Finally, the revisions create coherence and alignment, both vertically and horizontally, among and between grade levels, to ensure a rigorous and robust English Language Arts experience for all Oregon students. An example of this is how the language of all of the RL.1, RI.1, RH.1, and RST.1 standards are aligned across grade levels to say a grade-appropriate version of, “Analyze what the text says explicitly as well as inferentially; cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support the analysis.” Of course, these standards ramp up in rigor, and support specific content-related elements, as appropriate.

As a result of public comment and feedback, a few additional changes have been made. There were additional changes made to the foundational reading skills standards, to address instructional gaps. There were some language changes that had been made in one grade level, but not the next; those changes have been carried across grade levels, for consistency. There was a change made at one grade level that impacted rigor of just that grade level. For consistency, and to maintain the integrity of the standards, that proposed change was eliminated.

**English Language Arts Review and Revision Process**

The review of the English Language Arts standards began in June, 2018, with a public comment survey. Data from the survey was collected and presented to the ELA Advisory panel. The Advisory, consisting of K-12 educators, ESD representatives, college and university faculty, and literacy and reading specialists, reviewed public comment and put forth revision recommendations to the ELA Revision panel. The Revision panel, also consisting of K-12 educators, ESD representatives, college and university faculty, and literacy and reading specialists, reviewed both public comment and the Advisory panel’s recommendations, and then wrote a first draft of revisions, which were put out for public comment in November, 2018. Public feedback regarding the initial proposed changes has been collected since that time, and this feedback helped inform subsequent revisions.

In February, 2019, the Revision panel reconvened to review the new round of public comment and to make final revision suggestions. Their revision suggestions were compiled and presented to the Advisory, who reviewed the lastest public comment, as well as the revised standards, and then put forth final recommendations. At the start of each panel meeting, panel members engaged in grounding activities to center our reasoning for undertaking this work—to put forth the relevant, equitable, accessible, rigorous standards, and to challenge our own inadvertent contributions to equity gaps, including the achievement, opportunity, and belief gaps.

An internal ODE team went through the revised standards, public feedback, and the revision rationales written by both panels. With an eye toward coherence and alignment, as well as looking from an equity lens at how the revisions reach all Oregon students, this internal ODE team collaborated on the revisions that are being presented at the June Board meeting, with a request for adoption.
Revision and Advisory panelists had an opportunity to

- Review public comment on current ELA standards, identifying common threads, areas of concern, and potential for growth
- Review current standards and create revised standards that address the identified areas of focus from the public comment review
- Review standards revision work from other states that have already been through a Common Core Standards review and revision process
  - These states guided our work:
    - New Jersey
    - North Carolina
    - Ohio
    - Tennessee
- Attend to equity issues that were created in the way the first iteration of Oregon’s CCSS ELA standards were written
- Draft revisions for K-12 ELA standards
- Share proposed revisions for public feedback
- Collect and review public feedback
- Ground themselves in the equity focus of the revision work
- Make final revision recommendations

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION

1. This is a first read, so there has been no previous board action.

HAS THE RULE CHANGED SINCE LAST BOARD MEETING?

☐ N/A; first read—hasn’t been before board
☒ No; same as last month
☐ Yes – As follows:

POLICY ISSUE OR CONCERNS

The draft English Language Arts Academic Content Standards are proposed so as to address concerns about content gaps with regards to foundational reading skills, equity of voice in anchor texts, as well as ensuring rigor and accessibility of standards for our students to be competent, successful, highly literate global citizens. The process for the revision is described below:

Process:
1. ELA Advisory panel was appointed (2016).
2. Current ELA CCSS were compiled and shared out via public comment survey (June, 2018)
3. Revision panel was selected and appointed (June, 2018).
4. Public Comments were collated and presented to ELA Advisory panel. Advisory panel made revision recommendations to Revision panel (July, 2018).
5. Revision panel reviewed public comment, Advisory panel comments and proposed revisions (July, 2018).
6. Revisions were documented and shared out with survey via the following (November, 2018):
   a. ESD superintendents and curriculum directors; asked them to share with school districts
   b. Email listservs from different teams and offices in ODE
   c. ODE Communications shares
   d. Links posted on the Standards and Assessment webpages
   e. Shared via face-to-face Professional Development engagements

Stakeholders have been engaged throughout the revision process:
   a. National Council on Improving Literacy—Brian Gearin
   b. Anita Archer, Explicit Instruction and National Literacy Specialist
   c. Tribal Partners via Indian Education Specialist
   d. Lucy Hart Paulson, National Literacy Specialist
   e. Higher Education Partners
      i. Concordia University, Portland
      ii. Pacific University, Forest Grove
      iii. Southern Oregon University, Ashland
   f. Three rounds of public review—surveys and comment documents
      i. Round 1: June, 2018
      ii. Round 2: November, 2018
      iii. Round 3: April, 2019
   g. Oregon Department of Education staff:
      i. Office of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
      ii. Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
      iii. Office of Student Services
      iv. Early Learning Division
      v. Tribal Partners and the Education Specialist on Indian Education
   h. ELA Standards Revision work group, first convened in July of 2018, consisting of:
      i. K-12 teachers
      ii. District and ESD administrators
      iii. Literacy and reading specialists
      iv. University professors and administrators

The following regions were represented by this group:
- Lane ESD—Lane County: Springfield, Eugene 4j
- Douglas ESD—Douglas County: Oakland; Jackson County: Roseburg
- High Desert ESD—Deschutes County and Jefferson County: Redmond
- Northwest Regional ESD—Washington County: Forest Grove, Yamhill Carlton, Hillsboro, Tigard-Tualatin, Beaverton
• Multnomah ESD—Multnomah County: Gresham-Barlow, Parkrose, Portland Public, Reynolds
• Southern Oregon ESD—Klamath County: Klamath County; Jackson County: Medford
• InterMountain ESD—Umatilla County: Echo
• North Central ESD—Crook County
• Clackamas ESD—Clackamas County: North Clackamas
• Willamette ESD—Marion County: Oregon School for the Deaf, Salem-Keizer

i. ELA Advisory Panel that met throughout the revision and review process, since 2016:
   i. K-12 teachers
   ii. District and ESD administrators
   iii. Literacy and reading specialists
   iv. University professors and administrators

The following regions were represented by this group:
• Southern Oregon ESD—Josephine County: Three Rivers, Jackson County: Southern Oregon University, Medford 549C
• Willamette ESD—Marion County: Salem-Keizer, Yamhill County: Newberg
• Northwest Regional ESD—Washington County: Hillsboro, Beaverton; Clatsop County: Seaside
• Multnomah ESD—Multnomah County: Portland Public, Concordia University-Portland, Gresham-Barlow, Reynolds, MESD, Centennial
• InterMountain ESD—Morrow County: Morrow County; Umatilla County, Hermiston
• Malheur ESD—Maulheur County: Vale
• High Desert ESD—Deschutes County: Bend-La Pine
• Linn Benton Lincoln ESD—Linn/Benton County: Greater Albany
• Clackamas ESD—Clackamas County: CESD
• Lane ESD—Lane County: Eugene 4j

In all, 21 of 36 counties and 12/19 ESDs in Oregon were represented in this review and revision work.

Negative/Positive Effects:
   a. The proposed standards provide for more inclusive English Language Arts instruction and study, allowing all students to “see themselves” in the content.
   b. The proposed standards provide stronger expectations in foundational reading skills, clarify the language of the standards, and eliminate references to texts that marginalize students.

Barriers to more equitable outcomes:
   a. Potential political barriers stem from opposition to the Common Core State Standards and the corresponding state assessment of those standards.
   b. Potential financial barriers come from funding concerns for adoption of instructional materials with which to address the Common Core State Standards for ELA.
   c. Programmatic considerations are similar to above. If there is not adequate funding for instructional materials, or if there is not time for teachers to develop
d. Instructional materials, then programmatic barriers will be difficult to contend with.

EQUITY IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following questions are designed to examine how the proposed rule, policy or action systematically affect historically underserved students and/or communities.

1. Will historically underserved populations be impacted by this docket items?
   a. Historically underserved populations will be positively impacted by these proposed ELA CCSS revisions, as the revision writers attended to language and exemplars that previously marginalized students, through the use of white normative language.
   b. There is greater coherence and alignment between and among grade levels, creating more explicit opportunity for teachers to meet students where they are and grow them beyond that point.

2. Examine the potential impact of the rule changes, policy, or action on historically underserved populations in Oregon. Describe this ongoing and/or foreseeable impact, using as much detail as possible.
   a. Students who have typically been underserved will see themselves represented in the revised standards, as examples and exemplars have been changed to provide a more diverse range of texts from which to choose for instructional purposes.
   b. Instruction for teachers have been embedded in the standards, reminding teachers that the standards are iterative, and if a student is not meeting a particular standard, then the standard should be taught again.
   c. The iterative nature of the standards builds, one skill, and one grade level, upon the next, so students are revisiting the same skill in more sophisticated and complex ways as they move across the grade levels in their educational careers.

3. Explain how the rule change, policy, or action works toward the elimination of either (one or both):
   a. The Achievement Gap: Foundational Reading Skills standards have been revised to include a larger grade band range, to help ensure appropriate development of these skills, which will set up students for long-term reading success.
   b. The Opportunity Gap: References to anchor texts that marginalize students or serve as microaggressions against students have been changed or eliminated. A broader range of voices have been included as anchor text examples.
   c. The Belief Gap: Concerns about the standards not being developmentally appropriate for students have been addressed, initially, with panel members, through grounding work during review and revision sessions. Additionally, when the standards are rolled out for implementation, part of that effort will include professional learning about challenging the belief gap and the way we interact with our students, based on the funds of knowledge we bring into the classroom with us.
FISCAL ANALYSIS

What is the fiscal impact of the proposed rule changes to the Department of Education, school districts, education service districts or schools? Use the following suggestions as a guide:

1. **How does the proposed rule fit within the budget of the agency?** There will need to be a rollout of newly-adopted standards, which will require state-wide travel for the ELA education specialist. Professional development for standards implementation will also require state-wide travel and training meetings.
   a. OTLA, Standards and Instructional Supports Team and Assessment Team will need to develop and present professional development for teachers around implementation of new standards.

2. **How does the proposed rule change impact school districts and ESDs?**
   a. School districts will have to do an instructional materials review adoption.
   b. School districts and ESDs will also have to support professional development for teachers around standards implementation.

3. **How does the proposed rule change impact schools and other educational institutions?**
   a. Schools will have to implement newly-adopted instructional materials.
   b. School administrations will have to support professional development for teachers around standards implementation, instructional materials implementation, and curriculum development.

EFFECT OF A “YES” OR “NO” VOTE

A “YES” vote will adopt these revised standards, which will take the place of the original CCSS ELA standards. Obtaining this “YES” vote now will allow for school districts to plan for and implement the newly-revised standards at the start of the 2019-20 school year.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

☑ Approve ☐ Approve next month ☐ No recommendation at this time
Promoted by: ☐ State law changes ☐ Federal law changes ☐ other

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Public Comments
Attachment 2: Proposed Standards Revisions