



**Indigenous and World Language Standards
Review Committee Notes
November 4, 2021**

Participants: Kristine Middleton, Erika Feole, Davonne Eldredge

Meeting started at 3:30 PM via TEAMS

Agenda:

1. Review public comments
2. Discuss potential edits based on standards review
3. Prepare feedback for the writing committee based on reviews of standards and public comment

The standards and public comment were reviewed by the attendees. Comments and feedback are listed below:

Introduction

No public comments on the introduction. The reviewers noted on page 7 in the “How to Read the Standards” section that it would make sense to switch the last two sentences of the third paragraph. These sentences currently read:

North Dakota offers learners the opportunity to receive a foil seal on their high school diploma. The Seal of Biliteracy is color coded based on their level of language proficiency and begins in the intermediate range.

The reviewers indicated it makes sense to mention the Seal of Biliteracy before describing it as a foil seal. They propose the following wording:

North Dakota offers the Seal of Biliteracy to learners based on their level of language proficiency which begins in the intermediate range. Students demonstrating proficiency will receive a foil seal on their high school diploma. The seal is color coded based on the level of language proficiency achieved.

Communications (Page 10)

Public comment in this section stated:

“I appreciate the breakdown of the three modes of communication: interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational similar to the ACTFL definition of the modes of communication. My feedback on the communication goal definition are:

- **Presentational – it is my interpretation that this can be polished or UNpolished.**
- **Interpretive – in the definition for the interpretive mode of communication “viewed” was also mentioned. I might recommend adding “images” as an example or elaborate a little more on “media” literacy.”**

The reviewers discussed the comments and arrived at the following conclusions.

Presentational Comment:

- *The reviewers were unsure if it was necessary to make changes because they felt that “rehearsed” covers the unpolished aspect since a presentation that is rehearsed is unpolished.*
- **Recommendation: Leave the definition as it is currently stated.**

Interpretive Comment:

- *The reviewers agreed with the suggestion to add something about images to clarify “viewed” in this definition.*
- **Recommendation:**
***Interpretive Communication** is understanding what is heard, read, or viewed in the target language such as reading a newspaper, watching a TV program, listening to the radio, **examining a picture or infographic on a website**, etc. The learner will extract meaning and use information for personal or community enrichment.*

Communications Performance Indicators

There were two suggestions in the public comment regarding Performance Indicator 1.1.NH (page 10)

- 1.1.NH – Might it be clearer if we changed “including questions” to “including asking questions”?
- Interpersonal 1.1.NH – Possible reword the and questions. Novice low students might use memorized questions but they’re still questions. Therefore, I would reword the Novice High to state, “including student formatted questions” or something like that to imply that students are forming their own questions. They might not be complex, but they are formed on their own.

The Performance Indicator currently reads:

Engage in spontaneous exchanges on very familiar topics using practiced or memorized phrases and simple sentences, including questions.

The reviewers discussed the comments and reviewed the performance indicators for interpersonal communication to check the vertical alignment. They made the following recommendation:

Engage in spontaneous exchanges on very familiar topics using practiced or memorized phrases, **and** simple sentences, **including and** questions.

The public comment offered feedback on Performance Indicator 1.3.NH (page 10)

- 1.3.NH – You may want to add in something about “simple transition words” in order to include an additional different mark between novice low/mid to high.

The performance indicator currently reads:

1.3.NH Present information on very familiar topics using practiced or memorized phrases and simple sentences from the target language.

The reviewers read the comment and reviewed the performance indicators to evaluate the vertical alignment. They indicated that adding “simple transition words” in the indicator would start to get into the area of instructional tasks which is not the intent of the standards. ***They recommended leaving the performance indicator as it is currently stated.***

Cultures (page 12)

Public comment feedback received on the goal stated:

- In my opinion, I would maybe like a brief explanation or definition of intercultural communications with a little more of a breakdown on the terms “investigate” and “interact.”

The reviewers searched the goal for the reference to “intercultural communications” and did not find the reference. This goal talks about developing an awareness of cultures and their tangible and intangible contributions (products), patterns of social interactions (practices), and the perspectives or attitudes and views of the world behind those products and practices. The term “interact” appeared in the definition and goal and was later clarified in the definition. The term “investigate” appeared in the standards to describe one of the actions the learner takes to learn about cultures. ***The reviewers recommended leaving the definition as it is currently stated. The terms are defined in the definition and later in the standards.***

One observation the reviewers made was that the lowercase letters used in the code to identify the different performance indicators was initially confusing. They discussed the use of numbers, however concluded this would also lead to confusion. Upon further discussion of the formatting, ***the reviewers concluded it was best to leave the formatting as is.*** After looking further at the standards, the initial confusion was resolved.

Connections (page 14)

After reading the goal, the reviewers asked, “What about family situations?” They referenced the fact that we do have native language speakers or Indigenous language speakers who may use the language at home. They did not see that situation reflected in the current goal. The situation is referenced in the standards and in the performance indicators.

The goal currently reads:

Connect with other disciplines and acquire information and diverse perspectives to apply the language in academic- and career-related situations.

The definition reads:

The study of languages provides multiple opportunities to connect with other disciplines either formally or informally, thereby expanding the educational experiences of all

learners. It benefits their growth in other disciplines and encourages the transfer, enrichment and strengthening of information. The learners' access to information and diverse perspectives through the use of another language and culture increases their abilities in both academic- and career-related settings.

The reviewers made the following recommendations to address the connections within the family or social situations:

Goal:

Connect with other disciplines and acquire information and diverse perspectives to apply the language in academic, **and** career-related, **and** social situations.

Definition:

The study of languages provides multiple opportunities to connect with other disciplines either formally or informally, thereby expanding the educational experiences of all learners. It benefits their growth in other disciplines and encourages the transfer, enrichment and strengthening of information. The learners' access to information and diverse perspectives through the use of another language and culture increases their abilities in **both** academic, **and** career-related, **and** social settings.

Comparisons (page 15)

The public comment addressed Performance Indicators 4.2.N.b, 4.2.I.b, and 4.2.A.b at the bottom of the page.

- 4.2 – States “...cross-cultural similarities and differences in the practices, products, and perspectives of the cultures studies.” It seemed a little odd to see the “product, practice, and perspectives” listed out of order.

The reviewers discussed the comment and stated that in the standard for the cultures goal, practices are in standard 2.1 and products are in standard 2.2. **They recommended that the order of the words be changed so it aligns with the order in the cultures goal.**

Current Performance Indicator	Recommended Performance Indicator
4.2.N.b Recognize and begin to compare and contrast cross-cultural similarities and differences in the products, practices, and perspectives of the cultures studied	4.2.N.b Recognize and begin to compare and contrast cross-cultural similarities and differences in the practices, products, and perspectives of the cultures studied
4.2.I.b Recognize, compare, and contrast cross-cultural similarities and differences in the products, practices, and perspectives of the cultures studied.	4.2.I.b Recognize, compare, and contrast cross-cultural similarities and differences in the practices, products, and perspectives of the cultures studied
4.2.A.b Analyze cross-cultural similarities and differences in the products, practices, and perspectives of the cultures studied.	4.2.A.b Analyze cross-cultural similarities and differences in the practices, products, and perspectives of the cultures studied



Communities (page 16)

The reviewers questioned the need for the terms “at home and around the world” at the end of the goal statement. They examined the ACTFL standard and the definition, standards, and performance indicators. They indicated the definition, standards, and performance indicators explained that expectation and indicated the terms appeared redundant.

Current Goal:

Interact with and celebrate multilingual communities with cultural competence at home and around the world.

The reviewers recommended the goal read:

**Interact with and celebrate multilingual communities with cultural competence
~~at home and around the world.~~**

The public comments had some positive feedback for the writing committee which is expressed below:

- (Communications) The goal and explanations of interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational communication are very clear.
- (Format) I LOVE the colors line up with the same colors in the ACTFL World-Readiness Standards! I already have my scales and rubrics color-coded to match so I truly appreciate this detail.
- (Other Comments to Share) Thank you to the committee members that have volunteered their time and effort to redoing the standards.

The reviewers were thanked for their time and told their input was greatly appreciated.

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 PM.