**Summary of Public Comments and Responses Report**

**World Languages Curriculum Framework**

At the December 15, 2020 Board Meeting, the Board voted to release the draft of the 2021 World Languages Curriculum Framework for Public Comment. The public comment period for the Draft Revised World Languages Curriculum Framework concluded on February 22, 2021. Consistent with recent framework revisions, DESE collected comments using a survey. We received 41 partial responses and 65 complete responses. Three additional respondents submitted feedback by email.

Overall, the public comment was highly supportive of the draft Framework. For example, 100 percent of respondents agreed that the vision sets forth a clear and compelling description of the importance of world languages and high-quality programming. In all the public comment, the lowest level of agreement with the revisions was 75 percent in the case of two standards, where commentors did not agree that the standard aligned with the ACFL proficiency benchmarks and indicators.

The Department made three notable revisions to the draft as a result of public comment:

* In response to comments from the Board at the December 2020 Board meeting and the public requesting more supports for longer-sequence programs and higher proficiency outcomes, we linked the vision and programmatic outcomes to the proficiency requirements for the Massachusetts Seal of Biliteracy.
* In response to comments requesting more support for districts in selecting content, supporting best practices, and supporting all learners, we added a new section titled “What the Framework Does and Does Not Do” to distinguish more the Framework and the implementation support (this section mirrors a similar section in other Frameworks).
* In response to comments requesting clarification of the communication standard, we added a linguistic component “Comprehensibility” in the interpersonal communication, presentational communication, and intercultural communication standards.

The following table documents the detailed revisions DESE completed in response to public comment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **High-Interest Areas from Public Comment** | |
| **Comment Summary/Example** | **DESE Response** |
| Communication Standard (37 Comments) | |
| Public comments were overwhelmingly supportive of the integration of the ACTFL standards. Some commenters expressed concern that the discussion of linguistic proficiency was incomplete (in the case of comprehensibility), confusing (as was the case for intercultural communication), or exclusive to certain languages (such as classical languages and ASL).  **Comprehensibility**   * “I think text type and function are well represented, but the comprehensibility of the student does not seem to be.” * “Precision is one of the four criteria (with context, function and text type) and needs to be included here as well. We will only gear to proficiency oriented programming when districts understand the important role of errors and the growth of comprehensibility over the proficiency levels.”   **Intercultural Communication**   * “The principle states that intercultural communication is measurable and many times it is not perfectly measured.” * “I am not sure the intercultural mode lends itself to measurable terms”   **Classical &ASL**   * “I have concerns about the implementation for classical languages. I teach Latin and I have not taught Latin viva voce. I do some, but do not teach as much as seems will be required.” * “American Sign Language (ASL) students are not "listening" to ASL they are "empathetic visual receivers" of ASL.” | * Revision of Communication Content Standards to include comprehensibility * Revision of text introducing the Content Standards (p.20) to explain comprehensibility and related terminology * Revision of Guiding Principle 5 to no longer include explicit mention of measurable intercultural communication. * Addition of text introducing the Content Standards (p.22) to address that Classical language teachers may use the target language less than modern language counterparts, but they should be encouraged to use the target language to the maximum extent possible. * Document reviewed and edited to ensure ASL and ASL-corresponding language included everywhere “speaking/listening/pronunciation” are used. |
| Social, Emotional, and Critical Consciousness (25 Comments) | |
| Of the 25 comments regarding social, emotional, and critical consciousness, the majority (19) were positive. Commenters paid special attention to centering the students, ensuring that speakers of English dialects other than Standard American English felt included and valued, and included LGBTQ+ individuals.   * “Love the vision and guiding principles how they are inclusive and student centered.” * In Practice 10, the phrase "other languages and members of other cultures" is used. When I read this, I interpret "other" to refer to languages and cultures besides standard-American-English. However, I recognize that Massachusetts students are part of "other" cultures. How can the terminology be more inclusive so that students aren't "othered"? * “In the description text of guiding principle 2, the experience of LGBTQ students is missing.” | * Revised “context” section (teal text in introductory sentence of all Communication Content Standards) to be more truly student-centered. E.g. “Common daily settings,” became “settings that students would find familiar and highly predictable.” * Practice 10 and GP2 revised to eliminate others and value linguistic assets and dialects of all languages, including various dialects of English. * GP2 revised to include “identities and expression.” |
| Support in Making District-level decisions (16 Comments) | |
| 51 comments indicated a need for more support and materials in implementing these standards. Although the shift to ACTFL-based standards were welcome, commenters expressed concern that some current teaching practices would not support the framework. Seven questioned a lack of specific ACTFL Core Practices, such as 90% use of the target language, backward design of lesson plans, and use of authentic resources. One commenter named the Core practices as necessary to the framework. 11 comments requested more specificity in topic/content for proficiency levels. 5 commenters requested that the framework provide more support for their districts to include heritage learners and students with disabilities in world language programming.   * “it needs to be explicitly stated that WL education be conducted almost exclusively in the target language by all in the class, teachers, students and between students, and that the use of authentic resources are necessary for communication that takes place.” * “I agree that ACTFL's directive of 90% is very hard to measure, but at least it gives teachers a concrete indication of a time limit (no more than 4 minutes in a 45-minute class, for example) that is easy to grasp. The manner in which this guiding principle is written may be misinterpreted by teachers as "allowing" more use of English than ACTFL. Finally, it may be useful to provide some examples of when use of English is acceptable” * “The Core Practices need to be mentioned and elaborated on.” * “You can't simply ‘borrow’ somebody's lesson plan or unit. Teachers need to have an understanding of teaching for proficiency to be able to apply it regularly” * “While I agree that the WL Content Standards be organized by proficiency level, it needs to be clear that the content and instruction for a Novice level student must vary according to the age, maturity and prior experience with language learning.” * I would like to know more about addressing the needs of heritage language speakers as well as students with disabilities. I have found that students with disabilities have been "exempt" from world languages classes. This has been true when the students are already heritage language speakers of that language. | * Added section of framework titled “What the Framework Does and Does Not Do” to help stakeholders understand scope of framework and to provide support for decisions that districts must make. This section includes:   + Addition of a section titled “Supporting High-Leverage Teaching Practices” provides a clearer context for the content standards.   + Addition of a section titled “District Decisions about Topical Content” addresses concerns regarding what content to teach while still ensuring that teachers and districts have ample flexibility to determine the topics most appropriate for their students.   + Addition of a new section titled “Supporting all students that expresses urgency for all heritage language students and students with disabilities to be fully included and references Departmental material support (in the form of Quick Reference Guides) to support districts to fully include all students. |
| Organization (15 Comments) | |
| The organization of the standards was positively received with 11/15 comments praising the layout and color-coding of the standards. 3 commenters used the terms *dense, complicated,* and *overwhelming* to describe expressing overall positive sentiment about the standards. One commenter enjoyed the organization but thought that a section discussing the significance of the framework itself would be useful.   * “A bit overwhelming, but looking forward to more explanation on how to implement the proficiency model” * “Although at first the standards are a little complicated to take in, with a little training of how they operate one sees there is a lot packed into each of the different standards. It works well to have the color printing to help one t see the different elements.” * “I do not understand the importance of the new framework. For example, the MA Arts framework includes: The standards define what all students should know and be able to do...The Curriculum Framework provides a structure intended to guide the selection, development, and evaluation of arts curriculum and programming that builds students' artistic literacy.” | * Addition of the section “What the Framework Does and Does Not Do” to more closely align to Arts Framework as well as to explain the significance of this framework. * Alignment of color-coding within the standards as well as color-coded addition of the Comprehensibility component * Graphical formats in Appendix 1 for easier comprehensibility. |
| Outcomes (2 Comments) /Seal of Biliteracy (3 Comments) | |
| 5 comments addressed outcomes and requirements for districts. Two commenters expressed a desire that world language be a required course. Three others requested that course and/or programmatic outcomes be listed. One commenter went further and suggested that the Department explicitly recommend AAPPL and/or STAMP tests at varying points in the program.   * is there a possibility that a second language education begin in pre-k a common core standard for all state schools? * This portion of the document needs to give some information about the time that it takes to progress over the proficiency levels and the need to set proficiency targets over the levels of programming, then assess to see how well they are being met. | * Added statement in Vision and “What the Framework Does and Does Not Do,” explicitly tying suggested outcomes to the Seal of Biliteracy and explaining how long that outcome is likely to take. * Document revised to add that Seal of Biliteracy is an essential component of the world-ready student. * Future resources will provide guidance for amount of programming to reach Seal of Biliteracy-level proficiency and guidance for individual course outcomes. |

The charts below summarize the types of public comment received.

Respondents were permitted to comment on all or part of the draft framework. The breakdown of comments by sections of the draft framework is below.

The majority of respondents (88.5%) were not part of the development of the proposed revisions to the Framework, which indicates a new audience for feedback. Feedback was solicited using newsletters, emails, tweets, the Commissioner’s weekly update, two virtual meetings with world language stakeholders, a virtual meeting with general curriculum leaders, and a meeting with world language teachers in training. Most respondents (76%) were teachers, and most respondents (77.9%) indicated that they work in high schools. Regional participation in public comment comports approximately with the amount of regional involvement of DESE world language events and participation in the Massachusetts Foreign Language Association (MAFLA), with majority of respondents (80.8%) coming from Eastern Massachusetts.

The following data summarizes the results of the public comment survey

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Prompts** | **% Agree** |
| **Vision** |  |
| Overall, the Vision section of the draft framework provides a clear and compelling description of world languages as central to a well-rounded education. | 100 |
| Overall, the Vision identifies the most important benefits of a high-quality world languages education program. | 100 |
| **Guiding Principles** |  |
| Guiding Principle One states that "Effective World Language education invites, includes, supports, and benefits all students." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| Guiding Principle Two states that "Effective World Language education advances social justice by affirming the dignity of all students, languages, and cultures." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 92 |
| Guiding Principle Three states that "Effective World Language education enables students to become linguistically and culturally proficient in languages other than English." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| Guiding Principle Four states that "Effective World Language education is communicative in nature and supports meaningful, authentic, and affirming interactions in the target language." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 92 |
| Guiding Principle Five states that "Effective World Language education is measurable in terms of proficiency across interpretive, interpersonal, presentational, and intercultural modes." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 92 |
| Guiding Principle Six states that "Effective World Language education fosters risk-taking and mistake-making toward growth in linguistic and cultural proficiency." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| Guiding Principle Seven states that "Effective World Language programs deliver meaningful, relevant, and cross-disciplinary content to motivate students to acquire the language and build proficiency." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| Guiding Principle Eight states that "Effective World Language programs differentiate content and instruction, so that they are accessible, rigorous, and appropriate for all students." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| Guiding Principle Nine states that "Effective World Language programs connect students to their peers in the classroom, their community, and speakers/signers of the target language throughout the world." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| Guiding Principle Ten states that "Effective World Language education promotes social and emotional growth." To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| Overall, the Guiding Principles identify the most important characteristics of a high-quality world languages education program. To what degree do you agree or disagree with this guiding principle? | 100 |
| **Practices** |  |
| Practices 1-8 fully include all five of the ACTFL Goal Areas (the 5 C's). To what degree do you agree or disagree with this statement? | 100 |
| Practices 9-10 promote equity, strong communication skills, and positive relationships among students. To what degree do you agree or disagree with this statement? | 91 |
| **Content Standards (General)** |  |
| The World Languages Content Standards are organized by proficiency level rather than grade level. To what degree do you agree or disagree with this change? | 90 |
| Components of language, such as context, function, text type, and supports are color coded within the framework. To what degree do you agree or disagree with this change? | 95 |
| The World Languages Content Standards section adequately recognizes that students studying various languages and in various program types will acquire proficiency at different rates. To what degree do you agree or disagree with this statement? | 90 |
| **Content Standard 1 (Interpretive Communication)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 86 |
| The standard is equitable. | 92 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 92 |
| **Content Standard 2 (Interpersonal Communication)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 92 |
| The standard is equitable. | 92 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 91 |
| **Content Standard 3 (Presentational Communication)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 92 |
| The standard is equitable. | 92 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 92 |
| **Content Standard 4 (Intercultural Communication)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 92 |
| The standard is equitable. | 83 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 92 |
| **Content Standard 5 (Cultures)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 83 |
| The standard is equitable. | 83 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 83 |
| **Content Standard 6 (Comparisons)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 83 |
| The standard is equitable. | 83 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 75 |
| **Content Standard 7 (Connections)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 83 |
| The standard is equitable. | 84 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 83 |
| **Content Standard 8 (Communities)** |  |
| The standard is clear. | 83 |
| The standard is equitable. | 75 |
| The standard is aligned with ACTFL-NCSSFL Proficiency Benchmarks and Performance Indicators for all proficiency levels. | 75 |

The following table documents areas addressed as DESE refined the draft Framework in response to public comment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **High-Interest Areas from Public Comment** | |
| **Comment Summary/Example** | **DESE Response** |
| Communication Standard (37 Comments) | |
| Public comments were overwhelmingly supportive of the integration of the ACTFL standards. Some commenters expressed concern that the discussion of linguistic proficiency was incomplete (in the case of comprehensibility), confusing (as was the case for intercultural communication), or exclusive to certain languages (such as classical languages and ASL).  **Comprehensibility**   * “I think text type and function are well represented, but the comprehensibility of the student does not seem to be.” * “Precision is one of the four criteria (with context, function and text type) and needs to be included here as well. We will only gear to proficiency oriented programming when districts understand the important role of errors and the growth of comprehensibility over the proficiency levels.”   **Intercultural Communication**   * “The principle states that intercultural communication is measurable and many times it is not perfectly measured.” * “I am not sure the intercultural mode lends itself to measurable terms”   **Classical &ASL**   * “I have concerns about the implementation for classical languages. I teach Latin and I have not taught Latin viva voce. I do some, but do not teach as much as seems will be required.” * “American Sign Language (ASL) students are not "listening" to ASL they are "empathetic visual receivers" of ASL.” | * Revision of Communication Content Standards to include comprehensibility * Revision of text introducing the Content Standards (p.20) to explain comprehensibility and related terminology * Revision of Guiding Principle 5 to no longer include explicit mention of measurable intercultural communication. * Addition of text introducing the Content Standards (p.22) to address that Classical language teachers may use the target language less than modern language counterparts, but they should be encouraged to use the target language to the maximum extent possible. * Document reviewed and edited to ensure ASL and ASL-corresponding language included everywhere “speaking/listening/pronunciation” are used. |
| Social, Emotional, and Critical Consciousness (25 Comments) | |
| Of the 25 comments regarding social, emotional, and critical consciousness, the majority (19) were positive. Commenters paid special attention to centering the students, ensuring that speakers of English dialects other than Standard American English felt included and valued, and included LGBTQ+ individuals.   * “Love the vision and guiding principles how they are inclusive and student centered.” * In Practice 10, the phrase "other languages and members of other cultures" is used. When I read this, I interpret "other" to refer to languages and cultures besides standard-American-English. However, I recognize that Massachusetts students are part of "other" cultures. How can the terminology be more inclusive so that students aren't "othered"? * “In the description text of guiding principle 2, the experience of LGBTQ students is missing.” | * Revised “context” section (teal text in introductory sentence of all Communication Content Standards) to be more truly student-centered. E.g. “Common daily settings,” became “settings that students would find familiar and highly predictable.” * Practice 10 and GP2 revised to eliminate others and value linguistic assets and dialects of all languages, including various dialects of English. * GP2 revised to include “identities and expression.” |
| Support in Making District-level decisions (16 Comments) | |
| 51 comments indicated a need for more support and materials in implementing these standards. Although the shift to ACTFL-based standards were welcome, commenters expressed concern that some current teaching practices would not support the framework. Seven questioned a lack of specific ACTFL Core Practices, such as 90% use of the target language, backward design of lesson plans, and use of authentic resources. One commenter named the Core practices as necessary to the framework. 11 comments requested more specificity in topic/content for proficiency levels. 5 commenters requested that the framework provide more support for their districts to include heritage learners and students with disabilities in world language programming.   * “it needs to be explicitly stated that WL education be conducted almost exclusively in the target language by all in the class, teachers, students and between students, and that the use of authentic resources are necessary for communication that takes place.” * “I agree that ACTFL's directive of 90% is very hard to measure, but at least it gives teachers a concrete indication of a time limit (no more than 4 minutes in a 45-minute class, for example) that is easy to grasp. The manner in which this guiding principle is written may be misinterpreted by teachers as "allowing" more use of English than ACTFL. Finally, it may be useful to provide some examples of when use of English is acceptable” * “The Core Practices need to be mentioned and elaborated on.” * “You can't simply ‘borrow’ somebody's lesson plan or unit. Teachers need to have an understanding of teaching for proficiency to be able to apply it regularly” * “While I agree that the WL Content Standards be organized by proficiency level, it needs to be clear that the content and instruction for a Novice level student must vary according to the age, maturity and prior experience with language learning.” * I would like to know more about addressing the needs of heritage language speakers as well as students with disabilities. I have found that students with disabilities have been "exempt" from world languages classes. This has been true when the students are already heritage language speakers of that language. | * Added section of framework titled “What the Framework Does and Does Not Do” to help stakeholders understand scope of framework and to provide support for decisions that districts must make. This section includes:   + Addition of a section titled “Supporting High-Leverage Teaching Practices” provides a clearer context for the content standards.   + Addition of a section titled “District Decisions about Topical Content” addresses concerns regarding what content to teach while still ensuring that teachers and districts have ample flexibility to determine the topics most appropriate for their students.   + Addition of a new section titled “Supporting all students that expresses urgency for all heritage language students and students with disabilities to be fully included and references Departmental material support (in the form of Quick Reference Guides) to support districts to fully include all students. |
| Organization (15 Comments) | |
| The organization of the standards was positively received with 11/15 comments praising the layout and color-coding of the standards. 3 commenters used the terms *dense, complicated,* and *overwhelming* to describe expressing overall positive sentiment about the standards. One commenter enjoyed the organization but thought that a section discussing the significance of the framework itself would be useful.   * “A bit overwhelming, but looking forward to more explanation on how to implement the proficiency model” * “Although at first the standards are a little complicated to take in, with a little training of how they operate one sees there is a lot packed into each of the different standards. It works well to have the color printing to help one t see the different elements.” * “I do not understand the importance of the new framework. For example, the MA Arts framework includes: The standards define what all students should know and be able to do...The Curriculum Framework provides a structure intended to guide the selection, development, and evaluation of arts curriculum and programming that builds students' artistic literacy.” | * Addition of the section “What the Framework Does and Does Not Do” to more closely align to Arts Framework as well as to explain the significance of this framework. * Alignment of color-coding within the standards as well as color-coded addition of the Comprehensibility component * Graphical formats in Appendix 1 for easier comprehensibility. |
| Outcomes (2 Comments) /Seal of Biliteracy (3 Comments) | |
| 5 comments addressed outcomes and requirements for districts. Two commenters expressed a desire that world language be a required course. Three others requested that course and/or programmatic outcomes be listed. One commenter went further and suggested that the Department explicitly recommend AAPPL and/or STAMP tests at varying points in the program.   * is there a possibility that a second language education begin in pre-k a common core standard for all state schools? * This portion of the document needs to give some information about the time that it takes to progress over the proficiency levels and the need to set proficiency targets over the levels of programming, then assess to see how well they are being met. | * Added statement in Vision and “What the Framework Does and Does Not Do,” explicitly tying suggested outcomes to the Seal of Biliteracy and explaining how long that outcome is likely to take. * Document revised to add that Seal of Biliteracy is an essential component of the world-ready student. * Future resources will provide guidance for amount of programming to reach Seal of Biliteracy-level proficiency and guidance for individual course outcomes. |