The Next Generation ESL (NGESL) Curriculum Project developed an approach, process, and tools for developing ESL units and lessons based on the NGESL Theory of Action and curriculum characteristics. It also led to the development of NGESL Model Curriculum Units (MCUs). This document presents the project’s assessment framework as guidance for educators developing ESL units and lessons following the NGESL approach. To learn more about the NGESL Curriculum Project, check out Section 1 of the NGESL Resource Guide.

## **Overview**

Just like a photo album typically contains a variety of pictures—some close-ups, some wide-angle shots, some focused portraits, and some including many people—so should our Stage 2 album include a variety of assessments matched to our goals (McTighe & Wiggins, 2012, p. 86).

The NGESL MCUs incorporate assessment within each step of the curriculum design process, from the collaborative pre-planning stages all the way to the end-of-unit summative performance assessment. Guided by the [Understanding by Design](https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/siteASCD/publications/UbD_WhitePaper0312.pdf) (UbD) approach, [Universal Design for Learning](http://www.cast.org/our-work/about-udl.html#.V1cNkyEtUyo) (UDL) guidelines, and the NGESL Project’s Theory of Action, the NGESL curriculum development process moves practice toward a more integrated, aligned assessment continuum. In ESL units and lessons developed following this approach, both students and teachers actively engage in continuous assessment and analysis of learning. Like a photo album, assessment in the NESL MCUs aims to capture and document language growth in different ways throughout a unit, and over longer periods of instructional time. The figure below shows an overview of this assessment as a progression across a continuum of planning, instruction and assessment, analysis, and adjustment:

Overview of steps in the continuous assessment and analysis of learning in NGESL



## **The Continuum of Assessment in NGESL Curriculum**

The NGESL assessment process begins at the pre-planning stage for a new unit, with teachers sharing and analyzing various types of student performance data, evidence from student work, and student prior knowledge. This structured time for collaborative assessment and planning recognizes that language development is a process that takes place over time. Continuous assessment occurs from unit to unit and from year to year as language develops—which means that teachers are constantly assessing students. Therefore, assessments at the beginning of an ESL unit (unless it is the first unit of the school year or intended for a new group of students) are not truly the beginning of the process: rather, they are the next goal-setting cycle where growth and development targets are established.

The following subsections describe assessment in the NGESL curriculum development process:

### **Pre-Planning Stage: Collaborative Assessment**

Pre-planning a new unit depends on existing performance artifacts and evidence of language growth, as well as student data and curriculum goals.

**Purpose:** To be effective, assessment at the pre-planning stage must be collaborative. It must recognize and engage the range of teachers who are collectively responsible for students’ overall English language development throughout a day and across a student’s program. Depending on the program, this group may include:

* ESL teachers, whose instruction focuses on promoting language development—as presented in the Massachusetts definition of ESL instruction.
* Teachers of content, whose instruction focuses on providing access to the Massachusetts Curriculum [Frameworks](http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html).
* Teachers in dual language and/or Transitional Bilingual (TBE) programs, who instruct for bilingualism and biliteracy.
* Teachers of partner language and literacy development in two-way programs that integrate language and literacy with content practices and standards through curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

This collaborative assessment and sharing may be done regularly through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), common planning time, periodic curriculum development sessions, language assessment team meetings, and/or teacher initiative as necessary. Establishing regular, formalized opportunities for collaboration between teachers may lead to more effective long-term assessment planning and a more powerful approach for developing a balanced assessment system (Gottlieb, 2012). Given that both content and language teachers integrate content and language standards to drive and differentiate instruction for English learners (ELs), collaboration *must* be supported in curriculum planning—and specifically in the continuous assessment of ELs, if the latter is to be coherent, connected, complete, and conclusive for instructional decision-making.

The English Learner Collaboration Tool developed by the NGESL Project team was also designed to help with this type of collaborative assessment. It provides a structure for reviewing assessment data and sharing current student performance to plan next instructional steps and curriculum goals within the UbD process. The Collaboration Tool and related process for creating Focus Language Goals (FLGs), or unit-level goals, recognize the multiple stakeholders involved in different aspects of EL assessment and the role they play in planning curricula. As a result of this structured and intentional collaboration, the ESL teacher can determine goals and contexts for new ESL units of instruction, including assessment approaches and performance outcomes.

**Process:** At this pre-planning stage, content and language teachers can collaboratively assess ELs by bringing student work data and examples of student language growth observed, documented, or assessed in their respective classrooms.

The Collaboration Tool prompts teachers to share their data, evidence of EL student performance, and contexts for language development and use in their classrooms in a structured way. By analyzing evidence that is gathered across program instructional components, teachers can use this language growth data to inform backward planning from FLGs and the unpacking and prioritizing of academic language skills and knowledge in a unit. The ESL teacher can also learn about upcoming content topics and contexts that can be useful for planning sustained and systematic language-focused instruction within rich meaningful content contexts.

### **Beginning of Unit Assessment: Pre-Assessment Language Sample**

Once unit-level FLGs are determined in Stage 1 of the unit development process, teachers dissect them for specific knowledge and linguistic components within the [WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework, 2020 Edition’s](https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/resource/WIDA-ELD-Standards-Framework-2020.pdf) (WIDA 2020) dimensions of language. At this point in the process, ESL teachers may elect to develop a mechanism to pre-assess students’ academic language skill and knowledge as related to the new unit’s specific context. Analyzing student language samples can help teachers plan the instructional sequence, materials, instructional configurations, and supports in a more targeted and differentiated way. Pre-assessment is particularly useful if the unit being developed is the first one of the year or if it is the first unit developed for a new group of students. In both these cases a teacher is still reviewing data and determining the range of student academic language needs.

**Purpose:** Effective pre-assessments will be designed to elicit and capture a student’s language sample as it relates to the unit goals. This type of sample can be used to analyze a student’s current language proficiency and establish baseline data for documenting growth from the beginning to the end of a particular unit—though it can be difficult to measure language growth within the short duration of one unit.

Overall, various data points are gathered and used to inform how the teacher designs and adapts instruction to best serve students’ learning trajectories. These pre-assessment samples are generally designed for the teacher, an informal gauge to inform instruction in the unit; they give teachers a diagnostic snapshot of selected aspects of the students’ ability to process and produce academic language. Teachers and experts cite the following purposes of pre-assessment (Guskey & McTighe, 2016):

* Identify students’ prior knowledge and skill.
* Identify students’ interests, talents, and learning styles and preferences.
* Focus student attention on goals, outcomes, and expectations of the new unit.
* Provide a metacognitive foundation for self-monitoring and self-regulation by helping students to connect prior and new learning.
* Prompt ELs to connect conceptual and linguistic repertoires with new content.
* Reveal existing misconceptions.

**Process:** Before designing a pre-assessment task, the teacher can review the Collaboration Tool’s Thinking Spaces 1 and 2, skills and knowledge established in Stage 1, unit outcomes, and the evaluative criteria determined in Stage 2. Reviewing these unit plan components enables the teacher to strategically select academic language from the unit to prioritize and pre-assess.

To ensure that pre-assessment is useful to both teachers and students, pre-assessment tasks must (Guskey & McTighe, 2016):

* Emphasize what things students will learn versus what they currently do not know or cannot do.
* Be used judiciously and efficiently, so as not to waste valuable instructional time.
* Be designed with a clear purpose to measure what students can already to around a unit’s language and content context.
* Provide relevant information that can be used by teachers to inform instruction and by students to self-monitor their progress toward stated goals.

**Sample pre-assessment and initial unit/lesson activities:** Pre-assessments can be very beneficial to both students and teachers if planned efficiently and with a clear purpose. They are not essential components of Next Generation ESL curriculum, and therefore not all ESL MCUs contain pre-assessments (Guskey & McTighe, 2016). However, all ESL units include rich initial unit and lesson activities that activate and build background knowledge. Effective individual or group initial activities support student readiness to engage with a new unit or lesson, allow students to connect and share what they already know about a topic/essential question, give students a chance to build on their strengths, and elicit language related to the unit’s FLGs or lesson’s language objective. Many of these activities can also be used for pre-assessment purposes. Thus, these activities give the teacher an opportunity to capture student language, analyze it, validate instructional plans, and inform instructional groupings.

Some examples (not exhaustive) of pre-assessments, initial activities, and strategies for capturing language samples in ESL units might include:

* Writing or discussing photo prompts
* Generating word walls or picture word walls
* Know–want to know–learn charts and related variations
* Sentence starters and frames
* Think-pair-share
* Turn-and-talk
* Sorting and matching activities
* Observation checklists
* Semantic/concept maps or graphic organizers
* Watching a video with a focus prompt and discussion (grades 6–8)
* Discussing objectives
* Anticipation guides

**Analysis and documentation:** To show language growth over time, it is important to capture and analyze students’ productive language, and to keep electronic samples (such as voice recordings or videos) to show what students [can do](https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/can-do/descriptors) with oral language. For example, teachers and students can create portfolios showcasing evidence of language performance to analyze and document growth throughout a unit and the school year, capturing many snapshots of performance growth and types of evidence. The consistent use of recording can help capture oral language in ways that can be referred to over time. Capturing video or audio language samples can also help students monitor their own learning compared to expectations.

Written language samples can involve the teacher annotating student text, noting language features on individual copies of the WIDA 2020 [Proficiency Level Descriptors](https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/standards/eld) for their grade level and/or on a class chart where the teacher keeps a running record of academic language use for each student. Teachers and students may keep evidence of language growth that includes specific skills and knowledge from the unit’s FLGs and Stage 1 components in portfolios or may create a different system for documentation and analysis that works for them. Whatever the format chosen for pre-assessment it should help teachers make decisions about instruction. To help ensure validity of assessments, teachers can collaboratively analyze and assess student work to calibrate success criteria and acceptable evidence of development toward FLGs.

### **Mid-Unit Assessment: Language Checkpoint(s)**

The language checkpoint is a mid-unit student language sample and benchmark assessment aligned to the unit’s FLGs, evaluative criteria, and CEPA. Language checkpoints gauge progress toward evaluative criteria assessed through the end-of-unit CEPA, so they can be considered a form of formative assessment. However, they differ from in-the-moment formative assessment and adjustments made during instruction because they represent a more formalized time when the teacher steps back to analyze language samples gathered through the checkpoint. Teachers may create additional language checkpoints throughout a unit as necessary.

**Purpose:** A language checkpoint offers a snapshot of how a student has made progress toward selected aspects of academic language related to the FLGs during the unit. Like other formative assessments, language checkpoints gather data to inform instructional adjustments. This type of assessment highlights the dynamic aspect of curricula: it is assessment *for learning*, whereas the CEPA is designed as assessment *of learning*.

**Process:** Academic language assessed in a language checkpoint should be directly related to the FLGs, the pre-assessment, and end-of-unit assessments like the CEPA. The language checkpoint gives both teachers and students information about language progress over multiple lessons, informing teachers what descriptive feedback students may need, in relation to evaluative criteria in the unit. Students can self-assess and peer-assess productive language as part of the language checkpoint (which encourages ownership of their learning trajectory). For teachers, data gathered through the language checkpoint can be used to guide next instructional moves.

|  |
| --- |
| **Sample Language Checkpoint from a Next Generation ESL MCU: *Exploring Topics: African American Civil Rights Movement (Gr 9–12, English Language Proficiency Levels 1-2)***  **Focus Language Goals**:  G.1 Explain the causes and effects of key events of the Civil Rights Movement.  G.2 Discuss by building upon ideas of others and articulating your own claims. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Language Checkpoint:** Lesson 4, Day 6  Linguistic supports are available throughout the room: word walls, word banks, labeled images, student-friendly definitions, bilingual dictionaries, etc.  **During the Lesson:** “Now that we have practiced identifying claims supported by evidence, let’s practice creating and discussing our own statements supported by evidence.”   1. Model an academic conversation with a student or another teacher. If modeling with another student, work with a prepared script to illustrate taking turns and building on each other’s ideas. Consider co-creating an academic conversation norms chart with students after debriefing the conversation. 2. Review discussion norms and the sentence frames that will be used: “\_\_\_\_\_\_ is inspiring because \_\_\_\_\_; \_\_\_\_\_\_ is important because \_\_\_\_; \_\_\_\_\_\_ is powerful because \_\_\_\_\_.” 3. “Let’s take some time to form our opinion statements supported by evidence.” Model a few examples of how to do so with a think-aloud and sentence frames: “I think this image is powerful because it shows school desegregation. The Brown v. Board of Education decision is important because it desegregated the schools.” Have students view images and/or statements about the Civil Rights Movement while modeling. 4. Ask pairs or small groups of students to use the sentence frames and word banks to create opinion statements supported by evidence about the Civil Rights Movement. Provide options for action such as using a computer and/or text-to-speech software. Have students work with a partner, discussing their opinions about the Civil Rights Movement. Some additional sentence starters that students could use are: “I think \_\_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_\_; I believe\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_; In my opinion\_\_\_\_\_; I agree because\_\_\_\_\_; I disagree because \_\_\_\_\_\_.” 5. As students are working, confer with them one by one. Observe and assess their use of language using meaningful conversation prompts. Look for evidence of specific language skills and knowledge such as student choice of when and how to use present- and past-tense verbs, descriptive adjectives, supporting opinions with evidence, content-specific vocabulary, and application of collaborative discussion norms. Use this formative assessment to inform and adjust instruction. |

**Analysis and documentation:** As withpre-assessments, teachers can measure students’ productive language in terms of the unit’s FLGs by recording (via notes, video, or audio recording) and keeping this evidence to show what students “can do” with language and to illustrate growth throughout a unit and the school year. Teachers can calibrate and analyze oral and written student work collaboratively to deepen competency at analyzing and teaching academic language features.

### **Continuous Unit Assessment and Feedback: Formative Assessment**

When ELs are supported to continuously engage in communicative acts in language-rich environments, they can actively co-construct knowledge and language. From this perspective, the NGESL curriculum development approach encourages contingent formative assessment, where teachers continuously make decisions about how to deliver instruction and interact with students by providing feedback gathered through formative assessment.

Formative assessment, then, is not a measurement act for grading, but should instead be integrated into the ongoing social process of teaching and learning (Heritage, Linquanti, & Walqui, 2015). This dynamic process of assessment, timely feedback, deployment of expert scaffolding, and adjustment of instruction enables teachers to plan with longer-term unit goals as a guide, but also to tailor and adjust the curriculum to their students’ in-the-moment learning process, while it is happening, through formative moves that help students make progress toward the end-of-unit expectations. This act of assessment acknowledges both the planned and contingent aspects of assessment highlighted in the NGESL Theory of Action.

This dual “planned yet flexible” approach to curriculum and assessment can help teachers address the variability among English learners. Regardless of what proficiency level is attached to a particular student’s performance, this approach emphasizes how a dynamic curriculum must be responsive to the learning process as teachers and students engage with written unit or lesson plans.

Moreover, formative assessment can create the teaching and learning space that also acknowledges how language development is not a simple linear process, but rather a more complex series of actions that requires sustained, explicit, and systematic processes of feedback, scaffolding, and constant adjustment through meaningful interaction (Heritage, Linquanti, & Walqui, 2013).

**Purpose:** Teachers can use the process of formative assessment to recognize and respond to student learning, to enhance that learning during instruction (Bell & Cowie, 2001). Formative assessment can be structured as planned learning or performance tasks embedded into instruction. Assessment then happens during instruction, with “in the moment” analysis of student understanding by the teacher, who reacts with feedback to students or with a next instructional move, support, or scaffold. This gives students a steady flow of information about their learning in relation to lesson objectives and unit goals.

**Process:** Formative assessment is best done in the true spirit of the root word for “assess,” *assidere*, meaning *to sit beside* a student to guide next steps for learning. This root word highlights an important aspect of assessment: it is something that should be done with and for students during instruction (Heritage, 2010; MacDonald et al., 2015). An effective formative assessment process provides contingent, timely feedback. Feedback can help guide students to close the gap between where they are and where they need to go in the instructional progression. In other words, it closes the gap between current performance and next step outcomes in a learning trajectory (Heritage, 2007).

|  |
| --- |
| **Effective Feedback: Considerations and Recommendations[[1]](#footnote-1)**   * Students must be able to *use* feedback gathered from formative assessment to improve their learning. * Feedback needs to be tailored to students’ varied points of development (Hattie & Yates, 2014). It should respond to a student in a particular moment, given his or her specific needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| * Effectiveness in guiding students with feedback begins with clarity and explicitness about unit goals, or what matters most for students to know and be able to do at the end of a unit. Feedback should align to those explicit goals and criteria for success. * Feedback should take into consideration the human aspect or interaction between a teacher and a student. Tomlinson recommends that written feedback be like a conversation assuming future response and further interaction and growth, not just a one-sided grade or mark (Tomlinson, 2016). * Feedback should be provided with care, building student agency and self-regulation over time, in addition to moving the student to the next step in the instructional sequence. * Students need to understand the purpose for feedback and how it is an ongoing process of learning. They often need coaching to see feedback this way. Therefore, feedback should be a frequent and continuous interaction between students and the teacher. |

**Sample formats for formative assessment:** There are many ways to assess formatively. Learning logs or student journals, for example, can provide students with ownership and show growth over time. Other examples used in the NESL MCUs include:

* Turn-and-talks
* Think-pair-shares
* Reciprocal teaching
* Sentence starters
* Oral discussions
* Drawings and/or illustrations
* Cloze exercises
* Vocabulary quilts
* Foldable graphic organizers
* Total physical response activities
* Gallery walks
* Exit tickets
* Storyboards
* One-on-one conferences with students

The variety of assessments provides multiple opportunities to measure language growth across different domains and to attend to differences and variability by providing multiple means of representation, action and expression, and engagement in learning and assessment tasks as suggested by [Universal Design for Learning](https://udlguidelines.cast.org/) (UDL) Guidelines.

**Analysis and documentation:** Formative assessments quickly provide information about, from, and for learning, and therefore immediately inform teachers and students of progress toward established goals. Teachers can document formative assessment data through checklists and observation notes. Students should be encouraged to self-assess and peer-assess through meaningful and aligned formative assessment activities that are embedded into instruction, such as those suggested above. Formative assessments should build toward more interim or summative measures (such as the Curriculum Embedded Performance Assessment (CEPA), so that they are not seen as “gotchas” but rather as intentional sequences of activities with contingent feedback that are shared explicitly between teacher and student. This type of assessment builds toward a language-rich, authentic experience that supports students and helps them demonstrate learning.

### **Ongoing Assessment Documentation and Evidence**

In a successful unit of study, well-designed assessment in Stage 2 can help teachers gauge and track students’ language development throughout a unit of instruction. These assessments should be used to drive student learning and responsive teaching and planning. They should lead to targeted feedback that is effective in moving the students toward learning goals. Over longer periods, documentation of growth can be used with standards-based grading systems to support educational decisions and curriculum planning.

A suggested approach to documenting growth in language development over time is to create portfolios, binders, electronic student work capsules, or language development “albums” that include formative, interim, and summative forms of assessment, with reflections on their purpose, highlighting how students have met evaluative criteria and standards. Documentation of language development over time ensures that students have multiple opportunities to reflect on and see their academic language growth as it is built and enriched within a unit of instruction and across a series of units over time.

For samples of formative assessments strategies for ELs, watch [Assessment for ELLs](http://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=video+formative+assessment+of+ELLs&&view=detail&mid=F45AD16CAF95F9C79E16F45AD16CAF95F9C79E16&rvsmid=EFD9CCA029A5036C05D8EFD9CCA029A5036C05D8&FORM=VDFSRV&fsscr=0) and [Participation Quiz: Real Time Feedback](https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/instant-student-feedback-ousd). To learn more about formative assessment best practices for ELs, check out the ESL Best Practices: Formative Assessment Quick Reference Guide (QRG).

### **End-of-Unit Assessment: Curriculum Embedded Performance Assessment (CEPA)**

Effective CEPAs are rich, culminating performance assessments in which students demonstrate the knowledge and skills established as part of a unit’s goals in meaningful and authentic ways through multiple modalities. Throughout a school year, unit-level CEPAs become interim assessments to showcase students’ academic language development over time.

**Purpose:** A CEPA is intended to provide a summative unit assessment of learning, based on evaluative criteria established in connection to Stage 1 desired outcomes and FLGs. It is an authentic performance task or set of tasks that gives students an opportunity to transfer learning and demonstrate competency with the FLGs within a meaningful real-world context and application.It takes place during or after relevant instruction and can take up to several days. CEPA products or performances are examined for evidence of student acquisition of the knowledge and skills derived from targeted FLGs. Expectations for performance, including evaluative criteria and a rubric, should be shared with students in advance.

**Process:** The CEPA is intentionally designed to give students the opportunity to demonstrate they have met unit goals and evaluative criteria through a performance or set of performances and tasks. A rubric with the evaluative criteria should be shared with students as they prepare and engage in the CEPA. The teacher then uses task rubrics to score the CEPA, measuring growth toward the FLGs, skills, and knowledge of the unit. Where possible, exemplars of student work should also be shared with students in advance to make expectations visible and support self-monitoring and self-assessment as students prepare their performance, task, or product.

As the CEPA is designed, teachers can differentiate tasks for varying ELP levels of students within a class by transforming WIDA Model Performance Indicators (WIDA, 2012a) into new performance indicators aligned to the unit’s desired outcomes. Performance indicators contain the language function articulating the key use for academic language, the context for use in the CEPA, and a support appropriate to student needs and proficiency level. When designing a CEPA, teachers should attend to potential barriers to student performance by considering multiple means of representation, action and expression, and engagement, as [UDL guidelines](https://udlguidelines.cast.org/) suggest. CEPA performance indicators can also help with this task. Overall, performance indicators highlight differentiation and built-in supports/scaffolds for full participation and can showcase the application of UDL principles to address learner variability.

To learn more about how to develop an effective CEPA, check out the CEPA Development Tool available in Section 5 of the NGESL Resource Guide, 2nd Ed.

Below are sample CEPA (Stage 2) and related Stage 1 components from *Access to Clean Water*, an ESL MCU for grades 6–8, English Language Proficiency Levels 1–2:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage 1** | | |
| **Focus Language Goals/Standards**:  G.1 Discuss by stating opinions/claims about a substantive topic.  G.2 Explain causes and effects to create evidence-based claims. | **KNOWLEDGE: Academic Language**  *Students will know…*  K.1 Signal words of cause and effect can clarify meaning (e.g., *because, since, as a result*).  K.2 Signal words of sequence of events can clarify meaning (e.g., *first, next, then, finally*).  K.3 A mix of facts/evidence and opinions/claims effectively support a message.  K.4 Powerful communication requires fluency, eye contact, and appropriate body language.  K.5 Visual information in addition to text can support a message effectively.  K.6 A combination of technology, visuals, text, and original ideas will make an effective PSA.  K.7 Academic conversations develop speaking and collaboration skills and familiarity with conversation norms and will lead to sound academic performance.  K.8 Simple present tense structure (interrogative, negative and positive), and auxiliary and modal verbs (e.g., *can, should, must*).  K.9 Content-specific vocabulary (e.g., *access, responsibility, human rights*). | **SKILLS: Academic Language**  *Students will be skilled at…*  S.1 Using and recognizing the signal words for cause and effect and sequence.  S.2 Discussing and writing opinions/claims and supporting ideas with facts/evidence in order to present a point of view.  S.3 Presenting claims and findings, emphasizing points with descriptions, facts/evidence, details, and examples; using appropriate eye contact, adequate volume, and clear pronunciation.  S.4 Including multimedia components and visual displays in presentations to clarify claims and findings and emphasize salient points.  S.5 Engaging in collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly. (Adapt for the student grade band in your classroom, e.g., 6–8.)  S.6 Following rules for collegial discussions and defining individual roles as needed.  S.7 Demonstrating command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking. |
| **Stage 2** | | |
| **EVALUATIVE CRITERIA** | **CURRICULUM EMBEDDED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (Performance Tasks)** | |
| * Accurate use of topic vocabulary in context (e.g., *access*, *responsibility*, *human right*). * Effective use of cause and effect language (e.g., *because*, *since*, *as a result*). * Appropriate construction and use of fact/evidence and opinion/claim statements. * Student use of language at the discourse, sentence, and word/phrase levels at the expected level of linguistic complexity. | *As a result of:*   * Reading abridged articles about access to clean water * Drawing conclusions about graphs, charts, and videos about access to clean water * Analyzing and using the language of facts/evidence and opinions/claims * Analyzing and using the language of cause and effect * Identifying and using sequence signal words * Studying simple present tense statements, and questions with auxiliary and modal verbs   *Students will be able to write a script and create a PSA video about the challenges to and benefits of access to clean water around the world. They will be able to:*   * Discuss opinions/claims and facts/evidence about clean water access. * Use cause and effect language to explain the effects of a lack of access to clean water. * Use cause and effect language to explain the benefits of access to clean water. * Make linguistic choices (considering discourse, sentence, and word/phrase dimensions) about how to best process and produce language regarding the issue of access to clean water.   *PSA:*  **G**oal—Raise awareness of the global clean water access problem.  **R**ole—Advocate for clean water access.  **A**udience—School community on World Water Day (March 22) with an optional fundraising component.  **S**ituation—You have been asked to present the challenges to and solutions for those in countries without access to clean water in a PSA.  **P**roduct performance and purpose—You are writing, appearing in, and designing a PSA to raise awareness in the school community about the world clean water crisis.  *Reflection:*  Yes/no question checklist | |
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