

Instructional Materials Review and Approval

Languages Other Than English (LOTE) K–12 Quality Rubric

Clean Version

Implementation Quality

1. Implementation Supports

1.1 Course-Level Supports

Materials support educators in effective implementation through intentional course-level supports.

Number	Guidance
1.1a	Materials include course-level resources (e.g., scope and sequence, standards correlations, pacing guide, year-at-a-glance) to support educators in understanding the organization of the course, including what is taught and when it is taught. Course-level resources: • outline the sequence of units in the course; • explain the rationale for the unit sequence; • briefly summarize the scope of each unit in the course (e.g., topics, learning outcomes); • identify which TEKS are addressed in the scope of each unit in the course; • provide a TEKS correlation chart; • identify the assumed number of instructional minutes for lessons in the course; • provide the suggested number of instructional days for each unit in the course; • provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional calendars with fewer instructional days; and • provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional calendars with more instructional days.

1.2 Unit-Level Supports

Materials support educators in effective implementation through intentional unit-level supports.

Number	Guidance
1.2a	Materials include unit-level resources (e.g., unit overviews, unit plans) for each unit to support educators in understanding what students will learn and how students will be assessed in the unit. Unit-level resources: • provide a narrative explanation of the organizing concept, topic, or theme of the unit; • identify the unit objectives as can-do statements; • identify the unit TEKS; • explain how the unit connects to prior or future learning; • identify the summative assessments in the unit; • identify the unit vocabulary; and • outline the sequence of lessons in the unit.
1.2b	Materials include a unit internalization protocol with a step-by-step process for understanding a unit prior to teaching.
1.2c	Materials include resources for families (e.g., family guides, family letters) for each unit in both English and Spanish with suggestions on supporting the progress of their students.

1.3 Lesson-Level Supports

Materials support educators in effective implementation through intentional lesson-level supports.

Number	Guidance
1.3a	Materials include lesson-level resources (e.g., lesson overviews, lesson plans) for each lesson to support educators in understanding what students will learn and how students will be assessed in the lesson. Lesson-level resources: • identify the lesson objectives as can-do statements; • identify the lesson TEKS; • identify the formative assessments in the lesson; • identify the lesson vocabulary; • identify the lesson segments; • provide suggested timing for each lesson segment; • provide suggested groupings for each lesson segment (e.g., whole group, small group, partner, independent); • provide educator facilitation guidance for each lesson segment (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds); and • identify required educator and student materials for the lesson.
1.3b	Materials include a lesson internalization protocol with a step-by-step process for understanding a lesson prior to teaching.

1.4 Educator Usability

Materials support educators in efficient implementation through onboarding resources and user-friendly design.

Number	Guidance
1.4a	Materials include onboarding resources (e.g., navigation guide, getting started guide) to support educators in orienting themselves to the course. Onboarding resources: • identify all types of components in the course; • provide a brief description of each type of component in the course; • explain how the instructional design of the materials aligns with research-based instructional strategies for second language acquisition (e.g., proficiency-oriented design, integrated and contextualized instruction, high use of the target language, authentic texts); • explain the structure of units in the course; and • explain the structure of lessons in the course.
1.4b	Materials are designed for educators to efficiently locate and use implementation supports. Materials: • use consistent layouts across units in the course; • use consistent layouts across lessons in the course; and • embed educator facilitation guidance within the lesson.

2. Assessment Supports

2.1 Administering and Scoring Assessments

Materials support educators in consistently administering and accurately scoring assessments.

Number	Guidance
2.1a	Materials provide educator guidance (e.g., instructions, timing, necessary materials) for consistently administering each summative assessment.
2.1b	Materials support educators in accurately scoring each summative assessment by providing: • answer keys for selected-response item types; • proficiency-aligned rubrics for constructed-response item types or performance tasks; and • scored examples that span a range of performance levels for constructed-response item types or performance tasks.

2.2 Analyzing and Responding to Assessment Data

Materials support educators and students in analyzing and responding to assessment data.

Number	Guidance
2.2a	Materials support educators in analyzing and responding to student performance towards the target proficiency level for each summative assessment by providing resources (e.g., error analysis, student work analysis protocol) for: • analyzing individual student performance to inform targeted supports; • identifying trends in performance across students to inform adjustments to whole-group or sub-group instruction; and • using the instructional materials to respond to student performance.
2.2b	Materials support educators in analyzing and responding to student progress towards the target proficiency level across summative assessments by providing resources (e.g., data dashboard, longitudinal proficiency tracker) for: • analyzing individual student progress to inform targeted supports; • identifying trends in progress across students to inform adjustments to whole-group or sub-group instruction; and • using the instructional materials to respond to student progress.
2.2c	Materials support students in analyzing data and setting goals by providing resources (e.g., can-do statement tracker, portfolio) for: • identifying their own performance relative to the target proficiency level for each summative assessment; • identifying their own progress towards the target proficiency level across summative assessments; and • setting actionable proficiency goals.

3. Supports for All Learners

3.1 Differentiated Instruction and Practice

Materials support educators in reaching all learners through differentiated instruction and practice.

Number	Guidance
3.1a	Materials include educator guidance for providing differentiated instruction to support all learners throughout each unit, including: • supports for students performing below target proficiency levels that provide access but keep the communicative goal constant; • extensions that increase the rigor of tasks for students performing above target proficiency levels; and • supports or extensions for heritage speakers that build on existing proficiency to develop academic register.¹
3.1b	Materials include educator guidance for providing specially designed instruction (SDI) for students receiving supports and services through special education.
3.1c	Materials include additional practice for each unit that educators can use if students need practice beyond instruction in lessons.

¹ Supports or extensions for heritage speakers are not applicable for classical languages.

Learning Quality

4. Proficiency-Oriented Instruction

4.1 Proficiency-Oriented Design²

Materials are designed to support student growth on the proficiency continuum (e.g., novice low to novice mid, novice mid to novice high).

Number	Guidance
4.1a	Materials use a systematic sequence of instruction and practice that progressively increases the complexity of: • functions in each mode of communication; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
4.1b	Materials include assessments that progressively increase the complexity of: • functions in each mode of communication; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
4.1c	Materials use a spiraled sequence to reinforce retention and deepen proficiency by revisiting: • functions in each mode of communication; and • language forms.

² Classical languages will only be evaluated for the interpretive mode in 4.1a, 4.1b, and 4.1c.

4.2 Integrated and Contextualized Instruction

Materials are designed to develop communicative ability through integrated and contextualized instruction.

Number	Guidance
4.2a	Materials are organized into thematic units on topics of real-world or classical-world relevance ³ that include integrated: • texts; • communicative tasks in each mode;⁴ • vocabulary; and • language forms.
4.2b	Communicative tasks are consistently situated in functional and cultural contexts to promote use of the target language in real-world or classroom contexts. ⁵
4.2c	Vocabulary is taught in service of communicative functions (i.e., learning vocabulary in context versus only in isolation).
4.2d	Language forms are taught in service of communicative functions (i.e., learning language forms in context versus only in isolation).
4.2e ⁶	Materials connect input and output in an integrated and iterative sequence by consistently including: • interpretive tasks that inform output in communicative tasks (versus stand-alone exercises); • interpersonal tasks that use input from previous interpretive tasks; and • presentational tasks that use input from previous interpretive tasks.
4.2f ⁷	Summative assessments include an integrated performance assessment in each unit that requires students to demonstrate performance: • in each mode of communication; • in an integrated task; and • in a real-world context.

³ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for real-world relevance; classical languages will be evaluated for classical-world relevance.

⁴ Classical languages will only be evaluated for the interpretive mode.

⁵ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for real-world contexts; classical languages will be evaluated for classroom contexts.

⁶ 4.2e is not applicable for classical languages.

⁷ 4.2f is not applicable for classical languages.

4.3 High Target Language Use

Materials are designed to develop communicative ability through consistent exposure to comprehensible input and production of meaningful output in the target language.

Number	Guidance
4.3a	Materials maximize target language use by requiring students to use the target language almost exclusively when: • processing input; and • producing output.⁸
4.3b	Materials provide comprehensible input (i.e., target language input within the zone of proximal development appropriate for the target proficiency level).
4.3c ⁹	Materials include educator guidance for making the educator's use of the target language during instruction comprehensible.
4.3d	Materials include educator guidance for providing scaffolds that gradually decrease as student proficiency increases, including scaffolds to support students in: • processing input in the interpretive mode;¹⁰ • producing output in the interpersonal mode;¹¹ and • producing output in the presentational mode.¹²

⁸ Producing output in the target language almost exclusively is not applicable to classical languages.

⁹ 4.3c is not applicable for classical languages.

¹⁰ Modern languages will be evaluated for both interpretive listening and interpretive reading scaffolds; classical languages will be evaluated for interpretive reading scaffolds; ASL will be evaluated for interpretive receptive scaffolds.

¹¹ Scaffolds in the interpersonal mode are not applicable for classical languages.

¹² Modern languages will be evaluated for both presentational speaking and presentational writing scaffolds; ASL will be evaluated for presentational expressive scaffolds. Scaffolds in the presentational mode are not applicable for classical languages.

4.4 Authentic Texts

Materials include authentic texts in the target language to expose students to real-world or classical-world language use.¹³

Number	Guidance
4.4a	Materials consistently include authentic texts from a variety of communities that use or used the target language.
4.4b	Authentic texts build knowledge of the communities that use or used the target language, including: • cultural products; • cultural practices; and • cultural perspectives.

¹³ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for real-world language use; classical languages will be evaluated for classical-world language use.

5. Input Processing in the Target Language¹⁴

5.1 Explicit Instruction in the Interpretive Mode

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in the interpretive mode through effective explicit instruction.

Number	Guidance
5.1a	Materials set a real-world or classroom purpose ¹⁵ for input processing.
5.1b	Materials activate or supply background knowledge to prepare students for input processing.
5.1c	Materials provide explicit instruction in interpretive communication skills, including how to: • develop literal comprehension; • develop inferential comprehension; • develop analytical comprehension;¹⁶ • interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives; • understand vocabulary in context; and • understand language forms in context.
5.1d	Explicit instruction in interpretive communication skills is aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
5.1e	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in the interpretive mode, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpretive communication skills; • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpretive communication strategies; • providing brief noticing of relevant vocabulary; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.

¹⁴ In Section 5, modern languages will be evaluated for both interpretive listening and interpretive reading skills; classical languages will be evaluated for interpretive reading skills; ASL will be evaluated for interpretive receptive skills.

¹⁵ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for setting a real-world purpose; classical languages will be evaluated for setting a classroom purpose.

¹⁶ Analytical comprehension is applicable only for Level IV–VII courses for modern languages and classical languages.

5.2 Student Practice in the Interpretive Mode

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in the interpretive mode through effective student practice.

Number	Guidance
5.2a	Materials include interpretive tasks in each unit that require students to: • demonstrate literal comprehension; • demonstrate inferential comprehension; • demonstrate analytical comprehension;¹⁷ • interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives; • understand vocabulary in context; and • understand language forms in context.
5.2b	Interpretive tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
5.2c	Interpretive tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.
5.2d	Interpretive tasks in each unit use a variety of authentic texts.
5.2e	Materials include student practice in the interpretive mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: • guided practice; and • independent practice.
5.2f	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in the interpretive mode, including: • practice in each lesson cycle; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.
5.2g	Materials include educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency in the interpretive mode.

¹⁷ Analytical comprehension is applicable only for Level IV–VII courses for modern languages and classical languages.

5.3 Performance-Based Assessment in the Interpretive Mode

Materials are designed to evaluate student performance in the interpretive mode through aligned assessments.

Number	Guidance
5.3a	Materials include summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit that require students to: • demonstrate literal comprehension; • demonstrate inferential comprehension; • demonstrate analytical comprehension;¹⁸ • interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives; • understand vocabulary in context; and • understand language forms in context.
5.3b	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
5.3c	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit are aligned to instruction.
5.3d	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit use authentic texts.
5.3e	Materials include multiple formative assessments in each unit to provide feedback on student performance in the interpretive mode prior to summative assessments.

¹⁸ Analytical comprehension is applicable only for Level IV–VII courses for modern languages and classical languages.

6. Communicating in the Interpersonal Mode

6.1 Explicit Instruction in the Interpersonal Mode (Modern Languages and ASL)

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in the interpersonal mode through effective explicit instruction.

Number	Guidance
6.1a	Materials set a real-world purpose for interpersonal communications.
6.1b	Materials provide explicit instruction in interpersonal communication skills, including how to: • understand what a conversation partner communicates; • engage in a range of communicative functions; • negotiate meaning; and • use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.
6.1c	Explicit instruction in interpersonal communication skills is aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
6.1d	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in the interpersonal mode, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpersonal communication skills; • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpersonal communication strategies; • providing support for relevant vocabulary; • providing support for relevant language forms; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.

6.2 Student Practice in the Interpersonal Mode (Modern Languages and ASL)

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in the interpersonal mode through effective student practice.

Number	Guidance
6.2a	Materials include interpersonal tasks in each unit that require students to: • understand what a conversation partner communicates; • engage in a range of communicative functions; • negotiate meaning; and • use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.
6.2b	Interpersonal tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
6.2c	Interpersonal tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.
6.2d	Materials include opportunities for students to practice communicating in the interpersonal mode through a variety of communicative tasks.
6.2e	Materials consistently include interpersonal tasks with an information gap (versus scripted dialogues).
6.2f	Materials include student practice in the interpersonal mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: • guided practice; and • independent practice.
6.2g	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in the interpersonal mode, including: • practice in each lesson cycle; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.
6.2h	Materials include educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency in the interpersonal mode.

6.3 Performance-Based Assessments in the Interpersonal Mode (Modern Languages and ASL)

Materials are designed to evaluate student performance in the interpersonal mode through aligned assessments.

Number	Guidance
6.3a	Materials include summative assessments of student performance in the interpersonal mode in each unit that require students to: • understand what a conversation partner communicates; • engage in a range of communicative functions; • negotiate meaning; and • use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.
6.3b	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpersonal mode in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
6.3c	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpersonal mode in each unit are aligned to instruction.
6.3d	Materials include multiple formative assessments in each unit to provide feedback on student performance in the interpersonal mode prior to summative assessments.

6.4 Communicating in the Interpersonal Mode (Classical Languages)

Materials include opportunities for students to communicate about classical texts, cultures, or contexts in the interpersonal mode.

Number	Guidance
6.4a	Materials include opportunities for students to produce written or spoken language to communicate about classical language texts, cultures, or contexts in the interpersonal mode.

7. Communicating in the Presentational Mode¹⁹

7.1 Explicit Instruction in the Presentational Mode (Modern Languages and ASL)

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in the presentational mode through effective explicit instruction.

Number	Guidance
7.1a	Materials set a real-world purpose for presentational communications.
7.1b	Materials provide explicit instruction in presentational communication skills, including how to: • develop ideas to address a prompt; • create messages considering audience and context; and • revise messages.
7.1c	Explicit instruction in presentational communication skills is aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
7.1d	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in the presentational mode, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling of presentational communication skills; • providing concise explanations and modeling of presentational communication strategies; • providing support for relevant vocabulary; • providing support for relevant language forms; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.

¹⁹ In Section 7, modern languages will be evaluated for both written presentational and spoken presentational skills; ASL will be evaluated for expressive presentational skills.

7.2 Student Practice in the Presentational Mode (Modern Languages and ASL)

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in the presentational mode through effective student practice.

Number	Guidance
7.2a	Materials consistently include presentational tasks that require students to: • develop ideas to address a prompt; • create messages considering audience and context; and • revise messages.
7.2b	Presentational tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
7.2c	Presentational tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.
7.2d	Materials include opportunities for students to practice communicating in the presentational mode through a variety of communicative tasks.
7.2e	Materials include student practice in the presentational mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: • guided practice; and • independent practice.
7.2f	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in the presentational mode, including: • practice in each unit; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.
7.2g	Materials include educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency in the presentational mode.

7.3 Performance-Based Assessments in the Presentational Mode (Modern Languages and ASL)

Materials are designed to evaluate student performance in the presentational mode through aligned assessments.

Number	Guidance
7.3a	Materials include summative assessments of student performance in the presentational mode in each unit that require students to: • develop ideas to address a prompt; • create messages considering audience and context; and • revise messages.
7.3b	Summative assessments of student performance in the presentational mode in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.
7.3c	Summative assessments of student performance in the presentational mode in each unit are aligned to instruction.
7.3d	Materials include multiple formative assessments in each unit to provide feedback on student performance in the presentational mode prior to summative assessments.

7.4 Communicating in the Presentational Mode (Classical Languages)

Materials include opportunities for students to communicate about classical texts, cultures, or contexts in the presentational mode.

Number	Guidance
7.4a	Materials include opportunities for students to produce written or spoken language to communicate about classical language texts, cultures, or contexts in the presentational mode.

8. Scripts in Non-Roman Writing Systems (Modern Languages with Non-Roman Writing Systems)

8.1 Scripts in Non-Roman Writing Systems

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in script elements (e.g., characters and radicals, letters, diacritics, position or connecting forms) through effective explicit instruction and student practice.

Number	Guidance
8.1a	Materials provide explicit instruction in script elements, including how to: • recognize script elements; • decode script elements; and • produce script elements.
8.1b	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in script elements, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.
8.1c	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in script elements, including: • practice in each unit; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.

9. Signs in American Sign Language (ASL)

9.1 Signs in American Sign Language

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in sign language structure, including the use of sign parameters (e.g., handshape, location, movement, palm orientation, non-manual markers), three-dimensional space (e.g., verb agreement, directionality, compare and contrast concepts, referencing, organizing information), and classifiers through effective explicit instruction and student practice.

Number	Guidance
9.1a	Materials provide explicit instruction in sign language structure, including the use of: • sign parameters; • three-dimensional space; and • classifiers.
9.1b	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in sign language structure (i.e., sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers), including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.
9.1c	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in sign language structure (i.e., sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers), including: • practice in each unit; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.

Redline Version

Implementation Quality

1. ~~Intentional~~ Implementation Supports

1.1 Course-Level Supports

Materials support educators in effective implementation through intentional course-level supports.

Proposed Revisions to 1.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include an explanation of how the instructional design of the materials aligns with research-based instructional strategies for second language acquisition (e.g., proficiency-oriented design, integrated and contextualized instruction, high use of the target language, authentic texts).	Materials include an explanation of how the instructional design of the materials aligns with research-based instructional strategies for second language acquisition (e.g., proficiency-oriented design, integrated and contextualized instruction, high use of the target language, authentic texts).		The indicator guidance statement was moved to new guidance statement 1.4a, as the explanation of how the materials aligns with research-based instructional strategies is a resource that supports educator onboarding to their materials.

Proposed Revisions to 1.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(1.1b) Materials include course-level resources (e.g., scope and sequence, standards correlations, pacing guide, year-at-a-glance) to support educators in understanding the organization of the course, including what is taught and when it is taught. Course-level resources: - outline the sequence of units in the course and explain the rationale for the unit sequence; - provide a high-level summary of the scope of each unit in the course (e.g., topics, learning outcomes); - identify where each TEKS is addressed within the course; and - provide the suggested number of instructional days for each unit in the course and guidance for adjusting pacing for varying instructional calendars (e.g., Additional Days School Year [ADSY] requirements).	Materials include course-level resources (e.g., scope and sequence, standards correlations, pacing guide, year-at-a-glance) to support educators in understanding the organization of the course, including what is taught and when it is taught. Course-level resources: - outline the sequence of units in the course and explain the rationale for the unit sequence; explain the rationale for the unit sequence; briefly summarize provide a high-level summary of the scope of each unit in the course (e.g., topics, learning outcomes); - identify which where each TEKS is are addressed in the scope of each unit in is within the course; and provide a TEKS correlation chart; identify the assumed number of instructional minutes for lessons in the course; - provide the suggested number of instructional days for each unit in the course; and guidance for adjusting pacing for varying instructional	Materials include course-level resources (e.g., scope and sequence, standards correlations, pacing guide, year-at-a-glance) to support educators in understanding the organization of the course, including what is taught and when it is taught. Course-level resources: - outline the sequence of units in the course; - explain the rationale for the unit sequence; - briefly summarize the scope of each unit in the course (e.g., topics, learning outcomes); - identify which TEKS are addressed in the scope of each unit in the course; - provide a TEKS correlation chart; - identify the assumed number of instructional minutes for lessons in the course; - provide the suggested number of instructional days for each unit in the course; - provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional calendars with fewer instructional days; and - provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional	The first bullet was split into two different bullets, as they are separate components that require a separate scoring point. In response to stakeholder feedback that “high-level summary” was unclear, the bullet was edited to clarify programs should “briefly summarize” the scope of each unit. To ensure educators are able to both contextualize TEKS alongside details about instructional content and quickly assess TEKS coverage overall and when TEKS are spiraled in instruction, revisions were made to expectations for TEKS identification. “Identify which TEKS are addressed in the scope of each unit in the course” was added to ensure educators have course-level resources to contextualize the TEKS within the content of each unit in the program. Bullet four was added requiring programs to “provide a TEKS correlation chart” to support educators in quickly understanding whether the program covers all TEKS and where TEKS are spiraled in instruction. A requirement that programs “identify the assumed number of

	calendars (e.g., Additional Days School Year [ADSY] requirements). • <u>provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional calendars with fewer instructional days; and</u> • <u>provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional calendars with more instructional days.</u>	calendars with more instructional days.	instructional minutes for lessons in the course” was added to help educators better understand the pacing needed to implement lessons in the materials. The parenthetical with the example of Additional School Days (ADSY) instructional calendars in the bullet about pacing was removed given the program is currently limited to grades PK–8 and the majority of LOTE courses are taught in grades 9–12. Guidance for adjusting pacing of instruction was moved to a separate bullet, as the guidance would require a separate scoring point. To offer more clarity, language about guidance for adjusting pacing was edited to clarify that publishers need to both “provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional calendars with fewer days” and “provide guidance for how to adjust pacing for instructional calendars with more instructional days.” This ensures educators have guidance for how to condense or extend instruction based on the number of instructional days available at their campus.
--	--	--	--

Proposed Revisions to 1.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials for educators and students are user-friendly. Print and digital materials: - include organizational features (e.g., table of contents, index, glossary, headings); - use consistent layouts; and - use visual design to support understanding and reduce extraneous load.	Materials for educators and students are user-friendly. Print and digital materials: include organizational features (e.g., table of contents, index, glossary, headings); use consistent layouts; and use visual design to support understanding and reduce extraneous load.		A new indicator, 1.4 Educator Usability, was created with expanded guidance statements to evaluate whether educator resources are user-friendly. All guidance statements evaluating whether materials are user-friendly were moved to 1.4.

1.2 Unit-Level Supports

Materials support educators in effective implementation through intentional unit-level supports.

Proposed Revisions to 1.2a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include unit-level resources (e.g., unit overviews) for each unit to support educators in understanding what students will learn and how students will be assessed. Unit-level resources: - provide a narrative of the purpose of the unit (e.g., topics, learning outcomes, essential ideas, connections to prior and future learning); - identify the unit objectives; - identify the unit TEKS; - identify the summative assessments; - identify the unit vocabulary; and - identify the duration of the unit and outline the sequence of instruction in the unit.	Materials include unit-level resources (e.g., unit overviews, <u>unit plans</u>) for each unit to support educators in understanding what students will learn and how students will be assessed <u>in the unit</u>. Unit-level resources: provide a narrative of the purpose of the unit (e.g., topics, learning outcomes, essential ideas, connections to prior and future learning); <u>provide a narrative explanation of the organizing concept, topic, or theme of the unit;</u> - identify the unit objectives <u>as can-do statements</u>; - identify the unit TEKS; <u>explain how the unit connects to prior or future learning;</u> - identify the summative assessments <u>in the unit</u>; - identify the unit vocabulary; and identify the duration of the unit and outline the sequence of <u>instruction lessons</u> in the unit.	Materials include unit-level resources (e.g., unit overviews, unit plans) for each unit to support educators in understanding what students will learn and how students will be assessed in the unit. Unit-level resources: - provide a narrative explanation of the organizing concept, topic, or theme of the unit; - identify the unit objectives as can-do statements; - identify the unit TEKS; - explain how the unit connects to prior or future learning; - identify the summative assessments in the unit; - identify the unit vocabulary; and - outline the sequence of lessons in the unit.	Added “unit plans” in the parenthetical to include a commonly used title for unit-level resources. In response to stakeholder feedback that the requirement for a narrative of the purpose of the unit was unclear, the revised version clarifies the narrative focuses on an “explanation of the organizing concept, topic, or theme of the unit.” Aligned with the focus on proficiency-based instruction, the requirement that unit objectives be written as can-do statements was added. This aligns with the revision in 1.3a that lesson objectives be written as can-do statements. A bullet requiring unit plans to “explain how the unit connects to prior learning or future learning in the course” was added to support educators in understanding how the unit fits into the overall sequence of learning in the course.

			The bullet requiring programs to “identify the duration of the unit” was removed because a bullet was added in 1.1a for the program to name the number of instructional minutes assumed in course design. With that information and the outline of lessons in the unit, educators have a clear understanding of the duration of the unit. “Sequence of instruction” was edited to “sequence of lessons” to make clear unit plans need to identify the specific lessons in the unit, not a more general explanation of unit instruction.
--	--	--	---

Proposed Revisions to 1.2b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include a unit internalization protocol with a step-by-step process for understanding a unit prior to teaching.	No changes	No changes	No changes

Proposed Revisions to 1.2c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include additional practice (e.g., homework, remediation, enrichment) for each unit.	Materials include additional practice (e.g., homework, remediation, enrichment) for each unit.		The indicator guidance statement was moved to 3.1c in Section 3 Supports for All Learners, as additional practice supports all students as a support.

Proposed New 1.2d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(1.2c) Materials include family resources (e.g., family guides, family letters) for each unit in both English and Spanish with suggestions on supporting the progress of their students.	Materials include family resources for families (e.g., family guides, family letters) for each unit in both English and Spanish with suggestions on supporting the progress of their students.	Materials include resources for families (e.g., family guides, family letters) for each unit in both English and Spanish with suggestions on supporting the progress of their students.	Revised the placement of “family” to after “resources” to provide increased clarity that the resources are for families.

1.3 Lesson-Level Supports

Materials support educators in effective implementation through intentional lesson-level supports.

Proposed Revisions to 1.3a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include lesson-level resources (e.g., lesson overviews, lesson plans) for each lesson to support educators in understanding what students will be learning and how students will be assessed in the lesson. Lesson-level resources: - identify the lesson objectives and can-do statements aligned to target proficiency levels; - identify the lesson TEKS; - identify the formative assessments; - identify the lesson vocabulary; - identify the lesson segments; - provide suggested timing for each lesson segment; - provide suggested groupings for each lesson segment (e.g., whole group, small group, partner, independent); - provide educator guidance for each lesson segment (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds); and	Materials include lesson-level resources (e.g., lesson overviews, lesson plans) for each lesson to support educators in understanding what students will be learning learn and how students will be assessed in the lesson. Lesson-level resources: - identify the lesson objectives as and can-do statements aligned to target proficiency levels; - identify the lesson TEKS; - identify the lesson formative assessments in the lesson; - identify the lesson vocabulary; - identify the lesson segments; - provide suggested timing for each lesson segment; - provide suggested groupings for each lesson segment (e.g., whole group, small group, partner, independent); - provide educator facilitation guidance for each lesson segment (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student	Materials include lesson-level resources (e.g., lesson overviews, lesson plans) for each lesson to support educators in understanding what students will learn and how students will be assessed in the lesson. Lesson-level resources: - identify the lesson objectives as can-do statements; - identify the lesson TEKS; - identify the formative assessments in the lesson; - identify the lesson vocabulary; - identify the lesson segments; - provide suggested timing for each lesson segment; - provide suggested groupings for each lesson segment (e.g., whole group, small group, partner, independent); - provide educator facilitation guidance for each lesson segment (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds); and	Based on stakeholder feedback that requiring lesson objectives and can-do statements is duplicative, the requirement in bullet one was edited to “identify the lesson objectives as can-do statements.” By requiring objectives to be in the form of can-do statements, unit plans align to proficiency-oriented instruction stating what students should be able to do with the target language by the end of the lesson. “Aligned to the target language” was removed in bullet one because reviewers are expected to score whether can-do statements are present, not whether they are aligned to the target proficiency level. In Sections 5–8, indicator guidance statements evaluate whether instruction, practice, and assessment are aligned to the target proficiency level. “Facilitation” was added to bullet eight to make clear guidance should support educators in effectively facilitating the lesson segment with students.

• identify required educator and student materials.	misconceptions, suggested scaffolds); and • identify required educator and student materials for the lesson.	• identify required educator and student materials for the lesson.	“For the lesson” was added to the last bullet to clarify the listed materials are relevant for facilitating the lesson.
---	--	--	--

Proposed Revisions to 1.3b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include a lesson internalization protocol with a step-by-step process for understanding a lesson prior to teaching.	No changes	No changes	No changes

1.4 Educator Usability

Materials support educators in efficient implementation through onboarding resources and user-friendly design.

Proposed New 1.4a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(1.1a) Materials include an explanation of how the instructional design of the materials aligns with research-based instructional strategies for second language acquisition (e.g., proficiency-oriented design, integrated and contextualized instruction, high use of the target language, authentic texts).	Materials include <u>onboarding resources (e.g., navigation guide, getting started guide) to support educators in orienting themselves to the course. Onboarding resources:</u> • <u>identify all types of components in the course;</u> • <u>provide a brief description of each type of component in the course;</u> • <u>an explanation of explain</u> how the instructional design of the materials aligns with research-based instructional strategies for second language acquisition (e.g., proficiency-oriented design, integrated and contextualized instruction, high use of the target language, authentic texts); • <u>explain the structure of units in the course; and</u> • <u>explain the structure of lessons in the course.</u>	Materials include onboarding resources (e.g., navigation guide, getting started guide) to support educators in orienting themselves to the course. Onboarding resources: • identify all types of components in the course; • provide a brief description of each type of component in the course; • explain how the instructional design of the materials aligns with research-based instructional strategies for second language acquisition (e.g., proficiency-oriented design, integrated and contextualized instruction, high use of the target language, authentic texts); • explain the structure of units in the course; and • explain the structure of lessons in the course.	The previous draft of the rubric included a guidance statement in course-level resources evaluating the user-friendliness of educator and student resources as a whole. This revision focuses specifically on the usability needs of educators. The original draft indicator guidance statement evaluated user-friendliness across both student and educator materials. Revised language in 1.4 narrows the scope of the evaluation to just the usability of resources for educators. While the draft rubric focused on organizational features, layouts, and visual design, this guidance statement requires materials to include intentional onboarding materials that support educators in understanding what is included in the materials and how course, unit, and lesson resources are organized. High-quality instructional materials do not just have good components and structure, but also explain their

			structure to educators explicitly. These onboarding resources support educators in gaining context for the materials' components and structure, supporting effective implementation. The first two bullets ensure all program components are identified and explained. Instructional materials often have many varied components (e.g., teacher's edition, student workbook, digital platform, manipulatives). A resource with an overview identifying all components and a description of their purpose supports teachers in understanding each component and its unique purpose. The third bullet is the previous 1.1a in the draft rubric, and it ensures there is an explanation to support educators in understanding how the instructional strategies used throughout the program align with research-based instructional strategies for second language acquisition. The fourth and fifth bullets ensure there is an explanation for educators of the organization of units and lessons in the program. This supports educators in understanding what reoccurring
--	--	--	--

			components throughout units and lesson plans to orient them to the structure of each.
--	--	--	---

Proposed New 1.4b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(1.1c) Materials for educators and students are user-friendly. Print and digital materials: - include organizational features (e.g., table of contents, index, glossary, headings); - use consistent layouts; and - use visual design to support understanding and reduce extraneous load.	Materials <u>are designed</u> for educators and students are user-friendly. Print and digital to efficiently locate and use implementation supports. Materials: include organizational features (e.g., table of contents, index, glossary, headings); - use consistent layouts <u>across units in the course; and</u> <u>use consistent layouts across lessons in the course; and</u> <u>embed educator facilitation guidance within the lesson.</u> use visual design to support understanding and reduce extraneous load.	Materials are designed for educators to efficiently locate and use implementation supports. Materials: - use consistent layouts across units in the course; - use consistent layouts across lessons in the course; and - embed educator facilitation guidance within the lesson.	The previous draft of the rubric included a guidance statement in course-level resources evaluating the user-friendliness of educator and student resources as a whole. This revision focuses specifically on the usability needs of educators. This guidance statement focuses on whether materials support educators in effectively locating implementation supports. The original draft indicator guidance statement evaluated user-friendliness across both student and educator materials. Revised language in 1.4 narrows the scope of the evaluation to just the useability of resources for educators. Although organizational features (e.g., table of contents, index, glossary, headings) are important to user-friendly design, this requirement was removed as being too general. The first and second bullets require that programs use consistent layouts across the materials to support ease of use. For example, consistent lesson play layouts ensure an educator

			can rely on the same layout for each lesson plan. This supports efficient navigation and use. Bullet three focuses on lesson-level resources specifically, ensuring educator facilitation guidance is embedded within the lesson plan. This makes it easier for educators to both contextualize the guidance in the lesson tasks and reference the guidance efficiently during facilitation with students.
--	--	--	--

2. ~~Progress Monitoring Assessment Supports~~

2.1 ~~Administering and Scoring Instructional Assessments~~

Materials support ~~effective implementation with a variety of instructional summative~~ educators in assessments that include through guidance for consistently ~~administration administering~~ and accurately scoring assessments.

Proposed Revisions to 2.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(2.1a) Materials provide a variety of instructional assessments, including: • pretest(s) administered at the beginning of the course or the beginning of unit(s); • formative assessments at the lesson level; and • summative assessments at the unit level. (2.1b) Materials support educators in administering and scoring instructional assessments. Materials provide educator guidance (e.g., instructions, answer keys, rubrics with scored examples) for: • consistently administering instructional assessments; • accurately scoring selected response item types; and • accurately scoring constructed response item types or performance tasks.	(2.1a) Materials provide a variety of instructional assessments, including: • pretest(s) administered at the beginning of the course or the beginning of unit(s); • formative assessments at the lesson level; and • summative assessments at the unit level. (2.1b) Materials support educators in administering and scoring instructional assessments. Materials provide educator guidance (e.g., instructions, <u>timing, necessary materials</u>) for: consistently administering <u>each instructional summative assessment.</u>; • accurately scoring selected response item types; and • accurately scoring constructed response item types or performance tasks.	Materials provide educator guidance (e.g., instructions, timing, necessary materials) for consistently administering each summative assessment.	Indicator guidance statements evaluating the inclusion and quality of assessments have been moved to Learning Quality (5.3, 6.3, 7.3). Section 2 now focuses on assessment supports that aid in effective assessment implementation. Indicator 2.1 focuses on support for educators in administering and scoring assessments. In order to contain the scope of evaluation for the requirements in 2.1b, language previously in 2.1b about administering assessments was pulled out as a new 2.1a. Indicator guidance statement 2.1b now solely focuses on support for scoring. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was broad and unclear, added “summative” to make clear guidance should be provided for administration of summative assessments.

Proposed Revisions to 2.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials support educators in administering and scoring instructional assessments. Materials provide educator guidance (e.g., instructions, answer keys, rubrics with scored examples) for: - consistently administering instructional assessments; - accurately scoring selected response item types; and - accurately scoring constructed response item types or performance tasks.	Materials support educators in administering and accurately scoring each summative instructional assessments accurately by providing: Materials provide educator guidance (e.g., instructions, answer keys, rubrics with scored examples) for: consistently administering instructional assessments; accurately scoring answer keys for selected-response item types; and accurately proficiency-aligned rubrics for scoring constructed-response item types or performance tasks; ; and scored examples that span a range of performance levels for constructed-response item types or performance tasks.	Materials support educators in accurately scoring each summative assessment by providing: - answer keys for selected-response item types; - proficiency-aligned rubrics for constructed-response item types or performance tasks; and - scored examples that span a range of performance levels for constructed-response item types or performance tasks.	In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was broad and unclear, added “summative” to make clear guidance should be provided for scoring of summative assessments. In order to contain the scope of evaluation for the requirements in 2.1b, language previously in 2.1b about administering assessments was pulled out as a new 2.1a. Indicator guidance statement 2.1b now solely focuses on support for scoring. Instead of including examples in a parenthetical in the stem, they were moved to relevant bullets to make clear which guidance is most relevant for each scoring point. Additionally, examples were revised from suggestions to explicit requirements. Answer keys are required for selected-response item types. Constructed-response item types or performance tasks require rubrics and scored samples. The requirement that rubrics are “proficiency-aligned” and “scored

			examples that span a range of performance levels” was added in response to stakeholder feedback that these resources are needed for accurate, proficiency-aligned scoring of LOTE performance tasks.
--	--	--	--

2.2 ~~Data Analysis and Progress Monitoring~~ Analyzing and Responding to Assessment Data

Materials support ~~effective implementation through support for~~ educators and students ~~to in~~ analyzing and ~~monitor progress towards target proficiency levels- responding to assessment data.~~

Proposed Revisions to 2.2a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials support educators in analyzing student performance on instructional assessments by including educator guidance (e.g., error analysis, student work analysis protocol) for: - analyzing individual student performance towards target proficiency levels; - identifying trends in student performance towards target proficiency levels; and - using the instructional materials to respond to student performance.	Materials support educators in analyzing and responding to student performance towards the target proficiency level on instructional for each summative assessments by including providing educator guidance resources (e.g., error analysis, student work analysis protocol) for: - analyzing individual student performance towards target proficiency levels to inform targeted supports; - identifying trends in student performance towards target proficiency levels across students to inform adjustments to whole-group or sub-group instruction; and - using the instructional materials to respond to student performance.	Materials support educators in analyzing and responding to student performance towards the target proficiency level for each summative assessment by providing resources (e.g., error analysis, student work analysis protocol) for: - analyzing individual student performance to inform targeted supports; - identifying trends in performance across students to inform adjustments to whole-group or sub-group instruction; and - using the instructional materials to respond to student performance.	“Towards the target proficiency level” was added to the stem to make clear that the guidance for analysis of and response to data should support educators in determining students’ performance towards proficiency in alignment with proficiency-oriented instruction. To align with stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was unclear, edited to “summative assessments” to make clear the support for analysis and response is required for summative assessments. “For each” was added to clarify this guidance statement focuses on supporting educators in analyzing student performance on each individual summative assessment. Indicator guidance statement 2.2b focuses on analysis across assessments. “Educator guidance” was changed to “resources” in response to stakeholder feedback that it was

			unclear if data dashboards would meet this requirement. “Resources” offers flexibility for programs to meet this requirement with guidance or a data analysis tool. In bullet one, “inform targeted supports” was added to offer greater clarity about the purpose of individual student data analysis. In bullet two, “across students to inform adjustments to whole-group or sub-group instruction” was added to clarify that the trend analysis should both occur across students (as opposed to only at the individual student level) and support adjustments to instruction with groups of students.
--	--	--	--

Proposed Revisions to 2.2b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials provide tools for educators and students to monitor progress toward proficiency in each mode of communication.	Materials provide tools for support educators <u>in analyzing</u> and <u>responding to student</u> progress towards <u>the target</u> proficiency <u>in each mode of communication level across summative assessments by providing resources (e.g., data dashboard, longitudinal proficiency tracker) for:-</u> • <u>analyzing individual student progress to inform targeted supports;</u> • <u>identifying trends in progress across students to inform adjustments to whole-group or sub-group instruction; and</u> • <u>using the instructional materials to respond to student progress.</u>	Materials support educators in analyzing and responding to student progress towards the target proficiency level across summative assessments by providing resources (e.g., data dashboard, longitudinal proficiency tracker) for: • analyzing individual student progress to inform targeted supports; • identifying trends in progress across students to inform adjustments to whole-group or sub-group instruction; and • using the instructional materials to respond to student progress.	To create a clearer focus for evaluation, the guidance statement was revised to focus solely on educator-facing resources for monitoring progress. A new guidance statement, 2.2c, was added to address student resources for monitoring progress. A parallel structure aligned to 2.2a was adopted to create consistency in the support for analyzing data educators receive both for individual summative assessments and across summative assessments. Aligned with stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was unclear, edited to “summative assessments” to make clear the support for analysis and response is required for summative assessments. “Tools” was changed to “resources” in response to stakeholder feedback that the meaning of tools was unclear. Additionally, examples of resources to support analysis and response across assessments for both digital and print programs were offered in a parenthetical.

Proposed New 2.2c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(2.2b) Materials provide tools for educators and students to monitor progress toward proficiency in each mode of communication.	Materials provide support tools for educators and students to monitor progress toward proficiency in each mode of communication. in analyzing data and setting goals by providing resources (e.g., can-do statement tracker, portfolio) for: • identifying their own performance relative to the target proficiency level for each summative assessment; • identifying their own progress towards the target proficiency level across summative assessments; and • setting actionable proficiency goals.	Materials support students in analyzing data and setting goals by providing resources (e.g., can-do statement tracker, portfolio) for: • identifying their own performance relative to the target proficiency level for each summative assessment; • identifying their own progress towards the target proficiency level across summative assessments; and • setting actionable proficiency goals.	To create a clearer focus for evaluation, the guidance statement was revised to focus solely on student resources for analyzing and responding to their own performance data. Indicator guidance statement 2.2b addresses educator tools for monitoring progress. A parallel structure aligned to 2.2a and 2.2b was adopted to create consistency in the support for analyzing data both educators and students receive for individual summative assessments and across summative assessments. Aligned with stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was unclear, edited to “summative assessments” to make clear the support for analysis is required for summative assessments. “Tools” was changed to “resources” in response to stakeholder feedback that the meaning of tools was unclear. Examples were added in a parenthetical for further clarity. In response to stakeholder feedback that student-facing tools should also include goal setting,

			an additional bullet requiring resources support students in setting “actionable proficiency goals” was added.
--	--	--	--

3. Supports for All Learners

3.1 Differentiated Instruction and Scaffolds Practice

Materials support educators in reaching all learners through ~~design focused on engagement, representation, and action/expression~~ differentiated instruction and practice.

Proposed Revisions to 3.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include educator guidance for providing differentiated instruction to support all learners, including: - students performing below target proficiency levels; - students performing above target proficiency levels; and - heritage language learners.	Materials include educator guidance for providing differentiated instruction to support all learners <u>throughout each unit</u> , including: <u>supports for</u> students performing below target proficiency levels <u>that provide access but keep the communicative goal constant</u>; <u>extensions that increase the rigor of tasks for</u> students performing above target proficiency levels; and <u>supports or extensions for</u> heritage <u>speakers language learners that build on existing proficiency to develop academic register.</u>¹	Materials include educator guidance for providing differentiated instruction to support all learners throughout each unit, including: - supports for students performing below target proficiency levels that provide access but keep the communicative goal constant; - extensions that increase the rigor of tasks for students performing above target proficiency levels; and - supports or extensions for heritage speakers that build on existing proficiency to develop academic register.¹	“Throughout each unit” was added to clarify the frequency of differentiation guidance required by the guidance statement. In response to stakeholder feedback that descriptors of high-quality differentiation should be included, language describing what successful differentiation looks like for each group was added. For students performing below the target proficiency level, language was added that guidance should include scaffolds that provide supports that “provide access but keep the communicative goal constant.” Based on feedback from educators that differentiation for students performing above grade level should not just include more

¹ Supports or extensions for heritage speakers are not applicable for classical languages.

			work, “extensions that increase the rigor of tasks” was included. Differentiation that meets the unique needs of heritage speakers builds upon students’ existing proficiency to develop students’ academic register. Thus, language was added requiring supports or extensions for heritage speakers to “build on existing oral or receptive proficiency to develop academic register.” In response to stakeholder feedback that there are no heritage speakers for classical languages, a footnote was added to the last bullet making this requirement not applicable for classical languages.
--	--	--	--

Proposed Revisions to 3.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials include educator guidance for providing specially designed instruction (SDI) for students receiving supports and services through special education.	No change	No change	No change

Proposed New 3.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(1.2c) Materials include additional practice (e.g., homework, remediation, enrichment) for each unit.	Materials include additional practice (e.g., homework, remediation, enrichment) for each unit <u>that educators can use if students need more practice beyond instruction in lessons.</u>	Materials include additional practice for each unit that educators can use if students need practice beyond instruction in lessons.	This guidance statement was moved to Section 3 to more clearly situate additional practice as a support for students as opposed to a unit-level resource. “That educators can use if students need more practice beyond instruction in lessons” was added to make clear the practice should be in addition to practice provided in lessons. The parenthetical examples of homework, remediation, and enrichment were removed. This removal more clearly situates the purpose of the practice as additional grade-level practice as opposed to remediation or enrichment.

Learning Quality

4. Proficiency-Oriented Instruction

4.1 Proficiency-Oriented Design²

Materials are **designed sequenced** to support student growth on the proficiency continuum (e.g., novice low to novice mid, novice mid to novice high) **towards the target proficiency level.**

Proposed Revisions to 4.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials use a systematic sequence aligned to the target proficiency level that progressively increases the rigor and complexity of: • functions and tasks in each mode of communication; • context and content; • texts; and • language forms.	Materials use a systematic sequence of instruction and practice aligned to the target proficiency level that progressively increases the rigor and complexity of: • functions and tasks in each mode of communication; • contexts and content; • texts types; and • language control forms.	Materials use a systematic sequence of instruction and practice that progressively increases the complexity of: • functions in each mode of communication; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	At the header for this indicator (4.1 Proficiency-Oriented Design), a footnote was added to clarify that classical languages will be evaluated only for the interpretive mode in 4.1a, 4.1b, and 4.1c. In alignment with the classical language TEKS, output modes (i.e., interpersonal, presentational) serve the interpretive mode. “Of instruction and practice” was added to clarify that reviewers are evaluating only instruction and practice in this guidance statement. The rigor of assessments is evaluated in 4.1b. “Aligned to the target proficiency level” was removed because indicator guidance statements in Sections 5–8 evaluate whether

² Classical languages will only be evaluated for the interpretive mode in 4.1a, 4.1b, and 4.1c.

			instruction, practice, and assessment are aligned to the target proficiency level for each mode of communication. Removing the language here prevents duplicative scoring. “Rigor” was removed because it is redundant with complexity. This revision allows for more efficient, streamlined scoring. “Tasks” was removed from bullet one because it is redundant with functions. Both ask reviewers to consider what students are required to do with the target language. This revision allows for more efficient, streamlined scoring. “Content” was removed because it is redundant with contexts. This revision allows for more efficient, streamlined scoring. “Texts” was replaced with “text types” to align with ACTFL terminology for describing the complexity of texts. “Language forms” was replaced with “language control” to align with ACTFL’s four-part proficiency framework. Language forms describes how forms appear in instruction. Language control describes how consistently and accurately a student manages
--	--	--	---

			language forms (e.g., grammar, syntax) during language use.
--	--	--	---

Proposed Revisions to 4.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned language in draft rubric)	<u>Materials include assessments that progressively increase the complexity of:</u> • <u>functions in each mode of communication;</u> • <u>contexts;</u> • <u>text types; and</u> • <u>language control.</u>	Materials include assessments that progressively increase the complexity of: • functions in each mode of communication; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	Indicator guidance statement added to ensure assessments progressively increase in complexity across the course.

Proposed New 4.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(4.1b) Materials use a spiraled sequence to reinforce retention and deepen proficiency aligned to the target proficiency level by revisiting: • functions in each mode of communication; • text types; and • language forms.	Materials use a spiraled sequence to reinforce retention and deepen proficiency aligned to the target proficiency level by revisiting: • functions in each mode of communication; • text types; and • language forms.	Materials use a spiraled sequence to reinforce retention and deepen proficiency by revisiting: • functions in each mode of communication; and • language forms.	Removed “aligned to the target proficiency level” to more clearly focus the evaluation in the guidance statement on spiraling as opposed to alignment. Sections 5–8 evaluate whether instruction, practice, and assessment are aligned to the target proficiency level for each mode of communication. “Text types” refers to the structural complexity and length of texts. Because text complexity and length should increase over the course of the materials, spiraling to less complex text types is not necessary.

4.2 Integrated and Contextualized Instruction

Materials are designed to develop communicative ability through integrated and contextualized instruction.

Proposed Revisions to 4.2a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials are organized into thematic units on topics of real-world (modern languages and ASL) or classroom (classical languages) relevance that include integrated: • texts; • communicative tasks in each mode; and • instruction in language forms.	Materials are organized into thematic units on topics of real-world or classical-world (modern languages and ASL) or classroom (classical languages) relevance ³ that include integrated: • texts; • communicative tasks in each mode;⁴ and • vocabulary; and • instruction in language forms.	Materials are organized into thematic units on topics of real-world or classical-world relevance ³ that include integrated: • texts; • communicative tasks in each mode;⁴ • vocabulary; and • language forms.	In response to stakeholder feedback, changed “classroom” relevance to “classical-world” relevance. This ensures units develop students’ skills in the target language in the context of classical history and culture, as opposed to decontextualized instruction with texts solely focused on language forms. A footnote was added to clarify which language types are required to have real-world relevance and which language types are required to have classical-world relevance. Moving to a footnote offers clarification, while improving the readability of the guidance statement language. “Vocabulary” was added in bullet three to ensure vocabulary is relevant to the unit topic. “Instruction in” was removed to not narrow the focus of evaluation

³ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for real-world relevance; classical languages will be evaluated for classical-world relevance.

⁴ Classical languages will only be evaluated for the interpretive mode.

			solely to instruction. Instruction, practice, and evaluation can be considered when reviewers assess whether language forms are integrated with the unit's theme.
--	--	--	---

Proposed Revisions to 4.2b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Communicative tasks are consistently situated in functional or cultural contexts to promote use of the target language in real-world contexts (modern languages and ASL) or classroom contexts (classical languages).	Communicative tasks are consistently situated in functional or and cultural contexts to promote use of the target language in real-world or classroom contexts.⁵ (modern languages and ASL) or classroom contexts (classical languages):	Communicative tasks are consistently situated in functional and cultural contexts to promote use of the target language in real-world or classroom contexts.⁵	Changed the “or” to “and” to require communicative tasks be situated in both a functional and cultural context. Without “and,” tasks could be functional (e.g., ordering food at a restaurant) without cultural context. This does not mirror real-world communication. Real-world communication is embedded in cultural norms (e.g., register, customs, expectations). Requiring both functional and cultural contexts ensures materials situate tasks in both dimensions, better ensuring tasks are real-world. Moved clarification that classical languages are evaluated for classroom contexts instead of both functional and classroom contexts to a footnote to improve readability.

⁵ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for real-world contexts; classical languages will be evaluated for classroom contexts.

Proposed Revisions to 4.2c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned language in draft rubric)	<u>Vocabulary is taught in service of communicative functions (i.e., learning vocabulary in context versus only in isolation).</u>	Vocabulary is taught in service of communicative functions (i.e., learning vocabulary in context versus only in isolation).	Indicator guidance statement was added to ensure vocabulary is taught when relevant for a communicative function. This aligns with research-based instruction that situates vocabulary and language forms in context, as opposed to only in isolated instruction.

Proposed Revisions to 4.2d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(4.2c) Language forms are taught in service of communicative functions (i.e., learning forms in context versus only in isolation).	Language forms are taught in service of communicative functions (i.e., learning language forms in context versus only in isolation).	Language forms are taught in service of communicative functions (i.e., learning language forms in context versus only in isolation).	Moved to 4.2d to account for new 4.2c evaluating vocabulary in context. “Language” was added to parenthetical for consistency of use of term “language forms” throughout the rubric.

Proposed New 4.2e⁶

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(4.3f) Materials connect input and output in an iterative sequence where comprehensible input proceeds and informs meaningful output.	Materials connect input and output in an <u>integrated and</u> iterative sequence <u>by consistently including:</u> where comprehensible input proceeds and informs meaningful output. <u>interpretive tasks that inform output in communicative tasks (versus stand-alone exercises);</u> <u>interpersonal tasks that use input from previous interpretive tasks; and</u> <u>presentational tasks that use input from previous interpretive tasks.</u>	Materials connect input and output in an integrated and iterative sequence by consistently including: - interpretive tasks that inform output in communicative tasks (versus stand-alone exercises); - interpersonal tasks that use input from previous interpretive tasks; and - presentational tasks that use input from previous interpretive tasks.	Moved guidance statement from 4.3f to 4.2e because the requirement supports ensuring input and output relate to each other, strengthening the integration of content and tasks in instructional materials. The three bullets were added to ensure reviewers discretely evaluate the relationship between input and output in each mode of communication.

⁶ 4.2e is not applicable for classical languages.

Proposed New 4.2f⁷

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(4.2d) Summative assessments include an integrated performance assessment that requires students to demonstrate performance in all three modes of communication in a real-world (modern languages and ASL) or classroom (classical languages) task.	Summative assessments include an integrated performance assessment <u>in each unit</u> that requires students to demonstrate performance: in all three modes of communication in a real-world (modern languages and ASL) or classroom (classical languages) task. • <u>in each mode of communication;</u> • <u>in an integrated task; and</u> • <u>in a real-world context.</u>	Summative assessments include an integrated performance assessment in each unit that requires students to demonstrate performance: • in each mode of communication; • in an integrated task; and • in a real-world context.	In response to stakeholder feedback and because the TEKS for classical languages largely focus on development of student proficiency in the interpretive mode, this guidance statement was made not applicable for classical languages. A footnote was added to the guidance statement heading to clarify it is not applicable for classical languages. “In each unit” was added to ensure integrated performance assessments appear throughout the program, not as an isolated example. Bullets were added to discretely evaluate the components of an integrated assessment. This ensures all relevant features of integrated performance tasks are consistently present in the materials.

⁷ 4.2f is not applicable for classical languages.

4.3 High Target Language Use

Materials are designed to develop communicative ability through consistent exposure to comprehensible input and production of meaningful output in the target language.

Proposed Revisions to 4.3a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(4.3a) Input in materials is almost exclusively in the target language. (4.3d) Materials promote consistent production of meaningful output in the target language in educator–student and student–student interactions.	(4.3a) Input in materials is almost exclusively in the target language <u>Materials maximize use by requiring students to use the target language almost exclusively when:</u> • <u>processing input; and</u> • <u>producing output.</u>⁸ (4.3d) Materials maximize-promote consistent production of target language use almost exclusively when: • <u>processing input; and</u> • <u>producing meaningful output.</u>⁸ <u>in the target language in educator-student and student-student interactions.</u>	Materials maximize target language use by requiring students to use the target language almost exclusively when: • processing input; and • producing output.⁸	Because both 4.3a and 4.3c in the draft rubric address students being in the target language almost exclusively, the two guidance statements were combined for more efficient scoring. A footnote was added to clarify that classical languages are not required to have students produce output primarily in the target language to align with classical languages’ primary focus on the interpretive mode.

⁸ Producing output in the target language almost exclusively is not applicable to classical languages.

Proposed Revisions to 4.3b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials provide comprehensible input (i.e., target language input within the zone of proximal development appropriate for the target proficiency level) with embedded supports (e.g., visuals, vocabulary, background knowledge, guiding questions).	Materials provide comprehensible input (i.e., target language input within the zone of proximal development appropriate for the target proficiency level) with embedded supports (e.g., visuals, vocabulary, background knowledge, guiding questions).	Materials provide comprehensible input (i.e., target language input within the zone of proximal development appropriate for the target proficiency level).	Revisions to 4.3d require materials to include scaffolds for each mode of communication, including input for the interpretive mode. To avoid duplicative scoring, the requirement for embedded supports was removed from this guidance statement.

Proposed Revisions to 4.3c⁹

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(4.3e) Materials include educator guidance for making target language use during instruction comprehensible (e.g., language simplification, verbal strategies, non-verbal strategies, scaffolding, checks for understanding).	Materials include educator guidance for making the educator's use of the target language use during instruction comprehensible (e.g., language simplification, verbal strategies, non-verbal strategies, scaffolding, checks for understanding).	Materials include educator guidance for making the educator's use of the target language during instruction comprehensible.	Removed parenthetical examples, as the evidence guide will offer additional examples and explanation to support reviewers in scoring aligned to guidance statement intent.

⁹ 4.3c is not applicable for classical languages.

Proposed Revisions to 4.3d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials provide educator guidance for supporting students in consistent production of meaningful output in the target language.	Materials provide educator guidance for <u>providing scaffolds that gradually decrease as student proficiency increases, including scaffolds to</u> supporting students in: • <u>processing input in the interpretive mode;</u>¹⁰ • <u>consistent production of meaningful output in the target language interpersonal mode;</u>¹¹ and • <u>producing output in the presentational mode.</u>¹²	Materials include educator guidance for providing scaffolds that gradually decrease as student proficiency increases, including scaffolds to support students in: • processing input in the interpretive mode;¹⁰ • producing output in the interpersonal mode;¹¹ and • producing output in the presentational mode.¹²	Instead of just educator guidance for supporting students, the more specific requirement of “providing scaffolds” was added to ensure educators have concrete guidance for how to support students during target language use. To support student growth in proficiency across a course, the requirement that scaffolds “gradually decrease as student proficiency increases” was added. The guidance statement was expanded beyond output to all three modes of communication (i.e., interpretive, interpersonal, presentational) to ensure educators have guidance for how to effectively scaffold both input processing and output production.

¹⁰ Modern languages will be evaluated for both interpretive listening and interpretive reading scaffolds; classical languages will be evaluated for interpretive reading scaffolds; ASL will be evaluated for interpretive receptive scaffolds.

¹¹ Scaffolds in the interpersonal mode are not applicable for classical languages.

¹² Modern languages will be evaluated for both presentational speaking and presentational writing scaffolds; ASL will be evaluated for presentational expressive scaffolds. Scaffolds in the presentational mode are not applicable for classical languages.

Proposed Removal of 4.3f

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials connect input and output in an iterative sequence where comprehensible input proceeds and informs meaningful output.	Materials connect input and output in an iterative sequence where comprehensible input proceeds and informs meaningful output.		This guidance statement was moved to 4.2e as part of indicator 4.2 Integrated and Contextualized Instruction because the guidance statement evaluates whether the modes of communication are integrated (i.e., input informs output).

4.4 Authentic Texts

Materials include authentic texts in the target language to expose students to real-world ~~(modern languages and ASL)~~ or classical-world ~~(classical languages)~~ language use.¹³

Proposed Revisions to 4.4a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials consistently include authentic texts from a variety of communities that use (modern languages and ASL) or used (classical languages) the target language.	Materials consistently include authentic texts from a variety of communities that use (modern languages and ASL) or used (classical languages) the target language.	Materials consistently include authentic texts from a variety of communities that use or used the target language.	Moved clarification that modern languages are evaluated for real-world language use while classical language are evaluated for classical-world language use to a footnote accompanying the introductory sentence for the indicator to improve the readability of the guidance statements.

Proposed Revisions to 4.4b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Authentic texts build knowledge of the cultural products, practices, and perspectives of the communities that use (modern languages and ASL) or used (classical languages) the target language.	Authentic texts build knowledge of the cultural products, practices, and perspectives of the communities that use (modern languages and ASL) or used (classical languages) the target language-. <u>including:-</u> • <u>cultural products;</u> • <u>cultural practices; and</u> • <u>cultural perspectives.</u>	Authentic texts build knowledge of the communities that use or used the target language, including: • cultural products; • cultural practices; and • cultural perspectives.	Moved clarification that modern languages are evaluated for real-world language use while classical language are evaluated for classical-world language use to a footnote accompanying the introductory sentence for the indicator to improve the readability of the guidance statements. Moved language about cultural products, practices, and

¹³ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for real-world language use; classical languages will be evaluated for classical-world language use.

			perspectives embedded in the guidance statement stem to bullets to align with overall design choice throughout the rubric to bullet individual, discrete components within a guidance statement. This supports ease of use by reviewers when scoring materials.
--	--	--	---

5. Input Processing in the Target Language¹⁴

5.1 **Explicit Effective** Instruction in the Interpretive Mode

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in ~~listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern languages and classical languages) comprehension in~~ the interpretive mode through **effective** explicit instruction; ~~effective practice, and aligned assessment.~~

Proposed Revisions to 5.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: - supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; - setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; - providing concise explanations and modeling;	Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; setting a real-world or classroom purpose¹⁵ for input processing listening, viewing, or reading;	Materials set a real-world or classroom purpose ¹⁵ for input processing.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. The previous draft of the guidance statement asked for educator guidance for “setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading.” The revised guidance statement more clearly situates this purpose as a “real-world” purpose for modern languages and ASL in response to stakeholder feedback that expectations for the interpretive mode should not focus on comprehension skills without attention to communicative purposes.

¹⁴ In Section 5, modern languages will be evaluated for both interpretive listening and interpretive reading skills; classical languages will be evaluated for interpretive reading skills; ASL will be evaluated for interpretive receptive skills.

¹⁵ Modern languages and ASL will be evaluated for setting a real-world purpose; classical languages will be evaluated for setting a classroom purpose.

• providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	• providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and providing immediate specific feedback.		For classical languages, however, materials are required to set a “classroom” purpose when students engage in the interpretive mode as the real-world, output-oriented focus of modern languages and ASL does not mirror interpretive purposes for classical languages. By removing the phase “educator guidance” this revised version allows for the communicative purpose of interpretive tasks to be set in student-facing materials or in educator guidance.
---	--	--	--

Proposed New 5.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; • setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • supplying or activating build relevant activate or supply background knowledge to prepare students for input processing. • setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials activate or supply background knowledge to prepare students for input processing.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. “To prepare students for input processing” was added to clarify the activation or supply of background knowledge happens before input processing to successful prepare students ahead of processing a text. By removing the phase “educator guidance” the activation or supply of background knowledge can happen in student-facing materials or in educator guidance.

Proposed New 5.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: - supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; - setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; - providing concise explanations and modeling; - providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; - conducting frequent checks for understanding; - facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and - providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction on in interpretive communication listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages), comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level., including how to: develop literal comprehension; develop inferential comprehension; develop analytical comprehension;¹⁶ interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives; understand vocabulary in context; and understand language forms in context. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: supplying or activating relevant background knowledge;	Materials provide explicit instruction in interpretive communication skills, including how to: - develop literal comprehension; - develop inferential comprehension; - develop analytical comprehension;¹⁶ - interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives; - understand vocabulary in context; and - understand language forms in context.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on more discretely identifying the comprehension skills necessary for the interpretive mode. In response to stakeholder feedback requesting clarity on the interpretive skills evaluated, revisions name the specific TEKS-aligned interpretive skills required. Materials must provide instruction to support students in literal and inferential comprehension. For Level IV–VII modern and classical language courses, instruction for analytical comprehension must also be included. Instruction to support students in “interpreting cultural products, practices, or perspectives,” “vocabulary in context,” and “language forms in context” is also required. These revisions ensure students receive explicit instruction in key interpretive skills that are essential

¹⁶ Analytical comprehension is applicable only for Level IV–VII courses for modern languages and classical languages.

	• setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.		to interpretive mode TEKS across all language courses. Specific language domains evaluated in the guidance statement (i.e., reading, listening, viewing) were moved from the guidance statement language to a footnote to improve readability. Supports for educator facilitation of instruction were taken out and are evaluated in 5.1d to make the guidance statements more concise and focused to align with stakeholder feedback.
--	--	--	---

Proposed New 5.1d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; • setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility is aligned to the target proficiency level for:- • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; • setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and	Explicit instruction in interpretive communication skills is aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether explicit instruction is aligned to the target proficiency level. ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines describe proficiency expectations using four dimensions of student performance; these were added to the guidance statement for more precision in scoring. Having reviewers evaluate whether the “functions,” “contexts,” “text types,” and “language control” align to the target proficiency level for the interpretive mode ensures all dimensions of interpretive mode instruction are within the zone of proximal development appropriate for students.

	providing immediate specific feedback.		
--	---	--	--

Proposed New 5.1e

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; • setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator <u>facilitation</u> guidance <u>for providing effective explicit instruction in the interpretive mode, including guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds)</u> for: • supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; • setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling <u>of interpretive communication skills</u>; • <u>providing concise explanations and modeling of interpretive communication strategies</u>; • <u>providing brief noticing of relevant vocabulary</u>; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; <u>and</u>	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in the interpretive mode, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpretive communication skills; • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpretive communication strategies; • providing brief noticing of relevant vocabulary; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on discretely identifying supports required to support educators in facilitating explicit instruction in the interpretive mode. Since both requirements to provide relevant background knowledge and setting a purpose for input processing were pulled out into a separate guidance statement (5.1b), they were removed from this guidance statement. Aligned to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, interpretive skills and interpretive strategies were separated into two separate areas of need for concise explanations and modeling. Vocabulary was added to the third bullet requiring support for “brief noticing” to ensure educators have support to teach vocabulary in context. Because student practice is evaluated in revised indicator 5.2,

	• conducting frequent checks for understanding. • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and providing immediate specific feedback.		“facilitating guided and independent practice” was removed to prevent duplicative scoring. In response to stakeholder feedback requesting clarity about the phrase “immediate specific feedback,” the phrase was replaced with the term “explanatory feedback” to align to terminology used in the Commissioner’s Rules Concerning Educator Standards (19 TAC §149.1001(b)(8)).
--	---	--	---

5.12 Effective Instruction Student Practice in the Interpretive Mode

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in ~~listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern languages and classical languages) comprehension in~~ the interpretive mode through ~~explicit instruction, effective student practice, and aligned assessment.~~

Proposed New 5.2a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: - practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); - sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and - educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials <u>include interpretive tasks in each unit that require students to:</u> <u>demonstrate literal comprehension;</u> <u>demonstrate inferential comprehension;</u> <u>demonstrate analytical comprehension;¹⁷</u> <u>interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives;</u> <u>understand vocabulary in context; and</u> <u>understand language forms in context.</u> provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories;	Materials include interpretive tasks in each unit that require students to: - demonstrate literal comprehension; - demonstrate inferential comprehension; - demonstrate analytical comprehension;¹⁷ - interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives; - understand vocabulary in context; and - understand language forms in context.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether student practice helps students to build proficiency in the interpretive skills required in explicit instruction (5.1c). While the draft version required materials include student practice in “comprehension skills,” guidance statement was revised (similarly to 5.1c) to explicitly name those skills in response to stakeholder feedback that the broad term “comprehension skills” was not clear.

¹⁷ Analytical comprehension is applicable only for Level IV–VII courses for modern languages and classical languages.

	conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.		
--	--	--	--

Proposed New 5.2b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build <u>Interpretive tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for:-</u> • <u>functions;</u> • <u>contexts;</u> • <u>text types; and</u> • <u>language control.</u> Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Interpretive tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating student practice and is aligned to the target proficiency level to ensure student practice is within students' zone of proximal development. As for 5.1d, the specific dimensions of interpretive task performance (i.e., functions, contexts, text types, language control) was added for more precise evaluation of alignment of practice to the target proficiency level.

Proposed New 5.2c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Interpretive tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction. Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Interpretive tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether student practice aligns to instruction (i.e., the interpretive skills explicitly taught).

Proposed New 5.2d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a <u>Interpretive tasks in each unit use a</u> variety of <u>authentic texts.</u> formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Interpretive tasks in each unit use a variety of authentic texts.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses whether student practice in the interpretive mode uses a variety of authentic texts. The draft guidance statement language focused on a variety of formats and genres. The guidance statement was edited to evaluate whether materials include a variety of “authentic texts” for interpretive practice aligned with research about the importance of authentic texts in developing student proficiency.

Proposed New 5.2e

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • supplying or activating relevant background knowledge; • setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading; • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials <u>include student practice in the interpretive mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: provide effective explicit instruction on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level.</u> Materials <u>include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for:</u> • <u>supplying or activating relevant background knowledge;</u> • <u>setting a purpose for listening, viewing, or reading;</u> • <u>providing concise explanations and modeling;</u> • <u>providing brief noticing of relevant language forms;</u> • <u>conducting frequent checks for understanding;</u> • <u>facilitating</u> guided practice; and • independent practice; <u>and,</u> • <u>providing immediate specific feedback.</u>	Materials include student practice in the interpretive mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: • guided practice; and • independent practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have practice that gradually releases them to independence, including guided and independent practice.

Proposed New 5.2f

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing provide effective student practice in the interpretive mode, including: on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice in each lesson cycle with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced practice; and • interleaved practice. (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in the interpretive mode, including: • practice in each lesson cycle; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have ongoing practice throughout the course to advance their skills towards the target proficiency level. In response to stakeholder feedback requesting clarity about what is meant by “sufficient” practice, the indicator guidance statement language was revised to specify students should practice in the interpretive mode “in each lesson cycle.”

Proposed New 5.2g

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of formats (e.g., print, audio, spoken, visual, multimedia) and genres (e.g., stories, conversations, informational texts); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency <u>in the interpretive mode.</u>	Materials include educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency in the interpretive mode.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether materials include explanatory feedback on proficiency as student practice in the interpretive mode.

5.13 Effective Instruction Performance-Based Assessment in the Interpretive Mode

Materials are designed to ~~evaluate student performance in the interpretive mode through develop student proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern languages and classical languages) comprehension in the interpretive mode through explicit instruction, effective practice, and~~ aligned assessments.

Proposed New 5.3a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that <u>summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit that require the students to:</u> <u>demonstrate literal comprehension;</u> <u>demonstrate inferential comprehension;</u> <u>demonstrate analytical comprehension;¹⁸</u> <u>interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives;</u> <u>understand vocabulary in context; and</u> <u>understand language forms in context.</u>	Materials include summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit that require students to: - demonstrate literal comprehension; - demonstrate inferential comprehension; - demonstrate analytical comprehension;¹⁸ - interpret cultural products, practices, or perspectives; - understand vocabulary in context; and - understand language forms in context.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether assessments are aligned to the interpretive skills explicitly taught. While the draft version required materials assess “comprehension skills,” this revised guidance statement explicitly names those skills (similarly to 5.1c, 5.2a) in response to stakeholder feedback that the broad term “comprehension skills” was not clear. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the

¹⁸ Analytical comprehension is applicable only for Level IV–VII courses for modern languages and classical languages.

	• align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.		guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, the revised guidance statement language clarifies that assessments are evaluating “student performance in the interpretive mode,” not proficiency.
--	--	--	--

Proposed New 5.3b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional <u>Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit that are</u> aligned to the target proficiency level <u>for:</u> <u>functions;</u> <u>contexts;</u> <u>text types; and</u> <u>language control.</u> align to instruction (meaning and form); collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: - functions; - contexts; - text types; and - language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether assessments are aligned to the target proficiency level. As for 5.1d and 5.2b, the specific dimensions of interpretive task performance (i.e., functions, contexts, text types, language control) was added for more precise evaluation of alignment of assessments to the target proficiency level. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that assessments are evaluating

			“student performance in the interpretive mode,” not proficiency.
--	--	--	--

Proposed New 5.3c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional <u>Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit are that:</u> • align to the target proficiency level; • <u>aligned</u> to instruction. (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • <u>include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.</u>	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit are aligned to instruction.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether assessments evaluate the interpretive mode skills addressed in instruction. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that summative assessments are evaluating “student performance in the interpretive mode,” not proficiency.

Proposed New 5.3d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned language in draft rubric)	<u>Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit use authentic texts.</u>	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpretive mode in each unit use authentic texts.	This guidance statement was added to ensure assessments evaluate students' interpretive mode skills with authentic texts. Authentic texts are situated in real-world or classical-world contexts where speakers of the target language used the target language to communicate for real-world purposes. Demonstration of skill using authentic texts more accurately assesses whether students can use the target language in real-world or classical-world contexts.

Proposed New 5.3e

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(5.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials assess student performance and proficiency in listening (modern languages), viewing (ASL), and reading (modern and classical languages) comprehension skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments <u>in each unit with to provide feedback on student performance in the interpretive mode before prior to</u> summative assessments.	Materials include multiple formative assessments in each unit to provide feedback on student performance in the interpretive mode prior to summative assessments.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 5.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether the materials include multiple formative assessments before summative assessments. To ensure consistency in scoring, “in each unit” was added to clarify that within each unit students should have multiple formative assessments in the interpretive mode. This ensures ongoing formative assessments for students to receive feedback and adjust performance ahead of a summative assessment. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that formative assessments are evaluating “student performance in the interpretive mode,” not proficiency.

6. Communicating in the ~~Target Language~~ Interpersonal Mode

6.1 ~~Effective~~ Explicit Instruction in the Interpersonal Mode (Modern Languages; ~~and~~ ASL)

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency ~~in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) communication~~ in the interpersonal mode through effective explicit instruction, ~~effective practice, and aligned assessment~~.

Proposed New 6.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned language in draft rubric)	<u>Materials set a real-world purpose for interpersonal communications.</u>	Materials set a real-world purpose for interpersonal communications.	This guidance statement was added to ensure instruction in the interpersonal mode is situated in a realistic communicative context in support of a proficiency-oriented approach to language instruction. A “real-world purpose” requires students do something with language to accomplish a goal, as opposed to scripted dialogue.

Proposed New 6.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills, that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for including how to: • <u>understand what a conversation partner communicates;</u> • <u>engage in a range of communicative functions;</u> • <u>negotiate meaning; and</u> • <u>use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.</u> • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and	Materials provide explicit instruction in interpersonal communication skills, including how to: • understand what a conversation partner communicates; • engage in a range of communicative functions; • negotiate meaning; and • use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on discretely identifying interpersonal communication skills necessary for the interpretive mode. In response to stakeholder feedback requesting clarity on the interpretive skills evaluated, revisions name the specific TEKS-aligned interpretive skills required.

	• providing immediate specific feedback.		
--	---	--	--

Proposed New 6.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills is that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level: Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • <u>functions;</u> • <u>contexts;</u> • <u>text types; and</u> • <u>language control.</u> • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Explicit instruction in interpersonal communication skills is aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This guidance statement focuses on whether explicit instruction is aligned to the target proficiency level. ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines describe proficiency expectations using four dimensions of student performance; these were added to the guidance statement for more precision in scoring. Having reviewers evaluate whether the “functions,” “contexts,” “text types,” and “language control” align to the target proficiency level for the interpersonal mode ensures all dimensions of interpersonal mode instruction are within the zone of proximal development appropriate for students.

Proposed New 6.1d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator <u>facilitation</u> guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for <u>providing effective explicit instruction in the interpersonal mode, including guidance for:</u> • providing concise explanations and modeling <u>of interpersonal communication skills;</u> • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms <u>concise explanations and modeling of interpersonal communication strategies;</u> • <u>providing support for relevant vocabulary;</u> • <u>providing support for relevant language forms; and</u> • conducting frequent checks for understanding;.	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in the interpersonal mode, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpersonal communication skills; • providing concise explanations and modeling of interpersonal communication strategies; • providing support for relevant vocabulary; • providing support for relevant language forms; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on discretely identifying educator-facing supports for facilitating effective instruction in the interpersonal mode. Aligned to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, interpersonal skills and interpersonal strategies were separated into two separate areas of need for concise explanations and modeling. Because student practice is evaluated in the revised indicator 6.2, “facilitating guided and independent practice” was removed to avoid duplicative scoring. In response to stakeholder feedback for clarity about the requirements for feedback, “immediate specific feedback” was replaced with the term “explanatory feedback” to align to terminology used in the Commissioner’s Rules Concerning Educator Standards ((19 TAC §149.1001(b)(8)).

	• facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.		
--	---	--	--

6.12 Effective Instruction Student Practice in the Interpersonal Mode (Modern Languages, and ASL)

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in ~~spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) communication in~~ the interpersonal mode through ~~explicit instruction, effective student practice, and aligned assessment.~~

Proposed New 6.2a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials <u>include interpersonal tasks in each unit that require students to provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include:</u> • <u>understand what a conversation partner communicates;</u> • <u>engage in a range of communicative functions;</u> • <u>negotiate meaning; and</u> • <u>use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.</u> • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and	Materials include interpersonal tasks in each unit that require students to: • understand what a conversation partner communicates; • engage in a range of communicative functions; • negotiate meaning; and • use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether student practice helps students build proficiency in the interpersonal skills required in explicit instruction (i.e., 6.1b). While the draft version required materials require student practice in “interpersonal communication skills,” this revised guidance statement explicitly names those skills (similarly to 6.1b) in response to stakeholder feedback that the broad term “interpersonal communication skills” was not clear.

	• educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.		
--	--	--	--

Proposed New 6.2b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal tasks in each unit are aligned to the target communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency level for. Materials include: • <u>functions;</u> • <u>contexts;</u> • <u>text types; and</u> • <u>language control.</u> • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Interpersonal tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating student practice in alignment with the target proficiency level to ensure student practice is within students' zone of proximal development. As for 6.1c, the specific dimensions of interpersonal task performance (i.e., functions, contexts, text types, language control) was added for more precise evaluation of alignment of practice to the target proficiency level.

Proposed New 6.2c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned guidance in draft rubric)	Interpersonal tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.	Interpersonal tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether student practice aligns to instruction (i.e., the interpersonal skills explicitly taught).

Proposed New 6.2d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include opportunities for students to : • practice <u>communicating in the interpersonal mode through</u> with a variety of <u>communicative tasks.</u> activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and	Materials include opportunities for students to practice communicating in the interpersonal mode through a variety of communicative tasks.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether students have opportunities to practice in the interpersonal mode with a variety of tasks. “Communicative tasks” replaced “activities” to emphasize the communicative purpose of the communication, as opposed to scripted dialogue.

	• educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency:		
--	---	--	--

Proposed New 6.2e

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials <u>consistently include</u> provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages); written (modern and classical languages); and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills tasks that with an have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap (versus scripted dialogues).; role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials consistently include interpersonal tasks with an information gap (versus scripted dialogues).	In response to stakeholder feedback that materials often label tasks interpersonal when the task does not require students to listen to and respond to what their conversation partner(s) say (e.g., scripted dialogue), this guidance statement was revised to ensure student practice tasks are truly interpersonal (i.e., spontaneous two-way conversation) to grow student proficiency in the interpersonal mode.

Proposed New 6.2f

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include provide effective student practice in the on-spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • guided practice; and with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include student practice in the interpersonal mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: • guided practice; and • independent practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have practice that gradually releases them to independence, including guided and independent practice.

Proposed New 6.2g

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in the interpersonal mode, including: • with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice in each lesson cycle; to advance towards target proficiency; including • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice. (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in the interpersonal mode, including: • practice in each lesson cycle; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have ongoing practice throughout the course to advance their skills towards the target proficiency level. In response to stakeholder feedback requesting clarity about what is meant by “sufficient” practice, the indicator guidance statement language was revised to specify students should practice in the interpersonal mode “in each lesson cycle.”

Proposed New 6.2h

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., information gap, role play, interviews, digital interactions); • sufficient practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency <u>in the interpersonal mode.</u>	Materials include educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency in the interpersonal mode.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether materials include explanatory feedback on proficiency as student practice in the interpersonal mode.

6.13 Effective Instruction Performance-Based Assessments in the Interpersonal Mode (Modern Languages, and ASL)

Materials are designed to evaluate develop student performance proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) communication in the interpersonal mode through explicit instruction, effective practice, and aligned assessments.

Proposed New 6.3a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials include Formative and summative assessments of student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) in the interpersonal mode in each unit communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: align to the target proficiency level; align to instruction (meaning and form); collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments; understand what a conversation partner communicates;	Materials include summative assessments of student performance in the interpersonal mode in each unit that require students to: - understand what a conversation partner communicates; - engage in a range of communicative functions; - negotiate meaning; and - use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether assessments are aligned to the interpersonal skills explicitly taught. While the draft version required materials assess “interpersonal communication skills,” this revised guidance statement explicitly names those skills (similarly to 6.1b, 6.2a) in response to stakeholder feedback that the broad term “interpersonal communication skills” was not clear. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement

	• <u>engage in a range of communicative functions;</u> • <u>negotiate meaning; and</u> • <u>use culturally appropriate expressions, register, or gestures.</u>		focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, the revised guidance statement language clarifies that assessments are evaluating “student performance in the interpersonal mode,” not proficiency.
--	--	--	--

Proposed New 6.3b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials Summative assessments of student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) the interpersonal mode in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency levels for: communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: align to the target proficiency level; align to instruction (meaning and form); collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments. <u>functions;</u> <u>contexts;</u> <u>text types; and</u> <u>language control.</u>	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpersonal mode in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: - functions; - contexts; - text types; and - language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether assessments are aligned to the target proficiency level. As for 6.1c and 6.2b, the specific dimensions of interpersonal task performance (i.e., functions, contexts, text types, language control) was added for more precise evaluation of alignment of assessments to the target proficiency level. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that assessments are evaluating

			“student performance in the interpersonal mode,” not proficiency.
--	--	--	---

Proposed New 6.3c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials Summative assessments of student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) the interpersonal mode in each unit communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • are aligned to instruction. (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying in levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Summative assessments of student performance in the interpersonal mode in each unit are aligned to instruction.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether assessments evaluate the interpersonal communication skills addressed in instruction. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that summative assessments are evaluating “student performance in the interpersonal mode,” not proficiency.

Proposed New 6.3d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) interpersonal communication skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction (meaning and form); • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments <u>in each unit to provide with feedback on student performance in the interpersonal mode prior to</u> summative assessments.	Materials include multiple formative assessments in each unit to provide feedback on student performance in the interpersonal mode prior to summative assessments.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.1c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether the materials include multiple formative assessments before summative assessments. To ensure consistency in scoring, “in each unit” was added to clarify that within each unit students should have multiple formative assessments in the interpersonal mode. This ensures ongoing formative assessments for students to receive feedback and adjust performance ahead of a summative assessment. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that formative assessments are evaluating “student performance in the interpersonal mode,” not proficiency.

6.14 ~~Effective Instruction~~ Communicating in the Interpersonal Mode in Classical Languages (Classical Languages)

~~Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) communication in the interpersonal mode through explicit instruction, effective practice, and aligned assessment.~~

Materials include opportunities for students to communicate about classical texts, cultures, or contexts in the interpersonal mode.

Proposed New 6.4a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no previously aligned guidance statement)	<u>Materials include opportunities for students to produce written or spoken language to communicate about classical language texts, cultures, or contexts in the interpersonal mode.</u>	Materials include opportunities for students to produce written or spoken language to communicate about classical language texts, cultures, or contexts in the interpersonal mode.	In response to stakeholder feedback that the draft rubric too heavily weighted the interpersonal mode for classical languages, the guidance statements in 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 were made not applicable for classical languages and 6.4 was created for a classical language specific evaluation approach to the interpersonal mode. Aligned to the expectation in the classical language TEKS that the interpersonal mode support the interpretive mode, this guidance statement evaluates whether materials provide opportunities for students to write or speak to communicate about the texts they process or the cultures and contexts necessary to understand classical texts. As such, this guidance statement situates interpersonal communication in service of the interpretive mode.

67. Communicating in the ~~Target Language~~ Presentational Mode¹⁹

7.16.2 ~~Effective Explicit~~ Instruction in the Presentational Mode (Modern Languages; and ASL)

Materials are designed to develop student proficiency in ~~spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) communication in~~ the presentational mode through effective explicit instruction, ~~effective practice, and aligned assessment.~~

Proposed New 7.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned language in draft rubric)	<u>Materials set a real-world purpose for presentational communications.</u>	Materials set a real-world purpose for presentational communications.	This guidance statement was added to ensure instruction in the presentational mode is situated in a realistic communicative context in support of a proficiency-oriented approach to language instruction. A “real world” purpose supports doing something with language to accomplish a goal as opposed to a task solely for a classroom purpose.

¹⁹ Modern languages will be evaluated for written and spoken presentational communication skills. ASL will be evaluated for expressive presentational skills.

Proposed New 7.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials for students provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills, including how to: that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback <u>develop ideas to address a prompt;</u> • <u>create messages considering audience and context; and</u> • <u>revise messages.</u>	Materials provide explicit instruction in presentational communication skills, including how to: • develop ideas to address a prompt; • create messages considering audience and context; and • revise messages.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on discretely identifying presentational communication skills necessary for the presentational mode. In response to stakeholder feedback requesting clarity on the presentational skills evaluated, revisions name the specific TEKS-aligned presentational skills required.

Proposed New 7.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility is aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific formative feedback: • <u>functions;</u> • <u>context;</u> • <u>text types; and</u> • <u>language control.</u>	Explicit instruction in presentational communication skills is aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This guidance statement focuses on whether explicit instruction is aligned to the target proficiency level. ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines describe proficiency expectations using four dimensions of student performance; these were added to the guidance statement for more precision in scoring. Having reviewers evaluate whether the “functions,” “contexts,” “text types,” and “language control” align to the target proficiency level for the interpersonal mode ensures all dimensions of presentational mode instruction are within the zone of proximal development appropriate for students.

Proposed New 7.1d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • providing brief noticing of relevant language forms; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator <u>facilitation</u> guidance (e.g., <u>facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds</u>) for <u>providing effective explicit instruction in the presentational mode, including guidance for:</u> • providing concise explanations and modeling <u>of presentational communication skills</u>; • providing <u>concise explanations and modeling of presentational communication strategies</u> <u>brief noticing of relevant language forms</u>; • <u>providing support for relevant vocabulary</u>; • <u>providing support for relevant language forms; and</u>	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in the presentational mode, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling of presentational communication skills; • providing concise explanations and modeling of presentational communication strategies; • providing support for relevant vocabulary; • providing support for relevant language forms; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on discretely identifying educator-facing supports for facilitating effective instruction in the presentational mode. Aligned to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, presentational skills and presentational strategies were separated into two separate areas of need for concise explanations and modeling. Because student practice is evaluated in the revised indicator 7.2, “facilitating guided and independent practice” was removed to avoid duplicative scoring.

	• conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.		
--	---	--	--

76.2 Effective Instruction Student Practice in the Presentational Mode (Modern Languages, and ASL)

For modern languages and ASL, materials are designed to develop student proficiency in the presentational mode through ongoing, intentionally designed interpersonal tasks effective student practice.

Proposed New 7.2a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) consistently include presentational tasks that require students to: communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards the target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency: • develop ideas to address a prompt; • create messages considering audience and context; and • revise messages.	Materials consistently include presentational tasks that require students to: • develop ideas to address a prompt; • create messages considering audience and context; and • revise messages.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether student practice helps students build proficiency in the presentational skills required in explicit instruction (i.e., 7.1b). While the draft version required materials require student practice in “presentational communication skills,” this revised guidance statement explicitly names those skills (similarly to 7.1b) in response to stakeholder feedback that the broad term “presentational communication skills” was not clear.

Proposed New 7.2b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) pPresentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include opportunities for students to practice communicating in the presentational mode through: tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • practice with a variety of activities communicative tasks (e.g., brochure infographic, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement, vlog); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	Presentational tasks in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: • functions; • contexts; • text types; and • language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating student practice in alignment with the target proficiency level to ensure student practice is within students' zone of proximal development. As for 7.1c, the specific dimensions of presentational task performance (i.e., functions, contexts, text types, language control) was added for more precise evaluation of alignment of practice to the target proficiency level.

Proposed New 7.2c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned language in draft rubric)	<u>Presentation tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.</u>	Presentation tasks in each unit are aligned to instruction.	This new guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether student practice aligns to instruction (i.e., the interpersonal skills explicitly taught).

Proposed New 7.2d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective <u>include opportunities for</u> students to practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communicationg in the presentational mode through a variety of communicative tasks. <u>skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency.</u> Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include opportunities for students to practice communicating in the presentational mode through a variety of communicative tasks.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether students have opportunities to practice in the presentational mode with a variety of tasks. “Communicative tasks” replaced “activities” to emphasize the communicative purpose of the communication, as opposed to scripted dialogue.

Proposed New 7.2e

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include provide effective students to practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) in the presentational communication skills mode, that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: • guided practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); and • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and; • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency; • independent practice.	Materials include student practice in the presentational mode that gradually releases students to increasing levels of responsibility, including: • guided practice; and • independent practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have practice that gradually releases them to independence, including guided and independent practice.

Proposed New 7.2f

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) in the presentational mode, including communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice in each unit with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced practice; and • interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in the presentational mode, including: • practice in each unit; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have ongoing practice throughout the course to advance their skills towards the target proficiency level. In response to stakeholder feedback requesting clarity about what is meant by “sufficient” practice, the indicator guidance statement language was revised to specify students should practice in the presentational mode “in each unit.” While interpretive and interpersonal tasks are required in each lesson cycle, the frequency of presentational tasks is only within each unit to reflect the balance of student expectations in TEKS. The presentational mode has the fewest number of TEKS across the modes.

Proposed New 7.2g

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2b) Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials provide effective student practice on spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational communication skills that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • practice with a variety of activities (e.g., brochure, review, proposal, narrative, podcast, public service announcement); • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice (meaning and form); and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency <u>in the presentational mode.</u>	Materials include educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency in the presentational mode.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether materials include explanatory feedback on proficiency as student practice in the presentational mode.

7.36.2 Effective Instruction Performance-Based Assessment in the Presentational Mode (Modern Languages, and ASL)

Materials are designed to ~~evaluate student performance~~ ~~develop student proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) communication~~ in the presentational mode through ~~explicit instruction, effective practice, and~~ aligned assessments.

Proposed New 7.3a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials include Formative and summative assessments of student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) in the presentational mode in each unit skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: require students to: align to the target proficiency level; and align to instruction (meaning and form); collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments. develop ideas to address a prompt;	Materials include summative assessments of student performance in the presentational mode in each unit that require students to: - develop ideas to address a prompt; - create messages considering audience and context; and - revise messages.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether assessments are aligned to the presentational skills explicitly taught. While the draft version required materials assess “presentational skills,” this revised guidance statement explicitly names those skills (similarly to 7.1b, 7.2a) in response to stakeholder feedback that the broad term “presentational skills” was not clear. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement

	• create messages considering audience and context; and • revise messages.		focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, the revised guidance statement language clarifies that assessments are evaluating “student performance in the presentational mode,” not proficiency.
--	---	--	---

Proposed New 7.3b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials Summative assessments of student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) the presentational mode skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: align to the target proficiency level; align to instruction (meaning and form); collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments. <u>functions;</u> <u>contexts;</u> <u>text types; and</u> <u>language control.</u>	Summative assessments of student performance in the presentational mode in each unit are aligned to the target proficiency level for: - functions; - contexts; - text types; and - language control.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating whether assessments are aligned to the target proficiency level. As for 7.1c and 7.2b, the specific dimensions of interpersonal task performance (i.e., functions, contexts, text types, language control) was added for more precise evaluation of alignment of assessments to the target proficiency level. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that assessments are evaluating

			“student performance in the presentational mode,” not proficiency.
--	--	--	--

Proposed New 7.3c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials Summative assessments of student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) in the presentational mode in each unit are aligned to instruction. skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: align to the target proficiency level; align to instruction (meaning and form); collectively assess varying in levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity within each unit; and include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Summative assessments of student performance in the presentational mode in each unit are aligned to instruction.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether assessments evaluate the presentational communication skills addressed in instruction. In response to stakeholder feedback that “instructional assessments” was too broad and did not give enough guidance about which assessments to evaluate, the guidance statement was revised to specify the guidance statement focuses solely on summative assessments. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that summative assessments are evaluating “student performance in the interpretive mode,” not proficiency.

Proposed New 7.3d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(6.2c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: - align to the target proficiency level; - align to instruction (meaning and form); - collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; - collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials assess student performance and proficiency in spoken (modern languages), written (modern and classical languages), and expressive (ASL) presentational skills that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: align to the target proficiency level; align to instruction (meaning and form); collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and - include multiple formative assessments <u>in each unit to provide with feedback on student performance in the presentational mode prior to</u> summative assessments.	Materials include multiple formative assessments in each unit to provide feedback on student performance in the presentational mode prior to summative assessments.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 6.2c was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether the materials include multiple formative assessments before summative assessments. To ensure consistency in scoring, “in each unit” was added to clarify that within each unit students should have multiple formative assessments in the interpersonal mode. This ensures ongoing formative assessments for students to receive feedback and adjust performance ahead of a summative assessment. In response to stakeholder feedback that assessments do not need to evaluate performance and proficiency, revised guidance statement language clarifies that formative assessments are evaluating “student performance in the presentational mode,” not proficiency.

7.4 Communicating in the Presentational Mode in Classical Languages (Classical Languages)

Materials include opportunities for students to communicate about classical texts, cultures, or contexts in the presentational mode.

Proposed New 7.4a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(no aligned language in draft rubric)	<u>Materials include opportunities for students to produce written or spoken language to communicate about classical language texts, cultures, or contexts in the presentational mode.</u>	Materials include opportunities for students to produce written or spoken language to communicate about classical language texts, cultures, or contexts in the presentational mode.	In response to stakeholder feedback that the draft rubric too heavily weighted the presentational mode for classical languages, the guidance statements in 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3 were made not applicable for classical languages and 7.4 was created for a classical language specific evaluation approach to the presentational mode. Aligned to the expectation in the classical language TEKS that the presentational mode support the interpretive mode, this guidance statement evaluates whether materials provide opportunities for students to write or speak to communicate about the texts they process or the cultures and contexts necessary to understand classical texts. As such, this guidance statement situates presentational communication in service of the interpersonal mode.

87. Scripts in Non-Roman Writing Systems (Modern Languages with Non-Roman Writing Systems)

78.1 Scripts in Non-Roman Writing Systems

Materials ~~for non-Roman writing systems~~ are designed to develop student proficiency in ~~the composition, structure, and recognition of~~ script elements (e.g., characters ~~and radicals, symbols,~~ letters, ~~diacritics, position, or connecting forms~~) through ~~effective~~ explicit instruction and student, ~~effective~~ practice, ~~and aligned assessment~~.

Proposed New 8.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(7.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in composition, structure, and recognition of script elements that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction in composition, structure, and recognition of script elements, including how to that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level: Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • recognize script elements; • decode script elements; and • produce script elements. • providing concise explanations and modeling; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide explicit instruction in script elements, including how to: • recognize script elements; • decode script elements; and • produce script elements.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 7.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on more discretely identifying skills necessary for effective use of scripts in non-Roman writing systems. Supports for educator facilitation of instruction were taken out and evaluated in 8.1b to make the guidance statement more concise and focused aligned to stakeholder feedback. The draft language required explicit instruction in “composition, structure, and recognition.” These terms describe the visual properties of characters. Recognition, decoding, and production describe the cognitive skills needed to learn a non-Roman

			writing system. This revision to describe cognitive skills allows guidance statement language to be inclusive of non-character non-Roman writing systems. “Produce” was added to ensure practice in the creation of scripts (e.g., stroke order) requested in stakeholder feedback.
--	--	--	---

Proposed New 8.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(7.1a) Materials provide effective explicit instruction in composition, structure, and recognition of script elements that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials provide effective explicit instruction in composition, structure, and recognition of script elements that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator facilitation guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for <u>providing effective explicit instruction in script elements, including guidance for:</u> • providing concise explanations and modeling; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding; and • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in script elements, including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 7.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on discretely identifying educator-facing supports for facilitating explicit instruction in recognizing, decoding, and producing script elements.

Proposed New 8.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(7.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on composition, structure, and recognition of script elements that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and interleaved practice; and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing provide effective student practice on composition, structure, and recognition of in script elements, including that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. Materials include: • sufficient independent practice in each unit; to advance towards target proficiency; including • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice, and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in script elements, including: • practice in each unit; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 7.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have enough practice to grow their skills in recognizing, decoding, and producing script elements. In response to stakeholder feedback that the term “sufficient” was unclear, the revised guidance statement makes clear that students should practice script elements “in each unit.”

Proposed Revision to 8.1d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(7.1c) Materials assess student performance of and proficiency in composition, structure, and recognition of script elements that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction; • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	(Materials assess student performance of and proficiency in composition, structure, and recognition of script elements that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction; • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	(removed from proposed rubric)	This guidance statement was removed based on stakeholder feedback that this should be evaluated in the context of the modes of communication as opposed to stand-alone assessments.

89. Signs in American Sign Language (ASL)

89.1 Signs in American Sign Language (ASL)

Materials ~~for ASL~~ are designed to develop student proficiency in sign language structure, including the use of sign parameters (e.g., handshape, location, movement, palm-orientation, non-manual markers), three-dimensional space (e.g., verb agreement, directionality, compare and contrast concepts, referencing, organizing information), and classifiers through effective explicit instruction, ~~effective and student~~ practice, ~~and aligned assessment~~.

Proposed New 9.1a

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(8.1a) Materials consistently provide effective explicit instruction on the use of sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers aligned to the target proficiency level that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials consistently provide effective explicit instruction <u>in sign language structure, on the use of sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers aligned to the target proficiency level including the use of:</u> • <u>sign parameters;</u> • <u>three-dimensional space; and</u> • <u>classifiers.</u> that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • conducting frequent checks for understanding;	Materials provide explicit instruction in sign language structure, including the use of: • sign parameters; • three-dimensional space; and • classifiers.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 8.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on evaluating explicit instruction for the discrete skills for sign language structure (i.e., sign parameters, three-dimensional space, classifiers). Supports for educator facilitation of instruction were taken out and evaluated in 8.1b to make the guidance statement more concise and focused aligned to stakeholder feedback.

	• facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.		
--	---	--	--

Proposed New 9.1b

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(8.1a) Materials consistently provide effective explicit instruction on the use of sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers aligned to the target proficiency level that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds) for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; • conducting frequent checks for understanding; • facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and • providing immediate specific feedback.	Materials consistently provide effective explicit instruction on the use of sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers aligned to the target proficiency level that gradually releases students to increasing levels of cognitive and linguistic responsibility aligned to the target proficiency level. Materials include educator <u>facilitation</u> <u>guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in sign language structure (i.e., sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers), including guidance (e.g., facilitation notes, sample scripts, questions, sample educator–student and student–student interactions, common student misconceptions, suggested scaffolds)</u> for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; <u>and</u> • conducting frequent checks for understanding; <u>and</u> • <u>facilitating guided practice and independent practice; and</u> • <u>providing immediate specific feedback.</u>	Materials include educator facilitation guidance for providing effective explicit instruction in sign language structure (i.e., sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers), including guidance for: • providing concise explanations and modeling; and • conducting frequent checks for understanding.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 8.1a was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on discretely identifying educator-facing support for facilitating effective instruction in ASL signs.

Proposed New 9.1c

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(8.1b) Materials provide effective student practice on the use of sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. The materials include: • sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including spaced and • interleaved practice; and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing provide effective student practice on the use of in sign language structure (i.e., sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers), including that have been explicitly taught to build proficiency. The materials include: • practice in each unit; sufficient independent practice to advance towards target proficiency, including • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.; and • educator guidance for providing explanatory feedback on proficiency.	Materials include frequent and ongoing student practice in sign language structure (i.e., sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers), including: • practice in each unit; • spaced practice; and • interleaved practice.	In response to stakeholder feedback that draft guidance statement 8.1b was too dense, distinct evaluative criteria were pulled out into separate guidance statements. This revised guidance statement focuses on whether students have enough practice to grow their skills in sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers. In response to stakeholder feedback that the term “sufficient” was unclear, the revised guidance statement makes clear that students should practice input processing “in each unit.”

Proposed Revision to 9.1d

Draft Guidance Statement	Redline	Proposed Guidance Statement	Rationale
(8.1c) Materials assess student performance and proficiency in the use of sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction; • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	Materials assess student performance and proficiency in the use of sign parameters, three-dimensional space, and classifiers that have been explicitly taught to monitor progress. Materials include instructional assessments that: • align to the target proficiency level; • align to instruction; • collectively assess varying levels of cognitive and linguistic complexity; • collectively gather data on performance and proficiency; and • include multiple formative assessments with feedback before summative assessments.	(removed from proposed rubric)	This guidance statement was removed based on stakeholder feedback that this should be evaluated in the context of the modes of communication as opposed to stand-alone assessments.