



**tesol** international  
association

**Advancing Excellence in English Language Teaching**

---

# Overview of the Common Core State Standards Initiatives for ELLs

**A TESOL Issue Brief  
March 2013**

# Overview of the Common Core State Standards Initiatives for ELLs

A new chapter in the era of standards-based education in the United States began with the creation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiative in 2009. Although states have been required by law to have content-area standards for education since the 1990s, the CCSS initiative will create more commonality among content-area standards for those states that have agreed to adopt the CCSS.

At the time of their initial publication, the CCSS did not include a correlating set of English language proficiency development (ELPD) standards for students learning English. Since then, several related initiatives that address the role of English language proficiency have been started. The purpose of this issue brief is to provide a comprehensive overview of the policies behind the CCSS and to outline some of the initiatives now in place to address the needs of English language learners (ELLs) in relation to the CCSS.

## Brief History of the Standards Movement

The 1983 report “A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform” ushered in the standards movement in education in the United States. Written by the Commission on Excellence in Education, the report decried a steady decline in student performance. Recognizing that the education system represented a patchwork of expectations for students, proponents of the standards movement pushed for more coherent policies. For the first time, the federal government lent its support to standards-based reform in education. A wave of reforms followed, incorporating their way into reauthorizations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1994 (the [Improving America’s Schools Act](#)) and in 2001 (the [No Child Left Behind Act](#) or NCLB). Although NCLB is credited with unveiling large disparities in educational outcomes among and within states, the law as written did not produce the results it intended, namely to raise proficiency levels for all.

Also, beginning in 1997 the [Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development](#) (OECD) developed and administered [international tests](#) allowing countries to compare the performance of their students against an international benchmark. Although the best students in the United States have consistently scored among the highest performing international students, those experiencing difficulty in school and living in poverty have scored consistently lower than their international peers, keeping the overall performance of the United States at or below average among countries participating in those assessments. This persistent achievement gap within U.S. schools has also motivated proponents of standards-based education.

Many argue that for the United States to be competitive in today’s global economy, students in U.S. schools must lead in educational performance. Advocates of the CCSS describe how the standards were developed based on international learning outcomes from the highest performing countries. They argue that the CCSS will raise the bar for U.S. graduates, making them competitive not only in the domestic workforce but also on an international level.

Holding all students to the same expectations is one of the main drivers behind the CCSS, the most recent chapter in standards-based education reform. Unlike previous reform efforts, the CCSS represent state education policy leaders working collectively to improve the educational attainment of all students. Because U.S. education is widely accepted to be a function of the individual states, this new policy holds more promise than others in the past.

## Development of the CCSS

In June 2009 the [Council of Chief State School Officers \(CCSSO\)](#) and the [National Governors Association \(NGA\)](#) announced that they would be working together to establish a set of common standards for states. Working with a large number of supporting education groups, NGA and CCSSO created several committees and working groups that collaboratively drafted mathematics and English language arts standards that were publicly released, in draft form, in June 2010. Many education groups and associations (including [TESOL International Association](#)) provided feedback and comments, and joined the vast majority of states in support of these efforts.

The resulting standards define the knowledge and skills that students should gain as they progress from kindergarten through Grade 12 to ensure that they will graduate from high school with the ability to succeed in introductory-level, credit-bearing academic college courses and in the workplace. As the mathematics and English language arts standards were finalized, states were given the option to adopt them. The Obama administration has been supportive of a common set of standards. Under U.S. law, the federal government cannot institute a national curriculum or national standards. The administration embedded support for such standards in the guidelines for states applying for grants under the federal [Race to the Top Fund \(RTTT\)](#). Specifically, states that chose to adopt “college- and career-ready” standards were eligible to compete for RTTT funds.

Agreement to adopt the standards means that a state agrees to use them for at least 85% of its standards in mathematics and English language arts. Each state will develop its own process for setting and measuring standards and has 3 years to do so. To date, all but five states have agreed to adopt the new standards; Alaska, Virginia, Montana, Nebraska, and Texas have opted out. (U.S. Territories Puerto Rico and American Samoa have similarly decided not to adopt the CCSS.) In addition, Minnesota has agreed to adopt only the English language arts standards.

## Next Generation Science Standards

In July 2011, the [National Research Council \(NRC\)](#) unveiled [A Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas](#). This document marked the first step in a cooperative effort with the [National Science Teachers Association](#), the [American Association for the Advancement of Science](#), and [Achieve](#) to develop common science standards for states to adopt. Developed by an 18-member committee of scientists and experts in education, the report identifies key scientific ideas and exercises that high school graduates should know and be able to do related to life science, physical science, earth and space science, and engineering.

Using the framework as the foundation, the second step was the development of draft science standards. A first draft of the [Next Generation Science Standards](#) (NGSS) was released in May 2012, and the education stakeholders (including [TESOL International Association](#)) were invited to submit comments. A [second draft](#) was released in January 2013, with a final draft expected in mid-2013. Funding for the project is being provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, a major sponsor of the CCSS initiative, and several other foundations.

Although the NGSS effort is not technically part of the CCSS Initiative, it is hoped that when the final science standards are completed, they will be voluntarily adopted by states. Advocates for other disciplines, such as civics, social studies, and the arts, are determining where they and their stakeholders fit in this process.

## ELL Demographics

Before shifting focus to how ELLs fit into the CCSS initiative, the sheer numbers of ELLs must be examined. In the decade between the 1997–1998 and 2008–2009 school years, the number of ELLs in public schools increased by 51%, while the general population of students grew by just 7% (see [Center for American Progress, 2012](#)). ELLs are the fastest growing population in U.S. public schools. Close to 6 million ELLs are enrolled in public schools—an increase of more than 100% since 1991, when there were 2.4 million ELLs enrolled. Today, 1 in 10 students is an ELL; by 2025 it is predicted that ELLs will make up 25% of the student population ([National Education Association](#)). This is a dramatic increase; no other student population has experienced this amount of growth. The increasing number of ELLs in the U.S. public school system today—along with the attendant questions on educational achievement—will have an impact on every school as it implements the CCSS.

## What the CCSS Mean for ELLs and Their Teachers

When the Common Core State Standards were published in 2010, the developers acknowledged in a brief addendum that the needs of ELLs should be taken into account in the CCSS implementation. However, beyond providing some general information and suggestions for ELLs, the developers initially left the question of how to implement the standards for this student population up to the states.

Recognizing the need for guidance and resources in this area, Stanford University launched a privately funded initiative led by Kenji Hakuta in 2012 called the [Understanding Language Project](#). The mission of this project is to heighten educator awareness of the critical role that language plays in the CCSS and the NGSS. Although the historical paradigm of teaching content and language to ELLs focused mainly on vocabulary and grammar, the Understanding Language Project emphasizes that the new paradigm of the CCSS requires teachers to teach content and language by focusing on such language constructs as discourse, complex text, explanation, argumentation, purpose, typical structure of text, sentence structures, and vocabulary practices. According to the experts at the Understanding Language Project, ELLs' success in terms of the CCSS requires a different kind of collaboration at all levels, including students, teachers, site and district leaders, state leaders, pre- and in-service providers, test makers, publishers, and funders.

## CCSS Shifts and Teacher Expertise Needed for ELLs

According to [Achieve the Core](#), the CCSS are grounded by three overarching shifts each in mathematics and English language arts, which are listed in left column of Table 1. However, teachers of ELLs need to examine these shifts further in order to determine what the shifts might mean for ELLs and those who teach them. The table shows the continuum of expertise, according to Achieve the Core, that teachers will need to develop to ensure that ELLs with varying levels of first language literacy, background knowledge, and English language proficiency can achieve the CCSS.

**Table 1. English Language Arts/Literacy CCSS Shifts and English Language Teacher Expertise**

| Shift  | To address this shift, teachers of ELLs must be able to...  |
|--|---|
| <b>Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess and build ELLs' background knowledge about the content and structure of nonfiction text</li> <li>• Integrate ELLs' background knowledge and culture into instruction</li> <li>• Teach ELLs differences between structure of informational text and literary text</li> <li>• Know and use ELLs' first-language reading literacy skills as a support as appropriate</li> <li>• Adapt/supplement grade-level complex texts for ELLs at lower levels of English language proficiency</li> <li>• Collaborate to share effective strategies for teaching ELLs using nonfiction</li> <li>• Scaffold and support instruction using nonfiction for ELLs</li> <li>• Design appropriate classroom assessments so that ELLs can demonstrate what they know and can do</li> <li>• Use English language proficiency standards to support instruction</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from both literary and informational text</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build on students' background and cultures; build background where necessary on using evidence from different types of text</li> <li>• Create appropriate text-dependent questions for students at different levels of English language proficiency</li> <li>• Teach ELLs the academic language necessary so that they can use evidence from literary and informational text in reading, speaking, listening, and writing</li> <li>• Provide ELLs with linguistic structures so that they can use evidence, cite sources, avoid plagiarism, synthesize information from grade-level complex text, and create argumentative/persuasive speech and writing</li> <li>• Create and use scaffolding and supports so that ELLs at different levels of English language proficiency can take part in meaningful conversations and writing using complex text</li> <li>• Design appropriate classroom assessments for ELLs at different levels of English language proficiency</li> <li>• Collaborate to share effective strategies for teaching ELLs to cite evidence when writing and speaking</li> <li>• Use English language proficiency standards to support instruction</li> </ul> |
| <b>Regular practice with complex text and its academic language</b>                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze complex texts and make ELLs aware of academic language found in complex texts</li> <li>• Choose and adapt supplementary texts in English and/or ELLs' first language based on ELLs' reading level, English language proficiency level, background, and culture</li> <li>• Teach ELLs strategies to guess unknown words (e.g., cognates, prefixes, roots, suffixes)</li> <li>• Teach the meanings of words with multiple definitions, idiomatic expressions, and technical terms</li> <li>• Explicitly teach the academic language necessary to comprehend complex texts so that ELLs can draw on these texts to speak and write across content areas</li> <li>• Collaborate to share effective strategies for teaching ELLs the academic language they need to access complex text</li> <li>• Use English language proficiency standards to support instruction</li> </ul>   |

Note. Table adapted by Diane Staehr Fenner from Student Achievement Partners. (2012). Description of Common Core shifts. Retrieved from [http://www.achievethecore.org/downloads/E0702\\_Description\\_of\\_the\\_Common\\_Core\\_Shifts.pdf](http://www.achievethecore.org/downloads/E0702_Description_of_the_Common_Core_Shifts.pdf)

## What Content Assessments Are Being Developed for the CCSS?

Under federal policy guidelines, states are required to adopt new assessment benchmarks to measure student achievement of college- and career-ready standards. Formal CCSS-based assessment is scheduled to begin during the 2014–2015 school year, which is also the year that most states have agreed to complete implementation of the CCSS. To support the development of new assessments for all students aligned to the CCSS, the U.S. Department of Education awarded funds to two consortia of states in September 2010. Per the grant guidelines, the content assessments are required to

- be valid and reliable
- support and inform instruction
- provide accurate information about what students know and can do, and
- measure student achievement against standards designed to ensure that all students gain the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and the workplace

The two consortia, the [Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers \(PARCC\)](#) and the [Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium \(SBAC\)](#), each received 4-year grants of approximately \$170 million each to develop new CCSS-aligned assessments. Part of this work requires designing assessments that accommodate ELLs and students with disabilities. The PARCC and SBAC assessments, in development now, are expected to be ready for states to administer during the 2014–2015 school year. (For detailed PARCC and SBAC time lines, see Appendix A.)

Throughout the development period for these assessments, each consortium has published drafts and sample items. For example, SBAC has released [sample items and performance tasks](#) to illustrate and prepare teachers for the types of questions that will be asked on the assessment. PARCC has also shared [test item samples and task prototypes](#) for its assessment. In addition, each consortium has engaged with stakeholders in different ways, such as through conducting focus groups and eliciting feedback on published drafts. Both PARCC and SBAC are conducting pilot tests of their assessments during the 2012–2013 school year, with field testing the following school year.

## How Will This Assessment of Content Affect ELLs?

Recognizing that all students will be required to participate in their assessments, both SBAC and PARCC have taken steps in the development phase to ensure that ELLs' needs are addressed. At an organizational level, both groups have appointed panels of experts on second language acquisition to advise on test item development. For example, PARCC has appointed the [Accessibility, Accommodations, and Fairness Technical Working Group](#), which includes many experts on ELLs and second language acquisition. Similarly, SBAC has appointed an [English Language Learners Advisory Committee](#), comprising national experts in ELL assessment, bilingual education, and language acquisition, to provide feedback and guidance on developing the assessment. Some national experts, such as Kenji Hakuta, are serving on both panels.

### States in Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)

|                      |               |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Alabama*             | Massachusetts |
| Arizona              | Mississippi   |
| Arkansas             | New Jersey    |
| Colorado             | New Mexico    |
| District of Columbia | New York      |
| Florida              | North Dakota* |
| Georgia              | Ohio          |
| Illinois             | Oklahoma      |
| Indiana              | Pennsylvania* |
| Kentucky             | Rhode Island  |
| Louisiana            | Tennessee     |
| Maryland             |               |

\*Advisory states in both PARCC and SBAC

### States in Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)

|             |                |
|-------------|----------------|
| Alabama*    | New Hampshire  |
| California  | North Carolina |
| Connecticut | North Dakota*  |
| Delaware    | Oregon         |
| Hawaii      | Pennsylvania*  |
| Idaho       | South Carolina |
| Iowa        | South Dakota   |
| Kansas      | Vermont        |
| Maine       | Washington     |
| Michigan    | West Virginia  |
| Missouri    | Wisconsin      |
| Montana     | Wyoming        |
| Nevada      |                |

\*Advisory states in both PARCC and SBAC

One of the most significant issues facing both consortia is the alignment of state policies concerns ELLs to the CCSS assessments. As set forth by the regulations for the federal grants each group has received, the states participating in the consortia must have a common definition for identifying ELLs and agreement on the testing accommodation policies for them. The definitions of ELLs and the types of accommodations used by states vary widely, so establishing this consensus in and of itself is a major undertaking.

Because the assessments being developed by PARCC and SBAC will be administered by computer, both consortia are exploring technology-based accommodations, such as pop-up glossaries and captions for audio. To ensure the widest accessibility to the test items, PARCC is applying the principles of [Universal Design for Learning](#) in the development for its assessments. SBAC has taken the step of publishing resources and literature reviews on [assessment issues for special populations](#) to guide its work and is seeking ELL populations to participate in pilot testing in early 2013.

## English Language Proficiency Development Standards and the Common Core

---

When the CCSS were initially published, the authors indicated that the question of English language proficiency development (ELPD) standards would be left up to the states and that a common set of ELPD standards would not be published. However, the need for resources and guidance in helping states link their ELPD standards to the CCSS soon became clear. In September 2012, the Council of Chief State School Officers released an [English language proficiency development framework](#) to assist states in revising their ELPD standards so that they correspond to the CCSS and the Next Generation Science Standards.

Written by leading experts on English language learning and the lead writers of the CCSS, the goal of the framework is to delineate the language practices that all ELLs must acquire in order to successfully meet the CCSS. Aimed at state education leaders, the framework outlines the language demands of the CCSS and NGSS and provides a protocol for determining the degree of alignment between the framework and a state's current ELPD standards (or those under development). Although the framework does not offer a specific set of ELPD standards or give pedagogical recommendations, it does highlight how language instruction throughout the four domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) can be utilized while adhering to the CCSS and NGSS.

Many states have already begun revising their ELPD standards to correspond to the CCSS. For example, California has just adopted newly created [English language development standards](#) that correspond to the CCSS. As of February 2013, 31 states and territories belong to the [World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment](#) consortium (WIDA), which has released a new edition of amplified English language development standards that illustrate the academic language that teachers need to use while implementing the CCSS.

## English Language Proficiency Development Assessments Aligned to CCSS

Recognizing the need for ELPD standards to correspond to the CCSS, the U.S. Department of Education has provided grants to two state-led consortia to develop the next generation of

### States in Assessment Services Supporting ELs through Technology Systems (ASSETS) Consortium

|                      |                |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Alabama              | New Mexico     |
| Delaware             | North Carolina |
| District of Columbia | North Dakota   |
| Idaho                | Oklahoma       |
| Illinois             | Pennsylvania   |
| Maine                | Rhode Island   |
| Maryland             | South Carolina |
| Massachusetts        | South Dakota   |
| Minnesota            | Tennessee      |
| Mississippi          | Utah           |
| Missouri             | Vermont        |
| Montana              | Virginia       |
| Nevada               | Wisconsin      |
| New Hampshire        | Wyoming        |
| New Jersey           |                |

ELPD assessments. According to the provisions of the grants, these new assessments must measure students' proficiency against a set of commonly held ELPD standards that correspond to a set of college- and career-ready standards in English language arts and mathematics. In addition to producing results that are valid, reliable, and fair for its intended purpose, the new assessment system had to meet additional criteria:

- be based on a common definition of *English language learner* adopted by all consortium states
- include diagnostic (e.g., screener, placement) and summative assessments
- assess English language proficiency across the four language domains (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) for each grade level from kindergarten through Grade 12
- produce results that indicate whether individual students have attained a level and complexity of English language proficiency that is necessary to participate fully in academic instruction in English
- be accessible to all ELLs with the exception of those who are eligible for alternate assessments based on alternate academic standards
- use technology to the maximum extent appropriate to develop, administer, and score assessments

## ASSETS

The first such ELPD assessment grant was awarded in 2011 to a consortium led by the [Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction](#), in collaboration with the WIDA consortium. The new system is called [Assessment Services Supporting ELs through Technology Systems \(ASSETS\)](#). Assisting with the development of the assessment are several organizations, including [WestEd](#), the [Center for Applied Linguistics](#), and the [University of California, Los Angeles](#), along with 30 states.

According to the WIDA consortium, the ASSETS assessment is, in fact, a complete system that will include a summative language assessment, an on-demand diagnostic screener, classroom interim assessments, and formative assessment tools for use in instruction. The system will be leveraged on the work of the WIDA consortium and will include professional development materials for teachers. The assessment is scheduled to be operational by the 2015–2016 school year. (For a detailed ASSETS time line, see Appendix A.)

## ELPA21

The second grant was awarded in September 2012 to a consortium of states led by Oregon. Working in collaboration with CCSSO and Stanford University, the [English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century \(ELPA21\)](#) consortium is developing the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century. Similar to the ASSETS consortium, ELPA21's goal is to develop an assessment system to gauge English language proficiency based on ELPD standards that correspond to the CCSS.

According to [preliminary information](#) available at the time of this writing, the work of the ELPA21 consortium will focus on developing a screener/diagnostic form and two summative assessments to be used by states for their ELLs. In addition, the consortium will begin

### States in English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA 21) Consortium

|           |                |
|-----------|----------------|
| Oregon    | Nebraska       |
| Florida   | Ohio           |
| Arkansas  | South Carolina |
| Iowa      | Washington     |
| Kansas    | West Virginia  |
| Louisiana |                |

Note. California was originally a member of the ELPA 21 consortium, but withdrew in February 2013

developing interim benchmark assessments, supporting professional development, and providing recommendations on formative assessment practices; however, work on these elements will not be completed under the resources of the grant. The new assessment will be fully operational by the 2015–2016 school year. (For a detailed ELPA21 time line, see Appendix A.)

## The Role of ESL and Bilingual Teachers

English as a second language (ESL) and bilingual education teachers in particular have a critical role to play in this new phase of educational reform. As the number of ELLs increases, particularly in states and communities affected by rapid demographic changes, ESL and bilingual teachers are well equipped to assist their content-area colleagues in charting this new territory for ELLs as defined by the CCSS.

In the history of education reform, teachers are too often an afterthought, which holds especially true for teachers who instruct ELLs. Yet the success of any educational policy hinges on its implementation. Policymakers are right to push for more rigorous standards, but without a robust effort to build all teachers' capacity to teach ELLs, these students will not succeed.

In moving ahead with the implementation of the CCSS, states, districts, and schools must consider their capacity to address the needs of ELLs and the teachers who serve them. Specifically, stakeholders at state, district, and school levels should discuss the following:

- How are content-area teachers and general education teachers being prepared to work with ELLs as they implement the CCSS?
- What teaching skills are required to help ELLs successfully meet the CCSS?
- How has the role of ESL and bilingual educators during the implementation of the CCSS been defined in schools and districts?
- How are ESL and bilingual educators being prepared to work with the CCSS?
- What do ESL and bilingual educators need in order to successfully implement the CCSS?
- How are future teachers being prepared to work with the CCSS in diverse classrooms?

## TESOL's Role in the Implementation of the CCSS for ELLs

TESOL International Association has played an active role in the standards-based reform movement in the United States, and its work has served as the foundation for standards impacting all aspects of English language instruction. However, the best policies and standards will not ensure excellence without highly qualified educators and specialists, which is especially true for the field of English language instruction.

In support of its mission to advance professional expertise in English language teaching and learning for speakers of other languages worldwide, TESOL will continue to support all educators who work with ELLs and to provide specialized programming for those working with college- and career-ready standards, such as the CCSS. The association will also continue to advance the field by examining policies and practices and offering guidance on teacher education and preparation. TESOL will also continue to support ELLs and their teachers through its advocacy work.

## Conclusion

International tests like the OECD Performance of International Student Assessment show that a nation's academic ranking is not static. Some countries have dramatically improved their students' academic performance, while others' performance has remained the same or decreased. The United States has the capability to improve its academic standing, provided it is able to narrow or close the wide achievement gaps that currently exist in its schools. The CCSS represents a robust strategy to improve the academic performance of all students, including the growing number of ELLs. But to be successful, the policy must engage teachers in a meaningful and productive way.

The CCSS represent a paradigm shift in education. By including all domains of language acquisition across content areas and requiring use of complex texts and rigorous academic language, the CCSS represent both an opportunity and a significant challenge for ELLs and their teachers. Much of the work under way for ELLs holds great promise. However, implementation of the CCSS ultimately will occur in the classroom, so significant resources and professional development for teachers are needed, especially for those working with the growing number of ELLs.

As the population of ELLs continues to grow in the United States, it is vital that states and districts focus more attention on effectively preparing educators to serve the distinct needs of this population. The shifts in the CCSS present a new paradigm in instruction, especially for ELLs. Educators who are specially trained in aspects of second language acquisition are more important than ever, so policymakers and administrators must not overlook the critical expertise they bring.

The stakes are high for all who will implement CCSS in the education system. For all students in the United States to succeed, all educators must now share the responsibility for teaching ELLs.

## Appendix A. Assessment Consortia Time Lines

### PARCC

**2010–11:** Launch and design phase

**2011–12:** Development begins

**2012–13:** First year pilot/field testing and related research and data collection

**2013–14:** Second year pilot/field testing and related research and data collection

**2014–15:** Full operational administration of PARCC assessments

**Summer 2015:** Set achievement levels, including college-ready performance levels

Taken from <http://www.parcconline.org/parcc-timeline>

### SBAC Time Line

**Fall 2011:** Content specifications in mathematics and English language arts/literacy developed

**Spring 2012:** Computer adaptive testing specifications developed and exemplar items and tasks released

**Spring/Summer 2012:** Pilot items and tasks developed

**Fall 2012:** Field test items and tasks developed

**Early 2013:** Development of exemplar instructional modules across grades in ELA/literacy and online professional learning materials

**Winter/Spring 2013:** Pilot test of summative and interim assessment items and performance tasks

**Spring 2013:** Pilot test scoring

**Summer/Fall 2013:** Field test items and tasks are reviewed for content and bias/sensitivity

**Spring 2014:** Field test and scoring of summative and interim assessment items and performance tasks

**Fall 2014:** Assessments and digital library ready for use by states

**Spring 2015:** States administer summative assessment during last 12 weeks of the school year

**Summer 2015:** Final achievement standards for the summative assessment verified and adopted

Adapted from <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/timeline/>

### ASSETS Time Line

- 2011–12: Development
- 2012–13: Pilot testing
- 2013–14: Field testing
- 2014–15: Operationalization
- 2015–16: Fully operational

### ELPA 21 Time Line

- Spring 2013: Multistate English Language Proficiency Assessment Standards
- Fall 2013: Item bank platform
- Spring 2014: Field test forms
- Fall 2015: Final summative and diagnostic test forms
- Summer 2015: Performance (benchmark) standards, weighting, cut scores
- Winter 2014: Report templates
- Spring 2013: Data protocols
- Spring 2014: Professional development field tests, including ELPA21 scoring certification course
- Fall 2015: Final professional development materials
- Summer 2015: Media package

Taken from <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/learning-the-language/ELPA21Narrative.pdf>

## Appendix B. State Participation in Assessment Consortia as of February 2013

The majority of states are participating in more than one assessment consortia. The following table is provided to illustrate the cross-section of state participation.

|                          |                        | Academic Assessment Consortia                         |   |             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---|---|-------------|
| ELP Assessment Consortia | ASSETS                 | PARCC   | SBAC  | Independent |
|                          |                        | AL*, CO, DC, IL, MA, MD, MS, NJ, NM, ND*, OK, PA*, RI | AL*, DE, HI, ME, MO, MT, NV, NH, NC, ND*, PA*, SD, VT, WI, WY | MN, VA      |
|                          | ELPA 21                | AR, FL, LA, OH  | IA, KS, OR, SC, WA, WV  | NE          |
| Independent              | AZ, GA, IN, KY, NY, TN | CA, CT, ID, MI  | AK, TX, UT  |             |

\*Advisory states in both PARCC and SBAC.

## TESOL Issue Briefs

TESOL Issue Briefs summarize education issues in the United States and other countries that affect English language learners, educators, and the field of English language teaching.

TESOL International Association > 1925 Ballenger Ave. Suite 550 > Alexandria, VA 22314 > Main +1 703.836.0774 > Direct +1 703.518.2512 > FAX +1 703.836.7864 > [www.TESOL.org](http://www.TESOL.org)

Copyright © 2013 by TESOL International Association



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 444 Castro Street, Suite 900, Mountain View, California, 94041, USA.

To cite this paper, please use the following format:

TESOL International Association. (2013, March). *Overview of the Common Core State Standards Initiatives for ELLs*. Alexandria, VA: Author.