

# Academic Language Development Implementation Rubric



This rubric is designed with teachers in mind for self-reflection in their practice and planning. Administrators can use the rubric to provide a point of discussion and feedback associated with classroom visitations. The indicators under each heading serve to create a common language and shared understanding about how academic language development is used to determine student progress toward content mastery by articulating understandings of new knowledge through comprehensible input (listening and reading), scaffolded output (writing and speaking), and structured interactions. It is recommended that users of the rubric highlight or circle indicators that best describe what is being observed in the classroom. The indicators are set out on a continuum, recognizing that implementation will deepen over time as teachers learn more about the purposes of embedding explicit academic language development into content teaching and its potential to enhance student learning.

	<b><u>Emerging Implementation</u></b> At the emerging level, the teacher is aware of the linguistic needs of their students and is exploring ways to improve language development practices.	<b><u>Approaching Implementation</u></b> At the approaching level, systems are in place to further academic language development, but implementation is generally teacher-centered.	<b><u>Developed Implementation</u></b> At the developed level, established instructional routines are in place to further academic language development; the teacher elicits student engagement and ownership of their own language development.
<b>INPUT: Listening and Reading</b>  <i>Practice Overview: When designing lessons for students, input- that is, what the students will read and hear- should be considered in terms of the cognitive and linguistic demands of upcoming content instruction. Linguistic demands of learning tasks come from the standard: what students will be required to DO with the knowledge. Language functions (purposes for speaking) are the cognitive tasks that drive us to connect thought and language. Text selection is also key. Texts should be thought of in the broadest sense as all medium of input from which students derive and process information. Therefore, “texts” include books, articles, videos, charts, models/visuals, guest speakers, interviews, etc. They are structured clearly and coherently and include vocabulary elaborated through context, visuals which support main ideas, subtitles/subheadings and guiding questions.</i>	Teacher <b>models</b> academic language by speaking in the <b>formal register</b> with compound complex sentences and word choices.	Teacher models academic language by speaking in the formal register, and provides <b>opportunities for students to practice</b> as well.	Teacher models academic language by speaking in the formal register, and <b>explicitly teaches</b> students how to move from the <b>informal to the formal for different settings</b> .
	In oral speech, teacher purposefully clarifies key vocabulary (bricks) by embedding some <b>context clues</b> .	In oral speech, teacher <b>purposefully amplifies</b> key vocabulary and concepts (both bricks and mortar) by embedding <b>context clues and/or clarification</b> .	In oral speech, teacher <b>frequently</b> and purposefully amplifies all key concepts (both bricks and mortar) by embedding <b>context clues and/or clarification</b> .
	<i>For example: “When we- meaning ourselves: teachers- teach students we should amplify-that is add more information, use synonyms, embed definitions, exaggerate tone, use facial expressions, and gestures- within the statements themselves.</i>		
	Language development is an <b>instructional routine</b> focused on content <b>vocabulary</b> (bricks).	Language development is an instructional routine focused on content vocabulary (bricks) and <i>may</i> include <b>functional language</b> (mortar).	Language development is an <b>established instructional routine</b> focused on <b>both</b> content vocabulary (bricks) and functional language (mortar).
Lesson design includes an <b>awareness of the language function</b> (purpose) being used in a given learning task.	Lesson design includes <b>explicit teaching</b> of the language function being used in a given learning task so that students can <b>identify language patterns</b> .	Students are able to identify the language function of a given task and effectively <b>manipulate language patterns</b> to successfully complete the task or assessment.	

# Academic Language Development Implementation Rubric



	<b><u>Emerging Implementation</u></b> At the emerging level, the teacher is aware of the linguistic needs of their students and is exploring ways to improve language development practices.	<b><u>Approaching Implementation</u></b> At the approaching level, systems are in place to further academic language development, but implementation is generally teacher-centered.	<b><u>Developed Implementation</u></b> At the developed level, established instructional routines are in place to further academic language development; the teacher elicits student engagement and ownership of their own language development.
<i>(Input continued)</i>	Text selection is based on the <b>rigorous, cognitive demands</b> of the content.	Text selection is based on the rigorous, cognitive demands of the content and may <b>consider the linguistic demands</b> of the learning task.	Text selection is based on the rigorous, <b>cognitive demands</b> of the content <b>and the linguistic demands</b> of the learning task. <i>For example, if students are going to create a compare and contrast diagram, they need to interact with a text that utilizes the language of comparing and contrasting.</i>
	Lessons are designed to improve listening and reading comprehension through <b>focused, accountable student-to-student discussion</b> tasks.	Lessons are designed to improve listening and reading comprehension through <b>frequent</b> and focused accountable student-to-student discussion tasks.	<b>Regular, frequent and focused</b> accountable student-to-student discussion tasks designed to improve listening and reading comprehension are part of the <b>established instructional routines</b> of the classroom.
<b>OUTPUT: Writing and Speaking</b>  <i>Practice Overview: In order to develop <b>communicative competence</b>- that is, writing and speaking- all students need daily supported opportunities to utilize academic language for <b>diverse purposes</b>. Like input, output should be considered in terms of the <b>cognitive and linguistic demands</b> of upcoming content instruction. Language support should be focused on equipping students to</i>	Teacher provides <b>open-ended questions</b> and requires students to engage in academic discourse within a small group.	Teacher provides open-ended, <b>inquiry-based questions</b> and requires students to engage in complex academic discourse within a small group <b>prior to</b> sharing responses with the larger group.	Students discuss both teacher and <b>student-generated</b> open-ended and inquiry-based questions, requiring students to engage in sophisticated academic discourse within a small group prior to sharing responses with the larger group.
	Lessons are designed to improve speaking and writing skills through <b>focused, accountable student-to-student discussion</b> tasks.	Lessons are designed to improve speaking and writing skills through <b>frequent</b> and focused accountable student-to-student discussion tasks and products.	<b>Regular, frequent and focused</b> accountable student-to-student discussion tasks designed to improve speaking and writing skills are part of the <b>established instructional routines</b> of the classroom.

# Academic Language Development Implementation Rubric



	<p><b><u>Emerging Implementation</u></b> At the emerging level, the teacher is aware of the linguistic needs of their students and is exploring ways to improve language development practices.</p>	<p><b><u>Approaching Implementation</u></b> At the approaching level, systems are in place to further academic language development, but implementation is generally teacher-centered.</p>	<p><b><u>Developed Implementation</u></b> At the developed level, established instructional routines are in place to further academic language development; the teacher elicits student engagement and ownership of their own language development.</p>	
<p><b><i>construct and express meaning.</i></b> <i>“Text” is separated into meaningful “chunks” and discussions are scaffolded to allow for annotations that question, anticipate, summarize, analyze, and synthesize. In order for new ideas to grow and for content information to be fully comprehended, students must have <b>ample and frequent opportunities to use language</b> to express thought in <b>structured</b> peer-to-peer interactions. As a general rule ideas should always be <b>written and spoken</b> to simultaneously build both oral and written communicative competence.</i></p>	<p>Students are <b>encouraged</b> to respond using <b>formal academic language</b> to express thinking.</p>	<p>Students are <b>required</b> to communicate (<b>ask questions</b> that deepen knowledge) using formal academic language to express their thinking.</p>	<p>Students are required to communicate (<b>ask questions</b> that deepen knowledge &amp; <b>make relevant connections</b> to previous knowledge) using <b>sophisticated</b> formal academic language to express their own thinking and <b>the thinking of others</b>.</p>	
	<p>Teacher <b>provides language frames</b> and sentence starters that are focused on <b>content</b> according to student language proficiency level targets.</p>	<p><b>Students use</b> language frames and sentence starters that are focused on content and that incorporate <b>high-level vocabulary</b> according to student language proficiency level targets.</p>	<p>Students use <b>differentiated</b> language frames and sentence starters that are focused on content and that incorporate high-level vocabulary according to student language proficiency level targets.</p>	<p><i>In other words, the teacher is providing resources that push students towards the “just-right, next level” of proficiency, that is to say, their zone of proximal development (ZPD).*</i></p>
	<p>Students use language frames and sentence starters (mortar) in conjunction with scaffolded instructional “tools” <b>to produce written and oral academic language</b>.</p>	<p>Students use language frames and sentence starters mortar in conjunction with scaffolded instructional “tools” to produce <i>written and oral academic language</i> that <b>connects concepts within the content</b>.</p>	<p>All <b>students effectively use sophisticated language frames</b> and sentence starters mortar in conjunction with scaffolded instructional “tools” to produce <i>written and oral academic language</i> that connects concepts within the content bricks and <b>extends higher-level thinking beyond the content (synthesis)</b>.</p>	
	<p>Teacher has an <b>established instructional routine</b> for <b>targeted academic writing</b> practice to improve written expression at the <b>sentence level</b>.</p>	<p>Teacher has an established instructional routine for targeted academic writing practice to improve written expression at the sentence and <b>paragraph</b> levels.</p>	<p>Teacher has an established instructional routine for <b>frequent</b>, targeted academic writing practice in order to improve written expression for <b>various purposes</b> (summarizing, generalizations, etc.) at the sentence, paragraph, and <b>essay</b> levels.</p>	

# Academic Language Development Implementation Rubric



	<p><b><u>Emerging Implementation</u></b> At the emerging level, the teacher is aware of the linguistic needs of their students and is exploring ways to improve language development practices.</p>	<p><b><u>Approaching Implementation</u></b> At the approaching level, systems are in place to further academic language development, but implementation is generally teacher-centered.</p>	<p><b><u>Developed Implementation</u></b> At the developed level, established instructional routines are in place to further academic language development; the teacher elicits student engagement and ownership of their own language development.</p>
<p><b>Structured Student Interactions</b></p> <p><i>Practice Overview: Students should have several opportunities for supported and accountable language production during a lesson and a wide array of mediated experiences over the course of a unit of study. In order for students to process information, students must engage in <b>structured interactions frequently</b> (roughly every 5-10 minutes). <b>Partner activities</b> (as opposed to group activities) offer students the greatest opportunity and frequency of language production. Daily language practice should be part of a <b>well-established instructional routine</b> so that students can move quickly into settings where they can write and speak in pairs and/or small groups. Additionally, teachers need to ensure that there is <b>adequate time</b> for individual reflection and preparation, <b>thorough modeling</b> of task and use of response frames, and <b>carefully assigned</b> partners/groups.</i></p>	<p>Teacher implements three step <b>structured tasks</b> with language frames for <i>some</i> phases of structured task.</p>	<p>Teacher <b>frequently</b> implements three step <b>structured tasks</b> with language frames for all three phases of structured task.</p>	<p>Teacher implements three step <b>structured tasks on a daily basis</b> with language frames for all three phases of structured task.</p>
	<p>Students are engaged in <b>structured interactions</b> where ultimately every student expresses their thinking and/or consensus of group through academic written and oral responses.</p>	<p>Students are engaged in <b>every phase</b> of the task in structured interactions where ultimately every student expresses their thinking and/or consensus of group through academic written and oral responses.</p>	<p>Students are engaged in every phase of the task by <b>alternating roles</b> in structured interactions where ultimately every student expresses their thinking and consensus of group through academic written and oral responses. <i>For example, a student first asks a question and on a later round will also have to answer one as well. All students would then be responsible for reporting to someone else.</i></p>
	<p>Students are <b>encouraged to take risks</b> by trying out new vocabulary and syntax, and <b>teacher constructively corrects</b> student misconceptions.</p>	<p>Students often <b>take risks</b> by trying out new vocabulary and syntax, and teacher <b>encourages students to constructively correct</b> one another when misconceptions occur.</p>	<p>Students willingly <b>take risks</b> while appropriating new vocabulary, syntax, and <b>concepts</b> and constructively correct one another when misconceptions occur.</p>
	<p><b>Minimal or excessive</b> processing time is provided for students to develop ideas, so students do not fully engage in the task or become off-task.</p>	<p>Teacher plans for and provides <b>adequate</b> processing time for students to develop ideas thereby allowing students to fully engage in the task.</p>	<p>Teacher has <b>systems in place</b> to plan, anticipate, and monitor adequate processing time for students to develop ideas thereby allowing students to fully engage in the task.</p>
<p><i>Norms should be pre-determined and taught so students are aware of their roles in group settings and the task should be clearly communicated. In order for a task to be effective in developing academic language, teachers need to be sure that it is a highly <b>generative task</b>: one that is open-ended, interesting, and lends itself to inquiry, discussion, and consensus-building that requires <b>application of high-leverage language</b> (“mortar”). All structured interactions should occur within a general <b>three-step framework</b>: individual think time, paired sharing/discussion, and reporting conclusions to larger group.</i></p>			