

**Ceibal en Inglés Report
DJ Kaiser, PhD
Webster University
St. Louis, Missouri, USA
September 2015**

First of all, many thanks to everyone on the Ceibal en Inglés team, Plan Ceibal, the British Council, and everyone else involved in this project who opened their doors to allow me to observe classes and ask questions. The purpose of this report is to summarize some of my research and observations of this innovative and incredible project, and to provide a few suggestions for your team to consider. All suggestions are given in the spirit of strengthening an already well-designed English language program.

A note on abbreviations: Many common abbreviations used in Uruguay are used throughout this report. While many of these abbreviations are defined in this report, an appendix of these abbreviations has been provided along with translations into English and a brief description for the external reader.

Program Overview

Ceibal en Inglés is a new and innovative project that Uruguay is using to address the high demand for English language instruction when there is a significant shortage of qualified English instructors in the country to meet that need (Brovetto, 2013, p. 213). The project specifically addresses several goals set out in 2008 at the highest levels of administration in Uruguay (including la Ley General de Educación, N° 18.437) to “democratize” foreign language instructions and promote a “plurilinguistic” society (see Brovetto, 2011; Canale, 2009).

Started in the primary schools in 2012 as a pilot with several dozen groups, Ceibal en Inglés has now expanded to include more than 3300 class groups in the public primary schools and now more than 300 class groups in the public secondary schools. The project involves the collaboration of Plan Ceibal (famous for its One Laptop per Child program, to coordinate most of the technology aspects), ANEP (the National Administration of Education, to meet public school curricular expectations), the British Council (to assist with curriculum development and the remote teaching aspect), Antel (Uruguay’s telecommunications company to provide internet connections throughout the nation’s public school system), and other subcontractors to provide additional support and services. A team of mentors and staff in Ceibal en Inglés provide ongoing training, coordination, and support to those directly involved with lesson delivery.

The primary model for the delivery of language instruction in the primary schools is through three 45-minute English language lessons per week. The first of these three lessons (lesson A) is delivered by an experienced English language instructor who teleconferences into the students’ classroom. Two-way high-quality video cameras and larger high-definition televisions allow for better communication across great distances for these “remote lessons.” The remote teachers for this project teach from one of dozens of teaching points in various remote teaching centers both in Uruguay and abroad. The two remaining lessons (lessons B and C) are taught by the

classroom teacher, who is often learning English along with his or her students (and with additional language support through online language classes). Lesson plans for three different levels have been developed to take students from an A0 to A2 proficiency level on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) over a three-year period. Each of these levels is divided into 30 weeks of instruction, seeking to maintain consistency in the delivery of English language instruction.

The addition of this project into the secondary schools follows a similar model of a remote teacher delivering one remote lesson per week to a class group. In the secondary schools, however, students already have an experienced English instructor (who then teaches the remaining three lessons each week for a total of four classes per week). The expansion into the secondary schools seeks to strengthen the development of oral communication skills in students and specifically exposes learners to a native speaker of English. While the Ceibal en Inglés curriculum for primary schools is a comprehensive set of lesson plans, for the secondary program the remote lesson plans are designed as a supplement to the existing English curriculum set forth by CES (the Counsel for Secondary Education). Table 5 (below) includes details contrasting Ceibal en Inglés in the primary and secondary schools.

In all, Ceibal en Inglés is an original and innovative project that seeks to address a problem faced by many nations around the world: how do you provide quality English instruction to the next generation of learners with a shortage of qualified English instructors? Uruguay has leveraged one of its newest and greatest assets—a strong telecommunication infrastructure connecting public school students and teachers to each other and the world through sponsor-provided laptops and technology services.

Observations

While in Uruguay from July 25, 2015 through August 17, 2015 I had the opportunity to observe several Ceibal en Inglés classes including:

- A remote class in a secondary classroom in Maldonado
- A remote class in a secondary classroom in Canalones
- Two remote classes in primary classrooms in Montevideo
- Two English classes taught by the classroom teacher (CT) in the same primary classrooms in Montevideo
- Two remote classes taught to primary classrooms in Durazno (from a teaching point in the British Council's remote teaching center in the LATU)

I also had the opportunity to teach a remote lesson from a teaching point in the Alianza Cultural Center Uruguay-USA to a primary classroom in Canalones.

Through these observations, interviews, and reviewing documents I had the opportunity to become familiar with Levels 1, 2, and 3 for the primary program, and also the conversation classes in the secondary program. I was also provided access to the learning management system, CREA 2, allowing me access to lesson plans and other materials developed for Ceibal en Inglés. This report is informed by research from reading dozens of articles and documents, my personal observations of classes in the this project, and both formal and informal interviews with multiple people involved in Ceibal en Inglés.

Program Expansion

Perhaps one of the most notable aspects of this project is the rapid rate at which the program has expanded into primary schools throughout all nineteen of the country's regions (called "departments"). Not only has Ceibal en Inglés had great success in expanding in primary schools throughout Uruguay, but the program is now being implemented in the secondary schools (albeit using a different model). Already in its first official year, Ceibal en Inglés's "conversation classes" component in the secondary schools is in seventeen of the nineteen departments (all except for Artigas and Lavalleja). Table 1 summarizes the data received on class groups reached each year of this program.

Table 1. Data on Expansion of Ceibal en Inglés in Both Primary and Secondary Schools

Level	2012	2013	2014	2015
Primary School (grades 4-6 only)	48 groups (pilot phrase)	500 groups at the beginning of the year, which expanded to 1000	Approx. 2000 groups	Approx. 3300 groups
Secondary School (Ciclo Básico [grades 1-3] and bachillerato [grades 4-6])		1 group (pre-pilot in Maldonado)	59 groups (formal pilot in Salto, Paysandú, Canelones, & Maldonado)	344 groups (covering 17 of the 19 departments)
UTU (Technical schools)				Expansion in the early planning stages

This quick expansion shows that Plan Ceibal, Ceibal en Inglés, the British Council, Antel, and all partners have been working tirelessly to democratize English language instruction and reach the entire country. The ability to expand into schools across the nation through the installment of teleconference equipment, the establishment of numerous remote teaching centers, the training and scheduling of an army of remote teachers around the world, the preparation and support of classroom teachers across the nation, and most importantly the very learning of English from tens of thousands of school children is nothing short of astounding. Support for this project at all levels has been crucial and the strong commitment and professionalism from members of Ceibal en Inglés, Plan Ceibal, and the British Council was evident through my three weeks working with these teams.

The quick expansion into the secondary schools, discussions of future expansions into the technical schools (UTU), and possibly beginning the program in the third grade of primary schools shows that these teams are truly dedicated to and capable of meeting the goals set forth

by the Uruguay government and ANEP in 2008 to promote a plurilingual society and democratize English language instruction in the public schools.

While this fast and successful expansion is laudable, my recommendation is to wait until the primary school program has been able to implement all three levels of English into at least 75% of the schools they seek to cover. This will allow the addition of a new level to be significantly easier. Discussions with various team members demonstrate recognition that some of the Ceibal en Inglés curriculum may need re-development and that in place of adding a level 4 it may be necessary to add a transitional level between levels 2 and 3 (which I will discuss later in this report). Waiting until the primary school program has more fully expanded will allow for all schools to start both 3rd and 4th grade with level 1 and then phase in the additional level for those groups who begin the program in their 3rd year of their primary studies.

I would also recommend waiting a few more years to expand into the UTUs because the secondary program will likely need revision as the primary program expands to a greater percentage of schools. Because a greater number of public school students will begin to enter secondary schools with several years of English language instruction (unlike in previous years), the entire curriculum for secondary school English (both the existing CES curriculum and new supplemental Ceibal en Inglés lessons will need to be adjusted to account for higher proficiency levels). It may, however, be possible to look at developing a curriculum for the UTU that is more advanced than the current SEC English curriculum with the goal of transferring portions of this new UTU English curriculum down into the secondary schools once primary school students have had three or four years of English instruction before entering secondary school. In any case, over the long-term ANEP, CES, CETP, and Ceibal en Inglés will greatly benefit by collaboration to strengthen the English language curricula at the secondary and tertiary levels to challenge Uruguayan students after they complete primary school. I will discuss this issue further in a future section on curriculum.

Ceibal en Inglés in the Uruguayan Public School System

In addition to understanding the Ceibal en Inglés project itself, I learned that it is important to understand how it fits into the Uruguay public school system. Table 2 shows how Ceibal en Inglés fits into the Uruguay public school system. Under current ANEP guidelines, students are required to attend nine years of schools (all of primary school and the first three years of secondary school). Tables 3 and 4 show how Ceibal en Inglés fits into the both the primary and secondary schools contrasting various schooling models currently in use in Uruguay.

Table 2. Ceibal en Inglés in the Uruguayan Public School System

Level	Obligatory or Not	Ceibal en Inglés Availability	Supervision
Preschool	Not	No	ANEP-CODICEN CEIP
Primary School (grades 1-3)	Obligatory	No	ANEP-CODICEN CEIP
Primary School (grades 4-6)	Obligatory	<i>Yes</i>	ANEP-CODICEN CEIP

Secondary School “Ciclo Básico” (grades 1-3)	Obligatory	Yes	ANEP-CODICEN CES
Secondary School (grades 4-6)	Not	Yes	ANEP-CODICEN CES
Technical Schools (UTU)	Not	In Planning	ANEP-CODICEN CETP-UTU
University	Not	No	UdelaR or Private University

Table 3. Ceibal en Inglés in the Primary Schools of Uruguay

Type	Private Schools (Escuelas privadas)	Common Schools (Escuelas communes)	Full-Day Schools (Escuelas con día completo)	Extended-Day Schools (Escuelas con día extendido)
Hours	Full day	4 hours per day (8am-12pm or 1pm-5pm)	6.5 hours per day	7 hours per day
Number of Schools	174 schools (6.6% of primary schools)	1800 schools (87.9% of public schools)	204 schools (10% of public schools)	43 schools (2.1% of public schools)
Management	Managed by the individual school	CEIP	CEIP	CEIP
Ceibal en Inglés	No	Approx. 550 schools in 2015 (approx. 30%)	12 schools in 2015 (approx. 6%)	None listed for 2015

Based on data from the ANEP website and provided by Ceibal en Inglés staff.

Table 4. Ceibal en Inglés in the Secondary Schools of Uruguay

Type	Escuelas privadas	Liceos
Hours	Full day	39 hours per week
Number of Schools	186	412
Management	Managed by individual school	CES
Ceibal en Inglés	No	Now starting

Based on data provided by Ceibal en Inglés staff.

As Table 2 shows, Ceibal en Inglés is currently being used in both primary and secondary schools. The inclusion in each system works differently. Ceibal en Inglés is included in the last

three years of six years of obligatory primary education. While secondary school is only obligatory through the third year (Ciclo Básico), the program is being made available to all six grade levels.

As Table 3 shows, not all public primary schools are using Ceibal en Inglés. This is because some schools already had English instruction. Canale (2011) details a history of experimenting with English instruction in some public full-day (*día completo*) primary schools as early as 1993 (Programa Inglés en Escuelas Públicas) with another program (Programa de Inmersión Parcial en Inglés) beginning in 2001 (p. 58). CEIP (2013) also describes English classes as one of the “workshops” (*talleres*) provided in their extended-day (*día extendido*) primary schools. For this reason, Ceibal en Inglés has focused on the common schools (where students attend four hours a day).

Table 4 shows the secondary schools, where there is more consistency in the public school model. Secondary schools already had a long tradition of teaching foreign languages, including English (see La Paz Barbarich, 2012). While Ceibal en Inglés serves to fill in large gaps in the primary schools where few schools had English instruction, Ceibal en Inglés serves to supplement secondary English instruction.

One particular challenge specific to Uruguay is that primary and secondary education are under the supervision of different Consejos (Counsels) under ANEP. This requires stronger coordination so that Ceibal en Inglés meets the curricular needs of both CEIP and CES while seeking to provide consistent English language instruction as students progress through their obligatory years of study into optional cycles beyond Ciclo Básico. Expansion of Ceibal en Inglés into the UTUs would add a third counsel (CETP) to the table. A committee, such as or similar to the Commission of Linguistic Policies for Public Education in ANEP-CODICEN, may be in a position to assist with the elaboration and coordination of a comprehensive English language curriculum and make recommendations on best practices to strengthen the work of Ceibal en Inglés, CEIP, CES, and CETP to meet the Uruguayan government’s and ANEP’s goals to democratize English instructions and increase the English proficiency of public schools students and teachers.

Technology

Technology is truly the backbone of Ceibal en Inglés to allow for English instruction delivery whether that be through teleconference or using the project-provided laptops (the “ceibalitas”) to access the learning management system, CREA 2, to connect with lesson plans and instructional materials. Through my observations and interviews I learned that students at different grade levels receive different ceibalitas and after every so many years students are upgraded to a newer model. Teachers also receive their own ceibalitas and I observed that teacher candidates in the IPA also had a schedule to receive upgraded computers. It sounds like Plan Ceibal has created a system that will allow students and teachers to maintain newer equipment to be able to continually upgrade and adapt to more advanced technology and needs.

Through interviews I learned that in cases where a student breaks or loses his or her ceibalita that he/she may need to wait until he/she is schedule for an upgrade to receive a new one. As the

program continues and students return their older laptops to receive the next level ceibalita, it might be possible to reappropriate some of these used ceibalitas as replacements for those students and teachers who legitimately need a replacement. This will support the universal access to technology and instructional content, which is a primary goal of all Plan Ceibal initiatives.

Observable from both the classroom side and from the remote teaching point side, the installation of the teleconference equipment in public schools is a unique challenge. While some schools have been able to designate a specific classroom as their Ceibal classroom, other schools—due to limited space—have had to re-appropriate space in order to accommodate this new technology. One report noted that four rural schools travel to an urban school to receive their remote lesson in that school's facilities (Ceibal en Inglés, 2015). In one school I visited, the library was being used as the Ceibal classroom. In another school I visited, the teleconference equipment was put into a room that is also used as the school's office, the library, the kitchen, the lunchroom, and also had access to the bathroom. As a result, there were several disturbances during the remote class periods. I observed, however, that both students and the remote teacher had learned to ignore and work around these disturbances.

Discussions with remote teachers detailed much variance in the public school classrooms used for the remote lessons. Disturbances such as office phones ringing and people walking through the room were not uncommon and classrooms with poor acoustics were commonly cited as challenges. A strength of Plan Ceibal, however, is that they have successfully installed the same teleconference equipment into schools with less than optimal space resources. In the effort to democratize technology and English access this is to be celebrated. Despite disturbances and occasional auditory problems, English instruction is still taking place throughout all of these schools as all those involved quickly learn to adapt. In a world that is increasingly requiring communication through voice chat and videoconference often mitigated by technological static and ambient disturbances, remote lessons through Ceibal en Inglés prepare Uruguayan school children to use English in communication situations that are realistic to 21st-century personal and professional interactions.

ANEP and Plan Ceibal may need to monitor and coordinate to have a better understanding of schools where adjustments may need to be made for the placement of the teleconference equipment. This may entail planning the construction of new school facilities with two purposes in mind: (1) building new facilities that will allow for optimal installment of teleconference equipment into a dedicated classroom and (2) allowing for the shift of students from one building into a new one to allow a classroom in existing school buildings to be re-appropriated as a dedicated teleconference classroom.

The installation of free wired and wireless connections by Antel into all public schools is truly laudable and specifically meets the goals of democratizing technological access throughout Uruguay. Giving students laptop computers also provides alternative ways for students to gain access to content through new modalities. While many school districts in the United States have gone the route of installing data projectors, SMART boards, and Promethean boards in multiple classrooms (and often all classrooms), many districts in the United States find themselves with uneven access to technology in the classroom. Plan Ceibal's One Laptop per Child program is a

more effective means of democratizing access to technology, ensuring that any classroom with Internet access may integrate technology into classroom instruction.

One obvious limitation with students having laptops is that not all students may bring their laptop to class (as I saw when observing one class). The teacher was able to do well to have students work with another student if they did not have their laptop, but asking students to view a video caused the issue of sound being heard from multiple laptops at the same time. Some students brought headphones to help with this issue. Another more significant issue is the bandwidth required for more than a dozen laptops to connect to the Internet and stream video. In one class that I observed many students had to wait for the video to load or the video would freeze while playing.

Another great feature of the One Laptop per Child program through Plan Ceibal is that students can take their laptops home and their learning may continue. This is crucial considering that the majority of Uruguayan public school children are only in school for four hours a day. Interviews revealed that attempts have been made to extend class days in the public schools, but with a shortage of school facilities and teaching staff this is not currently feasible on a large scale. Plan Ceibal, however, is in a position to provide additional instruction using the “flipped classroom” classroom model, where students access academic content outside the classroom using the ceibalitas and then use classroom time to practice this content. Formalizing such a plan would require additional locations where children could go while not in class to connect to the Internet to be able to reliably access content and work with few disturbances.

Discussions with several remote teachers revealed that another challenge of this project is that many classroom teachers struggle with technology. Some commented that some classroom teachers needed assistance with getting an email address and using email. This issue can be addressed from two different directions. First, ANEP can work with the IINN, the IDFs, the IPA, and the CERPs to ensure that all pre-service teachers develop technological skills needed to use the current technology available and the ability to adapt to newer technologies as they become available. Second, ANEP can work with CEIP and CES on providing professional development for in-service teachers to assist them with using the current technology required for Plan Ceibal projects in their classrooms. These initiatives can make Uruguay’s large investment in technology to support classroom instruction even more valuable.

Classroom Teachers and Remote Teachers

Perhaps the most crucial aspect of this project and the greatest determination of success is the relationship between the classroom teacher (CT) and the remote teacher (RT) (in the secondary program it is the classroom English teacher (CTE)). Table 5 looks at the CTs/CTEs in contrast with the RTs in Ceibal en Inglés.

Table 5. Comparison of Ceibal en Inglés in the Primary and Secondary School Programs

	Primary Schools	Secondary Schools
Classroom Teachers	CT (Classroom Teacher)	CTE (Classroom Teacher of English)
Teaches	Lessons B and C based on lesson A (from the RT and centralized lesson plans)	Based on CES curriculum and lessons developed by CTE (3 other hours)
Teacher Preparation	Institutos Normales (IINN in MVD) or Institutos de Formación Docente (IFD in the interior) (4 years)	Instituto de Profesores Artigas (IPA) and CERP (4 years) <i>or</i> Semipresencial (CFE)
Certification	Required	Not required for secondary schools
English Preparation	Not required in the IINN or IFD; may have had English in Secondary School	Required in the IPA or CERP to be a CTE
English Knowledge	May be A0 on the CEFR	Should be C1 on the CEFR
Role	Model of learning (learning English along with students)	Main English teacher (RT supplements instruction)
Supervision	CEIP	CES
Remote Teachers	RT	RT
Teachers	Lesson A	“Conversation Class” or “remote lesson”
Native or Not	Most are non-native speakers of English with a C1 level of English (currently from Argentina, Mexico, Uruguay, the Philippines, and England)	All are native speakers of English (currently from the UK, USA, South Africa, and Australia)
Contract	70% contracted by British Council through affiliated institutions in MVD and abroad; 30% contracted by Ceibal en Inglés through affiliated institutions in MVD	Contracted by remote teaching centers in various institutes
Prior Training	Experienced English Instructors	Can vary greatly
Knowledge of Spanish	Required (level B1) – but in the Philippines this is not common	Not required

Primary Purpose	Lead the instruction and assist the CT to teach the B and C lessons	Supplement the English instruction of the CTE with a focus on oral production
Students	4th through 6th Grade	1st through 6th Grade
Technology	Have their ceibalitas to supplement classroom instruction (through CREA 2)	Do not use their ceibalitas to supplement instruction
Prior English Instruction	First start English instruction through this program	Most had English instruction <i>before</i> Ceibal en Inglés (so this is a new instructional method for them, but English is not new)
CT/CTE Supervision	Primary supervision is from CEIP; mentors from Ceibal en Inglés can assist CTs with the lessons B and C	Primary supervision is from CES; some input from the secondary program coordinators from Ceibal en Inglés on integration of the remote lesson (not on other English lessons)

Of great note in this project is the variety of remote teachers used. The use of Uruguayans, other South Americans, native English speakers, and other world English speakers of English (for example, from the Philippines) mirrors the use of English that today’s Uruguayan school children will encounter today and in the future, both personally and professionally.

While the use of remote teachers from the Philippines who do not know Spanish may appear to be a problem at first (and is not consistent with the methodology statement for the program), it does present a real-world communication situation where English is the only language available to communicate. This supports the “dialogic approach,” which is another methodological goal of Ceibal en Inglés (Brovetto, 2015; Plan Ceibal, 2014).

In a meeting with directors of the remote teaching center in the Philippines, a system was described where remote teachers had two bells: one to ring for technical problems and a second for when a translator was needed. This presents an effective safety net during remote lessons; RTs, CTs, and students must make their best use of English during the lesson but have access to a translator when needed. This can constitute a limitation when RTs and CTs coordinate the lesson, as outlined in the methodology statement for the project (Plan Ceibal, 2014). During class observations I saw two different RTs from the Philippines make attempts at using Spanish. While their use was limited to simple words and phrases, this showed a strong sense of commitment on the part of RTs and allows for the RTs to also be seen as “models of learning” (an expectation of the CTs), albeit with Spanish (Plan Ceibal, 2014).

In terms of promoting real-world communication situations that lead to increased understanding and use of English, my assessment is that the use of remote teachers presents more meaningful opportunities than it does problems and limitations. Most notably in the primary program, the British Council provides training for RTs both before they teach and on an ongoing basis. Interactions with multiple remote teaching centers also showed a system of live supervision to provide immediate assistance. In 2015, 54% of the remote lessons for the primary school program were taught from one of six remote teaching centers outside of Uruguay (four centers in Argentina, one in the Philippines, and one in the UK) while the remaining 46% were taught from remote teaching points set up in the facilities of eleven organizations in Uruguay; for example, the British Council Uruguay, the Alianza Cultural Center Uruguay-USA, the Anglo-Uruguayan Cultural Institute, Berlitz, and the University of Montevideo (Ceibal en Inglés, 2015). For the program in secondary schools (which started in 2015), five remote teaching centers in Uruguay were used with one remote teacher center in the United States at the University of Texas at Arlington (Ceibal en Inglés, 2015). Discussions with British Council staff and staff in remote teaching centers showed a true sense of responsiveness, seeking to find stronger ways to address issues that may arise.

While the majority of RTs for Ceibal en Inglés in the primary school program are non-native speaker, all RTs in the secondary program are native speakers of English. Multiple discussions with Ceibal en Inglés staff described the purposes of the conversation classes in the secondary schools as having the following purposes: (1) to address an identified weakness in promoting oral English proficiency skills in Uruguayan schoolchildren and (2) in many cases addressing identified weaknesses with classroom English teachers (whether that be in their English or pedagogy skills). It is important to note that while teaching in a public elementary school requires being certified (*egresado*), this is not a requirement to teach in the public secondary schools or UTUs (Solari, 1989, p. 50). Canale (2011) reported that a 2007 ANEP census of teachers found that only one third (33.8%) of public secondary school English teachers were certified, making it one of the subjects most likely to have a non-certified teacher in the classroom (p. 61). These data suggest that secondary schools also need assistance from a program such as Ceibal en Inglés to strengthen English language instruction due to an identified lack of qualified English instructors to meet the current need in the public schools.

While this need for assistance in the secondary schools can be supported by data, the use of remote teachers is still somewhat difficult politically due to these classrooms already having English teachers. For this reason, the conversation class program currently only uses native speakers of English, which ensures that their English proficiency level of the RT will surpass that of the CTE. Students also benefit from access to a native speaker of English as they seek to advance their oral fluency and pronunciation. Native speakers of English, however, are not necessarily more qualified than non-native speakers and may even be less qualified if they did not go through the same formal training in the English language and pedagogy that most non-native speakers were required to do in order to apply for such a position. In both secondary school remote lessons I observed, I could note numerous areas for improvement in language pedagogy. This may require that the selection process for RTs for the secondary program be made more rigorous (for example, asking for a minimum qualification of a TEFL certificate with preference for teachers with an MA in TESL, TESOL, or Applied Linguistics). Additional training for the RTs of the conversations classes could also help strengthen their pedagogy skills.

Because Ceibal en Inglés is so new in the secondary schools, it may still take time to address the qualifications and training for a constantly increasing pool of remote teachers than must quickly adapt to a rapidly expanding curriculum to meet the needs of more students throughout the Uruguayan public school system. This is further complicated considering that some of the native English speaking RTs teach in both the primary and secondary programs.

Despite a few of the issues discussed above, the close collaboration between the British Council and Ceibal en Inglés allows for greater consistency and stronger quality control in the delivery of English language instruction through their supervision of the remote teachers. The greatest variable that can affect the quality of instruction in this project for both the primary and secondary programs, though, is the participation of the classroom teacher and how he or she collaborates with the remote teacher. Chua Siew Kheng and Bauldauf (2011) cite various authors to highlight how classroom teachers are the primary “gatekeepers” that “hold the power as they are placed in the position of mediator between policy and the pupils, and they are in control of how their classes are to be engaged with the texts” (p. 938). Both CTs in the primary schools and CTEs in the secondary schools play a crucial role in the quality of instruction in Ceibal en Inglés.

In both programs, the CT and CTE play a critical role during the remote lesson. First of all, the classroom teachers can set up a positive view of the remote lessons for their students or they may have a negative view of these lessons. The more that CTs and CTEs “buy in” to the use of remote teachers, the greater affect that Ceibal en Inglés can have on the students. Promoting the value of English and the value of adding outside expertise to their students’ classroom experience is not a simple task. This promotion will require the participation of school directors, ANEP-CODICEN officials (e.g., the inspectors), the media, and the classroom teachers themselves all working together to promote the benefits of English encouraged by the Uruguayan government and ANEP. Classroom teachers can become a critical voice in this initiative through public service announcements and promotional materials. Placing classroom teachers at the center of this promotion may be the most effective method because more resistant teachers would probably more apt to listen to their peers. During my time in Uruguay I saw numerous classroom teachers who saw the project as having a personal benefit *and* being vital to the education of their students. One CT viewed Ceibal en Inglés as a great opportunity for her to learn English and receive ongoing support for a skill for which she had previously not had access to receive training. She further saw the value of English for her students, which was evidenced through her enthusiasm in her classroom when teaching English or assisting with the remote lesson. When classroom teachers view Ceibal en Inglés as a vital part of their personal and professional development as an educator in the 21st century, a more positive environment for English instruction will be created in Uruguay’s public schools.

Secondly, the CT and CTE play a critical role in the classroom management. Based on my personal observations of classes, discussions with several RTs, and my own experience teaching one class as an RT, the involvement of the CT or CTE during the remote lesson is crucial. RTs can be limited in asking students to pay attention and in encouraging participation from a greater variety of students during the lesson. When the CT or CTE was less involved, participation was more limited to fewer students who already had the personal motivation to learn and use English.

Some RTs made use of a class roster to call on a greater variety of students, but this sometimes resulted in a loss of time when multiple students the RT called upon were absent. In classrooms where the CT or CTE took ownership and actively contributed in the remote lesson there was observably more active participation from a higher percentage of students. Strong tactics used by CTs and CTEs included assisting with selecting students to respond to questions, asking students to pay attention, modeling responses for questions, repeating and recasting what the RT said, and connecting current instruction to prior knowledge.

There are many opportunities to strengthen the role of CTs and CTEs during the remote lessons. For in-service teachers, orientation sessions may present and promote a variety of skills and techniques that they may use during the remote lessons to promote more active collaboration. These techniques could be broken into levels so that classroom teachers with lower English proficiency still have specific and realistic suggestions to try in their classrooms. Presentation of these skills and techniques from the classroom teachers themselves can strengthen the reception of these skills. RTs may be asked to nominate strong CTs and CTEs to be filmed in their classrooms to produce short videos that highlight effective strategies. Videos taken from inside the classroom coupled with interviews with these classroom teachers can provide a repertoire of online resources collected from an already strong pool of classroom teachers. For pre-service teachers, ANEP-CODICEN can help coordinate the inclusion of strategies for classroom teachers into the curricula of IINN, IFD, IPA, and CERP. Videos and interviews of identified in-service teachers can serve as the basis for this new element of teacher formation.

Third, the instruction that the CT or CTE provide in the English lessons taught without the remote teacher and how they relate to the remote lesson play a critical role in providing quality instruction for the students. In the primary program, the curriculum is guided by the RT and the remote lesson that is taught (Lesson A). Discussions with multiple RTs revealed that some CTs do not teach the B and C lessons (or voice concerns that they do not have enough time to teach the English lessons). While the remote lessons are scheduled ahead of time (out of necessity to coordinate both the technology and remote teaching) and are also tracked electronically (daily reports are run of remote lessons taught and whether they started on time or not), there is no similar mechanism for lessons B and C. The common primary school four-hour schedule provides classroom teachers much flexibility in their schedule to decide what to teach, when, and for how long. Ensuring that lessons B and C are taught (along with teaching other subjects part of national curriculum) falls under the supervision of CEIP and the inspectors. In the secondary schools, the hours for English instruction are already carved out into the schedule because students must change instructors for their English lesson (requiring prior scheduling). While scheduling is one issue, the coordination of the remote lesson taught by the RT and the other lessons taught by the CT or CTE is a topic I will address in the curriculum section.

Curriculum

While the delivery of remote lessons in Ceibal en Inglés is quite similar in both the primary and secondary programs, the curricular side of the project is quite different between these two levels (see Table 6). Ceibal en Inglés originated as a means of providing English language instruction in the primary schools that did not already have an English program to meet the new guidelines

from ANEP. The project has since been expanded into the secondary schools as means of supplementing and strengthening an already existing English language program.

Table 6. Comparison of the Ceibal en Inglés Curriculum in the Two Programs

	Primary Schools	Secondary Schools
Curriculum	Designed by the British Council for Ceibal en Inglés	A team in Ceibal en Inglés and <i>Inspeccion del inglés de secundaria</i> (from CES); some lessons were also prepared by the British Council
Primary Purpose	To provide English instruction in primary schools where there had previously been no English instruction; to address the need for English teachers in primary schools (because IINN and IFD do not prepare English teachers)	To supplement existing English instruction with native speakers who can focus on oral production; to address the mixed levels of proficiency in the current secondary school English teachers (by providing a more consistent component to participating classrooms)

Although many primary schools already had English language instruction (e.g., in the extended-day programs and several complete-day programs), Ceibal en Inglés is an original curriculum not based on a prior curriculum used in Uruguay. Ceibal en Inglés began with an open call for a partner to provide the curricular support. Out of multiple applications they chose an application made from the British Council in Buenos Aires. This partnership has allowed for the project to be connected into the international framework of the British Council while having access to local specialists in South America with a greater familiarity with Uruguay’s educational system and culture.

The primary school lesson plans are currently designed in three different levels (with the intention of taking students from A0 to A2 on the CEFR). Each of the three levels is divided into 30 weeks with material for an additional four weeks in each level. While the curriculum follows many of the standard topics and structures that would be found in other British Council curricula, the curriculum has been localized for Uruguayan school children. In one remote class, students were asked to tell the time in Toronto, Paris, Tokyo, and Colonia (Uruguay). In a lesson taught by a classroom teacher she reviewed the gerund form with flashcards that included “he is grilling the meat for the chivitos” (which received cheers from the students). I was also shown a lesson plan from level 3 that included trees native to Uruguay. I was not even familiar with most of these trees, but it shows a commitment to teaching Uruguayans the skills needed to describe their local customs and resources to people outside of their country using the English language. Review of lesson plans in CREA 2 showed that specific and meaningful references to life, history, culture, and resources of Uruguay are embedded throughout this curriculum, for

example, a level 2 lesson focused on discussing Uruguay and the World Cup (which should interest a great number of students).

Concerns over “linguistic imperialism” in English Language Teaching have been part of the profession since the publication of Robert Phillipson’s (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Wan Shun Eva Lam (1999) has advocated for “deculturizing” English to “rid itself of the stigma of cultural imperialism” (p. 381). Mahdi Sofi-Karim (2015) described the pitfalls of not properly *contextualizing* a national English curriculum in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq and suggested replacing references to history and literature of the United Kingdom with that of Kurdistan (pp. 94-95). Ceibal en Inglés through its collaboration with a local British Council affiliate has demonstrated that you can successfully develop a national English language curriculum including cultural elements from English-speaking cultures, local customs, and the rest of the world. This is further mirrored and reinforced through the use of native English speakers, local Uruguayan English speakers, and other English speakers from around the world.

The weekly schedule for the primary school program is a three-lesson cycle that starts with a lesson A taught by the remote teacher followed by B and C lessons allowing practice activities led by the classroom teacher. B and C lessons may also lead into the following week’s lesson A as I observed in one remote class where the remote teacher asked students to model dialogues I watched the students prepare and practice the day before in their lesson C (showing a successful pairing of RT and CT to benefit student learning). For practical purposes and due to the limited expertise of more CTs, the RT is the one to guide and introduce the majority of the instructional material. Lesson A often follows the PPP model of Presentation, Practice, and Production. All lessons I saw included a variety of activities and covered more than one single topic to help keep students’ attention. Lesson plans provide an appropriate variety of vocabulary and grammar focus with specific focus on the four skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, including focused attention on pronunciation.

The full week’s lesson plan (for the A, B, and C cycle) is available in CREA 2 in both English and in Spanish so that RTs and CTs can both follow the instructions. The B and C lessons provide a nice variety of activities that CTs with limited English proficiency can lead in class. One issue that came up in many discussions while I was in Uruguay was the *agency* of classroom teachers in terms of their ownership of the English language instruction in their classrooms. As the lesson plans are currently designed, they appear more prescriptive. One suggestion would be to take the existing activities for lessons B and C and add a few more options to create a “bank” of activities from which the CT may choose. Activities could be tagged for various aspects of language learning and practice (reading, writing, listening, speaking, individual, pair, group, personal, academic, etc.). CTs could be encouraged to make decisions about the activities they choose to use and encouraged to be mindful in decisions they make. Opportunities could be made for CTs to suggest and/or develop additional activities or to post a successful ordering that they choose. This could help promote greater agency for CTs because they are making conscious decisions about material selection and they have opportunities to create new activities.

In discussions with several people from Ceibal en Inglés and the British Council there is an identified issue that has surfaced with the addition of level 3 to the curriculum. Many commented that the jump from level 2 to level 3 may be too far of a jump. One cited reason is

that level 3 includes more content-based instruction. In my own review of the lesson plans I noted that level 2 also includes many lessons with a focus on academic content (for example, lesson 53 focuses on photosynthesis). One explanation for the difficulty that learners face in level 3 is that as texts and academic material becomes more complex, it is not always a matter of learning the specialized vocabulary.

Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2013) differentiate a three-tier framework of vocabulary, in which tier-one words are common in oral conversation while tier-three words are content-specific terms (p. 9). Learners of academic English, however, most often struggle with the tier-two words, which “are characteristic of written text and are found only infrequently in conversation, which means that students are less likely to learn these words independently” (Beck et al., 2013, p. 9). Beck et al. (2013) provide the examples “contradict, circumstances, precede, auspicious, fervent, and retrospect” (p. 9). Some school districts in English-speaking countries have started to make available online academic words lists with a focus on the Tier II words (Hyde Park Central School District, 2015; Oak Grove Elementary School, 2015). These resources may be helpful as the curriculum is revised and strengthened to meet the goals of promoting English acquisition and use along with academic content. Hyde Park Central School District (2015) has organized words by grade level, while Oak Grove Elementary Schools (2015) provides academic words in word families, which could allow for a specific focus on word endings in English. (The web address for both of these resources is included in the references to this report.)

While the primary school curriculum for Ceibal en Inglés is a comprehensive set of 90 lessons over a three-year period led by the remote teacher, the secondary school curriculum for Ceibal en Inglés functions differently. The secondary program functions as an optional supplement to the already existing English language program in the public secondary schools. Using the same technology of teleconference to bring a remote teacher into a Uruguayan classroom, the basic issues of technology and collaboration between the remote teacher (RT) and classroom English teacher (CTE) are the same.

From a curricular perspective, the secondary program truly is a supplement to the already existing secondary English program. Ciclo Básico (the first three years of secondary school) underwent a revision with the Reformulación 2006 specifying that English was to be taught four hours per week in the 39-hour curriculum (CES, 2015). The curriculum for the English program in Ciclo Básico is published in a series of reports (CES, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c) with an additional web page describing the curriculum for the sixth year of secondary school (CES, 2010). While each year has a set of linguistic and communicative objectives, the curriculum is organized around a set of integrated thematic units. In the second year of secondary school, for example, the units are eating habits, sports, history makers, fashion, and festivals (CES, 2006b, p. 7). The third-year program report provides more details on the level on the CEFR on which each year is designed to focus (CES, 2006c, pp. 2–3).

Table 7. Summary of the CEFR Levels in the National Curriculum and in Ceibal en Inglés Conversation Class Lesson Plans

Secondary School Grade Level	Curriculum Target Level	Target Levels in the Ceibal en Inglés Conversation Lesson Plans
1st year	A1	A1
2nd year	A1	A1, A1-A2, A2
3rd year	A1	A2, B1
4th year	A2	A1, A1-A2, A2, B1
5th year	B1	A1, A1-A2, A2, B1
6th year	B1	A1-A2, A2, B1

Conversation class lesson plans cannot follow a more organized and ordered curriculum as found in the primary school program due to the existing curriculum set forth by CES. For this reason, conversation lesson plans were developed to meet the needs of the integrated thematic units, with a stronger focus on oral production skills. In a review of lessons plans for the conversation classes I noted that many are marked for the language proficiency level on the CEFR. It is of note that the lesson plans from Ceibal en Inglés provide opportunities to work with higher language-level expectations than the CES curriculum, yet the conversation class lesson plans also continue to focus on lower-level language skills even after Ciclo Básico when the target proficiency level should be at the A2 and B1 level. This may be to address mixed levels of proficiency in the class or because some classroom English teachers may not have reached a B1 proficiency level yet.

One concern often raised in conversations with Ceibal en Inglés staff was that classroom English teachers felt that either they were losing control of their class or that they would simply give over control of their class to the RT. While the RT serves to lead instruction more in the primary program, the intention in the secondary program is the CTE remain the primary guiding instructor for the course and that the RT serve as a supplement to this instruction. One major issue limiting this is that conversation class lesson plans are currently set for each week (though they may be adapted or modified). Because the CES curriculum is based on integrated thematic units, it may be more beneficial to create several options of lessons and/or activities from which the CTE may select to meet the needs of his or her class. Tagging various activities for specific skills (pronunciation, discrete listening, global listening, conversation, debate, etc.) may allow for the CTE to make informed decisions about activities for the RT to use to supplement his or her class's instruction.

As Ceibal en Inglés seeks to collaborate with institutions of higher learning (such as the University of Montevideo and the University of Texas in Arlington), it may be possible to work with graduate students studying to teach English to develop additional instructional materials in support of the conversation classes. This may save on the cost of hiring people to develop additional materials while providing meaningful experience for teachers in training, in addition to forming new partnerships to promote future cooperative endeavors. Additionally, the inclusion of multiple options may help address issues of varying proficiency in the classroom. While two different class groups may be in the same thematic unit, their proficiency levels may

vary substantially. Additional options can help meet these needs while increasing the pedagogical literacy of CTEs as they must judiciously select the materials for the RT to present during the remote lessons.

As the primary school English program reaches a higher percentage of schoolchildren, both CES and Ceibal en Inglés (along with the British Council) will benefit by revisiting the English curriculum for the secondary schools. If Ceibal en Inglés is successful in taking primary school students from A0 to A2 proficiency (Plan Ceibal, 2014, p. 2), then CES will benefit by revising the secondary school curriculum with a stronger focus on B1 and B2 levels of proficiency (and possibly even working into the C1 level during the sixth year of secondary). This may also require a shift away from the integrated thematic units to a stronger focus on language through content. Such a curricular shift is in line with pedagogical statements set forth by CES (CES, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2010).

The resources previously discussed on Tier 2 vocabulary (Beck et al., 2013) would also be beneficial to promote stronger academic fluency in line with CES's articulated goals of students become independent readers ("*lector independiente*") in English and "*proveer al alumno con estrategias de lectura que le posibiliten el acceso a las fuentes de información en inglés en aquellas etapas superiores de su aprendizaje (nivel terciario) y/o le faciliten su ingreso al mercado laboral*" (to provide the student reading strategies that make it possible for them access informative sources in English during their advanced levels of study (tertiary school) and/or facilitate their entry into the labor market" (CES, 2010, Objetivos). Together CES, Ceibal en Inglés, the British Council, and the Commission of Linguistic Policies for Public Education have the authority, expertise, and shared goal of promoting stronger quality English language instruction to meet the Uruguayan government's goals to increase foreign language study and promote a plurilingual society.

Students with Special Needs

Data on schools currently using Ceibal en Inglés in the primary schools showed that two schools (with six class groups) are schools for students with special needs. One class that I observed from a remote teaching center included a student with an orthopedic impairment (possibly cerebral palsy). The remote teacher was a substitute for the class and she had not been alerted ahead of time. This particular student, however, was extremely involved in the lesson and the classroom teacher did a wonderful job ensuring that he was included in the lesson (though I am not certain his enthusiasm could be contained). The RT also included this student as she did all others. This was a great success to see a student with special needs fully participating in a remote class and the interaction with his classroom teacher suggests that his participation in other lessons is similarly strong.

In a discussion with the RT after her remote lessons I asked about students with special needs. The RT commented that another RT mentioned teaching a class group with two blind students. This creates an added challenge when using a new mode of instruction that focuses so much on visual support (videoconferencing, instructional materials in slide shows, videos and other visual materials in CREA 2, and flashcards used during the B and C lessons). Addressing the needs of these students may require the collaboration of teachers and staff from the schools for students

with special needs, the classroom teachers with students with special needs, remote teachers who can suggest or identify useful resources or strategies, and other specialists that can collaborate with Ceibal en Inglés to meet these students needs. For example, flashcards with braille and shapes that students can feel may be helpful with some lessons. The issue of meeting the needs of Deaf students to learn English has already been addressed by Díaz (2010), demonstrating that there is already scholarship in Uruguay to address the needs of students with special needs when learning English. As the curricular materials for Ceibal en Inglés are further revised, the needs of students with special needs will provide opportunities for the development of new materials.

Recommendations to Consider

The following recommendations are being provided to help meet the goals and objectives of Ceibal en Inglés and its partners in meeting the goals of the Uruguayan government and ANEP to democratize the access to quality English language instruction and promote a plurilingual society, in which English plays a critical role:

1. While implementation of all three levels in the primary program and expansion into all six grade levels of the secondary schools has been successful, consider waiting to expand the program further (i.e., add an additional level to the primary program, expand into the UTUs). This will allow the current focus to be on addressing areas for improvements and strengthening the program before taking on new responsibilities.
2. Write a methodology statement for the “conversation classes” for the secondary program similar to the methodology statement for the primary program. Consider updating the methodology statement for the primary program to reflect changes made in the program (e.g., the use of RTs in the remote teaching center that do not have B1 proficiency in Spanish). Methodology statements can be very helpful to articulate goals and is a formal document that can be re-visited for assessment purposes and when making changes to the programs.
3. Work within the strong curricular framework and instructional materials already available through Ceibal en Inglés and add various options that are tagged to meet diverse learners and specific goals. Then work to educate CTs and CTEs on the conscious selection of materials and activities to meet their learners’ needs for the purposes of increasing CT/CTE agency and leveraging local classroom teachers’ knowledge of their learners to strengthen instruction. CTs, CTEs, RTs, and graduate students training to become English teachers may all be to assist with this project and provide a nice variety of materials in the end. Some supervision will be required for this to ensure quality.
4. Strengthen existing lesson plans and instructional materials (through revising or supplementing) at all levels with a stronger focus on accessing academic language through an explicit focus on Tier II vocabulary (see Beck et al., 2013; Hyde Park Central School District, 2015; Oak Grove Elementary School, 2015 in the reference list). This new focus may address some of the issues of transitioning students from Level 2 to Level 3 and will make content-based instruction more effective. Students will also benefit from better preparation to access professional and technical texts in English required for tertiary education and many professional fields.
5. Collaborate with all stakeholders involved in the English language curriculum for Uruguayan public schools to map out the current, transitional, and aspirational curricula for English at various levels (primary schools, Ciclo Básico, bachillerato, and UTU).

This can help Ceibal en Inglés meet the goals of English curriculum set forth by CEIP, CES, and CETP and also help these counsels adjust their curricula as Ceibal en Inglés reaches more students and increases the level of English earlier on. Collaboration with a strong focus on the learning experience and language acquisition process of Uruguayan school students will ensure that revisions to all English curricula benefit public school students as they work their way through both the obligatory and optional sequences of public education.

Summary

Any limitations or issues cited with Ceibal en Inglés must be placed into the bigger picture that this project is truly visionary and extremely complex. Perfection is simply impossible and the observations show that Ceibal en Inglés is extremely successful in meeting its primary goal of strengthening and delivering English language instruction in public schools across an entire nation. Most importantly, the program is supported by groups of intelligent, passionate, visionary, and diligent workers all willing to work across company, political, national, and cultural boundaries to make Ceibal en Inglés work. Plan Ceibal as the parent organization shows strong support most notably through the technological support from everything from the XO laptops, to adjustments and adaptation of the CREA 2 platform, to creating a data management system to help coordinate administrative aspects. The British Council has shown itself to be responsive to not only meet the needs of the project expanding, but also pilot new mini-projects, such as synchronous online English classes through videoconference to assist Level 3 CTs in the primary school program. Additionally, both Plan Ceibal and the British Council have staff designated to focus on research and data collection for the means of self-evaluation and continuous improvement.

Perhaps one of the most compelling aspects of Ceibal en Inglés is that this project necessitates the use of many skilled English language instructors and specialists who were the product of the private school system in Uruguay. Before Ceibal en Inglés, the graduates of the majority of private schools and private institutes served the needs of other students whose parents could afford a better education or private instruction. As the Uruguayan government seeks to democratize access to technology and language instruction, Ceibal en Inglés has also democratized the access to Uruguay's greatest resource: a group of Uruguay's teachers, educators, specialists, and leaders that were the product of better opportunities. Ceibal en Inglés places this crucial generation in a position to shape and strengthen the next generation by taking their skills to directly impact public education today and tomorrow.

Most importantly, nearly everyone I spoke to about Ceibal en Inglés had a healthy sense of skepticism and a keen critical eye all with the intention of strengthening this project. I am confident that Ceibal en Inglés will not only be able to find the creative solutions needed to address the issues and concerns that arise to strengthen this project in Uruguay, but also be in a unique position to use the expertise gained through Ceibal en Inglés to provide support to other nations and organizations with similar goals and objectives. While Ceibal en Inglés was originally conceptualized as a way to "catch up" to neighboring countries and other nations around the world in terms of English instruction in the public schools, this project will certainly position Uruguay as a global leader in instructional innovation.

Appendix

The following abbreviations are used throughout this report. For external readers who may be less familiar with the Uruguayan school system, the following explanations are provided.

MEC – Ministerio de Educación y Cultura (Ministry of Education and Culture) – Founded in 1848 to oversee education and culture in Uruguay.

ANEP – Administración Nacional de Educación Pública (National Administration of Public Education) – Founded in 1985 to serve as Uruguay’s Ministry of Education. Uruguay is divided into 19 different *departamentos* (departments) but decisions on education are made at the national level. This is in contrast to Argentina, where each province has their own ministry of education.

CODICEN – Consejo Directivo Central (Central Directive Council) – Founded in 1985 as the central directive council for primary, secondary, and technical education.

CFE – Consejo de Formación en Educación (Council for the Formation of Education) – Founded in 2010 by ANEP to oversee tertiary education in Uruguay

IINN – Institutos Normales “M^a Stagnero de Munar y Joaquín R. Sánchez” (Normal Universities) – These are the teacher training centers in Montevideo that prepare educators for teaching in public primary schools.

IFD – Institutos de Formación Docente (Teaching Training Institutes) – These are also teacher-training centers to prepare educators for teaching in public primary schools but they are all located in the interior. CFE currently lists 22 IFDs throughout Uruguay (CFE, 2015).

IPA – Instituto de Profesores Artigas (The Artigas Institute for Teachers) – Founded in 1951, this institute in Montevideo is responsible for training and preparing secondary school teachers.

CERP – Centros Regionales de Profesores – These are also teacher-training centers to prepare educators for teaching in public secondary schools but they are all located in the interior. CFE currently lists 6 CERPs through Uruguay (CFE, 2015).

UdelaR – Universidad de la República – Founded in 1838, it is the only public university (though some public technical universities are being developed). There are currently 9 institutes of higher learning in Uruguay with the addition of private universities and institutes. Universidad Católica del Uruguay was the first private university and was founded in 1982.

CEIP – Consejo de Educación Inicial y Primaria (Council for Initial and Primary Education) – Founded in 2008, this council oversees primary education in Uruguay and forms part of CODICEN.

CES – Consejo de Educación Secundaria (Counsel for Secondary Education) – This counsel oversees secondary education in Uruguay and forms part of CODICEN.

UTU – La Universidad del Trabajo del Uruguay (the University of Work in Uruguay) – Also known as CETP (Consejo de Educación Técnico Profesional), UTU is responsible for technical training beyond secondary school. CETP forms part of CODICEN along with CEIP and CES.

CLE – Centros de Lenguas Extranjeras (Centers for Foreign Languages) – Founded in 1996, these centers provide the students in public secondary schools and at the UTUs to study French, Italian, or Portuguese. The CLEs fall under the supervision of CODICEN.

CEFR – Common European Framework of Reference for Languages – This system that originated in Europe is now used in many other parts of the world, especially when describing the language proficiency level of a European language. There are three general levels (basic, independent, and proficient user) which are expressed using the six following levels: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2.

References

- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Brovetto, C. A. (2011). Alcances y limitaciones del uso de tecnologías para la enseñanza de inglés en educación primaria. In *El v encuentro internacional de investigadores en políticas lingüísticas* (pp. 37–41). Asociación de Universidades Grupo Montevideo.
- Brovetto, C. A. (2013). “Ceibal en Inglés”: Enseñanza de inglés por videoconferencia en educación primaria. In *Aprendizaje abierto y aprendizaje flexible: Más allá de formatos y espacios tradicionales* (pp. 209–229). ANEP/CODICEN.
- Brovetto, C. A. (2015). Language policy and language practice in Uruguay: A case of innovation in English language teaching in primary schools. In *English language teaching in South America: Policy, preparation, and practices* (p. in press). Multilingual Matters.
- Canale, G. (2009). El inglés como lengua extranjera en la educación pública uruguaya: Políticas, discursos y representaciones lingüísticas. In *IV Encuentro Internacional de Investigadores de Políticas Lingüísticas* (pp. 177–181).
- Canale, G. (2011). Planificación y políticas lingüísticas en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras: El acceso al inglés en la educación uruguaya. *Revista Digital de Políticas Lingüísticas*, 3(3), 49–76.
- Ceibal en Inglés. (2015). *Informe Ceibal en Inglés – Julio 2015*. Montevideo.

- CEIP. (2013). Elementos que caracterizan actualmente la propuesta de Tiempo Extendido. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from <http://www.cep.edu.uy/ctx-caracteristicas/ctx-elementos>
- CES. (2006a). *Programa de inglés: Primer año - Ciclo básico - Reformulación 2006*. Montevideo. Retrieved from <http://www.ces.edu.uy/ces/images/stories/reformulacion06primerocb/ingles1cb.pdf>
- CES. (2006b). *Programa de inglés: Segundo año - Ciclo básico - Reformulación 2006*. Montevideo. Retrieved from <http://www.ces.edu.uy/ces/images/stories/reformulacion06segundocb/ingles2cb.pdf>
- CES. (2006c). *Programa de inglés: Tercer año - Ciclo básico - Reformulación 2006*. Montevideo. Retrieved from <http://www.ces.edu.uy/ces/images/stories/reformulacion06tercerocb/ingles3cb.pdf>
- CES. (2010). Inglés 3er. año del segundo ciclo (sexto curso). Retrieved September 5, 2015, from http://www.ces.edu.uy/ces/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2529
- CES. (2015). Reformulación 2006: Programas ciclo básico. Retrieved September 5, 2015, from http://www.ces.edu.uy/ces/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=668
- CFE. (2015). Lista de institutos y centros de formación docente. Retrieved September 4, 2015, from <http://www.cfe.edu.uy/index.php/institutos-de-formacion/institutos>
- Chua Siew Kheng, C., & Baldauf, R. B. (2011). Micro language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume 2* (pp. 936–951). New York: Routledge.
- Díaz, N. (2010). Inglés para estudiantes sordos en Secundaria. In *Tercer foro de lenguas de ANEP* (pp. 129–135). Montevideo: Programa de Políticas Lingüísticas - Administración Nacional de Educación Pública - Consejo Directivo Central.
- Hyde Park Central School District. (2015). Grades K-6 Tier II vocabulary lists. Retrieved September 4, 2015, from <http://www.hpcsd.org/district.cfm?subpage=29208>
- La Paz Barbarich, E. (2012). Imperialismo lingüístico: El caso del inglés en la educación secundaria uruguaya (1941-2003). *Lingüística*, 27, 168–196.
- Lam, W. S. E. (1999). The question of culture in global English-language teaching: A postcolonial perspective. In *Tokens of exchange: The problem of translation in global circulations* (pp. 375–397). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Oak Grove Elementary School. (2015). Common core tier vocabulary information. Retrieved September 4, 2015, from <http://www.wappingersschools.org/site/default.aspx?PageType=3&DomainID=618&ModuleInstanceID=4106&ViewID=047E6BE3-6D87-4130-8424->

D8E4E9ED6C2A&RenderLoc=0&FlexDataID=16669&PageID=3688

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Plan Ceibal. (2014). *Ceibal en inglés: Methodology statement*.

Sofi-Karim, M. (2015). *English language teaching in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq*. (Master's thesis). St. Louis, MO, USA. doi:10.13140/RG.2.1.3494.2564

Solari, A. E. (1989). *Políticas sociales en Uruguay: Educación y juventud*.