Session Outcomes

1. Analyze a Smarter Balanced release test item for language and literacy demands
2. Examine the diversity among secondary English Learners and the implications for designing an appropriate instructional program
3. Learn a process for supporting content instruction using a model for note-taking to facilitate close reading
4. Analyze the connection between language for content learning and dedicated ELD

Agenda

♦ The Demands of a CCSS Performance Task
♦ Diversity among English Learners
♦ Applying the Blueprint
♦ A Vision of Explicit Language Instruction
♦ Facilitating a Successful Struggle
♦ Dedicated ELD Instruction

The importance of bringing kids into a command of language cannot be overstated as a door through which everyone must walk. This allows the confidence for students - all students - to lean into new subjects and take on challenging work.

David Coleman, College Board President
Directions for beginning

You are chief-of-staff for your local congresswoman in the U.S. House of Representatives. She has called you into her office to outline an urgent project.

“I have received advance notice,” she says as you sit down, “that a power company is proposing to build a nuclear plant in the southeastern corner of our state. The plan will be announced to the public tomorrow morning, and citizens and journalists will want to know what my position is on this controversial issue. To be honest, I am not sure how I feel about it. We currently don’t have any nuclear power plants in this state, so I haven’t taken time to consider the issue deeply.”

“I need you,” she continues, “to conduct a brief survey of the pros and cons of nuclear power. Summarize what you have learned and report back to me this afternoon.”

Back in your office, you enter “nuclear power pros and cons” into a Google search engine, and it returns what looks like a promising mix of articles, videos, and data charts. You must review and evaluate these sources and summarize their arguments—both pro and con—before reporting back to the congresswoman.

You have been provided with and are encouraged to use a note-taking guide that will help you gather and process your findings.

Research Questions

After you have reviewed the research sources, answer the questions below. Your answers to these questions will be scored. Also, they will help you think about the sources you have read and viewed, which should help you write your report. Answer the questions in the spaces provided below each question.

1. From the sources you have reviewed, summarize 3 major arguments that support, and 3 major arguments that oppose, the use of nuclear power for generating electricity. For each of the arguments, cite at least one source that supports this fact or point of view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument / Fact in Favor of Nuclear Power</th>
<th>Source Supporting This Argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument / Fact in Opposition to Nuclear Power</th>
<th>Source Supporting This Argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Evaluate the credibility of the arguments and evidence presented by these sources. Which of the sources are more trustworthy and why? Which of the sources warrant some skepticism because of bias...
Performance Task

or insufficient evidence?

Part 2 (70 minutes)

You will now have 70 minutes to review your notes and sources, plan, draft, and revise your report. You may use your notes and refer to the sources. You may also refer to the answers you wrote to the questions in Part 1, but you cannot change those answers. Now read your assignment and the information about how your report will be scored; then begin your work.

Your Assignment

Back in the congresswoman’s office, you start to hand her your notes on the pros and cons of nuclear energy, but she waves away your papers.

“Some emergency meetings have come up and I don’t have time to review your research notes,” she says. “Instead, go ahead and make a recommendation for our position on this nuclear power plant. Should we support the building of this nuclear plant in our state, or should we oppose the power company’s plan? Be sure that your recommendation acknowledges both sides of the issue so that people know that we have considered the issue carefully. I’ll review your report tonight and use it for the press conference tomorrow morning.”

Write an argumentative report that recommends the position that your congresswoman should take on the plan to build a nuclear power plant in your state. Support your claim with evidence from the Internet sources you have read and viewed. You do not need to use all the sources, only the ones that most effectively and credibly support your position and your consideration of the opposing point of view.

Report Scoring

Your report will be scored on the following criteria:

1. **Statement of purpose / focus and organization:** How well did you clearly state your claim on the topic, maintain your focus, and address the alternate and opposing claims? How well did your ideas logically flow from the introduction to conclusion using effective transitions? How well did you stay on topic throughout the report?

2. **Elaboration of evidence:** How well did you elaborate your arguments and discussion of counterarguments, citing evidence from your sources? How well did you effectively express ideas using precise language and vocabulary that were appropriate for the audience and purpose of your report?

3. **Conventions:** How well did you follow the rules of usage, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling?

Now begin work on your report. Manage your time carefully so that you can:

- plan your report
- write your report
- revise and edit for a final draft
# Note-Taking Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Source</th>
<th>Published by . . .</th>
<th>Arguments for Nuclear Power</th>
<th>Arguments against Nuclear Power</th>
<th>How reliable is the evidence from this source?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nuclear power - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_power
Nuclear power is the use of sustained nuclear fission to generate heat and electricity. Nuclear power plants provide about 6% of the world's energy and 13–14% ...

James Hansen on Nuclear Energy - YouTube
www.youtube.com/watch?v=alrxqx_B34s
Nov 16, 2010 - 1 min - Uploaded by Newsweek Magazine
“NASA's premier climate change expert believes that next-generation, safe nuclear power is an option which we need to develop. And it is being ...”

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: Against plans for nuclear power plant
ottumwacourier.com/letters/.../Against-plans-for-nuclear-power-plant
Mar 17, 2012 – I would like to comment on Mid-American Energy's intent to build a nuclear power plant in Iowa. We already have one nuclear plant in Palo, ...

Look inside Fukushima's meltdown zone a year later - YouTube
www.youtube.com/watch?v=-6oQAyunXqk
Feb 28, 2012 - 3 min - Uploaded by CNN
CNN's Kyung Lah reports from the meltdown zone. ... Look inside Fukushima's meltdown ...

The Truth About Nuclear Power - Reason.com
reason.com/archives/2011/03/25/the-truth-about-nuclear-power
The chart here uses data compiled from various sources to compare the deaths per unit of energy produced. Deaths resulting from the production of nuclear power are over 4000 times less than the rate of death resulting from the production of energy from coal....

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: Nuclear a cost-effective energy source ...
www.washingtontimes.com/.../nuclear-a-cost-effective-energy-source...
Jan 3, 2012 – The truly rational view of Mario Salazar on nuclear power should be a lesson on dispassionately ... The Washington Times ... LETTER TO THE EDITOR: Nuclear a cost-effective energy source ... to the real alternatives of burning gas, oil and coal, and much more reliably than alternatives like wind and solar.
The Truth About Nuclear Power

Veronique de Rugy / Mar. 25, 2011 12:00 pm

Editor’s Note: Reason columnist and Mercatus Center economist Veronique de Rugy appears weekly on Bloomberg TV to separate economic fact from economic myth.

Myth 1: Nuclear power is a cheap alternative to fossil fuels.

Fact 1: It isn’t.

As Jerry Taylor of the Cato Institute wrote in Reason magazine in 2009, “Nuclear energy is to the Right what solar energy is to the Left: Religious devotion in practice, a wonderful technology in theory, but an economic white elephant in fact (some crossovers on both sides notwithstanding). When the day comes that the electricity from solar or nuclear power plants is worth more than the costs associated with generating it, I will be as happy as the next Greenpeace member (in the case of the former) or MIT graduate (in the case of the latter) to support either technology.”

Until that time comes, producing nuclear energy remains a very costly business.

The chart above uses data from a 2009 interdisciplinary study at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to compare the costs of generating a kilowatt hour of electricity using nuclear, coal, and gas power.

Looking at this data, the cost differential is clear—nuclear-powered energy costs 14 percent more than gas to produce a unit of electricity, and it costs 30 percent more than coal. Furthermore, according to Gilbert Metcalf’s recent National Bureau of Economic Research paper on energy, this increased cost of nuclear energy includes a baked-in taxpayer subsidy of nearly 50 percent of nuclear power’s operating costs.

While the nuclear industry in the United States has seen continued improvements in operating performance over time, it remains uncompetitive with coal and natural gas on the basis of price. This cost differential is primarily the result of high capital costs and long construction times. Indeed, building a nuclear power plant in the United States has cost, on average, three times as was originally estimated.

The United States Energy Information Administration estimates that these cost trends will continue for the near future.

This chart compares the projected costs of generating electricity in the year 2016 using various sources. As you can see, nuclear power remains more expensive than other conventional forms of power.

As Taylor notes, this is why nuclear power has only flourished in countries where the government has intervened on its behalf.

Myth 2: Risk is the main problem with nuclear power.

Fact 2: Cost is the main problem, not risk.

Radiation is terrifying to most people. And like most things, the less you actually know about it, the more frightening it can be.

Safety is certainly a critical issue, as the tragedy in Japan makes clear. However, so far the death toll from the current nuclear crisis in Japan is zero.
The chart above uses data compiled from various sources to compare the deaths per terawatt of energy produced. Deaths resulting from the production of nuclear power are over 4000 times less than the rate of death resulting from the production of energy from coal.

Writing in the *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons*, Bernard Cohen, a physics professor at the University of Pittsburgh, puts the risk from nuclear power into context, comparing the relative risk of nuclear power to other activities. He used a one-in-a-million chance of increased risk of premature death as a standard. His calculations indicate that if one lived at the boundary of a nuclear power plant for five years, there would be an increased risk of premature death from nuclear radiation of one in a million. That risk would decline significantly as one moved further away from the plant.

Put differently, Cohen found that the risk of living next to a nuclear power plant is comparable to the risk incurred from riding 10 miles on a bicycle, riding 300 miles in an automobile, or riding 1,000 miles in an airplane.

In fact, Steven Chu, President Barack Obama’s energy secretary, has made it clear he doesn’t think nuclear power is dangerous per se. When asked to compare coal and nuclear energy in 2009, Chu responded: “I’d rather be living near a nuclear power plant.”

That being said, what happened in Japan reminds us that while nuclear doesn’t kill people on a yearly basis, it has the potential to be very lethal under certain circumstances. However, the idea of risk-free world is unrealistic because unanticipated vulnerabilities are inevitable in any complex system. Future technologies may reduce the chance of some terrible disaster but it won’t ever eliminate it completely. Like all other sources of energy, nuclear power entails some risk.

**Myth 3:** The spread of nuclear power has stalled in the U.S. due to a hostile regulatory environment.

**Fact 3:** Nuclear power has stalled because it is simply not profitable.

Many Americans argue that government regulations are the real reason why nuclear power is so expensive. As evidence, they point out that in France, where there is more opportunity to build nuclear power plants, nuclear power is safe and affordable.

It is true that France gets about 75 percent of its electricity from nuclear power. It is also true that the country has avoided a large-scale disaster due to the many safety regulations it has imposed, most of which are similar to regulations enacted in the U.S.

However, producing nuclear energy in France is not any cheaper than it is here. The chart above shows, in U.S. dollars, the parity between the costs of generating nuclear power in the United States (which has a relatively strict regulatory regime) and France (which has a relatively loose one).

The chart presents a range of estimates of the costs of nuclear reactors in the two countries gathered by Mark Cooper, a senior research fellow for economic analysis at the Institute for Energy and the Environment at the Vermont Law School. As Cooper found, the ranges overlap: France’s estimated cost of a kilowatt of power is between $4,500 and $5,000; the United States’ estimated cost for this unit of power is between $4,000 and $6,000.

From the start of commercial nuclear reactor construction in the mid-1960s through the 1980s, capital costs (dollars per kilowatt of capacity) for building nuclear reactors rose dramatically. Although unit costs for technology usually decrease with volume of production because of scale factors and technological learning, nuclear power has gone in the opposite direction. This exception to the rule is usually attributed to the idiosyncrasies of the nuclear regulatory environment as public opposition grew, laws were tightened, and construction times increased.
As a result, no new nuclear power plants have been built in the United States in 29 years. Nuclear has proven to be a poor investment, producing far more expensive electricity than originally promised.

**Myth 4:** Nuclear power is the key to energy independence.

**Fact 4:** More nuclear doesn’t mean less oil.

On last Sunday’s *Meet the Press*, Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY) cited America’s need to get off of foreign oil as a strong reason for pursuing nuclear power.

Setting aside the misguided goal of so-called energy independence, Schumer is still wrong. Oil is primarily used in vehicles and in industrial production. Nuclear power is primarily used for electricity.

As the chart below illustrates, data from the United States Energy Information Administration shows that the vast majority of our electricity comes from non-oil sources.

Interestingly, according Michael Levi, a senior fellow and director of the program on energy security and climate change at the Council on Foreign Relations, it wasn’t always the case. “During the heyday of nuclear power, the early 1970s (45 plants broke ground between 1970 and 1975),” Levi writes, “oil was a big electricity source, and boosting nuclear power was a real way to squeeze petroleum out of the economy. Alas, we’ve already replaced pretty much all the petroleum in the power sector; the opportunity to substitute oil with nuclear power is gone.”

Perhaps more importantly, less than 1 percent of the oil used in the United States today goes to generate electricity while 70 percent is consumed by the transportation sector, with roughly 30 percent of oil being used by the residential and industrial sectors.

The bottom line is that more nuclear power would mean less coal, less natural gas, less hydroelectric power, and less wind energy. But more nuclear won’t mean less oil.

Am I against nuclear power? It certainly looks like nuclear can never be a sustainable source of energy because it is just too expensive. And while it is a safe source of energy overall, there are tremendous risks in those instances where something goes disastrously wrong. The probability of such a dire scenario may be low, but the need to build-in protections against it will always raise the cost of producing nuclear power.

But more importantly, what I am against is the government deciding that nuclear power must be encouraged and then subsidizing the industry. On that point, I leave the last word to *Reason* Science Correspondent Ronald Bailey.

“The main problem with energy supply systems is that for the last 100 years, governments have insisted on meddling with them, using subsidies, setting rates, and picking technologies,” Bailey observes. “Consequently, entrepreneurs, consumers, and especially policymakers have no idea which power supply technologies actually provide the best balance between cost-effectiveness and safety. In any case, let’s hope that the current nuclear disaster will not substantially add to the terrible woes the Japanese must bear as a result of nature’s fickle cruelty.”

*Contributing Editor Veronique de Rugy is a senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University.*
OTTUMWA — I would like to comment on Mid-American Energy’s intent to build a nuclear power plant in Iowa.

We already have one nuclear plant in Palo, near Cedar Rapids.

I am against nuclear plants. Our state and federal governments are destroying our great country with all this nuclear filth.

Have we forgotten Chernobyl and what happened to Japan just one year ago? And even some of our own nuclear plants are in bad shape.

Iowa is on the New Madrid Fault Line, so we are at great risk for a bad earthquake. Do we want to live with nuclear waste just so a company can get richer? What ever happened to wind turbines? They don’t cost so much and are safe to use.

Speak up people. Don’t let Iowa be contaminated with nuclear plants. The power plants are rich enough. We can’t afford the prices they charge now and still they want more.

Rose M. Christy

Ottumwa
LETTER TO THE EDITOR: Nuclear a cost-effective energy source

By The Washington Times Tuesday, January 3, 2012

The truly rational view of Mario Salazar on nuclear power should be a lesson on dispassionately assessing a technology (“Nuclear power: The case for a safe, alternative energy source,” Web, Dec. 28).

Mr. Salazar rightly observes that nuclear energy provides large amounts of power at very low risk compared to the real alternatives of burning gas, oil and coal, and much more reliably than alternatives like wind and solar.

Despite the accident last year at the Fukushima plant, we in the United States have come to the understanding that this incident was caused by an unbelievably massive natural occurrence. There are some lessons to learn from the event and the nuclear industry is already applying those lessons. None of those lessons, however, is that we should abandon nuclear power.

The plans for new plants in Georgia and Florida are proceeding, being followed by the possibility of other plants in Maryland and Texas. As a self-professed “bleeding heart liberal,” Mr. Salazar should be seated squarely in the anti-nuclear-power camp, but he isn't. He has demonstrated how we can stop viewing technologies as good or evil and instead see their ability to serve us with an energy source that has the lowest economic cost and least environmental hazard.

WILLIAM H. MILLER

Professor, nuclear engineering

Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute

University of Missouri-Columbia

Columbia, Mo.
I. Cognitive Task

Rich language knowledge is needed to:
- Engage in grade-level reading and writing
- Express thinking orally and in writing
- Engage in social and academic conversations
- Inform text structure

Language functions

What language functions are commonly embedded in grade-level tasks?
What text structures must students comprehend?
- Classify and compare/contrast
- Describe, explain, and elaborate
- Pose a problem/solution
- Sequence of events or processes
- Express cause/effect
- Present and defend an argument

II. Target Language

What language is needed to communicate for a particular purpose?
What language is needed to comprehend and interpret complex texts and express thinking orally and in writing?

Mortar

Mortar consists of the words and phrases specific to a particular language function. Command of functional mortar allows us to generate oral and written language for a wide range of purposes.

Agile use of mortar relies on a working knowledge of grammatical features, syntax, formal and informal conventions, and the ability to vary sentence structures.

Bricks

Brick vocabulary is specific to a particular content concept or topic. It may include nouns, adjectives, verbs, and/or adverbs related to a theme or subject. These words and phrases may move from basic to specific to increasingly precise, and can be used in various contexts:

```
would have liked to  are usually/tend to
is similar to          agree with ______ because
noticed that           makes me think that
resulted in           slower than
```

```
nice → kind → caring → compassionate
draw → sketch → map out
water, air → liquid, gas → property, matter
```

Bricks also include technical vocabulary and terminology used in distinct contexts (gravitational force, prose).

III. Instruction and Application

How do we introduce, model, and practice the target language using various levels of support through I/We/You Do It?
What opportunities for structured interaction do we provide to ensure oral and written fluency?

- Model and demonstrate
- Facilitate collaborative application of learning
- Lead guided practice
- Assess progress through written and oral production tasks
When Amelia Morán Ceja and her brother-in-law Armando Ceja look out at the vineyards around her house, they can also see the past, when their fathers traveled from Mexico to harvest fruit in stifling heat for meager wages. Ms. Ceja can still feel the grape juice on her hands, made raw from helping her father tend the vines in fields just like these.

But now the Ceja family owns its own vineyards and produces critically praised wines, a global emblem of the good life.

The California wine industry was built on the backbreaking labor of a largely Mexican seasonal work force. But the rise of the fine-wine business created a growing demand for year-round workers with special skills in Napa and other regions. Many former migrant workers settled down in wine country. They sent their children to school and taught them how to tend the vines. Some saved money and bought land, and soon began growing their own grapes.

Ceja Vineyards' first wines came out in 2001. The year before, the Robledo Family Winery, owned by Reynaldo Robledo Sr., a former migrant worker, offered its first bottles for sale. Alex Sotelo, who arrived in the Napa Valley as a field worker in 1991 and is now the winemaker at the Robert Pecota Winery, will begin selling his own wines this fall under the label Alex Sotelo Cellars.

Their tales are new versions of a familiar story, in which the children of immigrants, by working hard and celebrating the virtues of family, achieve the American dream of ownership.

Today the wine industry uses far fewer seasonal workers than it did 25 years ago, said Karen Ross, president of the California Association of Winegrape Growers in Sacramento. Still, an overwhelming proportion of the field workers in the wine industry – 98 percent by Mr. Sotelo's estimate – are Mexican.

It was not always that way. Until World War II the field workers were Americans, an image immortalized by John Steinbeck. But when the draft caused a shortage of agricultural workers, the Mexican and American governments collaborated on the bracero* program, which brought Mexicans to the United States for field work.

Ms. Ceja's father, Felipe Morán, first came to the United States in 1947. Pablo Ceja, the father of her husband, Pedro Ceja, and her brother-in-law Armando, worked in the bracero program for many years. Mr. Robledo came to the Napa Valley in 1968 as a migrant worker, living in a transient labor camp set up at the Christian Brothers Winery. Typically the migrants would work their way up the West Coast, following the harvest of grapes, pears, plums, cherries and apples before returning to their families in Mexico.
Some liked California so much that they decided to stay. It helped if they had particular skills that were useful year-round. Mr. Morán was a mechanic, and Mr. Robledo became a specialist in grafting, a valued skill in the wine industry because vines are almost never grown on their own rootstock.

“I didn’t speak a word of English when I arrived here,” said Ms. Ceja, who was 12 when Mr. Morán relocated his family to the Napa Valley in 1967. “Neither did Armando or Pedro, but that wasn’t an obstacle.”

As a boy, Armando Ceja hung out with his brothers among the vines while his father worked.

“Growing up in the vineyards, you understand it from the ground up,” he said. “It’s second nature: plant, prune, grow, succor, harvest. When the fruit goes away, it leaves kind of a void.” He is now the winemaker for the Ceja Vineyards.

As with many immigrant families, the Cejas, the Moráns and the Robledos had ambitions for their children and encouraged them to get an education. Amelia Ceja studied history and literature at the University of California, San Diego. Armando Ceja studied winemaking at the University of California, Davis, which has perhaps the nation’s leading program. Mr. Robledo so much wanted his nine children to work in the wine industry that he decided to start his own business so that each would have a place.

He worked long hours on his own time, he said, to learn every aspect of the wine business: matching budding vine to rootstock, making thousands of grafts that will thrive, pruning so the vines get just the right amount of sun, determining the proper number of grape bunches per vine, and any number of other small but important skills.

In the 1970s, he bought a house, which he sold in 1984 to pay for his first vineyard. The Robledos now own 200 acres, 160 of which are planted with vines.

In 1983 the Cejas – Amelia, Pedro and Armando – bought 15 acres in the Carneros, the gently rolling hills southwest of the city of Napa, with Pablo Ceja and his wife. They now own 113 acres of vineyard, including the 20 acres that surround the house Amelia and Pedro Ceja share with their three children. Through the 1990s, Armando Ceja managed the vineyards, while Amelia worked in marketing and sales at the Rutherford Hill Winery. In 1998, when the Cejas decided they were ready to strike out on their own as winemakers, Ms. Ceja quit her job to devote herself to Ceja Vineyards.

“To give up everything and to start a wine production company is very scary,” she said.

Making wine requires money for barrels and bottles, for labor and for a place to do the work. And starting up is tricky, especially for fine wines, because the product must be stored for a few years or more before it can be sold and start to offer a return on the investment.

“We’re able to do it because our vineyards subsidize our wine production,” Ms. Ceja said. Of their 113 acres, the Cejas keep only 10 to 15 percent of the grapes for their own use, selling the rest to other wineries.
“We’re all making top-of-the-line wines, which I think is very interesting,” Mr. Sotelo said. “I think because people looked at us as farmers for many years, and we’re proud of it, but we wanted to prove that we’re able to do much more than that.”

Mr. Sotelo was 18 when he arrived in the United States in 1991. He got a job in the fields through an uncle who had been in the Napa Valley for 23 years. He fell in love with the place, he said, and then learned to speak English and got a job working in the cellar at the Robert Pecota Winery. With encouragement, he took classes at Napa Valley College in viticulture and learned the laboratory skills necessary for modern winemaking. He graduated in 2000. He says the formal education was crucial in gaining the confidence to become a successful winemaker, a position that, like executive chef at a restaurant, now requires some public image building.

“We’ve been making the wine for many years, although people don’t notice this,” he said, “but we have to learn to feel comfortable to step out and take charge.”

Mr. Sotelo says the success of Mexican-American winemakers has encouraged him to pursue his dreams. In an effort to help others pursue their dreams, 15 Mexican-American winemakers and brand owners are to gather at the Robledo winery on Sunday to discuss forming an association that would coordinate marketing and help finance education programs.

“We’re just getting started,” said Mr. Robledos. “The sons and daughters of the Robledos, they’re going to get into the industry. They’re going to get formal educations, going to Davis and Fresno State.”

“I think we’re limited to a certain point,” he said of his generation, “but they’re not going to have limitations.”

Just as important as moving into winemaking, Vanessa Robledo says, is elevating the status of those who remain in the field.

“One of my main goals is to promote what the farmers do,” she said, “because it’s their labor that helps to produce these fine wines. A lot of times it’s called unskilled labor, but it’s very highly skilled labor, and that’s why I’m proud to say that my father was a migrant worker.”

*On August 4, 1942, the U.S. and the Mexican government instituted the Bracero program. The majority of the braceros were experienced farm laborers.*
## Attaining the Dream Note Taker

“Our gallery of success stories is not complete without mentioning the [Morán-Ceja], [Robledo], and [Sotelo] families.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Obstacles/Problems</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Cause and Effect Summarizing Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The [Morán-Ceja]     | ▪ didn’t speak English                                | ▪ hard work          | ▪ owns vineyard                            | Even though the Ceja family _______ 
| family               | ▪ didn’t own a home                                    | ▪ dedication         | ________________________                  | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      | ▪ no formal education                                  | ▪ motivation         | ▪ produces wines                           | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        | ▪ skill              | ▪ sent children to college                 | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
| The [Robledo]        |                                                        |                      |                                            | In response to ____________, the Robledos ____________ and were successful in _________________.
| family               |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
| The [Sotelo]         |                                                        |                      |                                            | Despite ________________, the Sobelo family demonstrated the characteristics of ____________ and ________________.
| family               |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
| My friends,          |                                                        |                      |                                            |.............................................................................................................................................. |
| my family, myself    |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
|                      |                                                        |                      |                                            | .............................................................................................................................................. |
1. **Brainstorm:** List three rites of passage that you have experienced in your life.
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________

2. **Write:** Choose one idea from your list and generate a complete sentence.
   *Sentence starter: I experienced a rite of passage when...*

   __________________________________________

3. **Give:** Share your experience with three classmates.

4. **Get:** Record your partners’ names and their experiences in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Reflect:** Choose one idea you got from a partner and generate a complete sentence. Prepare to report a classmate’s rite of passage experience.
   - (Partner’s name) shared that ___________. This is an example of a rite of passage because...
   - (Partner’s name)’s rite of passage was when ___________. This supports the definition of a rite of passage in that...