



STANDARDS FOR THE RECOGNITION OF INITIAL TESOL PROGRAMS IN P–12 ESL TEACHER EDUCATION

*Prepared and Developed by the TESOL/NCATE P-12 ESL Teacher Education Program Standards Team and
TESOL's ESL Program Coordinator for P–12 Teacher Education Programs*

For questions related to SPA submission, please contact Diane Staehr Fenner:

**TESOL International Association
1925 Ballenger Ave., Suite 550
Alexandria, VA 22314
dstaehrfenner@tesol.org
703-518-2533
www.tesol.org**

For information on the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE),
please visit their web site at www.ncate.org.

Copyright © 2010 by TESOL International Association (TESOL)

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any informational storage and retrieval system, without permission from the author. Permission is hereby granted for personal use only.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	4
Preface	5
Introduction	8
Standards	25
Domain 1. Language	25
Standard 1.a. Language as a System	26
Rubric for Standard 1.a.	27
Standard 1.b. Language Acquisition and Development	31
Rubric for Standard 1.b.	31
Domain 2. Culture	37
Standard 2. Culture as it Affects Student Learning	37
Rubric for Standard 2	39
Domain 3. Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction	42
Standard 3.a. Planning for Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction	42
Rubric for Standard 3.a.	43
Standard 3.b. Implementing and Managing Standards-Based ESL and Content	46
Rubric for Standard 3.b.	47
Standard 3.c. Using Resources and Technology Effectively in ESL and Content Instruction	52
Rubric for Standard 3.c.	53
Domain 4. Assessment	55
Standard 4.a. Issues of Assessment for English Language Learners	55
Rubric for Standard 4.a.	57
Standard 4.b. Language Proficiency Assessment	60

Rubric for Standard 4.b.	61
Standard 4.c. Classroom-Based Assessment for ESL	63
Rubric for Standard 4.c.	64
Domain 5. Professionalism	67
Standard 5.a. ESL Research and History	67
Rubric for Standard 5.a.	68
Standard 5.b. Professional Development, Partnerships and Advocacy	70
Rubric for Standard 5.b.	71
Appendix A. Development and Review of Standards	75
Appendix B. Selecting and Training Reviewers	85
Appendix C. Preparing and Reviewing Program Reports	87
Appendix D. SPA Responsibilities Under NCATE Partnerships	88
Glossary of Terms	89
Resources	93

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The TESOL/NCATE ESL Teacher Standards Committee would like to thank the following people for their support and contributions to the revised TESOL P–12 ESL Teacher Standards:

Previous members of the committee including Keith Buchanan, Eric Dwyer, Lydia Stack, and Beth Witt, who were part of the revision effort. Fred Genesee and Candace Harper, who wrote the new introduction.

Our colleagues who took the time to review and comment on the standards, including those who attended the board-sponsored sessions at the past three TESOL conferences. Those who responded to the standards, which were posted at both the TESOL and NCATE Web sites, and those compilers and program reviewers who commented as well.

The TESOL Standards Standing Committee for their support and feedback.

The Standards Committee of the Specialty Areas Studies Board at NCATE and the NCATE staff who provided feedback to our committee on the revised standards.

The TESOL Board of Directors, Executive Director Charles S. Amorsino, Director of Professional Development John Donaldson, and especially our Program Coordinator, Diane Staehr Fenner, who has been instrumental in compiling this document.

PREFACE

In 1999, TESOL became a member organization of NCATE and began the process of developing standards for the recognition of P–12 ESL teacher education programs. The TESOL Executive Committee and the NCATE Specialty Areas Studies Board approved the current TESOL/NCATE Standards for P–12 ESL Teacher Education Programs in 2001.

In response to NCATE requirements, TESOL began the process of revising the 2001 standards in 2005. When developing the current and the revised standards, the TESOL/NCATE team reviewed the standards of other NCATE professional association members. Various aspects of the organization of the TESOL standards are modeled on other organizations' standards, including general formatting and rubrics, and other specialty-area associations (SPAs) have modeled aspects of their standards on TESOL's.

TESOL examined the National Board's English as a New Language program and found that the TESOL "exceeds" description is generally linked with the National Board standards. The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) does not have any type of ESL or foreign language standards. They have only language arts, which was not appropriate as a model. Standards for students were also consulted, such as those for World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) and the European Framework.

TESOL is the primary source for the development of ESL standards for teachers of P–12 students in the United States. Many states have adopted the standards to guide their teacher education programs. When revising the TESOL standards, the competencies identified in California were reviewed. California does not have ESL licensure but has "Teacher Expectations." The California CLAD (Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development) credential standards served as a primary source for the original TESOL Standards. The CLAD Certificate requirements currently mirror the content of the revised TESOL Standards. New York requires TESOL/NCATE certification for its teacher preparation programs and used the TESOL standards to develop their requirements.

Overlap with American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Standards

The ACTFL standards are based on TESOL's standards; with this in mind, the overlap as well as differences in the two sets of standards will be outlined. The overarching content knowledge in the two sets of standards is similar: for example, knowledge of language as a system (for the target language), second or foreign language acquisition and development, and assessment procedures. These are the areas in which the content knowledge overlaps.

The major differences between the two sets of standards lie with the target audience. In the case of TESOL, teachers will be teaching students who are exposed to or use a language other

than English and who must acquire English in order to function both in the U.S. classroom and in society at large. The loss of English language learners' first or home language often occurs within 1–3 generations.

Culture is an area in which the two sets of standards differ. For ACTFL, knowledge of culture primarily refers to the language and culture that are used outside of the United States (e.g., French culture in France or Quebec). However, for TESOL, the target culture is the culture of the United States. Other issues related to culture for English language learners include how the home culture might affect students' education in the United States and when those two cultures may be in conflict, possibly affecting academic achievement. Teachers of English language learners (ELLs) in the United States need to have knowledge of other cultures and know how culture may affect the acculturation of immigrants or children of immigrants in the United States. They also need to know how acculturation may be in conflict with typical U.S. educational patterns.

Although both sets of standards deal with assessment, the standards differ in the types of assessments and purposes for them. Teachers of ELLs must be familiar with content-area tests that all students in the United States are required to take to meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) such as content-area tests in mathematics and science. In addition, they must also be knowledgeable about NCLB-mandated language proficiency tests in which ELLs must participate yearly. They must understand the purposes of English language proficiency assessment, such as for identification, placement, and reclassification of ELLs from ESL services. Furthermore, teachers who work with ELLs must also be adept at formative, classroom-based assessment in the content areas as well as to measure English language proficiency.

To summarize, the TESOL standards are similar to those of ACTFL, specifically in the area of general content knowledge, although only for the English language, not for other languages. More importantly, the two sets of standards differ because ACTFL standards typically focus on the content needed to teach a foreign language for enrichment, whereas TESOL teachers need to be prepared to teach English for differing purposes, such as for academic success in the United States.

Context and Process of TESOL Standards Revision

Because the current standards were created less than 10 years ago, the revised standards are an update rather than a major rewrite. They are still designed for teacher education programs that prepare candidates for an initial certification, endorsement, or license in ESL teaching. They remain organized around the original five domains (Language, Culture, Instruction, Assessment, and Professionalism) with each standard accompanied by an explanatory

statement and a rubric of illustrative, *not prescriptive*, performance indicators described at three levels of proficiency: *approaches*, *meets*, and *exceeds*. The rubrics are designed to help institutions identify evidence of candidate performance and guide reviewer recognition recommendations. They are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Additionally, they are aligned with the proposed NCATE principles for standards development. The most significant changes in the draft revised standards are a reduction in the number of standards from 13 to 11, clarifying some standards and performance indicators, and an updating of the references. The introduction was also updated to provide the rationale for the standards and reflect the latest research in the field.

TESOL invited comments from the field throughout the revision process via presentations at the TESOL annual convention and affiliate conferences, Web-based surveys, targeted requests to specific groups of experts in the field, and postings on the TESOL and NCATE Web sites. More than 150 comments were received throughout the process, with feedback on the standards ranging in length from several words to several pages. Each comment was recorded, considered by the TESOL-NCATE team, and an appropriate response to the comment was undertaken. This revision of the standards has been overwhelmingly positively received, and the clarifications made in the latest version of the standards were welcomed by institutional representatives and other TESOL professionals who have responded to solicitations for feedback on drafts. A timeline of significant steps in the process of revising the standards and a chart that presents input from the field and action taken by the team is available in the Appendix A.

TESOL solicits program reviewers from its interest sections, the TESOL/NCATE team, ESL program compilers, and the general membership. Interested potential reviewers submit a reviewer application and are selected on the basis of professional experience; ability to represent the needs of the profession; and potential ability and willingness to provide comprehensive, valid, timely reviews. TESOL's pool of reviewers includes trainers, administrators, professors, teachers, and practitioners who are knowledgeable about the TESOL P–12 ESL Teacher Education Standards and have experience in ESL teacher preparation and/or PK–12 ESL education. All reviewers must participate in a reviewer training session held prior to the TESOL annual convention. Training covers various aspects of interpreting and applying the standards and evaluating the program report.

Training for Institution and States

TESOL also holds training sessions for institutions planning to compile reports during TESOL's annual convention. These sessions focus on the details of how to prepare and submit a program report. Institutions that are preparing for recognition are invited to send representatives to

these sessions. In addition, TESOL presents on the standards and procedures for submitting a program report at state meetings and conferences when invited by NCATE state partnership agencies and occasionally works on a consultant basis one-on-one with an institution.

To date, TESOL has never been asked to provide training for any state. However, should we be asked to do so, we would use the same kind of training we do for institutions, but on a more expanded scale tailored to the state's specific needs.

INTRODUCTION

Fred Genesee, McGill University

Candace Harper, University of Florida

A growing number of elementary and secondary schools in the United States are charged with the education of students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds, many of whom speak no or limited English; these students are referred to as *ESOL students* in the remainder of this section. The number of ESOL students grew by more than 65% between 1993 and 2004, but the total K–12 population in the U.S. grew by less than 7% (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2006). ESOL students come from diverse linguistic, cultural, and geographic regions (Capps, Fix, Murray, Ost, Passel, & Herwantoro, 2005), and ESOL teacher educators must focus on this diversity to ensure that ESOL teachers are prepared to individualize instruction to reflect their students' backgrounds and needs. Although most ESOL students have typically attended largely urban schools, more and more ESOL students are attending schools in suburban and rural settings and, thus, are the responsibility of educators in all regions of the country. The future of these students when they leave school and, arguably, the very future of the nation depend on how successfully schools meet their linguistic and cultural needs. The ultimate success of this challenge depends, in turn, on how effectively teacher education programs prepare new teachers to educate these students. It is this challenge that underlies the standards outlined in this document.

In the sections that follow, a selective review of research, theory, and applications for practice that provide the rationale for the TESOL/NCATE teacher education program standards is presented. Considerations of language, culture, assessment, and professionalism are treated separately, as they are in the TESOL teacher education standards, although it must be acknowledged that any separation of these domains is somewhat arbitrary. Instructional considerations are discussed in connection with language, culture, assessment, and professionalism and, thus, are not treated separately here.

Considerations of Language and Language Learning

Research over the last two decades has shown that language must be understood in relationship to the contexts in which it is used. In other words, language takes different forms when it is used in different contexts, such as in school or at a baseball game. This finding also means that language proficiency is not monolithic. One can be proficient using language at a baseball game but not proficient using language in the classroom to talk about mathematics or science (Bailey, 2007). As well, language is an integral part of young learners' overall development, including their social, cultural, and cognitive development. However, all too often, educational programs for ESOL students focus on teaching language to the exclusion of

other aspects of their social and academic development (Genesee, 1993), while also ignoring the link between language and specific academic domains in the curriculum.

As a result of extensive research on language learning in foreign language immersion programs for English-speaking majority group students (Genesee, 2004), it is now generally recognized that second languages are acquired most effectively when they are learned and taught in conjunction with meaningful academic content (see Crandall & Kaufman, 2005, for examples of content-based instruction in ESL classrooms). Integrating language and academic instruction is similarly supported by constructivist views of learning and teaching (Kaufman, 2004).

Constructivist pedagogy emphasizes the learners' active role in constructing knowledge based on meaningful, authentic, and relevant experiences in school. Academic content provides a motivation for second language learning that goes beyond language itself. Few school-age children are interested in learning language for its own sake. Integrating language learning with meaningful and interesting academic content also provides a substantive basis for language learning. In other words, academic content provides "cognitive hangers" on which new language structures and skills can be hung. Similarly, authentic communication about academic content provides a real context for learning communicative functions of the new language. In the absence of such authentic communication, language is often learned as an abstraction devoid of conceptual and communicative substance. The interdependence between language and academic development becomes increasingly important in the higher grades as mastery of advanced-level academic skills and knowledge becomes increasingly dependent on advanced-level academic language skills (Gibbons, 2003; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

Researchers also emphasize that there is considerable variation in the formal and functional characteristics of language from one academic subject to another. For example, the language skills that students need to function effectively in mathematics are different from the language skills they need for science and social studies, although clearly there is some overlap (Bailey, 2007). The differences include not only specialized vocabulary, but also grammatical, discourse, and pragmatic skills that are essential for mastery and use of the communication skills needed to talk about and explore academic subjects (Schleppegrell, 2004). The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2000), for example, refers to mathematics as a form of communication. ESOL students who know how to use language in social situations do not necessarily know how to use it effectively during academic instruction. Moreover, teaching ESOL students the language they need for social studies will not necessarily equip them for their science or mathematics classes.

An integrated approach to English teaching means that English should be taught implicitly during lessons when the explicit focus is on teaching academic objectives. This kind of teaching is done most effectively by classroom teachers who are responsible for teaching the core

academic objectives. At the same time, researchers have discovered that direct and explicit instruction of particular aspects of language can facilitate acquisition and subsequent use of those aspects of language (Lyster, 2007; Norris & Ortega, 2000). This is primarily the role of ESOL teachers—to provide explicit and direct instruction in those aspects of English, either oral or written, that their students need in mathematics, science, and social studies. ESOL teachers also have a valuable role to play in helping classroom teachers provide both implicit and explicit instruction, as needed, in those aspects of English that their students have difficulty mastering during classroom instruction (see Echavarría, Vogt, & Short, 2008, for a model of sheltered content instruction for use in mainstream classrooms). In other words, ESOL teachers can help classroom teachers know how to scaffold academic instruction by adapting their language use to match their ESOL students' current language proficiency levels (see Gibbons, 2002, and Verplaetse, 2008, for practical suggestions on scaffolding and language development in academic contexts).

Language is complex; it is comprised of different skills and subskills. Language competence in school requires skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing. For example, during a science class, high school students listen to the teacher lecture; they may make notes while the teacher is lecturing; they may be called on to discuss the material as the teacher talks about it; and they may then explore the material in greater depth by reading assigned material in their science textbook. ESOL students need to deploy listening comprehension, note-taking, speaking, and reading skills virtually at the same time if they are to be fully engaged in their science lesson. Therefore, ESOL teacher candidates need to learn how to integrate English skills instruction—for example, listening and note-taking, or reading and note-taking—to ensure that their students acquire functional competence in academic English. ESOL teacher candidates also need to understand the components of oral and written language, how they interconnect, and how they can be taught in parallel, with the focus of attention shifting as students advance in competence.

Reading is an example of a complex skill that consists of interrelated subcomponents. Learning to decode written words calls for mastery of these *small-unit skills* related to phonological awareness and knowledge of letter–sound relationships (Genesee & Geva, 2006; Riches & Genesee, 2006). Decoding skills are important in reading comprehension, but decoding skills alone are not sufficient. Students also need to learn *big-unit skills* related to listening comprehension, vocabulary, and inferencing in order to read text fluently and with comprehension (August & Shanahan, 2006; Geva & Genesee, 2006). There is often a temptation to teach the small-unit skills of reading (e.g., phonics) separately and in isolation from the big-unit skills. However, effective ESL reading instruction entails teaching both types of skills at the same time, although the focus of attention will differ at different stages of development. Small-unit skills should receive relatively more attention in early literacy instruction and big-unit skills

increasingly become the focus at more advanced literacy levels, but both may be included at all levels, depending on students' needs. ESOL teacher candidates should be able to individualize language and literacy instruction according to their students' diverse needs, and these instructional accommodations should be evident in their lesson plans.

For a long time now, ESOL researchers have understood that learning a language (first or second) involves more than learning a linguistic code to label the physical world or to refer to abstract concepts; it also entails learning how to use the code to communicate in socially appropriate and effective ways (Hymes, 1971; Labov, 1969). Anyone who has learned a second or foreign language as an adult and has tried to use it with native speakers will appreciate that knowing the words and grammar of the language is not enough—you must also know how to use them in socially acceptable ways. As ESOL students learn English, they should become fully functioning and valued members of the classroom and school community. If they are to become fully integrated into the life of the school and broader community (an important goal of education), ESOL students must learn to function effectively within the sociolinguistic norms of the school and of the broader community of which the school is a part. ESOL teacher candidates should understand these issues and know how to respond to them when teaching ESOL students.

In brief, ESOL and (and ideally all classroom) teachers charged with the education of ESOL students must understand language as a system of communication. They should understand the ways in which language varies as a function of social and academic contexts and purposes and know how to plan instruction that will permit their students to learn critical variations in language used in and outside school (Fillmore & Snow, 2002). ESOL teacher candidates must also know how to select and use meaningful content as a basis for planning and providing ESOL instruction. Planning that incorporates the English language skills that ESOL students need for learning in specific academic domains is a way of addressing the specificity of functional language use, as well as of ensuring that the language skills taught to ESOL students are useful. If language skills are taught in isolation from the rest of the curriculum, they may not transfer or be useful for coping with academic instruction. Consequently, ESOL students will not benefit fully from academic instruction in their other classes. ESOL teacher candidates must understand the links between academic content and language and know how to promote the acquisition of academic language proficiency so that ESOL students can communicate effectively about the academic concepts and skills they are learning in school.

Considerations of Culture

Effective instruction is culturally appropriate. It builds on the skills, knowledge, and experiences that students acquire prior to coming to school and while they are in school, and it extends and broadens their skills and experiences in developmentally meaningful ways throughout the

school years. In other words, the starting point for planning and delivering instruction is the student. Thus, the pedagogical approach of choice when working with ESOL students should be first and foremost student centered. From the ESOL teacher's point of view, planning and providing instruction on the basis of ESOL students' existing cultural experiences and competencies provides a solid foundation for extending their skills and knowledge in new directions. From the ESOL student's point of view, learning in the context of familiar cultural experiences and acquired skills provides a supportive environment in which to acquire new skills and concepts.

It is widely accepted that there are significant individual differences among students, even within the same cultural and linguistic groups. Such variation reflects the accumulation of both constitutional and experiential influences, such as socioeconomic, nutritional, and cultural factors. To be developmentally meaningful, instruction for ESOL students must be individualized to account for important personal and cultural differences among ESOL learners (see Echevarria & Graves, 2007, for suggestions on teaching ESOL students from diverse backgrounds). The backgrounds of ESOL students from nonnative English speaking cultural groups are clearly different from those of students from the English-dominant language and culture in U.S. schools (Capps et al., 2005). These differences are often viewed as a source of academic problems for ESOL students because the schools they attend typically reflect the backgrounds of students from the dominant cultural group. The term *cultural difference* has been used euphemistically by some educators and policymakers as a substitute for the earlier, unfounded cultural deficit theory (Bernstein, 1972). Although those who assume the difference perspective may not consciously characterize ESOL students as deficient, they often view them as unprepared for mainstream schooling and call for changes in the students and their families to redress the mismatch between home and school. As a result, the difference perspective is considered misguided and pedagogically empty because it fails to provide substantive insights into the specific characteristics of ESOL students, their families, and their communities. It also fails to help their teachers view these characteristics as resources that could have a positive impact on their schooling.

A long history of research in a variety of social and cultural communities has broadened our understanding of specific patterns of linguistic, social, and cognitive development in families and communities with diverse sociocultural characteristics (Heath, 1986; Park, 2003; Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). The findings from these studies as well as from Goldstein (2003) and Valdés (2001) have revealed rich and complex patterns of social interaction, language use, and cultural learning. More specifically, research evidence indicates that students from language minority backgrounds have often had linguistic and cultural experiences in their communities that, as Pease-Alvarez and Vasquez (1994) point out, have been enriched by the home culture, the dominant group culture in which they live, and the

multiculturalism that inevitably results from contact and interaction between minority and majority groups in a pluralistic society. In other words, far from being impoverished, deficient, or merely different, the out-of-school experiences of ESOL students are often immensely rich and complex. As a result, ESOL students acquire rich funds of knowledge that they bring to school (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). Thus, earlier views advocating educational programs that sought to remediate or compensate for developmental or cultural deficiencies in ESOL students are misinformed and counterproductive because these deficiencies are often nonexistent.

Educational approaches that aim to minimize differences between the home cultures of ESOL students and mainstream schools may be considered educationally wasteful because they ignore the capabilities and knowledge that ESOL students bring with them to school. On the contrary, research indicates that the developmentally sound approach is to encourage development of the home language (L1) and culture of ESOL students in school, where possible, and to use the linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural resources that they bring to school as a basis for planning their formal education in English (August & Shanahan, 2006; Riches & Genesee, 2006). In support of this view, research on the academic development of ESOL students has demonstrated that they use their cultural experiences, as well as their native language skills, to break into and master English and academic content (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). This process is particularly evident in reading acquisition, where numerous studies have found that there are significant and positive relationships between ESOL students' native language literacy skills and experiences and their acquisition of reading skills in English (August & Shanahan, 2006; Riches & Genesee, 2006). Thus, ESOL teacher candidates must become knowledgeable about and comfortable with the cultural communities in which their ESOL students live, and they must learn how to draw on the cultural and linguistic resources that ESOL students bring to school to support their language, literacy, and academic development in English.

Generally speaking, schools in the United States reflect the knowledge and assumptions held by educational authorities about the experiences and backgrounds of students from the majority cultural group (McGroarty, 1986). Indeed, most public education is based on systematic research into the development and experiences of these children (Heath, 1986). Education is thus developmentally sensitive to and culturally appropriate for students from the majority culture. For education to be sensitive to and appropriate for ESOL students, it is necessary for educators to refocus their attention to take into account significant background and learning factors particular to the development of language minority students. Variation in the background of ESOL students is likely to be extensive given the considerable diversity among their first languages, their level of English proficiency, their previous educational experiences, their medical conditions, the circumstances in which they live or have come to live in an

English-speaking community, and so on. Because ESOL students' backgrounds are so diverse and often unfamiliar to educators who are not members of these cultural groups, ESOL teacher candidates must actively seek to know and understand their students' backgrounds in order to plan effective instruction. ESOL teachers can get to know their students through, for example, dialogue journals with students, parent–teacher interviews, and home visits.

Considerations of Assessment

Effective and appropriate assessment of ESOL students shares important fundamental characteristics with effective and appropriate assessment of all students (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). First, it serves the same basic goals, including the measurement of academic achievement and the monitoring of student progress, the diagnosis of individual strengths and needs, and the engagement of learners through self-assessment. Second, effective assessment of ESOL students is developmentally appropriate, authentic, ongoing, and closely linked to instructional goals. ESOL teacher candidates must thoroughly understand the diverse goals and essential qualities of effective assessment and why these characteristics are important, and they must be able to operationalize them in assessing ESOL students. Although the assessment of ESOL students is similar to effective assessment of all students, the assessment of ESOL students is different from effective assessment of all students in a number of important ways. Most of these distinctions are associated with the assessment of language proficiency.

First of all, ESOL teachers must be able to distinguish between students' language proficiency and their competence in the subject matter being taught. This distinction is especially important for ESOL students in the early stages of English language acquisition. Native-English-speaking students who are educated through the medium of English already have considerable proficiency in the language of instruction when they begin school, and they generally have sufficient proficiency in English to express what they are learning in their school subjects. However, even these students continue to develop their language skills for academic purposes in school. ESOL students, on the other hand, must learn through the medium of English as a new language and may initially lack even rudimentary language skills in English. They often have difficulty expressing through language what they are learning in their content-area classes. ESOL teacher candidates must be able to assess their students' academic achievement during the initial stages of language development using methods that require only basic skills in English.

Second, as ESOL students progress into the higher grades, they must acquire the specialized language skills that are integral to mastery of and communication about advanced academic subject matter, such as math and science. ESOL teacher candidates must be able to assess their ESOL students' academic language proficiency to determine if they are acquiring the specialized language skills that are a critical aspect to learning those subjects. ESOL teacher candidates

must know, understand, and be able to use a variety of assessment techniques that will serve ESOL students' varied educational levels and language needs.

Because the current emphasis on accountability for student learning is measured largely through standardized achievement tests (usually through reading and usually in English), ESOL students at all but the highest English proficiency levels may fail to meet grade-level expectations in spite of their progress in English language development and academic achievement. ESOL students' failure to demonstrate oral reading fluency and reading comprehension targets set for native-English-speaking students at their grade level should not be interpreted as a deficit to be remediated through instruction designed for struggling readers. ESOL teacher candidates must be able to accurately assess the language and literacy skills and document appropriate learning gains for their ESOL students. They must be able to distinguish their ESOL students' learning needs from those of other students and be able to address these needs directly and appropriately through ESOL instruction and through collaborating with other content-area teachers and reading specialists to meet them.

Third, in assessing ESOL students' English language development, ESOL teacher candidates must learn how to apply their knowledge of bilingual processes and biliteracy development to identify if and when ESOL students are transferring native language skills, knowledge, and strategies to English. As noted earlier, ESOL students often draw on the native language and knowledge from the home culture when engaged in tasks conducted in English (Genesee & Geva, 2006; Riches & Genesee, 2006). ESOL students draw on their native language knowledge and skills especially during the early stages of English language development when they have many gaps in their English competence. It is important that they not be penalized for attempts to transfer native language knowledge and skills to English language and literacy learning because these cross-language influences on English reflect resourceful use of the native language to bootstrap into English. ESOL teacher candidates must learn how to identify and interpret instances of transfer and be able to take advantage of and encourage their strategic use to promote ESOL students' English language and academic development.

Fourth, whereas native-English-speaking students may naturalistically acquire without formal instruction the social language skills they need to interact effectively with other students and adults in (and outside) school, ESOL students typically require formal instruction to acquire these skills. Some ESOL students may lack even basic level social skills in English and thus may have difficulty interacting socially with mainstream peers. ESOL teacher candidates must be able to assess their students' proficiency in the social uses of English in order to identify those aspects of social discourse where students need focused instruction. Thus, in addition to monitoring their students' acquisition of academic language, ESOL teacher candidates must also know how to monitor their ESOL students' use of English language skills in social situations.

They must be able to evaluate ESOL students' opportunities to use English in academic and social settings throughout the school day. They must also be able to use this assessment information to plan future instruction and to inform changes in the school that would increase and improve ESOL students' opportunities and abilities to use English appropriately and for a variety of purposes.

Another aspect of assessing ESOL students that may differ from assessing mainstream students is the need for teachers' sensitivity to cultural differences. Whereas students who are educated through English as their first language have already learned many of the cultural norms associated with social interaction and language use, ESOL students must learn these sociocultural norms. (Even native English speakers from different cultural backgrounds—e.g., English-speaking African American, Asian American, or Latino students—may have to learn these norms.) ESOL teacher candidates must know how to assess their ESOL students' cultural competence with respect to language use and social interaction and be able to identify (and fill) important gaps in their sociocultural development. In planning and interpreting their assessment, ESOL teacher candidates must know how to identify and account for cultural differences among ESOL and native-English-speaking students. The following list (from Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000, p. 145) provides these variables.

- **Wait time:** Second language learners and students from some cultural groups require longer wait times than native-English speaking students from majority group backgrounds.
- **Individual or group response:** Students from some cultural backgrounds prefer to respond to teachers' questions or calls for displays of knowledge as part of the entire group; they are reluctant to give individual responses because they think it is inappropriate. Some students also prefer to work with their fellow students to formulate a response to a teacher's questions. This is frowned on by Anglo-American culture but is highly valued and preferred by many other cultural groups.
- **Feedback:** Whereas students from the majority English-speaking group like to receive individual and public praise from the teacher, students from some groups are deeply embarrassed by such praise; they do not expect public or explicit praise from the teacher.
- **Eye contact:** In contrast to students from the dominant Anglo-American culture who are taught to look directly at adults when being spoken to, children from many cultures are taught that direct eye contact with adults is inappropriate and is a sign of impertinence.


- **Guessing:** Some students will not give the answer to a question unless they are certain that they are accurate; language majority students are generally comfortable with guessing.
- **Question and answer format:** Be sure your students understand and have had prior experience with the question and/or answer format you are using. For example, do they understand what to do with multiple-choice questions that are presented with blank bubbles?
- **Volunteering:** Students from many cultural groups are very uncomfortable showing what they know by volunteering a response or initiating interaction with the teacher—such behavior is seen to be bragging and showing off. Chorale or group responding can be used to circumvent this cultural preference.

ESOL teacher candidates should be familiar with these and other related variables and know how to adapt their assessment methods to accommodate such factors with students from different cultural backgrounds. Clearly, ESOL teacher candidates need to know a variety of assessment methods and be able to use them creatively to meet their students' diverse and changing assessment needs.

Considerations of Professionalism

Professionalism lies at the heart of standards for teachers. The graphic image of five interlocking rings representing the five conceptual domains of the TESOL-NCATE standards (below) illustrates the centrality of ESOL teacher professionalism and the connections between standards related to professionalism and those related to language, culture, pedagogy, and assessment.

TESOL P-12 Teacher Education Program Standards



ESOL teachers' work occurs on multiple levels, in local, personal, and interpersonal contexts as well as in larger public, political, and sociocultural contexts of English language teaching. In order to engage fully as professionals, ESOL teacher candidates must be grounded in the historical and theoretical foundations of the field, committed to continue to learn through reflective practice and classroom inquiry, and able and willing to contribute to the professional development of their colleagues and actively serve as advocates for their ESOL students.

In terms of the social and historical foundations of educating K–12 ESOL students in the United States, ESOL teacher candidates should understand the significance of key legislation such as the Civil Rights Act (1964) and of landmark court cases such as *Lau v. Nichols* (1974).

Understanding the basis of our constitutional protection against discrimination, our guarantee of equal access to an education, and the decision that equal learning conditions do not necessarily result in equitable learning conditions for all students provides ESOL teacher

candidates with a solid basis on which to evaluate whether individual policies and practices are instructionally sound and socially just for their ESOL students.

Understanding the core principle of providing equal access for all students allows ESOL teachers to interpret and more sensibly implement program guidelines, curriculum standards, and state and federal education policies. Moore (2007) notes that educational policies such as No Child Left Behind (2002) are motivated by an equal outcomes orientation rather than an equal opportunities approach to schooling. Holding high expectations for the academic achievement of all students is essential. However, when a focus on outcomes measured through standardized assessments drives educational policy, and when common learning goals are targeted through homogeneous instruction prescribed for all students in general education settings, ESOL students' bilingual and bicultural characteristics are easily overlooked. ESOL teacher candidates who acknowledge ESOL students' unique learning needs and who understand the importance of ensuring their equal opportunity to learn will assume responsibility for differentiating curriculum, adapting instruction, and modifying assessment practices for ESOL students when they begin teaching. Their ability to draw on a rich body of theory and research to inform their practice and meet their students' distinct learning needs is one of the most important indicators of ESOL teachers' professionalism.

ESOL teachers serve as sources of teaching expertise, resources for professional development, and as contributors to the specialized knowledge base of the field. ESOL teacher candidates need to understand the roles that language and culture play in ESOL student learning and be able to apply this knowledge in effective language and literacy instruction for their students. ESOL teacher candidates must also be able to assist ESOL students as individual English language learners in the classroom and affirm their linguistic and cultural identities as they negotiate membership in the social contexts of school (e.g., Duff, 2002; Goldstein, 2003) and the larger community (Breen, 2007).

Aída Walqui (2008, personal communication) notes that a key aspect of professionalism involves "making your work public." For ESOL teachers, making their work public means being able to articulate the essential needs of ESOL students and the distinctive nature of their own professional expertise. ESOL teacher candidates must be able to explain how ESOL instruction is more than "just good teaching" (Harper & de Jong, 2004, p. 155) and be prepared to assist their general education colleagues in recognizing the explicit linguistic demands, implicit cultural expectations, and assumptions of prior experience that ESOL students face in school. ESOL teacher candidates should be able to suggest instructional techniques to mediate conceptual learning challenges for ESOL students and facilitate their English language and literacy acquisition. However, providing a menu of "ESOL strategy" options for their colleagues is

insufficient; all teachers should understand why certain approaches may (or may not) work with ESOL students and know how to adapt other teaching practices accordingly.

Because collaborative teaching partnerships are most successful when they are not separated by large differences in status (Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2000, 2005, 2006; Davison, 2006), ESOL teacher candidates should assume the identity and role of a language development specialist (and not that of an instructional assistant) in collaborating or team teaching with peers. They should seek to establish professional learning communities in which their expertise plays a prominent, not a peripheral, role (Breen, 2007; Lacina, Levine, & Sowa, 2008) and where teacher expertise can be “distributed” (Tsui, 2003, p. 179) across a faculty or team. Teacher learning communities may be local, based in schools or at the district level; they may also be much more global, as with national and international professional associations and e-mail discussion lists. Through these public networks, ESOL teachers can share their expertise with peers, exercise their agency, and expand their advocacy efforts for ESOL students.

Early in their careers, ESOL teacher candidates should strive to develop an inquiring stance and engage in reflective teaching to better understand their students’ learning needs and to inform and improve their own teaching practices (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). This process of inquiry and change should continue throughout their professional lives. As ESOL teacher candidates mature with experience into expert teachers, their understanding of their work inevitably changes. They take on different roles and mentor junior colleagues into the profession. They adapt to external change and work to shape it in positive ways. Leung (2009) notes that teacher professionalism must be “built on a dynamic process of engagement with emerging social, political, and technological developments” (p. 53). Although we cannot predict the exact nature of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed by ESOL teacher candidates of the future, the basic goals of equity, access, and opportunity to learn and succeed in school and beyond should continue to guide our work.

References

- Arkoudis, S. (2006). Collaborating in ESL education in schools. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 365–378). New York: Springer.
- August, D., & Shanahan. T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on Minority-Language Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bailey, A. (Ed.). (2007). *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Bernstein, B. (1972). A sociolinguistic approach to socialization: With some reference to educability. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 465–497). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Breen, M. (2007). Appropriating uncertainty: ELT professional development in the new century. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 1067–1084). New York: Springer.
- Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J. S., & Herwanto, S. (2005). *The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Crandall, J., & Kaufman, D. (Eds.) (2005). *Content-based instruction in primary and secondary school settings*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Creese, A. (2000). The role of the language specialist in disciplinary teaching: In search of a subject? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21, 451–470.
- Creese, A. (2005). *Teacher collaboration and talk in multilingual classrooms*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Creese, A. (2006). Supporting talk? Partnership teachers in the classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9, 434–453.
- Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 9, 1–20.
- De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32, 101–124.
- Duff, P. (2002). Discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 289–322.
- Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2007). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English language learners with diverse abilities* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

- Fillmore, L.W., & Snow, C. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–53). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems, and Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Genesee, F. (1993). All teachers are second language teachers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 47–53.
- Genesee, F. (2004). What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students. In T. K. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism and multiculturalism* (pp. 547–576). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Genesee, F., & Geva, E. (2006). Cross-linguistic relationships in working memory, phonological processes, and oral language. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on Minority-Language Children and Youth* (pp. 175–184). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Geva, E., & Genesee, F. (2006). First-language oral proficiency and second-language literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on Minority-Language Children and Youth* (pp. 185–196). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gibbons, P. (2003). Mediating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 3, 247–273.
- Goldstein, T. (2003). *Teaching and learning in a multilingual school: Choices, risks, and dilemmas*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harper, C. A., & de Jong, E. J. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching ELLs. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48, 152–162.
- Harper, C. A., & de Jong, E. J. (2005). Working with ELLs: What's the difference? In A. H. Macias (Ed.), *Working with English language learners: Perspectives and practice* (pp. 107–135). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

- Heath, S. B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 143–186). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.
- Hymes, D. H. (1971). Competence and performance in linguistic theory. In R. Huxley & E. Ingram (Eds.), *Language acquisition: Models and methods* (pp. 3–28). New York: Academic Press.
- Kaufman, D. (2004). Issues in constructivist pedagogy for L2 learning and teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 303–319.
- Lacina, J., Levine, L. N., & Sowa, P. (2007). *Helping English language learners succeed in Pre-K–elementary schools*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Labov, W. (1969). *The logic of non-standard English*. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown monographs on language and linguistics* 22 (pp. 1–22). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).
- Leung, C. (2009). Second language teacher professionalism. In A. Burns & J. Richards (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 49–58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- McGroarty, M. (1986). Educator's response to socio-cultural diversity: Implications for practice. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp.299–343). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.
- Moore, H. (2007). Non–language policies and ESL: Some connections. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 573–583.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2006). *The growing numbers of limited English proficient students: 1993–94–2003/04*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Retrieved August 10, 2009, from <http://standards.nctm.org/>.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Public Law No. 107-110. (2002). Available from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>.

- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417–528.
- Park, E. (2003). *Cultural diversity and language socialization in the early years*. Center for Applied Linguistics Research Digest EDO-FL-03–13. Retrieved August 10, 2009, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/Digest/0313park.html>.
- Pease-Alvarez, C., & Vasquez, O. (1994). Language socialization in ethnic minority communities. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children* (pp. 82–102). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riches, C., & Genesee, F. (2006). Cross-linguistic and cross-modal aspects of literacy development. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 64–108). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Eisenberg, A. R. (1984). Cultural variation in children's conversations. In R. Schiefelbusch & J. Rickar (Eds.), *The acquisition of communicative competence* (pp. 379–418). Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–246.
- Schleppegrell, M. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistic perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners. A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of ESL teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Verplaetse, L. S. (2008). Developing academic language through an abundance of interaction. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 167–180). New York: Erlbaum.

STANDARDS

Domain 1. Language

Candidates know, understand, and use the major theories and research related to the structure and acquisition of language to help English language learners' (ELLs') develop language and literacy and achieve in the content areas.

Issues of language structure and language acquisition development are interrelated. The divisions of the standards into 1.a. language as a system, and 1.b. language acquisition and development do not prescribe an order.

Standard 1.a. Language as a System

Candidates demonstrate understanding of language as a system, including phonology, morphology, syntax, pragmatics and semantics, and support ELLs as they acquire English language and literacy in order to achieve in the content areas.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates need a conscious knowledge of language as a system to be effective language teachers. Components of the language system include phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse varieties, aspects of social and academic language, rhetorical registers, and writing conventions. Teachers use knowledge of these interrelated aspects of language as they support ELLs' acquisition of English.

Candidates understand the ways in which languages are similar and different. They identify linguistic structures that distinguish written and spoken language forms as well as those representing social and academic uses of language. Candidates understand that one's first language (L1) may affect learning English.

Programs and states identify languages commonly spoken by students in their communities. Candidates relate their knowledge of English to these languages, as well as others they may encounter. Candidates build on similarities between English and students' L1s and anticipate difficulties that learners may have with English. They identify errors that are meaningful and systematic and distinguish between those that may benefit from corrective feedback and those that will not. They understand the role and significance of errors as a gauge of language learning and plan appropriate classroom activities to assist ELLs through this process.

Candidates apply knowledge of language variation, including dialects and discourse varieties, to their instructional practice.

Candidates serve as good models of spoken and written English.

Rubric for Standard 1.a. Language as a System

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
1.a.1. Demonstrates knowledge of the components of language and language as an integrative system.	Candidates are aware of the components of language and language as an integrative system.	Candidates can use the components of language and language as an integrative system to inform instruction with ELLs.	Candidates can use the components of language and language as an integrative system to create instructional plans for ELLs.
1.a.2. Apply knowledge of <i>phonology</i> (the sound system), <i>morphology</i> (the structure of words), <i>syntax</i> (phrase and sentence structure), <i>semantics</i> (word/sentence meaning), and <i>pragmatics</i> (the effect of context on language) to help ELLs develop oral, reading, and writing skills (including mechanics) in	<p>Candidates understand elements of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics and recognize stages of English language development in ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates recognize and can describe similarities and major differences between English and the native</p>	<p>Candidates apply knowledge of developmental phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics to identify aspects of English that are difficult for their students, noting how ELLs’ L1 and identity may affect their English learning.</p> <p>Candidates assist ELLs in recognizing, using, and acquiring</p>	<p>Candidates design instructional strategies that incorporate their knowledge of the English language system to aid ELLs’ learning.</p> <p>Candidates differentiate ELL learning to accommodate challenging aspects of English language acquisition.</p> <p>Candidates help ELLs develop strategies to</p>

<p>English.</p>	<p>languages commonly spoken by their students.</p>	<p>the English sound system and other communication skills, thus enhancing oral skills.</p> <p>Candidates teach syntactic structures that ELLs need to communicate effectively for social and academic purposes.</p> <p>Candidates incorporate a variety of instructional techniques to assist ELLs in developing literacy skills.</p> <p>Candidates incorporate a variety of instructional techniques to help ELLs understand and use vocabulary appropriately in spoken and written language.</p> <p>Candidates provide ELLs with timely input and sufficient contextualized practice with idioms, cognates,</p>	<p>monitor difficult aspects of the English language system.</p>
-----------------	---	--	--

		and collocations. Candidates design contextualized instruction using formal and informal language to assist ELLs in using and acquiring language for a variety of purposes.	
1.a.3. Demonstrate knowledge of rhetorical and discourse structures as applied to ESOL learning.	Candidates recognize a variety of discourse features and rhetorical patterns characteristic of written and spoken English. Candidates understand that rhetorical and discourse structures and conventions vary across languages, and can identify important ways in which the languages commonly spoken by their ELLs differ from English.	Candidates use a variety of strategies to help ELLs acquire discourse features and rhetorical patterns characteristic of written and spoken English.	Candidates design instructional activities that help ELLs develop strategies to monitor their own use of English genres, rhetorical patterns, discourse structures, and writing conventions.
1.a.4. Demonstrate proficiency in English and serve as a good language	Candidates demonstrate proficiency in most aspects of English.	Candidates demonstrate proficiency in all aspects of English.	Candidates serve as good models for English for ELLs and as good models for

model for ELLs.			the L1 where possible.
-----------------	--	--	------------------------

Standard 1.b. Language Acquisition and Development

Candidates understand and apply theories and research in language acquisition and development to support their ELLs' English language and literacy learning and content-area achievement.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates understand that acquiring English for social and academic purposes takes a long time. ELLs often understand linguistic concepts intellectually while still needing time to fully comprehend all of the elements. On the other hand, candidates should expect students to have difficulty with the marked linguistic phenomena of the second language (L2) because these unusual forms often confound and confuse L2 learners.

Candidates understand the communicative, social, and constructive nature of language and are able to use linguistic scaffolding to aid ELLs' comprehension and production of academic and social English.

Candidates understand the role of personal and affective variables in language learning and establish secure, motivating classrooms in which ELLs are encouraged to take risks and use language productively, extending their conceptual knowledge as well as their language and literacy skills.

Candidates understand how different theories of language acquisition (for L1 and L2) have shaped views of how language is learned, ranging from nativist to cognitive and social interactionist perspectives. Candidates are familiar with key research in factors that influence the acquisition of English, such as the amount and quality of prior formal education in an English-dominant country, the age of arrival and length of residence in an English-dominant environment, developmental stages and sequences, the effects of instruction and feedback, the role of L1 transfer, L2 input, and communicative interaction. They are able to take pertinent issues in second language acquisition (SLA) into account when planning for instruction and apply these SLA findings in the classroom. Candidates also understand that individual learner variables such as age and cognitive development, literacy level in the L1, personality, motivation, and learning style can affect learning in the L1 and L2. Candidates understand the processes of language and literacy development, use this knowledge to provide optimal language input, and set appropriate goals and tasks for integrated oral and written language development. Candidates are familiar with developmental stages of language acquisition (including interlanguage) and understand that errors are often signs of language learning.

Candidates understand that language acquisition and development are affected by age, previous education, and personal experience. They are aware that linguistic structures are often acquired by implicit means rather than explicit direction, particularly with younger learners.

Candidates understand that aspects of ELLs' L1 may be transferred to English and may affect an individual student's learning.

Candidates understand the important foundation set by the L1; the cognitive, linguistic, and academic benefits of L1 development; and the potential transfer of language skills and strategies from the L1 to the L2. They understand that without a strong base in L1 literacy, it may be more difficult for ELLs to acquire L2 literacy. Candidates understand that ELLs come to class with previously developed language skills, and when appropriate, they extend and use a student's L1 as a resource for learning the new language and for learning in other areas. Candidates understand that proficiency in an L2 (or subsequent language) does not have to come at the cost of the L1. They are aware of the possible negative effects of losing a home language and encourage the maintenance and development of students' L1s, even when formal bilingual programs are not available.

Candidates understand the sociolinguistic variables affecting the learning of an L2 and the maintenance of an L1. They understand the systematic nature of code-switching and know that code-switching is a rule-driven communication strategy used for participating in social interaction, building community, and expressing identity.

Rubric for Standard 1.b. Language Acquisition and Development.

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
1.b.1. Demonstrate understanding of current and historical theories and research in language acquisition as applied to ELLs.	Candidates understand some aspects of language acquisition theory and research.	Candidates apply their knowledge of L1 and L2 acquisition to ESOL learning.	Candidates use their understanding of language acquisition theory and research to provide optimal learning environments for their ELLs and to conduct theory-based research in their own classrooms.
1.b.2 Candidates understand theories and research that explain how L1 literacy development differs from L2 literacy development.	Candidates are aware of theories and research that explain how L1 literacy development differs from L2 literacy development.	Candidates use theories and research that address how L1 literacy development differs from L2 literacy development to inform their teaching.	Candidates use theories and research that explain how L1 literacy development differs from L2 literacy development to design instruction and to conduct their own classroom

			research.
<p>1.b.3. Recognize the importance of ELLs’ L1s and language varieties and build on these skills as a foundation for learning English.</p>	<p>Candidates allow ELLs to use their L1 to facilitate their understanding or participation in class.</p>	<p>Candidates understand the importance of ELLs’ L1 and encourage families to use that language with their children at home.</p> <p>Whenever possible, candidates use the L1 as a foundation and resource for learning English in the classroom through bilingual aides, families, and volunteer support.</p>	<p>Candidates provide regular opportunities for ELLs to read, learn, and express themselves in their L1 in class.</p> <p>Candidates use the L1 in the classroom to support literacy and content learning.</p>

<p>1.b.4. Understand and apply knowledge of sociocultural, psychological, and political variables to facilitate the process of learning English.</p>	<p>Candidates are aware of the sociocultural, psychological, and political variables within a community of ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates understand the complex social, psychological, and political nature of learning an L2 in school and integrate this knowledge in their teaching.</p>	<p>Candidates apply knowledge of sociocultural, psychological, and political variables to design instruction and improve communication with ELLs and their families.</p> <p>Candidates investigate variables that affect language learning.</p>
<p>1.b.5. Understand and apply knowledge of the role of individual learner variables in the process of learning English.</p>	<p>Candidates recognize individual differences among their ELLs (e.g., age, L1 literacy level, personality, motivation, socioeconomic status).</p>	<p>Candidates know their ELLs and understand that individual variables can have important effects on the process and level of L2 learning.</p> <p>Candidates apply this knowledge by setting high but reasonable expectations for individual students, varying instructional objectives and strategies, and monitoring</p>	<p>Candidates use their understanding of learner variables to consistently provide individualized language- and content-learning goals and appropriate instructional environments for ELLs.</p>

		student success. Candidates vary their teaching style to accommodate students' different learning styles.	
--	--	--	--

Domain 2. Culture

Candidates know, understand, and use major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups to construct supportive learning environments for ELLs.

Standard 2. Culture as It Affects Student Learning

Candidates know, understand, and use major theories and research related to the nature and role of culture in their instruction. They demonstrate understanding of how cultural groups and individual cultural identities affect language learning and school achievement.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates recognize that language and culture interact in the formation of students' cultural identities. They further recognize that students' identities are tied closely to their sense of self-worth, which is correlated to their academic achievement. Candidates know that all students can learn more readily when cultural factors are recognized, respected, and accommodated, and they demonstrate that knowledge in their practice. They further understand that students' academic achievement can suffer if classroom instruction does not respect students' cultural identities.

Candidates address cross-cultural conflicts, such as stereotyping and bullying, using a combination of cultural appreciation techniques and conflict resolution strategies.

Candidates use information about their students' backgrounds to choose appropriate and effective teaching techniques. They use their knowledge of cultural diversity to foster critical thinking and improve student achievement.

The nature and role of culture encompasses such factors as cultural relativism, cultural universalism, the additive nature of culture, intra- and intergroup differences, the interrelationship between language and culture, and the effect of this relationship on learning. It also recognizes the various stages of acculturation and assimilation. Taking these and other factors into account, candidates design lessons that embed instruction in the appropriate cultural context.

The content of a culture includes values, beliefs, and expectations; roles and status; family structure, function, and socialization; humanities and the arts; assumptions about literacy and other content areas; communication and communication systems; and learning styles and modalities. From this knowledge base, candidates design culturally appropriate learning environments and instruction.

Candidates understand the importance of the home culture and involve ESOL families and community members in students' learning. They understand that multicultural inquiries and

interactions among students and colleagues foster critical discourse, systemic discovery, and multiplicity in approaches to academics.

Rubric for Standard 2. Culture as It Affects English Language Learning

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Suggested Performance Indicators	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
2.a. Understand and apply knowledge about cultural values and beliefs in the context of teaching and learning.	Candidates are aware that cultural values and beliefs have an effect on ELL learning.	Candidates teach using a variety of concepts about culture, including acculturation, assimilation, biculturalism, , and the dynamics of prejudice, including stereotyping.	Candidates consistently design and deliver instruction that incorporates students’ cultural values and beliefs.
2.b. Understand and apply knowledge about the effects of racism, stereotyping, and discrimination to teaching and learning.	Candidates are aware that racism and discrimination have effects on teaching and learning.	Candidates consistently use an antibias curriculum and materials that promote an inclusive classroom climate, enhancing students’ skills and knowledge to interact with each other.	Candidates design and deliver instruction that includes antibias materials and develop a classroom climate that purposefully addresses bias, stereotyping, and oppression.
2.c. Understand and apply knowledge about cultural conflicts and home events that can have an impact on ELLs’	Candidates are aware that cultural conflicts and home events affect interpersonal classroom relationships and ELL	Candidates teach cross-cultural appreciation by addressing cross-cultural conflicts and establishing high	Candidates design and deliver instruction that allows students to participate in cross-cultural studies and

learning.	learning.	expectations of ELLs' interactions across cultures.	cross-cultural extracurricular opportunities. Candidates integrate conflict resolution techniques into their instruction.
2.d. Understand and apply knowledge about communication between home and school to enhance ESL teaching and build partnerships with ESOL families.	Candidates are aware of effective techniques for communication between home and school. Candidates recognize the importance of family participation and support in their children's education.	Candidates incorporate effective techniques for communication between home and school, including using the L1 as much as possible, in their instruction. Candidates are able to communicate with and build partnerships with students' families. If candidates are not fluent in their students' L1, they make use of bilingual paraprofessionals and/or volunteers.	Candidates communicate in a culturally respectful and linguistically appropriate manner with students' families. Candidates establish ongoing partnerships with the community's adults and leaders by including them in curriculum and classroom activities. Candidates design and conduct classroom activities that encourage families to participate in their children's education.
2.e. Understand and apply concepts about the interrelationship between language and culture.	Candidates are aware of the links between language and culture.	Candidates' choice of techniques and materials reflect their knowledge of the interdependence of	Candidates design classroom activities that enhance the connection between home and school

		<p>language and culture.</p> <p>Candidates act as facilitators to help students' transition between the home culture and language and U.S. and school culture and language.</p>	<p>culture and language.</p> <p>Candidates act as advocates to support students' home culture and heritage language.</p>
<p>2.f. Use a range of resources, including the Internet, to learn about world cultures and specifically the cultures of students in their classrooms and apply that learning to instruction.</p>	<p>Candidates have a general understanding of major cultural groups and begin to identify resources to increase their knowledge and understanding.</p>	<p>Candidates use a range of resources about major cultural groups to deliver instruction.</p> <p>Candidates integrate different ways of learning and different cultural perspectives into their curriculum and instruction.</p>	<p>Candidates consistently design activities that are based on their knowledge of cultural groups and incorporate them into their teaching.</p>
<p>2.g. Understand and apply concepts of cultural competency, particularly knowledge about how an individual's cultural identity affects their learning and academic progress and how levels of cultural identity will vary widely among students.</p>	<p>Candidates are aware that ELLs' cultural identities will affect their learning.</p>	<p>Candidates plan and deliver instruction that values and adapts to students' different cultural perspectives.</p>	<p>Candidates consistently design in-class activities and opportunities for students and families to share and apply their cultural perspectives to learning objectives.</p>

Domain 3. Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use evidence-based practices and strategies related to planning, implementing, and managing standards-based ESL and content instruction.

Candidates are knowledgeable about program models and skilled in teaching strategies for developing and integrating language skills. They integrate technology as well as choose and adapt classroom resources appropriate for their ELLs.

Standard 3.a. Planning for Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction

Candidates know, understand, and apply concepts, research, and best practices to plan classroom instruction in a supportive learning environment for ELLs. They plan for multilevel classrooms with learners from diverse backgrounds using standards-based ESL and content curriculum.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates assess students' knowledge using multiple measures (see Domain 4) and address their students' diverse backgrounds, developmental needs, and English proficiency as they plan their instruction. They plan toward specific standards-based ESL and content-based objectives but include multiple ways of presenting material. They collaborate with general education and content-area teachers to ensure that ELLs access the whole curriculum while learning English.

Candidates design their classrooms as supportive, positive climates for learning. They model positive attitudes and interactions and respect for the perspectives of others. Language-building activities are student centered, incorporating cooperative learning and flexible grouping.

Candidates recognize the needs of students with interrupted formal education (SIFE) in acclimating to the school environment. They plan for a broad spectrum of instructional techniques in a variety of settings in which students interact, use their first language whenever possible, and learn reading strategies that emphasize comprehension and writing strategies that emphasize communication.

Rubric for Standard 3.a. Planning for Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
3.a.1. Plan standards-based ESL and content instruction.	<p>Candidates are aware of standards-based ESL and content instruction.</p> <p>Candidates are knowledgeable about effective program models, including those that are standards based.</p>	Candidates plan standards-based ESL and content instruction.	<p>Candidates design standards-based ESL and content instruction.</p> <p>Candidates work with their colleagues to plan standards-based instruction.</p>
3.a.2. Create supportive, accepting classroom environments.	Candidates recognize ELLs’ various approaches to learning.	Candidates implement standards-based programs and instructional models appropriate to individual student needs.	<p>Candidates systematically design ESL and content instruction that is student centered.</p> <p>Candidates design lessons such that students work collaboratively to meet learning objectives.</p>
3.a.3. Plan differentiated learning experiences based on assessment of students’ English and L1 proficiency ,	Candidates are aware of students’ language proficiency, learning styles, and prior knowledge when planning ESL and	Candidates plan activities at the appropriate language levels, integrating students’ cultural backgrounds and	Candidates design multilevel activities and are flexible in grouping students to meet instructional needs

learning styles, and prior formal educational experiences and knowledge.	content-learning activities.	learning styles. Candidates use students' prior knowledge in planning ESL and content instruction.	of linguistically and culturally diverse student populations.
3.a.4. Provide for particular needs of students with interrupted formal education (SIFE).	Candidates are aware that SIFE have unique characteristics that necessitate the use of specialized teaching strategies.	Candidates plan learning tasks specific to the needs of SIFE. Candidates plan ESL and content instruction to meet reading and writing needs of SIFE. Candidates plan assessment of SIFE competence with text.	Candidates design ways to motivate and guide SIFE to successful academic experiences. Candidates design visually supportive, text-rich environments using appropriate materials that include students' personal and shared experiences, language, and culture.
3.a.5 Plan for instruction that embeds assessment, includes scaffolding, and provides reteaching when necessary for students to successfully meet learning objectives.	Candidates are aware of assessments to measure students' degrees of mastery of learning objectives.	Candidates plan lessons that scaffold and link students' prior knowledge to newly introduced learning objectives. Candidates continually monitor students' progress toward learning objectives with	Candidates assist colleagues by sharing additional techniques and assessments to meet individual students' learning needs. Candidates connect ELLs with additional

		<p>formal and informal assessments.</p> <p>Following formal and informal assessments, candidates reteach, using alternate materials, techniques, and assessments for students who need additional time and approaches to master learning objectives.</p>	<p>supports for learning, such as after-school tutoring, homework clubs, or homework buddies.</p>
--	--	--	---

Standard 3.b. Implementing and Managing Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction

Candidates know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Candidates support ELLs' access to the core curriculum by teaching language through academic content.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates provide ESL and content instruction and assessment that are standards based and that integrate listening, speaking, reading, and writing for purposes that are relevant and meaningful to students. Candidates provide a wide variety of activities for students to develop and practice their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in social and academic environments. Candidates base activities on student interests, texts, and themes, a range of genres, and personal experiences to enhance students' comprehension and communication.

Candidates view language and content learning as joint means to achieve ELLs' academic and language development goals. They understand that language is developed most effectively in meaningful contexts, and they manage and implement learning around subject matter and language learning objectives. They also understand that such learning is more effective when it is standards based. Candidates use meaningful instruction to build relevant academic vocabulary.

Rubric for Standard 3.b. Implementing and Managing Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*; *Exceeds Standards* assumes that candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
3.b.1. Organize learning around standards-based subject matter and language learning objectives.	Candidates are familiar with standards relevant to ESL and content instruction at the national, state, and local levels.	Candidates provide standards-based ESL and content instruction from relevant national, state, and local frameworks.	Candidates aid their colleagues in teaching from a standards-based perspective that meets national, state, and local objectives.
3.b.2. Incorporate activities, tasks, and assignments that develop authentic uses of language as students learn academic vocabulary and content-area material.	Candidates are aware of the need for authentic uses of academic language in ESL and content-area learning and the need to design activities and assessments that incorporate both.	Candidates plan for and implement activities, tasks, and assignments that develop authentic uses of academic language as students access content-area learning objectives.	Candidates design and implement activities, tasks, and assignments that develop authentic uses of academic language as students access content-area learning material. Candidates collaborate with non-ESL classroom teachers to develop authentic uses of academic language and activities in content areas.
3.b.3. Provide activities and materials that integrate listening,	Candidates are aware that integrated learning activities build meaning through practice.	Candidates provide integrated learning activities using authentic sources	Candidates design activities that integrate skill and content areas through thematic and

speaking, reading, and writing.		that build meaning through practice. Candidates model activities to demonstrate ways students may integrate skills (e.g., language and/or content).	inquiry-based units.
3.b.4. Develop students' listening skills for a variety of academic and social purposes.	Candidates are aware of the need to assist students in making use of what they know in order to listen effectively.	Candidates provide a variety of activities and settings to assist students in making use of what they know in order to listen effectively.	Candidates provide practice and assist students in learning to assess their own listening skills in a variety of contexts. Candidates help students develop and use listening strategies. Candidates collaborate with non-ESL classroom teachers to select listening goals for content areas.
3.b.5. Develop students' speaking skills for a variety of academic and social purposes.	Candidates provide opportunities for students to interact socially. Candidates monitor and correct student speech as appropriate.	Candidates provide opportunities for students to practice a variety of speech registers linked to academic and social activities.	Candidates adapt activities to assist ELLs' social and academic speaking skills. Candidates collaborate with non-ESL classroom teachers to select speaking goals for content areas.

<p>3.b.6. Provide standards-based instruction that builds on students' oral English to support learning to read and write.</p>	<p>Candidates are familiar with ways in which oral language influences reading and writing acquisition for ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates provide standards-based instruction that builds and integrates learners' reading and writing as their oral language develops.</p>	<p>Candidates develop a variety of ways to integrate learners' reading and writing as their oral language develops.</p>
<p>3.b.7. Provide standards-based reading instruction adapted to ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates identify specific literacy needs of ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates choose literature for instruction from limited resources.</p> <p>Candidates are aware of instructional activities designed to assist students with reading in standards-based, content-area texts.</p>	<p>Candidates plan for and provide reading instruction that includes various cueing systems appropriate for ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates model standards-based reading activities using different genres for students at different proficiency levels and developmental stages, including students with limited literacy in their L1s.</p> <p>Candidates use a variety of texts, including literature and other content materials, to support and aid ELLs' reading development.</p> <p>Candidates explain and model explicit reading strategies that assist students with standards-based</p>	<p>Candidates engage ELLs who are having difficulty developing their English reading skills.</p> <p>Candidates develop lessons around texts in a variety of genres related to students' studies in content-area classes.</p> <p>Candidates collaborate with non-ESL classroom teachers to select reading goals for content areas.</p>

		texts from content-area course work.	
<p>3.b.8. Provide standards-based writing instruction adapted to ELLs. Develop students' writing through a range of activities, from sentence formation to expository writing.</p>	<p>Candidates are aware of orthographic, linguistic, and rhetorical influences of the L1 on ESL writing.</p> <p>Candidates are aware of the need for explicit writing strategies for ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates model standards-based writing activities using different genres (e.g., narrative, expository, argumentative) for students at different proficiency levels and developmental stages, including students with limited literacy in their L1s.</p> <p>Candidates, when appropriate, instruct students regarding contrasts between English and the writing systems of their L1.</p> <p>Candidates provide opportunities for written assignments that are ungraded, including interactive journals.</p> <p>Candidates provide instruction in a variety of writing development models, including the writing process, which promote high expectations and</p>	<p>Candidates design standards-based writing activities using different genres (e.g., narrative, expository, argumentative) for students at different proficiency levels and developmental stages, including students with limited literacy in their L1s.</p> <p>Candidates collaborate with non-ESL classroom teachers to select writing goals and activities in content areas.</p>

		personal value for writing.	
--	--	-----------------------------	--

Standard 3.c. Using Resources and Technology Effectively in ESL and Content Instruction

Candidates are familiar with a wide range of standards-based materials, resources, and technologies, and choose, adapt, and use them in effective ESL and content teaching.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates select challenging, culturally appropriate, interesting, and motivating materials to support student learning. They must also know how to select materials that are linguistically accessible and age appropriate. Candidates match materials to the range of developing language and content-area abilities of students at various stages of learning. They can also determine how and when it is appropriate to use L1 resources to support learning.

Candidates are capable of finding, creating, adapting, and using a wide range of print and nonprint resources, including ESL curricula, trade books, audiovisual materials, and online multimedia. They also are knowledgeable regarding the selection and use of technology, such as computer software and Internet resources, to enhance language and content instruction.

Rubric for Standard 3.c. Using Resources Effectively in ESL Instruction

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
3.c.1. Select, adapt, and use culturally responsive, age-appropriate, and linguistically accessible materials.	Candidates are aware that materials should be appropriate for students' age and language proficiency.	Candidates select print and visual materials that are appropriate for students' age, learning style, and language proficiency. They adapt these materials if necessary.	Candidates build on students' culture in selecting, adapting, and sequencing ESL and content-area materials. Candidates use students' community and family to locate and develop culturally appropriate materials.
3.c.2. Select materials and other resources that are appropriate to students' developing language and content-area abilities, including appropriate use of L1.	Candidates are aware of differences between content-area materials for ELLs and those for native speakers of English. Candidates select materials appropriate for ELLs from existing	Candidates incorporate a variety of resources at multiple proficiency levels, including selections from or adaptations of materials from content-area texts. Candidates use materials in students' L1 as	Candidates collaborate with non-ESL classroom teachers to develop materials and resources that integrate ESL and content areas.

	content-area texts.	appropriate.	
3.c.3. Employ a variety of materials for language learning, including books, visual aids, props, and realia.	Candidates are aware of the usefulness of a variety of materials and resources in English and the L1.	<p>Candidates provide instructional materials in English and the L1 for student instruction and use.</p> <p>Candidates enable students to use a variety of learning tools, including hands-on, visual, and multimedia means of instruction.</p>	Candidates use a variety of resources (e.g., community, family, students) to obtain and create materials that promote language, literacy, and content development in English and, whenever possible, the students' L1s.
3.c.4. Use technological resources (e.g., Web, software, computers, and related devices) to enhance language and content-area instruction for ELLs.	Candidates are aware of ways in which computers and other technological resources can improve ELLs' learning.	Candidates use technological resources to enhance, create, and/or adapt instruction to meet ELLs' language and content learning needs.	Candidates assist students in learning how to evaluate and use technological resources for their own academic purposes.

Domain 4. Assessment

Candidates demonstrate understanding of issues and concepts of assessment and use standards-based procedures with ELLs.

Standard 4.a. Issues of Assessment for English Language Learners

Candidates demonstrate understanding of various assessment issues as they affect ELLs, such as accountability, bias, special education testing, language proficiency, and accommodations in formal testing situations.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates understand the different purposes of assessment (e.g., diagnostic, language proficiency, academic achievement) and the basic concepts of assessment so that they are prepared to assess ELLs. For example, measures of knowledge or ability (including language) that are standards based should be equitable (fair), accurate (valid), consistent (reliable), and practical (easy) to administer. Authentic or performance-based assessment measures often best meet these criteria while addressing students as individuals. These measures should be both formative (ongoing) and summative (proficiency testing) and include both languages where possible. The more closely assessment tasks resemble instructional activities, particularly those relevant to English learners' lives, the more likely the tasks are to accurately assess what has been taught and learned and to inform further instruction.

Candidates also demonstrate understanding of issues around accountability such as implications of norm-referenced standardized assessment and other high-stakes testing. They understand the differences between these kinds of assessment and alternative assessments and also understand issues of accommodation for ELLs in formal testing situations.

Candidates understand how assessments for native English speakers and English learners differ and the variety of ways in which assessments of English learners may be biased and therefore invalid measures of what they know and can do. Such assessments may contain *cultural bias* (e.g., images or references that are unfamiliar to ELLs). Assessments may also contain *linguistic bias* (e.g., items overtly or implicitly favoring speakers of standard dialects or items that are more difficult for ELLs because of complex language). ELLs may also be challenged in formal testing situations if they are unfamiliar with item types (e.g., multiple choice) or response formats (e.g., bubble sheets), or if they are unfamiliar with timed, competitive, high-stakes testing. Candidates should be able to identify such biasing elements in assessment situations and work to help ELLs become familiar with the content and conditions of tests in school.

Candidates work with other professionals (e.g., speech pathologists, psychologists, special educators) who assess ELLs in order to distinguish the differences among normal language

development, language differences, and learning problems. They understand that learning problems, as well as factors identifying gifted and talented students, should be verified in the student's native language, if possible. Candidates use multiple sources of information (e.g., native language assessment, home contacts, other teachers, other learners from the same cultural group, teaching style, the curriculum) to make appropriate adjustments before concluding the problem resides within the learner and making a referral for special education.

Rubric for 4.a. Issues of Assessment for English Language Learners

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
<p>4.a.1. Demonstrate an understanding of the purposes of assessment as they relate to ELLs and use results appropriately.</p>	<p>Candidates are aware that there are various purposes of assessment (e.g., diagnostic, achievement, L1 and L2 proficiency).</p>	<p>Candidates understand and can identify and explain the different purposes for assessment.</p> <p>Candidates prepare their students appropriately for the type of assessment being used, including technology-based assessment.</p>	<p>Candidates share their knowledge and experience about the purposes of assessment with colleagues and parents.</p>
<p>4.a.2 Knowledgeable about and able to use a variety of assessment procedures for ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates are aware of a variety of purposes and procedures for assessment of ELLs (e.g., proficiency, diagnosis, placement, and classroom instruction and achievement).</p> <p>Candidates are</p>	<p>Candidates use multiple and appropriate formative and summative assessment measures for a variety of purposes, including classroom and student self-assessment and technology-based assessment (e.g.,</p>	<p>Candidates design and adapt classroom tests and alternative assessment measures to make them appropriate for ELLs for a variety of purposes.</p>

	<p>aware of the importance of using multiple measures to accurately assess ELLs.</p>	<p>audio, video, computer).</p> <p>Candidates understand that procedures intended for native English speakers may not apply to English learners.</p>	
<p>4.a.3. Demonstrate an understanding of key indicators of good assessment instruments.</p>	<p>Candidates are aware of technical aspects of assessment (e.g., validity and reliability).</p>	<p>Candidates can explain why tests are valid and reliable and use this knowledge in making assessment-related decisions.</p>	<p>Candidates can create assessment measures that are standards based, valid, and reliable, as appropriate.</p>
<p>4.a.4. Demonstrate understanding of the advantages and limitations of assessments, including accommodations for ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates are aware of some of the advantages and limitations of assessments for ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates understand obstacles ELLs commonly face and have strategies to help them in such situations.</p> <p>Candidates know state-allowed test accommodations for ELLs and apply them when appropriate.</p>	<p>Candidates evaluate formal and informal assessment measures for psychological, cultural, and linguistic limitations and create strategies to help ELLs in such situations.</p>
<p>4.a.5. Distinguish among ELLs' language differences, giftedness, and special education needs.</p>	<p>Candidates recognize some similarities between a language difference and a learning disability for ELLs (e.g., delayed language production, limited</p>	<p>Candidates work with a variety of resources, including native-language assessment and knowledgeable colleagues, to distinguish among language differences,</p>	<p>Candidates work collaboratively with assessment personnel to assess ELLs who are gifted and talented and/or have special learning needs.</p> <p>Candidates share with</p>

	<p>vocabulary and reading skills).</p> <p>Candidates recognize how cultural and linguistic bias may misinform results of such assessments.</p>	<p>giftedness, and a learning disability for ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates understand appropriate diagnostic processes and are able to document ELL growth and performance required before considering referral for gifted and talented or special education assessment.</p>	<p>colleagues their knowledge and experience about gifted and talented and special learning needs of ELLs.</p>
--	--	--	--

Standard 4.b. Language Proficiency Assessment

Candidates know and can use a variety of standards-based language proficiency instruments to show language growth and to inform their instruction. They demonstrate understanding of their uses for identification, placement, and reclassification of ELLs.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates are familiar with national and state requirements, procedures, and instruments for ELL identification, reclassification, and exit from language support programs. They use available language proficiency test results to identify ELLs' language skills. They also use criterion and norm-referenced language proficiency instruments, both formative and summative, as appropriate. Candidates design assessment tasks that measure students' discrete and integrated language skills and their ability to use language communicatively within a range of contexts. The teaching of test-taking and learning strategies has an important place in the ESOL classroom.

Candidates are aware that the term *language proficiency assessment* may be used synonymously with *language achievement assessment* and, hence, is usually summative in nature. Candidates know that these assessments are designed to show language growth over time and to identify areas that need more work. Candidates know how to interpret the results of language proficiency assessments and how to apply the results in classroom instruction.

Rubric for Standard 4.b. Language Proficiency Assessment

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
4.b.1. Understand and implement national and state requirements for identification, reclassification, and exit of ELLs from language support programs.	Candidates understand national and state requirements (e.g., L1 surveys or benchmarks) for identifying, reclassifying, and exiting ELLs from language support programs.	Candidates make informed decisions regarding placement and reclassification of students in ESOL programs based on national and state requirements. Candidates involve families in program decisions for ELLs.	Candidates share their knowledge and expertise regarding identification, placement, reclassification, and exiting of ELLs with their colleagues.
4.b.2. Understand the appropriate use of norm-referenced assessments with ELLs.	Candidates are familiar with norm-referenced assessments but have not used them to make decisions about ELLs.	Candidates understand norm-referenced assessments, including their strengths and weaknesses, and use this information to make decisions about ELLs (e.g., identification, placement, achievement, reclassification, and possible giftedness	Candidates share this knowledge with their colleagues.

		and/or learning disabilities).	
4.b.3. Assess ELLs' language skills and communicative competence using multiple sources of information.	Candidates use simple measures and a limited number of sources of information to assess ELLs' individual language skills and communicative ability.	Candidates assess ELLs' discrete and integrated ability to use grammar, vocabulary, listening, speaking, reading, and writing to communicate appropriately using performance-based measures.	Candidates create multiple performance-based measures to assess students' language skills and communicative competence across the curriculum. Candidates share these measures with their colleagues.

Standard 4.c. Classroom-Based Assessment for ESL

Candidates know and can use a variety of performance-based assessment tools and techniques to inform instruction for in the classroom.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates understand the interdependent relationship between teaching and assessment and can develop instructional tasks and assessment tools that promote and measure student learning. They are familiar with assessment goals, tools, and tasks appropriate for ELLs that correspond with the program’s philosophy, the unit’s conceptual framework, as well as state and national standards in ESOL. Candidates can assess learners’ content-area achievement independently from their language ability and should be able to adapt classroom tests and tasks for ELLs at varying stages of English language and literacy development. They also understand the importance of assessing language skills in an integrative way.

Candidates understand that portfolios are important tools in the assessment of ELL learning. A portfolio is a collection of student work that reflects progress over time. Portfolio samples are typically based on work conducted as part of class activities or home assignments. Using authentic examples is a characteristic of unbiased performance assessment. Performance assessments help candidates evaluate students’ complex thinking (the ability to write a summary is demonstrated through a written summary; the ability to orally debate an issue is demonstrated through an oral debate). Candidates are familiar with and can use a variety of rubrics to assess portfolios and their individual contents. They also understand that self-assessment and peer-assessment techniques can be used regularly to encourage students to monitor and take control of their own learning.

Candidates develop classroom assessments using a variety of item types and elicitation and response formats to assess students’ receptive and productive language skills. Candidates assess their ELLs’ English literacy skills appropriately. They understand the implication of assessing language and literacy skills in students’ native languages. They also know how to interpret test results and plan instruction based on those results.

Candidates understand that some classroom reading assessments designed for native speakers, such as independent oral reading, may be uninformative or misleading as assessment tools for ELLs who may be overly concerned with the pronunciation demands of the task and pay less attention to comprehension.

Rubric for Standard 4.c. Classroom-Based Assessment for ESL

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standards* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
4.c.1. Use performance-based assessment tools and tasks that measure ELLs' progress.	Candidates use a limited set of performance-based tasks to assess ELLs' language and content-area learning.	Candidates use a variety of performance-based assessment tools (e.g., portfolios, classroom observation checklists, reading logs, video, spreadsheet software) that measure ELLs' progress.	Candidates design performance-based tasks and tools to measure ELLs' progress.
4.c.2. Understand and use criterion-referenced assessments appropriately with ELLs.	Candidates are familiar with criterion-referenced assessments but have not used them to make decisions about ELLs.	Candidates use authentic and traditional criterion-referenced procedures to assess ELLs' language and content-area learning. Candidates appropriately use these assessments to help determine possible special	Candidates construct and evaluate a range of criterion-referenced measures and item types to assess ELLs' learning. Candidates share this knowledge with their colleagues.

		needs (e.g., giftedness and/or learning disabilities).	
4.c.3. Use various instruments and techniques to assess content-area learning (e.g., math, science, social studies) for ELLs at varying levels of language and literacy development.	Candidates are aware of instruments and techniques to assess the content-area knowledge of ELLs, who are at varying levels of English language and literacy abilities.	Candidates use a variety of instruments and techniques, including technology-based assessment, to assess ELLs' knowledge in the content areas at varying levels of English language and literacy ability. Candidates use test adaptation techniques (e.g., simplifying the language of assessment measures and directions).	Candidates develop and adapt a variety of techniques and instruments when appropriate to assess ELLs' content learning at all levels of language proficiency and literacy.
4.c.4. Prepare ELLs to use self- and peer-assessment techniques when appropriate.	Candidates encourage ELLs to monitor their own performance and provide feedback to other learners.	Candidates model self- and peer-assessment techniques and provide opportunities for students to practice these in the classroom.	Candidates embed self- and peer-assessment techniques in their instruction and model them across the curriculum. Candidates share self- and peer-assessment techniques with their colleagues.
4.c.5. Use a variety	Candidates are	Candidates use a	Candidates develop

of rubrics to assess ELLs' language development in classroom settings.	familiar with some basic rubrics that can be used to assess ELLs' language development.	variety of rubrics to assess ELLs' language development.	and adapt a variety of rubrics to assess ELLs' language development.
--	---	--	--

Domain 5. Professionalism

Candidates keep current with new instructional techniques, research results, advances in the ESL field, and education policy issues and demonstrate knowledge of the history of ESL teaching. They use such information to reflect on and improve their instruction and assessment practices. Candidates work collaboratively with school staff and the community to improve the learning environment, provide support, and advocate for ELLs and their families.

Standard 5.a. ESL Research and History

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of history, research, educational public policy, and current practice in the field of ESL teaching and apply this knowledge to inform teaching and learning.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates are familiar with the history of ESL teaching and stay current with recent research, methodologies, and strategies in the field. They use this knowledge to design effective instruction for ELLs.

Candidates understand legal processes, mandates, and policies that have had an impact on the development of the field of ESL. They are knowledgeable about the history of legal decisions (e.g., *Lau v. Nichols*) and national legislation (e.g., No Child Left Behind) and their subsequent application to the instruction of ELLs. They can explain the impact of state and federal legislation on their classrooms and the school's community.

Rubric for Standard 5.a. ESL Research and History

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Suggested Performance Indicators	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
5.a.1. Demonstrate knowledge of language teaching methods in their historical contexts.	Candidates are familiar with different well-established teaching methodologies and theories in their historical contexts.	Candidates use their knowledge of the evolution and research in the field of ESL to provide effective instruction and can articulate their personal educational philosophy in this area.	Candidates use their knowledge of the evolution of the field of ESL to design instruction and make instructional and assessment decisions and conduct their own classroom-based research.
5.a.2. Demonstrate knowledge of the evolution of laws and policy in the ESL profession.	Candidates are aware of the laws, judicial decisions, policies, and guidelines that have shaped the field of ESL.	Candidates use their knowledge of the laws, judicial decisions, policies, and guidelines that have influenced the ESL profession to provide appropriate instruction for students.	Candidates use their knowledge of the laws, judicial decisions, policies, and guidelines that have influenced the ESL profession to design appropriate instruction for students. Candidates participate in discussions with

			colleagues and the public concerning federal, state, and local guidelines, laws, and policies that affect ELLs.
5.a.3. Demonstrate ability to read and conduct classroom research.	Candidates are familiar with the basics of classroom research.	Candidates are able to conduct classroom research.	Candidates design and implement classroom research that will affect their instruction.

Standard 5.b. Professional Development, Partnerships, and Advocacy

Candidates take advantage of professional growth opportunities and demonstrate the ability to build partnerships with colleagues and students' families, serve as community resources, and advocate for ELLs.

Supporting Explanation. Candidates actively participate in professional growth opportunities, including those offered by appropriate organizations, and they can articulate their own philosophy of education..

Candidates view ESOL families as vital resources that inform their classrooms and schools. They promote the important roles that families play in their children's linguistic, academic, and personal development. Candidates are aware of resources in the community to assist ELLs and their families and share this information with students, families, and professional colleagues.

Candidates know and understand public issues that affect the education of ELLs, and they support ELLs and their families socially and politically.

Candidates promote a school environment that values diverse student populations and provides equitable access to resources for ELLs. They collaborate with school staff to provide educational opportunities for ELLs with diverse learning needs at all English proficiency levels.

Candidates advocate for appropriate instruction and assessment by sharing their knowledge of ELLs with their general-education and content-area colleagues and the community. They also advocate for equal access to educational resources for ELLs, including technology.

Rubric for Standard 5.b. Professional Development, Partnerships, and Advocacy

These rubrics are additive. *Meets Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard*. *Exceeds Standard* assumes that the candidate has also met the criteria under *Approaches Standard* and *Meets Standard*. Performance indicators provide examples of candidate performance, and are not intended to be prescriptive.

Suggested Performance Indicator	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
5.b.1. Participate in professional growth opportunities.	Candidates are aware of professional growth opportunities, including local and national ESOL organizations.	Candidates participate in local professional growth opportunities. Candidates participate in ESOL organizations.	Candidates assist others' professional growth by sharing their expertise and mentoring others. Candidates take active roles in their professional association(s).
5.b.2 Establish professional goals.	Candidates formulate professional development plans based on their interests.	Candidates implement a personal professional development plan based on interests and reflection, taking advantage of opportunities to support these goals in professional associations and other academic organizations.	Candidates engage in a continuous cycle of ESL professional development that is informed by their instructional reflections and analysis.
5.b.3. Work with other teachers and	Candidates understand the	Candidates collaborate with	Candidates provide leadership to staff

staff to provide comprehensive, challenging educational opportunities for ELLs in the school.	importance of establishing collaborative relationships among ESL staff members and all departments and resource personnel in the school.	general and specialist school staff (e.g., multidisciplinary faculty teams) to establish an instructional program appropriate for ELLs at a variety of English proficiency levels.	in establishing appropriate instructional opportunities for ELLs.
5.b.4. Engage in collaborative teaching in general education, content-area, special education, and gifted classrooms.	Candidates are aware of a variety of collaborative teaching models.	Candidates teach collaboratively with other teachers to assist ELLs in general education, content-area, special education, and gifted classrooms.	Candidates provide leadership to staff in developing collaborative instructional models for ELLs.
5.b.5. Advocate for ELLs' access to academic classes, resources, and instructional technology.	Candidates understand the importance of advocating for ELLs, including full access to school resources and technology and appropriate instruction for students with special needs or giftedness.	Candidates advocate for ELLs and their families including full access to school resources and technology and appropriate instruction for students with special needs or giftedness. Candidates share with colleagues the importance of ELLs' equal access to	Candidates serve as advocates and ESOL resources to support ELLs and their families as families make decisions in the schools and community. Candidates help colleagues appropriately select, adapt, and customize resources

		<p>educational resources, including technology.</p> <p>Candidates take part in instructional teams advocating for appropriate instructional services for ELLs who may have special needs or giftedness.</p>	<p>for use by ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates take leadership roles on instructional teams advocating for appropriate instructional services for ELLs who may have special needs or giftedness.</p>
5.b.6 Support ELL families.	Candidates are familiar with community language education and other resources available to ELLs and their families.	<p>Candidates provide ELLs and their families with information, support, and assistance as they advocate together for the students and their families.</p> <p>Candidates help families participate fully in their school and community.</p> <p>Candidates engage with community members and policymakers with respect to issues affecting ELLs.</p>	<p>Candidates help create empowering circumstances and environments for ELLs and their families.</p> <p>Candidates take leadership roles with community members and policymakers with respect to issues affecting ELLs.</p>
5.b.7. Serve as professional	Candidates understand ways to	Candidates model for their colleagues	Candidates help other teachers and

<p>resource personnel in their educational communities.</p>	<p>facilitate cooperation among ESOL professionals, families, administrators, community members, policymakers and their ELLs.</p>	<p>a variety of techniques and attitudes needed to work effectively with ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates keep current with media reports about the education of ELLs.</p>	<p>school administrators' work effectively with ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates provide instruction and professional growth activities for colleagues and share skills for working with ELLs.</p> <p>Candidates help policymakers understand the curricula and instructional approaches that best meet the needs of ELLs in their community.</p>
---	---	---	--

APPENDIX A. DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW OF STANDARDS

Time Line

When	Task
July 05–Sept 05	Develop plan and RAIs to revise the standards and form the TESOL/NCATE PK–12 ESL Teacher Education Program Standing Committee.
July 05–July 06	Write “how-to” document for institutions.
Oct 06	Submission of “Revision of Standards Plan” to TESOL Standing Committee On Standards (SCS).
Oct 06 TESOL Board Meeting	Consideration of RAIs to form PK–12 Teacher Education Program Standing Committee.
Nov 06	Appoints members of the PK-12 Teacher Education Program Standing Committee (Committee).
Dec 06	Develop survey for campus reps, teacher trainers, PK–12, TESOL interest sections Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Bilingual Education, and Teacher Education about changes to current standards and guidance documents; make available online from December 05 through June 06.
Mar 1, 2007	Interim survey results available to PK–12 Teacher Education Program Standing Committee.
Mar 07	Begin revision of guidance document.
Mar 07	Begin revision of standards.
Sept 07	Revise target date for submission to NCATE to October 09. Respond to TESOL survey on revisions.
Oct 07	Complete first draft of revised standards and share with TESOL Standards Committee and NCATE.
Nov 07	TESOL office posts revised standards on TESOL Web site for comment.

Nov 07–Feb 08	Revise standards based on comments and prepares for submission to TESOL Standards Standing Committee.
Mar 08 @ TESOL Conference	TESOL Standards Standing Committee reviews and approves draft standards.
April 08	Present revised standards at CATESOL conference.
April 09	Present revised standards at CATESOL conference.
May 09	Write and submit RAI for approval of revised standards at June TESOL Executive Committee meeting.
June 09	TESOL Executive Committee approves revised standards and submits to TESOL Publication Dept. to edit and prepare for publication.
October 09	NCATE approves standards.
February 2010	Revised standards are officially in use by Institutes of Higher Education

TESOL Standards Aligned with Proposed NCATE Principles and Elements

At the time of publication, NCATE is proposing to revise the way SPAs write standards so that SPAs will produce consistent results. To this end they have created a task force that proposes a model with four principles. As the TESOL/NCATE P-12 ESL Teacher Education Program Standards Team worked through our revisions and examined the proposed principles, we found that all of the principles and their elements could easily be aligned with the newly revised TESOL Standards.

The following chart aligns the proposed NCATE Principles (and their defining elements) with the revised TESOL Standards. The column on the left lists the proposed 11 TESOL standards, and the four columns on the right list the NCATE proposed principles at the top, and the relevant elements next to the TESOL Standards.

NCATE Proposed Principles Aligned With the TESOL Standards

TESOL Standard	Content Knowledge	Content Pedagogy	Learning Environments	Professional Knowledge & Skills
-----------------------	-------------------	------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

	e			
1.a. Language as a system	All	<p>Knowledge of how students develop and learn,</p> <p>Students' diversity and differing approaches to learning,</p> <p>Cultural influences on learning,</p> <p>Students' preconceptions that must be engaged for effective learning, and</p> <p>Familiarity with standards-based instruction, assessment, and learning.</p>	<p>Individual and group motivation for a disciplined learning environment and engagement in learning,</p> <p>Assessment and analysis of student learning, making appropriate adjustments in instruction, and monitoring student progress to assure meaningful learning experiences for all students.</p>	
1.b. Language acquisition and development	All	<p>Knowledge of how students develop and learn,</p> <p>Students' diversity and differing</p>	<p>Individual and group motivation for a disciplined learning environment and engagement in</p>	<p>Understanding and ability to demonstrate a commitment to equitable and ethical treatment of all students and colleagues;</p>

		<p>approaches to learning,</p> <p>Cultural influences on learning,</p> <p>Students' preconceptions that must be engaged for effective learning, and</p> <p>Familiarity with standards-based instruction, assessment, and learning.</p>	<p>learning,</p> <p>Assessment and analysis of student learning, making appropriate adjustments in instruction, and monitoring student progress to assure meaningful learning experiences for all students, and</p> <p>Use of a variety of instructional strategies, materials, and applications of technology to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.</p>	<p>knowledge of the collaborative roles of other school professionals and readiness to work with colleagues, families, and community agencies.</p>
2. Culture as it affects student learning	All	Students' diversity and differing approaches to	Individual and group motivation for a disciplined	

		<p>learning,</p> <p>Cultural influences on learning,</p> <p>Students' preconceptions that must be engaged for effective learning,</p>	<p>learning environment and engagement in learning,</p>	
<p>3.a. Planning for standards-based ESL and content instruction</p>	All	<p>Familiarity with standards-based instruction, assessment, and learning.</p> <p>Knowledge of how students develop and learn,</p> <p>Students' diversity and differing approaches to learning,</p> <p>Cultural influences on learning,</p>	<p>Assessment and analysis of student learning, making appropriate adjustments in instruction, and monitoring student progress to assure meaningful learning experiences for all students.</p>	<p>Understanding and ability to demonstrate a commitment to equitable and ethical treatment of all students and colleagues; knowledge of the collaborative roles of other school professionals and readiness to work with colleagues, families, and community agencies.</p>
<p>3.b. Managing and implementing standards-</p>	All	<p>Knowledge of how students develop and learn,</p>	<p>Individual and group motivation for a disciplined</p>	<p>Understanding and ability to demonstrate a commitment to</p>

<p>based ESL and content instruction</p>		<p>Students' diversity and differing approaches to learning,</p> <p>Cultural influences on learning,</p> <p>Students' preconceptions that must be engaged for effective learning, and</p> <p>Familiarity with standards-based instruction, assessment, and learning.</p>	<p>learning environment and engagement in learning,</p> <p>Assessment and analysis of student learning, making appropriate adjustments in instruction, and monitoring student progress to assure meaningful learning experiences for all students, and</p> <p>Use of a variety of instructional strategies, materials, and applications of technology to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.</p>	<p>equitable and ethical treatment of all students and colleagues;</p> <p>knowledge of the collaborative roles of other school professionals and readiness to work with colleagues, families, and community agencies.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

<p>3.c. Using resources and technology effectively in ESL and content instruction</p>	<p>All</p>		<p>Use of a variety of instructional strategies, materials, and applications of technology to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.</p>	<p>Engagement in professional experiences and reflection on them to enhance their own professional growth.</p>
<p>4.a. Issues of assessment for English language learners</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Familiarity with standards-based instruction, assessment, and learning.</p>	<p>Knowledge of how students develop and learn, Students' diversity and differing approaches to learning, Cultural influences on learning, Assessment and analysis of student learning, making appropriate adjustments in instruction, and monitoring student</p>	<p>Engagement in professional experiences and reflection on them to enhance their own professional growth. Understanding and ability to demonstrate a commitment to equitable and ethical treatment of all students and colleagues; knowledge of the collaborative roles of other school professionals and readiness to work with colleagues, families, and community</p>

			progress to assure meaningful learning experiences for all students.	agencies.
4.b. Language proficiency assessment	All	Familiarity with standards-based instruction, assessment, and learning.	Assessment and analysis of student learning, making appropriate adjustments in instruction, and monitoring student progress to assure meaningful learning experiences for all students.	
4.c. Classroom-based assessment for ESL	All	Knowledge of how students develop and learn, Students' diversity and differing approaches to learning, Cultural influences on learning, Students'	Individual and group motivation for a disciplined learning environment and engagement in learning, Assessment and analysis of student learning, making	

		<p>preconceptions that must be engaged for effective learning, and</p> <p>Familiarity with standards-based instruction, assessment, and learning.</p>	<p>appropriate adjustments in instruction, and monitoring student progress to assure meaningful learning experiences for all students, and</p> <p>Use of a variety of instructional strategies, materials, and applications of technology to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.</p>	
5.a. ESL research and history	All			Engagement in professional experiences and reflection on them to enhance their own professional growth.
5.b. Professional development,				Engagement in professional experiences and

<p>partnership& advocacy</p>			<p>reflection on them to enhance their own professional growth;</p> <p>Understanding and ability to demonstrate a commitment to equitable and ethical treatment of all students and colleagues; knowledge of the collaborative roles of other school professionals and readiness to work with colleagues, families, and community agencies; and</p> <p>Ability to identify opportunities for collaborative and leadership roles as members of teams.</p>
---	--	--	--

APPENDIX B. SELECTING AND TRAINING REVIEWERS

NCATE requires all specialty-area organizations (SPAs) to develop procedures for quality assurance in the selection, training, and evaluation of individuals who will conduct program reviews as well as procedures to avoid conflicts of interest or bias in assigning review of programs in each institution. SPAs also are required from time to time to provide materials to NCATE for use by the Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) and its Process and Evaluation Committee to show how SASB guidelines for review procedures, quality, and feedback to institutions are being implemented and whether SPA actions are completed in a timely manner. SPAs may be asked as well to review and comment on analyses prepared by NCATE for use by the Process and Evaluation Committee.

In keeping with these NCATE requirements, TESOL has developed the following procedures for selecting and training reviewers.

Procedures for Selecting Reviewers

TESOL's pool of potential volunteer reviewers includes trainers, administrators, professors, teachers, and practitioners who have acquired training and experience in the application of the TESOL/NCATE P–12 ESL Teacher Education Standards. TESOL solicits nominations of reviewers from its interest sections (ISs), the TESOL Standards Committee, or by colleagues or supervisors. In addition, interested TESOL professionals may self-nominate. Once nominated, interested individuals complete and submit a reviewer application.

Applications are screened and rated by at least two TESOL/NCATE team members to ensure that all reviewer requirements are met. Reviewers are selected on the basis of professional experience; ability to represent the needs of the profession; and potential ability and willingness to provide comprehensive, valid, timely reviews. Although no deliberate action has been taken to recruit diverse reviewers, the vast diversity that exists within the ELL teaching profession is reflected among the growing pool of TESOL/NCATE reviewers.

The following is a list of recommended qualifications to become an NCATE/TESOL program reviewer:

- Expertise in the field of teaching, administration, teacher education, research, and/or program evaluation.
- Three or more years of teaching or other experience related to P–12 ESL education (some of which has been U.S. based).
- Expertise in the fields of TESOL, applied linguistics, and/or TESOL teacher education.

- Current membership in TESOL.
- Basic knowledge about interpretation of data, performance-based assessment, use of rating scales and rubrics, and analysis of written information.
- Ability to write clearly and concisely.
- Ability to make reasoned professional judgments about educational programs.
- Good interpersonal skills, the ability to interact with team members in a courteous and collegial manner, and the ability to work toward consensus in team deliberations.
- Computer literacy, particularly word-processing skills.
- E-mail access.
- Commitment and availability to perform duties for a 3-year term.

Procedures for Training Reviewers

All reviewers must participate in the day-long TESOL reviewer-training program, held every year prior to the TESOL annual convention at the convention site. Training covers various aspects of interpreting and applying the standards and holistically evaluating the program using the TESOL designated rubrics for preparing the program report. New reviewers do not have to pay the TESOL convention registration fee. In addition, experienced reviewers are invited to attend the training session to help refresh their skills.

APPENDIX C. PREPARING AND REVIEWING PROGRAM REPORTS

Training for Institutions in Preparing and Submitting a Program Report

TESOL holds training sessions for institutions prior to TESOL's annual convention on how to prepare and submit a program report. Institutions that are preparing for national recognition by NCATE are invited to send at least one representative to these sessions.

For information on scheduling and costs, please contact the TESOL/NCATE Program Coordinator, Diane Staehr Fenner at dstaehrfenner@tesol.org.

Procedures for Reviewing Program Reports

Before evaluating materials, each reviewer is provided a list of the institutions that have submitted TESOL reports that cycle. Reviewers are asked to consider whether a potential conflict of interest might exist or be perceived to exist with any institution for any reason, including factors such as prior involvement with the institution, program, or personnel at that institution. A program submission is never assigned to reviewers who live in the state in which the institution is located.

Trained reviewers are assigned to two- to three-member review teams, comprising one lead reviewer and one to two reviewers. Each member of a review team independently evaluates the program under review for compliance with each standard by examining the statements made by the program in submitted material(s), programmatic evidence (e.g., of program policy and practice), and evidence of candidate performance consistent with the standards.

Each review team member independently conducts an initial review of program materials uploaded to NCATE's electronic system; reviewers are encouraged to confer with each other prior to submitting their independent reports. When at least two reviewers agree, the lead reviewer compiles the reviews into one report and uploads it to NCATE for auditing by an experienced reviewer and subsequent return to the submitting institution. Reviewers are given a specific time frame within which they must complete their reviews and submit them to NCATE.

APPENDIX D. SPA RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER NCATE PARTNERSHIPS

TESOL follows the guidelines set down in NCATE's Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) Policies, Section 4: SASB and SPA Responsibilities Under State Partnerships, adopted in October 2004. Under these guidelines, SPAs are expected to review the alignment of state standards with their program standards as part of the state partnership application, which is completed every seven years.

TESOL's P-12 ESL Teacher Education Program Standards Team reviews state partnership applications by comparing the state's standards for the licensure, certification, or endorsement for ESL teachers with TESOL's NCATE-approved standards. The team decides if (a) there is alignment, noting any state standards that exceed the SPA program standards, or (b) there is not sufficient alignment with the SPA program standards, noting which of the standards are not sufficiently aligned, and explaining why alignment is not achieved. The term *alignment* means comparability or similarity; it does not demand that state standards be identical to those of TESOL.

TESOL is also available to work proactively with states during development of state standards both to provide the expertise in the field and to avoid, so far as is possible, major problems of omission or differences that would prevent successful alignment with the TESOL/NCATE standards.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

academic language: Language used in the learning of academic subject matter in a formal school context; aspects of language strongly associated with literacy and academic achievement, including specific academic terms or technical language, and speech registers related to each field of study.

accommodation: Accommodations for ELLs involve changes to testing procedures, testing materials, or the testing situation in order to allow students meaningful participation in an assessment (e.g., test translations, bilingual dictionaries, extended time).

acculturation: The process of accepting, borrowing, and exchanging ideas and traits among cultures, resulting in new or blended cultures.

achievement test: Test that reflects a student's progress and learning of materials specific to course objectives. Achievement tests can also be comprehensive state or nationwide standardized tests given once a year to show school-wide improvement.

acquisition: The process of developing competency in a language.

affective variables: The emotional variables that affect language acquisition (e.g., motivation, self-esteem, attitudes, anxiety).

alternative measures of assessment: Criterion-referenced method of assessment that is alternative to traditional testing, often using nonquantifiable results. For examples, see *authentic measures*.

assimilation: The blending or fusing of minority groups into the dominant society.

authentic measures: Various kinds of assessment reflecting student learning of, progress on, and attitudes toward relevant coursework (e.g., performance assessment, portfolios, peer assessment, self-assessment).

bias: Content material reflects cultural and/or linguistic information unfamiliar to ESOL learners.

biculturalism: Identifying with the cultures of two different ethnic, national, or language groups.

biliteracy: Ability to read and write fluently in two languages.

benchmark: A sample of performance that is used as a standard to judge other samples.

code-switching: A change by a speaker or writer from one language or variety of language to another at the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level.

cognate: A word in one language that is similar in form and meaning to a word in another language.

cognitive variables: Developmental factors (e.g., age, developmental maturity, learner styles, learner strategies) that enable students to think, solve problems, and acquire information.

communicative competence: The ability to recognize and produce authentic and appropriate language correctly and fluently in any situation; use of language in realistic, everyday settings; involves *grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.*

comprehensible input: A construct developed to describe understandable and meaningful language directed at L2 learners under optimal conditions; characterized as the language the learner already knows plus a range of new language that is made comprehensible by the use of certain planned strategies.

constructivism: A learning theory that suggests that learners actively construct their own understandings within a social context rather than being merely receptacles of knowledge.

criterion referenced: In this form of assessment, all students who meet the criteria can be successful. Frequently used to judge how students are achieving along a continuum, as opposed to norm-referenced testing, which uses a bell curve so that not all students can be successful (*see norm referenced*).

diagnostic assessment: Assessment measure used to identify ELLs' strengths and areas needing improvement, usually for placement purposes.

dialect: A regional or social variety of language distinguished by features of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and discourse that differ from other varieties.

ELL (English language learner): In this document, the term refers to the student who is learning English in a language program (*see ESOL*).

ESL (English as a second language): In this document, the term refers to the profession of English language teaching (and the professionals who work in it).

ESOL (English to speakers of other languages): In this document, the term refers to the program designed to teach the English language to students who need to learn it.

high-stakes testing: Any test that is used to determine a student's future or that functions as a gatekeeper (e.g., a test that qualifies a student to graduate from high school). Also used to refer to the statewide achievement tests given to meet federal requirements of yearly progress in content areas such as math and English.

interlanguage: An intermediate system that learners create as they attempt to achieve native-like competence.

language varieties: Variations of a language used by particular groups of people that includes regional dialects characterized by distinct vocabularies, speech patterns, grammatical features, and so forth; may also vary by social group (*sociolect*) or idiosyncratically for a particular individual (*idiolect*).

learning styles: Preferences for processing information; these preferences are often culturally based.

native language assessment: An instrument designed to provide information on the level of proficiency an individual possesses in his or her native, or first, language; the assessment should cover proficiency in all four skill areas: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

nonverbal communication: Paralinguistic and nonlinguistic messages that can be transmitted in conjunction with language or without the aid of language; paralinguistic mechanisms include gestures, facial expressions, and body language.

norm referenced: Norm-referenced tests rank students or groups by measuring their relative performance against that of the norm group. Most commonly used to meet state and federal requirements for yearly achievement.

peer assessment: A form of assessment where students provide feedback for each other. Teachers will usually need to model this practice, particularly for ELLs.

placement: Assessment to determine the language proficiency level of a student to place them in an appropriate program.

portfolio: Selections of a student's work that reflect progress over time, typically conducted as part of class activities or homework; using authentic samples is a characteristic of performance assessment.

primary language: First or native language spoken by an individual, sometimes referred to as the individual's L1 or home language.

proficiency testing: Assessment to determine progress in language development over time. Usually criterion referenced.

reclassification: Determination that an ELL is ready to be mainstreamed and does not need further English language support. It is usually determined by a language proficiency test, teacher input, and a standardized academic achievement test used with the general population.

reliability: A technical measure to determine an assessment's ability to produce consistent, accurate results.

SIFE: See *students with interrupted formal education*.

social language: The aspect of language proficiency strongly associated with basic fluency in face-to-face interaction; natural speech in social interactions, including those that occur in a classroom.

sociocultural competence: ability to function effectively in a particular social or cultural context according to the rules or expectations of behavior held by members of that social or cultural group.

sociocultural variables: Factors associated with the social and cultural community (e.g., language and ethnic status, value systems, etc.).

sociolinguistic competence: Related to communicative competence; the extent to which language is appropriately understood and used in a given situation (e.g., the ability to make apologies, give compliments, and politely refuse requests).

standardized achievement tests: Measures developed commercially or at the district or state level intended to determine how schools are performing in content areas (see *high-stakes testing*).

standards-based assessment: The systematic planning, gathering, analyzing, and reporting of student performance according to established standards, such as the ESL standards.

students with interrupted formal education (SIFE): Typically newcomer students who arrive with significant gaps in their education from their home country or latest country of residence.

traditional measures of assessment: Forms of assessment, for example, multiple choice, true/false, fill in the blank, that typically examine discrete forms of knowledge and do not include actual performance or application of knowledge.

validity: A technical measure of an assessment's match between the information collected by the items and its specified purposes.

RESOURCES

Domain 1. Language

Bailey, A. (Ed.). (2007). *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Andrews, L. (2001). *Linguistics for L2 teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Blum, S. D. (Eds.). (2009). *Making sense of language: Readings in culture and communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Brown, H. D. (2007a). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Prentice Hall.

Brown, H. D. (2007b). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Clark, V. P., Eschholz, P. A., Rosa, A. F., & Simon, B. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Language: Introductory readings* (7th ed.). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.

Chamot, A. U (2009). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18–36.

Cummins, J., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2001). *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Díaz-Rico, L. T., & Weed, K. Z. (2010). *The cross-cultural, language, and academic development handbook: A complete K–12 reference guide* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fasold, R. W., & Connor-Linton, J. (Eds.). (2006). *An introduction to language and linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2000, August 23). *What teachers need to know about language*. Retrieved March 4, 2002, from <http://faculty.tamu-commerce.edu/jthompson/Resources/FillmoreSnow2000.pdf>

- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2001). *Between worlds: Access to second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, D. E. & Freeman, Y. S. (2004). *Essential linguistics: What you need to know to teach reading, ESL, spelling, phonics, and grammar*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fromkin, V., & Rodman, R. (1998). *An introduction to language* (6th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. New York: Routledge.
- Genesee, F. (1994). *Educating second language children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, C. J. (2005). *An introduction to language & linguistics: Breaking the language spell*. New York: Continuum.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Celce-Murcia, M. A. (2007). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course*. 2nd ed. Boston: Heinle ELT.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Luria, H., Seymore, D. M., & Smoke, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Language and linguistics in context: Readings and applications for teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Oaks, D. D. (2001). *Linguistics at work: A reader of applications*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Omaggio-Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.
- Parker, F., & Riley, K. (2005). *Linguistics for non-linguists: A primer with exercises* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Perez, B., & Torres-Guzman, M. E. (1996). *Learning in two worlds: An integrated Spanish/English biliteracy approach* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Rickerson, E. M., & Hilton, B. (Eds.). (2006). *The 5 minute linguist*. London: Equinox.
- Scarcella, R. (2003). *Academic English: A conceptual framework* (Technical Report 2003-1). Irvine: University of California.

VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2007). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Domain 2. Culture as It Affects English Language Learning

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2007). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J., Brown, K., Sayers, D. (2007). *Literacy, technology, and diversity: Teaching for success in changing times*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fishman, J. A. (1999). *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freedman, J. (2002). *The temple of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldstein, T. (2003). *Teaching and learning in a multilingual school: Choices, risks, and dilemmas*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (2002). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Hall, J. K. (2002). *Teaching and researching language and culture*. New York: Pearson.

Kubota, R., & Lin, A. M. Y. (Eds.). (2009). *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*. New York: Routledge.

McKay, S. L., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moran, P. (1998). *Teaching culture*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Nieto, S. (2006). Language, literacy and culture: Intersections and implications. In H. Luria, D. M. Seymour, & T. Smoke (Eds.), *Language and linguistics in context* (pp. 1–24). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Purcell-Gates, V. (Ed.). (2007). *Cultural practices of literacy: Case studies of language, literacy, social practice, and power*. New York: Routledge.

Rasool, J., & Curtis, A. C. (2000). *Multicultural education in middle and secondary classrooms: Meeting the challenge of diversity and change*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Saville-Troike, M. (2005). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2007). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Trudgill, P., & Cheshire, J. (Eds.). (1998). *The sociolinguistic reader: Multilingualism and variation*. London: Arnold.

Trumbull, E., Rothstein-Fish, C. R., Greenfield, P. M., & Quiron, B. (2001). *Bridging cultures between home and school*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wong, S. (2006). *Dialogic approaches to TESOL: Where the ginkgo tree grows*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Domain 3. Using Resources Effectively in ESL Instruction

Ada, A. F., & Campoy, F. I. (2004). *Authors in the classroom: A transformative education process*. New York: Pearson.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Becker, H., & Hamayan, E. (2001), *Teaching ESL K–12: Views from the classroom*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connections*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Butler, Y. G., & Hakuta, K. (2006). Cognitive factors in children’s L1 and L2 reading. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10, 23–27.

Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2004). *The literacy curriculum and bilingual education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Cappellini, M. (2005). *Balancing reading and language learning: A resource for teaching English language learners, K–5*. Portland, OR: Stenhouse.

Chamot, A. U. (2009). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2009). *Literacy Instruction for English language learners*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Cummins, J., Brown, K., Sayers, D. (2007). *Literacy, technology, and diversity: Teaching for success in changing times*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Díaz-Rico, L. (2007). *Strategies for teaching English language learners: Methods and strategies* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Díaz-Rico, L. T., & Weed, K. Z. (2006). *The crosscultural language and academic development handbook* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Echevarria, J. M., & Short, D. J. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Echevarria J., & Graves, A. (2007). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English language learners with diverse abilities* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Fathman, A. K., & Crowther, D. T. (Eds.). (2006). *Science for English language learners: K–12 classroom strategies*. Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.
- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2000). *Teaching reading in multilingual classrooms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (2004). *Essential linguistics*. Boston, MA: Heinemann.
- Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (2007). *English language learners: The essential guide*. New York, NY: Scholastic.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, B., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, F., Paradis, J., & Crago, M. (2004). *Dual language development and disorders: A handbook on bilingualism and second language learning*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Gunderson, L. (2009). *ESL (ELL) literacy instruction: A guidebook to theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

- Hamayan, E., Marler, B., Sanchez-Lopez, C., & Damico, J. (2007). *Special education considerations for English language learners: Delivering a continuum of services*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K. G. (2005). *Mastering ESL and bilingual methods: Differentiating instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students*. Boston: Pearson.
- High, J. (1998). *Second language learning through cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writer's text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2008). *Becoming a language teacher: A practical guide to second language learning and teaching*. Boston: Pearson.
- Kaufman, D., & Crandall, J. (Eds). (2005). *Content-based instruction in primary and secondary school settings*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Kinsella, K. (2005, November). Teaching academic vocabulary. *Aiming High RESOURCE: Aspirando a lo Mejor*. Santa Rosa, CA: Sonoma County Office of Education. Retrieved August 13, 2009, from http://www.scoe.org/docs/ah/AH_kinsella2.pdf.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marzano, R. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervisions and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works—Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2008). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening & speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York: Routledge.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2000). *English as a new language standards for National Board certification*. Available from <http://www.nbpts.org/nbpts/standards/ecmc-english.html>

Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2008). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A Resource book for K–12 teachers* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Proctor, C. P., Carlo, M., & Show, C. (2005). Native Spanish-speaking children reading in English: Toward a model of comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 246–256.

Samway, K. D. (2006). *When English language learners write*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Samway, K. D., & McKeon, D. (2007). *Myths and realities: Best practices for English language learners* (2nd ed.) Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work—Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellence in Education.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (2006). *PreK–12 English language proficiency standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for English language learners*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2003). *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Enriching ESOL pedagogy: Readings and activities for engagement, reflection, and inquiry*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Domain 4. Assessment

Anthony, R., Johnson, T., Mickelson, N., & Preece, A. (1991). *Evaluating literacy: A perspective for change*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Arter, J., & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bailey, K. M. (1998). *Learning about language assessment*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. New York: Longman.

- Brown, J. D. (1998). *New ways in classroom assessment*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Chappelle, C. A.; Stoyhoff, S., (Eds.). (2005). *ESOL tests and testing*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Chase, C. (1999). *Contemporary assessment for educators*. New York: Longman.
- Coombe, C., Folse, K., & Hubley, N. (2007). *A practical guide to assessing English language learners*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2006). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English language learners with diverse abilities* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2006). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge.
- Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. A. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottlieb, M. (2006a). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gottlieb, M. (2006b). *ELL assessment kit*. Austin, TX: Rigby, Harcourt Achieve
- Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Classroom testing*. New York: Longman.
- Hughes, A. (2002). *Testing for language teachers, 2nd edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McKay, P. (2005). *Assessing young language learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- Rhodes, R. L., Ochoa, S. H., & Ortiz, S. O. (2005). *Assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students: A practical guide*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Rollins Hurley, S. & Villamil Tinajero, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Literacy assessment of second language learners*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shohamy, E. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. New York: Longman.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (1998). *Managing the assessment process: A framework for measuring student attainment of the ESL standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Domain 5. History of the Field

Baker, C. (2006.). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2001). *An introductory reader of the writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Díaz-Rico, L. (2007). *Strategies for teaching English learners*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Díaz-Rico, L. T., & Weed, K. Z. (2010). *The cross-cultural, language, and academic development handbook: A complete K–12 reference guide* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (2008). *The foundations of dual language instruction* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Advocacy

Christison, M., & Murray, D. E. (Eds.). (2008). *Leadership in English language education: Theoretical foundations and practical skills in changing times*. New York: Routledge.

Cloud, N., Genessee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cummins, J. (2001). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Díaz, C. F., Massialas, B. G., & Xanthopoulos, J. S. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Krashen, S. D. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education.

Krashen, S. (1999). *Condemned without a trial: Bogus arguments against bilingual education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Shannon, P. (1992). *Becoming political: Readings and writing in the politics of literacy education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Sharle, A., & Szabó, A., (2000). *Learner autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shohamy, E. (2005). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (2008). A human rights perspective on language ecology. In A. Creese, P. Martin, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed.): Vol. 9. *Ecology of Language* (pp. 3–14). New York: Springer.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2008). Human rights and language policy in education. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed.): Vol. 5. *Bilingual Education* (pp. 117–131). New York: Springer.
- Tiedt, P. L., & Tiedt, I. M. (1999). *Multicultural teaching: A handbook of activities, information, and resources*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tollefson, J. (1995). *Power and inequality in language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reflective Practitioner**
- Bennet, C. I. (1999). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Byrd, P., & Nelson, G. (Eds.). (2003). *Sustaining professionalism*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2004). *The literacy curriculum & bilingual education: A critical examination*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cadiero-Kaplan, K., Ochoa, A., Kuhlman, N., Olivos, E., & Rodriguez, J. (Eds.). (2006). *The living work of teachers: Ideology & practice*. Covina, CA: California Association of Bilingual Education.
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Nelson, O. G., & Linek, W. M. (1999). *Practical classroom applications of language experience: Looking back, looking forward*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nieto, S. (2007). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wink, J. (2000). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Research

Anderson, N., & Han, Z. (Eds.). (2009). *Second language reading research and instruction: Crossing the boundaries*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Burns, A. (2009). *Doing action research in second language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. New York: Routledge.

Doughty, C., & Long, M. (Eds.). (2003). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Edge, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Action research*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (2005). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Johnson, D. (1992). *Approaches to research in 2nd language learning*. New York: Longman.

Johnson, K., & Golombek, P. (2002). *Teachers narrative inquiry as professional development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. New York: Routledge.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

McKay, S. L. (2005). *Researching second language classrooms*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2009). *Doing and writing action research*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Perry, F. L., Jr. (2005). *Research in applied linguistics: Becoming a discerning consumer*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Samway, K. D. (2006). *When English language learners write: Connecting research to practice, K-8*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Seliger, H. W., & Shohamy, E. G. (1990). *Second language research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stringer, E. T. (2007). *Action research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

Stringer, E. T., Christensen, L. M., & Baldin, S. C. (2009). *Integrating teaching, learning, and action research: Enhancing instruction in the K–12 classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.