
2F

Information

Professional Services Committee

Recommendations from the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel

Executive Summary: At its April 2008 meeting, the Commission directed that an advisory panel be convened to review the range of English Learner authorizations and make recommendations to the Commission as appropriate to meeting the needs of English learners. The panel met three times during 2009. This agenda item presents the recommendations from the panel along with additional information for the Commission's consideration.

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator,
Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

January 2010

Recommendations from the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel

Introduction

In February 2008, a stakeholder meeting was held to discuss the current credentialing system as it relates to preparation to teach English learners (EL). This discussion led to the development of an agenda item presented to the Commission at its April 2008 meeting during which the Commission directed staff to convene an advisory panel to consider the range of English learner authorizations and make recommendations to the Commission as appropriate to meeting the needs of English learner students (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2008-04/2008-04-2E.pdf>). Commission direction to staff included asking the panel to look at the possibility of establishing a new single subject credential in the teaching of English as a New Language in addition to looking at English learner authorizations. The panel met three times, in March, May, and October 2009. An update on the work of the panel was presented to the Commission at the October 2009 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-10/2009-10-2H.pdf>).

Part I: Background

Based on the discussion at the February 2008 stakeholder meeting and the Commission meeting of April 2008, the charge to govern the work of the English Learners Authorization Advisory panel was developed, as follows:

Charge to the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel

The charge to the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel is to review current research and findings in the field of English learner education in order to provide recommendations for the Commission's consideration in the following areas:

1. Teacher preparation for all teachers working with English learners:

- Where are the key gaps in EL student achievement in attaining proficiency in English?
- Is the set of knowledge, skills and abilities represented in the Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD)/California Teacher of English Learner (CTEL) content specifications sufficient to meet teacher and student needs at the elementary and at the secondary levels?
 - If not, what additional knowledge, skills and abilities are needed?
 - Do these knowledge, skills and abilities differ with respect to elementary/secondary, or with respect to EL proficiency in English?
 - Are the additional knowledge, skills and abilities contained within any other set of Commission standards?
- How do the CLAD content specifications relate to other states' requirements for teachers of English learners, such as Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages/English as a Second Language (TESOL/ESL) standards?

2. Teacher preparation for secondary level teachers working with English learners:

- Are single subject teacher candidates prepared to teach their specific content to English learners? If not, what additional preparation should they have in their credential program?

3. English as a New/World Language (ENL/EWL)

- What is the purpose and use of a credential in English as New/World Language as used in other states and in National Board Certification?
- How do the standards for ENL/EWL relate to the CLAD standards? to TESOL standards? to World Language standards?
- What is the relationship between ESL and ENL/EWL?
- Do other states give college-eligible standing to ENL/EWL courses?
- Should California consider a single subject credential in ENL/EWL?

First Panel Meeting, March 2009

The first meeting of the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel was held on March 11, 2009. At that meeting, the panel:

- Reviewed the charge for the work of the panel.
- Reviewed the source documents and data discussed by attendees at the stakeholder meeting of February 2008.
- Reviewed the sets of current standards for teacher preparation to teach English learners (i.e., CLAD, CTEL, and TESOL).
- Discussed a wide range of issues relating to the achievement of English learners, including how to help secondary level English learner students and teachers, what content might be lacking in the current sets of standards, what teacher support needs exist in the field for beginning and veteran teachers of English learners, and related items.

The panel members were deeply engaged in the day's discussions, and captured their thoughts in writing for sharing at the next meeting. Following the meeting, members provided additional source readings for the reflection and consideration of all panel members. These documents are listed in Appendix B, and represent current thinking in the field. Panel members read these documents prior to the second panel meeting with a focus on how the information related to the panel's scope of work.

Second Panel Meeting, May 2009

The English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel held a second meeting on May 20, 2009. At this meeting, participants:

- Reviewed the written thoughts of panel members from the initial meeting.
- Discussed and came to consensus on a set of core themes emerging from both the panel's discussions and the current research literature in the field.
- Discussed credentialing options and structures reflecting these themes that could form the basis for recommendations to the Commission.
- Discussed what should be in the report that will be developed for the Commission's consideration.

Panel members agreed that the range of research literature in the field was essentially consonant with the views held by panel members even though panel members came from a wide variety of

backgrounds, including school districts, postsecondary institutions, professional organizations, and other key constituencies and stakeholders.

Third Panel Meeting, October 2009

The English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel held a third meeting on October 8, 2009. At this meeting, participants:

- Reviewed and came to consensus on their views of the current status and conditions of English learner student achievement, teacher preparation with respect to learning about teaching English learners, teacher support in the field for continued professional development in the area of teaching English learners, and appropriateness of current preparation standards with respect to SDAIE and English Language Development (ELD). These views will be articulated below in relation to each of the panel’s recommendations.
- Came to consensus on the set of recommendations presented below, as well as identified some additional areas where the panel felt the issues involved were sufficiently complex that the panel could not determine at this point what recommendation should be developed. These areas will also be described below as they relate to the panel’s deliberations and recommendations, and options for future consideration will be presented.

At the conclusion of the third and final panel meeting, it was agreed that staff would develop this agenda item and circulate the draft to panel members for their review. This agenda item has been reviewed by all members of the panel and accurately reflects their discussions, viewpoints, and recommendations.

Part II: Contextual Information About the Status of English Learners in California

Background information about English learners

The academic, social, and economic status of English learners are critical factors in California’s overall student achievement outcomes. The issue of English learner achievement affects every grade level, every content area, and virtually every teacher in the state. English learners make up 25% of the K-12 student population. In 2007, data reported by the Legislative Analyst’s Office showed that 85% of EL students spoke Spanish as their primary language; 85% were economically disadvantaged, 8 to 10% per year were designated as “Fluent English Proficient,” and at least 6 percent had attended California schools less than one year. Of all EL students in 2007, 61 percent were in elementary grades (K-5), 20 percent were in middle school grades (6-8) and 19 percent were in high school (9-12).

The information from the Legislative Analyst’s Office also showed that approximately 40% of the state’s EL students (603,510) attend just 20 school districts. These districts are:

Los Angeles	Fontana	Ontario-Montclair Elem.
San Diego	Compton	Oakland
Santa Ana	San Francisco	Moreno Valley
Garden Grove	Pomona	Sweetwater Union High
Fresno	Sacramento	Elk Grove
Long Beach	Montebello	Coachella Valley
San Bernardino	Anaheim	

Despite being identified by the common term of “English learner,” these students vary widely in their prior academic knowledge, their backgrounds, the length of time they have been in the United States as well as in California, and their ability levels in both English and their primary language. Each of these factors affects their instructional needs and the determination of the instructional approach to best meet those needs. Similarly, programs serving these students will need to vary depending on the needs of the particular English learners being served.

A further complexity for instructional planning is the fact that within the English learner group, there are students who have been in the United States and/or California their whole lives; students who come to the U.S. and/or California during elementary grade levels, and students who come as adolescents in middle or high school. Students in each of these groups may or may not have prior instruction in English, may or may not be literate in their primary language, and may or may not be familiar with the context and expectations of schooling as it is organized within the United States and in California. Students who speak primary languages that do not use the English language alphabet have an additional challenge in accessing English language instruction and curriculum materials. These non-Roman alphabet-based primary languages may be tonal in nature where different tones of the same word signify key differences in meanings; some may be written in a different spatial order than English (e.g., written from right to left, or written in a column or vertical style), and some may use pictograms to represent concepts rather than using specific sound-letter or sound-symbol correspondence. Each of these primary language groups of students has differing needs for appropriate instruction for both learning English and learning content delivered in English. Yet most of these students are tested in English and expected to access grade-level content knowledge in English along with their primary language English peers.

English Learner Achievement Outcomes

There are three key sources of data regarding EL student achievement. These are the CELDT (California English Language Development Test), which measures EL student achievement of the English Language Development (ELD) standards, the CST (California Standards Test), which measures EL student achievement in grade-level core content areas, and the CAHSEE (California High School Exit Examination).

CELDT Results: The CELDT categorizes student results according to five levels of English language proficiency: Beginning (Level 1), Early Intermediate (Level 2), Intermediate (Level 3), Early Advanced (Level 4), and Advanced (Level 5). Data from the 2007 CELDT results from 1,709,085 EL students assessed show that across grades K-12, overall student achievement in learning English tended to cluster at the “Early Intermediate” and “Intermediate” levels of language acquisition and performance (i.e., at Levels 2 and 3). These two categories accounted for 45-66% of all English learners tested regardless of grade level. This is not a language proficiency level that would allow students to be fully proficient in English and to achieve on an equal basis with English primary language students. Across the grade levels, a maximum of 13% of students tested in 2007 per grade level achieved “Advanced” (Level 5) status, with most grade levels showing less than 10% of students scoring at Level 5. As the LAO’s office also noted, “performance levels [on the CELDT] differ by primary language” and “Our analysis of individual student scores suggests overall EL student progress is slow.”

The CELDT results, however, do not represent a longitudinal look at EL student achievement since students who score at the upper levels of English proficiency (i.e., Levels 4 and 5) and who

also meet additional criteria become eligible to be “redesignated,” or reclassified as English language proficient. Once students are redesignated, they are no longer tested on the CELDT and their scores no longer show up in the data tables. In addition, new EL students are constantly entering and/or leaving the public school system across the state. Thus, the results of the CELDT do not represent a longitudinal picture of the same students over time.

The CELDT data along with other district-generated achievement data show that many students “stall out,” or do not achieve full English proficiency. Even though students may score at the Intermediate, Early Advanced, or Advanced levels on the CELDT, EL student achievement on the California Standards Test show a different picture.

California Standards Test (STAR) Results: The CST results in the table below show the outcomes over time on the English/Language Arts CST for English Only students and EL students. Test score data indicate that the achievement gap between English Only students and English learner students scoring proficient on California’s Content Standards Test in English has grown from 33.4% in 2003 to 37.9% in 2009.

**Percentages of Students Scoring Advanced or Proficient on English/Language Arts CST
(Summary of All Grade Levels)**

School year	English Only	English Learners	Percentage Gap
2002-03	43.3	8.8	33.4
2003-04	44.1	9.4	34.7
2004-05	48.3	11.8	36.5
2005-06	50.6	13.7	36.9
2006-07	51.8	15.0	36.8
2007-08	53.7	16.5	37.2
2007-08	58.1	20.2	37.9

These longitudinal data indicate that English learners are not making sufficient progress in learning English and in achieving on an equal basis with English only students to improve their learning outcomes in core curriculum presented in English. In fact, the gap between English only student achievement and EL student achievement in core curriculum is actually getting larger over time.

California High School Exit Examination Results: The Legislative Analyst’s Office reported that in 2005-6 about 40 percent of the EL tenth graders passed the English portion and half passed the mathematics portion of the exam.

In the view of the panel, it is imperative that attention be paid to improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of teachers in order to improve the academic achievement of this significant group of students.

Key Instructional Approaches to Working with English Learners

Learning another language is a task that typically takes more than a year or two in order to move beyond “surface fluency” to being able to use a language for learning basic and/or advanced content and within a high stakes assessment environment. In order to compete with students who have been speaking English all their lives, English learners need to be instructed in a way that will prepare them for standards-based instruction and state-mandated assessments in which all students are expected to participate. Given this context and societal expectations for EL students, it is vital to look at the preparation of mainstream teachers providing instruction in English for this critical task of helping EL students not only learn English but also learn core academic content at a level equivalent to their English only classmates.

There have historically been two major instructional approaches addressed within teacher preparation programs to prepare candidates for working with English learner students to help them access core curriculum in English. These are *SDAIE*, or Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English, and *ELD*, or English Language Development (i.e., learning English as a language new to the student). All teachers of English learners are expected to use both of these strategies in public school classrooms, and to grow and develop in their professional ability to implement these instructional strategies appropriately to meet the needs of their EL students.

SDAIE is a teaching approach that takes into account an English learner’s language, prior background knowledge, and cultural experiences. Content concepts are presented in ways that are more easily accessible to English language learners. Examples of SDAIE strategies include using advance organizers to help students understand the content to be covered in a lesson; teaching and providing opportunities to practice the use of academic vocabulary prior to content instruction; providing a note-taking framework to help EL students understand and be able to review the key concepts of the lesson; and paying attention to the level of complexity of the language used by the teacher in presenting new concepts. Teacher candidates typically learn SDAIE strategies both in general and as applicable to the specific content area of the credential sought. All public school teachers who have EL students in their classes are expected to be knowledgeable about and to use appropriate SDAIE strategies to help EL students access the content. SDAIE’s primary focus is not on helping the student to learn the English language per se, but on making core content instruction in English more understandable to English learners.

ELD refers to the organized and systematic teaching of English as a language new to the English learner student. Although ELD may be context-embedded and/or content-focused, the primary purpose of ELD instruction is to help students learn English as a language that has its own grammar, structure, vocabulary, pronunciation, and usage patterns that transcend a given content area. By statute, English learners must be provided with ELD as part of the core curriculum. Providing ELD instruction requires teachers to know how first and second languages are acquired, how to structure English language learning lessons in a systematic and organized fashion, how to assess an English learner’s proficiency in English, and how to take students from where they currently are in terms of English language acquisition and proficiency levels to more advanced levels of English fluency. The ultimate goal of ELD is for English learners to become fully proficient and able to achieve along with English only students on as equal a basis as possible.

The CELDT results, the CST results, and the CAHSEE results all indicate that EL students as a subgroup are not reaching the desired levels of proficiency in either learning the English language or in core academic content that is presented and tested in the English language.

It is important to note here that in its discussions the panel raised significant questions concerning the degree to which current teacher preparation, whether via Ryan programs, SB 2042 programs, and/or CTET/CLAD programs, develop sufficient knowledge, skills, and abilities on the part of teacher candidates to prepare them to meet expectations of providing effective SDAIE and ELD instruction to all English learner students. The panel's discussions and recommendations concerning this issue are presented in more detail later in this agenda item.

Current Commission Authorizations to Teach English Learners and What They Authorize

The chart on the following page indicates the current Commission authorizations to teach English learners and what type of instruction is authorized. The chart shows that all EL authorizations except for the Sojourn credential allow a teacher to provide English Language Development to EL students regardless of the teacher's underlying credential, and that all authorizations except for the Sojourn credential, the General Teaching Credential and a Supplementary Authorization in English as a Second Language authorize the holder to provide SDAIE.

Professional Development for Teachers of English Learners

Once teachers have received an authorization to teach English learners, there is limited professional development available. During the induction period, support providers help beginning teachers identify areas for professional growth needed in order to work as effectively as possible with English learners and to provide both SDAIE and ELD services, but the ability of the support providers to help the new teacher advance in this area may be limited by the knowledge level of the support provider him or herself.

A study entitled "Listening to Teachers of English Learners" conducted by Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005), who are researchers at the University of California Language Minority Research Institute, reported that results of an online survey of over 5,000 California teachers indicated that in the five years preceding the study, *43% of teachers with 50% or more English learners in their classrooms had received no more than one in-service that focused on the instruction of English learners. For those teachers with 20-50% English learners in their classes, half had had no, or only one, such professional development.* The respondents in this study also indicated that the quality of the professional development was minimally satisfactory and the background of the trainers was not sufficient to provide in-depth opportunities for teachers to advance in their learning about teaching English learners.

When asked if they feel competent to address the needs of English learner students, anecdotal evidence indicates that most teacher candidates will respond "no." Given the nature of the task before them and the varied needs of the English learner students, it is not difficult to understand why beginning teachers might not feel sufficiently prepared in this area. In the study cited above, respondents were asked to rate their own abilities to teach English learners in six areas as poor, fair, good, or excellent. The areas were: pedagogy, ELD, English reading, English writing, primary language reading and primary language writing. On average, teachers rated themselves as "good" or slightly higher in only one area: teaching reading at the elementary level. Secondary level teachers rated their teaching ability lower in all areas.

All of the above contextual information helped to frame as well as to inform both the panel's discussions over the three meetings and the recommendations provided below.

English Learner Authorizations

English Language Development (ELD):

Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE):

Instruction in Primary Language (Bilingual):

EL Authorizations that can Currently be earned

Authorization	ELD ¹	SDAIE ¹	Bilingual ¹
Multiple or Single Subject SB 2042 Credential	X	X	
CLAD Certificate, earned through passage of the CTEL exam or completion of a CTEL Program	X	X	
BCLAD Certificate or BCLAD Emphasis	X	X	X
Education Specialist Credential (after 6/1/2007)	X	X	
Sojourn Teaching Credential			X

EL Authorizations that are no longer initially issued, but authorize instruction to English learners

Authorization (last initial issuance)	ELD ¹	SDAIE ¹	Bilingual ¹
CLAD Certificate or CLAD Emphasis (1/31/2008)	X	X	
Certificate of Completion of Staff Development (1/1/2008)	X	X	
Multiple or Single Subject Credential with AB 1059 English Learner Content (12/31/2007)	X	X	
Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC)	X	X	X
General Teaching Credential	X		
Supplementary Authorization in English as a Second Language	X		
Bilingual Specialist Credential	X	X	X
Language Development Specialist (LDS) Certificate	X	X	

¹ There may be restrictions to the grade level and subject area(s) that may be taught in each of the settings – check document for specific authorization. All CTC-issued documents with the exception of the multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist teaching credentials require a prerequisite teaching credential.

Adapted from the Administrator's Assignment Manual

Part III: Recommendations from the English Learners Authorizations Advisory Panel

Introduction to the Panel's Recommendations

The recommendations presented below represent the best thinking of the expert panel based on the members' knowledge and experience in the field. The panel stipulates and emphasizes that with respect to recommendations which, if adopted by the Commission, would alter the authorization of any document currently issued by the Commission, all holders of the current document(s) and authorization(s) would be held harmless and that all current documents and authorizations would remain valid for the lifetime of the validity of that credential/authorization. If the Commission were to adopt any recommendation that would alter a current credential and/or authorization, a timeline for phase-in of the new credential and/or authorization would need to be developed.

The first set of recommendations concerns the interrelated areas of the first two topics in the panel's charge:

Topic 1: Teacher preparation for all teachers working with English learners

Topic 2: Teacher preparation for secondary level teachers working with English learners

Panel Recommendations Relating to Topics 1 and 2

Panel Recommendation 1: The panel recommends that the SB 2042 Teacher Preparation and the Teacher Induction standards relating to the preparation of teachers to teach English learners be reviewed and updated/revised as necessary to reflect current research and issues in the field, including a specific focus on "academic language" and "academic literacy" in the context of teaching English learners.

Panel Recommendation 2: The panel recommends that the Single Subject Teacher Preparation Program Standards be reviewed, updated and revised to reflect the need for single subject teachers to develop the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to successfully use SDAIE strategies not only in general, but also as these strategies apply to the particular subject area of the credential.

Panel Recommendation 3: The panel recommends that the preparation standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential be reviewed, updated and revised to assure that the content provided within preparation programs regarding English learners reflects current research and issues in the field, including but not limited to issues of "academic language," "academic literacy," program instructional models for EL students, EL student placement and course scheduling issues, and management of EL instructional programs to facilitate student learning.

Panel Recommendation 4: The panel recommends that preparation standards for Pupil Personnel Services credentials be reviewed, updated and revised to assure that the content provided within the preparation programs regarding English learners reflects current research and issues in the field relating to the needs of English learners and instructional programs for English learners to facilitate student growth and learning.

Panel members commented that the first two topics in the panel's charge represent critical and urgent issues to address for two key reasons. First, the CELDT, the California Standards Test,

and the CAHSEE data clearly show that English learner student achievement affects EL student achievement in every grade level and in every content area on a daily basis. Second, aggregate EL achievement outcomes are a key component and a leverage factor affecting school and district abilities to improve overall student academic achievement, AYP, and outcomes on other achievement measures.

The panel noted that the CELDT and other district-provided student achievement data show that many English learner students tend to “stall out” at English proficiency levels short of full proficiency and do not go on to reach full English proficiency at a level sufficient to allow them to access core curriculum across all grade levels and to achieve on an equal basis with English only peers.

The panel further noted that teachers of these students also tend to “stall out” at less than full proficiency in working effectively with EL students, and that teachers lack resources and support for helping these students move forward to full proficiency. The set of knowledge, skills and abilities reflected in CLAD preparation and in the CTEL examination represent only a base level of knowledge for working effectively with EL students. Teachers typically lack access to more in-depth training via professional development because of a lack of expertise available to them in the school setting. This is particularly apparent and acute at the secondary level, where teachers are primarily content experts and there are few staff development opportunities and/or mentoring opportunities available to them from experts in the field of teaching EL students.

In the view of the panel, as well as of the Legislative Analyst’s Office, the issue of teaching EL students effectively is a *systemic* problem affecting teachers, students, administrators, curriculum developers, and curriculum materials. This problem is also one of public perception, as there is typically a lack of understanding that learning a foreign language, which English is for EL students, takes more than one or two years. Students who are “redesignated” as being proficient in English are often just at a level of English proficiency sufficient to function in the regular classroom, and they may be left without further support in focused English language development to support their academic achievement.

The panel also discussed the status of standards relating to the instruction of EL students, including the SB 2042 teacher preparation standards, the CTEL/CLAD standards and competencies, the Administrative Services credential standards, and the Pupil Personnel standards. The panel concluded that the SB 2042 teacher preparation program, the Administrative Services, and the Pupil Personnel Services standards are due for a review since the original standards relating to English learners may no longer reflect a sufficient range of base knowledge in the field. With respect to Induction in particular, the panel members felt that the induction program could do more to help teachers move forward, especially in a coaching mode and through discussions about practice. The panel also feels that having an authorization to work with EL students doesn’t automatically equate to quality teaching, and that not only is Induction a place to support new teachers, we also need to look at how to support veteran teachers in this area.

Panel members suggested the idea of developing a “Learning to Teach English Learners” continuum similar to the existing “Learning to Teach” continuum as a means of identifying the range of expected sets of knowledge, skills and abilities at different stages of an educator’s career. Since it is not possible to “front load” all the training that a teacher would need to work

effectively with English learners during the single year of teacher preparation or even during the two years of Induction, and since teachers need to be able to grow and develop over the course of their professional career, such a continuum might provide an avenue for teachers to become experts in this area and to provide mentoring and support to others in that role.

The panel noted that the Pupil Personnel Services credentials are not teaching credentials but felt that given the magnitude and import of the EL issue, all providers of services to EL students need and would benefit from an enhanced knowledge base about working particularly with EL students and their families.

Although in the panel's view the more recent CTEL/CLAD competencies are appropriate as a base level of knowledge, skills and abilities about instruction of EL students, these are sufficient only to support the delivery of SDAIE strategies in the classroom for all teachers and may be minimally sufficient to support the delivery of English Language Development (ELD) in the multiple subject classroom (see below for further discussion regarding the issue of ELD). The panel also noted, however, that CTEL training does not include enough differentiation for the individual content areas, and that in general, subject specific methodology courses are either not available for individual content areas and those that are available provide insufficient attention to SDAIE strategies for the particular content area. Based on the initial results from the Teaching Performance Assessment implemented statewide during 2008-09 as one source of data, teacher candidates do not receive sufficient field-based practice with English learners during their preparation sequence.

The panel further noted that the CLAD/CTEL standards were similar in nature to those of other states as well as to the National Board standards in the area of teaching English learners. Other state standards and the National Board standards do not exceed California's CTEL/CLAD standards.

The panel also discussed at length the issue of the preparation of administrators. The panel feels that administrators need not only to understand EL issues as these pertain to general classroom instruction, but also to understand how the assignment of EL students to classes, and the organization and scheduling of these classes especially at the secondary level affects the ability of teachers and students to be successful.

Panel Recommendation 5: The panel recommends that the EL authorization for single subject teachers should be limited to authorizing the holder to provide SDAIE instruction only and should not include an authorization to provide ELD.

The panel emphasizes, however, that training for the EL authorization for single subject teachers should address fully SDAIE but also present basic ELD concepts.

Panel Recommendation 6: The panel recommends that further study be given to the issue of whether the EL authorization for multiple subject teachers should include both SDAIE and ELD.

Currently all English learner authorizations except for the Sojourn credential, regardless of preparation route or of the underlying credential, allow teachers to deliver English Language Development (ELD) to EL students. Providing ELD instruction is equivalent, in the view of the panel, to teaching a foreign language, since English is in actuality a foreign language for EL students who come with a primary language other than English. Foreign language teachers are

required to earn a full credential in World Language that covers a range of knowledge, skills and abilities beyond those covered in CLAD/CTEL. Some of these areas include comparative and contrastive linguistics, and issues of “academic language and literacy.”

The panel deliberated at length about whether it is reasonable to expect every teacher in the state to be qualified as, in essence, a foreign language teacher on the basis of only the CLAD/CTEL competencies, and on the basis of the limited amount of training provided in this specific area along with the many other areas covered within the one-year teacher preparation program. The panel also noted that many teachers had prior CLAD training that might have been under the “old” CLAD standards, Certificate of Completion of Staff Development (CCSD), or other English learner authorization routes that do not reflect even the level of the current CTEL/CLAD competencies. The panel concluded that it is not reasonable for a single subject teacher to be authorized to teach ELD on the basis of current standards and training for an EL authorization. Even within the context of providing SDAIE instruction, panel members felt that secondary teachers need more training in academic content, language and literacy development, both depth and breadth, than is presently included in their initial training.

The panel debated as to whether it might be more reasonable for a multiple subject teacher to be authorized to teach ELD on the basis of current standards and training given that multiple subject teachers are more intimately engaged in literacy development on a sustained basis within a self-contained classroom during which they had the same students all day than are secondary teachers who change students each period. The panel concluded, however, that for both multiple and single subject teachers, current CLAD/CTEL preparation and standards were insufficient in the area of preparing teachers to provide sustained, organized and systematic instruction in English Language Development (i.e., English as a new language) for EL students.

Panel Recommendation 7: The panel recommends that further study be given to the issue of the possibility of establishing an advanced English Learner authorization in order to provide an instructional and a professional development resource to elementary and especially to secondary teacher, and potentially also to administrators, with respect to teaching English learners in the content areas.

Panel members noted the lack of available school-site advanced expertise in the teaching of English learners, particularly at the secondary level, and were interested in providing an avenue for teachers with interest and expertise in this area to be able to provide this support service for teachers as well as for students. An individual with such a certificate might also be able to provide potential advice, guidance and teacher-level leadership to school administrators with respect to English learner issues.

Panel Recommendation 8: The panel recommends that the Commission discontinue the use of the terms “Languages Other Than English” (LOTE) and “Foreign Languages,” and use instead the term “World Languages.”

The panel noted that the K-12 student academic content standards, to which subject matter preparation programs and subject matter content specifications are aligned, are entitled “World Languages” standards. On the national level, states and the federal government are increasingly adopting this terminology. The panel feels that is appropriate and timely for the Commission to update the terminology related to language teaching, language learning, and credentialing for language teachers to the term “World Languages.”

The second set of panel recommendations concerns the third topic in the charge to the panel:

Topic 3: English as a New/World Language (ENL/EWL)

- What is the purpose and use of a credential in English as New/World Language as used in other states and in National Board Certification?
- How do the standards for ENL relate to the CLAD standards? To TESOL standards? to World Language standards?
- What is the relationship between ESL and ENL/EWL?
- Do other states give college-eligible standing to ENL/EWL courses?
- Should California consider a single subject credential in ENL/EWL?

Panel Recommendation 9: The panel recommends that a credential in the area of English as a New Language, or English as a World Language, be developed, and that a panel of experts in the field be convened to develop subject matter competencies and program standards relating to this credential area.

The concept of a new single subject credential in the area of teaching English as a new or world language generated significant discussion and support by panel members, as expressed by the following panel consensus:

- The urgent need for EL students to achieve a high level of proficiency in English as quickly as possible supports the need to provide a more formal, structured environment for learning English as a language.
- Beginning teachers have only a basic level of knowledge, skills and abilities relating to teaching English learners in the regular education classroom, including ELD, which has been insufficient to promote EL achievement. Beginning teachers as well as veteran teachers may need more intensive development and support in order to promote EL achievement.
- A lack of sufficient expertise relating to the teaching of EL across districts in the state results in a lack of experienced, trained support providers and mentors to effectively help beginning teachers grow and develop in the area of teaching EL.
- Insufficient high quality staff development is available in the area of teaching EL across districts in the state.
- There is a need for advanced level knowledge and training in areas not currently covered within the California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) programs and examination. While the panel felt that the new CTEL standards and programs are of high quality and appropriate for entry level beginning teachers of EL, panel members also identified some important additional areas for advanced level training such as training in linguistics, academic literacy needs of beginning and intermediate English learners, and on the differential effects of various primary languages on the learning of English. This advanced level content is not presently part of the requirements for an existing credential.
- Insufficient high quality data are available about EL achievement outcomes for classroom teachers to use for instructional improvement.
- There is a need to reframe the context of learning English for EL students, particularly at the middle and high school levels. In most instances, ELD does not carry academic credit and does not count towards graduation and/or CSU/UC credit. However, the panel believes that the study of English as a world language is a subject matter comparable to the study of Japanese as a world language in terms of the expected student learning and language proficiency outcomes. Although the background conditions and motivations of EL students for enrolling in such a language course might differ from those of English only students

enrolling in an elective Japanese course, for example, nonetheless the methodology of language teaching and learning is similar as are the required level of student effort and the expected outcomes in terms of proficiency in a language that is not the student's primary language.

- There is a need for personnel with advanced levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities to serve as resources for teachers, especially at the secondary levels. A Language Teaching and Learning Specialist, for example, might be an appropriate next level credential beyond the basic English as a World Language credential. This concept is also related to the broader ongoing discussions about the concept and role of teacher leaders in a wider context across a range of content areas.

A separate credential in the teaching of English as a new or world language could potentially meet all of these different student and staff development needs by eventually providing districts and/or schools with a cadre of highly trained English learner staff development providers, EL program directors, and other EL instructional support personnel. These same individuals could also provide models of effective classroom instruction to those EL students most in need of improvement. One stakeholder group in particular, the California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL), had already submitted a proposal to the Commission requesting that the Commission develop a credential in teaching English as a new language as a single subject credential.

A further discussion within the panel concerned the placement of such a potential credential and the content area in which academic credit might be granted to K-12 students. If a new credential were to be placed under the "World Languages" credentialing structure, then the new credential could simply become one more within the growing list of world language credentials offered by the Commission. If a new credential were to be placed within the Single Subject English credentialing structure, then there could potentially be an issue of two overlapping credentials, both of which would authorize an individual to teach English K-12. The panel recognizes the concern of not "proliferating" credentials. However, as the panel has noted, the preparation of a single subject English teacher does not encompass sufficiently the issues related to language learning and language teaching of English to a student who is an English learner.

Similarly, the panel debated whether academic credit for a course in English as a World Language should be given within the English department or the World Languages department. Panel members heard anecdotal information that in those schools that do offer such a course, some offer additional English credit and some offer language credit. The panel does not have a recommendation in this particular area because the panel members felt that this might be a matter for local districts to decide.

Finally, the Panel also noted that Recommendation 9 entailed the further need to explore the possibility of allowing students who successfully complete one or more courses in English as a New Language to receive academic credit towards graduation and towards UC/CSU requirements. This issue is not within the Commission's purview, but the panel feels that the importance of this issue is such that it should be forwarded to the California Department of Education, the California State University system, and the CSU system for discussion and possible action.

Next Steps

This is an information item. If directed by the Commission, staff will return with a further item at the April 2010 meeting and will incorporate any direction given by the Commission in response to this information item.

Appendix A
English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel (2009)

Name	Grade Level	Affiliation
1. Irene Oropeza-Enriquez		CTC – Commissioner Liaison to the Panel
2. Elodia Ortega-Lampkin	Elementary	ACSA – Woodland Joint Unified School District
3. Magaly Lavadenz	IHE	AICCU – Loyola Marymount University
4. Pansy Ceballos	Administrator	CCSESA – Tulare County Office of Education
5. Myron Berkman	Secondary	CFT – Berkeley Unified
6. Robert Hidalgo	Administrator	CSBA – Rowland USD
7. Zulmara Cline	IHE	CSU – CSU Chancellor’s Office
8. Kathy Harris	Elementary	CTA – Shaefer Elementary School
9. Cheryl Forbes	IHE	UC – UC San Diego
10. Therese Tiab		California Department of Education
11. Dorothea Bell	Elementary	Winters Joint Unified School District
12. Barbara Hernandez	Elementary	Orange Unified School District
13. Sharon Lazo-Nakamoto	Elementary	Long Beach Unified School District
14. Grace Lee	Elementary	Chino Valley Unified School District
15. Shirley Day	Secondary	Poway Unified School District
16. Amanda Kibler	Secondary	Stanford University/Charter School
17. Anthony Martinez	Secondary	Antelope Valley Union High School District
18. Maria Navarro	Secondary	San Francisco Unified School District
19. Duarte Silva	Secondary/IHE	California Foreign Language Project, UC President’s Office/Stanford Univ.
20. Nicole Naditz	Secondary	San Juan Unified School District
21. Linda Ventriglia-Navarrette	IHE	National University
22. Carol Anderson-Woo	Administrator	Tracy Unified School District

Appendix B

Reference Documents Reviewed by the Panel

Commission-Adopted Subject Matter Requirements Relating to Preparation to Teach English Learners

1. Language Other Than English subject matter requirements
http://www.cset.nesinc.com/CS_SMR_opener.asp
2. California Teacher of English Learners subject matter requirements
http://www.ctel.nesinc.com/BC_viewSG_opener.asp
3. Single Subject English subject matter requirements
http://www.cset.nesinc.com/CS_SMR_opener.asp

The Commission's Current Authorizations for Teaching English learners

1. English Learner Authorizations (adapted from the Assignment Manual)
2. Fingertip Facts for ELD Coursework
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/>

Other Related Standards

1. English as a New Language Standards
http://nbpts.org/userfiles/File/eaya_enl_standards.pdf
http://nbpts.org/for_candidates/certificate_areas1?ID=13

Revised TESOL Standards

1. http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=86&DID=10698

Information about the Academic Status of English Learners

1. CELDT results
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/>
2. Demographic results of Teachers Providing Primary Language Instruction to English Learners Students
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/>
3. *English Learners and Economic Impact Aid*. Report presented by the Legislative Analyst's Office to Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 2 on Education Finance, April 20, 2007.
4. Maxwell, Lesli A. "Shifting Landscape: Immigration Transforms Communities." *Education Week*. 2009. (submitted by Kathy Harris)

Preparing Teachers for English learners

1. Gandara, Patricia, Maxwell-Jolly, Julie, and Driscoll, Anne. *Listening to Teachers of English Language Learners*. Santa Cruz: The Regents of the University of California, 2005. -(submitted by Magaly Lavadenz)
2. Merino, Barbara. "Identifying Critical Competencies for Teachers of English Learners." *UC LMRI Newsletter*, Vol. 16 No.4, Summer 2007 (submitted by Magaly Lavadenz)

Instructional Support for English Learners

1. Goldenberg, Claude. *Teaching English Language Learners: What the Research Does and Does Not Say*. Summer 2008. (submitted by Kathy Harris)
2. Lesaux, Nonie. *Morphological Analysis: New Light on a Vital Skill*. 2009. <http://www.uknow.gse.harvard.edu/teaching/TC102-407.html> (submitted by Claudia Lockwood)
3. Wong Fillmore, Lily, and Snow, Catherine E. *What Teachers Need to Know About Language*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, Aug. 2000. (submitted by Carol Woo-Anderson)

Other Information

1. Futernick, Ken. *A Possible Dream: Retaining California Teachers So All Students Learn*. Sacramento: California State University. 2007. (submitted by Pansy Ceballos)
2. Gandara, Patricia, Maxwell-Jolly, Julie, and Rumberger, Russel. "Resource Needs for English Learners." *UC LMRI Newsletter* Vol. 17 No.3. June 2008. (submitted by Magaly Lavadenz)
3. Frost, Jeff., et.al. *Proposal for the Development of ESL Credential Submitted to the Commission*. Dec. 2007.
4. TESOL. *Position Statement on the Status of, and Professional Equity for, the Field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Oct. 2008. (submitted by Magaly Lavadenz)