
3B

Information

Professional Services Committee

Further Discussion of Recommendations from the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel

Executive Summary: At the January 2010 Commission meeting, the report containing recommendations from the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel was presented to the Commission for information. The Commission directed staff to provide further opportunities to discuss these recommendations at subsequent Commission meetings. This agenda item addresses three of the panel's initial recommendations.

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

April 2010

Further Discussion of 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 learners (<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>). The report of the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel, including nine recommendations, was presented at the January 2010 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-01/2010-01-2F.pdf>). The Commission directed staff to provide further opportunities to discuss these recommendations at subsequent Commission meetings. This agenda item brings back three specific recommendations for purposes of further discussion.

Background

Review of the charge to the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel

The charge to the English Learner Authorizations Advisory Panel was 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?
- 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?

Review of the Panel’s Recommendations:

The panel made nine recommendations, as follows:

The first set of recommendations concerned 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 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 Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (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 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.

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.

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.

The second set of panel recommendations concerned the third topic in the charge to the panel: English as a New/World Language.

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.”

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.

Recommendations Presented for Further Discussion

This agenda item brings back three recommendations for further discussion. The first two are as follows:

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.

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.

Although numbered as “5” and “6,” panel recommendations 5 and 6 actually serve as a foundational base for most of the other panel recommendations. Panel recommendations 1-4, for example, concern revisions to current standards. How these revisions should be made, however, and the content of the revisions would be dependent on what credential authorization the revised standards would be addressing, and what decisions the Commission might ultimately make with respect to these two recommendations.

Panel recommendations 7 and 9 are also dependent on the decision the Commission might make with respect to authorizations. If the Commission should decide, for example, that the basic multiple and single subject SB 2042 authorization should be limited to authorizing SDAIE instruction only for single subject teachers, then recommendation 9 could address the issue of who should be authorized to provide ELD instruction and what the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities for such an authorization should be.

A more in-depth look at panel recommendations 5 and 6 follows.

Discussion of Recommendations 5 and 6

The English Learner Advisory Panel recommended that the SB 2042 credential for single subject teachers include only an authorization to provide SDAIE instruction but not an authorization to provide English Language Development (ELD) instruction, and, further, the panel recommended that additional consideration be given to whether the SB 2042 authorization for multiple subject candidates should continue to include an ELD authorization.

There are two interrelated aspects to Recommendations 5 and 6: providing SDAIE-related services and providing ELD-related services to EL students. The interrelated nature of the recommendations reflects the two major learning needs of EL students: (1) Learning to speak, read, write, and understand English as a unique language with its own set of pronunciation, orthography, grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, construction rules, communication styles and interpersonal communication protocols, including sociolinguistic features, among other characteristics that distinguish one language from another (English Language Development instruction); and (2) learning other content through the medium of English such as mathematics, science, and other school subject areas (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English). These two learning needs are interrelated yet independent in key respects, and the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by teachers will vary depending on which of the EL students' learning needs are being addressed in the classroom.

SDAIE is a teaching approach that takes into account an English learner's language, prior background knowledge, and cultural experiences in order to help the learner access academic content in English. This approach addresses the second major learning need of EL students by presenting content in ways that are more 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. 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.

The panel felt that taken as a whole, the SB 2042 teacher preparation program standards meet a minimum level of support for the SDAIE authorization, although the panel felt that these standards needed revision and updating to focus more clearly on helping single subject teachers understand and practice how to apply SDAIE specifically in the content area of the credential.

The above rationale explains the panel's decision to recommend that the SB 2042 multiple and single subject preliminary credentials include a SDAIE authorization for all candidates.

The situation of English Language Development (ELD), however, is different from that of SDAIE under the SB 2042 standards. ELD refers to the organized and systematic teaching of English as a language new to the English learner student. Although ELD should 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 panel felt that the current SB 2042 standards do not address sufficient knowledge, skills, and abilities to support an ELD authorization for candidates, and they do not address ELD in a systematic or comprehensive manner. Their reasoning is based on analysis of the content of the SB 2042 teacher preparation program standards with respect to ELD.

Analysis of ELD Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Addressed in Current Commission Standards

ELD is a content area unto itself rather than a methodology applied across a wide variety of content areas. It requires a different set of knowledge, skills, and abilities on the part of teachers who in this respect, become in essence *world language teachers* in order to help students learn a new language "foreign" to them. In order to support an ELD authorization, teacher preparation programs should provide systematic, comprehensive coverage of the required knowledge, skills, and abilities relating to providing ELD instruction to K-12 students.

a. CTEL Standards

The CTEL standards highlight ELD and include concepts of content-focused ELD and the connections between the K-12 ELD standards and the K-12 English Language Arts standards. However, these standards apply only to candidates who are not in SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.

b. SB 2042 Multiple and Single Subject Preparation Program Standards

The SB 2042 multiple and single subject preparation standards address teaching English learners in standards 7A (Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction); 7B (Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction); 8B (d) (Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates); and 12 (Preparation to Teach English Learners). None of these standards reference the K-12 ELD standards.

Standard 7B addresses "...teaching content-based reading and writing skills to a full range of students..." and also "...provide systematic and differentiated instruction in the content area to meet the full range of learners" but these approaches are descriptive of SDAIE rather than ELD. The same is true of the language represented in standards 7A and 8B (d). English language development is specifically mentioned in standard 12, although the general nature of the language of the standards leaves room for interpretation and differential content coverage across individual preparation programs.

Within the current SB 2042 teacher preparation program standards, standard 8B (e), Languages Other Than English, comes closest to referencing concepts contained in the K-12 ELD standards as well as in the CTEL standards. This standard addresses the developmental nature of learning a new language, is based on students' demonstration of competencies along a continuum of performance, and incorporates concepts of the nature

of language and linguistic rules and conventions along with an understanding of the cultural context within which the language is used.

In summary, the panel believes SB 2042 teacher preparation program standards do not provide opportunities for candidates to develop the required knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to provide appropriate ELD instruction to English learners.

ELD Authorization for SB 2042-Prepared Single Subject Candidates

At the secondary level, ELD is typically provided as a separate class for English learners. Currently, a single subject teacher with an SB 2042 credential, regardless of the subject area of the credential, is authorized to provide ELD instruction to EL students. The panel felt that single subject teachers prepared under the SB 2042 teacher preparation program standards would not have the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to successfully provide ELD instruction to EL students. Therefore, the panel recommended that the SB 2042 single subject credential not include an ELD authorization.

ELD Authorization for SB 2042-Prepared Multiple Subject Candidates

The issue of whether an ELD authorization should be maintained for SB 2042-prepared multiple subject teachers is more complex. Although multiple subject candidates do not receive more preparation specifically in the area of ELD than do single subject candidates, multiple subject teachers also receive extensive training in teaching Reading/Language Arts in English beyond that received by single subject teachers, and demonstrate that knowledge by passing the RICA examination. In addition, multiple subject teachers typically have the same students the entire day, and spend a considerable part of their day providing literacy-focused instruction. Further, the panel recognized the complexities of how schools might be able to provide the required ELD instruction for elementary grades students if the regular classroom teacher were not authorized to provide that service. For these reasons, the panel made Recommendation 6 concerning multiple subject candidates.

Question for Discussion:

- Should all multiple and single subject candidates be expected to learn the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected to teach ELD successfully in addition to teaching their own specific content areas?

Panel Recommendation 8

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.”

Panel recommendation 8 is the only panel recommendation not specifically dependent on any of the other recommendations for potential action by the Commission.

The panel noted that the K-12 student academic content standards, to which Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs and Commission-approved subject matter content specifications are aligned, are now entitled “World Languages” standards. This terminology is increasingly being used at the national level and within other states. The panel felt that it would

be timely for the Commission to update the terminology related to language teaching, language learning, and credentialing for language teachers to the term “World Languages.”

Next Steps

The Commission requested at its January 2010 meeting that the panel’s recommendations be brought back for further discussion. This agenda item has presented three of the nine panel recommendations. Depending on Commission direction, staff can provide further opportunity for review, discussion, and/or action on the three recommendations contained in this agenda item, and/or staff can bring other panel recommendations for further Commission review and discussion.

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