English Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs

A Handbook for
Teacher Educators
&
Program Reviewers

2003

English Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs

Created and Recommended by the
English Subject Matter Advisory Panel
(2001-2003)

Adopted and implemented by the
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
State of California
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814
2003

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Gray Davis, Governor
State of California

2003

Commission Members

Margaret Fortune, Chair	Public Representative
Lawrence Madkins, Vice Chair	Teacher
Kristen Beckner	Teacher
Alan Bersin	Administrator
Chellyn Boquiren	Teacher
Beth Hauk	Teacher
Elaine C. Johnson	Public Representative
Steve Lilly	Faculty Member
Alberto Vaca	Teacher
Marilyn Whirry	Designee, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Ex-Officio Members

Karen Gallagher	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Athena Waite	Regents, University of California
Sara Lundquist	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Bill Wilson	California State University

Executive Officers

Sam W. Swofford	Executive Director
Beth Graybill	Interim Director, Professional Services Division
Larry Birch	Administrator, Program Evaluation

The English Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panel

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
2001-03

Panelists	Professional Positions	Educational Organizations
John White	English Department Chair	California State University, Fullerton
Helen Anderson-Cruz	Professor of English	University of Southern California
Bernadette Cheyne	Professor of Drama	Humboldt State University
Darryl Eisele	English Department Chair	California State University, Chico
June Gatewood	Teacher of English	San Juan Unified School District
Katherine Kinney	Professor of English	University of California, Riverside
Peter Kittle	Professor of English	California State University, Chico
Kiran Kumar	Teacher of English	Pomona Unified School District
Carol D. Lord	Professor of Linguistics	California State University, Long Beach
Catharine M. Lucas	Professor of English	San Francisco State University
Kim V. Morin	Professor of Drama	California State University, Fresno
Terri Munroe	Teacher of English	Newport-Mesa Unified School District
Jeannine D. Richison	English Coordinator	California Polytechnic University
Dennis Wymbs	English Coordinator	San Diego County Office of Education
Christine Stempson	Teacher of English	Escondido Union High School District
Carol Tyson	Teacher of English	Beverly Hills Unified School District

Commission Consultants to the Advisory Panel:	Helen Hawley
California Department of Education Liaison to the Panel:	Beth Brenneman
Commission Secretary to the Advisory Panel:	Margaret Rich

English Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs

Table of Contents

Part 1: Introduction to English Teaching Standards

Standards and Credentials for Teachers of English: A Foreword by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing 1
- Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness 2
- Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs 3
- Subject Matter Preparation Programs for Prospective Teachers 4
- Subject Matter Advisory Panels 4
- Essential Documents for Panel Use 5
- Field Review Survey 6
- The English Teaching Credential 7
- Alignment of Program Standards and Performance Assessments 7
- New Subject Matter Assessments 8
- Overview of the English Standards Handbook 8
- Contributions of the English Advisory Panel 9
- Request for Assistance from Handbook Users 9
- English Teaching and Teacher Education: Introduction by the Advisory Panel 10

Part 2: Standards of Program Quality in English

Definitions of Key Terms 12
Preconditions for the Approval of Subject Matter Programs in English 13
Category I: Standards Common to All Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs 15
- Standard 1 Program Philosophy and Purpose 15
- Standard 2 Diversity and Equity 16
- Standard 3 Technology 17
- Standard 4 Literacy 18
- Standard 5 Varied Teaching Strategies 19
- Standard 6 Early Field Experiences 20
- Standard 7 Assessment of Subject Matter Competence 21
- Standard 8 Advisement and Support 22
- Standard 9 Program Review and Evaluation 23
- Standard 10 Coordination 24

Category II: Program Standards 25
- Standard 11 Required Subjects of Study 25
- Standard 12 Extended Studies 26
- Standard 13 Literature and Textual Analysis 27

Standard 14 Language, Linguistics and Literacy 28
Standard 15 Composition and Rhetoric 29
Standard 16 Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance 30

Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of English 31
Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in English 31
Domain 1. Literature and Textual Analysis 31
Domain 2. Language, Linguistics, and Literacy 33
Domain 3. Composition and Rhetoric 34
Domain 4. Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance 36

Part 3: Implementation of Program Quality Standards for Subject Matter Preparation

Program Equivalency 39
Review and Improvement of Subject Matter Standards 39
Adoption and Implementation of Standards by the Commission 40
Technical Assistance Meetings 40
Implementation Timeline: Impact on Candidates for Credentials 40
Implementation Plan Adopted by the Commission 41
Timeline for Implementing the English Standards 42
Implementation Timeline Diagram 43
Review and Approval of Subject Matter Programs 44
Selection, Composition and Training of Program Review Panels 44
Steps in the Review of Programs 45

Submission Guidelines for Single Subject Matter Program Documents 46
Transmittal Instructions 46
Submittal Deadlines 46
Transmittal Documents 47
Blended Programs 47
Responding to the Standards 47
Packaging a Submission for Shipment to the Commission 49
Submission Request Forms 50

Appendix A, Assembly Bill 537 (Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999) 54

Part 1: Introduction to English Teaching Standards

Standards and Credentials for Teachers of English: A Foreword by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

One of the purposes of education is to enable students to learn the important subjects of the school curriculum to further their professional goals and to function effectively in work, society and family life. More than one million students in California enroll annually in English classes with teachers who are certified by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to teach those classes in public schools. Students who are the future of California and the nation must learn to use English thoughtfully and skillfully. Their ability to do so depends substantially on the quality of teacher preparation in English and English teaching.

The Commission is the agency of California government that certifies the competence of teachers and other professionals who serve in the public schools. As the policy-making body that establishes and maintains standards for the education profession in the state, the Commission is concerned with the quality and effectiveness of the preparation of teachers and other school practitioners. On behalf of the education profession and the general public, one of the Commission's most important responsibilities is to establish and implement strong, effective standards of quality for the preparation and assessment of credential candidates.

California teacher candidates are required to demonstrate competence in the subject matter they will be authorized to teach. Candidates for the Single Subject Teaching Credential have two options available for satisfying this requirement. They can either complete a Commission-approved subject matter preparation program or they can pass the appropriate Commission-adopted subject matter examination(s) (Education Code Sections 44280 and 44310). Because they satisfy the same requirement, these two options are to be as aligned and congruent as possible.

The substance and relevance of the single subject matter program standards and the validity of examination specifications (subject matter requirements) is not permanent, however. The periodic reconsideration of subject matter program standards and the need for periodic validity studies are related directly to one of the Commission's fundamental missions to provide a strong assurance that teaching credentials issued by the Commission are awarded to individuals who have the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are needed in order to succeed in public school teaching positions in California. Best professional practice related to the program standards and the legal defensibility of the examination specifications require that the standards and specifications be periodically reviewed and rewritten, as job requirements and expectations change over time (Ed Code 44225i,j, 44257, 44288).

In the early 1990s, CCTC developed and adopted (a) standards for single subject matter preparation programs and, at the same time, (b) specifications for the single subject matter examinations. This work was based on the advice of subject matter advisory panels and data from validity studies and resulted in program standards and examination specifications (defining the subject matter competence requirement) that were valid and closely aligned with each other. Those standards and specifications were adopted by the Commission in 1992 and are still in use today. They are now

being replaced by the newly adopted (2002) subject matter requirements and single subject matter standards.

Establishing high standards for teachers is based, in part, on three major pieces of legislation. In 1988, 1992 and 1998 the Legislature and the governor enacted legislation sponsored by the Commission that strengthened the professional character of the Commission and enhanced its authority to establish rigorous standards for the preparation and assessment of prospective teachers. These reform laws were Senate Bills 148 (1988), 1422 (1992) Bergeson, and 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998). As a result, the Commission has taken on new responsibilities for establishing high and acceptable levels of quality in teacher preparation and of competence among beginning teachers. To implement these three statutes, CCTC has developed new standards, subject matter requirements and other policies collaboratively with representatives of post-secondary institutions, teachers and administrators in public schools, and statewide leaders involved in public education.

In the late 1990s, the State Board of Education adopted academic content standards for California K-12 students in English, mathematics, science, and social science. These new standards have direct implications for the subject matter competence requirement of prospective teachers. This was recognized in SB 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998), which requires the Commission to ensure that subject matter program standards and examinations are aligned with the K-12 student content standards adopted by the State Board of Education.

The Commission appointed four panels in 1999 (English, mathematics, science, and social science) to begin the first of three phases to meet the SB 2042 mandate for single subject matter programs. The second and third phases will bring all 13 subject matter areas for credentials into alignment with K-12 student content standards by 2005. The first phase single subject matter panels (2001, 2002) spent considerable time to ensure that the new subject matter standards were grounded in, and aligned with, the academic content standards for California K-12 students.

Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness

Over the past 15 years CCTC has thoroughly redesigned its policies regarding the preparation of education professionals and the review of preparation programs in colleges and universities. In initiating these reforms, the Commission adopted the following principles regarding the governance of educator preparation programs. The Commission asked the Single Subject Panels to apply these general principles to the creation of standards for subject matter programs in English, mathematics, science and social science.

1) *The status of teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities should be determined on the basis of standards that relate to significant aspects of the quality of those programs.*
2) *There are many ways in which a teacher preparation program could be excellent.*
3) *The curriculum of teacher education plays a central role in a program's quality.*
4) *Teacher education programs should prepare candidates to teach the public school curriculum effectively.*

5) *In California's public schools, the student population is so diverse that the preparation of educators to teach culturally diverse students cannot be the exclusive responsibility of professional preparation programs in schools of education.*
6) *The curriculum of a teacher education program should be based on an explicit statement of purpose and philosophy. An excellent program also includes student services and policies such as advisement services and admission policies.*
7) *The Commission is concerned about the high level of attrition among beginning teachers, and has successfully sponsored legislation to improve the conditions in which new teachers work.*
8) *The assessment of each student's attainments in a teacher education program is a significant responsibility of the institution that offers the program.*
9) *The Commission's standards of program quality allow quality to assume different forms in different environments.*
10) *The Commission's standards of program quality are roughly equivalent in breadth and importance.*
11) *Whether a particular program fulfills the Commission's standards is a judgment that is made by professionals who have been trained in interpreting the standards.*

The Commission fulfills one of its responsibilities to the public and the profession by adopting and implementing standards of program quality and effectiveness. While assuring the public that educator preparation is excellent, the Commission respects the considered judgments of educational institutions and professional educators and holds educators accountable for excellence. The premises and principles outlined above reflect the Commission's approach to fulfilling its responsibilities under the law.

Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs

The effectiveness of the English curriculum in California schools does not depend entirely on the content knowledge of English teachers. Another critical factor is the teachers' ability to *teach* English language arts. To address the *pedagogical* knowledge and effectiveness of English teachers, the Commission in September 1998 launched an extensive standards and assessment reform that led to the development of new teacher preparation standards. In January 2001, CCTC authorized an extensive field review of the draft standards, and in July a summary and analysis of the field review findings were presented to the Commission. During July and August 2001, the standards were amended, based on field review findings and direction from the Commission, and finally adopted by the Commission in September 2001.

The advisory panel that developed the standards was charged with developing the following three policy documents for review and consideration by the Commission:

- New standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher preparation programs.
- Teaching Performance Expectations that would serve as the basis for evaluating the competence of teacher candidates on teaching performance assessments embedded in preparation programs.
- New standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher induction programs.

These standards implement the structural changes in the teacher credentialing system that were called for in Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998). Three significant changes enacted in this reform legislation are:

- alignment of all teacher preparation standards with the state-adopted academic content standards and performance levels for students and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP);
- inclusion of a teaching performance assessment in preparation programs; and
- a required induction period of support and formative assessment for all first and second year teachers.

In addition to these structural and thematic shifts in the Commission's credentialing system and standards, SB 2042 replaced the Professional Clear Credential course requirements in health, mainstreaming and technology with a requirement that essential preparation in these three areas be addressed in preparation and induction standards. Follow-up legislation in 1999, AB 1059 (Ducheney, Chapter 711, Statutes of 1999) required that new standards for preparation and induction programs include preparation for all teachers to teach English learners in mainstream classrooms. The subject matter standards in this handbook have been designed to complement the SB 2042 standards for programs of pedagogical preparation.

Subject Matter Preparation Programs for Prospective Teachers

In California, subject matter preparation programs for prospective teachers are not the same as undergraduate degree programs. Post-secondary institutions govern academic programs that lead to the award of degrees, including baccalaureate degrees in English. The Commission sets standards for academic programs that lead to the issuance of credentials, including the Single Subject Teaching Credential in English. An applicant for a teaching credential must have earned a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, but the degree may be in a subject other than the one to appear on the credential. Similarly, degree programs for undergraduate students in English may or may not fulfill the Commission's standards for subject matter preparation. Completing an approved subject matter program that satisfies the standards enables a candidate to qualify for the Single Subject Credential in English.

Subject Matter Advisory Panels

The California Commission On Teacher Credentialing asked the English Subject Matter Advisory Panel to create new standards of program quality and effectiveness that could be used to review and approve subject matter preparation programs. The Commission requested the development of standards that would emphasize the knowledge, skills and perspectives that teachers must have in order to teach English effectively in the public schools.

In January 2001 CCTC's executive director appointed subject matter panels in English, mathematics, science, and social science to advise Commission staff on the development of new subject matter program standards and examinations in these subject areas. Each panel consists of:

- Classroom teachers of the subject area,
- Subject area specialists in school districts, county offices of education, and postsecondary institutions,
- Professors in the subject area teaching in subject matter preparation programs,
- Teacher educators,
- Members of relevant professional organizations,
- Members of other relevant committees and advisory panels, and
- A liaison from the California Department of Education.

Eighteen panel members were appointed to the English panel; 17 members appointed to the mathematics panel; 20 appointed to the social science; and 23 appointed to the science panel. The panels began their work in March 2001 with a written "charge" describing their responsibilities in developing the Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs). The SMRs are the subject-specific knowledge, skills, and abilities, which specify the content required in Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs for teacher candidates. The SMRs were approved by the Commission at its June 6, 2002, meeting.

Essential Documents for Panel Use

From their first meeting in March 2001, the subject matter panels used a number of documents as primary resources for their work. The documents listed below were essential for the panels' use in developing the draft program standards that were adopted by the Commission.

- The academic content standards for K-12 students and frameworks that have been approved by the California State Board of Education (1998-2002).

- The Commission-approved (1992) Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs in English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science, and Handbooks for Teacher Educators and Program Reviewers in each of the four academic areas (1992).

- The Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirements for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential (Sept. 2001).

- The Standards for Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs (Sept. 2001).

- The National Standards for the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE), National Council for Social Science (NCSS), and National Science Teachers Association (NSTA).

- The panels also reviewed several other publications and research articles. Several panel members brought state and national studies and publications for each panels' use.

The State Board of Education adopted K-12 student academic content standards were the seminal documents used by the panels. In the 1992 documents the panels identified six standard areas that were common to each of the four sets of academic standards. This process was instrumental in assisting the panels in identifying the 10 "Standards Common to All" that were developed and apply to all 13 single subject areas.

The Subject Matter Requirements for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential were also an important document used by the panel. In many cases the Multiple Subject Standards language and organization of the standards and standard elements were adopted by the panels. The standards of the national professional organizations also served as a guide and provided a comprehensive perspective for panel members.

The single subject matter standards were formatted and aligned with the SB 2042 standards. In the new format the standard is presented, followed by the identification of the required elements of the standard. All elements were written to articulate the language of the standard. This practice contrasts with the structure of the 1992 single subject standards, where a "rationale" was provided for each standard that, at times, went beyond the language of the standard itself. The 1992 standards contained "factors to consider" that, in certain instances, also went beyond the language of the standard.

Field Review Survey

Early in August 2002 the draft Single Subject Matter Standards and the 10 "Standards Common to All" were mailed to all deans of education, directors of teacher education, and single subject coordinators at all Commission-accredited four-year institutions in California, learned societies and professional organizations, funded subject matter projects, teacher organizations, school districts, and county offices of education. Over 100 selected K-12 public school teachers and college/university professors were sent the draft standards. The standards were also placed on the Commission's web site with instructions on how to download the standards and complete the field review survey and how to fax, email, or mail completed surveys to the Commission.

There were 717 responses submitted to the Commission in October 2002. Over 80% of all responses fell in the "Essential" or "Important" categories. Fewer than 5% of all responses were scored as "Not Important" and less than 15% were scored as "Somewhat Important." The responses were evenly distributed among the five sets of standards.

Over 80% of all responses were from higher education faculty at colleges and universities in California. Over 70% of responses were received from academic departments or faculty in the California State University (CSU) system. Responses were received from all 23 CSU campuses, five University of California campuses, and 14 private or independent institutions. The CSU Academic Senate was instrumental in obtaining strong responses from academic departments in the CSU system.

Consultant staff tallied all responses and listed all comments on a master survey form for each subject matter area. The Single Subject Matter Panels made revisions in the language of certain

standards, based on the 2002 field review, and the revised standards were recommended to CCTC for adoption at its meeting on December 5, 2002. The Commission also approved eight technical assistance meetings for spring 2003 and an implementation plan for the new standards.

The English Teaching Credential

The Single Subject Teaching Credential in English authorizes an individual to teach English classes in departmentalized settings. The holders of this credential may teach at any grade level, but the great majority of English classes occur in grades seven through twelve. The Commission asked the English Teacher Preparation and Assessment Advisory Panel to recommend new policies to ensure that future teachers of English are prepared to instruct the subjects that are most commonly taught in English classes. In 2001-02 when the advisory panel was established, approximately half of all English classes in California public schools were comprehensive courses in language, composition and literature for students in grades seven through twelve. The other classes taught by English teachers in 2000-01 were more specialized courses in:

Reading Improvement	11% of All English Classes
English as a Second Language	7%
Journalism, Speech and Other Subjects	11%
American, English and World Literature	11%
Drama, Theater and Television	4%
Composition	2%

The requirements and other policies in this document are designed to prepare teachers for comprehensive classes in language, composition and literature, as well as the more specialized courses listed above.

Alignment of Program Standards and Performance Assessments

The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970 (Ryan Act) established the requirement that candidates for teaching credentials verify their knowledge of the subjects they intend to teach. Candidates for teaching credentials may satisfy the subject matter requirement by completing approved subject matter programs or passing subject matter examinations that have been adopted by the Commission. In 1998 Senate Bill 2042 required that subject matter programs and examinations for prospective teachers be aligned with K-12 student standards and frameworks.

To achieve this alignment and congruence in English, the Commission asked the English Subject Matter Advisory Panel to develop subject matter requirements that would be consistent in scope and content with the K-12 standards and frameworks. Following extensive research and review, the Commission adopted a detailed set of *Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of English*, which follow the standards in this handbook. College and university faculty and administrators are urged to examine these requirements as a source of information about content that is essential to include in subject matter preparation programs.

The Commission sought to align the subject matter requirements with the program standards in each subject area. Each subject matter advisory panel is asked to develop standards and subject mater requirements that are as congruent with each other as possible, to maximize the equivalence between credentials that are earned by completing programs and ones that are earned by passing examinations. Standards and examinations were developed from the same set of subject matter requirements.

New Subject Matter Assessments

The Commission has used a variety of assessments to satisfy the examination option for various subject areas. In the early 1990s, the Commission developed and adopted (a) standards for subject matter preparation programs and, at the same time, (b) specifications for the subject matter examinations. The validity of the subject matter competence requirement (i.e., program standards and examination specifications) is not permanent, however. The need for periodic validity studies of the subject matter requirement is directly related to one of the Commission's most fundamental missions: to provide a strong assurance that teaching credentials are awarded to individuals who have learned the most important knowledge, skills, and abilities that are actually needed in order to succeed in California public school teaching positions.

In the late 1990s, the State Board of Education adopted K-12 student content standards in English, mathematics, science, and social science. Beginning in early 2001, the Commission began the process of developing assessments that were aligned with these new standards. In the spring of 2002, the Commission contracted with National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES®) to implement a new examination program called the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET). In the four subject areas, multiple-choice and constructed-response items were drafted based on the subject matter requirements, and reviewed and revised as needed by both the Bias Review Committee and the appropriate subject matter advisory panel.

The CSET for English, mathematics, science, and social science were first administered in January 2003, and by June 2003, fully replaced the SSAT and Praxis II examinations as the new subject matter examinations in these areas. From January through June 2003, teacher candidates in these subject areas were allowed to use the either the new CSET or the combination of appropriate SSAT and Praxis II examinations.

Overview of the English Standards Handbook

This introduction to the handbook concludes with a statement by the English Advisory Panel regarding English teaching and teacher preparation in California. Part 2 of the handbook includes the sixteen standards as well as the Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of English. Part 3 provides information about implementation of the new standards in California colleges and universities.

Contributions of the English Advisory Panel

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is indebted to the English Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panel for the successful creation of *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Preparation of Prospective Teachers of English*. CCTC believes strongly that the standards in this handbook will improve the teaching and learning of English language arts in California's public schools.

Request for Assistance from Handbook Users

The Commission periodically reviews its policies, in part on the basis of responses from colleges, universities, school districts, county offices, professional organizations and individual professionals. The Commission welcomes all comments and questions about the standards and other policies in this handbook, which should be addressed to:

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213

English Teaching and Teacher Preparation: An Introduction by the English Advisory Panel

A successful subject matter preparation program in English provides comprehensive preparation in the discipline of English. Through the focused study of literature, composition, language, media and creative performance, students discover the power of language to articulate the best of human thought and to affect the course of human action. As a result of this course of study, prospective teachers will be prepared to teach a curriculum that includes the full range of skills and knowledge found in the California Reading/Language Arts Framework.

Literature and Textual Analysis: Literature reflects the most eloquent statements about the human condition, and becomes the central core of study in the preparation of English teachers. The program curriculum will honor both traditional and emerging definitions of literature for the most comprehensive relevant representation of an evolving canon. It will include a broadened definition of the content, types and periods of literature, theories of textual analysis and types of discourse. Recognizing changes in the nature of text, modern literary studies also include non-print and non-linear media forms of communication. Through the study of oral and written expression, and of the nature of language itself, students in the English preparation program are intellectually challenged by the body of knowledge and modes of inquiry that are specific to the discipline. They are also motivated to communicate an enthusiasm for literature and language to younger learners.

Language, Linguistics and Literacy: Essential to the study of English is a knowledge of language structures, linguistics, and language acquisition. The study of linguistics provides necessary in-depth knowledge of the history, complexity, and power of language. Since today's prospective teachers must be prepared to teach students from diverse linguistic backgrounds, traditional studies of language and linguistics must be expanded to include the study of language acquisition and development, as well as the acquisition and uses of literacy.

Composition and Rhetoric: The study of composition and rhetoric should reflect the current best practices in composition studies. These should include an understanding of composing processes as well as structures of texts, rhetorical effects of grammatical choices, and conventions of usage and mechanics. Prospective teachers of writing should be able to construct coherent effective texts for a variety of purposes in a variety of contexts, including the preparation of oral or media presentations and the conducting of academic research.

Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance: Well-prepared students of English understand the critical role the art of communication plays in our complex world today. Instruction in this area develops competencies in the study and practice of effective communication. The program will include instruction in oral communication processes, media analysis and journalistic applications, dramatic performance, and creative writing. Prospective teachers will have opportunities to obtain knowledge and experience in the practice of creative expression.

Together the four domains provide comprehensive preparation for the authorized areas of the English credential. An approved teacher preparation program may either maintain established traditional divisions of course work or seek an innovative integration of these areas of study. Because all four domains are addressed in the English/Language Arts classrooms, it is also paramount that English education programs encourage students to recognize the interconnections among those domains.

The planning of effective subject matter preparation is no small task, but neither is the teaching of English in today's public schools. The challenges and the rewards are many because the contribution of the English/language arts curriculum to the school program and to society at large is so great.

The power of the discipline of English lies in its capacity to open doors for all students. The study of English provides them with the skills of listening and speaking, reading, writing, and thinking that enable them to succeed in all their academic studies, whether science or mathematics or social studies or other languages or the arts. It empowers them to communicate effectively in the workplace or the marketplace, to participate fully in the democracy or interpersonal relationships, to understand that using language effectively enables them to persuade or influence others or to function successfully in an era of technology and information. The study of English motivates students to reflect on the connection between their own experience and the human condition; to appreciate the diverse cultures in our literary heritage and society at large; and to understand the ways that language articulates moral and ethical values, delights the spirit, or expresses the creative impulses of human thought.

The significant challenge to subject matter preparation programs in English lies in preparing candidates to enter credential programs and teaching careers with excitement about the potential for accomplishing those ends by teaching and learning English through the study of literature, composition, and language and linguistics, and communications.

Part 2: Standards of Program Quality in English

Definitions of Key Terms

California state law authorizes the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to set standards and requirements for preparation programs (Ed Code 44225a, i, j, 44310, 44311).

Precondition

A precondition is a requirement for initial and continued program approval. Unlike standards, preconditions specify requirements for program compliance, not program quality. The Commission determines whether a program complies with the adopted preconditions on the basis of a program document provided by the college or university. In the program review sequence, a program that meets all preconditions is eligible for a more intensive review to determine if the program's quality satisfies the Commission's standards. Preconditions for the approval of subject matter programs in English are on following pages.

Standards

Standards are state policies adopted by the California Commission On Teacher Credentialing to describe acceptable levels of quality in programs of subject matter study that are offered by regionally-accredited colleges and universities that award baccalaureate degrees. Each standard is elaborated by Required Elements for that standard. Program reviewers selected by the Commission must find that a program meets each standard. When they do so, CCTC approves the program.

Standards are statements of program quality that must be fulfilled for initial or continued approval of a subject matter program by the Commission. In each standard, the Commission has described an acceptable level of quality in a significant aspect of English teacher preparation. The Commission determines whether a program satisfies a standard on the basis of an intensive review of all available information related to the standard.

Required Elements

Required Elements guide institutions in developing programs that meet the standards and program review panels in judging the quality of a program in relation to a standard. Within the scope of a standard, each element describes how an area of the subject matter requirements should be applied in a program. The elements identify the dimensions of program quality that the CCTC considers important. Required Elements are descriptive statements that elaborate and clarify the meaning of a major provision of a standard of program quality. In determining whether a program fulfills a given standard, the Commission expects the review panel to consider all of the required elements in conjunction with each other. Program reviewers selected by the Commission must find that a program meets each required element. When they do, the CCTC approves the program.

Preconditions for the Approval of Subject Matter Programs in English

The following Preconditions for the Approval of Subject Matter Programs in English are based on recommendations of the English Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panel. The Commission's statutory authority to establish and enforce the preconditions is based on Sections 44310 through 44312 of the California Education Code. The number and distribution of units has been expanded to accommodate the addition of the fourth domain and new content in the first three domains. The new structure is intended also to encourage experiments in program design that allow integration of various content areas in course work across domains. Coursework offered by any appropriate department(s) of a regionally accredited institution may satisfy the preconditions and standards in this handbook.

(1) Each Program of Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Teaching Credential in English shall include (a) at least 36 semester units (or 54 quarter units) of core coursework in English and related subjects that are commonly taught in departmentalized classes in California public schools, and (b) a minimum of 12 semester units (or 18 quarter units) of coursework that provides extended study to supplement the essential core of the program. These two requirements are elaborated in Preconditions 2 and 3 below. Discrete courses designed to address the technology and field experience standards shall be in addition to content studies that meet Precondition 1 and shall not be counted in partial satisfaction of the unit requirement in this precondition. However, curriculum that addresses these and other program design standards may be integrated into core course work. General education courses/content may be counted as part of the program. Courses may be a combination of lower and upper division.

(2) The basic core of the program shall include coursework in (or directly related to) the following subjects that are commonly taught in departmentalized classes of English and related subjects in the public schools:

- Literature and Textual Analysis
- Language, Linguistics, and Literacy
- Composition and Rhetoric
- Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance

All elements of the four domains must be included in the core (see Subject Matter Requirements). The required content elements may be either covered as discrete courses or integrated into other course work in the core program.

In addition to describing how a program meets each standard of program quality in this handbook, the program document by an institution shall include a listing with catalog descriptions and syllabi of all courses that constitute the basic core of the program. The document must include a matrix showing how all of the standards have been met. Institutions shall have flexibility to offer a choice of equivalent courses to satisfy requirements. Institutions may also determine whether the core consists of (a) one or more distinct courses for each commonly taught content area, or (b) courses that offer integrated coverage of these content areas. Documents must be paginated, and appendices of evidence must be indexed for clarity and ease of reference in review.

Additional coursework in the program shall be designed to provide extended studies to supplement the essential core of the program. Extended study may be offered in any or all of the following patterns:

1) A combination of related content areas within or across domains.
2) Concentration in one domain
3) Concentration in any content area within a domain.

The program document shall include a listing with catalog description and syllabi of all courses that are offered for the purposes of breadth and perspective. Institutions may define this program component in terms of required coursework or elective courses.

Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness

Category I: Standards Common to All Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs

Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose

The subject matter preparation program is based on an explicit statement of program philosophy that expresses its purpose, design, and desired outcomes in relation to the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs. The program provides the coursework and field experiences necessary to teach the specified subject to all of California's diverse public school population. Subject matter preparation in the program for prospective teachers is academically rigorous and intellectually stimulating. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the State-adopted *Content Standards for California Public Schools K-12* and curriculum frameworks for California public school*s.* The program is designed to establish a strong foundation in and understanding of subject matter knowledge for prospective teachers that provides a basis for continued development during each teacher's professional career. The sponsoring institution assigns high priority to and appropriately supports the program as an essential part of its mission.

Required Elements

1.1 The program philosophy, design, and intended outcomes are consistent with the content of the State-adopted academic content standards for K-12 students and curriculum frameworks for California public schools.

1.2 The statement of program philosophy shows a clear understanding of the preparation that prospective teachers need in order to be effective in delivering academic content to all students in California schools.

1.3 The program provides prospective teachers with the opportunity to learn and apply significant ideas, structures, methods and core concepts in the specified subject discipline(s) that underlies the 6-12 curriculum.

1.4 The program prepares prospective single-subject teachers to analyze complex discipline-based issues; synthesize information from multiple sources and perspectives; communicate skillfully in oral and written forms; and use appropriate technologies.

1.5 Program outcomes are defined clearly and assessments of prospective teachers and program reviews are appropriately aligned.

1.6 The institution conducts periodic review of the program philosophy, goals, design, and outcomes consistent with the following: campus program assessment timelines, procedures, and policies; ongoing research and thinking in the discipline; nationally accepted content standards and recommendations; and the changing needs of public schools in California.

Standard 2: Diversity and Equity

The subject matter program provides equitable opportunities to learn for all prospective teachers by utilizing instructional, advisement and curricular practices that insure equal access to program academic content and knowledge of career options. Included in the program are the essential understandings, knowledge and appreciation of the perspectives and contributions by and about diverse groups in the discipline.

Required Elements:

2.1 In accordance with the Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999, (See Appendix A), human differences and similarities to be examined in the program include, but are not limited to those of sex, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion, sexual orientation, and exceptionality. The program may also include study of other human similarities and differences.

2.2 The institution recruits and provides information and advice to men and women prospective teachers from diverse backgrounds on requirements for admission to and completion of subject matter programs.

2.3 The curriculum in the Subject Matter Program reflects the perspectives and contributions of diverse groups from a variety of cultures to the disciplines of study.

2.4 In the subject matter program, classroom practices and instructional materials are designed to provide equitable access to the academic content of the program to prospective teachers from all backgrounds.

2.5 The subject matter program incorporates a wide variety of pedagogical and instructional approaches to academic learning suitable to a diverse population of prospective teachers. Instructional practices and materials used in the program support equitable access for all prospective teachers and take into account current knowledge of cognition and human learning theory.

Standard 3: Technology

The study and application of current and emerging technologies, with a focus on those used in K-12 schools, for gathering, analyzing, managing, processing, and presenting information is an integral component of each prospective teacher's program study. Prospective teachers are introduced to legal, ethical, and social issues related to technology. The program prepares prospective teachers to meet the current technology requirements for admission to an approved California professional teacher preparation program.

Required Elements:

3.1 The institution provides prospective teachers in the subject matter program access to a wide array of current technology resources. The program faculty selects these technologies on the basis of their effective and appropriate uses in the disciplines of the subject matter program.

3.2 Prospective teachers demonstrate information processing competency, including but not limited to the use of appropriate technologies and tools for research, problem solving, data acquisition and analysis, communications, and presentation.

3.3 In the program, prospective teachers use current and emerging technologies relevant to the disciplines of study to enhance their subject matter knowledge and understanding.

Standard 4: Literacy

The program of subject matter preparation for prospective Single Subject teachers develops skills in literacy and academic discourse in the academic disciplines of study. Coursework and field experiences in the program include reflective and analytic instructional activities that specifically address the use of language, content and discourse to extend meaning and knowledge about ideas and experiences in the fields or discipline of the subject matter.

Required Elements:

4.1 The program develops prospective teachers' abilities to use academic language, content, and disciplinary thinking in purposeful ways to analyze, synthesize and evaluate experiences and enhance understanding in the discipline.

4.2 The program prepares prospective teachers to understand and use appropriately academic and technical terminology and the research conventions of the disciplines of the subject matter.

4.3 The program provides prospective teachers with opportunities to learn and demonstrate competence in reading, writing, listening, speaking, communicating and reasoning in their fields or discipline of the subject matter.

Standard 5: Varied Teaching Strategies

In the program, prospective Single Subject teachers participate in a variety of learning experiences that model effective curriculum practices, instructional strategies and assessments that prospective teachers will be expected to use in their own classrooms.

Required Elements:

5.1 Program faculty include in their instruction a variety of curriculum design, classroom organizational strategies, activities, materials and field experiences incorporating observing, recording, analyzing and interpreting content as appropriate to the discipline.

5.2 Program faculty employ a variety of interactive, engaging teaching styles that develop and reinforce skills and concepts through open-ended activities such as direct instruction, discourse, demonstrations, individual and cooperative learning explorations, peer instruction and student-centered discussion.

5.3 Faculty development programs provide tangible support for subject matter faculty to explore and use exemplary and innovative curriculum practices.

5.4 Program faculty use varied and innovative teaching strategies, which provide opportunities for prospective teachers to learn how content is conceived and organized for instruction in a way that fosters conceptual understanding as well as procedural knowledge.

5.5 Program coursework and fieldwork include the examination and use of various kinds of technology that are appropriate to the subject matter discipline.

Standard 6: Early Field Experiences

The program provides prospective Single Subject teachers with planned, structured field experiences in departmentalized classrooms beginning as early as possible in the subject matter program. These classroom experiences are linked to program coursework and give a breadth of experiences across grade levels and with diverse populations. The early field experience program is planned collaboratively by subject matter faculty, teacher education faculty and representatives from school districts. The institution cooperates with school districts in selecting schools and classrooms for introductory classroom experiences. The program includes a clear process for documenting each prospective teacher's observations and experiences.

Required Elements:

6.1 Introductory experiences shall include one or more of the following activities: planned observations, instruction or tutoring experiences, and other school based observations or activities that are appropriate for undergraduate students in a subject matter preparation program.

6.2 Prospective teachers' early field experiences are substantively linked to the content of coursework in the program.

6.3 Fieldwork experiences for all prospective teachers include significant interactions with K-12 students from diverse populations represented in California public schools and cooperation with at least one carefully selected teacher certificated in the discipline of study.

6.4 Prospective teachers will have opportunities to reflect on and analyze their early field experiences in relation to course content. These opportunities may include field experience journals, portfolios, and discussions in the subject matter courses, among others.

6.5 Each prospective teacher is primarily responsible for documenting early field experiences. Documentation is reviewed as part of the program requirements.

Standard 7: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence

The program uses formative and summative multiple measures to assess the subject matter competence of each candidate. The scope and content of each candidate's assessment is consistent with the content of the subject matter requirements of the program and with institutional standards for program completion.

Required Elements:

7.1 Assessment within the program includes multiple measures such as student performances, presentations, research projects, portfolios, field experience journals, observations, and interviews as well as oral and written examinations based on criteria established by the institution.

7.2 The scope and content of each assessment is congruent with the specifications for the subject matter knowledge and competence as indicated in the content domains of the Commission-adopted subject matter requirement.

7.3 End-of-program summative assessment of subject matter competence includes a defined process that incorporates multiple measures for evaluation of performance.

7.4 Assessment scope, process, and criteria are clearly delineated and made available to students when they begin the program.

7.5 Program faculty regularly evaluate the quality, fairness, and effectiveness of the assessment process, including its consistency with program requirements.

7.6 The institution that sponsors the program determines, establishes and implements a standard of minimum scholarship (such as overall GPA, minimum course grade or other assessments) of program completion for prospective single subject teachers.

Standard 8: Advisement and Support

The subject matter program includes a system for identifying, advising and retaining prospective Single Subject teachers. This system will comprehensively address the distinct needs and interests of a range of prospective teachers, including resident prospective students, early deciders entering blended programs, groups underrepresented among current teachers, prospective teachers who transfer to the institution, and prospective teachers in career transition.

Required Elements:

8.1 The institution will develop and implement processes for identifying prospective Single Subject teachers and advising them about all program requirements and career options.

8.2 Advisement services will provide prospective teachers with information about their academic progress, including transfer agreements and alternative paths to a teaching credential, and describe the specific qualifications needed for each type of credential, including the teaching assignments it authorizes.

8.3 The subject matter program facilitates the transfer of prospective teachers between post-secondary institutions, including community colleges, through effective outreach and advising and the articulation of courses and requirements. The program sponsor works cooperatively with community colleges to ensure that subject matter coursework at feeder campuses is aligned with the relevant portions of the state-adopted academic *Content Standards for California Public Schools K-12*.

8.4 The institution establishes clear and reasonable criteria and allocates sufficient time and personnel resources to enable qualified personnel to evaluate prospective teachers' previous coursework and/or fieldwork for meeting subject matter requirements.

Standard 9: Program Review and Evaluation

The institution implements a comprehensive, ongoing system for periodic review of and improvement to the subject matter program. The ongoing system of review and improvement involves university faculty, community college faculty, student candidates and appropriate public schools personnel involved in beginning teacher preparation and induction. Periodic reviews shall be conducted at intervals not exceeding 5 years.

Required Elements:

9.1 Each periodic review includes an examination of program goals, design, curriculum, requirements, student success, technology uses, advising services, assessment procedures and program outcomes for prospective teachers.

9.2 Each program review examines the quality and effectiveness of collaborative partnerships with secondary schools and community colleges.

9.3 The program uses appropriate methods to collect data to assess the subject matter program's strengths, weaknesses and areas that need improvement. Participants in the review include faculty members, current students, recent graduates, education faculty, employers, and appropriate community college and public school personnel.

9.4 Program improvements are based on the results of periodic reviews, the inclusion and implications of new knowledge about the subject(s) of study, the identified needs of program students and school districts in the region, and curriculum policies of the State of California.

Standard 10: Coordination

One or more faculty responsible for program planning, implementation and review coordinate the Single Subject Matter Preparation Program. The program sponsor allocates resources to support effective coordination and implementation of all aspects of the program. The coordinator(s) fosters and facilitates ongoing collaboration among academic program faculty, local school personnel, local community colleges and the professional education faculty.

Required Elements:

10.1 A program coordinator will be designated from among the academic program faculty.

10.2 The program coordinator provides opportunities for collaboration by faculty, students, and appropriate public school personnel in the design and development of and revisions to the program, and communicates program goals to the campus community, other academic partners, school districts and the public.

10.3 The institution allocates sufficient time and resources for faculty coordination and staff support for development, implementation and revision of all aspects of the program.

10.4 The program provides opportunities for collaboration on curriculum development among program faculty.

10.5 University and program faculty cooperate with community colleges to coordinate courses and articulate course requirements for prospective teachers to facilitate transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution.

Category II: Program Standards for English

Standard 11: Required Subject of Study

The subject matter preparation program is based on an explicit statement of program philosophy that expresses its purpose, design, and desired outcomes reflective of the Standards for Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs. The program provides the course work and field experiences necessary to teach the specified subject to all students in California's diverse public school population. The subject matter preparation for prospective teachers is academically rigorous and intellectually stimulating. The institution assigns high priority to and appropriately supports the program as an essential part of its mission. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the State-adopted English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) and Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999). The program is designed to establish a strong foundation in subject matter knowledge and understanding that provides a basis for continued development during the teachers' professional career.

Required Elements

11.1 The core program provides broad foundational studies in the four English domains as detailed in Standards 13 through 16 (literature and textual analysis; language, linguistics and literacy; composition and rhetoric; communications, speech, media and creative performance).

11.2 The core program includes focused, in-depth study in one or more domains to provide rigorous, scholarly work in the recognized disciplines of English Language Arts.

11.3 The core program introduces English candidates to current and emerging issues in literacy, language acquisition and multicultural studies.

11.4 The core program includes the study of canonical literature as well as the literature of diversity, world literature, non-literary readings, workplace communications, and visual technologically mediated texts.

11.5 The core program includes study of research conducted and presented in multiple genres and media reflective of current technology in usage.

11.6 Throughout the program, literary works and other forms of human communication are considered in their historical and political contexts.

Standard 12: Extended Studies

The program includes coursework to supplement the program core and further prepare prospective teachers in the range of subjects included in the state-adopted Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999). Prospective teachers build upon foundational knowledge acquired in the program core by further work within or across content domains. The program's design for extended studies provides prospective teachers with options, including both specialized and comprehensive preparation based on coherent patterns of coursework.

Required Elements:

12.1 The program offers extended studies that ensure that prospective teachers deepen their knowledge within or across content domains.

12.2 Extended study may be offered in any or all of the following patterns:

a. A combination of related content areas across one or more of the four domains: literature and textual analysis; language and linguistics; composition and rhetoric; and communications: speech, media and creative performance

b. Concentration in one domain

c. Concentration in any content area within a domain (e.g., speech, multicultural literature, theater)

12.3 The program provides advising for prospective teachers to select or develop a coherent pattern of extended study based on a well-defined goal (i.e., to meet requirements of the major; to complement or supplement studies in the program core; to pursue special professional interests, e.g. drama, journalism, and media).

Standard 13: Literature and Textual Analysis

Prospective teachers of English learners are prepared to recognize the power and importance of literature as it reflects the most eloquent statements about the human condition. Prospective teachers of English develop an appreciation for our diverse literary heritage as an expression of our poly-cultural society and understand the ways that language can be used to articulate moral and ethical values, delight the spirit, or express the creative impulses of human thought. The program curriculum includes traditional and emerging definitions of literature, types and periods of literature, and textual analysis.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

13.1 Read, study and analyze works of literature from the canon, including the literature of diversity, from a variety of literary traditions, movements and historical contexts.

13.2 Know and analyze a variety of literary elements, their forms and uses.

13.3 Analyze literary and non-literary texts and understand their structure, content and interpretations.

13.4 Consider and articulate the ways in which literature can engage readers and cause them to reflect on their own experiences and the human condition.

13.5 Reflect on the ways literature can inspire personal and social growth and change.

Standard 14: Language, Linguistics and Literacy

The program requires prospective teachers of English to develop an understanding of language structures, language acquisition, linguistic diversity and the development of literacy. Prospective teachers know, understand and appreciate the varieties of spoken and written English and how they are related to the diverse cultures and societies where English is a medium of communication. Recognizing the needs of both native and non-native speakers, the program effectively models English as a communicative tool.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

14.1 Know the conventions, forms and functions of Standard English grammar and sentence structure.

14.2 Recognize the universality of linguistic structures while acknowledging variation arising from differences of time, place and community.

14.3 Learn basic principles of morphology, phonology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

14.4 Explain cognitive, affective and socio-cultural as well as first language influences on language acquisition and development, and the role of these influences in developing academic literacy.

14.5 Examine and explain strategies for constructing meaning within the processes of reading and writing.

Standard 15: Composition and Rhetoric

In the program prospective teachers learn and apply a variety of composing processes. Prospective teachers of English analyze and compose texts representing a variety of discourse types and demonstrate the ability to use research strategies, text production technologies and presentation methods appropriately in a range of rhetorical contexts.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

15.1 Read and study the rhetorical features of literary and non-literary texts, both fiction and non-fiction.

15.2 Analyze rhetorical and structural differences between oral written language to explain relations between speaking and writing. Study and apply aspects of oral and written composing processes.

15.3 Use and analyze grammatical elements of oral and written English for a variety of rhetorical effects.

15.4 Consistently and accurately apply the conventions of oral and written English.

15.5 Learn and apply advanced research strategies for academic work in English, including collection, integration and citation of data.

Standard 16: Communications: Speech, Media and Creative Performance

In the program prospective teachers of English acquire the breadth of knowledge needed to integrate journalism, technological media, speech, dramatic performance and creative writing into the language arts curriculum. Prospective teachers gain experience with oral and visual communication as expressed through media and performance as well as creative writing forms to understand how to use language effectively to communicate ideas and express themselves creatively.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

16.1 Demonstrate and evaluate oral performance in a variety of forms, using appropriate delivery criteria.

16.2 Demonstrate the ability to analyze and respond to components of communication discourse such as audience feedback, supportive listening and critical thinking.

16.3 Learn and apply strategies used by the media to impact society and evaluate the impact.

16.4 Specify the processes and techniques for making presentations in a variety of media forms.

16.5 Participate in dramatic performance, such as traditional playscripts, reader's theater and oral interpretation.

16.6 Engage in theatrical processes, which apply production techniques, such as rehearsal strategies, principles of theatrical design and textual interpretation.

16.7 Produce creative writing in a variety of genres using processes and techniques that enhance the text.

Subject Matter Requirements For Prospective English Teachers

Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in English

More than ever before, teachers of English in California's middle and high schools must deliver a complex and dynamic curriculum to students of every socioeconomic, linguistic and cultural background. Furthermore, society is increasingly technologically and media oriented. The Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) forms the basis for the preparation of English teachers, who must equip their students to meet the challenges of this changing world. In this context, new paradigms and models are required for teaching English/Language Arts. Multiple forms of literacy demand a broad theoretical knowledge of language and literacy acquisition, while new information technologies require an emphasis on critical analysis of both print and non-print texts.

Candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English have a broad knowledge of literature, language and linguistics, rhetoric and composition, and communication studies. Candidates must be able to read and write well for a variety of purposes and communicate effectively within a variety of rhetorical contexts. In addition, candidates must have experience in theater arts, public speaking, journalism, textual analysis of nonfiction and electronic media, and production of technologically enhanced documents. This broad scope of background and skills ensures a greater degree of success in English/Language Arts classrooms for California's public school children.

Domain 1. Literature and Textual Analysis

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the literature and textual analysis contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. The candidate's preparation should include breadth of knowledge in literature, literary analysis and criticism, as well as non-literary text analysis. Literary analysis presumes in-depth exploration of the relationship between form and content. The curriculum should embrace representative selections from different literary traditions and major works from diverse cultures. Advanced study of multicultural writers is also fundamental preparation for teaching these works. Shakespeare remains integral to the secondary school curriculum; advanced study of his work is, therefore, essential to future secondary teachers. Candidates must be enthusiastic readers and writers, who know and apply effective reading strategies and compose thoughtful, well-crafted responses to literary and non-literary texts. Candidates will be able to:

1.1 Literary Analysis

a. Recognize, compare, and evaluate different literary traditions to include:
   - American (inclusive of cultural pluralism)
   - British (inclusive of cultural pluralism)
   - World literature and literature in translation (inclusive of cross-cultural literature)
   - Mythology and oral tradition

b. Trace development of major literary movements in historical periods (e.g., Homeric Greece, medieval, neoclassic, romantic, modern)
c. Describe the salient features of adolescent/Young Adult literature
d. Analyze and interpret major works by representative writers in historical, aesthetic, political, and philosophical contexts

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.4; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.2, 3.5-7)

1.2 Literary Elements

a. Distinguish salient features of genres (e.g., short stories, non-fiction, drama, poetry, and novel)
b. Define and analyze basic elements of literature (e.g., plot, setting, character, point of view, theme, narrative structure, figurative language, tone, diction, and style)
c. Articulate the relationship between the expressed purposes and the characteristics of different forms of dramatic literature (e.g., comedy, tragedy, drama, and dramatic monologue)
d. Develop critical thinking and analytic skill through close reading of texts

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1-2, 2.1, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0; Grade 7, Reading: 1.1, 2.4, 3.1-5; Grade 8, Reading: 1.1, 2.7, 3.0; Grades 9-10, Reading: 1.1, 2.8, 3.1-4, 3.7-10; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.2, 3.1-4)

1.3 Literary Criticism

a. Research and apply criticism of major texts and authors using print and/or electronic resources
b. Research and apply various approaches to interpreting literature (e.g., aesthetic, historical, political, philosophical)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.6-8, 3.6; Grade 7, Reading: 2.1, 2.4, 2.6, 3.0; Grade 8, Reading: 2.2, 2.6, 3.0; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.2, 2.4, 2.8, 3.5-7, 3.11-12, Writing 1.6-7; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.2, 2.4, 3.8-9, Writing 1.6-7)

1.4 Analysis of Non-Literary Texts

a. Compare various features of print and visual media (e.g., film, television, Internet)
b. Evaluate structure and content of a variety of consumer, workplace, and public documents
c. Interpret individual works in their cultural, social, and political contexts

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.0, 3.0; Grade 7, Reading: 2.1-5, 2.2, 3.0; Grade 8, Reading: 2.1-7, 3.0; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4-7, 3.0; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.1-3, 2.6, 3.0)

Domain 2. Language, Linguistics, and Literacy

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the language, linguistics, and literacy contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. Many California students, coming from a variety of linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds, face specific challenges in mastering the English language. The diversity of this population requires the candidate to understand the principles of language acquisition and development. Candidates must become knowledgeable about the nature of human language, language variation, and historical and cultural perspectives on the development of English. In addition, candidates must acquire a complex understanding of the development of English literacy among both native and non-native speakers. Candidates will be able to:

2.1 Human Language Structures

a. Recognize the nature of human language, differences among languages, the universality of linguistic structures, and change across time, locale, and communities
b. Demonstrate knowledge of word analysis, including sound patterns (phonology) and inflection, derivation, compounding, roots and affixes (morphology)
c. Demonstrate knowledge of sentence structures (syntax), word and sentence meanings (semantics), and language function in communicative context (pragmatics)
d. Use appropriate print and electronic sources to research etymologies; recognize conventions of English orthography and changes in word meaning and pronunciation

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1-5; Grades 7-8, Reading: 1.2; Grades 9-10, Reading: 1.1-3)

2.2 Acquisition and Development of Language and Literacy

a. Explain the influences of cognitive, affective, and sociocultural factors on language acquisition and development
b. Explain the influence of a first language on second language development
c. Describe methods and techniques for developing academic literacy (e.g., tapping prior knowledge through semantic mapping, word analogies, and cohesion analysis)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grades 6-12, Reading: 1.0)

2.3 Literacy Studies

a. Recognize the written and oral conventions of Standard English, and analyze the social implications of mastering them
b. Describe and explain cognitive elements of reading and writing processes (e.g., decoding and encoding, construction of meaning, recognizing and using text conventions of different genres)
c. Explain metacognitive strategies for making sense of text (e.g., pre-reading activities, predicting, questioning, word analysis, and concept formation)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grades 6-12, Reading: 1.0)

2.4 Grammatical Structures of English

a. Identify methods of sentence construction (e.g., sentence combining with coordinators and subordinators; sentence embedding and expanding with clausal and phrasal modifiers)
b. Analyze parts of speech and their distinctive structures and functions (e.g., noun phrases including count and noncount nouns and the determiner system; prepositions, adjectives, and adverbs; word transformations)
c. Describe the forms and functions of the English verb system (e.g., modals, verb complements, and verbal phrases)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 8, Reading: 1.2)

Domain 3. Composition and Rhetoric

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the composition and rhetoric contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools; Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. Candidates face dynamic challenges in the domains of oral and written communication. They must make appropriate use of current text-production technologies and develop sensitivity to patterns of communication used by different social and cultural groups. Candidates are competent writers and speakers who are able to communicate appropriately in various rhetorical contexts, using effective text structures, word choice, sentence options, standard usage conventions, and advanced research methods as needed. The subject matter preparation program provides opportunities for candidates to develop skills and confidence in public speaking. Candidates will be able to:

3.1 Written Composing Processes (Individual and Collaborative)

a. Reflect on and describe their own writing processes
b. Investigate and apply alternative methods of prewriting, drafting, responding, revising, editing, and evaluating
c. Employ such strategies as graphic organizers, outlines, notes, charts, summaries, or précis to clarify and record meaning
d. Integrate a variety of software applications (e.g., databases, graphics, and spreadsheets) to produce print documents and multi-media presentations

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.4, Writing: 1.4-6; Grade 7, Reading: 2.3-4, Writing: 1.3-4, 1.6-7; Grade 8, Reading: 2.4, Writing: 1.1, 1.4-1.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.4; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.4, Writing: 1.8-9; Grades 11-12, Writing: 1.4, 1.7-9, Listening and Speaking: 2.4)

3.2 Rhetorical Features of Literary and Non-Literary, Oral and Written Texts

a. Recognize and use a variety of writing applications (e.g., short story, biographical, autobiographical, expository, persuasive, business and technical documents, historical investigation)

b. Demonstrate awareness of audience, purpose, and context

c. Recognize and use various text structures (e.g., narrative and non-narrative organizational patterns)

d. Apply a variety of methods to develop ideas within an essay (e.g., analogy, cause and effect, compare and contrast, definition, illustration, description, hypothesis)

e. Apply critical thinking strategies to evaluate methods of persuasion, including but not limited to:

- Types of appeal (e.g., appeal to reason, emotion, morality)
- Types of persuasive speech (e.g., propositions of fact, value, problem, policy)
- Logical fallacies (e.g., bandwagon, red herring, glittering generalities, ad hominem)
- Advertising techniques (e.g., Maslow's hierarchy of needs)
- Logical argument (e.g., inductive/deductive reasoning, syllogisms, analogies)
- Classical argument (e.g., claim, qualifiers, rules of evidence, warrant)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, Writing: 1.1-3, 1.6, 2.1-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.8-9; Grade 7, Reading: 1.3, 2.2-3, Writing: 1.1-3, 1.7, 2.1-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.1, 1.3; Grade 8, Reading: 1.3, 2.2, Writing: 1.1-3, 1.52.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.8; Grades 9-10, Writing: 1.1-2, 1.4, 1.9, 2.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.5, 1.10, 1.13; Grades 11-12, Reading: 1.3, 2.2, 2.4-6, Writing: 1.1-5, 1.9, 2.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.4, 1.12-13)

3.3 Rhetorical Effects of Grammatical Elements

a. Employ precise and extensive vocabulary and effective diction to control voice, style, and tone

b. Use clause-joining techniques (e.g., coordinators, subordinators, and punctuation) to express logical connections between ideas

c. Identify and use clausal and phrasal modifiers to control flow, pace, and emphasis (e.g., adjective clauses, appositives, participles and verbal phrases, absolutes)

d. Identify and use devices to control focus in sentence and paragraph (e.g., active and passive voice, expletives, concrete subjects, and transitional phrases)

e. Maintain coherence through use of cohesive devices

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, Writing: 1.2, 1.6, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-5; Grade 7, Writing: 1.1, 1.7, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-7; Grade 8, Writing: 1.2, 1.6, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.5-6; Grades 9-10, Writing: 1.1-2, 1.6, 1.9, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-5; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.1-2, Writing: 1.2-5, 1.9, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-3, Listening and Speaking: 1.5)

3.4 Conventions of Oral and Written Language

a. Apply knowledge of linguistic structure to identify and use the conventions of Standard Edited English

b. Recognize, understand, and use a range of conventions in both spoken and written English, including:

- Conventions of effective sentence structure (e.g., clear pronoun reference, parallel structure, appropriate verb tense)
- Preferred usage (e.g., verb/subject agreement, pronoun agreement, idioms)
- Conventions of pronunciation and intonation
- Conventional forms of spelling
- Capitalization and punctuation

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-5: Grade 7, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-7; Grade 8, Writing: 1.2, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.6: Grades 9-10, Writing: 1.9, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.9; Grades 11-12, Writing: 1.4, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-3, Listening and Speaking: 1.8)

3.5 Research Strategies

a. Develop and apply research questions

b. Demonstrate methods of inquiry and investigation

c. Identify and use multiple resources (e.g., oral, print, electronic; primary and secondary), and critically evaluate the quality of the sources

d. Interpret and apply findings

e. Use professional conventions and ethical standards of citation and attribution

f. Demonstrate effective presentation methods, including multi-media formats

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, 2.1, 2.3, 2.6-8, Writing: 1.4-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-2, 1.6-7, 2.1, 2.3; Grade 7, Reading: 2.2, 2.6, Writing: 1.4-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.2, 1.6-7, 2.1, 2.3; Grade 8, Reading: 2.2, 2.7, Writing: 1.3-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.2-3, 1.6-8, 2.3; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.2-5, 2.8, Writing: 1.3-8, Listening and Speaking: 1.7, 2.2; Grades 11-12, Writing: 1.4, 1.6-8, Listening and Speaking: 2.4)

Domain 4. Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the speech, media, and creative performance contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. The Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) puts consistent emphasis on analysis and evaluation of oral and media communication as well as on effective public speaking and performance. The candidate must

possess the breadth of knowledge needed to integrate journalism, technological media, speech, dramatic performance, and creative writing into the language arts curriculum, including sensitivity to cultural approaches to communication. The subject matter preparation program should include opportunities for candidates to obtain knowledge and experience in these areas. The candidate skillfully applies the artistic and aesthetic tools and sensitivities required for creative expression. Candidates will be able to:

4.1 Oral Communication Processes

a. Identify features of, and deliver oral performance in, a variety of forms (e.g., impromptu, extemporaneous, persuasive, expository, interpretive, debate)
b. Demonstrate and evaluate individual performance skills (e.g., diction, enunciation, vocal rate, range, pitch, volume, body language, eye contact, and response to audience)
c. Articulate principles of speaker/audience interrelationship (e.g., interpersonal communication, group dynamics, and public address)
d. Identify and demonstrate collaborative communication skills in a variety of roles (e.g., listening supportively, facilitating, synthesizing, and stimulating higher level critical thinking through inquiry)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-8, 2.0; Grade 7, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-7, 2.0; Grade 8, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-8, 2.0; Grades 9-10, Listening and Speaking: 1.1, 1.3-6, 1.8-13, 2.0; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.4-6, 1.8-13, 2.0)

4.2 Media Analysis and Journalistic Applications

a. Analyze the impact on society of a variety of media forms (e.g., television, advertising, radio, Internet, film)
b. Recognize and evaluate strategies used by the media to inform, persuade, entertain, and transmit culture
c. Identify aesthetic effects of a media presentation
d. Demonstrate effective and creative application of these strategies and techniques to prepare presentations using a variety of media forms and visual aids

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.9; Grade 7, Reading: 2.1, Listening and Speaking: 1.8-9; Grade 8, Reading: 2.1, 2.3, Listening and Speaking: 1.8-9; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.1, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-2, 1.7, 1.9, 1.14; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.1, Writing: 2.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-4, 1.9, 1.14, 2.4; Visual and Performing Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Theatre, Grades 6-12, 5.0: Connections, Relationships, Applications)

4.3 Dramatic Performance

a. Describe and use a range of rehearsal strategies to effectively mount a production (e.g., teambuilding, scheduling, organizing resources, setting priorities, memorization techniques, improvisation, physical and vocal exercises)

b. Employ basic elements of character analysis and approaches to acting, including physical and vocal techniques that reveal character and relationships
c. Demonstrate basic knowledge of the language of visual composition and principles of theatrical design (e.g., set, costume, lighting, sound, and props)
d. Apply fundamentals of stage directing, including conceptualization, blocking (movement patterns), tempo, and dramatic arc (rising and falling action)
e. Demonstrate facility in a variety of oral performance traditions (e.g., storytelling, epic poetry, and recitation)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Listening and Speaking: 2.1, 2.3; Grade 7, Listening and Speaking: 2.1; Grade 8, Listening and Speaking: 1.1, 2.1-2, 2.5; Grades 9-10, Listening and Speaking: 2.1, 2.4; Grades 11-12, Listening and Speaking: 1.7, 1.9-10, 2.5; Visual and Performing Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Theatre, Grades 6-12, 1.0: Artistic Perception, 2.0: Creative Expression, 3.0 Historical and Cultural Context, 4.0 Aesthetic Valuing)

4.4 Creative Writing

a. Demonstrate facility in creative composition in a variety of genres (e.g., poetry, stories, plays, and film)
b. Understand and apply processes and techniques that enhance the impact of the creative writing product (e.g., work-shopping, readings, recasting of genre, voice, and perspective)
c. Demonstrate skill in composing creative and aesthetically compelling responses to literature

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6-12, Writing: 2.1)

Part 3: Implementation of Program Quality Standards for the Subject Matter Preparation of English Teachers

The 2003 Program Quality Standards for Subject Matter Preparation in English are part of a broad shift in the policies of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing related to the preparation of professional teachers and other educators in California colleges and universities resulting from the mandate of Senate Bill 2042. The Commission initiated this policy change to insure high quality in educator preparation and to combine flexibility with accountability for institutions that offer programs for prospective teachers. The success of this reform effort depends on the effective *implementation* of program quality standards for each credential.

Program Equivalency

The Ryan Act established two alternatives for prospective teachers to meet the subject matter requirement:

- individuals who completes an approved subject matter program are not required to pass the subject matter examination, and

- individuals who achieve a passing score on an adopted examination are not required to complete a subject matter program.

Subject matter programs are completed by more than half of the candidates for Single Subject Credentials.

Senate Bill 2042 required that subject matter programs and examinations be aligned with the K-12 Student Content Standards and made equivalent to each other. This has been achieved in the new standards, and references are included. A candidate who completes an approved subject matter program is issued an "equivalency" to the subject matter examination.

Review and Improvement of Subject Matter Standards

The Commission will adhere to its cycle of review and reconsideration of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs in English* and in other subjects. The standards will be reviewed and reconsidered in relation to changes in academic disciplines, school curricula, and the backgrounds and needs of California students (K-12). Reviews of program standards will be based on the advice of subject matter teachers, professors and curriculum specialists. Prior to each review, the Commission will invite interested individuals and organizations to participate in the review process.

Adoption and Implementation of Standards by the Commission

Program sponsors have approximately two years to transition from current to new standards of quality and effectiveness for Single Subject Matter Programs. Each sponsor is being asked to select from among seven submission deadlines during the period October 2003 through March 2005. The form for requesting a submission date is included in this section. In the absence of a timely request for a submission date, the review may take longer. All program documents will be reviewed by statewide teams of peer reviewers selected from among qualified K–12 and IHE professional educators. It should be noted that each program of Single Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Credentials must be submitted for review by the statewide panel. No new programs written to the old standards will be reviewed after the adoption of the new standards in January 2003.

Information about transition timelines for candidates, sunset dates for currently approved programs, and preconditions will be provided by the Commission through Coded Correspondence and additional program transition documents as it becomes available. Program sponsors should check the Commission website (www.ctc.ca.gov) frequently for updates.

Technical Assistance Meetings for Colleges and Universities

During April and May 2003, the Commission sponsored eight meetings to provide assistance to institutions related to their subject matter programs in English. The agenda for each workshop included:

- Explanation of the implementation plan adopted by the Commission.
- Description of the steps in program review and approval.
- Review of program standards, factors to consider preconditions and examples presented by Subject Matter Advisory Panel members and others with experience in implementing Standards of Program Quality.
- Opportunities to discuss subject-specific questions in small groups.

Information disseminated at those meetings is available upon request to those who were unable to attend.

Implementation Timeline: Impact on Candidates for English Credentials

Based on the Commission's implementation plan, candidates for Single Subject Credentials in English who do not plan to pass the subject matter examinations adopted by the Commission should enroll in subject matter programs that fulfill the "new" standards either (1) once a new program commences at their institution, or (2) before July 1, 2005, whichever occurs first. After a new program begins at an institution, no students should enroll for the first time in an "old" program (i.e. one approved under "old" standards). Regardless of the date when new programs are implemented, no students should enter old programs after July 1, 2005.

Candidates who enrolled in programs approved on the basis of 1994 standards ("old" programs) may complete those programs provided that (1) they entered the old programs either before new

programs were available at their institutions, or before July 1, 2005, and (2) they complete the old programs before July 1, 2009. Candidates who do not comply with these timelines may qualify for Single Subject Teaching Credentials by passing the subject matter examinations that have been adopted for that purpose by the Commission.

Implementation Plan Adopted by the Commission

July 1, 2003

(1) By July 1, 2005, existing ("old") programs based on current guidelines should be superseded by new programs with full approval.

(a) Once a new program receives full approval, all students not previously enrolled in the old program (i.e., all "new" students) should enroll in the new program.

(b) After July 1, 2005, no "new" students should enroll in an "old" program, even if a new program in the subject is not available at that institution.

(c) Students who enrolled in an old program prior to July 1, 2005, may continue to complete the old program until July 1, 2009.

Timeline for Implementing the English Standards

January 2003	The Commission on Teacher Credentialing adopts the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness that are in this handbook. The Commission adopts the implementation plan outlined in this handbook. No new subject matter programs in English will be reviewed in relation to the Commission's "old" standards.
April to May 2003	The Commission conducts statewide technical assistance meetings for developing new subject matter programs to meet the new standards.
July/October 2003	The Commission disseminates the handbook. The Commission selects, orients and trains a Program Review Panel in English. Qualified subject matter experts are prepared to review programs in relation to the standards beginning in 2003-04.
October 2003	Review and approval of programs under the new standards begins.
2003-05	Institutions may submit programs for review on or after October 1, 2003, after requesting and being assigned a submission date by Commission staff. Once a "new" program is approved, all students who were not previously enrolled in the "old" program (i.e., all new students) should enroll in the new program. Students may complete an old program if they enrolled in it either (1) prior to the commencement of the new program at their campus, or (2) prior to July 1, 2005, whichever occurs first.
July 1, 2005	"Old" programs that are based on 1994 standards must be superseded by new programs with full approval (see pages 42-43). After July 1, 2005, no new students may enroll in an old program, even if a new program in English is not yet available at the institution.
2005-09	The Commission will continue to review program proposals based on the standards and preconditions in this handbook. Institutions which submit program proposals without an assigned submission date will be reviewed at the earliest date of an opening in the submission schedule.
July 1, 2009	The final date for candidates to complete subject matter preparation programs approved under the 1994 standards. To qualify for a credential based on an "old" program, students must have entered that program prior to either (1) the implementation of a new program with full or interim approval at their institution, or (2) July 1 2005, whichever occurs first.

Implementation Timeline Diagram

January 2003

Adopt the English standards and preconditions in this handbook, including the implementation plan.

January to May, 2003

Disseminate the standards, timeline and implementation plan throughout the state. Hold regional technical assistance meetings to offer information, answer questions, and assist colleges and universities in developing new programs.

October 2003

Colleges and universities may begin to present program documents for review by the Commission's staff and Program Review Panels.

July 1, 2005

"Old" subject matter programs in English must be superseded by new approved programs.

July 1, 2009

Final date for candidates to qualify for Single Subject Credentials in English on the basis of "old" programs of subject matter preparation.

Review and Approval of English Subject Matter Programs

A regionally accredited institution of post-secondary education that would like to offer (or continue to offer) a Program of Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Credential in English may present a program proposal that responds to the standards and preconditions in this handbook. The submission of programs for review and approval is voluntary for colleges and universities.

If an institution would like to offer two or more distinct programs of subject matter preparation in English, a separate proposal may be forwarded to the Commission for each program. For example, one program in English might emphasize studies of language acquisition and development, while a second program at the same institution could have an emphasis in drama or comparative literature. However, the Commission encourages institutions to coordinate its single subject programs that are within the same subject matter discipline.

The Commission is prepared to review subject matter program proposals beginning on October 1, 2003. Prior to that date, the Commission's professional staff is able to consult with institutional representatives on meeting the new standards and preparing program documents.

Selection, Composition and Training of Program Review Panels

Review panel members are selected because of their expertise in English and their knowledge of English curriculum and instruction in the public schools of California. Reviewers are selected from institutions of higher education, school districts, county offices of education, organizations of subject matter experts, and statewide professional organizations. Members are selected according to the Commission's adopted policies that govern the selection of panels. Members of the Commission's former Single Subject Waiver Panels and Subject Matter Advisory Panels may be selected to serve on Program Review Panels.

The Commission staff conducts a training and calibration session that all reviewers must attend. Training includes:

- The purpose and function of subject matter preparation programs.
- The Commission's legal responsibilities in program review and approval.
- The role of the review panel in making program determinations.
- The role of the Commission's professional staff in assisting the panel.
- A thorough analysis and discussion of each standard and rationale.
- Alternative ways in which the standard could be met.
- An overview of review panel procedures.
- Simulated practice and calibration in reviewing programs.
- Responsive feedback for program revision.

Steps in the Review of Programs

The Commission is committed to conducting a program review process that is objective, authoritative and comprehensive. The agency also seeks to be as helpful as possible to colleges and universities throughout the review process. Commission staff is available to consult with during program document development.

Review of Preconditions. An institution's response to the preconditions is reviewed by the Commission's professional staff because the preconditions are based on Commission policies and do not involve issues of program quality. Preconditions are reviewed upon the institution's formal submission of a document. Once the status of the preconditions is established, the program document is referred to the expert review panel.

Review of Program Quality Standards. Unlike the preconditions, the standards address issues of program quality and effectiveness, so each institution's response to the standards is reviewed by a small Program Review Panel of subject matter experts. If the Program Review Panel determines that a proposed program fulfills the standards, the Commission's staff recommends the program for approval by the Commission during a public meeting no more than eight weeks after the panel's decision.

If the Program Review Panel determines that the program does not meet the standards, the document is returned to the institution with an explanation of the panel's findings. Specific reasons for the panel's decision are communicated to the institution. If the panel has substantive concerns about one or more aspects of program quality, representatives of the institution can obtain information and assistance from the Commission's staff.

The Commission would like the program review process to be as helpful as possible to colleges and universities. Because a large number of institutions prepare teachers in California, representatives of an institution should first consult with the Commission's professional staff regarding programs that are in preparation or under review. The staff responds to all inquiries expeditiously and knowledgeably. Representatives of colleges and universities should contact members of a Program Review Panel only when they are authorized to do so by the Commission's staff. This restriction must be observed to ensure that membership on a panel is manageable for the reviewers. If an institution finds that needed information is not sufficiently available, please inform the designated staff consultant. If the problem is not corrected in a timely way, please contact the executive director of the Commission. After changes have been made in the program, the proposal may be re-submitted to the Commission's staff for reconsideration by the panel.

If the Program Review Panel determines that minor or technical changes should be made in a program, the responsibility for reviewing the resubmitted document rests with the Commission's professional staff, which presents the *revised* program to the Commission for approval without further review by the panel.

Appeal of an Adverse Decision. An institution that would like to appeal a decision of the staff (regarding preconditions) or the Program Review Panel (regarding standards) may do so by submitting the appeal to the executive director of the Commission. The institution should include the following information in the appeal:

- The original program document and the stated reasons of the Commission's staff or the review panel for not recommending approval of the program.

- A specific response by the institution to the initial denial, including a copy of the resubmitted document (if it has been resubmitted).

- A rationale for the appeal by the institution.

The CCTC executive director may deny the appeal, or appoint an independent review panel, or present the appeal directly to the Commission for consideration.

Submission Guidelines for Single Subject Matter Program Documents

To facilitate the proposal review and approval process, Commission staff has developed the following instructions for organizations submitting documents for approval of Single Subject Matter Programs. It is essential that these instructions be followed accurately. Failure to comply with these procedures can result in a proposal being returned to the prospective program sponsor for reformatting and/or revision prior to being forwarded to program reviewers.

Transmittal Instructions

Sponsoring agencies are required to submit **three printed and bound notebook copies** of their proposal(s), **and one unbound copy** to the following address:

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division: Single Subject Matter Programs
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

In addition, **one electronic CD ROM copy of the proposal text** (including supporting evidence where possible) should be submitted. This electronic submission should be in Microsoft Word, or a Microsoft Word compatible format. Some phases of the review process will involve secure web-based editing. To facilitate this process, please leave no spaces in the name of your document, and be sure that the name of the file ends in ".doc" (example: CCTCdocument.doc).

Submittal Deadlines

There are seven opportunities during which to submit proposals for review and approval. The submittal deadlines are:

October 1, 2003	**August 2, 2004**
January 5, 2004	**November 2, 2004**
March 2, 2004	**March 1, 2005***
June 1, 2004	

*Any programs submitted after 2005 will be reviewed according to the availability of the review panel.

Transmittal Documents

Additional materials including the required Transmittal Cover Sheet are included at the end of this section. Sponsoring agencies should send the Sponsoring Organization Transmittal Cover Sheet with the original signatures of the program contacts and chief executive officer along with their proposal(s). In addition, each of the four copies of each proposal should begin with a copy of the Sponsoring Organization Transmittal Cover Sheet. The program contact identified on the Transmittal Cover Sheet, which is included at the end of this document, will be informed electronically and by mail as changes occur. Program sponsors are strongly urged to consult the CCTC web site at www.ctc.ca.gov for updates relating to the implementation of new single subject matter standards.

Each proposal must be organized in the following order:

- Transmittal Cover Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Responses to Each Standard, including the Common Standards.

The response to the standards must:

- be tabbed/labeled to help guide the reviewers,
  - have numbered pages,
  - include a matrix identifying which courses meet which standards to address the pre-conditions, and
  - provide supporting evidence included after each response or organized into appendices. Evidence should be cross-referenced in the response, and appendices *must* be tabbed for easy access by reviewers.

Blended Programs

Blended Program sponsors are reminded that they must have an approved Subject Matter Preparation Program for the Single Subject Preliminary Credential and an approved Professional Teacher Preparation Program for the Single Subject Preliminary Credential in order to apply for approval for a Blended Program. The transition timeline for blended programs is the same as for single subject programs; all submissions must adhere to the 7/1/03-7/1/05 timeframe to avoid interruption in approved program admissions. Program sponsors may submit a Blended Program proposal at the same time as a single subject matter program submissions. A submission request form is included with the single subject submission form at the end of this section.

Responding to Standards

The Commission adopted 10 standards that relate to program design and structure for programs in *all* single subject disciplines.

Standard 1 Program Philosophy and Purpose

Standard 2	Diversity and Equity
Standard 3	Technology
Standard 4	Literacy
Standard 5	Varied Teaching Strategies
Standard 6	Early Field Experiences
Standard 7	Assessment of Subject Matter Competence
Standard 8	Advisement and Support
Standard 9	Program Review and Evaluation
Standard 10	Coordination

These 10 standards are referred to as "standards common to all" because they are the same in all subject areas.

An institution's program document should include a subject-specific reply to Standards 1 through 10. An institution *may* submit a "generic response" to these ten common standards. In a generic response, the institution should describe how credential preparation programs in all subjects will meet the four standards. A generic response should include sufficient information to enable an interdisciplinary panel of reviewers to determine that the ten common standards are met in each subject area. Once the institution's generic response is approved, it would not be necessary to respond to the ten standards in the institution's program document in any other subject.

Program proposals should provide sufficient information about how the program intends to deliver content consistent with each standard so that a knowledgeable team of professionals can determine whether each standard has been met by the program. The goal in writing the response to any standard should be to describe the proposed program clearly enough for an outside reader to understand what a prospective teacher will experience, as he or she progresses through the program in terms of depth, breadth, and sequencing of instructional and field experiences, and what he or she will know and be able to do and demonstrate at the end of the program. Review teams will then be able to assess the responses for consistency with the standard, completeness of the response, and quality of the supporting evidence.

The written text should be organized in the same format as the standard itself and the required elements. **Responses that do not address each standard and all of its required elements will be considered incomplete**. Responses should not merely reiterate the standard. They should demonstrate how the standard will be met by describing both the content and processes that will be used to implement the program and by providing evidence to support the explanation.

Lines of suitable evidence will vary with each standard. Some examples of evidence helpful for review teams include:

- Charts and graphic organizers to illustrate program organization and design
- Descriptions of faculty qualifications, including vitae for full time faculty
- Course or module outlines, or showing the sequence of course topics, classroom activities, materials and texts used, and out-of-class assignments
- Specific descriptions of assignments and other formative assessments that demonstrate how prospective teachers will reinforce and extend key concepts and/or demonstrate an ability or competence

- Documentation of materials to be used, including tables of contents of textbooks and identification of assignments from the texts, and citations for other reading assignments.
- Current catalog descriptions.

Packaging A Submission for Shipment to the Commission

Please do **not**:

- Use foam peanuts as packaging material
- Overstuff the binders. Use two binders if necessary.
- Overstuff the boxes in which the binders are packed, as these may break open in shipment.

Submission Request Form
For Single Subject Matter Preparation Program Response to Standards

_____
Program Sponsor (Name of Institution and Department)

Please fill out the requested information below to help us plan for providing technical assistance in a timely manner.

Contact Person: _____Title:_____

Department: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

Please indicate the subject area for which you are submitting a program proposal document:
English_____ Mathematics_____ Science_____ Social Science_____

Please indicate when you intend to submit program documents responding to the new Single Subject Matter Preparation Standards: Rank your first four choices from the time frames provided below (1 = first choice, 4 = last choice):
Submission responding to the Single Subject Matter Preparation Standards by:

____October 3, 2003 ____August 2, 2004

____January 5, 2004 ____November 2, 2004

____March 2, 2004 ____March 1, 2005

____June 1, 2004

Submit to: Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division:
Single Subject Matter Programs
1900 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 324-8927

_____ ***THIS FORM HAS TWO PAGES***

Submission Request Form
Blended Teacher Preparation Program Response to Standards

_____
Program Sponsor (Name of Institution and Department)

Please fill out the requested information below to help us plan for providing technical assistance in a timely manner.

Contact Person: _____ Title:_____

Department:_____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

If you are presently operating any CLAD Emphasis program(s) as part of your Blended Program(s), please indicate the type of response you will be submitting:

_____SB 2042 only (includes AB 1059 authorization)

_____SB 2042 "Plus" (includes AB 1059 authorization plus CLAD Certificate)

Please indicate when you intend to submit program documents responding to the new Blended Program Standards: Rank your first four choices from the time frames provided below (1 = first choice, 4 = last choice):

____October 3, 2003 ____August 2, 2004

____January 5, 2004 ____November 2, 2004

____March 2, 2004 ____March 1, 2005

____June 1, 2004

Submit to: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division: Blended Programs
1900 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 327-3165

Single Subject Matter Program Sponsor - Transmittal Cover Sheet
(Page 1 of 2)

- **Sponsoring Organization**:

Name _____

- **Submission Type(s) Place a check mark in the appropriate box.**

English Subject Matter Preparation	
Mathematics Subject Matter Preparation	
Science Subject Matter Preparation	
Social Science Subject Matter Preparation	

- **Program Contacts:**

1. Name _____

Title_____

Address_____

_____

Phone _____Fax _____

E-mail _____

Single Subject Program Sponsor - Transmittal Cover Sheet
(Page 2 0f 2)

Name _____

Title_____

Address_____

_____

Phone _____Fax _____

E-mail_____

Chief Executive Officer *(President or Provost; Superintendent):*

Name_____

Address_____

_____

Phone _____Fax _____

E-mail_____

I Hereby Signify My Approval to Transmit This Program Document to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing:

CEO Signature _____

Title _____

Date_____

Appendix A
Assembly Bill No. 537
(Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999)

CHAPTER 587

An act to amend Sections 200, 220, 66251, and 66270 of, to add Section 241 to, and to amend and renumber Sections 221 and 66271 of, the Education Code, relating to discrimination.

[Approved by Governor October 2, 1999. Filed
with Secretary of State October 10, 1999.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 537, Kuehl. Discrimination.

(1) Existing law provides that it is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools and postsecondary institutions, regardless of their sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, or mental or physical disability, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state.

Existing law makes it a crime for a person, whether or not acting under color of law, to willfully injure, intimidate, interfere with, oppress, or threaten any other person, by force or threat of force, in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him or her by the Constitution or laws of this state or by the Constitution or laws of the United States because of the other person's race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, gender, or sexual orientation, or because he or she perceives that the other
person has one or more of those characteristics.

This bill would also provide that it is the policy of the state to afford all persons in public school and postsecondary institutions equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state, regardless of any basis referred to in the aforementioned paragraph.

(2) Existing law prohibits a person from being subjected to discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, color, or mental or physical disability in any program or activity conducted by any educational institution or
postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid.

This bill would also prohibit a person from being subjected to discrimination on the basis of any basis referred to in paragraph (1) in any program or activity conducted by any educational institution or postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid.

(3) This bill would state that it does not require the inclusion of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or a postsecondary educational institution and would prohibit this bill from being deemed to be violated by the omission of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or a postsecondary educational institution.

To the extent that this bill would impose new duties on school districts and community college districts, it would impose a state-mandated local program.

(4) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement, including the creation of a State Mandates Claims Fund to pay the costs of mandates that do not exceed $1,000,000 statewide and other procedures for claims whose statewide costs exceed $1,000,000.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. This bill shall be known, and may be cited, as the California Student Safety and Violence Prevention Act of 2000.

SEC. 2. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) Under the California Constitution, all students of public schools have the inalienable right to attend campuses that are safe, secure, and peaceful. Violence is the number one cause of death for young people in California and has become a public health problem of epidemic proportion. One of the Legislature's highest priorities must be to prevent our children from the plague of violence.

(2) The fastest growing, violent crime in California is hate crime, and it is incumbent upon us to ensure that all students attending public school in California are protected from potentially violent discrimination. Educators see how violence affects youth every day; they know first hand that youth cannot learn if they are concerned about their safety. This legislation is designed to protect the institution of learning as well as our students.

(3) Not only do we need to address the issue of school violence but also we must strive to reverse the increase in teen suicide. The number of teens who attempt suicide, as well as the number who actually kill themselves, has risen substantially in recent years. Teen suicides in the United States have doubled in number since 1960 and every year over a quarter of a million adolescents in the United States attempt suicide. Sadly, approximately 4,000 of these attempts every year are completed. Suicide is the third leading cause of death for youths 15 through 24 years of age. To combat this problem we must seriously examine these grim statistics and take immediate action to ensure all students are offered equal protection from discrimination under California law.

SEC. 3. Section 200 of the Education Code is amended to read:

200. It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, mental or physical disability, or regardless of any basis that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts which are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefor.

SEC. 4. Section 220 of the Education Code is amended to read:

220. No person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, color, mental or physical disability, or any basis that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid.

SEC. 5. Section 221 of the Education Code is renumbered to read:

220.5. This article shall not apply to an educational institution which is controlled by a religious organization if the application would not be consistent with the religious tenets of that organization.

SEC. 6. Section 241 is added to the Education Code, to read:

241. Nothing in the California Student Safety and Violence Prevention Act of 2000 requires the inclusion of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or postsecondary educational institution; the California Student Safety and Violence Prevention Act of 2000 shall not be deemed to be violated by the omission of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or postsecondary educational institution.

SEC. 7. Section 66251 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66251. It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons, regardless of their sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, mental or physical disability, or regardless of any basis that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the postsecondary institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts that are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefor.

SEC. 8. Section 66270 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66270. No person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, color, or mental or physical disability, or any basis that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code in any program or activity conducted by any postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid.

SEC. 9. Section 66271 of the Education Code is renumbered to read:

66270.5. This chapter shall not apply to an educational institution that is controlled by a religious organization if the application would not be consistent with the religious tenets of that organization.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding Section 17610 of the Government Code, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code. If the statewide cost of the claim for reimbursement does not exceed one million dollars ($1,000,000), reimbursement shall be made from the State Mandates Claims Fund.