Bilingual Authorization Program Standards

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Standards Adopted
June 2009

Handbook Revised June 22, 2017

This handbook, like other publications of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, is not copyright. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution is requested.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

(Reflects the composition of the Commission at the time of adoption of the Bilingual Authorization standards. Click here for the current membership of the Commission.)

State of California
Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor

Members of the Commission

Caleb Chung, Chair	Teacher Representative
Margaret Gaston, Vice Chair	Public Representative
Constance Baumgardt Blackburn	Teacher Representative
Josephine Calderon	Public Representative
Marlon Evans	Public Representative
Charles Gahagan	Teacher Representative
Steven Dean	Teacher Representative
Leslie Littman	Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Carolyn McInerney	School Board Member
Irene Oropeza-Enriquez	Administrative Services Representative
David Pearson	Faculty Representative
Ting Sun	Public Representative

Ex Officio Representatives

Shane Martin	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Marilyn T. McGrath	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Tine Sloan	University of California
Beverly Young	California State University

Executive Officer

Dale A. Janssen	Executive Director

The Bilingual Certification Design Team

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
2006-2007

Harold Acord	Spanish Teacher	Moreno Valley School District California Teachers Association
Estella Acosta Co-Chair	Administrator, Literacy and Language Development	Orange County Department of Education
Denise Beck	Principal	Davis Joint Unified School District
Karen Cadiero-Kaplan	Associate Professor	San Diego State University Past President (2007-08), California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL)
Sara Fields	Principal	Culver City Unified School District
Magaly Lavadenz	Professor	Loyola Marymount University Past President, California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE)
Claudia Lockwood	Director, Multilingual Education	San Joaquin County Office of Education
Teresa Márquez-López	Academic Administrator	University of California, Riverside
George Martínez	Teacher	Santa Cruz City Schools California Federation of Teachers
Huong Tran Nguyen	Professor	California State University, Long Beach
Lettie Ramírez	Professor	California State University, East Bay
Lilia Romero	National Board Certified Teacher with BCLAD Authorization	Pasadena Unified School District
Alexander Sapiens	Professor	San Jose State University
Gay Q. Yuen	Professor	California State University, Los Angeles
Charles G. Zartman, Jr. Chair	Professor	California State University, Chico

Commission Consultant to the Advisory Panel: Jo Birdsell

California Department of Education Liaison to the Panel: Paula Jacobs

Commission Assistants to the Advisory Panel: Lori Gonzales, Benjamin Pop

Table of Contents

Bilingual Authorization Teacher Preparation Programs

Introduction

The quality of public education depends substantially on the performance of professional educators. Like all other states, California requires educators to hold credentials granted by the state in order to serve in the public schools. Each state, including California, establishes and enforces standards and requirements for earning credentials for public school service. These certification standards and requirements are among the ways in which states exercise their constitutional responsibility for governing public education.

The quality of professional performance depends heavily on the quality of initial preparation. Each state has a legitimate interest in the quality of training programs for professional educators. In each state, completion of a professional preparation program that has been approved by the state's certification agency is a legal requirement for earning each type of credential, including teaching credentials. State legislatures adopt such requirements because they recognize the critical role of professional preparation in subsequent professional performance.

The bilingual teaching authorization prepares individuals to provide English language development, specially designed academic instruction in English and academic content instruction in both English and the language of their bilingual authorization. The Bilingual authorization may be earned concurrently with or added subsequent to a basic teaching document.

This handbook has been prepared to guide program sponsors in submitting documents for initial program approval as required by the *Accreditation Framework* and implemented by the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission). This handbook is organized in three sections.

Section 1   provides information on the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Bilingual Authorization programs. The standards are available in Appendix A. Appendix B provides additional resources for the preparation of bilingual educators.

Section 2   provides the conceptual framework that addresses the body of research and information underlying the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) adopted by the Commission for CSET: LOTE Examinations II or III, IV and V and the program standards for bilingual teacher authorization.

Section 3   provides information for the preconditions and common standards, and lists the program standards.

The Commission is grateful to all the members of the profession who participated in the development of these program standards.

Adoption and Implementation of the Bilingual Program Standards

The bilingual program standards were approved by the Commission on January 31, 2008. Subsequent legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 1871, (Chap. 660, Stats. 2008) was signed by the Governor on September 30, 2008 enabling multiple routes to bilingual authorization. These provisions provided for concurrent completion of bilingual authorization with a 2042 program, completion after initial credentialing, and options for completion through a program, examination, or a combination of both. Program Sponsor Alert 09-06 (5/28/09) clarified for institutions the process for recommending candidates for authorization by using a combination of coursework and Commission-approved CTEL or CSET: LOTE examinations are provided in Program Sponsor Alert 09-06.

Program Sponsor Alert 08-09 (10/29/08) informed institutions and BCLAD programs about the new bilingual program standards and related implementation timelines and processes and included the table of important dates included below.

Coded Correspondence 09-06 (4/1/09) provided guidance on the implementation of Assembly Bill 1871 concerning Bilingual and English Learner Authorizations and clarifies credentialing procedures under the new program standards.

As indicated in the following table of important dates, December 31, 2010 was the last date that an individual could have been accepted into an institution's program approved under the previous Bilingual emphasis program standards.

Important Dates:

Activity	Date
Adoption of the proposed standards by the Commission	January 2008
Program planning and revision activities; document preparation began	October 2008
AB 1871 (Coto) took effect	January 1, 2009
Process for review of institutional program documents submitted for approval, including training program reviewers	January 2009 and ongoing
COA approval of revised programs for bilingual authorization	April 2009 and ongoing
Last date candidates could have been accepted into programs approved under the Bilingual Emphasis program standards	December 31, 2010
Programs that have not been approved under the revised Bilingual Program Standards (2008) have expired.	December 31, 2011

Section 1: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness - *Preconditions, Common Standards and Program Standards*

California state law authorizes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to set standards and requirements for preparation of California teachers. These include:

- **Preconditions** established by State law or Commission policy must be met as a prerequisite to program accreditation. A precondition is a requirement for initial and continued program approval. Unlike standards, preconditions specify requirements for program compliance, not program quality. Commission staff members determine 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 whether the program's quality satisfies the Commission's standards.

- **Common Standards** of program quality and effectiveness apply to all credential programs. This category includes standards regarding the overall leadership and climate for educator preparation within the unit at an institution, as well as standards pertaining to quality features that are common to all programs such as resources, coordination, admissions and advisement. The [Common Standards are available here](#), and are discussed in section three of this document.

- **Program Standards** address the quality of program features that are specific to a credential, such as program design, curriculum, field experiences, and knowledge and skills to be demonstrated by candidates in the specific credential area. When institutions prepare for continuing accreditation reviews, they may consider from among three Commission-approved options for program-specific standards. The three options are: (1) California Program Standards, (2) National or Professional Program Standards, and (3) Experimental Program Standards. Different options may be exercised by different credential programs at an institution.

Standards are statements of program quality that must be fulfilled for initial or continued approval of teacher preparation programs by the Commission. The Commission adopts program standards and in January 2008 the Commission adopted the Bilingual Authorization program standards. In each standard the Commission has detailed the minimum programmatic inputs and minimum candidate competencies required for approval of a program.

The Commission determines whether a program satisfies a standard on the basis of an intensive review of all available information related to the standard. Program reviewers selected by the Executive Director must find that a program meets each Commission adopted standard. When the program has been deemed to meet all adopted standards, the program is recommended for approval to the COA, and the COA determines whether to approve the program.

This handbook specifically addresses program standards for programs leading to bilingual authorization. The bilingual program standards have been designed to address current research and methodologies in bilingual education. These program standards are available in Appendix A.

Section 2: Conceptual Framework for Preparing California's Bilingual Teachers

Program standards for the preparation of bilingual teachers draw upon foundational and current research in three areas: the Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Bilingual Methodology, and the Culture of Emphasis.

The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

Historical, Theoretical and Legal Foundations for Bilingual Education in the United States

Bilingual teacher preparation programs should ensure that teacher candidates are knowledgeable of the rich history regarding the use of languages in addition to English in our schools. Beginning with our nation's inception, educators have employed languages of diverse linguistic communities in public and private schools throughout the U.S. (Kloss, 1998). Historical and political events in our nation's history significantly influenced the type and amount of instruction in languages other than English. (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990, Brisk, 1998, Crawford, 1989). The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1968, influenced states in developing policies to ensure equal educational opportunities for English Learners (EL). Federal court cases, such as Lau v. Nichols (1974) and Castañeda v Pickard (1981) have had a significant impact on language and education polices in the U.S.

Bilingual teacher candidates need to demonstrate a clear understanding of the theoretical foundations, practices, and effects of both additive and deficit theories of bilingual education (Brisk, 1998, Baker, 2005). Bilingual teacher candidates need to be prepared to recognize and to teach in all bilingual program models; models serving students learning English, and models serving English proficient students developing proficiency in a second language.

Bilingual Teacher Education in California: Historical and Policy Perspectives

California has a 35-year history of preparing bilingual teachers. A series of bills beginning with Chacon-Moscone AB 2284 (1972) and AB 1329 (1976), and Chacon AB 507 (1980), which sunset in 1987. Despite the sunset of AB 507, credentialing requirements for bilingual teacher preparation in the state remained intact. Pre-dating the historic Lau v. Nichols case of 1974, Chacon-Moscone led to the establishment of policy guidelines by the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Policy Guidelines addressed compliance issues for K-12 bilingual programs and the adequate preparation of teachers respectively. These guidelines lasted well into the early 1990s, with the development of Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) and Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) authorizations as the first major reform in the preparation of teachers of ELs in California. This teacher education policy for ELs in the state continued until 2001, when SB 2042 updated teacher education standards in the state. Standards for both preliminary teacher preparation and induction guided the acquisition and application of knowledge, skills and abilities for teaching in K-12 classrooms. The CLAD-BCLAD option was replaced with the mandate that all general teacher preparation in the state would address the needs of ELs. However, the SB 2042 reform did not address the competencies, skills and standards for bilingual teacher preparation in the state. The Commission passed an interim policy continuing bilingual teacher preparation programs offering the BCLAD option until an advisory panel addressed the issue.

Following the 1998 passage of Proposition 227 (California *Education Code* Sections 300-313), the number of EL students served by K-12 bilingual programs decreased from 30% in 1998 to 6% in 2007 (R-30, CDE). Many universities eliminated bilingual teacher preparation programs. Since SB 2042 did not provide recommendations for updating bilingual teacher preparation standards, in 2005 the Commission convened a Bilingual Certification

Advisory Work Group the task for this group was to address policy concerns related to bilingual authorization in light of the SB 2042 reform. The Work Group was reconfigured and convened in 2006 as the Bilingual Certification Design Team. This group had two tasks: 1) to develop Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) that would inform the development of the BCLAD Examinations (CSET: LOTE Tests III, IV, and V) and 2) to establish Bilingual Teacher Preparation Program Standards.

The Bilingual Design Team recommended and the Commission concurred that there should be multiple routes for bilingual teacher preparation and authorization. These routes include preliminary teacher preparation, teacher induction, and bilingual authorization for experienced teachers. Examinations in the areas of language, culture and methodology provide an alternate route for bilingual teacher certification and may be combined with coursework to complete the authorization.

Promoting and Developing Language Proficiency for Bilingual Teacher Candidates
The development of language proficiencies for bilingual teachers should take into consideration that teachers need to use both conversational and academic language in English and in the other language of instruction. Bilingual teachers should demonstrate knowledge of syntax, phonology, semantics, and pragmatics, as well as the ability to communicate in both languages through oral, non-verbal, written discourses in a variety of contexts. Bilingual teachers should demonstrate academic language competencies in both languages and in varied ways throughout the continuum of teacher education to maximize biliteracy and bicultural development in their students.

Bilingual Methodologies

Pedagogies for Bilingualism and Biliteracy
Emerging research on biliteracy instruction in the United States is derived from various disciplines including cognitive science (Durán, 1981), neuroscience and brain research (Pettito, et al, 2005), applied and pure linguistics, and reading/biliteracy research (Jiménez, 1997). Cognitive science is concerned with the mental processes in biliteracy, such as schema and metacognition related to the uses and locations of two or more languages in the brain. Bilingual teachers apply this knowledge of current and emerging theories and research on bilingual teaching and learning by incorporating practices, methods and materials that promote the development of bilingualism and biliteracy in their students. Bilingual teacher candidates use metacognitive strategies to both assess and to systematically assist bilingual students in understanding how to bridge between two languages. Teachers need strategies that foster language transference. Bilingual teacher candidates need to know how language skills transfer in order to provide targeted instruction to promote biliteracy.

In order to assess biliteracy and cognitive development, bilingual teachers should recognize that language ability varies from context to context and is influenced by affect, interaction or topic (Valdés and Figueroa, l994). Thus, teachers must understand that bilingual students, dominant in either the target or primary language, may not yet be able to express their complete knowledge in their second language. Due to these differences, all children cannot be assessed solely by approaches that consider performance in only one language and in only one way (Moll and Díaz, l987).

Crosscultural/Intercultural Knowledge and Pedagogy

Crosscultural and intercultural knowledge are "…important factors in the acquisition of literacy and reasoning in schools and in the creation and maintenance of conditions of civility in the school social system" (Erickson, 1984, p. 537).

Highly qualified bilingual teachers are important and critical resources to educate and empower American youth for a global society. Bilingual teachers form a cultural and linguistic bridge that links the bilingual community to the larger society. They partner with parents in decisions concerning their children's education. Students bring valuable resources which include language, culture, and interaction styles that should be 'tapped into' in order to maximize learning outcomes. These "funds of knowledge" can be shared by students and teachers and provide culturally relevant opportunities that enhance learning (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll & Greenberg, 2005). Friedman (2006) contends that our increasingly global and international economies are dependent on an educated citizenry who can negotiate multiple languages and cultures.

The *Learning to Teach Continuum* for Bilingual Teachers

The bilingual program standards included in this document are part of the preliminary preparation of bilingual teachers. However, the extension of knowledge, skills and abilities through the induction phase of bilingual teacher preparation has not been considered in this document. According to SB 2042 (EC §44259), "a professional teaching credential is earned through completion of a two year professional teacher induction program that begins with the candidates' initial employment as a teacher of record." Professional development for bilingual teachers in induction should include mentoring by a support provider who holds a bilingual teaching authorization. The bilingual induction phase should also include opportunities to further develop the teachers' skills using bilingual curriculum and methodologies.

Preconditions

Preconditions are requirements that must be met in order for an accrediting association or licensing agency to consider accrediting a program sponsor or approving its programs or schools. Some preconditions are based on state laws, while other preconditions are established by Commission policy.

There are essentially two kinds of preconditions. The first are the Commission's 10 General Institutional Preconditions. These apply to all professional preparation programs—teacher and services credential preparation programs. These preconditions do not apply to subject matter programs.

The second type of preconditions are those that apply to particular kinds of credential preparation programs. There are 4 Program Specific preconditions that apply to all types of educator preparation programs. In addition, there are preconditions for many types of educator preparation programs. All program sponsors must respond to each of the applicable preconditions.

Click to the following link to locate the Preconditions. http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Standards-Preconditions.pdf.

*The required Preconditions for the **Bilingual Authorization Program** are: General Preconditions 1-10; Program Specific Preconditions 1-4 and 5-7.*

Common Standards

The Common Standards address issues of institutional infrastructure, stability and processes that are designed to ensure that the implementation of all approved programs is successful and meets all standards. Consequently, there is a single response to the nine Common Standards that reflects the institution's support of each of its educator preparation programs. Institutions are required to submit information related to the Common Standards to the Commission at two points in the accreditation system: 1) during year 5 of the accreditation cycle-the year before the accreditation site visit; and 2) upon submitting a new program proposal.

The institution must develop **one response** to the Common Standards that reflects institutional support for all approved educator preparation programs. In other words, individual programs do not respond to the Common Standards. The Common Standards document is inclusive of the entire unit consequently only one Common Standards document will be maintained at the CTC for each approved institution/program sponsor regardless of how many approved programs are offered. Click on the following link to locate the Common Standards http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/STDS-common.html.

If the institution's Common Standards are up to date and the institution submits a new program proposal, the institution must complete an addendum to the Common Standards that assures the Commission that the institution will support the proposed program in the same way it has supported other educator preparation programs. Click on the following link to locate the Common Standards Addendum http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-standards.html.

The Common Standards Glossary should be consulted for definitions of any of the terms found in *italics* in the Common Standards.

Appendix A: Program Standards for Bilingual Authorization

Standard 1: Program Design

The design of the professional bilingual teacher preparation program follows from an explicit statement of program philosophy and purpose and is coordinated effectively in accordance with a cohesive design that has a cogent rationale. The program philosophy articulates a clear understanding of the instructional needs of learners in bilingual settings. The sponsoring institution shows a high priority to the program by providing appropriate support for the program and a demonstrated commitment to teacher preparation and to bilingual education. The program has a leadership team whose members are qualified in the areas of teacher preparation and bilingual instruction. The program demonstrates initial and ongoing collaboration with local school districts in order to reflect the needs of teachers serving in bilingual programs at the local and state level. This on-going coordination between the bilingual program and other teacher development programs is designed to strengthen the learning-to-teach continuum for teachers of learners in bilingual classroom. The curriculum is designed around the Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) for Bilingual Methodology and Culture. It provides candidates with a depth of knowledge regarding current research-based theories and research in academic and content literacy in two languages, building upon both SB 2042 and California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) competencies. The program shows candidates how to help learners to access the K-12 grade level content instruction and how to provide benchmarks of English Learners' progress toward meeting standards as defined in the California Curriculum Frameworks (2006). The design of the program clearly indicates the options for completion of the program in a concurrent model and/or as a post-credential model.

Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Prior to recommending each candidate for a bilingual authorization, one or more persons responsible for the program determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that each candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of program standards including language proficiency as they apply to bilingual authorization. During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in bilingual instruction using formative assessment processes. Verification of candidate's performance is provided by both institutional and field-based individuals with bilingual expertise and/or possessing bilingual authorization.

Standard 3: The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

The professional bilingual teacher preparation program provides candidates with knowledge of the history, policies, programs, and research on the effectiveness of bilingual education and bilingualism in the United States.   The program develops candidates who demonstrate understanding of the philosophical, theoretical, legal and legislative foundations of bilingual education and their effects on program design and educational achievement.

Candidates apply knowledge of the research on the cognitive effects of bilingualism and biliteracy as developmental processes in instructional practice. Candidates understand and apply research and its effects on the dimensions of learning in bilingual education program models. The program prepares candidates' knowledge of the transferability between primary and target language with the understanding that the level of transferability is affected by the level of compatibility and may vary among languages.

The program prepares candidates to actively promote authentic parental participation that includes learning about school systems, assuming leadership roles and affecting policy. The program promotes candidates' understanding of the family as a primary language and cultural resource. Candidates are cognizant that students' motivation, participation and achievement are influenced by an intercultural classroom climate and school community.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS

3.1   How does the program ensure that candidates develop understanding of the philosophical, theoretical, and research bases for bilingual education, including knowledge of the historical and legal foundations of bilingual education in the United States (e.g., Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA], Lau v. Nichols, Castañeda v. Pickard) and California (e.g., Méndez v. Westminster, Proposition 227, Williams v. State of California) and their effects on bilingual education programs?

3.2   How does the program ensure that candidates can analyze the effects and impact of federal, state and local policies on the measurement of educational achievement of students in bilingual programs?

3.3   How does the program help candidates to develop understanding of the theoretical foundations, practice, limitations, and effects of the deficit perspective of bilingual education (e.g., viewing the primary language as an obstacle, limiting use of the primary language, promoting assimilation in the target culture) and the enrichment perspective of bilingual education (e.g., viewing the primary language as a right and an asset, promoting the development of bilingualism and biculturalism, promoting acculturation to the target culture?

3.4   How does the program provide guidance for philosophical, theoretical, and research bases for bilingual education, including the characteristics, components, benefits, and limitations of research-based program models of bilingual education (e.g., dual-language, one-way immersion, two-way immersion, transitional bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, heritage language education)?

3.5   What components of the program prepare candidates to develop and apply knowledge of metacognitive and metalinguistic processes (e.g., choosing the appropriate language to use in a given situation, evaluating similarities and differences between languages, transferring linguistic knowledge between languages) and roles of code-switching, language mixing and interlanguage in the development of bilingualism and biliteracy?

3.6   What components of the program support teachers to understand brain research on the developmental processes of bilingualism and biliteracy, and apply knowledge for appropriate language use and usage (e.g., translation, language allocation by program model) when interacting with students at different developmental stages of bilingualism and biliteracy?

3.7   How does the program develop each candidates' understanding of the transferability of language and literacy skills and the acquisition of content and context knowledge between the primary and target languages, including ways in which language transfer can be affected by the level of compatibility between the primary and target language?

3.8   How does the program incorporate opportunities for candidates to apply knowledge of the use of contrastive analysis (i.e., comparing and contrasting similarities and differences, including nonexistent features, in the phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and usage of different

languages) to facilitate development of listening, speaking, reading, and writings skills in the primary and target language?

3.9   How does the program prepare candidates to enhance school-home partnerships, and assist in identifying and using community resources? (i.e., candidates support families to contribute their knowledge to culturally inclusive institutions and participate in school forums and organizations)

3.10   How does the program prepare candidates for effective, two-way communication with families through the appropriate medium (e.g. parent conferences, phone, home visits, written communication, e-mail, and videos in the primary language) on matters of students success, the family's educational goals, guidance, notification of rights, placement and program options; understanding student achievement and assessment results; parent roles in supporting student achievement; school and district policies and parent opportunities to influence school policy?

3.11   How does the program promote the candidates' understanding of cultural influences on learning and teaching in bilingual program settings and the understanding of the effects of intercultural communication on school/community climate, student motivation, participation and achievement?

Standard 4: Bilingual Methodology

The bilingual teacher preparation program prepares bilingual candidates to understand the interrelatedness among the four domains of language (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and to know language forms and functions. The program also prepares candidates to plan, develop, implement and assess standards-aligned content instruction in the primary and target language. Candidates are prepared to employ a variety of instructional and assessment strategies, appropriate to student language proficiency levels, that foster higher-order thinking skills. The program ensures that bilingual candidates have knowledge of bilingual instructional models, instructional strategies and materials to appropriately apply them to their instructional and assessment practices. In addition, programs develop bilingual candidates' understanding of knowledge of intercultural communication and interaction that is linguistically and culturally responsive. The bilingual teacher preparation program further prepares candidates to evaluate, select, use and adapt state-board adopted and state-board approved materials, as well as other supplemental instructional materials. The program provides opportunities for teacher candidates to demonstrate the ability to use a variety of criteria for selection of instructional materials, to assess the suitability and appropriateness for local context and to augment resources when they are not suitable or available.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS

4.1   How does the program design and develop the candidates' understanding of the applications, benefits and limitations of different bilingual program models?

4.2   How does the program provide candidates the understanding of ways in which variations in students' primary languages (e. g, dialectal and/or tonal differences, use of vernacular forms) can be used to facilitate the development of social and academic language?

4.3   How does the program ensure that candidates apply knowledge of language structures (e.g., word roots, prefixes, suffixes), forms (e.g., registers) and functions (e.g., informing, describing, persuading) to develop and deliver effective language and literacy instruction in the primary and target languages?

4.4   How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate knowledge of literary analysis in appropriate genres and forms, and their significance for planning, organization, and delivery

including strategies to provide differentiated instruction in primary and target language instruction based on student proficiency levels.

4.5 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of the roles, purposes and uses of standardized and non-standardized primary and target language assessments in bilingual education settings in order to interpret the results to plan, organize, modify and differentiate instruction in the appropriate language(s) in bilingual education settings?

4.6 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to evaluate and incorporate technology to develop students' literacy in the primary and target languages as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of technology for literacy development?

4.7 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate knowledge of strategies for aligning instruction with California K-12 content standards and frameworks appropriate to grade-level expectations and students' language proficiency in the primary and target languages?

4.8 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of the interrelatedness of language and literacy development in order to plan, select and use a variety of strategies for developing students' content-area knowledge and skills in bilingual education settings including language and grade-level content objectives in lesson, providing linguistic scaffolding and activating background knowledge and experiences?

4.9 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of a variety of instructional approaches that foster student engagement and interaction and the development of higher-order thinking skills (e.g., analysis, inference, synthesis, evaluation) and facilitate students' understanding and use of content-specific language functions (e.g., analyzing, comparing and contrasting, persuading, citing evidence, making hypotheses) in oral and written forms of the primary and target language?

4.10 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of ways in which students' life experiences (immigrant or refugee experience, prior educational experiences, oral tradition), language development, and language variations can be used to foster content learning in the primary and target languages?

4.11 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to select, develop and/or adapt, administer and interpret a variety of content assessments in order to plan, organize and differentiate instruction in bilingual settings?

4.12 How does the program ensure that candidates have the ability to reflect upon and implement effective practice that fosters the development of biliteracy through content instruction?

4.13 How does the program promote the candidates' understanding of central concepts of intercultural communication including patterns of nonverbal communication, oral and written discourse and origins of dialectical and/or tonal variations and their influence on standard academic language development?

4.14 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to review and evaluate materials, to identify potential areas of offense or bias (e.g., race, class, gender, religion, country of origin) and to ensure appropriate representation of linguistic and cultural diversity within and across language and cultural groups?

4.15 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to develop, adapt, evaluate, and/or align primary and target language materials, content standards and curriculum frameworks?

4.16 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to evaluate and select state-adopted and state-approved textbooks, and supplementary materials in primary and target language for bilingual education settings based on a variety of criteria including

appropriateness for instructional purpose, alignment with curriculum, student and community needs and level of academic language?

Standard 5: Culture of Emphasis

The professional bilingual teacher preparation program develops candidates' knowledge of the traditions, roles, status, and communication patterns of the culture of emphasis as experienced in the country or countries of origin and in the United States. Included in that knowledge is the understanding of crosscultural, intercultural and intracultural relationships and interactions, as well as contributions of the culture of emphasis in California and the United States. Also included is the knowledge of major historical events, political, economic, religious, and educational factors that influence the socialization and acculturation experiences of the target groups in the California and the U.S. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the country/countries of origin, including geographic barriers, demographic and linguistic patterns, and the ways in which these affect trends of migration, immigration and settlement in the United States.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS

5.1   How does the program curriculum develop the candidates' knowledge and understanding of significant geographic, demographic, sociocultural and economic factors of the country/ countries of origin and the effect these factors have on language, cultural and social variations within the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?

5.2   How does the program's curriculum account for the candidates' understanding of historical and contemporary immigration/migration and settlement/resettlement patterns among the culture of emphasis in the country/countries of origin and the United States, including the influence of economic globalization patterns?

5.3   How does the program's curriculum provide candidates with knowledge of the major historical eras, movements and developments of the country/countries of origin and help the candidates to analyze and understand the influences of those historical events on the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?

5.4   How does the program help candidates to recognize the primary social and political structures within the country/countries of origin, and demonstrate understanding of the beliefs, values, and contributions of various groups, including indigenous populations, to the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?

5.5   How does the program curriculum prepare the candidates regarding the effects of historical and social factors (e.g., economic, political, religious, class structure) of the country/countries of origin and help the candidates to analyze and understand the influences of these factors on the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?

5.6   How does the program prepare candidates to understand that the roles and status of an individual (i.e., economic, gender, racial, ethnic, social class, age, education level) influence inter- and intracultural relationships and how those factors affect the process of acculturation in California and the U.S.?

5.7   How does the program prepare candidates to demonstrate understanding of the educational system in the country/countries of origin and how they are able to analyze ways in which these systems and structures have influenced their involvement in schools of the United States?

Standard 6: Assessment of Candidate Language Competence

The institution must verify, during the program or at its completion that the candidate has attained, in listening, speaking, reading and writing a language proficiency level that is equivalent to the passing standard on the appropriate CSET: LOTE language examination. The program creates clear guidelines by which the candidate will be assessed.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS
6.1   Is the program using the CSET: LOTE examination or local assessment to meet this standard?
If the program chooses local assessment of candidate language skills competencies;
6.2   What measures are used? What are the characteristics and types of these measures?
6.3   How does the program ensure that each candidate being recommended for the authorization meets the appropriate language proficiencies?
6.4   How does the program assure that all candidates are assessed in a fair and equitable manner?

Clarification for Program Standard 6: Assessment of Candidate Language Competence
Standard 6 is unique in that it requires that candidates must demonstrate a range of language competence skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing equivalent to the CSET:LOTE Subject Matter Requirements for Subtest II or III (Domains 5-8), and at a level equivalent to the passing standard for the CSET:LOTE examination. This performance level is set at a minimum of ACTFL Advanced-Low for Western languages and ACTFL Intermediate-High for non-Western languages. A description of performance levels exemplified by the ACTFL scales is provided in [Appendix C](#)*.*

Programs may choose to require candidates to complete the applicable CSET: LOTE subtest II or III (depending on the language of the authorization) to meet Program Standard 6. Candidates who complete the program route and those who complete the examination route to establishing their language skills competency must demonstrate an equivalent level of language proficiency skills. Additional guidance for responding to Standard 6 is provided below.

For programs that elect not to use the CSET:LOTE subtest to meet Program Standard 6, the program must provide information in its response to this standard to clarify how it is determined that a candidate's language skills are equivalent to the CSET: LOTE content specifications as well as, the qualifications of those individuals making the determination..

In curriculum and/or field work assignments and opportunities, the program needs to address the equivalent subject matter requirements as are addressed in Domains 5-8 of the CSET examination. Local assessments are a component of the program for determining the language skills competence of a candidate. The type of questions that may be included in a local language proficiency skills assessment task can be modeled on the examples provided within the subject matter requirements. Some examples are provided below:

For example, to demonstrate their listening skills within the program option, candidates either in coursework activities or fieldwork activities should demonstrate that they are able to:
- *Draw conclusions based on information presented in oral messages.*
- *Characterize the tone or mood of one or more speakers.*
- *Infer the social relationships among speakers (e.g., gender, age, social status).*
- *Analyze a personal relationship implied but not stated in an oral communication.*

♦ *Interpret the cultural context of spoken communications.*

For another example, to demonstrate their writing skills within the program option, candidates either in coursework activities or fieldwork activities should demonstrate that they are able to
  ♦ *Demonstrate the ability to compose written texts in appropriate orthography and writing systems.*
  ♦ *Compose personal correspondence.*
  ♦ *Compose formal correspondence for a variety of purposes and audiences.*
  ♦ *Write cohesive summaries of a variety of extended written texts (e.g., a newspaper article, an excerpt from a textbook).*
  ♦ *Write extended narratives and detailed descriptive accounts of events.*
  ♦ *Formulate and defend a hypothesis in response to a given situation.*
  ♦ *Describe the reasoning behind a personal or professional decision.*
  ♦ *Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of an idea or a proposed course of action.*
  ♦ *Take a position on an issue and support it with persuasive evidence.*

Programs responding to this standard should describe how the program will provide opportunities within coursework and/or fieldwork for candidates to demonstrate their language skills competencies. Documentation should describe the qualifications of individuals who will be assessing the level of the candidates' language skills, and how the program will assure that candidates language proficiency level is equivalent to the Commission-adopted passing standard on the CSET:LOTE language examination.

Appendix B: Resources for the Preparation of Bilingual Educators

Acuña, R. (1988). *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Aguila, Veronica. (In Press) Schooling English Learners: Contexts and Challenges. *Educating English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento: California Department of Education. 2009.

Anaya, R. (1972). *Bless Me, Ultima*. Berkeley: Tonatiuh-Quinto Sol International, Inc.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Bankston, C., & Zhou, M. (1995). Effects of Minority-language Literacy on the Academic Achievement of Vietnamese in New Orleans. *Sociology of Education*, *68*, 1–17.

Beykont, Z., Editor. (2000). *Lifting Every Voice: Pedagogy and Politics of Bilingualism*. MA: Harvard Publishing Group.

Boyer, J., & Baptiste, H., Jr. (1996). The crisis in teacher education in America: Issues of recruitment and retention of culturally different (minority) teachers. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed, pp. 779–794). New York: Schuster Macmillan.

Brisk, M.E. (1998). *Bilingual Education: From Compensatory to Quality Schooling*. New Jersey: Earlbaum.

Burns, A.F. (1993). *Maya in Exile: Guatemalans in Florida.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2004). *The Literacy Curriculum and Bilingual Education: A Critical Examination.* New York: Peter Lang

California Dept. of Education, 2009. (In Press) *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches.* Sacramento, California Department of Education

California Law: California Education Code (2009). Sections 300-313. Accessed at: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=edc&codebody=&hits=20 on March 6, 2009.

Caplan, N., Choy, M. H., & Whitmore, J. K. (1991). *Children of the Boat People: A Study of Educational Success.* Ann Harbor: University of Michigan Press.

Caplan, N., Whitmore, J. K., & Choy, M. (1989). *The boat people and achievement in America: A study of family life, hard work, and cultural values*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Celce-Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press, UK.

Chang, E. & Diaz-Veizades, J. (1999). *Ethnic Peace in the American City*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Cheng, L. & Yang, P. (2000). In M. Zhou & J. Gatewood (Eds.). *Contemporary Asian America: A multidisciplinary reader.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Chun, K. T. (1980). The Myth of Asian American Success and its Educational Ramifications. *IRCD Bulletin* (Winter/Spring, 1980): 1-12. Teachers College, Columbia University: Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Corson, D. (1998). *Language Policies in Schools.* England: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice.* Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing

Crawford, J. (2000). *At War with Diversity: US Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety*. England: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English Learners: Language Diversity in the Classroom.*   Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services

Darder, A., Torres, R. & Gutiérrez, H. (1997).   *Latinos and Education*: *A Critical Reader.* New York: Routledge.

Delgado-Gaitan, Concha. (1994). *Sociocultural change through literacy: Toward the empowerment of families.*

Durân, R. (1981). Editor. *Latino language and the M**etaset***, NJ: Norwood Press.

Escobedo, D. (1999). Propositions 187 and 227: Latino immigrant rights to education. *Human Rights Magazine* (summer), pp. 13–15. Faltis, C. & Hudelson, S. (1998). *Bilingual Education in Elementary and Secondary School Communities: Toward Understanding and Caring*. Allyn and Bacon.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American Panethnicity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 1–40). New York: Longman.
Ferdman, B., Weber, R. & Ramirez, A. (eds.), *Literacy across Languages and Cultures*. Albany: University of New York Press.

Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y. (2007). *La enseñanza de la lectura y escritura en español en el aula bilingüe.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freidman, T.L. (2006) *The World is Flat 3.0: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century.* New York: Picador Publishers.

García, O. & Otheguy, R. (1988). The Language Situation of Cuban Americans. In: S. McKay & S.Wong, *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?* Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.

Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. & Amanti, C. (2005) *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities and Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Goodwin, A., L., Genishi, C., Asher, N., & Woo, K. A. (1997). Voices from the Margins: Asian American Teachers' Experiences in the Profession. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Teacher Education Yearbook* (Vol. *5*, pp. 219–241). Thousand Oaks, CA: Association of Teacher Educators and Corwin Press.

Gordon, J. (1994). Why Students of Color are not Entering Teaching: Reflections from Minority Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *45*, 346–353.

Gordon, J. (2000). Asian American Resistance to Selecting Teaching as a Career: The Power of Community and Tradition. *Teachers College Record*, *102*(1), 173–196.

Guyton, E., &McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student Teaching and School Experiences. *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hsu, S. (2005). *Help-seeking Behavior of Student Teachers*. Educational Research, 47(3), 308–318.

Ima, K. & Rumbaut, R. G. (1989). Southeast Asian Refugees in American schools: A comparison of fluent-English-proficient and limited-English-proficient students. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 9:3.

Jimenez, R.T. (1997). The Strategic Reading Abilities and Potential of Five Low-Literacy Latina/o Readers in Middle School. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 32(3), 224-243.

Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Kitano, H. (1969). *Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kloss, Heinz. (1998). *The American Bilingual Tradition. Language in Education: Theory and Practice* No.88 . Washington D.C.: Eric Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). Who will Teach our Children? Preparing Teachers to Teach African American Learners. In E. Hollins, J. King, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching Diverse Learners: Formulating a Knowledge Base for Teaching Diverse Populations* (pp. 129–158). Albany, NY: State University Press.

Lavadenz, M. (2005). Como Hablar en Silencio: Culture and Language Identity of Central Americans in Los Angeles. In: Zentella, A. *Latinos and Language Socialization in Families, Communities, and Schools: Anthro-political Perspectives*. NY: SUNY Press.

Lavadenz, M & Duque de Reyes, S. (2001-Segunda Edición). *Los Estándares de Lecto-Escritura en Español, K-12*. San Diego, CA: San Diego County Office of Education.

Lemlech, J. K., & Hertzog-Foliart, H. (1993, Fall). Linking School and University through Collegial Student Teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *20*(4), 19–28.

Lindholm-Leary, K, and Genesee, F., (In Press) Dual Language Programs for English Learners. *Educating English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento: California Department of Education. 2009.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual Language Education.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lipman, P. (1998). *Race, class, and Power in School Restructuring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

Lippi-Green, R. (2001). *English with an Accent.* New York: Routledge, Inc.
Lortie, D. C. (1975).

López, G. R., Scribner, J. D., & Mahitivanichcha, K. (2001). Redefining Parental Involvement: Lessons from High-Performing Migrant-Impacted Schools. *American Educational Research Journal,* 38, 253-288.

Olivios, E. (2006). *The Power of Parents*. New York: Peter Lang.

Macclure, M. (1993). Arguing for Your Self: Identity as an organization principle in teachers' Jobs and Lives. *British Educational Research Journal*, *19*, 311–322.

Makaroff, J. (1967). America's Other Racial Minority: Japanese Americans. *Contemporary Review*, 210: 310-314.

Malakoff, M. & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of Language Minority Education in the United States. In: A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Advances in Language Education: Theory, Research, and Practice.* New York: Sage Publications.

Manning, D. T. (1977). The Influence of Key Individuals on Student Teachers in Urban and Suburban Settings. *The Teacher Educator*, 13(2), 2–8.

Martinez, R. R., & O'Donnell, J. (1993, April). *Understanding the Support Systems of Hispanic Teacher Candidates: A study through In-depth Interviews*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 12–16.

McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. L. C. (Eds.). (1996). *New Immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, A. (1998). African American teachers. Unique Roles and Universal Lessons. *Education and Urban Society*, *31*(1) 104–122.

Moll, L.C., & Diaz, R. (1987) Changes as the Goal of Educational Research. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 300-311.

Moll, L. & Greenberg, J.B. (2005). Creating Zones of Possibilities: Combining Social Contexts for Instruction. In *Vygotsky and Education: Instructional Implications and Applications of Sociohistorical Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nguyen, D. H. (1972). *Some Aspects of Vietnamese Culture*. Carbondale, IL: Center for Vietnamese Studies, University of Southern Illinois.

Nguyen, H. T. (2008a). Conceptions of Teaching by Five Vietnamese American Preservice Teachers, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 7*(2), 113 -136.

Nguyen, H. T. (2007). Educating Vietnamese American Students. *Multicultural Education, 15*(1), 23-26.

Nguyen, M. H., & Haines, D. W. (1996). Vietnamese. In: D. W. Haines (Ed.), *Refugees in America in the 1990s: A Reference Handbook* (pp. 305–330). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. (2002, July 11). *Summary and Overview*. Retrieved   March 25, 2003
        from http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea/summary.html
            Romaine, S. (1999). *Bilingualism*. Oxford University Press: England.

Petitto, L.A. (2005). How the Brain Begets Language: On the Neural Tissue Underlying Human Language
        Acquisition. In J. McGilvray (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Chomsky,* (pp. 84-101). England:
        Cambridge University Press.

Rong, X. L., & Preissle, J. (1997). The Continuing Decline in Asian American Teachers. *American
        Educational Research Journal*, *34*(2), 267–293.

Rumberger, R.W. & Gandara, P. (2004). Seeking Equity in the Education of California's English learners.
        Teachers College Record,106, 10, pp. 2032–2056. New York, NY: Columbia University.

Su, Z. (1996). Why Teach: Profiles and Entry Perspectives of Minority Students as Becoming Teachers.
        Journal of Research and Development in Education, *29*(3), 117–133.

Santa Ana. O.(1993). Chicano English and the Nature of the Chicano Language Setting. *The Hispanic
        Journal of Behavioral Sciences, V 15,* N 1. California: Sage Publications

Seperson, M. A., & Joyce, B. R. (1973). Teaching Styles of Student Teachers as Related to those of
        Cooperating Teachers. *Educational Leadership Research Supplement* 146–151.

Shoris. E. (1992). *Latinos: A Biography of the People.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Soltero, S.W. (2004). *Dual Language: Teaching and Learning in two languages*. Boston: Pearson
        Education.

Thomas, WP & Collier, VP (2002). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority
        Students' Long Term Academic Achievement. Final Report*. Washington, DC: Center for Research
        on Education Diversity & Excellence.

Tierney, W. G. (2002). Parents and families in precollege preparation: The lack of connection between
        research and practice. *Educational Policy*, 16, 588-606.

Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and Not Learning English: Latino Students in American Schools.* Teachers
        College Press: NY.

Valdés, G. (1988). The Language Situation of Mexican-Americans. In: S. McKay & S.Wong.   *Language
        Diversity: Problem or Resource?* Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.

Valdés, G. & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and Testing: a Special Case of Bias.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research,* 54(2),
        143–178.

Villegas, A. M. (1996). Increasing the Racial and Ethnic Diversity in the U.S. Teaching Force. In B. Biddle, T. Good, & I. Goodson (Eds.), *International Handbook on Teachers and Teaching*. The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Winitsky, N., Stoddart, T., & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great Expectations: Emergent Professional Development Schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 52–65.

Wollenberg, C. (1975). *All deliberate speed: Segregation and exclusion in California schools, 1855–1975*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Yee, A. H. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? *Journal of Educational Psychology,* LX, 327.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, M. J. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 329 348). New York: Macmillan.

Zentella, A.C. (1988). The Language Situation of Puerto Ricans. In: S. McKay & S.Wong.   *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?* Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.

Zentella, A. (2005). *Latinos and Language Socialization in Families, Communities, and Schools: Anthro-political Perspectives*. NY: SUNY Press.

Appendix C: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Standards Descriptions

ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: LISTENING

Intermediate-Low
Able to understand full length spoken sentences in content areas referring to personal background, personal needs, and routine social practices (ordering meals, receiving instructions, and receiving directions). Listening is primarily fact to face. Understanding is often uneven; repetition and rewording may be necessary. Misunderstandings arise frequently.

Intermediate-Mid
Able to understand full length spoken sentences in additional content areas referring to more difficult tasks (lodging, transportation, and shopping), personal interests, activities, and greater diversity of receiving instructions and directions. Listening tasks will also pertain to short routine telephone conversations and some deliberate speech (simple announcements and news reports) Understanding continues to be uneven.

Intermediate-High
Able to understand longer stretches of dialogue on additional content areas pertaining to different times and places. Understanding may be inconsistent due to difficulty in grasping main ideas and/or details. Topics are not significantly different from an Advanced level listener, but comprehension will be poorer.

Advanced
Able to understand main ideas and most details of longer stretches of dialogue on a variety of topics that may fall outside of the immediate situation, however comprehension may be uneven due to topic familiarity or other factors. Dialogue will frequently involve different time frames (present, past, regularly occurring, or seldom occurring), and may include interviews, short lectures on familiar topics, and reports on factual information. Listener is aware of cohesive devices, but may not be able to use them to follow the sequence of thought when listening.

Advanced Plus
Able to understand the main ideas of most speech in the standard dialect, however it may be difficult to sustain understanding during lengthy or especially complex communication. Listener is beginning to become aware of culturally implied meanings beyond the surface meanings of the dialogue, but may fail to understand the subtle sociocultural meanings in the message.

Superior
Able to understand the main ideas of all speech in the standard dialect, including technical discussion in a particular field of specialization (academic/ professional settings, lectures, speeches, and reports). Listener shows some appreciation of aesthetic norms (idioms, colloquialisms, register shifting), and can understand subtle sociocultural meanings. Rarely misunderstand, except during fast paced, highly colloquial speech, or speech with highly strong cultural references.

Distinguished

Able to understand virtually all forms and styles of speech, has a strong understanding of social and cultural references. Understands plays, movies, academic debates, literary readings, and most jokes and puns. May have some difficulty with non standard dialects and slang.

ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: SPEAKING

Intermediate-Low

Able to successfully handle limited, face-to-face, conversation involving tasks and social situations such as introducing self, ordering meals, asking directions, and making purchases. Strong inference from native language may occur and misunderstands are frequent.

Intermediate-Mid

Able to successfully handle a variety of simple conversation involving tasks and social situations beyond their most immediate needs (personal history, leisure time activities). Speech length increases slightly, but frequent long pauses are likely. Pronunciation may still be strongly influenced by native language. Misunderstandings still arise.

Intermediate-High

Able to successfully handle most simple conversations involving task and social situations, as well as general conversation on a range of circumstances and topics. Errors are evident and limited vocabulary may cause speaker to hesitate and ramble. Simple narration and/or description is improved.

Advanced

Able to successfully handle conversations required in everyday situations, and routine school and work requirements. Complicated tasks and social situations (elaborating, complaining, apologizing) may still be difficult. Can narrate and describe with some details, linking sentences together smoothly. Can communicate facts and talk casually about topics of current public and personal interest, using general vocabulary. Weaknesses can be smoothed over by pause fillers and different rates of speech. Some groping for words may still be evident.

Advanced Plus

Able to successfully handle a broad variety of everyday, school, and work conversations, as well as discuss concrete topics relating to interests and special fields of competence. Speaker is beginning to be able to support opinions, explain in detail, and hypothesize. Has a well-developed ability to compensate for weaknesses by paraphrasing. Can communicate fine shades of meaning with inflection and differentiated vocabulary.

Superior

Able to speak the language with sufficient accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics. Can discuss special fields of competence and interest with ease. Can support opinions and hypothesize, but may not be able to tailor language to audience or discuss in depth highly abstract or unfamiliar topics. Speaker commands a wide variety of interactive strategies and shows good awareness of discourse strategies. Can distinguish main ideas from supporting information. No patterns of error are evident.

ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: READING

Intermediate-Low
Able to understand main ideas and/or some facts from the simplest test about basic personal and social needs. Examples of texts include messages with social purposes and information for the widest possible audiences, such as public announcements and short, straightforward instructions dealing with public life. Some misunderstandings will occur.

Intermediate-Mid
Able to read consistently with increased understanding simple texts dealing with basic personal and social needs about which the reader has personal interest and/or knowledge. Texts provide basic information and guesswork is minimal for the reader. Examples include short, straightforward descriptions of persons, places, and things written for a wide audience.

Intermediate-High
Able to read consistently with full understanding simple texts dealing with basic personal and social needs about which the reader has personal interest and/or knowledge. Can understand some main ideas from texts at next higher level featuring description and narration. Basic grammatical relations may be misinterpreted. Tests do not differ significantly from those at the Advanced level, comprehension is less consistent. May have to read several times for understanding.

Advanced
Able to read longer prose with familiar sentence patterns. Reader gets the main ideas and facts, may miss some detail. Comprehension comes from situational and subject matter knowledge as well as increasing control of the language. Texts include descriptions and narrations such as simple short stories, news items, social notices, correspondence, and simple technical material written for a the general reader.

Advanced Plus
Able to follow essential points at the Superior level in areas of special interest or knowledge. Able to understand parts of texts which are conceptually abstract and have complex language, and/or texts with unfamiliar topics, situations, or cultural references. Awareness of aesthetic properties of languages is emerging permitting comprehension of a wider variety of texts. Misunderstandings may occur.

Superior
Able to read with almost complete comprehension at normal speed on unfamiliar subjects and a variety of texts. Readers is not expected to thoroughly comprehend texts requiring a high degree of knowledge of the target culture. Texts feature hypotheses, argumentation, grammatical patterns, and academic/professional vocabulary. Occasional misunderstandings may still occur due to use of uncommon phrases. Material includes a variety of literary texts, editorials, correspondence, general reports, and technical material in professional fields. Rereading is rarely necessary.

Distinguished
Able to read fluently and accurately most styles and forms. Able to understand references in text to real-world knowledge and almost all sociolinguistic and cultural references. Able to understand nuance and subtlety, and follow unpredictable turns of thought. Text include sophisticated editorials, specialized journal articles, novels, plays, poems, as well as any subject matter area directed to the general reader.

ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: WRITING

Intermediate-Low
Able to write short messages, postcards, and simple notes. Can create statements or questions within the scope of limited language experience. Writing produces consists of simple sentences on very familiar topics.

Intermediate-Mid
Able to write for practical needs. Content involves personal preferences, daily routine, everyday events, and other topics grounded in personal experience. Can express present time and at least one other time frame (nonpast, habitual, imperfective). Writing tends to be a loose collection of sentences or sentence fragments on a given topic and provides little evidence of conscious organization.

Intermediate-High
Able to meet most practical writing needs and limited social demands. Can take notes in some detail on familiar topics and respond in writing to personal questions. Can write simple letters, brief synopses and paraphrases, summaries of biographical data, work and school experience. Can express time, tense, or aspect rather consistently, but not always accurately. An ability to describe and narrate in paragraphs is emerging.

Advanced
Able to write routine social correspondence and join sentences in simple discourse of at least several paragraphs in length on familiar topics. Can write simple social correspondence, take notes, write cohesive summaries and resumes, as well as narratives and descriptions of a factual nature. May still make errors in punctuation, spelling, or the formation of nonalphabetic symbols. Makes frequent errors in producing complex sentences. Uses a limited number of cohesive devices accurately. Writing may resemble literal translation from the native language, but a sense of organization is emerging.

Advanced Plus
Able to write about a variety of topics with significant precision and in detail. Can write most social and informal business correspondence. Can describe and narrate personal experiences fully but has difficulty supporting points of view in written discourse. Can write about the concrete aspects of topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence. Often shows remarkable fluency and ease of expression, but under time constraints and pressure writing may be inaccurate. Generally strong in either grammar or vocabulary, but not in both. Weakness and unevenness in one of the foregoing or in spelling or character writing formation may result in occasional miscommunication. Some misuse of vocabulary may still be evident. Style may still be obviously foreign.

Superior
Able to write clearly in most formal and informal writing. Good control of a full range of structures, spelling or nonalphabetic symbol production, and a wide general vocabulary allow the writer to hypothesize and present arguments or points of view accurately and effectively. An underlying organization, such as chronological ordering, logical ordering, cause and effect, comparison, and thematic development is strongly evident, although not thoroughly executed.

Appendix D: Sample Matrix to guide Bilingual Authorization Routes
CSET: LOTE Examination Subtest Domains and Program Coursework
http://www.cset.nesinc.com/CS_SMR_opener.asp

Subtest		Domain	Knowledge, Skills and Abilities	Course(s)
Subtest II or III: Assessment of Language and Communication Skills Domains 5,6,7 & 8	(Subtest choice depends on the language)	5. Language and Communication: Listening Comprehension	5.1 Literal Comprehension of Spoken Communication	
			5.2 Inferential and Interpretive Comprehension of Spoken Communication	
			5.3 Critical Analysis of Spoken Communication	
		6. Language and Communication: Reading Comprehension	6.1 Literal Comprehension of Written Texts	
			6.2 Inferential and Interpretive Comprehension of Written Texts	
			6.3 Critical Analysis of Written Texts	
		7. Language and Communication: Oral Expression	7.1 Speaking in the Target Language for a Variety of Purposes in Authentic Contexts	
		8. Language and Communication: Written Expression	8.1 Writing in the Target Language for a Variety of Purposes in Authentic Contexts	
Subtest IV: Bilingual Education and Bilingualism; Intercultural Communication; Instruction and Assessment		1: Bilingual Education and Bilingualism	001 Foundations of Bilingual Education	
			002 Bilingualism and Biliteracy	
		2: Intercultural Communication	003 Intercultural Communication and Culturally Inclusive Instruction	
			004 School, Home, and Community Collaboration	
		3: Instruction and Assessment	005 Language and Literacy Instruction and Assessment in Bilingual Education Settings	
			006 Content Instruction and Assessment in Bilingual Education Settings	
			007 Evaluation, Use, and Augmentation of Materials in Bilingual Education Settings	

Appendix D: Sample Matrix to guide Bilingual Authorization Routes
CSET:LOTE Examination Subtest Domains and Program Coursework
http://www.cset.nesinc.com/CS_SMR_opener.asp

Subtest	Domain	Knowledge, Skills and Abilities	Course(s)
Subtest V: Geographic and Historical Contexts; Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Contexts	1: Geographic and Historical Contexts	001 The Geographic and Demographic Contexts	
		002 The Historical Context	
	2: Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Contexts	003 The Sociopolitical Context	
		004 The Sociocultural Context	
		005 Crosscultural, Intercultural, and Intracultural Contexts	

Institution Plan for Granting an Equivalency
for Passage of CSET:LOTE Subtests

If a candidate has passed the following CSET: LOTE Subtest, then the courses indicated will be waived

CSET:LOTE Subtest Passed	Course(s) that may be waived
III: Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in Languages Other than English	
IV: Bilingual Education and Bilingualism; Intercultural Communication; Instruction and Assessment	
V: Geographic and Historical Contexts; Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Contexts	