

**Languages Other than English Teacher Preparation in
California:
Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for
Subject Matter Programs
American Sign Language**

**A Handbook for
Teacher Educators
&
Program Reviewers**



**Languages Other than English Teacher Preparation in
California:
Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for
Subject Matter Programs
American Sign Language**

**Based on and Adapted from the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for
Languages Other Than English Teacher Preparation* developed by the
Languages Other than English Subject Matter Advisory Panel
(2003-2004)**

2004-2005



**Adopted and Implemented by the
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
State of California
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814
2005
(Revised September 2010)**

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor
State of California

2004

Commission Members

Lawrence Madkins, Chair	Teacher
Elaine C. Johnson, Vice-Chair	Public Representative
Kristen Beckner	Teacher
Beth Hauk	Teacher
Steve Lilly	Faculty Member
Leslie Littman	Designee, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruct
Os-Maun Rasul	Non-Administrative Service Credential Holder
Alberto Vaca	Teacher

Ex-Officio Representatives

Karen Symms 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	Director, Professional Services Division
Lawrence Birch	Administrator, Program Evaluation

The Languages Other than English (LOTE) Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panel

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing 2003-04

Panelists	Professional Positions	Educational Organizations
Mary Gautreau	Teacher of LOTE	Retired
Christine Lanphere	Teacher of LOTE	Natomas High School
Dede Mousseau	Professor of LOTE	State Center Community College
Ilse Daly	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Monterey Bay
Marjorie Tussing	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Fullerton
Hiroko Kataoka	Teacher of LOTE	California State University, Long Beach
Sachiko Matsunaga	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Los Angeles
Yoshiko Saito-Abbott	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Monterey Bay
Setsue Shibata	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Fullerton
Grace Chi	Teacher of LOTE	Sunny Hills High School
Kijoo Ko	Professor of LOTE	University of California, Berkeley
May Su	Teacher of LOTE	Defense Language Institute
Eugenia Chao	Teacher of LOTE	Cerritos High School
Manjit Jhutti	Teacher of LOTE	Luther Elementary School
Natalie Collins	Teacher of LOTE	Private Instruction
Nina Stankous	Professor of LOTE	InterAmerican College
E. Dale Carter	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Los Angeles
Duarte Silva	Professor of LOTE	Stanford University
Fidalgo Von Schmidt	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Fullerton
Chi Pham	Professor of LOTE	Evergreen Valley College
Kim-Oanh Nguyen-Lam	Professor of LOTE	California State University, Long Beach

Commission Consultants to the Advisory Panel:

Susan Porter

The Languages Other than English (LOTE) Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panel

American Sign Language

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
2004-05

Panelists	Professional Positions	Educational Organizations
Lawrence Fleischer	Professor of ASL	California State University, Northridge
Margo Cienik	Teacher of ASL	South Hill High School
Tom Humphries	Professor of ASL	University of California, San Diego
Susannah Kirchner	Teacher of ASL (ret.)	Burbank High School
Mala Kleinfeld	Interpreter of ASL	University of California, San Diego
Sandra Lee Klopping	Professor of ASL	Ohlone Community College
Marlon Kuntze	Professor of ASL	San Jose State University
Christine Lanphere	Teacher of LOTE	Natomas High School
Patty Lessard	Interpreter of ASL	
Cindy Shields	Teacher of ASL	Huntington Beach High School
Colleen Smith	Professor of ASL	San Diego State University
Janet Maxwell	Interpreter of ASL	

Commission Consultants to the Advisory Panel:

Mark McLean, Phyllis Jacobson

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

Table of Contents

Part 1: Introduction to Languages Other than English Teaching Standards

Standards for the Preparation of Teachers of Languages Other than 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 Languages Other than English Teaching Credential.....	7
Alignment of Program Standards and Performance Assessments.....	6
New Subject Matter Assessments.....	8
Overview of the Languages Other than English Standards Handbook.....	8
Contributions of the Languages Other than English Advisory Panel.....	8
Requests for Assistance from Handbook Users.....	9

Part 2: Standards of Program Quality in Languages Other than English

Definitions of Key Terms.....	10
Preconditions for the Approval of Subject Matter Programs in Languages Other than English ..	12
Category I: Standards Common to All Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs.....	13
Standard 1 Program Design.....	13
Standard 2 Program Resources and Support.....	13
Category II: Program Standards.....	14
Standard 3 Program Philosophy and Purpose.....	14
Standard 4 Nature of Language.....	15
Standard 5 Linguistics of the Target Language.....	16
Standard 6 Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions.....	17
Standard 7 Cultural Analysis and Comparison.....	18
Standard 8 Language and Communications: Receptive Comprehension.....	19
Standard 9 Language and Communications: Expressive Production.....	20
Standard 10 Connections to Other Disciplines and Language Communities.....	21

Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of Languages Other than English	
Part I: Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in Languages Other than English: American Sign Language.....	22
Domain 1. General Linguistics.....	22

Domain 2. Linguistics of the Target Language.....	24
Domain 3. Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions	25
Domain 4. Cultural Analysis and Comparison.....	26
Domain 5. Language and Communications: Receptive Comprehension.....	28
Domain 6. Language and Communications: Expressive Production.....	29

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

Review and Improvement of Subject Matter Standards.....	31
Technical Assistance for Program Sponsors.....	31
Review and Approval of Subject Matter Programs	31
Submission Guidelines for Single Subject Matter Program Documents	33
Transmittal Instructions.....	33
Submission Deadlines	34
Transmittal Documents	34
Blended Programs	34
Responding to the Standards	34
Packaging a Submission for Shipment to the Commission.....	36
Intent to Submit a Program Response Form	37
Transmittal Cover Sheet Form	39
Appendix A: Assembly Bill 537 (Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999).....	41

Part 1: Introduction to Languages Other than English Teaching Standards

Standards and Credentials for Teachers of Languages Other than 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. Each year in California, thousands of students enroll in classes for languages Other than English with teachers who are certified by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to teach those classes in public schools. The extent to which students learn to engage creatively in languages other than English and respond critically to languages other than English depends substantially on the preparation of their teachers in languages other than English and the teaching of languages other than English.

The Commission is the agency of California government that licenses 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, CTC 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 role 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, CTC 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.

The State Board of Education adopted academic content standards and/or frameworks for California K-12 students. These standards have direct implications for the subject matter competence requirement of prospective teachers. Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) addresses the need to require the Commission to ensure that subject matter program standards and examinations are aligned with the K-12 student content adopted by the State Board of Education.

The Commission appointed four panels in 2003 (art, languages other than English, music and physical education) to begin the second of three phases to meet the SB 2042 mandate for single subject matter programs. The third phase (agriculture, business, health, home economics, and industrial and technology education) brings all 13 subject matter areas for credentials into alignment with K-12 student content standards by 2005. In addition, the third phase of development included a separate languages other than English panel for American Sign Language (ASL), in recognition of the unique characteristics of ASL subject matter preparation. The first phase of single subject matter (English, mathematics, science and social science) 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. The second and third phases of panels followed the same process for alignment.

Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness

Over the past 15 years CTC 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 single subject matter programs.

- 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 languages other than English curriculum in California schools does not depend entirely on the content knowledge of teachers of languages other than English. Another critical factor is the teachers' ability to *teach* languages other than English. To address the *pedagogical* knowledge and effectiveness of teachers of languages other than English, the Commission in September 1998 launched an extensive standards and assessment reform that led to the development of new teacher preparation standards. In January 2004, CTC authorized an extensive field review of the draft standards for languages other than English. During spring 2004, the standards were amended, based on field review findings and direction from the Commission, and finally adopted by the Commission in May 2004.

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 (Duchenev, 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. Postsecondary institutions govern academic programs that lead to the award of degrees, including baccalaureate degrees in languages other than English. The Commission sets standards for academic programs that lead to the issuance of credentials, including the Single Subject Teaching Credential in Languages Other than 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 languages other than 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 Languages Other than English.

Subject Matter Advisory Panels

The California Commission On Teacher Credentialing asked the Languages Other than English Subject Matter Advisory Panel (2003-04) 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 languages other than English effectively in the public schools.

In January 2003 CTC's executive director appointed subject matter panels in art, languages other than English, music, and physical education to advise Commission staff on the development of new subject matter program standards and examinations in these subject areas. Each panel consisted 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.

Fifteen panel members were appointed to the Art Panel; 24 members appointed to the Languages Other than English Panel; 18 appointed to the Music Panel; and 15 appointed to the Physical Education Panel. The panels began their work in March 2003 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 January 2004, meeting.

Essential Documents for Panel Use

From their first meeting in March 2003, 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/or 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 Art, Languages Other Than English, Music and Physical Education 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 art, languages other than English, music and physical education
- 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 and/or frameworks were the central documents used by the panels. In 2002 the first phase of panels also identified six standards in the 1992 documents that were common to all of the academic standards. The panels went on to identify several new areas relevant for standards from the SB 2042 reform. This process resulted in the development and approval of ten “Standards Common to All” that were developed and apply to all thirteen 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 followed by “factors to consider” that were only suggestions for meeting the standard. In the new standard format all required elements must be addressed and satisfied for the standard to be met.

Field Review Survey

Early in 2004 the draft Single Subject Matter Standards 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, complete the field review survey, and return survey responses to the Commission.

There were several hundred standard review surveys returned to the Commission by February 2004. The numbers of responses were evenly distributed among the four single subject areas. 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.”

A majority of responses to the Phase 2 (single subject) standards field review were from higher education faculty at colleges and universities in California. More than half of these responses were received from faculty in academic departments. A majority of the responses were from faculty in the California State University (CSU) system. Responses were also received from the University of California campuses and from the private and independent colleges and universities. All four CSU campuses that presently include a dance concentration in their physical education programs provided substantial review of the four proposed dance concentration standards.

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 2004 field review, and the revised standards were recommended to CTC for adoption at its meeting in June 2004. At that meeting the Commission also approved an implementation plan for the new standards including technical assistance meetings in 2004/05.

The Languages Other than English Teaching Credential

The Single Subject Teaching Credential in Languages Other than English authorizes an individual to teach languages other than English in departmentalized classrooms. The holders of this credential may teach at any grade level, but the great majority of classes in languages other than English occur in grades seven through twelve. The Commission asked the Languages Other than English Teacher Preparation and Assessment Advisory Panel to recommend new policies to ensure that future teachers of languages other than English are prepared to instruct the subjects that are most commonly taught

in languages other than English classes. In 2003 when the advisory panel was established, almost half of all classes for languages other than English in California public schools were Spanish for students in grades seven through twelve. The other language classes taught by teachers of languages other than English in 2003-04 were taught in:

French	Approximately 28% of classes in languages other than English
German	8%
Japanese	3%
Latin	3%

Other courses in languages other than English taught comprise the remaining percentage (e.g., Italian, Russian, Korean, Chinese, Portuguese, Vietnamese, American Sign). The requirements and other policies in this document are designed to prepare teachers for teaching a specific language other than English as a second language.

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 languages other than English, the Commission asked the Languages Other than 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 Languages Other than English*, which follow the standards in this handbook. In 2004, the Commission's Executive Director appointed a subject matter advisory panel to advise Commission staff on the development of subject matter program standards and an examination specifically for ASL, as a Single Subject Teaching Credential in ASL had not previously been available. Those subject matter requirements are provided 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 was asked to develop standards and subject matter 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 1990s, the State Board of Education adopted K-12 student content standards and frameworks in art, languages other than English, music and physical education. Beginning in early 2003, the Commission began the process of developing assessments that were aligned with these K-12 requirements. 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 art, languages other than English, music, and physical education were first administered in fall of 2004, replacing the SSAT and Praxis II examinations as the new subject matter examinations in these areas. The CSET for American Sign Language was first administered in fall of 2005 as a new examination within the CSET series.

Overview of the Languages Other Than English Standards Handbook for American Sign Language

Part 1 of the handbook provides context and background information about the new standards. Part 2 includes the sixteen standards as well as the "Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of Languages Other Than English." Part 3 provides information about implementation of the standards in California colleges and universities.

Contributions of the Languages Other Than English Advisory Panel

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is indebted to the Languages Other Than English Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panels for the successful creation of *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Preparation of Prospective Teachers of Languages Other Than English*. CTC believes strongly that the standards in this handbook will improve the teaching and learning of languages other than English in California's public schools.

Requests 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

Part 2: Standards of Program Quality in Languages Other Than 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).

Preconditions

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 languages other than 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, CTC 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 teacher preparation for languages other than English. 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 CTC 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 CTC approves the program.

Preconditions for the Approval of Subject Matter Programs in Languages Other than English

To be approved by the Commission, a Subject Matter Program in Languages Other than English must comply with the following preconditions.

- (1) Each Program of Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Credential in Languages Other Than English shall prepare prospective teachers in one language other than English, and shall include at least 33 semester units (or 50 quarter units) of advanced (non-introductory) coursework in the language and in related subjects commonly taught in California public schools.
- (2) The program coursework in (or directly related to) a language other than English shall include language, culture, linguistics, literature, and other related subjects commonly taught in California public schools. All courses used to meet the standards in the program shall be taught in the target language, with the exception of programs for classical languages such as Greek and Latin.

In addition to describing how a program meets each standard of program quality in this handbook, the program document by an institution shall include the course titles, unit designations, catalog descriptions and syllabi of all courses in the program that are used to meet the standards. Program documents must include a matrix chart that identifies which courses meet which standards.

Institutions may determine whether the standards and required elements are addressed through one or more courses for each commonly taught subject or courses offering integrated study of these subjects. Institutions may also define the program in terms of required or elective coursework. However, elective options must be equivalent in meeting the standards. Coursework offered by any appropriate department(s) of a regionally accredited institution may satisfy the preconditions and standards in this handbook. Programs may use general education courses in meeting the standards.

Category I: Standards Common to All Single Subject Matter Programs

Standard 1: Program Design

Subject matter programs are based on an explicit statement expressing the purpose, design, and expected outcomes of the program. The program curriculum builds on the K-12 State-adopted academic content standards, with student outcomes and assessments aligned to the subject matter requirements. The program provides prospective teachers with conceptual knowledge of the subject matter, develops academic literacy and discipline-based fluency, addresses issues of equity and diversity, and exposes prospective teachers to a variety of learning experiences appropriate for the discipline.

Standard 2: Program Resources and Support

The program sponsor allocates resources to support effective program coordination, which includes advising students, facilitating collaboration among stakeholders, and overseeing program review. Ongoing review processes use assessments of the prospective teachers and a variety of data such as input from stakeholders and other appropriate measurements for review and evaluation of the subject matter program.

Languages Other Than English (LOTE) Program Standards

Standard 3: Program Philosophy and Purpose

The program is based on an explicit statement of program philosophy that expresses its purpose, design, and desired outcomes and defines the institution's concept of a well-prepared teacher of language.

Required Elements:

- 11.1 The program faculty and administration, both collectively and collaboratively with K-12 and appropriate other representatives of the broader educational community, develop the program philosophy, design and intended outcomes. The development process reflects participants' awareness of recent paradigms and research in language, literature, culture and linguistics.
- 11.2 The program philosophy and intended outcomes are consistent with the major themes and emphasis of the Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools K-12, the K-12 World Language Content Standards (2009), other state curriculum documents, and nationally adopted guidelines for teaching languages.
- 11.3 The program philosophy recognizes that all students are capable of learning languages in addition to their primary language and should have access to a variety of language learning opportunities.
- 11.4 The program philosophy values candidates' diverse language and cultural backgrounds and acknowledges the need to respond to the strengths and needs of prospective candidates.
- 11.5 The program provides both formative and summative assessment of candidate competencies.
- 11.6 The program philosophy recognizes that prospective teachers need to understand and value the role of culture in language acquisition and are able to function in multiple cultural contexts.

Standard 4: Nature of Language

The program provides coursework and experiences necessary for candidates to acquire and demonstrate an understanding of the nature of language, language use, and applied linguistics.

Required Elements:

- 12.1 The program develops candidates' abilities to demonstrate an understanding of the nature, purposes and uses of language, including the basic elements of language structure as well as the universal characteristics of human language.
- 12.2 The program prepares candidates to analyze the processes by which languages change over time to understand how languages vary geographically, socially, and ethnographically and to describe the relationships among different languages.
- 12.3 The program prepares candidates to demonstrate an understanding of the communicative functions of language and how those functions vary depending upon the context and purpose of the communications.
- 12.4 The program prepares candidates to demonstrate an understanding of the language acquisition process; developmental patterns of language learning; the cognitive, affective, and social factors impacting language teaching and learning; and the interrelationship of language and culture.

Standard 5: Linguistics of the Target Language

The program insures that candidates understand and can demonstrate a deep and broad knowledge of the linguistic features of the target language system. The program insures that prospective teachers can demonstrate an understanding of the use of rhetorical and stylistic devices and the levels of language appropriate for various tasks and communication purposes.

Required Elements:

- 13.1 The program requires prospective teachers to demonstrate knowledge of the phonological features, transcription conventions, morphological rules, syntactic patterns and semantics of the target language.
- 13.2 The program requires prospective teachers to identify, analyze and correct grammatical and mechanical errors in target language samples.
- 13.3 The program requires prospective teachers to analyze and contrast linguistic structures of ASL and English.
- 13.4 The program requires candidates to demonstrate an understanding of the pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of the target language discourse.

Standard 6: Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions

The program requires prospective teachers of languages other than English to demonstrate knowledge of literary and cultural texts and traditions. Prospective teachers study major literary and intellectual movements, genres, writers, and works and use literary and cultural texts from a variety of media.

Required Elements:

- 14.1 The program requires prospective teachers to analyze, interpret and reflect upon the major movements, genres, writers and works in the literature of the target language.
- 14.2 The program requires prospective teachers to analyze the elements of literary works and interpret the use of rhetorical and literary techniques.
- 14.3 The program requires prospective teachers to identify and analyze the historical, social and cultural influences on works of literature in the target language
- 14.4 The program requires prospective teachers to interpret changes over time in the target culture by using their knowledge of the literary and cultural traditions of the target culture.
- 14.5 The program requires prospective teachers to identify and analyze the ways in which literary and intellectual works and movements of cultures associated with the target language both reflect and shape those cultures.
- 14.6 The program requires prospective teachers to analyze and interpret a wide range of literary and cultural texts as represented by a variety of forms and media.
- 14.7 The program requires prospective teachers to evaluate the use of language to inform, persuade, and evoke reader response.

Standard 7: Cultural Analysis and Comparison

The program requires prospective teachers of languages other than English to develop knowledge of the cultures associated with the target language and to demonstrate understanding of the interrelationships among the perspectives, practices and products of those cultures. As a result of their experiences in the program, candidates are able to recognize culture as a dynamic, interrelated system and employ a variety of processes to identify, analyze and evaluate cultural themes, values and ideas.

Required Elements:

- 15.1 Candidates develop an understanding of how a culture manifests itself through multiple perspectives.
- 15.2 Candidates compare and contrast various elements of the target culture with those of other cultures.
- 15.3 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of how factors such as geography, politics, history, religion, education and socioeconomic systems, as well as prominent figures, affect the target culture(s).
- 15.4 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of how the practices and products of a target culture reflect cultural perspectives.
- 15.5 Candidates identify and analyze stereotypes and their effects on the perceptions of and attitudes toward the target culture(s).

Standard 8: Language and Communications: Receptive Comprehension

The program requires prospective teachers of a language other than English to demonstrate proficiency in the comprehension of ASL discourse in the target language. Candidates demonstrate the ability to understand ASL discourse effectively for various purposes and to comprehend a range of content. Candidates can identify main ideas and supporting details of ASL communication, infer meaning within a given context, analyze ASL messages on a number of levels, provide supporting details, and demonstrate the ability to think critically about communication. Finally, prospective teachers evaluate ASL messages in relation to stylistics and to social relationships within the context of the communication, as well as in relation to the speaker's purposes, assumptions and intended audience.

Required Elements:

- 16.1 The program requires candidates to demonstrate an understanding of the main ideas and significant details in a variety of authentic contexts (literal comprehension of ASL discourse).
- 16.2 The program requires prospective teachers to make deductive and inductive inferences based on information contained in ASL discourse (inferential and interpretative comprehension of communication).
- 16.3 The program requires prospective teachers to analyze and evaluate ASL discourse in relation to purpose, context and point of view (critical analysis of communication).

Standard 9: Language and Communications: Expressive Production

The program requires prospective teachers of a language other than English to demonstrate proficiency in the production of American Sign Language (ASL) discourse at a minimum level of Intermediate-High, as described in the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL): *Program Standards for Foreign Language Teachers* (2002) and the stages of the language learning continuum as reflected in the *Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve* (2003) and in the K-12 World Language Content Standards (2009). Candidates are also required to clearly and accurately express ideas in culturally appropriate language across a range of topics, themes, and message types.

Required Elements:

- 17.1 The program develops candidates' abilities to communicate effectively in informal settings, including both ordinary and unexpected situations, as well as in formal settings. Each candidate uses communication strategies and language appropriate to diverse audiences.
- 17.2 The program prepares prospective teachers to understand and use appropriate ASL discourse for different communicative purposes including narrating, requesting, persuading, comparing and contrasting. Candidates formulate and defend hypotheses as well as communicate effectively on abstract topics and themes, as appropriate to ASL.
- 17.3 The program requires prospective teachers to acquire and demonstrate competence in expressing ideas, using culturally appropriate language across a range of content, including the arts, literature, politics, society and current events appropriate to the target language.

Standard 10: Connection to Other Disciplines and Language Communities

The program builds upon “Varied Teaching Strategies” (Standard 5), incorporating recent developments in language acquisition approaches. The program also implements a variety of contextualized authentic teaching and learning experiences, using media and various other means such as internet-based, community-based and other related strategies. These experiences enable prospective teachers to interact with the larger cultural communities associated with the target language to broaden their perspectives and experience base for language learning and teaching. Candidates demonstrate the ability to relate the target language to broaden their perspective and experience base for language learning and teaching. Candidates demonstrate the ability to relate the target language to other disciplines.

Required Elements:

- 18.1 The program faculty implements a variety of technology-assisted teaching and learning experiences that assist students to identify and interact with the local, regional and international language communities associated with the target language.
- 18.2 The program integrates content from other disciplines to strengthen interdisciplinary competency in the target language.
- 18.3 The program requires students to analyze the role and importance of media in communication in the target language.
- 18.4 The program requires students to know professional opportunities related to languages and the role of language competency in careers and professional issues in a global context.
- 18.5 The program facilitates the interaction of students with local resources and community events that help to deepen and broaden prospective teachers’ language and cultural background for teaching and learning.

Languages Other Than English—American Sign Language (ASL) Subject Matter Requirements

Part I: Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in Languages Other Than English—American Sign Language (ASL)

Domain 1. General Linguistics

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the nature, process, and components of language at the postsecondary level, as described in the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL): Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers (2002) and reflected in the Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (2003). Candidates demonstrate both broad and deep conceptual understanding of the subject matter, including the universal characteristics of human languages, both spoken and signed, and the ways in which linguistics describes and categorizes language structures. They analyze the processes by which languages change over time, understand how languages vary geographically, socially, and ethnographically, and recognize the family relationships among different languages. Candidates show an awareness of the communicative functions of language and how those functions vary depending upon the context and purpose of communication. They demonstrate a thorough understanding of language acquisition, including the processes by which additional languages are acquired and the developmental patterns of language learning, and recognize that language acquisition involves the interrelationship of language and culture.

1.1 The Nature of Language

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of the nature, purposes, and uses of language. For example:
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the basic elements of language structure (i.e., phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics) and how they are interrelated.
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding that languages can occur in different modalities.
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the basic principles of grammar and what is meant by a productive rule of language.
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the distinction between deep structure and surface structure.
- b. Demonstrate an understanding of the development of language and the significance of language change, including the variations that occur within the contexts of time, place, age, gender, and situation. For example:
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the classification of both spoken and signed languages into families and branches.
 - ◆ Describe different perspectives on the study of language (e.g., synchronic vs. diachronic).
 - ◆ Identify the different types of change that languages undergo at all levels (e.g., phonetic, morphological and syntactic, lexical and semantic).
 - ◆ Analyze the mechanisms by which language change occurs (e.g., assimilation,

metathesis, contact, borrowing, euphemisms, metaphors, taboo).

1.2 Language Use

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of principles of pragmatics, discourse analysis, and the theory of speech acts. For example:
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of how sentences may communicate more than they literally say.
 - ◆ Analyze principles of structure, regularity, and coherence in extended discourse.
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of distinctions between different types of speech acts (e.g., direct vs. indirect).
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of distinctions between different varieties of speech acts (e.g., commands, questions, assertions, exclamations).
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the functions of speech acts (e.g., to inform, to amuse, to control, to persuade).
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of pragmatic features (e.g., reference, sense, force, tone, conversational implicature) that affect the meaning of speech acts.
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the distinction between performative and constative utterances (language that performs an act, such as apologizing or promising, vs. language that describes facts or provides information).

1.3 Applied Linguistics

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of theories of language acquisition and learning. For example:
 - ◆ Analyze potential differences between learning first and second languages.
 - ◆ Identify the developmental stages through which language learners acquire first and second languages.
 - ◆ Analyze similarities and differences between language acquisition in different modalities (e.g., acquisition of a signed language compared with acquisition of a spoken language).
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of cognitive, affective, and social factors that affect second-language acquisition and learning (e.g., the concept of critical period, family and peer attitudes, linguistic interference, the interrelationship between language and power).
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the creativity and recursive character of human languages.

(American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL]: Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers, 1.b, 1.c)

Domain 2. Linguistics of the Target Language—American Sign Language (ASL)

Candidates demonstrate a broad and deep knowledge of American Sign Language (ASL) linguistics at the postsecondary level, as reflected in the Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (2003). Candidates demonstrate an understanding of ASL, including phonological structures, the rules by which lexical items are formed, and the ways in which phrases, clauses, and sentences are structured, and can explain the major levels and features of ASL grammar. They are able to describe ASL phonological features, transcription conventions, morphological rules, syntactic patterns, and semantics. Candidates are able to describe the rules for sign and sentence formation, as well as the structure, function, and meaning of ASL discourse, including pragmatic features, sociolinguistic features, and features for producing coherence in discourse. Candidates are familiar with rhetorical and stylistic devices and the levels of language appropriate for various tasks and communicative purposes. In addition, candidates understand the historical changes in ASL and its variations, including differences in articulation, vocabulary, and grammatical structures, as well as register.

2.1 Language Structures

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of the phonology of ASL. For example:
 - ◆ Describe the primary phonological features of ASL (e.g., handshape, movement, location, nonmanual markers, orientation, stress and tempo in sign formation).
 - ◆ Describe the phonological structure of ASL (e.g., hold and movement patterns, eye gaze, nodding).
 - ◆ Describe basic phonological and morphophonemic rules of ASL.
- b. Demonstrate an understanding of the morphology of ASL. For example:
 - ◆ Understand inflectional morphology in ASL (e.g., rules for adding adverbial, numerical, or distributive morphemes to root verbs; rules for forming plurals of nouns).
 - ◆ Understand derivational morphology in ASL (e.g., rules for forming derived and compound signs).
 - ◆ Understand lexical morphology in ASL, including the lexicalization of finger-spelled forms.
 - ◆ Describe strategies for identifying and using new signs in ASL by recombining morphemes.
- c. Demonstrate an understanding of the syntax of ASL. For example:
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the rules that govern the formation of phrases and sentences (e.g., the use of classifiers and classifier predicates).
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the significance of sign order in ASL.
 - ◆ Identify ways in which syntactic patterns in ASL can be used to convey nuances of meaning.
 - ◆ Identify linguistic devices used to create connected and cohesive discourse in ASL.
- d. Demonstrate an understanding of the semantics of ASL. For example:
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of how meaning is structured and communicated in ASL.
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the cultural meaning of ASL signs and sentences.
- e. Demonstrate a basic understanding of transcription conventions in ASL. For example:
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of commonly used glossing techniques in ASL.
- f. Describe changes that have occurred in ASL over time.

2.2 Error Analysis

- a. Identify, analyze, and correct grammatical and mechanical errors in ASL.

2.3 Contrastive Analysis

- a. Analyze and contrast linguistic structures of ASL and English.
- b. Compare and contrast how meaning is expressed in ASL and English.

2.4 Sociolinguistics and Pragmatics

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of ASL discourse.
For example:
 - ◆ Explain how linguistic choices depend on the setting, goals, and participants in communicative interactions.
 - ◆ Demonstrate an understanding of the influence of social and cultural norms on the use of ASL.
- b. Demonstrate an understanding of the origins and social implications of variations within ASL. For example:
 - ◆ Describe variations in articulation, vocabulary, and grammatical structures within ASL.
 - ◆ Describe the factors that account for the variations in ASL (e.g., culture/ethnicity, political background, level and/or background of education, gender, social class).
- c. Demonstrate an understanding of how the history of ASL in the United States and its acceptance as a language have influenced the use of ASL (e.g., how changing attitudes toward ASL have influenced language choice).

Domain 3. Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions

Candidates demonstrate a broad and deep knowledge of American Sign Language (ASL) and American Deaf culture literary and cultural texts and traditions, and of their contexts, at the postsecondary level, as reflected in the Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (2003). Candidates are familiar with major American Sign Language literary and intellectual movements, genres, creators, and works. Candidates are also familiar with major English-language works written by Deaf people within American Deaf culture. Candidates demonstrate the ability to analyze, interpret, and synthesize ideas as well as critical issues from a wide range of creators and thinkers across a variety of forms and media. They understand the historical, social, and cultural contexts in which literary and cultural texts were created, the influence of these factors on ideas and forms of expression, and the ways in which those texts both reflect and shape American Deaf culture. Finally, candidates use literary and cultural texts to interpret and reflect upon the perspectives of American Deaf culture over time.

3.1 Major Movements, Genres, Writers, and Works

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of major movements, genres, creators, and works in the literature of ASL.
- b. Demonstrate an understanding of the historical, social, and cultural influences on ASL works.
- c. Use knowledge of ASL literary and cultural traditions to interpret changes in American Deaf culture over time.
- d. Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which ASL literary and intellectual works and movements both reflected and shaped American Deaf culture.
- e. Demonstrate an understanding of English-language literary and cultural texts written by Deaf people within American Deaf culture.

3.2 Analysis of ASL and American Deaf Culture Literary and Cultural Texts

- a. Analyze and interpret a wide range of ASL literary and cultural works in a variety of forms (e.g., folk tales, short stories, jokes, sign songs, ABC stories, poetry, personal narratives, drama, biography, history).
- b. Evaluate the use of language (e.g., vocabulary, register, function, tempo, rhythm) in ASL works to convey meaning, to inform, to persuade, or to evoke a response.
- c. Analyze the elements of ASL literary and cultural works (e.g., setting, plot, theme, character, tone, style).
- d. Interpret the use of rhetorical and literary techniques (e.g., rhyme, repetition, metaphor, personification) in ASL literary and cultural works.
- e. Analyze and interpret English-language literary and cultural works written by Deaf people within American Deaf culture.

Domain 4. Cultural Analysis and Comparisons

Candidates possess a broad and deep knowledge of American Deaf culture and demonstrate an understanding of the interrelationships among the processes, perspectives, practices, and products of American Deaf culture at the postsecondary level, as reflected in the Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (2003). Candidates recognize culture as a dynamic, interrelated system and employ a variety of processes to identify, analyze, and evaluate cultural themes, values, and ideas. They are able to explore relationships among cultural perspectives and social institutions, and they understand how cultural practices and products exemplify the perspectives of American Deaf culture. Candidates exhibit familiarity with daily living patterns, cultural attitudes and priorities, contemporary and historical issues, social institutions, and significant artistic and literary works in American Deaf culture. They are able to identify the roles and contributions of major figures and notable individuals in American Deaf culture and references made to them. Candidates are able to interpret ideas, values, and beliefs that represent American Deaf culture's traditions and contemporary variations and are able to compare and contrast social, historical, and artistic traditions in American Deaf culture with those of other cultures.

4.1 The Nature of Culture and Cultural Processes

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of the nature and components of culture. For example:
 - ◆ definitions of culture
 - ◆ intragroup (e.g., ethnicity, generations, race, microcultures) and intergroup differences
 - ◆ values, beliefs, and expectations
 - ◆ educational, social, and political systems
 - ◆ roles, identity, and status (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, social class, age, occupation, educational level, cultural identity)
- b. Demonstrate an understanding of cross-cultural and intercultural interactions. For example:
 - ◆ processes of cultural contact (e.g., assimilation, acculturation, accommodation, enculturation, deculturation, biculturalism)
 - ◆ the nature of pluralism and multiculturalism
 - ◆ the dynamics of oppression (e.g., ethnocentrism, stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination)

4.2 Cultural Processes in American Deaf Culture

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of how cultural processes exemplify cultural perspectives in American Deaf culture. For example:
 - ◆ processes of cultural contact (e.g., assimilation, acculturation, enculturation, biculturalism) and their role in American Deaf culture, including responses to contact with others (e.g., creation of stereotypes and anti-stereotypes, growth of activism, emergence and creation of unifying themes, promulgation of warnings about others, historical changes in the relationship with others)
 - ◆ processes of cultural development and perspectives within American Deaf culture (e.g., processes that define, categorize, include, and marginalize who is Deaf; processes of linguistic, cultural, and social development among Deaf children; processes of learning to be Deaf at different ages; processes of transmitting Deaf culture across generations)
 - ◆ the nature of pluralism, multiculturalism, and cultural variation within American Deaf culture
 - ◆ the dynamics of audism (e.g., oppression, discrimination) that affect American Deaf culture

4.3 Cultural and Historical Perspectives in American Deaf Culture

- a. Demonstrate familiarity with significant individuals, key eras, and major historical events and developments within American Deaf culture, and analyze their influence on the culture's development and evolution.
- b. Demonstrate familiarity with the formation of ASL and Deaf communities and how they influence the development and evolution of American Deaf culture.
- c. Demonstrate an understanding of how political, social, economic, and educational systems and institutions are shaped by and influence American Deaf culture.
- d. Demonstrate an understanding of how the development of American Deaf culture and the interaction of Deaf and hearing cultures influence the development of ASL.
- e. Demonstrate an understanding of how American Deaf culture employs, influences, and interacts with technology, including attitudes toward technology within American Deaf culture.
- f. Analyze cultural stereotypes and their effects on the perceptions of and attitudes toward American Deaf culture.
- g. Analyze how political perspectives and legislation influence the development and evolution of American Deaf culture.

4.4 Cultural Practices in American Deaf Culture

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of how cultural practices exemplify cultural perspectives in American Deaf culture. For example:
 - ◆ rituals, values, and traditions (e.g., rituals of greeting and leave-taking)
 - ◆ social practices and institutions (e.g., Deaf marriages, Deaf gatherings)
 - ◆ social status and social relationships
 - ◆ rules governing social and communication interactions (e.g., attention getting, sight lines, turn taking)
 - ◆ patterns of work and leisure

4.5 Cultural Products of American Deaf Culture

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of how the products of American Deaf culture exemplify its cultural perspectives. For example:
 - ◆ works of art (e.g., painting, sculpture, handicrafts)
 - ◆ architecture (e.g., design of visual environments)
 - ◆ artistic performance (e.g., storytelling, theatre, dance)
 - ◆ literary works
 - ◆ media (e.g., publications, web sites)
 - ◆ technology
 - ◆ television, video, film
 - ◆ entertainment (e.g., Deaf sporting events, conferences, captioned movies)

Domain 5. Language and Communication: Receptive Comprehension

Candidates demonstrate proficiency in the comprehension of American Sign Language (ASL) discourse as reflected in the Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (2003). Candidates demonstrate the ability to understand ASL discourse for various purposes in different contexts, including a variety of message types and levels of formality, and to accurately comprehend ideas and vocabulary across a range of content, including art, literature, politics, society, and current events, as well as everyday communications and interactions. They demonstrate the ability to comprehend and make inferences about both limited and extended ASL discourse, including monologues, conversations, news reports, narratives and descriptions in various time frames, speeches, and debates. Candidates are not only able to identify the main ideas and supporting details of ASL discourse, but also to infer the meaning of unfamiliar signs from their contexts, understand ASL discourse on a number of levels, analyze it from multiple perspectives, and give detailed personal interpretations that are supported by a broad range of cultural knowledge and understanding. Finally, they demonstrate the ability to think critically about ASL discourse and to evaluate it in relation to stylistic variations and social relationships, as well as the signer's purposes, assumptions, and intended audience.

5.1 Literal Comprehension of ASL Discourse

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of the main ideas and significant details of ASL discourse in a variety of authentic contexts, both formal and informal. For example:
 - ◆ Understand the main idea of a signed message.
 - ◆ Respond appropriately to a request for information.
 - ◆ Choose or provide an appropriate response to a signed question or comment.
 - ◆ Recognize a stated cause or effect in a situation described in ASL discourse.
 - ◆ Identify the sequence of steps described in a set of signed directions or instructions.
 - ◆ Recognize localization and spatial relationships as described in ASL discourse.

5.2 Inferential and Interpretive Comprehension of ASL Discourse

- a. Make deductive and inductive inferences based on information contained in both formal and informal ASL discourse. For example:
 - ◆ Draw conclusions based on information presented in ASL discourse.
 - ◆ Characterize the attitude or emotions of one or more signers.
 - ◆ Infer the social relationships among participants in a conversation (e.g., age, social status, gender).

- ◆ Analyze a personal relationship implied but not stated in a conversation.
- ◆ Interpret the cultural context of a message or conversation.
- ◆ Recognize implied cause-and-effect relationships in ASL discourse.
- ◆ Understand figurative language (e.g., metaphors, similes) used in ASL discourse.
- ◆ Analyze ASL discourse to determine a signer's assumptions that are implied but not explicitly stated.

5.3 Critical Analysis of ASL Discourse

- a. Analyze and evaluate both formal and informal ASL discourse in relation to its purpose, context, and point of view. For example:
 - ◆ Analyze a signer's assumptions or point of view.
 - ◆ Analyze the historical, social, or cultural context of ASL discourse.
 - ◆ Evaluate the sufficiency and reliability of evidence presented in support of statements made in ASL discourse.
 - ◆ Evaluate the social and cultural appropriateness of the language used in ASL discourse.
 - ◆ Analyze the communicative and discourse strategies employed in ASL discourse.

Domain 6. Language and Communication: Expressive Production

Candidates demonstrate proficiency in the production of American Sign Language (ASL) discourse as reflected in the Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (2003). Candidates demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively in ASL in everyday situations and react competently when asked to respond to a complication or an unexpected turn of events. They communicate clearly and accurately to participate effectively in most formal and informal signed conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics and are able to narrate and describe in multiple dimensions of time, providing detailed accounts and exhibiting good control of aspect. Candidates demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively in ASL using correct articulation for various purposes in different contexts and employ a variety of message types. Candidates accurately express ideas in culturally appropriate language across a range of content, including art, literature, politics, society, and current events, as well as everyday communications and interactions. They are able to deliver presentations on a wide range of topics, employing communication strategies and language tailored to the situation, and present narrations and descriptions that relate relevant and supporting facts in extended and cohesive discourse.

6.1 Producing ASL Discourse for a Variety of Purposes in Authentic Contexts

- a. Construct connected ASL discourse that communicates a message effectively in both formal and informal situations, demonstrating fluency and correct articulation, a wide range of vocabulary, and inflectional and linguistic structures. For example:
 - ◆ Communicate appropriately within the context of everyday situations.
 - ◆ Respond to a variety of unexpected situations by explaining or describing events or by requesting assistance.
 - ◆ Narrate or describe a personal experience.
 - ◆ Describe the reasoning behind a personal or professional decision.
 - ◆ Explain the advantages and disadvantages of an idea or a proposed course of action.
 - ◆ Communicate formally and informally about topics of current public and personal interest, demonstrating an ability to use different registers and communication styles in appropriate contexts.

- ◆ Deliver signed presentations on a wide variety of topics to diverse audiences.
- ◆ Formulate and defend a hypothesis in response to a given situation.
- ◆ Take a position on an issue and support it with persuasive evidence.
- ◆ Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively on abstract topics and themes.

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

The 2004-2005 Program Quality Standards for Subject Matter Preparation in Languages Other than 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.

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 Languages Other than 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.

Technical Assistance for Program Sponsors

Program sponsors interested in submitting a new subject matter preparation program in ASL may contact the Commission for technical assistance. Topics typically covered during a technical assistance session include:

- Description of the steps in program review and approval.
- Review of program standards, factors to consider, preconditions and review of sample responses
- Opportunities to discuss subject-specific questions .

Review and Approval of Languages Other Than English Subject Matter Programs

A regionally accredited institution of post-secondary education that would like to offer a Program of Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Credential in ASL 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 more than one program of subject matter preparation in languages other than English, a separate proposal should be forwarded to the Commission for each language program.

Selection, Composition and Training of Program Review Panels

Review panel members are selected because of their expertise in languages other than English and their knowledge of language other than 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. Because the process is a peer review, the Commission strongly encourages institutions seeking program approval to designate a subject matter faculty member to serve as a reviewer. 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. 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 CTC 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 **two printed and bound 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 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: CTCdocument.doc).

Submission Deadlines

Proposals may be submitted at any time by a prospective program sponsor. Please contact the Commission staff member responsible for subject matter preparation programs if you are planning to submit an ASL program for review.

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.

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. 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. However, 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 for each subject area for which approval is requested.

The Standards Common to All suggest certain institutional mechanisms that could be common to all subject matter programs. For instance, institutional support for academic programs in the standards for technology or diversity and equity could apply to all subject matter programs. However, both of these standards (and many others) also require some measure of subject-specific program information. 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 subject which has already been addressed and approved in the generic document.

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 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.

**Intent to Submit a Single Subject Matter
Preparation Program Response to Standards
American Sign Language**

PROGRAM SPONSOR (Name of Institution and Department)

Contact Person: _____ Title: _____

Department: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

**Please indicate when you intend to submit program documents responding to the
new Single Subject Matter Preparation Standards: _____**

Please mail or fax this form to:

Helen Hawley
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 324-8927

Blended Teacher Preparation Program Response to Standards

PROGRAM SPONSOR (Name of Institution and Department)

Please fill out the requested information below If you are planning to submit a Blended ASL program

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

Please mail or fax this form to:

Terry Janicki
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 327-3165

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

- **Sponsoring Organization:**

Name _____

- **Program Contacts:**

1. Name _____

Title _____

Address _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

E-mail _____

**Single Subject Program Sponsor - Transmittal Cover Sheet
(Page 2 of 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.

