



PREPARING THE ACTFL/NCATE PROGRAM REPORT

WRITING TEAM:

Eileen W. Glisan, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Robert Headrick, Rockwood (MO) Public Schools
Stephen L. Levy, ACTFL
David McAlpine, University of Arkansas-Little Rock
Nadine F. Olson, Oklahoma State University
June K. Phillips, Weber State University

Introduction to the Preparation of an ACTFL/NCATE Program Report

What is the relationship between ACTFL and NCATE?

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has been a constituent member of NCATE since 1999. As one of 33 “specialized professional associations” (SPAs), we have developed a strong and positive role within the NCATE coalition. To find a listing of all NCATE state partnerships, as well as the type of partnership each state holds, please refer to NCATE's website <http://www.ncate.org/states/stateProgram.asp?ch=96>

NCATE incorporated the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles into its work in 1995, bringing the SPAs into the movement toward unified standards and beginning the alignment of accreditation and licensing across states. All of the SPAs have now endorsed a performance-based system in which candidates graduating from teacher education programs must be able to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. An institution provides this information through a process of program review that is web-based, grounded in assessment, and reviewed by trained ACTFL/NCATE program reviewers.

Who should prepare an ACTFL/NCATE Program Report?

If an institution offers undergraduate and/or graduate programs in foreign language teacher preparation, it must respond to these standards. ACTFL considers any program that prepares candidates for their first foreign language teaching certificate or licensure to be “initial.” These programs may be at the graduate or undergraduate level. The standards apply to all initial programs, regardless of the foreign language teacher certification options offered (e.g., K-12 certification, secondary certification). Therefore, all initial programs should prepare their program reports in the same manner. Programs such as bilingual programs, those that offer only endorsements, and those that offer “advanced level certification” are not eligible for review under these standards.

Institutions will need to decide whether to submit one program report that encompasses the programs representing all of the foreign languages in which candidates may earn teacher certification or whether to submit a separate report for each foreign language program. Institutional structure typically determines the number of program reports. Departments that house multiple languages and that have the same teacher preparation program for each language may submit one report. In the case of one report, programs must still provide candidate evidence by language program, clearly indicating any differentiation by language (e.g., OPI results for candidates in each language, study abroad in only one language). Where separate language departments exist, and where the programs across languages are not parallel, a program report should be submitted for each program that prepares candidates in a specific foreign language. Should language

programs be parallel across separate language departments, one program report may be submitted, with candidate evidence provided for each language program.

Institutions that offer a combination of undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and/or Master's degree options for initial foreign language teacher certification programs may address all levels of their programs in one program report, provided that they make the distinctions regarding the graduate programs as described in Appendix A dealing with Program Report Submissions for Graduate Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Programs.

Programs should note that the expectations described in these standards are the same for all foreign language teacher candidates, regardless of the foreign language they teach, with the exception of Standard 1.a. (Demonstrating Language Proficiency):

MINIMUM REQUIRED LEVELS OF ORAL PROFICIENCY*	
ADVANCED-LOW	INTERMEDIATE-HIGH
Group I, II, III languages on FSI Scale: French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish	Group IV languages on FSI Scale: Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean
MINIMUM REQUIRED LEVELS OF WRITING PROFICIENCY*	
ADVANCED-LOW	INTERMEDIATE-HIGH
Languages with Roman alphabet: French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish	Languages with non-Roman alphabet: Arabic, Hebrew, Korean, Russian Languages with characters: Chinese, Japanese

*Candidates of classical languages, such as Latin, are not required to demonstrate a specific level of speaking or writing proficiency.

How do we begin this process?

- Review the most current copy of the ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers available at <http://www.actfl.org/files/public/ncate2002.pdf>
- Identify the program(s) that will be submitted for review. (See previous section)
- Determine who has the key responsibility for preparing and submitting the program review report.
- It is very important at this stage that faculty in the College of Education, the foreign language department(s), and the foreign language pedagogy specialist(s) collaborate on the preparation of this report.
- Review and download all information on the NCATE Website (www.ncate.org) pertaining to the preparation of electronic program reports and become familiar with

the format of the ACTFL/NCATE Program Report template
(<http://www.ncate.org/ProgramStandards/actfl/actflWebReport-July1.doc>)

- Read carefully the General Directions provided in the Program Report template.
- Consult with the person in charge of your institution's campus-wide NCATE review to determine timelines and procedures.
- Where possible, attend workshops conducted by ACTFL and/or NCATE on the preparation of program reports and the interpretation of standards. Information on such workshops is available from either organization.
- For background information about foreign language instruction, the knowledge base for the ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards, and alignment of these standards with other professional standards, see Appendix B, "A Brief History of Foreign Language Instruction," Appendix C, "The Knowledge Base Supporting the Standards," and Appendix D, "Alignment of ACTFL Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers with Other Professional Standards."

What is our next step?

Collect the following source materials:

- Obtain the current course of study required for all candidates in the programs. If your institution has an electronic version of your university catalog, that is the most efficient way to submit. You will need to include this information as an attachment in *Section I-Context of the Program Report*.
- Determine, with the assistance of program faculty, the 7-8 key assessments to be used to represent the program in the report. All six ACTFL/NCATE Standards must be accounted for in the report.
- Obtain current documents that include a description of the assessment documentation and its use, including the assessment tool or description of the assignment, the scoring guide or rubrics for the assessment, and candidate data derived from the assessment for the past three years. These elements will need to be in formats that can be inserted easily into the electronic Program Report template.
- Organize documentation in the order required by the Program Report template:
 - Program Report Cover Sheet*
 - Section I: Context*
 - Section II: List of Assessments*
 - Section III: Relationship of Assessments to Standards*
 - Section IV: Evidence for Meeting Standards (the 7 required ACTFL/NCATE assessments)*
 - Section V: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance*
- Draft narratives to support each of the assessments to be submitted, paying close attention to the limitations on length. (See the section, "Preparing the Program Report," which appears later in this document.)

Are there any special circumstances?

The following apply to programs that may have difficulty providing appropriate data for the program review:

Dormant Programs: If no candidates are in the pipeline and no one has graduated from the program in the past three years, a program report is not required. When the dormant program is reactivated by admitting candidates, a program report may be voluntarily submitted at that time.

Reactivated Programs: If a dormant program is reactivated by admitting candidates, the program may voluntarily submit a program report at that point. However, the unit must submit a program report for a reactivated program as part of its scheduled program review cycle whether or not candidates have graduated from the program.

New Programs: A unit can voluntarily submit a program report for a new program anytime between on-site visits if the program has been approved by the state. It must submit a program report for the new program as part of its scheduled program review cycle whether or not candidates have graduated from the program.

Redesigned Programs: If a program is undergoing a major program redesign, it may request a delay of its submission of the program report. The delay request must be submitted to NCATE with a detailed explanation of the redesign and its timeline. A delay will be granted if the redesign requires major changes in the program and if the appropriate state agency agrees with the delay.

Small Programs: A program report must be completed if the program has had any completers at all over the past three years. However, the 80% pass rate requirement does not apply to programs that do not have 10 completers over a three-year period.

How do we submit the Program Report?

A Program Report template is provided by NCATE on their webpage (<http://www.ncate.org/ProgramStandards/actfl/actflWebReport-July1.doc>). Consult with the person in charge of your institution's campus-wide NCATE review for instruction on submitting your web-based program report to NCATE.

Who reviews the Program Report?

The completed report is submitted electronically to NCATE. NCATE then sends the report to trained ACTFL reviewers. They determine if the information provided in the report meets the ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards.

What are the possible program recognition decisions?

The three possible decisions are described below.

1. *National Recognition contingent upon unit accreditation*
 - The program substantially meets standards
 - No further submissions required, program will receive full national recognition when the unit receives accreditation
 - Program will be listed on the NCATE web site as Nationally Recognized if the unit is already accredited. If the unit is not accredited, the program will be listed as National Recognized pending unit accreditation.

2. *National Recognition with Conditions contingent upon unit accreditation*
 - The program generally meets standards; however, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
 - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met
 - Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides
 - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides
 - An insufficient number of SPA standards was met.
 - The NCATE requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met
 - The program has two opportunities within the 18-months after the decision to remove the conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
 - The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* until it achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.

3. *Further Development Required:*
 - The standards that are not met are critical to a quality program and more than a few in number OR are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate
 - The program will have two opportunities within the 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*

A program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in reaching either *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*.

Special note: To receive ACTFL/NCATE National Recognition, programs must meet Standard 1a fully as evidenced by assessment #6. To meet the standard, Advanced Low (Intermediate High for languages designated – see page 2 of this document) must be set as the minimum level required in oral proficiency for teacher education candidates. An appropriate testing system must be in place. It is not required that all candidates have reached that level at the time the Program Report is submitted. The data submitted should show that progress is being made at the institutional level. The report must describe the institutional plans for ensuring that all of its candidates reach the required level.

Preparing the Program Report: Overview and Section I

What is the relationship between the ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards and the program review?

The *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* are designed to reflect the approach to program review in NCATE's current performance-based accreditation system. The standards and the program review are related in the following ways:

- The standards describe what teacher candidates know, are able to do in their teaching, and are disposed to do in their roles as teachers. Institutions verify that these standards are met by means of a program report. This report illustrates that specific program standards are met by means of **key assessments and candidate performance data**. Analysis of the data should indicate that teacher candidates exhibit the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions as described in the ACTFL/NCATE program standards. There is a special emphasis on evidence that teacher candidates are having a positive effect on K-12 student learning.
- The decision to grant “national recognition” to programs is based on evidence from the key assessments and candidate performance data that verify attainment of the standards. This contrasts sharply with the previous program review system of NCATE, in which programs could use “input” such as course syllabi to indicate that standards were attained.
- It is the responsibility of all faculty in foreign language departments and colleges of education to collaborate in verifying that their teacher candidates are meeting the standards and to indicate how well candidates are meeting them.

What is the Program Report?

The Program Report is the official document submitted electronically to NCATE for peer review and evaluation by trained ACTFL reviewers. It describes the institution's foreign language teacher preparation program based on evidence from key assessments and candidate performance data. It represents the institution/program's best attempt to assemble evidence to illustrate how it complies with the six ACTFL teacher preparation program standards. Program reviewers will have only this report in order to make a recognition decision. Your program report and the resulting decision become important information used by the NCATE Board of Examiners (BOE) Team as they evaluate your unit's teacher preparation programs during their on-site visit.

What is the format of the Program Report?

To understand the format and content required for an electronic program review process, see the Program Report template at

<http://www.ncate.org/ProgramStandards/ACTFL/ACTFLWebReport-July1.doc>.
Preparers of the program report must provide the documentation as indicated on the template.

The program report includes the following sections:

Program Report Cover Sheet

Section I. Context (*6-page maximum narrative, plus three-four attachments*):

- ✓ General information on the program to help reviewers understand the program
- ✓ Attachments:
 - A program of study
 - Attachment A: Candidate & Completers Chart
 - Attachment B: Faculty Chart
 - Attachment C: ACTFL/NCATE Program Self-Assessment Table

Section II. List of Assessments (*completion of chart*):

- ✓ Seven or eight assessments that address these areas:
 1. Licensure assessment or other content-based assessment
 2. Assessment of content knowledge in language to be taught
 3. Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction
 4. Assessment of student teaching
 5. Assessment of candidate effect on student learning
 6. Assessment of candidate oral proficiency
 7. Additional assessment that addresses ACTFL standards (*required*)
 8. Additional assessment that addresses ACTFL standards (*optional*)

Section III. Relationship of Assessments to Standards (*completion of chart*)

- ✓ Indication of which assessments are used to determine if candidates meet ACTFL/NCATE program standards

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards

- ✓ For each assessment, a two-page maximum narrative that describes the assessment and its use in the program, illustrates the alignment with ACTFL/NCATE standards, analyzes the data findings, and interprets how that data provides evidence for meeting the standards

- ✓ Assessment documentation (three attachments for each assessment, each of which is limited to five text pages: the assessment tool or description of the assignment; the scoring guide for the assessment; and candidate data derived from the assessment); these attachments follow the assessment narrative within the same document/file

Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance *(3-page maximum narrative)*

- ✓ Description of how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and candidates' effect on student learning

What are the formatting requirements and page limits for narrative sections and attachments?

The report should be thorough, concise, easy to read, summative, and accurate. Refer to the NCATE website, guidelines for program review, for specific instructions on how to name each file that you submit.

Narrative: Sections I, IV, and V include narrative sections based on specific directions and page limits. Page limits are based on single-spaced text using 12-point type.

Attachments: Section I includes separate attachments. For Section IV, each assessment has a separate file named “Assessment 1,” “Assessment 2,” etc. The document in this file consists of the narrative plus three attachments; these attachments follow the narrative within the document. Each attachment should be no longer than the equivalent of five text pages.

Note: NCATE staff may require institutions to revise reports that do not follow directions on format and page limits. In addition, hyperlinks embedded in report documentation will not be read by reviewers and cannot be used as a means of providing additional information.

How do we prepare the Section I template?

Suggestions for writing the context narrative

This narrative is limited to six pages, not including attachments. See page 3 of the Program Report template for the specific information that should be discussed. It is advisable to begin by completing the Self-Assessment Table provided in Attachment C so that the descriptions/explanations referred to in the Table can be integrated into the narrative. For example, as you describe field and clinical experiences (#5 and #6 from

Attachment C), you should clarify whether the candidates are placed in foreign language classrooms, whether the cooperating teachers are qualified, how diverse sites and teachers are selected, and how the field experiences are assessed.

You will simplify the reviewers' task by using subtitles to organize the required contextual information (e.g., Early Field Experiences, Selection Criteria for Cooperating Teachers). Be advised that the reviewers will expect to find the descriptions/explanations from Attachment C.

Number 1 of the Program Report template (page 3) asks you to describe any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of the ACTFL/NCATE standards. For example, are there any state requirements for K-12 students and/or teachers that may impinge on implementation of the *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* or on the performance of the candidates? If so, explain how the program accommodates differences between the ACTFL/NCATE standards and your state's standards and/or policies.

Number 4 of the Program Report template (page 3) asks you to describe the relationship of your program to your unit's conceptual framework. This framework is typically a document that is created by the College of Education to describe the philosophy and structure of teacher preparation at your institution. In order to describe this relationship, you must be familiar with this framework. Be sure that you have consulted with the appropriate person in charge of teacher preparation at your institution, who may provide assistance in writing this section.

Number 5 of the Program Report template (page 3) asks you to clarify how your key assessments are derived from or are informed by your unit's assessment system. In order to describe this relationship, you must be familiar with this system. Be sure that you have consulted with the appropriate person in charge of teacher preparation at your institution, who may provide assistance in writing this section. In this section, you might mention any unique program assessments such as the OPI and refer back to Attachment C. If your unit's assessment system includes a portfolio, does it require specific artifacts that reflect your candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the foreign language? This would be another way to connect your program's assessment system to that of your unit. Keep in mind that a good assessment system:

- uses the results for individual candidate and program improvement;
- uses quantitative and qualitative measures of teacher candidate performance and should include one or more measures to yield evidence of teacher candidates' effect on K-12 student learning;
- includes one or more measures that have been created, reviewed, and/or scored by foreign language professionals external to the program (e.g., cooperating teachers, supervisors/employers of program candidates/graduates, certified OPI testers);

- includes clearly defined expectations in the form of rubrics or detailed scoring criteria, which reflect performance relative to the *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for Foreign Language Teacher Preparation*;
- familiarizes candidates with program standards and assessment requirements;
- includes assessments that are sufficiently rigorous and comprehensive to enable faculty to make important decisions concerning candidate performance relative to and at critical decision points (e.g., admission to program, granting of certification);
- includes procedures for sampling, analyzing, summarizing, and reporting aggregated/disaggregated results.

Section I requires attachments. The first attachment that you may include is a Program of Study that outlines the courses and experiences required for your candidates to complete the program. Notice that there is no table provided on the template for this attachment, since this information may be an attachment from the college catalog or a student advisement sheet. If you include the program information as an attachment, label it “Program of Study Attachment.”

Attachments A, B, and C are tables that do appear at the end of the Program Review template. For Attachment A, be sure to read the definition of “program completers” provided in footnote #14 of the template. If your Program Report covers more than one foreign language, you should list the number of candidates enrolled in the program and the number of program completers for each language.

For Attachment B, the faculty members referred to are those who participate in judging candidate readiness, or who observe, evaluate, or score information used in judging candidates (e.g., teacher education faculty and faculty in foreign language departments). **Curriculum vitae are not acceptable as evidence and should not be submitted.**

Reporting the Assessments: Preparing Sections II, III, and IV

What is meant by the term “assessment”?

An assessment is a “comprehensive, multifaceted analysis of performance; it must be judgment-based and personal” (Wiggins, 1993:13). An assessment may be based upon a series of smaller or more focused assessments that have been evaluated and scored. The final assessment would be more comprehensive. Often the judgment factor is based upon a rubric or scoring guide that describes the performance in terms of expected results.

How are “assessments” submitted in the ACTFL/NCATE Program Report?

The foreign language profession has a substantial history of assessing performance in terms of language proficiencies so that the direction that NCATE has taken to evaluate programs through the lens of assessment should not be considered revolutionary or novel. The standards with which programs align are statements of performance, and the ACTFL/NCATE standards document contains sample rubrics to help institutions make judgments about how candidates are performing

The seven required assessments for the ACTFL/NCATE Program Report likewise need to be comprehensive and multifaceted so that they are capable of judging how teacher education candidates meet the *Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers*. “Comprehensive” means that an assessment must not be narrow; for example, a test on the sound system to meet ACTFL/NCATE Standard 1.b. (Understanding linguistics) might measure phonology but that alone is not robust enough to infer that candidates “understand linguistics” in a meaningful way. Neither is it necessary to have every element of the standard(s) included in the assessment. A comprehensive assessment may take into account sufficient smaller measures, or the assessment itself may cover more areas (e.g., a project in a capstone course where the candidate demonstrates cultural understandings, interpretive and written proficiencies) and align with several standards.

In order to demonstrate that the assessment meets the requirements of comprehensiveness, multifaceted analysis, and judgment, assessments for ACTFL/NCATE should include:

- A description of the assessment that addresses all its components (e.g., a portfolio should describe the various submissions in it).
- The scoring guide which outlines how judgments are made. The underlying description of the performance (thus the usefulness of a rubric) that best characterizes how teacher education candidates meet the standard.

- Aggregated (summarized) data derived from the assessment that encapsulates how many candidates have performed at unacceptable, acceptable, or target, levels. The data may also be disaggregated (separated to show trends or to focus on one aspect) on occasion so that the program indicates how it is working to assure that more candidates meet acceptable levels of performance. For example, in a department with multiple languages, perhaps data are skewed because one language performs better or worse than another.

Another example: quantitative aggregations might include (1) percentage of candidates passing foreign language state licensure tests, (2) results of oral proficiency tests (OPI, OPIc), (3) results on state induction year examinations, admissions tests, etc. Qualitative aggregations include (1) assessments of teaching performance, (2) projects, (3) lesson plans, (4) teaching reflections, (5) research papers, etc., using rubrics or criteria.

Interpret data means to explain the meaning of the data. The program report should describe what the program faculty have learned and what concerns them about candidate proficiencies, and/or deficiencies, as evidenced by the data collected.

The assessments in the Program Report are limited to seven required and one optional. In order to demonstrate that programs do meet all six ACTFL/NCATE standards, some assessments will probably address multiple standards. This is an additional reason for institutions to create and report on multifaceted, comprehensive assessments.

How much data do we need?

For the most current assessment data requirements, go to <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/guidelinesProcedures.asp?ch=90>.

After September 15, 2009, programs will be expected to have three years of data for each set of assessments. However, faculty may decide to change, adapt, or create new assessments based on their experiences and candidate performance. In these cases, they may not have three years of data available for that assessment when they need to submit their next report. As a rule of thumb, it's better to submit a newly developed assessment that meets the expectations of the program report, than it is to submit a less compelling assessment for which you have several years of data. (Note: assessments still in the "planning stage" are not likely to carry much weight.) However, the reviewers will expect, at a minimum, to see at least one semester of aggregated data for each assessment.

How do we choose our assessments?

It is critical that the language and the education faculty responsible for the preparation of foreign language teachers work together on these sections so that the assessments cover content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions as well as

provide evidence of the impact teacher education candidates have on student (K-12) learning.

Sections II - IV must be done as a cluster because they constitute an interrelated unit. In brief, Section II acts as a “table of contents” for the fuller evidence presented in Section IV. Section II asks you to state the “Type or Form of Assessment.” Section III asks you to designate how each of the assessments aligns with the *ACTFL/NCATE Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers*. Your selection process will be iterative and may need to be adjusted as illustrated in the following scenario:

- Program faculty at University “Gen X” have discussed the topics of the required assessments and have chosen the seven assessments they wish to present in Section IV. As they look at Section III to align them with the standards, they discover that there is no assessment that meets the outcomes required for ACTFL/NCATE Standard 4 (Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction). The faculty would then need to replace an assessment or add an optional eighth to assure that they leave no standard unassessed.

You will only be able to finalize Section II once you have determined the final set of assessments that will comprise Section IV of your report.

How do we prepare the Section II template?

The table for Section II, List of Assessments lists in the first column the 7 required, 1 optional assessment. In column 2 you are to list the “Type or Form of Assessment. If the assessment has a widely understood name (e.g., Oral Proficiency Interview) or is a generally understood procedure (e.g., senior portfolio), that is sufficient. Or, if your institution has designed an assessment, title it with a descriptive phrase (e.g., capstone seminar research project). In column 3, tell when the assessment is administered. Some assessments may occur at several junctures, and it is appropriate to show that you are using them to demonstrate progress or to diagnose weaknesses in your teacher education candidates.

How do we prepare the Section III template?

The 2-column table in Section III, Relationship of Assessment to Standards, asks that you indicate how the assessments you list in Section II and for which you present evidence in Section IV align with the ACTFL/NCATE standards. The first column lists the standards and supporting standards for you. The second column is to be used to check off the ACTFL/NCATE program standards that are addressed by each assessment.

It is your role to look at each of the assessments you are presenting in Section IV and to identify which standards that evidence addresses. If your assessments are comprehensive and multifaceted, many will address more than one standard. Section III serves as a final checklist to see that all standards were addressed, although some may be more fully addressed than others.

How do we prepare the Section IV template?

In Section IV-Evidence for Meeting Standards of the report template, all programs are required to include assessments of the following seven types:

#1 Content Knowledge (Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge)

#2 Content Knowledge (Assessment of content knowledge in the languages to be taught)

#3 Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively **plan** classroom-based instruction)

#4 Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are **applied** effectively in practice)

#5 Effects on Student Learning (Assessment that demonstrates candidate **effects** on student learning)

#6 Content Knowledge (Assessment that demonstrates candidates are orally proficient in the languages to be taught, according to proficiency levels stipulated in Standard 1.a.)

#7 Additional assessment that addresses ACTFL Standards.

#8 Additional assessment (optional) that addresses ACTFL Standards.

Section IV consists of 7-8 separate files, one for each assessment. Each file is labeled "Assessment 1," "Assessment 2," etc., and contains the assessment narrative (maximum of 2 pages), and three attachments (each of which is limited to five pages) that are placed immediately following the narrative within the same document: the assessment tool or description of the assessment, the scoring guide for the assessment, and candidate data derived from the assessment.

Once assessments are selected, program faculty must ensure that there is a close match between the content of the standard(s) and what the assessment purports to measure. Here are some questions to ask when considering this match:

1. Do the same or consistent content topics addressed in the standards appear in the assessments?
2. Do the assessments clearly address the breadth and depth of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in the standards (i.e., in

general, is the preponderance of the content of the standard(s) addressed by the assessment(s) assigned to it?)

3. Do assessments evaluate meaningful cognitive demands and skill requirements reflected in standards at challenging but still reasonable levels for candidates?
4. What do different levels of performance of the assessment look like? How do unacceptable, acceptable, and target level performances differ from each other?
5. Do assessments #4 and #5 demonstrate how the required knowledge, skills, and dispositions are effectively applied within the context of a foreign language classroom?

According to Elliott in “Assessing Education Candidate Performance: A Look at Changing Practices” (May, 2003), there are criteria that assessments should possess in order to use them as means by which to determine the program’s assessment effectiveness:

1. Assessments are appropriate and measure the standards to which they refer. The instrument assesses elements of content, cognitive demands, and skill requirements at different levels for candidates.
2. Assessments are accompanied by descriptive statements of proficiencies that candidates are expected to demonstrate in their responses.
3. Assessments distinguish between different levels of proficiency; scoring procedures are consistent; reviewers are trained so that judgments are discriminating.
4. Assessments are used to reach meaningful program decisions, including identification of candidate needs, candidate progression, and course, program, or unit appropriateness.
5. Assessments include some elements of “authentic” forms of assessment in which candidates are asked to perform tasks that they are likely to face in “real world” situations.
6. Assessments are systematically evaluated to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency, and avoidance of bias.

Specific guidelines for addressing each assessment follow. Program preparers might also want to review Appendix E “Samples of Candidate Performance Evidence Correlated to ACTFL/NCATE Standards” for additional examples of creating and reporting assessments.

Assessment # 1

Licensure Tests or Professional Examinations of Content Knowledge

Consult the directions for preparing Section IV that are provided on page 7 of the Program Report template. Begin the narrative (limited to 2 pages) with a very brief

description of the assessment and its use in the program. Also explain how the assessment is aligned with ACTFL/NCATE standards if that alignment will not be clearly evident in your Attachment A document. Then, present your analysis of the data findings that will be viewed in your Attachment C. Finally, interpret how that data provide evidence of meeting standards.

NCATE is required by the U.S. Department of Education to request data regarding teacher candidates' performance on state licensure tests in the content area. Therefore, programs must provide data that indicate the percentage of candidates who passed the state licensure test in foreign language content (e.g., PRAXIS II test, or a state mandated content test) for at least the last three years. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge.

Questions to consider when preparing to report data include: (1) do data indicate that there is an 80% passage rate of candidates? (2) does the licensure/professional test address all applicable NCATE/ACTFL standards?

Following the narrative text, add Attachment A (a copy of the assessment tool), Attachment B (the scoring guide or rubric used for the assessment/assignment), and Attachment C (candidate data table) as per the template instructions. See Sample Assessment 1 (see Appendix F) for an example. (N.B. The NCATE template may undergo changes so it is important to follow current instructions for submission processes as provided in the template.)

Note that the ACTFL/NCATE Program Report template (pg. 4, footnote #7) indicates that, "If licensure test data is submitted as Assessment #1, the assessment and scoring guide attachments are not required. If the state does not require a licensure test, another content based assessment must be submitted (including the assessment and scoring guide)." Even though Attachments A and B are not required for state licensure exams, you may decide to include them as short narrative descriptions for the benefit of Program Report readers who are not familiar with your state's testing program, which may be quite unique.

For an example of the presentation of evidence for Assessment 1, see Appendix F. The sample is from Oklahoma State University.

Assessment #2

Content Knowledge in the Languages to be Taught

This assessment should include, but is not limited to, the content of Standards 1 and 2. Specifically, assessments should address how candidates demonstrate their mastery of such concepts as: (1) the linguistic elements of the target language, (2) similarities and differences of the target language and other languages, (3) connections among the perspectives of a culture and its practices and products, (4) the recognition of the value

and role literary and cultural texts play in the interpretation of the target culture, and (5) the integration of knowledge of other disciplines and viewpoints accessed through the target language.

For an example of an assessment tool and scoring guidelines suitable for Assessment 2, see Appendix G. The example is from Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Special note on submission of course grades as an indicator of candidate content knowledge: ACTFL is required by NCATE to consider course grades for ONE content knowledge assessment, i.e., Assessment #1 (ONLY if there is no state licensure test), Assessment #2, or Assessment #7 or #8. Course grades may not be used as a substitute for the OPI (in either Assessment #1 or #6).

NCATE has developed very specific guidelines for using and documenting course grades on an assessment of candidate content knowledge. Click on the following link to access these NCATE guidelines:

<http://www.ncate.org/institutions/GuidelinesGrades.asp?ch=90>

Assessment #3

Candidates Can Effectively Plan Classroom-Based Instruction

Assessment #3 is designed to show candidates can plan instruction within the context of a K-12 foreign language classroom. This assessment should include, but is not limited to the content of Standards 3, 4, and 5. Specifically, the assessment should address how candidates demonstrate their ability to plan classroom-based instruction that reflects a variety of instructional practices, engages students in developmentally-appropriate activities rich in target language input and meaningful interaction. Further, when planning classroom-based instruction attention should be given to the integration of the goals and standards of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (1999) within the lesson, and how the standards drive the evaluation, selection, and adaptation of instructional materials. Further, candidates utilize assessment to adjust instruction and assess the extent to which their classroom-based instructional plans are successful.

For an example of the presentation of evidence for Assessment 3, see Appendix H. The sample is from Oklahoma State University.

Assessment #4

Candidates Can Apply Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions Effectively in Practice

This assessment should demonstrate the manner in which candidates effectively put into classroom practice instruction as planned. Although not limited to Standards 3, 4, and 5, the focus in this assessment should be on the application of knowledge, skills and

dispositions related to classroom-based instruction in the context of a foreign language classroom.

It is important to point out that the generic student teaching/internship evaluations (used by all programs in a unit) do not provide direct evidence of meeting specific ACTFL/NCATE standards. Program faculty are encouraged to create a supporting student teaching/internship evaluation that addresses specific criteria that should be demonstrated in a foreign language classroom. Drawing parallels between the generic student teaching/internship evaluation and one specific to the discipline enables reviewers to better understand the degree to which candidates effectively deliver instruction that meets with the expectations of the ACTFL/NCATE standards.

For an example of forms used to collect evidence for Assessment 4, see Appendix I. Sample forms are provided from Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP).

Assessment #5

Candidate Effects on Student Learning

The expectation of Assessment #5 is to demonstrate the candidates' effects on student learning. Specific to this assessment is the assumption that candidates will plan and carry out a teaching task from which performance data can be generated for the purposes of determining the degree to which there is improvement in student learning.

NCATE has recently published a paper on the essential components of an assessment that addresses candidate impact on student learning. This paper (summarized in *Quality Teaching*, Fall 2004, available on the NCATE website) identifies four elements that should be included in an assessment that seeks to identify whether or not the candidate:

- Undertakes a diagnosis (a pre-test) on P-12 student learning in some area he or she will teach;
- Plans an appropriate sequence of instruction to advance P-12 student learning, and teaches in ways that engage P-12 students who bring differing background knowledge and learning needs;
- Conducts some concluding assessment (or post-test); documents the student learning that occurred, or did not; and
- Reflects on changes in teaching that might have improved the results.

There is a very direct measure of candidates' ability to affect K-12 student learning, as well as their ability to assess what they are teaching, and how they measure student achievement. Unit plans created by candidates might include the following categories so that the program can provide evidence for meeting the standard(s):

- lesson objective
- pre-assessment tool
- formative assessment

- feedback provided to students
- summative assessment
- report on student results
- reflection on student results
- lesson modifications for future

For an example of the presentation of evidence for Assessment 5, see Appendix J. The sample is from Oklahoma State University.

Assessment #6

Candidates are Orally Proficient in the Languages to be Taught

As indicated in the Introduction to the Preparation of an ACTFL/NCATE Program Report, regardless of the foreign language taught, the expectation of Standard 1.a. (Demonstrating Language Proficiency) is as indicated in the chart below:

MINIMUM REQUIRED LEVELS OF ORAL PROFICIENCY*	
ADVANCED-LOW	INTERMEDIATE-HIGH
Group I, II, III languages on FSI Scale: French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish	Group IV languages on FSI Scale: Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean
MINIMUM REQUIRED LEVELS OF WRITING PROFICIENCY*	
ADVANCED-LOW	INTERMEDIATE-HIGH
Languages with Roman alphabet: French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish	Languages with non-Roman alphabet: Arabic, Hebrew, Korean, Russian Languages with characters: Chinese, Japanese

Candidates' oral proficiency levels must be verified by a test that is administered by a central testing service, e.g., Language Testing International (LTI). Tests such as the official Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) ensure reliability because the testing center has procedures in place for validating the rating. Acceptable methods include: 1) official face-to-face or telephone OPI interviews arranged through LTI, 2) institutional academic upgrades from advisory OPIs, 3) advanced level check through LTI, 4) OPIc (Oral Proficiency Interview-Computer) for Spanish only at this time.

Programs must report results of candidate exit speaking performance as measured by the OPI. Programs that do not yet have these data should describe their plan for collecting it prior to the next program review.

Note: Although exit oral proficiency ratings may be reported using the OPI, programs are encouraged to assess candidates' oral proficiency at various points in the program (e.g., entry into the program, midway through the program, prior to student teaching) as a form of "prescreening" and to give diagnostic feedback to candidates. This type of testing may be done through procedures which are based on the official OPI but are not administered

by a central testing service that validates the ratings (e.g., SOPI, interviews by faculty trained in the OPI processes)

It is important that when preparing to report data for purposes of oral proficiency assessments, data should be aggregated, perhaps disaggregated, and interpreted so as to demonstrate that the required levels of proficiency are met for each individual language.

The following tables present aggregated and disaggregated data which report the results of oral proficiency assessment of candidates. They serve as examples of data tables for Assessment 6.

Table 1

Results of Oral Proficiency Interviews for 2004-2005
Department of Foreign Languages

All Majors (29)	2	Intermediate Mid
	9	Intermediate High
	13	Advanced Low
	1	Advanced Mid
	2	Advanced High
	1	Superior
	1	Not Ratable

Table 2

Results of Oral Proficiency Interviews by Language for 2004-2005

French Majors (1)	1	Advanced Low
German Majors (6)	5	Advanced Low
	1	Advanced Mid
Spanish Majors (22)	2	Intermediate Mid
	9	Intermediate High
	7	Advanced Low
	0	Advanced Mid
	2	Advanced High
	1	Superior
	1	Not Ratable

Note: If the OPI is used as your state licensure test, present those data for Assessment #1. Use Assessment #6 to present data from other content knowledge assessments, such as those used to assess candidates' knowledge of linguistics, culture, literature, cross-disciplinary connections, etc.

Assessment #7

Additional Assessment that Addresses ACTFL Standards

Program preparers might want to go back to Section 3 at this point and decide whether or not assessments have been created to support each of the required standards. In the event that assessments have been created for each of the required standards, then program preparers might want to use this assessment to address evaluations of professional development experiences, memberships in professional organizations, conference participation, philosophy statements, and case studies.

Examples of assessments include field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Assessment #8

Additional Assessment that Addresses ACTFL Standards

This assessment is optional and should only be included in the event that the institution believes it has some outstanding feature of its program that is not addressed in any of the required assessments.

Reporting the Use of Results: Preparing Section V

How do we prepare the Section V template?

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made (or planned) for the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvements of both candidate performance and the program. **This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning. (Response limited to 3 pages)**

How do we discuss our findings?

In this section of the report, the program faculty are given the opportunity to present their best efforts on how candidate data influence changes in the content of the program, the experiences candidates have as they move through the program, and the overall impact the program has on candidates to perform well in a variety of settings. The description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in or planned for the program as a result. In essence, the program faculty need to show clearly that they are responsive to the assessment data being collected, that careful planning goes into programmatic changes, and that determining the reliability and validity of the assessment data is a major part of the faculty's planning efforts.

It may be helpful to see a rubric used by program reviewers. Report preparers can self assess their submissions according to this rubric.

Rubric for Section V			
	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Principal findings summarized from the evidence	Minimal or no summarization from evidence	Summarization of evidence across most assessments	Summarization of evidence across all assessments
Faculty's interpretation of those findings	Minimal or no faculty interpretation of findings for either candidate or program improvement	Interpretation of data identifies candidate and program strengths and weaknesses	Data interpretation is insightful and leads to action plans to address candidate and program strengths and weaknesses
Changes made or planned for as a	Findings may be discussed but not	Findings are used to develop a plan for	Action plan establishes priorities

result of the interpretation	yet connected to future program improvements	improving the program and candidate learning	or program improvement based upon findings and expectations in the field
Steps taken by program faculty to use assessment information for improvement of program and candidate performance	No steps have been taken by faculty to use assessment information for improvement of program and candidate performance	Faculty have taken steps to use assessment information to improve program and candidate performance	Faculty have made significant progress in using assessment information to improve program and candidate performance

Finally, has the institution answered three basic questions when presenting and analyzing assessments:

- **What is it that the candidates know and are able to do?**
- **How well is the institution doing in helping candidates get to where they need to be?**
- **How can the institution do a better job?**

REFERENCES

- ACTFL performance guidelines for K-12 learners.* (1998). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- ACTFL revised proficiency guidelines—Speaking.* (1999). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- ACTFL revised proficiency guidelines—Writing.* (2001). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- ACTFL provisional program guidelines for foreign language teacher education.* (1988). *Foreign Language Annals* 21, pp. 71-82.
- Byrnes, H. (1998). *Learning foreign and second languages.* New York: Modern Language Association.
- Byrnes, H. (2000). Shaping the discourse of a practice: The role of linguistics and psychology in language teaching. *Modern Language Journal* 84 (4), 472-94.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1-47.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. *Curriculum Inquiry* 15 (4), 361-85.
- Clowse, B. B. (1981). *Brainpower for the Cold War. The sputnik crisis and the National Defense Education Act of 1958.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Coleman, A. (1929). *The teaching of modern foreign languages in the United States.* New York: Macmillan.
- Curtain, H., & Pesola, C. A. B. (1994). *Languages and Children: Making the match.* 2nd ed. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Elliott, E. (2003). *Assessing candidate performance: A look at changing practices.* Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Fantini, A. E. (Ed.). (1997). *New ways in teaching culture.* Arlington, VA.
- Finn, J. D. (1998). Taking foreign languages in high school. *Foreign Language Annals* 31 (3), 287-306.

- Fryer, T.B. (2001). *Four decades of foreign language education*. In C. M. Cherry (Ed.), *The Odyssey Continues. Dimension 2001* (pp.1-14). Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University).
- Gardner, H. (1995). Reflections on multiple intelligences: Myths and messages. *Phi Delta Kappan* 77, 200-202, 206-209.
- Gebel, T.A. & Schrier, L. L. (2002). Spanish teachers' beliefs and practices about reading in a second language. In J. Hammadou Sullivan (Ed.), *Literacy and the second language learner* (pp. 85-109). Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Gilzow, D. F. & Branaman, L. E. (2000) *Lessons learned: Model early foreign language programs*. McHenry: Delta Systems.
- Glisan, E. W. (2001). Reframing teacher education within the context of quality, standards, supply, and demand. In R. Z. Lavine (Ed.), *Beyond the boundaries: Changing contexts in language learning* (pp. 165-200). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Graden, E. C. (1996). How language teachers' beliefs about reading instruction are mediated by their beliefs about students. *Foreign Language Annals* 29, 387-398.
- Hadley, A. O. (2001). *Teaching language in context* 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2002, June). *Model standards for licensing beginning foreign language teachers: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. E. (1999). *Understanding language teaching: Reasoning in action*. Boston: Heinle/ITP.
- Kramsch, C. & O. Kramsch. (2000). The avatars of literature in language study. *Modern Language Journal* 84(4), 553-73.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Liskin-Gasparro, J.E. (1982). *ETS oral proficiency testing manual*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/Non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M.A. Clarke & J. Handscomb (Eds.), *On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching* (pp. 207-255). Washington, DC: TESOL.

- McDiarmid, G. W., Ball, D., & Anderson, C. W. (1989). Why staying one chapter ahead doesn't really work: Subject-specific pedagogy. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), *The knowledge-base for beginning teachers* (pp.193-206). Elmsford NY: Pergamon.
- Met, M. (1999). Making connections. In J. K. Phillips & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices* (pp. 137-164). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2001). *World languages other than English Standards*. Arlington, VA: NBPTS.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *National standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc.
- Oxford, R. L., & Lavine, R. Z. (1992). Teacher-student style wars in the language classroom: Research insights and suggestions. *ADFL Bulletin* 23, 38-45.
- Phillips, J. K., & Terry, R. M. (Eds.). (1999). *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Rhodes, N., & Branaman, L. (1999). *Foreign language instruction in the United States. A National survey of elementary and secondary schools*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co., Inc.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. (2000). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schrier, L. L. (2001) Developing precollegiate foreign language teachers: an overlooked mission of foreign language departments. In E. B. Wells & D. Goldberg (Eds.), *Chairing the foreign language and literature department, Part 2* (pp.71-78) 2nd ed. New York, Modern Language Association.
- Schrier, L. L. (1993). Prospects for the professionalization of foreign language teaching. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp.105-123). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.
- Schrier, L. L., & Everson, M. E. (2000). From the margins to the new millenium: Preparing teachers of critical languages. In D. W. Birckbichler & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Reflecting on the past to shape the future* (pp.125-161). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Shavelson, R., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational Research* 51, 455-98.

Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2005). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction*, 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge-base and teaching: foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review* 57(1), 1-22.

Shulman, L. (1988). Disciplines of inquiry in education. In R. Jager (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp.3-18). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Smith, A. N. (2000). Four decades of *Bonjour*: The story of one teacher's practice. In D. Birckbickler & R.Terry (Eds.), *Reflecting on the past to shape the future* (pp.19- 50). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watzke, J. L. (2002) *Lasting change in foreign language education: A historical case for change in national policy*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

Wiggins, G. (1993). *Assessing student performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Woods, D. (1995). *Teacher cognition in language teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

GLOSSARY

Assessment: A “comprehensive, multifaceted analysis of performance; it must be judgment-based and personal” (Wiggins, 1993, p. 13).

Formative Assessments: Assessment measures of student performance during the course of study, the results of which enable teachers to alter instruction during the course.

Integrated Communication Assessment: A theme-based assessment that features a series of tasks in all three modes of communication that support and build on one another. For example, a student might read an authentic text on the importance of maintaining good health (interpretive communication), interview classmates on their views about good health (interpersonal communication), and create an oral public service announcement with tips on ways to stay healthy (presentational communication). These are also called integrated performance assessments.

Multiple Assessments: An assessment system that describes a student’s ability to use a language through several assessment measures, such as oral interviews, listening comprehension tasks, reading comprehension measures, student work samples, etc.

Performance Assessment: A comprehensive assessment through which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies in subject, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, including their abilities to have positive effects on student learning.

Proficiency-Based Assessment: An assessment of performance of real-life functions, including the degree of accuracy and relevance of linguistic (grammar, vocabulary, syntax) and extralinguistic (including sociolinguistic) elements in a given context.

Summative Assessments: End-of-program assessments, measuring the proficiencies and knowledge that students have acquired over time.

Authentic Materials/Texts: Oral or printed materials/texts that have been produced by and for native speakers of the target culture for non-instructional purposes; e.g., newspapers, magazines, books, television programs, radio broadcasts.

Candidate Performance Data: Information derived from assessments of candidate proficiencies, in areas of teaching and effects on student learning, candidate knowledge, and dispositions. Candidate performance data may be derived from a wide variety of sources, such as projects, essays, or tests demonstrating subject content mastery; employer evaluations; state licensure tests; and mentoring year “portfolios” as well as assessments, projects, reflections, clinical observations, and other evidence of pedagogical and professional teaching proficiencies.

Aggregated Data: Data that are summarized for a group of candidates, thus illustrating how many candidates have performed at unacceptable, acceptable, and

target levels (e.g., a chart that presents the results of rubric scores to illustrate candidates' ability to plan standards-based lessons).

Disaggregated Data: Data that are separated to show trends in candidate performance or to focus on one particular aspect (e.g., OPI ratings separated by language group).

Candidates: Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial or advanced preparation of teachers, teachers continuing their professional development, or other professional school personnel. Candidates are distinguished from students in P-12 schools.

Conceptual Framework: An underlying structure in a professional education unit that gives conceptual meanings through an articulated rationale to the unit's operation, and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and unit accountability.

Content-based Instruction: Uses the content learning objectives from the school curriculum as the vehicle for teaching language skills.

Cross-disciplinary Instruction: The incorporation of other subject areas (e.g., mathematics, art, history) into foreign language instruction.

Culture: The philosophical perspectives, the behavioral practices, and the products — both tangible and intangible — of a society:

Perspectives: the world view of a culture — the attitudes, values, and ideas that characterize a particular society.

Practices: the patterns of behavior accepted within a society such as forms of address, use of personal space, rituals, storytelling, sports, and entertainment.

Products: the concrete cultural elements (e.g., literature, foods, tools, dwellings, and clothing) and abstract cultural elements (e.g., system of laws, education system, and religions) of a society (things created by members of a culture, both tangible and intangible such as books, tools, foods, laws, music, games)

Discourse: Use of either oral or written language in communication that goes beyond the sentence level to paragraphs and conversations.

Discourse Features: Features of language that join and link ideas and sentences together to produce coherent spoken or written texts, such as the use of subject, object, and relative pronouns (“he,” “him,” “who,” “whom”); and adverbial connectors such as “first,” “next,” “in conclusion,” “however.”

Discourse Knowledge: Understanding of the structure, function, and meaning of target language discourse.

Discrete-point Tests: Tests with items that assess a learner's recognition or production of isolated aspects of language (e.g., grammatical forms or vocabulary), that are easily scored, and for which there is a right or wrong answer.

Dispositions: The values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator’s own professional growth. Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice. For example, they might include a belief that all students can learn, a vision of high and challenging standards, or a commitment to a safe and supportive learning environment.

Diversity: Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area.

Elements of Standards. The major components of each standard that are described in the rubrics and explanations that accompany the standards.

Exceptionality. A physical, mental, or emotional condition, including a gifted/talented ability, that requires individualized instruction and/or other educational support or services.

Extralinguistic Support: The use of techniques such as gestures, body language, facial expressions, proxemics, and conventions other than spoken language to facilitate communication.

Feedback: Information provided to learners about their strengths and areas that need improvement following or during a classroom activity or following an assessment. Feedback focuses on both linguistic accuracy and meaning.

FLES: A sequential, articulated program of foreign language in the elementary school.

FLEX: A foreign language exploratory experience, designed to introduce students to one or more languages at the elementary or middle school levels.

Guided Assistance: The help that the teacher provides to learners to enable them to perform tasks that they may not yet have the knowledge or ability to do on their own.

Immersion: Teaching in which all instruction is conducted in the target language.

Initial Teacher Preparation: Programs at the baccalaureate or postbaccalaureate levels that prepare candidates for the first license to teach.

Input: A visual, oral, or printed message in the target language that calls for interpretation or reaction.

INTASC: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) that has developed model performance-based standards and assessments for the licensure of teachers.

Knowledge Base: Empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice.

Language Acquisition: The process of learning language, usually in a subconscious manner as in learning one’s native language. This process is often contrasted to “language learning,” which refers to the conscious focus on knowledge and applying

rules, as in a formal classroom situation. “Language acquisition” is also often used to refer to either the subconscious or conscious process of acquiring or learning a language.

Linguistics: The study of a language system, including its phonology, morphology, semantics, syntax, and discourse features.

Modes of Communication: The three ways in which communication is characterized, emphasizing the context and purpose of communication:

Interpersonal: Individuals exchange information and negotiate meaning orally, whether face-to-face or by telephone, or in writing through personal notes, letters, and E-mail.

Interpretive: A reader or listener is engaged in understanding the meaning of oral, written, or other cultural texts (i.e., film, radio, television, newspapers, magazines, or literature) when the author of these texts is not present and meaning cannot be negotiated.

Presentational: Individuals engage in one-way oral or written communication (i.e., reports, speeches, or articles) that presents information to an audience for interpretation with no possibility of negotiating meaning.

Morphology: The study of how meaningful elements form words.

Nationally Recognized Program: A program that has met the standards of a specialized professional association (i.e., ACTFL) that is a constituent member of NCATE. An institution’s state-approved program also will be considered a *nationally recognized program* if the state program standards have been approved by the appropriate national association.

NBPTS: The National Board for Professional Teacher Standards, an organization of teachers and other educators, which has developed both standards and a system for assessing the performance of experienced teachers seeking national certification.

Negotiation of Meaning: A form of interaction in which individuals work to understand each other and be understood through verbal requests for clarification, comprehension checking, and confirmation checking, such as “Could you repeat that?” “What do you mean by...?”, “So you’re saying...?”

Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI): A live, 20-30 minute telephonic interview between an ACTFL Certified Tester and a candidate, which is recorded by the LTI IVR system. It measures language production holistically by identifying patterns of strength and weakness within the assessment criteria of functions, contexts, and accuracy. [Refer to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines-Speaking (1999), Appendix P.] The official OPI is administered by Language Testing International (LTI), at www.languagetesting.com, a central testing service which has procedures in place for validating the ratings.

Advanced Level Check—Speaking: A truncated version of the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview which consists of a 10-20 minute, live, digitally recorded telephonic interview between the candidate and an ACTFL Certified Rater. The outcome is stated in terms of “Q” (qualified) if the candidate meets or exceeds an

Advanced Low level of speaking proficiency, or “NQ” (not qualified) if the candidate’s speech does not meet criteria for Advanced-Low.

Oral Proficiency Interview-Computer (ACTFL OPIc): An internationally used semi-direct test of spoken fluency designed to elicit a 20-30 minute sample of ratable speech delivered via the internet or telephonically using the VOIP technology. In both methods, the candidate’s spoken responses are digitally recorded and saved by LTI and then rated by ACTFL certified raters. Available for only Spanish candidates at this time.

Phonology: The study of the sound system of a language.

Portfolio: An accumulation of evidence illustrating individual skills, abilities, proficiencies, and performance, especially in relation to explicit standards and rubrics, used in the evaluation of one’s competency as a teacher or in another professional school role. Contents might include end-of-course evaluations and tasks used for instructional or clinical experience purposes such as projects, journals, and observations by faculty, videos, comments by cooperating teachers or internship supervisors, and samples of student work.

Pragmatic Features: Features of language that reflect the intended meaning of language. For example, a question can often imply an indirect command, such as “Don’t you think it’s too cold to have the window open?”

PRAXIS: “Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers,” a set of validated assessments that provides information for use by state education agencies in making licensing decisions. PRAXIS I: Academic Skills Assessments used for entrance into a teacher training program. PRAXIS II: Subject Assessments used for licensure. PRAXIS III: Classroom Performance Assessments used for assessing the first year of teaching.

Proficiency-oriented Instruction: Instruction that focuses on the development of effective communication in all three communicative modes.

Program Report: The report prepared by faculty responsible for a program (e.g., mathematics education, foreign language education) responding to specialized professional association (SPA) standards.

Program: A planned sequence of courses and experiences for preparing P-12 teachers and other professional school personnel. These courses and experiences sometimes lead to a recommendation for a state license or certificate to work in schools.

Realia: Authentic artifacts from the target cultures. See Authentic Materials/Texts.

Rubrics: Written and shared criteria for judging performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated, and that anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment.

SASB: The Specialty Area Studies Board of NCATE.

Semantics: The study of meaning in language at all levels: in words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and extended discourse.

Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview (SOPI): a tape-mediated interview developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics, based upon elicitation and rating procedures of the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). Since this procedure is not administered by a central testing service that validates the ratings, its use is recommended for pre-screening candidates and/or providing diagnostic progress throughout the program, but not for providing official exit oral proficiency ratings.

Skills: The ability to use content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge effectively and readily in diverse teaching settings in a manner that ensures that all students are learning.

Sociolinguistic Features: Features of language that reflect a particular culture or society of language users (e.g., formal and informal address systems, politeness conventions (e.g., honorifics in Japanese).

Sociolinguistic Variation: Variations of the target language influenced by factors such as geography, culture, politics, gender, social class, and level of education.

SPAs: Specialized Professional Associations. The national organizations that represent teachers, professional education faculty, and other school personnel who teach a specific subject matter (e.g., foreign languages), teach students at a specific developmental level (e.g., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g., bilingual education or special education), administer schools (e.g., principals or superintendents), or provide services to students (e.g., school counselors or school psychologists). Many of these associations are constituent members of NCATE and have standards for both students in schools and candidates preparing to work in schools. ACTFL is a SPA of NCATE.

Stakeholders: People, such as students, parents, teachers, and school administrators, who have a variety of vested interests in the quality of student performance, school programs, and assessment.

Students: Children and youth attending P-12 schools, as distinguished from teacher candidates.

Syntax: The relationship of words to one another in constructing grammatically correct sentences that accurately communicate the intended message.

Target Culture: The culture of the people who speak the language being learned, including their perspectives, practices, and products (See Culture above).

Target Language: The language being learned in the classroom.

Task-based Instruction: Instruction that is organized around having students perform realistic, meaningful, and purposeful tasks while using the language being learned.