



PREPARING THE ACTFL/CAEP PROGRAMREPORT

ACTFL Executive Director: Marty Abbott

ACTFL Program Review Coordinator: Judith Shrum, Emerita Virginia Tech

ACTFL Audit Team:

Teresa Bell, Brigham Young University

Rebecca Fox, George Mason University

Dave McAlpine, Emeritus, University of Arkansas-Little Rock

Shawn Morrison, College of Charleston

Pete Swanson, Georgia State University

Edward VanVliet, State University of New York, Geneseo

Preface

This version of guidelines to prepare the ACTFL/CAEP Program Report is built on the foundation provided in the 2007 version, written by Eileen W. Glisan (Indiana University of Pennsylvania), Nadine F. Olson (Oklahoma State University), and June K. Phillips (Weber State University).

Introduction to the Preparation of an ACTFL/CAEP Program Report

What is the relationship between ACTFL and CAEP?

Since 1999, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has been a constituent member of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, formerly the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]). CAEP is a professional accreditor that reviews departments, schools, and colleges that prepare teachers and other educators.

CAEP advances excellence in educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning. CAEP standards, available at <http://caepnet.org/standards/introduction>, incorporate the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) principles as well as National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Members of CAEP include 1) state departments of education; 2) institutions that typically are universities or colleges that prepare teachers, called Educator Preparation Provider (EPPs); and 3) specialized professional associations (SPAs).

Each state determines which CAEP options it will allow EPPs within that state to use. To find a listing of all CAEP state partnerships, as well as the type of partnership each state holds, please refer to CAEP's website at <http://caepnet.org/working-together/state-partners/state-partnership-agreements>.

When an EPP seeks accreditation from CAEP, it prepares a report following one of three pathways outlined by CAEP: Selected Improvement (SI), Inquiry Brief (IB), or Transformation Initiative (TI). This report shows how all of the programs within the EPP address the six CAEP Standards. For more information specifically related to the Accreditation Process for EPPs, see [http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation-resources](http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-resources). Regardless of the pathway chosen by the EPP, its programs must participate in Program Review, choosing one of three possible Program Review options: SPA review, Review with Feedback, or State Review. See <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options> for a description of each of the three options. The only option that leads to National Recognition is the SPA review.

ACTFL has developed a strong and positive role within CAEP. SPAs provide unified standards and alignment of accreditation and licensing across states through their performance-based standards requiring that candidates who graduate from teacher education programs are able to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The program provides this information through a web-based reporting system that is grounded in data-based inquiry and assessment, and reviewed by trained ACTFL/CAEP

program reviewers. To see the reporting system called AIMS (Accreditation Information Management System), please refer to <http://aims.caepnet.org>.

ACTFL Standards were initially approved by CAEP in 2002, and revised standards were approved in 2013. The standards consist of a description of the expected performance, a narrative justification based on current research, rubrics to guide programs in developing assessments to measure tasks that teacher candidates perform to demonstrate their knowledge and skill, and suggested assessments. Please see the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> for full documentation of the standards. Fall 2015 is the last cycle in which programs may use the 2002 ACTFL/NCATE/CAEP Standards for initial reports. All subsequent initial reports will be required to use the 2013 standards. Programs with recognition status of “Nationally Recognized with Conditions” should continue to use the standard they began with until they reach “Nationally Recognized.”

Who should prepare an ACTFL/CAEP 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 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 and assessments 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 (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

*For international programs, where candidates' first language is not English and where candidates are preparing to teach English as a Foreign Language, candidates speak at the proficiency level equivalent to the categories above. For example, candidates whose first language is Spanish speak English at Advanced Low; candidates whose first language is Arabic speak at Intermediate High.

★For Candidates of classical languages, such as Latin: Although there is no OPI for Latin, programs should demonstrate teacher candidate knowledge that addresses the standard. From *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards* (2002), p. 5-6, Standard 1:

“Candidates who teach target languages with a Roman alphabetic writing system, including the classical languages, must demonstrate a minimum writing proficiency level of Advanced-Low. ...” and

“Since the primary goal of teachers of classical languages lies in the interpretation of written texts, no specific speaking and writing proficiency levels are established for candidates who teach these languages. However, teachers of classical languages should be able to ask simple comprehension questions in the target language based on the texts being read. They should also have the ability to write simple sentences in the target language. Candidates teaching classical languages must be able to comprehend and interpret original written works in these languages. Their ability to interpret texts is based on the type of text and the degree to which they are familiar with the content of the text.”

How do we begin this process?

- Review the most current copy of the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* available at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>
- 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 members 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 CAEP Website (<http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/application>) pertaining to the preparation of electronic program reports; become familiar with the format of the ACTFL/CAEP Program Report template at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms>; download program review support information available at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-national-recognition>.
- Read carefully the General Directions provided in the Program Report template. EPPs 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.
- Consult with the person in charge of your institution's campus-wide CAEP review to determine timelines and procedures.
- Where possible, attend workshops conducted by ACTFL and/or CAEP 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/CAEP Program Standards*, and alignment of these standards with other professional standards, see the following document and appendices available at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards Proposal* – Aug. 19, 2013, revised April 2014.
- Download sample reports and assessments from <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>, and from <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>;

What is our next step?

Collect the following source materials:

- Obtain the current course of study required for all candidates in the programs. 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 6-8 key assessments to be used to represent the program in the report. Six assessments are required, and two are optional. All six *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* must be addressed and met in the report.
- Obtain current documents from your program that the following items. These components will need to be in formats that can be inserted easily into the electronic

Program Report template.

- *a description of the assessment documentation and its use*
- *the assessment tool or description of the assignment as given to teacher candidates*
- *the scoring guide or rubrics for the assessment*
- *candidate data derived from two applications of the assessment (this means two times the assessment was given)*
- 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 6 required ACTFL/CAEP 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 CAEP 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 and the SPA agree 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

CAEP 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 CAEP on their website <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>. You can also find exemplary program reports and assessments under “resources” at this site. Consult with the person in charge of your institution's campus-wide CAEP review for instruction on submitting your web-based program report to CAEP.

Who reviews the Program Report?

The completed report is submitted electronically to CAEP. CAEP then sends the report to trained ACTFL reviewers. They determine if the information provided in the report meets the *ACTFL/CAEP 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 CAEP 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 CAEP 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 CAEP 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 there are many of them, OR there are few unmet standards but they are 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*.

After two submissions within the 12- to 14-month period (from the first decision) that were unsuccessful in reaching either *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*, a program would receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized*.

Special note: To receive ACTFL/CAEP National Recognition, programs must meet Standard 1a fully as evidenced by an ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (Assessment 6 or 1). 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 on an official version of the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview for teacher education candidates. 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/CAEP Program Standards* and the program review?

The *PStandards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* are designed to reflect the approach to program review in CAEP'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 the program asks tasks of its teacher candidates to enable the candidates to exhibit the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions as described in the *ACTFL/CAEP 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 evidence of teacher candidate performance contrasts sharply to other kinds of “input” evidence such as syllabi.
- It is the responsibility of all faculty members 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 CAEP 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 CAEP 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://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>. Preparers of the program report must provide the documentation as indicated on the template. Exemplary program reports and assessments are available at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl> and on the ACTFL website at

The program report includes the following sections:

Program Report Cover Sheet

./ All requested information must be provided.

Section I. Context

- ./ General information on the program to help reviewers understand the program
 - State and institutional policies that influence the application of ACTFL/CAEP Standards (*limit 4000 characters*)
 - Description of Field or clinical experiences (*limit 8000 characters*)
 - Candidate & Completers Chart
 - Faculty Chart
- ./ Attachments:
 - A program of study
 - Attachment C: ACTFL/CAEP Program Self-Assessment Table

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

- ./ Six, seven, or eight assessments that address these areas:
 1. Licensure assessment or other content-based assessment required by the state
 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 (*optional*)
 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/CAEP Program Standards*
- ./ See *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* (2013) for recommendation of which assessments to use to address which standards. For example, Assessment 4 (Student Teaching), does not primarily address ACTFL/CAEP Standard 1 (Oral proficiency). Consider the primary nature of each assessment in making these determinations.

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/CAEP standards, analyzes the data findings, and interprets how that data provides evidence for meeting the standards.
- ./ Additional pages to provide assessment documentation (description of the assignment, the assessment tool itself as given to teacher candidates, the scoring guide or rubric for the assessment, and a table showing candidate data derived from the assessment. Do

not use candidate names. Place all of these components in a single file designated for each assessment. Use heading to separate the component parts.

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

- ./ Description of how faculty members 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 CAEP 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 character limits, 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: CAEP 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

The electronic space on the template allows only 4000 characters to answer question 1 (institutional or state factors that influence how the program addresses the ACTFL/CAEP Standards) and 8000 characters to describe the field or clinical experiences. 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/CAEP standards. For example, are there any state requirements for K-12 students and/or teachers that may impinge on implementation of the *ACTFL/CAEP 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/CAEP standards and your state's standards and/or policies. For example, the state may require the ACTFL OPI, but the minimum score the state requires is *Intermediate High*. Programs seeking national recognition must require *Advanced Low*.

Number 5 of the Program Report template (page 3) asks you to provide numbers of candidates for the last three years in terms of enrollees and completers. Be sure to read the definition of “program completers” provided in footnotes under the chart. 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. Keep in mind that these data refer only to the teacher candidates, not the numbers of majors in the language program. Reviewers will expect to see similarity, or explanations for variations, in numbers from this chart to those that appear in the data tables for each assessment.

Number 6 of the Program Report template (page 3) asks you to list the faculty members who are responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration of the program. 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 members and those in foreign language departments). **Curriculum vitae are not acceptable as evidence and should not be submitted.**

You don't need to list all the faculty members in the EPP or in the Foreign Language Department, only those involved with instruction and assessment of teacher candidates. For example, a professor of 20th century Spanish poetry need not be listed unless he or she also supervises student teachers, or teaches the foreign language methods course. In such instances, providing evidence of that faculty member's expertise in teacher education could be included in the section of the chart for scholarship, professional associations, etc. Be certain to read all of the footnotes under the table in number 6 on page 3 of the Program Report.

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.” Do not list the URL for the EPP catalog. Attachments C is a table that you can download from the ACTFL website or from the CAEP website (see above).

Number 7 of the Program Report requires you to submit a special document titled the ACTFL/CAEP Program Self-Assessment Table. **Go to the following URL for a copy of this table. Save it to your computer, fill it out, and then upload it below.**

<http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/AppendixLACTFL-CAEPProgramSelf-AssessmentTable.pdf>.

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

What is meant by the term “assessment”?

Assessment refers to “the act of determining the extent to which the desired results are on the way to being achieved and to what extent they have been achieved.” (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 6). 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.

In some states or EPPs, programs are required to use specific assessments or formats for reporting data. It is the responsibility of the program to show how the tasks required in any assessment enable the

program's teacher candidates to perform in foreign language classrooms in ways that address the expectations set forth in the ACTFL/CAEP Standards. For example, if your EPP or state requires the use of edTPA, the program should mention that in Section I and the narrative of each assessment must show how its candidates' performance addresses the ACTFL/CAEP Standards. ACTFL has prepared a crosswalk for use with the edTPA available at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>.

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

The foreign language profession has a substantial history of assessing performance in terms of language proficiencies so that the direction that CAEP 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/CAEP standards document contains sample rubrics to help institutions make judgments about how candidates are performing.

The six required assessments for the ACTFL/CAEP 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/CAEP Standard 2. Element 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/CAEP should include:

- A description of the assessment that addresses all its components (e.g., a portfolio should describe the various submissions in it) and shows how it aligns with ACTFL/CAEP Standards. Wording should be similar to the standard, e.g. “By analyzing a literary work in its historical, canonical, and cultural context, teacher candidates cite key perspectives of the target culture and connect them to cultural products and practices.”
- The scoring guide or rubric that outlines how judgments are made. A rubric is preferred over a Likert-type scoring guide because the rubric cells contain description of the performance that best characterizes how teacher education candidates meet, approach, or exceed the standard. Programs may use all or part or modifications of the rubrics provided in the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*.
- The actual assessment itself as given to teacher candidates.

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 by language or year/cohort, or separated to show trends or to focus on one aspect 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.

As another example of ways to disaggregate data, 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 members have learned and what concerns them about candidate proficiencies, and/or deficiencies, as evidenced by the data collected.

The Program Report allows six required and two optional assessments. In order to demonstrate that programs do meet all six ACTFL/CAEP 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?

Programs are expected to provide data from two applications of each assessment, that is, data from having given each assessment on two occasions. If the program is writing a Response to Conditions Report, then data are required from only one application of the assessment. Faculty members 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 that 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 aggregated data from one application of each assessment. For a complete explanation of data requirements, see <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/data-requirements>.

How do we choose our assessments?

It is critical that the language and the education faculty members 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/CAEP 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 members at University "Gen X" have discussed the topics of the required assessments and have chosen the six 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/CAEP Standard 6 (Professionalism, Advocacy, and Ethics). The faculty members would then need to design a seventh or an eighth assessment to assure that they leave no standard unassessed.
- Program faculty members have chosen the state required Praxis II test as evidence for the content Standards 1 (Oral Proficiency) and 2 (Cultural/literary/linguistic content knowledge). However, as they re-read Standard 2, and as they look at what evidence of cultural knowledge the state test provides, they decide that they need to strengthen the evidence of their candidates' cultural and literary knowledge. They design a seventh assessment that gives them the necessary strength of evidence.

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.

Section II - Assessments

How do we prepare the Section II template?

The table for Section II, List of Assessments, lists in the first column the 6 required and 2 optional assessments. 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). Use these same titles in your attached files, e.g., Assessment 7 “Literary and Cultural 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.

Section III – Relationship of Assessments to Standards

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/CAEP standards. The first column lists the standards for you. The second column is to be used to check off the *ACTFL/CAEP 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. It is not likely that any single assessment will address more than 3 standards; programs should identify the primary nature of each assessment and align it to the standards it addresses most appropriately. For example, a student teaching evaluation assessment will of course require that teacher candidates use the target language a large percentage of the class time (ACTFL recommends 90%), but a student teaching assessment does not measure oral proficiency as effectively as the ACTFL OPI.

In the description of each assessment, ACTFL has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in CAEP’s unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Section IV - Evidence

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:

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

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

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

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

Assessment 5 Effects on Student Learning (Assessment that demonstrates candidate **effects** on P-12 student learning)

Assessment 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.)

Assessment 7 Additional optional assessment that addresses ACTFL Standards.

Assessment 8 Additional optional assessment that addresses ACTFL Standards.

Section IV consists of 6-8 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 table(s) derived from the assessment.

Once assessments are selected, program faculty members 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 report preparers might also want to review the listings of “Sample Candidate Evidence...” contained in the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers. The following is an example for Standard 2:

Sample Candidate Evidence for ACTFL Standard 2

- ✓ Projects / technology-enhanced presentations on literary or cultural topics
 - ✓ Performance on examinations demonstrating understanding of cultural framework
 - ✓ Capstone projects / research reports addressing cross-disciplinary content
 - ✓ Reports on classroom experiences, describing cultural knowledge/perspectives acquired
 - ✓ Journal entries that illustrate knowledge and understanding of the culture, acquired as a result of interaction with target-language communities
 - ✓ Annotated list of websites that serve as sources of cultural and subject-matter content
 - ✓ Philosophy of teaching statement that addresses the role of culture, literature, and cross-disciplinary content
 - ✓ Lesson plans demonstrating the integration of culture and content from other disciplines into language lessons
 - ✓ Reflections on the benefits of extra-curricular events attended, such as theatre, round-table discussions, etc.
 - ✓ Literary interpretations of a variety of texts
- Dispositions: Annotated listing of investigations to learn about cultural or literary materials, including reference citations and web addresses

According to the CAEP Evidence Guide, the following questions may provide some useful guidance in constructing rubrics:

- What do the performance levels represent?
 - There are three, four or five distinct levels, and they are clearly distinguishable from one another.
 - Levels are constructed in parallel with one another in terms of the attributes and descriptors used.
 - For each level of performance, attributes are described that are related to actual classroom performance; attributes are not simply mechanical counts of particular attributes.
 - Levels represent a developmental sequence in which each successive level is qualitatively different from the prior level.
 - Headings clearly describe which levels are acceptable and which are not acceptable.
 - It is clear which level represents exit proficiency (ready to practice).

A “no data” or “unobserved” category is included

(See p. 24 of the CAEP Evidence guide at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-resources>.)

Since assessments and their rubrics are used to guide teacher candidates in shaping their teaching performance, programs must indicate in their rubrics which ACTFL Standard each row of the rubric is addressing, e.g., “Originality and Quality of Ideas (ACTFL/CAEP Standard 2: cultural products, practices,

perspectives)”.

Assessment 1

Licensure Tests or Professional Examinations of Content Knowledge

Consult the directions for preparing Section IV that are provided on page 5 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/CAEP standards. Limit this part of the narrative to two pages. Then, **within the same document** insert attachments using sub-headings to separate topics (e.g., Attachment A StudentTeachingEvaluation; Attachment B StudentTeachingEvaluationRubric; Attachment C StudentTeachingEvaluationDataTable), include the actual assessment as given to teacher candidates, present your analysis of the data findings, interpret how those data provide evidence of meeting standards, and finally present a data table showing aggregated and disaggregated data for this assessment. Data may be disaggregated by language, year/cohort, or some other characteristic of interest to the program. Components of the assessment must be included with the following exceptions: the assessment tool and scoring guide/rubric are not required for reporting state licensure data, and for some assessments data may not yet be available.

CAEP 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 two applications (administrations) of the assessment. 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. For the proper format for reporting data from Praxis II assessments, see <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/PraxisIIDataforNCATEStandardOne/tabid/457/Default.aspx>.

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 ACTFL/CAEP standards?

For an example of the presentation of evidence for Assessment 1, see Sample Assessment 1 from the University of South Carolina in the sample assessments on the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> or on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>. (N.B. The CAEP template may undergo changes so it is important to follow current instructions for submission processes as provided in the template.)

Note that the ACTFL/CAEP Program Report template (pg. 4) indicates that “(a) the assessment and scoring guide attachments are not required for reporting state licensure data, and (b) for some assessments, data may not yet be available.” Even though the assessment and scoring guide 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.

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 will:

1a) Speak in the interpersonal mode of communication at a minimum level of "Advanced Low" or "Intermediate High" (for Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean) on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) according to the target language being taught; 1b) Interpret oral, printed, and video texts by demonstrating both literal and figurative or symbolic comprehension; 1c) Present oral and written information to audiences of listeners or readers, using language at a minimum level of "Advanced Low" or "Intermediate High" according to the target language being taught; 2a) Demonstrate target cultural understandings and compare cultures through perspectives, products, and practices of those cultures; 2b) Demonstrate understanding of linguistics and the changing nature of language, and compare language systems; 2c) Demonstrate understanding of texts on literary and cultural themes as well as interdisciplinary topics. Note that, for international programs, where candidates' first language is not English and where candidates are preparing to teach English as a Foreign Language, candidates speak at the proficiency level equivalent to the categories above. For example, candidates whose first language is Spanish speak English at "Advanced Low"; candidates whose first language is Arabic speak English at "Intermediate High".

For an example of an assessment tool and scoring guidelines see Assessment 2 Literary Cultural Project from the University of South Carolina on the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> and at the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>.

Special note on submission of course grades as an indicator of candidate content knowledge: ACTFL is required by CAEP 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).

CAEP 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 CAEP guidelines: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/grade-policy>. If a program wishes to use course grades, they should be submitted in the format describe above, and not as part of another assessment.

For post-baccalaureate or Master's degree programs where teacher candidates are accepted having acquired their content knowledge at another institution, the EPP's program is required to present a Transcript Analysis that may be presented as an addendum to Assessment 2, or as Assessment 7 or 8. For the proper format for transcript analysis, please see <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/transcript-analysis>.

Assessment 3

Candidates Can Effectively Plan Classroom-Based Instruction

Assessment 3 is designed to show that candidates can plan instruction within the context of a P-12 foreign language classroom. Key elements of this assessment are:

- 3a) Demonstrate an understanding of key principles of language acquisition and create linguistically and culturally rich learning environments;
- 3b) Demonstrate an understanding of child and adolescent development to create a supportive learning environment for each student;
- 4a) Demonstrate an understanding of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* or their recently refreshed version *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and their state standards and use them as the basis for instructional planning;
- 4b) Integrate the goal areas of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* or their recently refreshed version *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and their state standards in their classroom practice;
- 4c) Use the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* or their recently refreshed

version *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and their state standards to select and integrate authentic texts, use technology, and adapt and create instructional materials for use in communication;

- 5a) Design and use ongoing authentic performance assessments using a variety of assessment models for all learners, including diverse students;
- 5b) Reflect on and analyze the results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, and use data to inform and strengthen subsequent instruction;
- 5c) Interpret and report the results of student performances to all stakeholders in the community, with particular emphasis on building student responsibility for their own learning.

This assessment should address Standards 3, 4, and 5, although it may also address Standard 6. 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* (2006) or the recent version of the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) 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 Sample Assessment 3 from the University of South Carolina in the sample assessments on the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> and on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>.

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. Please see key elements described above in Assessment 3, first paragraph.

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/CAEP standards. Program faculty members 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/CAEP standards.

See examples of presentation of evidence in Sample Assessment 4 from the University of South Carolina, Sample Assessment 4 from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and Sample Assessment 4 from SUNY Fredonia in the sample assessments on the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> and on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>.

Assessment 5

Candidate Effects on Student Learning

The expectation of Assessment 5 is to demonstrate the candidates' effects on student learning. Key elements this assessment should address are: 5a) Design and use ongoing authentic performance assessments using a variety of assessment models for all learners, including diverse students; 5b) Reflect on and analyze the results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, and use data to inform and strengthen subsequent instruction; 5c) Interpret and report the results of student performances to all stakeholders in the community, with particular emphasis on building student responsibility for their own 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.

CAEP identifies essential components that should be included in an assessment that seeks to identify teacher effect on student P-12 student learning. Does the candidate...

- Undertake a diagnosis (a pre-test) on P-12 student learning in some area he or she will teach;
- Plan 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;
- Conduct some concluding assessment (or post-test); documents the student learning that occurred, or did not; and
- Reflect on changes in teaching that might have improved the results?

Essential to addressing ACTFL/CAEP Standard 5 is the use of performance assessments for P-12 student learning. This can be accomplished in Assessment 5 and/or in other assessments. Examples of performance assessments include, but are not limited to, the ACTFL Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA).

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 Sample Assessment 5 from the University of South Carolina in the sample assessments on the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> and on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accrreditation/caep-accrreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>.

Assessment 6

Candidates are Orally Proficient in the Languages to be Taught

As indicated in the Introduction to the Preparation of an ACTFL/CAEP Program Report, regardless of the foreign language taught, the expectation of Standard 1 (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

*For international programs, where candidates' first language is not English and where candidates are preparing to teach English as a Foreign Language, candidates speak at the proficiency level equivalent to the categories above. Ex. Candidates whose first language is Spanish speak English at Advanced Low; candidates whose first language is Arabic speak at Intermediate High.

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

Candidates' oral proficiency levels must be verified by a test that is administered by Language Testing International (LTI). Tests such as the official ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) ensure reliability because the testing center trains and certifies the examiners; conducts "blind" ratings with three examiners; collects, retains, and analyzes the data from the assessment and publishes research to validate the ratings. Acceptable formats for the official OPI include: 1) official face-to-face or telephone OPI interviews arranged through LTI, 2) institutional academic upgrade OPIs scheduled through LTI and conducted by certified examiners who are faculty members at the EPP, 3) OPIc (Oral Proficiency Interview-Computer). For more information see <http://www.language-testing.com>.

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 that 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 members trained in the OPI processes)

It is important that when preparing to report data for purposes of oral proficiency assessments, data should be aggregated, 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 that report the results of oral proficiency assessment of candidates showing aggregated and disaggregated data. They serve as examples of data

tables for Assessment 6.

ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) Data Tables, Assessment 6

Aggregated data: N = 8 (French and Spanish)

Year	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Totals
2012-2013	0	0	0	0
2013-2014	0	1	0	1
2014-2015	2 (2 Superior)	4 (4 Advanced Low)	1 (1 Intermediate High)	7
Totals	2	5	1	8

Disaggregated data by level: N = 8

2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	Totals
Intermediate High	0	0	1	1
Advanced Low	0	1	4	5
Advanced Mid	0	0	0	0
Advanced High	0	0	0	0
Superior	0	0	2	2
Totals	0	1	8	8

Disaggregated data by language: N = 8

2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015

	French	Spanish	Totals
Intermediate High	0	1	1
Advanced Low	1	4	5
Advanced Mid	0	0	0
Advanced High	0	0	0
Superior	1	1	2
Totals	2	5	8

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 Optional 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 Assessment 1, and follow-up studies. For an example of the presentation of evidence for

Assessment 7, see Sample Assessment 7 from Indiana University of Pennsylvania on the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> and on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl>.

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.

For an example of the presentation of evidence for Assessment 8, see Sample Assessment 8 on the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>. The university from which this assessment was drawn has requested anonymity.

Section V - Reporting the Use of Results

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 members have 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).**

See <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-national-recognition>.

How do we discuss our findings?

In this section of the report, the program faculty members 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 members 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
Interpretation of those findings by faculty members	Minimal or no interpretation of findings by faculty members for either candidate or program	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 result of the interpretation	Findings may be discussed but not yet connected to future program improvements	Findings are used to develop a plan for improving the program and candidate learning	Action plan establishes priorities or program improvement based upon findings and expectations in the field
Steps taken by program faculty members to use assessment information for improvement of program and candidate performance	No steps have been taken by faculty members to use assessment information for improvement of program and candidate	Faculty members have taken steps to use assessment information to improve program and candidate performance	Faculty members 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 EPP and its program(s) doing in helping candidates get to where they need to be?**
- **How can the EPP and its program(s) do a better job?**

Section VI – Revised Reports or Response to Conditions Reports

How/when do we prepare Section VI?

Your program will receive a National Recognition Report from ACTFL/CAEP in August if you submitted your report in March or in February if you submitted your report in September. This report will contain comments about the evidence and information the program is receiving from the assessments it conducts with its teacher candidates. It will also report the recognition decision and status of the program's journey toward National Recognition. If the program achieves full National Recognition, no additional reporting is required until the next cycle of the program's EPP report to CAEP. The program should celebrate this accomplishment by using the CAEP and ACTFL logos on its web pages and other materials given to teacher candidates.

If the recognition decision is Further Development Required, the program should submit a Revised Report; either a completely new report or a report using Section VI to describe the changes or additions the program has made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Please note that the cover sheet identifying the program may not populate automatically in AIMS. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the CAEP web site at

<http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-national-recognition>

If the recognition decision was Nationally Recognized with Conditions, the program should understand that this is indeed a form of national recognition, and should strive to make the changes listed in the conditions section of the National Recognition Report. In this section of its Response to Conditions Report, the program should describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original National Recognition Report and provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Please note that the cover sheet identifying the program may not populate automatically in AIMS. In some cases the program may need to submit a new Section II and/or III if the assessments and the standards they address have changed. Thus, programs should complete the cover sheet in order to assist reviewers in identifying the program. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the CAEP web site at

<http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-national-recognition>

REFERENCES

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2012a). *ACTFL performance descriptors for language learners*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-performance-descriptors-language-learners>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2012). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2011a). A decade of foreign language standards: Influence, impact, and future directions. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Task Force of Decade of Standards Project. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/national-standards-2011.pdf>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2011b). A decade of foreign language standards: Influence, impact, and future directions. Survey results. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Task Force on Decade of Standards Project. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/StandardsImpactSurvey_FINAL.pdf
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2011a). A decade of foreign language standards: Influence, impact, and future directions. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Task Force of Decade of Standards Project. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/national-standards-2011.pdf>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2011b). A decade of foreign language standards: Influence, impact, and future directions. Survey results. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Task Force on Decade of Standards Project. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/StandardsImpactSurvey_FINAL.pdf
- 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., & Dahlberg, C. A. (2016). *Languages and learners—Making the match* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- 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.

- 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 Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2011, April). *Model standards for licensing beginning foreign language teachers: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_%28InTASC%29.html
- 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).
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2011, April). *Model standards for licensing beginning foreign language teachers: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_%28InTASC%29.html

- 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 (NBPTS). (2014). *The five core propositions*. Retrieved from <http://www.nbpts.org/five-core-propositions>.
- National Governors Association Centre for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/>
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). (2010). *World languages standards*. Arlington, VA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nbpts.org/>
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (NSFLEP). (2013). ACTFL/CAEP program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (NSFLEP). (2015). *World-Readiness standards for learning languages (W-RSLL)*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- 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, 455-498.
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2016). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction*, 5th ed. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- 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., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- 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 members' 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 post-baccalaureate 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 CAEP. 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 (2012)] 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.

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.

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 members 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 CAEP.

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 CAEP and have standards for both students in schools and candidates preparing to work in schools. ACTFL is a SPA of CAEP.

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.

ACTFL/CAEP Reviewer Worksheet

ACTFL/CAEP Standards [Insert ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards in this column]	A. Do the assessments align with the components of the standard?	B. Do the assessments assess meaningful cognitive demands & skill requirements at challenging levels for candidates?	C. Are the assessments accurate and free from bias?	D. Are the scoring guides clear and the levels of candidate proficiency they guides describe distinct and appropriate??	E. Do the data as reported indicate the extent to which the candidate meets the standard?	F. Is the standard met?
1 Language Proficiency: Interpersonal, Interpretive, & Presentational Assessments cited for this standard:	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	Met Not Met
Comments:						
2 Cultures, Linguistics, Literatures, Concepts from	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	Met Not Met
Comments:						

ACTFL/CAEP Standards [Insert ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards in this column]	A. Do the assessments align with the components of the standard?	B. Do the assessments assess meaningful cognitive demands & skill requirements at challenging levels for candidates?	C. Are the assessments accurate and free from bias?	D. Are the scoring guides clear and the levels of candidate proficiency they guides describe distinct and appropriate??	E. Do the data as reported indicate the extent to which the candidate meets the standard?	F. Is the standard met?
Other Disciplines Assessments cited for this standard:						
3 Language Acquisition Theories and Knowledge of Students and Their Needs Assessments cited for this standard:	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	Met Not Met
	Comments:					

ACTFL/CAEP Standards [Insert ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards in this column]	A. Do the assessments align with the components of the standard?	B. Do the assessments assess meaningful cognitive demands & skill requirements at challenging levels for candidates?	C. Are the assessments accurate and free from bias?	D. Are the scoring guides clear and the levels of candidate proficiency they guides describe distinct and appropriate??	E. Do the data as reported indicate the extent to which the candidate meets the standard?	F. Is the standard met?
4 Integration of Standards into Planning and Instruction Assessments cited for this standard:	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	Met Not Met
	Comments:					
5 Assessment of Languages and Cultures – Impact on Student Learning	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	Met Not Met
	Comments:					

ACTFL/CAEP Standards [Insert ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards in this column]	A. Do the assessments align with the components of the standard?	B. Do the assessments assess meaningful cognitive demands & skill requirements at challenging levels for candidates?	C. Are the assessments accurate and free from bias?	D. Are the scoring guides clear and the levels of candidate proficiency they guides describe distinct and appropriate??	E. Do the data as reported indicate the extent to which the candidate meets the standard?	F. Is the standard met?
Assessment cited for this standard s						
6 Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	U A T	Met Not Met
Assessment cited for this standard s	Comments:					

Notes:

Strengths:

Comment about State Test Results:

Areas for Consideration: (These should be numbered, and start with an action verb. They may become conditions in a subsequent report. If you list them here, they are not yet conditions and the program receives a decision of “not nationally recognized” or “further development required.”)

Comment for Board of Examiners: Section F.2 regarding the expertise of the faculty teaching the methods course or supervising student teacher candidates.

Final Decision:

- ☐ Nationally Recognized
- ☐ Not Nationally Recognized
- ☐ Recognized with Conditions
- ☐ Further Development Required

Comments:

Worksheet for Completing Part C of Program Recognition Report

	Which Assessments Provide Data?	What Standards Are Addressed? Are Standards Met?	What Is Institution Response in Section V?	Based on evidence provided in the report, summarize strengths and areas for improvement under each area.
C.1 Content K				
C.2 Ped/PK/D				
C.3 St Learning				