# ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards

ACTFL
Language Connects

# Table of Contents


**ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards ..... 3**

**Acknowledgments ..... 4**

**Introduction to the *ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards* (2026) ..... 5**

**ACTFL Standards, Components, and Supporting Explanations ..... 6**

**ACTFL STANDARD 1: Language Proficiency ..... 7**

Components and Supporting Explanation for Standard 1 ..... 7

Standard 1.1: Interpersonal Communication ..... 8

Standard 1.2: Interpretive Communication ..... 8

Standard 1.3: Presentational Communication ..... 8

Required Candidate Evidence for ACTFL Standard 1 ..... 8

**ACTFL STANDARD 2: Content Knowledge ..... 9**

Components and Supporting Explanation for Standard 2 ..... 9

Standard 2.1: Cultural Understanding and Comparisons ..... 9

Standard 2.2: Understanding Language Systems ..... 9

Standard 2.3: Literary and Cultural Understanding ..... 10

Sample Candidate Evidence for ACTFL Standard 2 ..... 10

**ACTFL STANDARD 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Knowledge of Students and Their Needs ..... 12**

Components and Supporting Evidence for Standard 3 ..... 12

Standard 3.1: Language Acquisition and Learning Environment ..... 12

Standard 3.2: Learner Development and Supportive Learning Environment ..... 13

Sample Candidate Evidence for ACTFL Standard 3 ..... 14

**ACTFL STANDARD 4: Integration of Standards into Planning and Instruction ..... 16**

Components and Supporting Evidence for Standard 4 ..... 16

Standard 4.1: Understanding and Use of Learner Standards for Planning ..... 16

Standard 4.2: Integration of Learner Standards into Classroom Teaching ..... 17

Sample Candidate Evidence for ACTFL Standard 4 ..... 17

**ACTFL STANDARD 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures — Impact on Student Learning ..... 19**

Components and Supporting Evidence for Standard 5 ..... 19

Standard 5.1: Design and Use Performance Assessments of Communication and Culture ..... 19

Standard 5.2: Analyze Assessment Data ..... 20

Standard 5.3: Communicate Results of Student Performance ..... 20

Sample Candidate Evidence for Standard 5 ..... 20

**ACTFL STANDARD 6: Professional Learning, Advocacy, and Ethics ..... 23**

Components and Supporting Evidence for Standard 6 ..... 23

Standard 6.1 Engage in Professional Learning ..... 23

Standard 6.2 Advocate for Language Learning ..... 24

Standard 6.3 Engage in Ethical Practice ..... 24

Sample Candidate Evidence for ACTFL Standard 6 ..... 24

# ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards

The *ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards* (2026) apply to the initial level of language teacher preparation at all levels. Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) seeking national recognition of their language teacher preparation programs submit full reports to ACTFL or submit reports for continuing recognition if they have achieved national recognition previously.

The following sets of guidelines were used to inform these revisions and updates:

- The *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) describe what language students should know and be able to do, with an emphasis on learning content while learning language. Learners also demonstrate what they know through their performance. These Standards are organized around five goal areas: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparison, and Communities.
- The *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* (2024) describe what learners can do with language in terms of speaking, writing, listening, and reading in real-world situations in a spontaneous and non-rehearsed context.
- The *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements* (2026) assist P–16 learners in identifying and setting language learning goals and charting their progress toward language and intercultural proficiency. The statements assist educators in writing communication learning objectives for curriculum, unit, and lesson plans. They also assist stakeholders in clarifying how well learners can communicate at different stages of their language learning.

# Acknowledgments


## ACTFL/CAEP STANDARDS REVISION TEAM

**Teresa Bell, (Chair)**, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT

**Rebecca Fox**, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

**Christina Huhn**, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA

**Laura Levi Altstaedter**, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

**Shawn Morrison**, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

***Special acknowledgment for feedback on intermediate iterations of the Standards:***

**Krista Chambless**, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL

**Carolyn Shemwell Kaplan**, St. Charles Preparatory School, Columbus, OH

**Pete Swanson**, United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, CO

# Introduction to the *ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards* (2026)

As the demand for highly qualified world language educators continues to grow, clearly defined national standards are essential to guide teacher preparation programs. The preparation of world language teachers is a shared and essential responsibility of both language and education faculty. The *ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards* serve as a national benchmark for high-quality teacher education, outlining the critical knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates must develop to support student learning and communication in another language effectively. Programs that have earned national recognition from ACTFL exemplify these standards in practice, demonstrating a strong commitment to excellence in teacher preparation. These exemplary programs consistently provide experiences that reflect the eight key components described below — elements that define the foundation of effective world language teacher education.

1. The development of teacher candidates' language proficiency in all areas of communication, with special emphasis on developing spoken or signed proficiency, in all language courses. Upper-level courses should also be taught in the language.

2. An ongoing assessment of candidates' spoken or signed proficiency and provision of diagnostic feedback to candidates regarding their progress in meeting minimum required levels of proficiency. Programs should consider the development of a Proficiency Support Plan for candidates who do not reach Advanced-Low.

3. Language, linguistics, cultures, and literature components.

4. A course in principles and practices of language teaching (methods) that deals specifically with the teaching of languages and that is taught by a qualified faculty member whose expertise is language education and who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues.

5. Field experiences in language classrooms prior to student teaching.

6. Field experiences, including student teaching, that are supervised by a qualified language educator who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues in the field of language education.

7. Opportunities for candidates to experience technology-enhanced instruction, to use technology and integrate it effectively in their own teaching and demonstrate how to teach in online and remote environments.

8. Opportunities for candidates to participate in a structured study abroad program and/or in an intensive immersion experience in a language community.

# ACTFL Standards, Components, and Supporting Explanations

The *ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards* (2026) apply to all undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare candidates to teach in P–12 settings. There are six *ACTFL Teacher Preparation Standards* made up of 17 components. These Standards are written for language teacher preparation programs and represent competencies that are expected of candidates who have completed a teaching licensure program and are prepared to begin teaching.

The following provides the full text of each standard title, statement, component statement, and supporting explanations for each component.

# ACTFL STANDARD 1: Language Proficiency

**Possess both a high level of proficiency in the language(s) they will teach and the ability to communicate effectively in interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational contexts.**

Candidates demonstrate interpersonal communication proficiency at a minimum level of Advanced-Low (or Intermediate-High for Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean), as evidenced by an ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), Oral Proficiency Interview–Computer (OPIc), or an equivalent nationally recognized assessment for the language of instruction.

Candidates comprehend and interpret spoken or signed, printed, multimedia, and video texts by identifying the main idea(s) and supporting details, inferring and interpreting the author's intent and cultural perspectives, and offering a personal interpretation of the text. Candidates present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers with language proficiency characteristic of a minimum level, as described above.

Candidates engage in both interpersonal and presentational writing, which refer to both spontaneous and reflective writing: (1) Spontaneous writing does not incorporate sufficient time for revision, rewriting, or clarification and elaboration, and (2) reflective writing allows the writer the time to better plan and organize the written product through a writing process that includes rereading, revising, and rewriting.

## COMPONENTS AND SUPPORTING EXPLANATION FOR STANDARD 1

***Be able to communicate successfully in the three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) in the language they intend to teach.***

The heart of language instruction is the ability to teach students to communicate, which can be possible only if teachers themselves exemplify effective communication skills. Reinforcing the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) is the expectation that teachers will provide effective spoken or signed and written input in the classroom.

All candidates seek opportunities to develop and strengthen their language proficiency outside of the classroom. For example, they interact with language speakers in the community, access language materials via technology, and take advantage of study abroad/immersion opportunities.

## STANDARD 1.1: INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

**Demonstrate interpersonal communication proficiency at a minimum level of Advanced-Low (or Intermediate-High for Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean), as evidenced by an ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), Oral Proficiency Interview–Computer (OPIc), or an equivalent nationally recognized assessment for the language of instruction.**

For *interpersonal* speaking (i.e., two-way interactive communication), candidates demonstrate a minimum level of proficiency described by the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines — Speaking* (2024). The expected minimum level of proficiency for teacher candidates is set to ensure that they can conduct their classes in the language and have the requisite degree of fluency and spontaneity to respond to student questions, provide explanations, and negotiate meaning of cultural and interdisciplinary content.

## STANDARD 1.2: INTERPRETIVE COMMUNICATION

**Interpret spoken or signed, printed, and video texts by demonstrating both literal and figurative or symbolic comprehension.**

For *interpretive* communication (e.g., reading, viewing, listening), candidates comprehend and interpret spoken or signed messages (e.g., face-to-face and telephone conversations, news broadcasts, narratives and descriptions in various time frames, speeches, and debates) and written messages (e.g., correspondence, newspaper and magazine articles, narratives and descriptions, and literary selections representing various genres). In *interpretive* communication, the level of detail of the comprehension is contingent on the candidate's familiarity with the topic of the text. All candidates, regardless of the language they teach, should be able to identify the main idea(s) and supporting details of the message, infer meaning of unfamiliar words in new contexts, infer and interpret the author's intent, identify some of the author's perspectives and some cultural perspectives, and offer a personal interpretation of the message they heard or viewed.

## STANDARD 1.3: PRESENTATIONAL COMMUNICATION

**Present spoken or signed and written information to audiences of listeners or readers, using language with proficiency characteristic of a minimum level as described above.**

All candidates, regardless of the language they teach, present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience using spoken or signed language. They know their audience and adjust their presentation accordingly. Candidates deliver spoken or signed presentations that may be pre-planned, but in which they present extemporaneously, referring to notes as needed rather than reading them verbatim. They use connected discourse that incorporates various time frames, vocabulary specific to the context of the presentation, and extralinguistic support as necessary to make the message clear to the audience (e.g., visuals). Presentations may consist of literary and cultural topics, and topics of personal interest to the presenter.

### REQUIRED CANDIDATE EVIDENCE FOR ACTFL STANDARD 1

Candidates demonstrate an official ACTFL Oral Proficiency rating of Advanced-Low or Intermediate-High in the language, as appropriate, through either the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), the Oral Proficiency Interview–Computer (OPIc), or an equivalent nationally recognized assessment for the language of instruction.

# ACTFL STANDARD 2: Content Knowledge

**Demonstrate understanding of the multiple content areas that comprise the field of language studies.**

Candidates demonstrate understanding of the interrelatedness of perspectives, products, and practices in the cultures; know the structural elements of the language system; read and analyze literary works representative of the cultures; and recognize the changing nature of language and the distinct viewpoints accessible to them only through the language.

### COMPONENTS AND SUPPORTING EXPLANATION FOR STANDARD 2

Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the interrelatedness in a culture of the perspectives, products, and practices that comprise the cultural framework presented in the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) or the 5 Cs. They know and interpret literary and cultural texts from various language cultures as well as the linguistic systems of the language. They use their knowledge of the language to learn about other disciplines.

## STANDARD 2.1: CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING AND COMPARISONS

**Culture Understanding — Demonstrate understanding of cultures and compare these cultures through products, practices, and perspectives of those cultures.**

Cultural competence may include understanding daily living patterns and societal structures, geography, history, religious and political systems, literature, fine arts, media, and authentic cultural products. In-depth study of culture requires candidates to investigate and hypothesize about the dynamic dimensions of culture and language that would foster successful interaction with communities of L1 speakers.

## STANDARD 2.2: UNDERSTANDING LANGUAGE SYSTEMS

**Demonstrate understanding of language systems and the changing nature of language.**

Candidates understand and can compare language systems and their changing natures. They understand and can identify the sociolinguistic features of the language; that is, ways in which language discourse can be tailored for a particular person or cultural or social context.

## STANDARD 2.3: LITERARY AND CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

**Demonstrate understanding of texts about literary and cultural themes, as well as interdisciplinary topics.**

Candidates identify, analyze, interpret, and synthesize the contributions of major writers, thinkers, artists, and cultural icons, the roles they play, and references made to them in the culture. Candidates compare literary and cultural traditions in the culture with those of other cultures.

### SAMPLE CANDIDATE EVIDENCE FOR ACTFL STANDARD 2

- Projects about literary or cultural topics
- Projects focused on language systems
- Projects focused on the changing nature of language systems
- Performance on examinations demonstrating understanding of cultural framework
- Capstone projects or research reports addressing cross-disciplinary content
- Journal entries that illustrate knowledge and understanding of the culture acquired because of interaction with language communities
- Annotated list of websites that serve as sources of cultural and subject-matter content
- Literary interpretations of a variety of texts (poetry, short stories, novels, etc.)

## Rubric for Standard 2

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cultural knowledge** | Candidates **consistently** cite key perspectives of the culture and connect them to cultural products and practices using the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015). | Candidates **adequately** cite key perspectives of the culture and connect them to cultural products and practices using the World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (2015). | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** cite key perspectives of the culture and/or inconsistently connect them to cultural products and practices using the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015). | Candidates **do not** cite key perspectives of the culture or connect them to cultural products and practices. |
| **Language systems and sociolinguistic knowledge** | Candidates **consistently** explain language systems and sociolinguistic features (e.g., politeness, formal/informal address) of the language. | Candidates **adequately** explain language systems and sociolinguistic features (e.g., politeness, formal/informal address) of the language. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** explain language systems and sociolinguistic features (e.g., politeness, formal/informal address) of the language. | Candidates **do not** explain language systems and sociolinguistic features (e.g., politeness, formal/informal address) of the language. |
| **Changing nature of language** | Candidates **consistently** describe changes over time in the language. | Candidates **adequately** describe changes over time in the language. | Candidates **partially** describe changes over time in the language. | Candidates **do not** describe changes over time in the language. |
| **Knowledge of literary and cultural texts** | Candidates **consistently** interpret and synthesize ideas and critical issues from literary and other cultural texts and/or artifacts that represent historical and contemporary works. | Candidates **adequately** interpret and synthesize ideas and critical issues from literary and other cultural texts and/or artifacts that represent historical and contemporary works. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** interpret ideas and critical issues from literary and other cultural texts and/or artifacts, but their analysis may be limited, incomplete, or lack synthesis across texts or cultural contexts. | Candidates **do not** interpret ideas and critical issues from literary and other cultural texts and/or artifacts that represent historical and contemporary works. |

# ACTFL STANDARD 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Knowledge of Students and Their Needs

**Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the principles of language acquisition and use this knowledge to create linguistically and culturally rich learning environments.**

Candidates demonstrate an understanding of child and adolescent development; the context of instruction; and their students' backgrounds, skills, and learning profiles to create a supportive learning environment that meets individual students' needs.

### COMPONENTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 3

Candidates develop their knowledge and application of language acquisition theories for the language classroom.

## STANDARD 3.1: LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

**Demonstrate an understanding of key principles of language acquisition and create linguistically and culturally rich learning environments.**

Candidates understand how language acquisition occurs at various developmental levels within and outside of the formal classroom setting. They use the language in the classroom at least 90% of the time, provide meaningful language input, and assist students in understanding this input. Candidates create content-based lessons that integrate language, culture, and student interests on topics drawn from a variety of subject areas. Candidates guide students in learning how to negotiate meaning; take risks with the language to express meaningful thoughts and ideas; and fulfill a variety of communicative interactions with one another, with the teacher, and with L1 speakers. In the role of facilitator, their feedback to students focuses on linguistic accuracy and on the meaning of the message, and encouragement and affirmation of their students' progress in the language, while recognizing that errors occur as part of the language acquisition process.

## STANDARD 3.2: LEARNER DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

**Demonstrate an understanding of child and adolescent development to create a supportive learning environment for each student.**

Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the physical, cognitive, emotional, and social development of P–12 students at all levels of instruction. They understand the important effects of language acquisition theories and learner development on instructional planning, practice, and assessment. They understand the relationship of a variety of well-articulated, sequential, and developmentally appropriate language outcomes and language program models. They demonstrate the ability to adapt language instruction to address students' multiple ways of learning and meet their special needs by means of a range of learning opportunities for learners of various ages, developmental and linguistic levels, language backgrounds, and learning styles. Candidates seek out information about their students' needs from a variety of school personnel and family members to adapt instruction accordingly.

Candidates use a variety of instructional strategies to engage students in critical thinking and problem-solving, valuing the role of inquiry and collaboration in the classroom. They maximize learning and interaction using paired, small, and large group activities. Candidates use questioning techniques, corrective feedback, and task-based instruction when appropriate to attain the goals of instruction in their language classroom.

## SAMPLE CANDIDATE EVIDENCE FOR ACTFL STANDARD 3

- Performance on assessments demonstrating understanding of language acquisition
- Reflections on classroom observations and/or case study reports that include discussion of theory and practice
- Reflections on lesson plans that illustrate teaching practices based on language acquisition theories
- Analysis of teaching performance over time that addresses progress made in providing language input, using negotiation of meaning, engaging students in interactions, serving as facilitator in the classroom, providing feedback that focuses on meaning and accuracy, and taking risks in using the language
- Lesson plans and reflections on lessons that illustrate modifications to meet specific learner needs, address multiple ways of learning, promote cultural thinking and problem-solving, and engage students in pair and group activities
- Written analysis of the context of instruction that addresses such things as the features of the community, school, and classroom settings that have an impact on student learning outcomes, curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Investigation and written analysis of the language backgrounds, learning goals, characteristics, and needs of individual students and groups of students
- Written analysis and reflections on formative and summative assessments in which the candidate describes expected outcomes and explains differentiated assessment options that address these outcomes
- Self-evaluations and reflections on recorded lessons in which candidates indicate their willingness to differentiate instruction to support a learner-centered classroom
- Reflection journal in which candidates describe how they seek out opportunities to learn about their students, their backgrounds, and their needs and how they work with students, parents, colleagues, and others to address the special needs of their students

## Rubric for Standard 3

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Language acquisition theories** | Candidates **consistently** apply language acquisition theories to instructional practice, using a wide variety of strategies to meet the needs of all P–12 students. | Candidates **adequately** apply language acquisition theories to instructional practice, using a wide variety of strategies to meet the needs of all P–12 students. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** demonstrate partial understanding of language acquisition theories but apply them inconsistently in instructional practice. | Candidates **do not** apply language acquisition theories to instructional practice. |
| **Language input** | Candidates **consistently** teach in the language at all levels of instruction. They use a variety of strategies to help students of varying proficiency levels understand input in the language. | Candidates **adequately** teach in the language at all levels of instruction. They use a variety of strategies to help students of varying proficiency levels understand input in the language. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** sometimes teach in the language but do not consistently maintain language use or provide sufficient strategies to support student comprehension. | Candidates **do not** teach in the language at all levels of instruction. |
| **Opportunities for meaningful language use in the classroom** | Candidates **consistently** design engaging activities that promote meaningful interaction and negotiation of meaning in the language. | Candidates **adequately** design engaging activities that promote meaningful interaction and negotiation of meaning in the language. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design some activities that encourage interaction, but opportunities for meaningful communication and negotiation of meaning are limited or inconsistent. | Candidates **do not** consistently design engaging activities that promote meaningful interaction and negotiation of meaning in the language. |
| **Theories of learner development and instruction** | Candidates **consistently** plan for instruction according to the physical, cognitive, emotional, social, and developmental needs of their P–12 students. | Candidates **adequately** plan for instruction according to the physical, cognitive, emotional, social, and developmental needs of their P–12 students. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** show emerging awareness of student developmental needs but inconsistently incorporate these considerations into instructional planning. | Candidates **do not** consistently plan for instruction according to the physical, cognitive, emotional, social, and developmental needs of their P–12 students. |

# ACTFL STANDARD 4: Integration of Standards into Planning and Instruction

**Understand and use the national *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and their state/local standards to make instructional decisions.**

Candidates demonstrate an understanding of these standards and integrate them into their curricular planning. They design instructional practices and classroom experiences that address these standards. Candidates use the principles embedded in the standards to select and integrate authentic materials and technology and adapt and create materials to support communication in their classrooms.

**COMPONENTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 4**

Candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the five goal areas (Communication, Cultures, Comparisons, Connections, Communities) and supporting standards.

## STANDARD 4.1: UNDERSTANDING AND USE OF LEARNER STANDARDS FOR PLANNING

**Demonstrate an understanding of the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and their state/local standards and use them as a basis for their instructional planning.**

Candidates use their knowledge of the W*orld-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and of their state/local standards to make instructional decisions.

## STANDARD 4.2: INTEGRATION OF LEARNER STANDARDS INTO CLASSROOM TEACHING

**Integrate the goal areas of the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and their state/local standards into their classroom practice, select and integrate authentic texts, and adapt and create instructional materials for communication.**

Candidates have a strong understanding of all five goal areas and the supporting Standards (e.g., three modes of communication; products, practices, and perspectives) and use these Standards to inform their instructional practice.

Candidates use the organizing principles of the Standards as they evaluate, select, and create instructional materials. Candidates evaluate, select, and create instructional materials using textbooks, visuals, and authentic materials, including multimedia. Candidates adapt textbooks and other resources to align them with standards-based practices. They devote the effort necessary to locate and adapt effective resources and materials and design their own.

### SAMPLE CANDIDATE EVIDENCE FOR ACTFL STANDARD 4

- Unit and lesson plans with reflections that illustrate integration of Standards into teaching and samples of P–12 student work
- Written rationales for the selection of materials used in lessons
- Journal entries that describe how the candidate uses technology to integrate the Standards into instruction and their effect on student learning
- Written critiques of instructional resources, such as textbooks, websites, and video segments
- Instructional materials created or adapted by the candidate with a description of how and why materials are used or adapted, and for which learning outcomes

### Rubric for Standard 4

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Integration of the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) into planning and instruction** | Candidates **consistently** integrate the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and state/local standards into their planning and instruction. | Candidates **adequately** integrate the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and state/local standards into their planning and instruction. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** integrate the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and state/local standards into their planning and instruction. | Candidates **do not** integrate the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) and state/local standards into their planning or instruction. |

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Integration of three modes of communication** | Candidates **consistently** design instruction that focuses on the three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) as the basis for actively engaging learners in communication. | Candidates **adequately** design instruction that focuses on the three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) as the basis for actively engaging learners in communication. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design instruction that focuses on the three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) as the basis for actively engaging learners in communication. | Candidates **do not** design instruction that focuses on the three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) as the basis for actively engaging learners in communication. |
| **Integration of cultural products, practices, and perspectives** | Candidates **consistently** design instruction that incorporates cultural products, practices, and perspectives of the culture as the basis for engaging learners in cultural exploration and comparisons. | Candidates **adequately** design instruction that incorporates cultural products, practices, and perspectives of the culture as the basis for engaging learners in cultural exploration and comparisons. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design instruction that incorporates cultural products, practices, and perspectives of the culture as the basis for engaging learners in cultural exploration and comparisons. | Candidates **do not** design instruction that incorporates cultural products, practices, and perspectives of the culture as the basis for engaging learners in cultural exploration and comparisons. |
| **Connections to other subject areas** | Candidates **consistently** design opportunities for students to learn about other subject areas in the language. | Candidates **adequately** design opportunities for students to learn about other subject areas in the language. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design opportunities for students to learn about other subject areas in the language. | Candidates **do not** design opportunities for students to learn about other subject areas in the language. |
| **Interaction with language communities** | Candidates **consistently** design opportunities for students to interact with members of language communities through a variety of means. | Candidates **adequately** design opportunities for students to interact with members of language communities. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design opportunities for students to interact with members of language communities. | Candidates **do not** design opportunities for students to interact with members of language communities. |
| **Selection and integration of authentic materials** | Candidates **consistently** select and integrate authentic materials into planning and instruction. | Candidates **adequately** select and integrate authentic materials into planning and instruction. | Candidates partially or inconsistently select and integrate authentic materials into planning and instruction. | Candidates **do not** select and integrate authentic materials into planning and instruction. |
| **Adaptation and creation of materials** | Candidates **consistently** adapt materials as necessary to reflect standards-based instruction when materials fall short. | Candidates **adequately** adapt materials as necessary to reflect standards-based instruction when materials fall short. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** adapt materials to reflect standards-based instruction when materials fall short. | Candidates **do not** adapt materials to reflect standards-based instruction. |

# ACTFL STANDARD 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures — Impact on Student Learning

**In language teacher preparation programs, design ongoing assessments using a variety of assessment models to show evidence of P–12 students' ability to communicate in the instructed language in interpersonal, interpretive, and presentation modes.**

These assessments also allow P–12 students to demonstrate understanding of cultural and literary products, practices, and perspectives of the instructed language, and compare these to their own. Candidates reflect on results of assessments, adjust instruction, and communicate results to stakeholders.

### COMPONENTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 5

Candidates use multiple formative and summative measures unique to language assessment to gauge student progress in communicative and cultural competencies. Teacher candidates provide opportunities for **all** learners to demonstrate what they know and can do with the language.

Candidates use student data to inform instructional decisions.

Candidates are familiar with a variety of performance guidelines, including The *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines: Speaking, Writing, Listening, and Reading* (2024); the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015); and the *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements for Intercultural Communication* (2017).

## STANDARD 5.1: DESIGN AND USE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS OF COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE

**Design and use ongoing performance assessments using a variety of assessment models for all learners.**

Before instruction begins, candidates plan authentic assessments as part of designing instruction, and they inform students of how performance will be assessed. Performance assessments show the level at which students consistently communicate in meaningful interactions, including appropriate cultural behaviors and knowledge of specific contexts and/or topics. An example of measuring student performance in inte-

grated contexts might be the use of Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs), a model that features a series of tasks built around a theme.

Assessment of *interpersonal* communication measures students' ability to negotiate meaning in the language through unscripted interactions that are culturally appropriate.

Assessment of *interpretive* communication (e.g., reading, viewing, listening) examines how students, as listeners, viewers, or readers, derive meaning from authentic texts, both literary and informational, measuring what is understood and what is inferred from meaningful contexts.

Assessment of *presentational* communication, which is planned speaking or writing, measures the end product of the student's work using holistic and/or analytic ratings.

## STANDARD 5.2: ANALYZE ASSESSMENT DATA

**Reflect on and analyze the results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, and use data to inform and strengthen subsequent instruction.**

Candidates assess how students use language in culturally appropriate ways as they learn about the perspectives, practices, and products of the cultures and make comparisons to their own cultures. Candidates systematically reflect on student performance data to inform and adapt their instruction, determining where student strengths lie, alternative instructional strategies are necessary, skills or knowledge should be reinforced, and additional practice is needed.

## STANDARD 5.3: COMMUNICATE RESULTS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

**Communicate the results of student performance to all stakeholders with emphasis on building student responsibility for their own learning.**

Candidates communicate their P–12 students' progress to stakeholders. Candidates help P–12 students identify strategies that support their growing knowledge and expanded proficiency in the language and cultures.

### SAMPLE CANDIDATE EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 5

Formative and summative P–12 assessments and rubrics across the communicative modes and cultural framework

- Analyses of student performance on assessment tasks, together with rubrics and assessment results
- Samples and analyses of integrated performance assessments
- Reports of how assessment results were used to improve subsequent instruction
- Summaries, journal entries, and/or case studies describing parent-teacher conferences and/or how student progress was reported

## Rubric for Standard 5

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Plan for assessment** | Candidates **consistently** design authentic performance assessments that are clearly aligned with student learning outcomes, reflect a variety of models, and are designed to meet the needs of all learners. | Candidates **adequately** design authentic performance assessments that are mostly aligned with student learning outcomes, mostly reflect a variety of models, and mostly meet the needs of all learners. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design assessments that are partially aligned with learning outcomes, but tasks may rely on limited models or do not fully address the needs of all learners. | Candidates **do not** plan authentic performance assessments, relying solely on traditional assessments that may only minimally meet the needs of all learners. |
| **Formative and summative assessments** | Candidates **consistently** design a clear system of formative and summative assessments that capture ongoing student learning and proficiency development. | Candidates **adequately** design formative and summative assessments that capture ongoing student learning and proficiency development. | Candidates partially or inconsistently demonstrate some understanding of formative and summative assessment but apply them inconsistently or rely primarily on one type of assessment. | Candidates may recognize the purposes of formative and summative assessments but **do not** apply them consistently in their assessment designs. |
| **Interpersonal communication** | Candidates **consistently** design and use performance assessments that measure students' abilities to negotiate meaning as listeners/speakers and as readers/writers in an interactive mode in the language in a culturally appropriate way. | Candidates **adequately** demonstrate that they can design and use performance assessments that measure students' abilities to negotiate meaning as listeners/speakers and as readers/writers in an interactive mode in the language in a culturally appropriate way. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design or use interpersonal assessments inconsistently and provide limited opportunities for students to negotiate meaning in interactive communication. | Candidates **minimally or do not** design and/or use interpersonal assessment measures. |
| **Interpretive communication (e.g.,** reading, viewing, listening) | Candidates **consistently** design and use assessment procedures that encourage students to interpret spoken or signed, audiovisual, and printed texts. | Candidates **adequately** demonstrate that they can design and use assessment procedures that encourage students to interpret spoken or signed, audiovisual, and printed texts. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design interpretive assessments, but tasks may focus primarily on literal comprehension or lack authentic or varied texts. | Candidates **minimally or do not** design and use assessment procedures that encourage students to interpret spoken or signed, audiovisual, and printed texts. |

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Presentational communication** | Candidates **consistently** design and use performance assessments that measure students' abilities to clearly convey their message in the language in a culturally appropriate way to an audience. | Candidates **adequately** demonstrate that they can design and use assessments that measure students' abilities to clearly convey their message in the language in a culturally appropriate way to an audience. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design presentational assessments, but tasks may lack clear communicative purpose, audience, or cultural appropriateness. | Candidates **minimally or do not** design and use performance assessments that measure students' abilities to clearly convey their message in the language in a culturally appropriate way to an audience. |
| **Cultural products, practices, and perspectives** | Candidates **consistently** create and use assessments that allow students to demonstrate that they can identify, analyze, and compare products, practices, and perspectives of the culture and their own. | Candidates **adequately** can create assessments that allow students to demonstrate that they can identify, analyze, and compare products, practices, and perspectives of the culture and their own. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** design assessments that address cultural products, practices, or perspectives, but tasks may focus on identification rather than analysis or comparison. | Candidates **do not** create assessments that allow students to demonstrate that they can identify, analyze, and compare the products, practices, and perspectives. |
| **Reflection on results and adjustment of instruction** | Candidates **consistently** reflect upon and use assessment results to improve teaching and learning for both whole group and individual students. Reflection thoroughly describes how they have adjusted instruction. | Candidates **adequately** demonstrate that they can reflect upon and use assessment results to improve teaching and learning. Reflection describes how they have adjusted instruction. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** reflect on assessment results but provide limited explanation of how instruction will be adjusted to support student learning. | Candidates **do not or minimally** reflect upon assessment results and do not describe how they have adjusted instruction. |
| **Communication with stakeholders** | Candidates **consistently** communicate student progress to stakeholders. | Candidates **adequately** demonstrate that they can communicate student progress to stakeholders. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** communicate student progress inconsistently or provide limited information about student learning to stakeholders. | Candidates **do not** communicate student progress to stakeholders. |
| **Communication with students** | Candidates **consistently** communicate assessment results to students and help them identify ways of improving their own proficiency. | Candidates **adequately** demonstrate that they can communicate assessment results to students and help them identify ways of improving their own proficiency. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** share assessment results with students but provide limited guidance on how students can improve their language proficiency. | Candidates **do not** communicate assessment results to students in a way that helps them improve their own proficiency. |

# ACTFL STANDARD 6: Professional Learning, Advocacy, and Ethics

## Engage in ongoing professional learning opportunities that strengthen their own linguistics, cultural, and pedagogical competence and promote reflection on practice.

Candidates articulate the role and value of languages and cultures by preparing all students to interact successfully in the global community. They understand the importance of collaboration to advocate for the learning of languages and cultures. Candidates understand and explain the opportunities and responsibilities inherent in being a professional language educator and are committed to equitable and ethical interactions with all stakeholders.

### COMPONENTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 6

Candidates engage in ongoing professional learning opportunities, articulate the role and value of languages and cultures, understand the importance of collaboration, and understand and explain the opportunities and responsibilities inherent in being a professional language educator.

### STANDARD 6.1 ENGAGE IN PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

**Engage in ongoing professional learning opportunities that strengthen their own linguistic, cultural, and pedagogical competence and promote reflection on practice.**

Candidates understand the importance and benefits of belonging to a professional learning community and that professional learning is a life-long endeavor. Candidates reflect on how their involvement in these professional learning communities strengthens their own linguistic and cultural competence and refines their pedagogical practices.

## STANDARD 6.2 ADVOCATE FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING

**Articulate the role and value of languages and cultures in preparing all students to interact in the global community through collaboration and advocacy with all stakeholders.**

Candidates believe that all students can benefit from language and culture study. They articulate a rationale for the importance of language and culture learning in the overall curriculum. They use relevant data to make a case for language programs that prepare all students to interact successfully in today's global society. They communicate the multiple benefits of language and culture learning to varied audiences. Candidates build ongoing alliances to promote the goal of language learning for all P–12 students.

## STANDARD 6.3 ENGAGE IN ETHICAL PRACTICE

**Use inquiry and reflection to understand and explain the opportunities and responsibilities inherent in being a professional language educator and demonstrate a commitment to equitable and ethical interactions with all students, colleagues, and other stakeholders.**

Candidates recognize the importance of being socialized into the profession and the responsibilities entailed in becoming a professional language educator. They seek, value, and emulate mentors. Candidates assume responsibility for selecting appropriate curriculum and instructional resources for their students and providing access to and equity in learning for all students. They learn about the school community and genuinely engage in ethical and professional interactions with students, colleagues, and all stakeholders.

### SAMPLE CANDIDATE EVIDENCE FOR ACTFL STANDARD 6

- Description of professional activities in which the candidate has participated and reflections on how these experiences benefitted the candidate (e.g., workshop or conference attendance)
- Reviews of articles published in professional journals about areas of inquiry of interest to the candidate and a rationale showing benefits to the candidate's teaching practice and the profession
- Summary of conference sessions attended and reflections on how the sessions will affect the candidate's instructional practice
- Reports of interviews with professionals who are leaders in the local, state, regional, or national language educational community
- Reports of advocacy projects designed to support language and culture study
- Evidence of participation with regional, state, and national advocacy groups promoting language and culture study
- A professional learning plan delineating areas for growth and potential providers for meeting identified needs
- Annotated reference list of key sources for accessing language-specific data and advocacy-oriented resources
- Position paper reflecting candidate's insights regarding the roles, responsibilities, and ethical expectations of a professional educator

- Simulated presentation to the school board, community members, and/or other stakeholders to demonstrate the ability to frame a cogent rationale for advocating for language learning
- Professional portfolios demonstrating candidate's successful interaction in professional settings and learning communities
- Philosophy statement reflecting candidate's belief that all students should have opportunities to learn a language
- Synthesis of professional journal articles that address current research and/or teaching practices, with a reflection on the information learned

## Rubric for Standard 6

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Seeking long-term professional growth opportunities** | Candidates **consistently** develop a plan for their induction into the profession and identify multiple pathways for pursuing professional growth and development. | Candidates **adequately** develop a plan for their induction into the profession and identify a pathway for pursuing professional growth and development. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** recognize the importance of professional growth but identify only limited or unclear pathways for ongoing development. | Candidates **do not** develop a plan for their induction into the profession. |
| **Development of an advocacy rationale for language learning** | Candidates **consistently** develop and articulate a rationale for language learning that includes the cognitive, social, emotional, academic, and economic benefits to students in today's global society. | Candidates **adequately** develop a rationale for advocating the importance of language learning. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** articulate a basic rationale for language learning, but the explanation is incomplete or lacks supporting evidence. | Candidates **do not** develop a rationale for advocating the importance of language learning. |
| **Use of relevant data to support language learning** | Candidates **consistently** use multiple relevant sources of data to prepare a coherent rationale for language learning for multiple audiences. | Candidates **adequately** use relevant data to prepare a rationale for language learning. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** reference limited data or sources when discussing the value of language learning. | Candidates **do not** use relevant data to prepare a rationale for language learning. |
| **Recognition of the importance of collaboration and building alliances** | Candidates **consistently** provide evidence that they actively collaborate with students, colleagues, and stakeholders to advocate for language learning. | Candidates **adequately** provide evidence that they have participated in efforts to collaborate with students, colleagues, and stakeholders to advocate for language learning. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** show awareness of collaboration but provide limited evidence of active participation in advocacy efforts. | Candidates **do not** provide evidence that they have participated in efforts to collaborate with students, colleagues, and stakeholders. |

| ELEMENTS | EXEMPLARY | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Becoming a member of the profession** | Candidates **consistently** join and participate in a variety of professional language teaching communities. | Candidates **adequately** join and participate in at least one professional language teaching community. | Candidates **partially or inconsistently** demonstrate awareness of professional language teaching communities but have minimal participation in them. | Candidates **do not** join or participate in any professional language teaching community. |

ACTFL
Language Connects