



## **Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

### **Introduction**

The draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs outline the content, pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed in order to prepare effective P-12 TESOL educators in the United States. The Commission for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) provides the following guidelines for the standards:

1. The standards are written to describe what candidates should know and be able to do by the completion of their teacher preparation programs in ways that can be assessed by actual performance.
2. The standards describe and make use of the knowledge base, including current research and the wisdom of practice in the specialty area (TESOL), and are to focus on the most critical knowledge and skills appropriate for the professionals in the field.
3. The standards focus on learners and creation of environments that will foster student learning.
4. The standards are concise, rigorous, and measurable, not perceived by program faculty as overwhelming in breadth and number.

### **Structure and Format of the Draft Standards**

The draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs have a different structure and format than the 2009 standards, also known as the TESOL P-12 Professional Teaching Standards. Following CAEP guidelines, the draft standards are comprised of two levels: a standard statement at the primary level, and a series of components at the secondary level. The standards must be written so that each concept that is to be a component appears in the language of the standard.

There are a total of five standards and 24 components in the draft 2017 standards:

1. Language Content
2. Instruction: Planning and Implementation
3. Assessment and Evaluation
4. English Language Learners in Context
5. Professionalism and Leadership

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

Included with the draft 2017 standards is rationale providing background and research to support the proposed standard and accompanying components. CAEP requires that the total number of standards and components must be sufficiently limited so that the standards can be sampled in six to eight program report assessments. Programs will be required to address all the components in their reports.

### Questions to Consider in Reviewing the Standards

As you review the draft standards, please consider the following questions. These will serve as the basis for the feedback collected in the survey.

- Do the standards identify what is most critical for newly prepared candidates?
- Are the knowledge and skills required by the standards achievable during the course of pre-service preparation?
- Are the standards guided by the 4 CAEP Principles:
  - (1) learner and learning;
  - (2) knowledge and application of content;
  - (3) instructional practice; and
  - (4) professional responsibility?
- Do the standards reflect the advances in research and practice in the field?
- Are the standards measurable?
- Do the rationale and citations adequately support the standard and components?

**Standard 1: Language Content**

**Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language structures, English language use, and second language acquisition and development to help ELs acquire academic language and literacies specific to various disciplinary practices or content areas.**

*Components*

1a. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of language structures in different discourse contexts to promote acquisition of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

1b. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of second language acquisition theory and developmental stages of language; the communicative, social, and constructive nature of language; and the effects of environmental and other influences (e.g., language disorders) to set expectations for and facilitate language learning.

1c. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of language processes (e.g., interlanguage, translanguaging, language progressions, social and academic language, and individual variables) to facilitate and monitor ELs' language learning in English.

1d. Candidates apply knowledge of English academic language functions, learning domains, discipline-specific language and discourse structures and vocabulary to promote ELs' acquisition of multiple and diverse literacies.

**Rationale for Standard 1**

*1a. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of language structures in different discourse contexts to promote acquisition of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.*

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), including candidates, need to be knowledgeable about English language structures and be able to apply that knowledge to support their students' language acquisition in the domains of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Specifically, candidates need to have sufficient understanding of English language so as to provide focused instruction on specific aspects of English grammar, answer students' questions about distinct features of language, and analyze student errors in order to provide instruction that will effectively facilitate language development (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1998). Research has shown that direct and explicit instruction of key aspects of language will support language acquisition as well as the use of those aspects of language that have been taught (Lyster, 2007; Norris & Ortega, 2000). In addition, TESOL candidates need to be cognizant of how language use varies within and across both social and academic contexts. Academic language is the language needed for students to successfully engage with the school curriculum, whereas social language is the informal everyday language that is used outside

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

the classroom (Bailey, 2007). Scarcella (2008) states that academic language is the language of power and students who are unable to acquire it, will not succeed academically. Within the framework of academic language, there is general academic language that is needed across disciplines, as well as language structures that are unique to particular discourse contexts and disciplines (Zwiers, 2014). In other words, the language of mathematics can look differently from the language of English language arts. Accordingly, candidates must be able to incorporate into their instruction understanding of variations of language use in these distinct discourse settings within the domains of reading, writing, speaking and listening (Fillmore & Snow, 2002).

*1b. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of second language acquisition theory and developmental stages of language; the communicative, social, and constructive nature of language; and the effects of environmental and other influences (e.g., language disorders) to set expectations for and facilitate language learning.*

In order to effectively facilitate ELs' second language acquisition, candidates must be able to identify the stages of language development and articulate what they can expect learners to be able to comprehend and produce at the various stages (Haynes, 2007). These understandings, in turn, will facilitate teachers in being able to provide comprehensible English language input and appropriate activities to facilitate student learning (Krashen, 1982; Kennedy, 2006). In addition to understanding the stages of language development, candidates must also recognize the factors that can impact language acquisition rates. Environmental factors and individual variables such as age, motivation, home language literacy, and quality of instruction will influence the amount of time it takes a student to learning English (Bailey & Heritage, 2010; Kennedy, 2006; Sousa, 2006). Additionally, there may be other influences upon ELs' language acquisition and development, such as language disorders. Receptive language issues which impact understanding and/or productive languages issues which impact expression of ideas and thoughts can affect the acquisition of a second language (Paradis, 2010; Paradis, Crago, Genesee, & Rice, 2003).

*1c. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of language processes (e.g., interlanguage, translanguaging, language progressions, social and academic language, and individual variables) to facilitate and monitor ELs' language learning in English.*

Candidates must bring to the classroom a solid understanding of theories of second language acquisition and factors that may impact students' acquisition of English (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Valdés, Kibler, & Walqui (2014) emphasize the need for ESOL teachers to be aware of the beliefs and theories about language acquisition that shape their practice. Research shows that effective instruction of second languages includes the integration of language within meaningful academic content (Crandall, & Kaufman, 2005; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2010; Tedick & Cammarata, 2012) as well as opportunities for learners to construct their understanding of language through authentic opportunities to engage with the language (Vygotsky, 1978). In developing lessons, TESOL educators must also recognize the role of social interaction in language acquisition (Swain & Deters, 2007).

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

In learning English as a second or additional language and before reaching fluency, ELs may develop what is known as interlanguage. Interlanguage is a combination of language principles from students' home language as well as often an overgeneralization of language rules that they have learned or formulated about English (Selinker, 1972). Translanguaging is the dynamic process of a multilingual students using their full linguistic repertoire to demonstrate what they know (Otheguy, García & Reid, 2015). Candidates must be able to identify features of individual students' interlanguage as a means of providing explicit instruction to support further language development. Research also indicates that ELs can draw from their home language when acquiring knowledge and skills in English. In addition, instruction that builds on ELs' home languages will support the development of their literacy skills in English (August, Branum-Martin, Cardenas-Hagan, & Francis, 2009; Carlo et al., 2004; Dressler & Kamil, 2006; Liang, Peterson, & Graves, 2005; Restrepo et al., 2010). Candidates should possess the knowledge and skills to effectively support students' home language use.

*1d. Candidates apply knowledge of English academic language functions, learning domains, discipline-specific language and discourse structures and vocabulary to promote ELs' acquisition of multiple and diverse literacies.*

Academic language functions can be understood as the use of language for specific purposes (Hill & Miller, 2013). In order to achieve academically, ELs need to be able to perform a variety of language functions across disciplines (e.g., mathematics, social studies, science). Examples of language functions include comparing and contrasting, sequencing, analyzing, classifying, justifying and persuading. Candidates, therefore, need to be knowledgeable of these language functions and strategies for supporting ELs in practicing using these functions through the support of such strategies as the use of sentence starters, key words, and mini lessons (Hill & Miller, 2013). While there is some general academic language that students need across disciplines, students also need to develop knowledge of discipline-specific vocabulary and language structures in order to support their achievement across disciplines (Bailey, 2007; Zwiers 2014). As a result, candidates need to be knowledgeable of how the features of academic language are similar and vary across disciplines. They also need to be able to share these understandings with their students (Cruz, B., & Thornton, 2013; Kersaint, Thompson, & Petkova, 2013; Nutta, Bautista, & Butler, 2011; Shleppegrell, & Fang, 2008).

**Standard 2: Instruction: Planning and Implementation**

**Candidates consider the characteristics, strengths, and needs of each EL holistically to plan English instructional processes, implement standards-based English instruction, reflect on progress, and adjust instruction. Candidates demonstrate understanding of the role of working in collaboration with colleagues and communicating with families to support their ELs' learning of English language and literacies in the content areas.**

*Components*

2a. Candidates plan for culturally and linguistically relevant, supportive environments that promote ELs' learning. Candidates design lessons to support the meeting of standards and curricular objectives through scaffolded instruction that develops ELs' language and literacies in the content areas.

2b. Candidates implement instruction with ELs using research-based, student-centered, interactive approaches.

2c. Candidates adjust and justify instructional decisions based on critical reflection on individual ELs' learning outcomes in both language and content.

2d. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the role of collaboration in working with content area teachers in order to support their ELs' learning of language and literacies in the content areas.

2e. Candidates use relevant technology and digital resources effectively to plan lessons for ELs, support communication with co-teachers and ELs and their families, and foster student language learning in the content areas.

**Rationale for Standard 2**

*2a. Candidates plan for culturally and linguistically relevant, supportive environments that promote ELs' learning. Candidates design lessons to support the meeting of standards and curricular objectives through scaffolded instruction that develops ELs' language and literacies in the content areas.*

Saifer, Edwards, Ellis, Ko, and Stuczynski (2011) emphasize the need for instruction that is both culturally responsive and standards-based. They note that culturally responsive teaching supports students' motivation and engagement, while standards-based instruction emphasizes the importance of challenging, high-level learning for all students. Thus, candidates must be able to incorporate the language and practices of students' home cultures and communities into their instruction as a way of building strong ties between students' home and school lives and fostering positive relationships with ELs and their families (Hammond, 2015; Saifer, et al., 2011).

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

In addition, candidates must recognize how the integrated instruction of rigorous content and academic language with specific kinds of support will foster EL engagement and achievement (Schleppegrell, 2005; Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). ELs develop language skills as they engage in scaffolded literacy and learning tasks. As they acquire specific language knowledge in a particular content area, they will be able to transition from spending most of their time focused on new information and skills to being able to use and apply both their content and language knowledge and skills in more complex ways (Zwiers, 2014). Candidates, then, must have the knowledge and skills to effectively scaffold instruction so as to provide the types of support that students need to be able to successfully engage with the academic work required by content standards. A scaffold is a temporary support (e.g., graphic organizer, model, word bank) provided by an educator to assist a student in engaging with an academic task (Gibbons, 2015; National Governors Association for Best Practices, CCSSO, 2010). ELs need scaffolds that allow them to successfully complete rigorous academic tasks and give them practice in developing the skills that will support them in being able to complete tasks independently in the future (Gibbons, 2015).

*2b. Candidates implement instruction with ELs using research-based, student-centered, interactive approaches.*

There are several research-based strategies that have been shown to be effective in the instruction of ELs. The strategies include the intensive instruction of academic vocabulary, the integration of oral and written language instruction into lessons, providing students opportunities to read for multiple purposes, and providing regular structured opportunities for developing written language skills (Baker, et al., 2014). Candidates should be familiar with these strategies and know how to incorporate them into their instruction.

ELs can benefit from the explicit, intensive instruction of a small set of academic vocabulary and opportunities to practice this new language across modalities (e.g., reading, writing, speaking, and listening) (Baker, et al., 2014). They also gain from the instruction of word learning strategies to use when independently figuring out the meaning of new words (Lesaux, Kieffer, Faller, & Kelley, 2010; Lesaux, Kieffer, Kelley, & Harris, 2014). During content instruction, ELs should be taught explicitly both the content-specific academic vocabulary as well as the general academic vocabulary needed to understand and engage with the content (August, et al., 2009; Baker, et al., 2014). ELs should also be provided opportunities to read for multiple purposes (August & Shanahan, 2008) and be provided scaffolds (e.g., graphic organizers, glossaries, text-dependent questions) that support their comprehension of content-rich texts (August, Staehr Fenner, & Snyder, 2014; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2013). ELs should be given written assignments that allow them to explore their understanding of content as well as develop their written language skills (Kim et al., 2011; Lesaux et al., 2014).

In addition to the use of specific research-based strategies, ELs also benefit from instruction that is interactive and student-centered. Student-centered instruction is grounded in building learning

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

objectives around students' lives, interests, and communities and involving students in planning for instruction, (Saifer, et al., 2011). Student-centered instruction also includes formative assessment practices that integrate students into the monitoring and evaluation of their learning progress (Gottlieb, 2016).

*2c. Candidates adjust and justify instructional decisions based on critical reflection on individual ELs' learning outcomes in both language and content.*

In order to effectively meet the needs of ELs in their classrooms, candidates must be able to evaluate individual ELs' learning outcomes in both language and content and adjust their instruction based on student performance (Gottlieb, 2016). In order to collect data that will inform their instruction, teachers of ELs must be clear about learning goals and progressions and share these with their students (Alvarez, Ananda, Walqui, Sato, & Rabinowitz, 2014). Through clearly articulated learning goals and learning progressions, teachers will be able to measure student progress and support ELs as they develop their content and language skills, progressing from novice to expert in a given domain (Heritage 2008; McManus, 2008; Alvarez, et al., 2014). Teachers can use student work and shared success criteria to critically reflect on students' performance and adapt their instruction accordingly (Gottlieb, 2016).

*2d. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the role of collaboration in working with content area teachers in order to support their ELs' learning of language and literacies in the content areas.*

Effective collaboration between ESOL teachers and content teachers has been shown to have multiple benefits for both ELs and the teachers that work with them (DelliCarpini, 2009; He, Prater, & Steed, 2011; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010, 2015). However, ensuring effective collaboration that will support the academic development of language and literacies of ELs requires training, sufficient opportunities for planning, and reflection on how to most effectively collaborate for students' benefit (Arkoudis, 2006; DelliCarpini, 2009; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010). In order to form strong collaborative partnerships, Candidates must be able to identify the unique set of skills and knowledge that they bring to such collaborative teams and be able to leverage these skills when collaborating with content teachers (Staehr Fenner, 2014). They also must learn to recognize both formal and informal opportunities to collaborate, model effective teaching strategies for ELs, and advocate for the ELs they work with (Staehr Fenner, 2014; Staehr Fenner & Snyder, 2017).

*2e. Candidates use relevant technology and digital resources effectively to plan lessons for ELs, support communication with co-teachers and ELs and their families, and foster student language learning in the content areas.*

A key component of designing lessons that support ELs' unique strengths and needs in order to meet standards and curricular objectives is knowing how to select, adapt, and develop English language teaching materials. According to Howard and Major (2004), the materials must be relevant to the experiences and realities of the learner, stimulate interaction, provide authentic opportunities for

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

*31 January 2017*

language use, support students' development of language learning strategies, be authentic, and integrate the four skills. Technology and digital resources provide a virtually unlimited resource to teachers of ELs for use in developing student-centered, scaffolded instructional materials. The effective use of technology and digital resources in locating, adapting, and creating materials is essential for teachers of ELs. According to the National Education Technology Plan, technology enables the teacher to scale up personalized learning, provide real-world, problem-based learning challenges, move learning beyond the classroom, connect learners with their unique interests and passions and provide transformative, equitable opportunities for learners (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). ELs in particular need access to technology not only to acquire language skills for accessing content knowledge but to develop digital literacy as well. It is vital that new digital literacies be incorporated into teachers of ELs' instructional practices in order to engage students in meaningful, purposeful activities (Gainer & Lapp, 2010). Furthermore, candidates should demonstrate understanding of the use of technology in collaborating and communicating with other educators as well as with ELs and their families and recognize the positive effect such collaboration can have on student learning (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2011).

**Standard 3: Assessment & Evaluation**

**Candidates apply assessment principles to design or adapt, analyze, and interpret multiple and varied assessments for ELs. Candidates understand how to make informed decisions that promote English language and content learning, progress, and facilitate collaboration and advocacy.**

*Components*

3a. Candidates apply knowledge of validity, reliability, and assessment purposes to analyze and interpret student data from multiple sources, including standardized, classroom-based, and English language proficiency assessments, to make informed instructional decisions that promote advocacy for ELs and support language learning.

3b. Candidates demonstrate understanding of classroom-based formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments scaffolded for both English language and content assessment. Candidates know how to determine language and content learning goals and communicate the results from these assessments to teachers, ELs, and ELs' families.

3c. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how to select research-based and state-approved accommodations appropriate to ELs for standardized assessments. Candidates understand how to accurately analyze and interpret standardized test data, including results of norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests, to inform instructional decision making and advocating for ELs.

3d. Candidates demonstrate understanding of how English language proficiency assessment results are used for identification, placement, reclassification and recommendation to investigate additional learning supports needed and how to communicate this information with families and teams who work with ELs.

**Rationale for Standard 3**

*3a. Candidates apply knowledge of validity, reliability, and assessment purposes to analyze and interpret student data from multiple sources, including standardized, classroom-based, and English language proficiency assessments, to make informed instructional decisions that promote advocacy for ELs and support language learning.*

Assessment of ELs' language learning is a complex process. There are a multitude of individual and programmatic variables that can impact ELs' language development and academic success (Gottlieb, 2016). Such variables may include, but are not limited to, students' exposure to academic language (inside and outside the classroom), literacy in the home language, educational experiences, and quality and continuity of language support (Gottlieb, 2006, 2016). Candidates must also recognize other factors,

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

in addition to language, that could impact the validity of classroom-based assessments, such as how the instructions are provided, the use of technology without sufficient instruction or practice in using the technology, and questions that are culturally biased (Staehr Fenner & Snyder, 2017). As a result, in order to make an informed decision about ELs' educational paths, it is essential to gather and interpret data from a variety of sources. Accordingly, candidates must be familiar with tools and strategies for gathering additional information about the ELs with whom they work. Examples of such tools and strategies include observation checklists, interviews, analysis of student work samples, and family member surveys (Hamayan, Marler, Sánchez-López, & Damico, 2013). Additionally, assessments must be designed so that they are measuring what they are intended to measure and that ELs are able to demonstrate what they know and can do. Consequently, candidates must be knowledgeable about issues of reliability and validity that may impact ELs' performance on both standardized and school-based assessments (Abedi, 2006).

*3b. Candidates demonstrate understanding of classroom-based formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments scaffolded for both English language and content assessment. Candidates know how to determine language and content learning goals and communicate the results from these assessments to teachers, ELs, and ELs' families.*

In addition to understanding basic principles of assessment validity and reliability, teachers of ELs should know the use of formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments in evaluating English language and content knowledge in the context of their classroom. They must be able to select and adapt content assessments that allow ELs, who are developing their English language proficiency, to be able to effectively demonstrate their content knowledge and skills (TESOL, 2010). Candidates must also be able to appropriately scaffold assessments, as needed, to strengthen the validity of those assessment for ELs. An assessment does not need to look the same for all students (Gottlieb, 2016). For example, ELs at beginning levels of proficiency may demonstrate understanding of content through non-verbal assessments such as picture sorts, whereas ELs at higher levels of proficiency may use sentence stems or frames to complete an assessment (Staehr Fenner & Snyder, 2017). As students gain proficiency, there is a gradual release of scaffolded support on classroom-based assessments (Gottlieb, Katz, & Ernst-Slavit, 2009).

In addition to selecting and adapting valid and reliable formative, summative, and diagnostic classroom-based assessments, it is also important that the results of these assessments are shared with ELs, so that they can take responsibility for their own learning (Gottlieb, 2016). Gottlieb (2016) proposes that there are several ways to include students in planning for and assessing their learning. She recommends that students be included in setting academic and language goals, determining criteria for success, selecting from a choice of options in terms of how they will demonstrate their learning, monitoring their growth, and reflecting on their learning. Student involvement in these key areas of goal setting and progress monitoring can lead to greater self-regulation and student autonomy in their learning (Alvarez, et al., 2014; Gottlieb, 2016). However, in order to encourage this type of collaborative relationship between teacher and student, the teacher must create a climate in which constructive feedback and self-assessment are perceived as non-threatening by the students (Heritage, 2008). Additionally, clear and

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

timely communication with ELs' families regarding classroom-based assessment results is recommended to increase family involvement and support in their ELs' progress (Stand for Children Oregon, 2014).

*3c. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how to select research-based and state-approved accommodations appropriate to ELs for standardized assessments. Candidates understand how to accurately analyze and interpret standardized test data, including results of norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests, to inform instructional decision making and advocating for ELs.*

Standardized testing is an area in which candidates must be especially well versed in order to thwart inequities and advocate for ELs (Staehr Fenner, 2014). Accordingly, candidates must be able to factor in ELs' linguistic, cultural, and educational background when analyzing standardized test data in order to prevent inappropriate instructional and assessment practices (Fairbairn & Jones-Vo, 2016). In addition, candidates must also be able to analyze assessments for linguistic and cultural bias (Abedi, 2006).

ELs, like their non-EL peers, are expected to be able to demonstrate what they know and can do in content subjects on standardized tests. However, in order to effectively demonstrate what they know in a language in which they are developing proficiency, they may need access to specific types of accommodations. These accommodations can include direct linguistic support which are adjustments designed to decrease the linguistic demands of a task or assessment (Shafer Willner, Rivera, & Acosta, 2008). ELs may also receive indirect linguistic support which include changes to the timing or the environment of the standardized assessment (e.g., extended time, separate or alternate setting) (Shafer Willner, et al., 2008). Candidates must be familiar with the types of accommodations available to ELs in their state and recognize the factors that should be taken into consideration with selecting appropriate accommodations for individual ELs (Rivera, Acosta, & Shafer Willner, 2008). Such factors include ELs' language proficiency levels, home language literacy, educational background (Dalton & Shafer Willner, 2012).

*3d. Candidates demonstrate understanding of how English language proficiency assessment results are used for identification, placement, reclassification and recommendation to investigate additional learning supports needed and how to communicate this information with families and teams who work with ELs.*

Students who are considered eligible for English learner services are given an English language proficiency assessment in order to appropriately identify and provide them with the services that they need. Once identified as ELs, these students are required to take annual English language proficiency assessments to measure language development and reclassify students as appropriate (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015). Educators of ELs need to understand how to use the data from English language proficiency assessments to appropriately identify, place, and reclassify students (O'Malley & Valdez Pierce, 1996; Valdez Pierce, 2003). They also need to be knowledgeable of how to use data on students' performance in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing to effectively plan instruction as ELs may develop their receptive and productive skills at different rates (Gottlieb & Hamayan, 2002).

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

*31 January 2017*

Specifically, it is important that candidates and teachers of ELs understand how a student’s performance on an English language proficiency assessment might be interpreted in relation to their general academic performance and that they share this information with the team of educators working with each EL (Boals, as cited in Staehr Fenner, 2014, p. 172). The English language proficiency assessment, along with many other assessments, can be used in measuring progress over time and can be one piece in determining the need for additional academic supports or interventions (Dunn & Walker, 2007). In addition to using the results from language proficiency assessments to support effective instruction for ELs, these results must also be shared with families of ELs in a language and form that they can understand (U.S. Department of Justice & U.S. Department of Education, 2015).

DRAFT

**Standard 4: English Language Learners (ELs) in Context**

**Candidates demonstrate and apply knowledge of the impact of dynamic academic, personal, familial, cultural, social, and socio-political contexts on ELs and English language learning as supported by research and theories. Candidates investigate the personal and academic characteristics of their students to develop effective instructional and assessment practices for their ELs. Candidates recognize how educator identity, role, culture, and biases impact the interpretation of ELs' strengths and needs.**

*Components*

4a. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how the greater social context of the school and community, plus socio-political factors and legislation, impact ELs.

4b. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research and theories of diversity and equity and how they impact the education of ELs.

4c. Candidates devise and implement methods to understand each EL's academic characteristics, including background knowledge, educational history, and current performance data, to develop effective instructional and assessment practices for their ELs.

4d. Candidates identify and describe the impact of cultural understandings and personal biases, including their own, on their interpretation of ELs' strengths and needs on the education of ELs in general.

4e. Candidates devise and implement methods to learn about personal characteristics of the individual EL (e.g., interests, motivations, learning preferences, strengths, needs, perspectives on schooling) through student and family interactions, reflections, discussions, and surveys.

4f. Candidates consider ELs' family circumstances, language use, and literacy practices to develop effective instructional practices and family outreach.

**Rationale for Standard 4**

*4a. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how the greater social context of the school and community, plus socio-political factors and legislation, impact ELs.*

The education of ELs occurs within a larger social context, and candidates must be aware of how socio-economic and socio-political factors; education legislation and regulations; and societal views of immigrants, immigration, and language use may impact their students. Families of ELs frequently live in

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

poverty and attend schools with low standardized test scores and high teacher to student ratios (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; Fry, 2008; Staehr Fenner, 2014). In addition, despite the reality that most teachers are or will be instructing ELs in their classrooms, many teachers receive insufficient training to effectively to support the academic needs of ELs in meeting the challenging demands of standards-aligned lessons and assessments (Sampson & Collins, 2012; Valdés, et al., 2014; Walker & Stone, 2011). There is also great discrepancy in state teacher-training requirements for teachers and administrators working with ELs (Ballantyne, et al, 2008). Furthermore, societal reception, or how society receives immigrants, can impact students' acculturation and ultimately students' academic achievement and performance (Súarez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). How students respond to societal perceptions can be impacted by the schools they attend, the opportunities they encounter, and the relationships that they build with others (Súarez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Candidates also need to be aware of the laws, policies, and regulations that govern the education of ELs. They not only need to know these laws so that they can understand what is expected of them in terms of their work with ELs, but also so that they can explain the laws and regulations to students and their families and other educators (Zacarian, 2012). Further, in advocating for ELs, candidates must ground their advocacy in a firm understanding of ELs' rights, as based in legislation and relevant court cases (National Education Association, 2015; Staehr Fenner, 2014).

*4b. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research and theories of diversity and equity and how they impact the education of ELs.*

There has been tremendous growth in the cultural and linguistic diversity in U.S. schools over the past two decades. An estimated 4.4 million students, or 9.3 percent of the student population, in grades kindergarten -12<sup>th</sup> grade are classified as ELs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). The U.S. Department of Education (2015) noted that between 2002-2003 and 2012-2013, 39 states reported an increase in the percentage of ELs in their public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). How educators, schools, and state education agencies respond to such diversity is a matter of equity. ELs experience a significant achievement gap on standardized tests, scoring well-below their non-EL peers (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2015). Similarly, ELs are underrepresented in gifted and talented programs and college preparatory and honors courses (Donovan & Cross, 2002; Hanson, Bisht, & Motamedi, 2016; Zehler et al., 2003). Accordingly, candidates must be knowledgeable about research in the areas of diversity and equity. Educational equity is present when all students, regardless of their family or cultural background, race, ethnicity, or other characteristics, have an equal opportunity to be academically successful (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Candidates must therefore recognize issues of equity that can stand in the way of ELs' achievement such as a deficit approach to the teaching of ELs (González, 2005; Valencia, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999). A deficit approach means that rather than recognizing the cultural and linguistic resources students bring to the classroom and building from these, students' backgrounds are seen as obstacles to their learning. In contrast, an assets-based approach builds on the rich linguistic and cultural resources that ELs have and recognizes that families of ELs are involved in and supporting their children's education in a variety of often unseen (and

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

underappreciated) ways (González, 2005; Staehr Fenner & Snyder, 2017; Valencia, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999).

*4c. Candidates devise and implement methods to understand each EL's academic characteristics, including background knowledge, educational history, and current performance data, to develop effective instructional and assessment practices for their ELs.*

In order to support the effective instruction and assessment of ELs, educators must have knowledge of individual student characteristics including educational history, language skills in English and home language, academic strengths and challenges, and learning preferences (Fairbairn & Jones-Vo, 2016; Saifer, et al., 2011; Staehr Fenner, 2014). Fairbairn & Jones-Vo (2016) emphasize the importance of learning about individual student's family backgrounds, cultural backgrounds, living situation, home language script, home language literacy skills, English skills, and a variety of other factors which may impact student performance.

What a student already knows and is familiar with can impact his/her understanding and interpretation of new content and new texts (McNamara, & Kintsch, 1996). Because ELs have such varied backgrounds and experiences, it is essential that candidates and teachers of ELs be able to reflect on students' prior knowledge and experiences in order to make connections to new concepts as well as look for background information that students might need to make connections to new content (Echevarria, Vogt and Short, 2004; Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2012).

*4d. Candidates identify and describe the impact of cultural understandings and personal biases, including their own, on their interpretation of ELs' strengths and needs on the education of ELs in general.*

Several characteristics of culture are significant in the teaching of ELs. First is the understanding that both students and teachers bring their culture with them into the classroom, but that culture may be largely invisible (Saifer, et al., 2011; Staehr Fenner, 2014). Second, culture which includes customs, values, norms, and ideas, are learned through socialization and participation in families and communities, including schools (Erickson, 2007). When ELs' home cultures and the culture of school have different expectations, norms, or values, there can be a mismatch which may impact students' engagement as well as how they see themselves as learners (Cummins, 1986, Entwistle, 1995). Candidates and educators, then, must have the understanding and skills to teach their students the culture of school while at the same time giving space for and honoring the home cultures of their students (Delpit, 1995; Saifer, et al., 2011). To respect and value students' home cultures, candidates should recognize the funds of knowledge, or the linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural resources ELs bring to the classroom and build on these resources during their teaching (August & Shanahan, 2006; Gonzalez, Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez; 1992; Riches & Genesee, 2006). Candidates must also recognize that within any cultural group, there is great variability in terms of how the culture is manifested (Erickson, 2007). When generalizations are made about a specific culture, there is a risk of developing stereotypes of a particular group of students that can be detrimental to their learning.

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

*4e. Candidates devise and implement methods to learn about personal characteristics of the individual EL (e.g., interests, motivations, learning preferences, strengths, needs, perspectives on schooling) through student and family interactions, reflections, discussions, and surveys.*

Learning more about individual students allows for teams of educators to collaborate to advocate for ELs both inside and outside the classroom and to develop an instructional plan that meets the specific needs of each student. Candidates should be familiar with strategies and tools that will provide them with this type of information, such as student and family surveys, home visits, formative and summative assessment data, student work samples, and home language assessments. They should also be able to work collaboratively with a team to gather and share individual student information and its relevance to student performance (Fairbairn & Jones-Vo, 2016).

In addition to focusing on a student's academic background, learning more about students at a personal level (such as through the use of interviews) can improve student behavior and academic performance (Neito, 2003). Saifer, et al., (2011) recommend a variety of activities for getting to know students better such as student surveys, poetic introductions in which students write a poem about themselves, and cultural boxes in which students fill a box with objects that are meaningful to them and then share with the class. In addition to in class activities, educators can learn more about their students through informal conversations, attending school and community events that students are involved in, and home visits (Staehr Fenner, 2014).

*4f. Candidates consider ELs' family circumstances, language use, and literacy practices to develop effective instructional practices and family outreach.*

An EL's home language use and literacy practices should be used as rich resources in designing effective instruction. Educators can incorporate instructional practices into their lessons that provide students the opportunity to build on their knowledge and skills in their home language or languages (August, Branum-Martin, Cardenas-Hagan, & Francis, 2009; Carlo et al., 2004; Dressler, 2006; Liang, Peterson, & Graves, 2005; Restrepo et al., 2010). Candidates should be familiar with strategies that support the practice of building on home language use such as the explicit instruction of cognates, providing supporting content materials in home language, use of bilingual glossaries or dictionaries, intentional grouping students that share a common home language, and bilingual homework tasks (August, Staehr Fenner, & Snyder, 2014). Candidates also need to be aware of strategies to support students with limited or interrupted schooling as well as other students who may have limited literacy in both their home language and English. Such strategies include ongoing use of pair or small group work, beginning lessons with conversational interactions, and emphasizing the connection between the new learning and students' lives (DeCapua & Marshall, 2011; Robertson & Lafond, 2008; WIDA, 2015).

Candidates and educators must also use their knowledge of students and their communities to foster effective outreach to families of ELs (Staehr Fenner, 2014; Saifer, et al., 2011). This knowledge is

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

*31 January 2017*

important when considering how to support families' involvement in their children's education, create a welcoming school environment for families, and communicate effectively with EL families (Breiseth, 2011; Staehr Fenner, 2014). For example, schools and educators need to consider factors which may impede families from participating in school activities and events in more traditional ways (e.g., language barriers, work or family obligations) and consider both how to overcome such obstacles as well as identify opportunities for increasing family involvement in non-traditional ways (e.g., offering a language class at the school for families).

DRAFT

**Standard 5: Professionalism and Leadership**

**Candidates demonstrate dispositions of professionalism and leadership by collaborating with colleagues, advocating for ELs and their families, engaging in self-assessment and reflection, pursuing continuous professional development, and honing their teaching practice through supervised teaching.**

*Components*

5a. Candidates demonstrate knowledge and initiative to plan instruction and assessment collaboratively with other teachers and proactively serve as a resource for EL instruction and support to teachers and school staff.

5b. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of school, district, and governmental policies and legislation that impact the education of ELs in order to advocate for ELs.

5c. Candidates practice self-assessment and reflection, make adjustments for self-improvement, and make plans for continuous professional development in the field of English learning and teaching.

5d. Candidates engage in supervised teaching to apply and hone their teaching of ELs and professional practice using self-reflection and feedback from their cooperating teachers and supervising faculty.

5e. Candidates demonstrate dispositions of professionalism and leadership through respect, empathy, and flexibility with ELs, their families, and colleagues.

**Rationale for Standard 5**

*5a. Candidates demonstrate knowledge and initiative to plan instruction and assessment collaboratively with other teachers and proactively serve as a resource for EL instruction and support to teachers and school staff.*

Collaboration with others, a hallmark of leadership (Danielson, 2007), is vital in today's changing role of the ESOL teacher. ESOL teachers serve as a resource and an advocate for other teachers and school staff to provide additional layers of support for ELs in general. They work with content area teachers and administrators by connecting them with community resources for ELs and providing knowledge on testing eligibility and requirements. (TESOL, 2013). Leadership and adult coaching and training skills are necessary for effective development of colleagues (TESOL, 2016). While ESOL teachers have had considerable training in such areas as second language acquisition, linguistics, language pedagogy and methodology, and language and literacy development, most content area teachers have not received enough training in these subjects (Valdés, Kibler, & Walqui, 2013). ESOL teachers' expertise is in

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

unprecedented demand, especially in support for content area teachers with less training in second language acquisition, linguistics, and language methodology and pedagogy and in the need for experience in co-teaching situations (TESOL, 2016). Content teachers will benefit from collaboration with ESOL teachers in planning effective instruction and assessment for diverse groups of ELs. Conversely, ESOL teachers, who will often find themselves collaborating and co-teaching with content teachers, will benefit from the support in content knowledge and instruction provided by their colleagues (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010).

*5b. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of school, district, and governmental policies and legislation that impact the education of ELs in order to advocate for ELs.*

Because the work of ESOL teachers occurs both at a local, personal level as well as within a larger sociocultural context, it is essential candidates have knowledge of policies and legislation that impacts the learning and assessment of ELs (NEA, 2015). Candidates need to understand the significance of key legislation and landmark court cases in order to understand the soundness and justness of local policies and practices (NEA, 2015; TESOL, 2010; Zacarian, 2012). Knowledge of local, state and federal policies and legislation is also an essential step towards successfully advocating for ELs and their families (National Education Association, 2015). While a solid understanding of the historical foundations of local, state, and federal policies and regulations is essential to navigating the infrastructure of the school system, it is not the sole competence needed. Interpersonal skills are critical for effective advocacy and communication to promote equity and excellence for ELs and their families (Staehr Fenner, 2014; Staehr Fenner & Snyder, 2017). To effectively advocate for ELs and their families, candidates need to draw from and/or develop such interpersonal skills as effective communication, relationship building, intercultural sensitivity, and motivation and support for others (Staehr Fenner & Snyder, 2017; Riggio & Tan, 2014).

*5c. Candidates practice self-assessment and reflection, make adjustments for self-improvement, and make plans for continuous professional development in the field of English learning and teaching.*

Candidates must be committed to continual learning through reflective practice and classroom inquiry with a special focus on how they can continually improve their practice to better serve ELs. Reflection and inquiry are both critical components of the experiential learning cycle. Reflective teaching is built upon an ethic of care, a constructivist approach to teaching, and candidates' creative problem solving (Henderson, 2001). In essence, key components of experiential learning are the continual process of inquiring about an experience and the subsequent critical reflection upon it (Kolb, 2016). Candidates should understand the foundations of classroom research in order to take a systematic, critical, and reflective look at their students' learning and consequently their own teaching with the ultimate goal of improving their teaching practice and better meeting the needs of ELs in their classes (Burns, 2010; Richards & Lockhart, 1994). Although candidates are already engaged in professional training as part of their teacher education program, it is important they demonstrate awareness of the need for continuous professional development as they progress in their career-long development as educators in order to improve their support of ELs.

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

*5d. Candidates engage in supervised teaching to apply and hone their teaching of ELs and professional practice using self-reflection and feedback from their cooperating teachers and supervising faculty.*

A well-structured teaching practicum is a vital component to teacher preparation programs. According to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, to prepare effective teachers for 21<sup>st</sup> century classrooms, teacher education must shift away from a norm which emphasizes academic preparation and course work loosely linked to school-based experiences. Rather, it must move to programs that are fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses. This approach creates opportunities for candidates to apply what they have learned, address the challenges of using it, and receive support and mentoring from skilled educators (2010, p. ii).

Experts and professionals in the field conclude that clinical experience is a key component of teacher education programs as they provide the opportunity for candidates to apply what they have learned and gain experience in today's classrooms (TESOL, 2016). Candidates benefit from the opportunity to practice teaching in a collaborative culture with opportunities for rigorous feedback from both their cooperating teacher and peers (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2010). Having opportunities to practice and refine their teaching skills, observe other teachers, and receive feedback on their teaching can increase candidates' sense of efficacy (Atay, 2008). Critical self-reflection is also essential to the development of teachers' awareness, knowledge, skills, and dispositions according to a large body of research (Bright, 1996; Cranton, 1996; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Reagan, Case, & Brubacher, 2000; Schoën, 1996).

*5e. Candidates demonstrate dispositions of professionalism and leadership through respect, empathy, and flexibility with ELs, their families, and colleagues.*

Developing dispositions in teacher candidates is an important part of pre-service educator preparation programs (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011; Association for Middle Level Education, 2012; Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2013). Teacher dispositions not only reflect beliefs but also demonstrate the application of these beliefs into instructional practice. (Costa & Kallik, 2000). Dispositions of leadership may include but are not limited to the following: deep commitment to student learning, optimism and enthusiasm, open-mindedness and humility, willingness to take risks, confidence and decisiveness, tolerance for ambiguity, creativity and flexibility, and perseverance (Danielson, 2007). Candidates demonstrate these dispositions beyond the classroom through collaboration with colleagues and their advocacy for ELs and their families.

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

### Rationale References

- Abedi, J. (2006). Psychometric issues in the ELL assessment and special education eligibility. *Teachers College Record*, 108(1), 2282-2303.
- Alvarez, L., Ananda, S., Walqui, A., Sato, E., & Rabinowitz, S. (2014). Focusing formative assessment on the needs of English language learners. In WestEd.org. Retrieved from [http://www.wested.org/wp-content/files\\_mf/1391626953FormativeAssessment\\_report5.pdf](http://www.wested.org/wp-content/files_mf/1391626953FormativeAssessment_report5.pdf)
- Arkoudis, S. (2006). Negotiating the rough ground between ESL and mainstream teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 415-433.
- Association for Middle Level Education. (2012). *Middle level teacher preparation standards*. Westerville, OH: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.amle.org/AboutAMLE/ProfessionalPreparation/AMLEStandards.aspx>
- Atay, D. (2007). Beginning teacher efficacy and the practicum in an EFL context. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development*, 11(2), 203-219.
- August, A., Branum-Martin, L., Cardenas-Hagan, E., & Francis, D. J. (2009). The impact of an instructional intervention on the science and language learning of middle grade English language learners. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2(4), 345–376. doi:10.1080/19345740903217623
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2008). *Developing reading and writing in second-language learners*. New York: Routledge.
- August, D., Staehr Fenner, D., & Snyder, S. (2014). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A resource guide for ELA. Retrieved from: <https://www.engageny.org/resource/scaffolding-instruction-english-language-learners-resource-guides-english-language-arts-and>
- Bailey, A. L. (Editor, 2007). *The Language Demands of School: Putting academic English to the test*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bailey, A. L., & Heritage, M. (2010). *English language proficiency assessment foundations: External judgments of adequacy. Evaluating the validity of English language proficiency assessments (An enhanced assessment grant)*. Retrieved from [www.eveaproject.com/doc/Generic%20ELPA%20Foundations%20Document%20FINAL%208%202%2010.pdf](http://www.eveaproject.com/doc/Generic%20ELPA%20Foundations%20Document%20FINAL%208%202%2010.pdf)

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

- Baker, S., Lesaux, N. Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J. Proctor, C. P., Morris, & J. Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014).
- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.
- Breiseth, L. (2011). A guide for engaging ELL families: Twenty strategies for school leaders. Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org/pdfs/guides/Engaging-ELL-Families.pdf>
- Bright, B. (1996). Reflecting on reflective practice. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 28(2), 162–184.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carlo, M. S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C. E., Dressler, C., Lippman, D. N., White, C. E. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs for English language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 188–215. doi:10.1598/RRQ.39.2.3
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (2014). *Dispositions: Changing mindsets for learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP Standards*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/standards/introduction>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). *Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium (InTASC) model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.legis.nd.gov/assembly/62-2011/docs/pdf/eft021612appendixg.pdf>
- Crandall, J., & Kaufman, D. (Eds.) (2005). *Content-based instruction in primary and secondary school settings*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Cranton, P. (1996). *Professional development as transformative learning: New perspectives for teachers of adults*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

- Cruz, B., & Thornton, S. (2013). *Teaching social studies to English language learners* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-36.
- Curtain, H., & Dahlberg, C. A. (2010). *Languages and children—Making the match* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Dalton, G., & Shafter Willner, L. (2012). ELL accommodation assignment protocol created for the 2012 DC OSSE testing accommodations manual. Washington, DC: District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent.
- Danielson, C. (September 2007). The many faces of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 65, 1. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept07/vol65/num01/The-Many-Faces-of-Leadership.aspx>
- DeCapua, A., & Marshall, H.W. (2011). *Breaking new ground: Teaching students with limited or interrupted formal education in U.S. schools*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press ELT.
- DelliCarpini, M. (2009). Success with ELLs. *English Journal*, 98(4), 133-137.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Donovan, S., & Cross, C. (2002). *Minority students in gifted and special education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Dressler, C., & Kamil, M. L. (2006). First- and second-language literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language minority children and youth* (pp. 197–238). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dunn, M. W., & Walker, T. (2007). Assessment of English language learners with disabilities. In F. Pawan & G. B. Sietman (Eds.), *Helping English language learners succeed in middle and high schools*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., and Short, D., 2004. *Making Content Comprehensible For English Language Learners: The SIOP Model*. Pearson.
- Entwistle, D. R. (1995). The role of schools in sustaining early childhood program benefits. *Future of Children*, 5(3), 133-144.

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

*31 January 2017*

- Erickson, F. (2007). Culture in society and educational practices. In J. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.) (pp. 33-61). USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95 § 114 Stat. 1177 (2015-2016).
- Fairbairn, S., & Jones-Vo, S. (2016). Engaging English learners through access to standards: A team-based approach to schoolwide student achievement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Fillmore, L.W., & Snow, C. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7-53). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems, and Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). Building and activating students' background knowledge: It's what they already know that counts. *Middle School Journal*, January 2012 pp. 22 – 31.
- Fry, R. (2008). The role of schools in the English language learner achievement gap. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/06/26/the-role-of-schools-in-the-english-language-learner-achievement-gap/>
- Gainer, J., & Lapp, D. (2010). *Literacy remix: bridging adolescents' in and out of school literacies*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003) Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *College of Education, The Ohio State University*, 42 (3). Retrieved from [tandfonline.com/doi/10.1207/s15430421tip4203\\_3](http://tandfonline.com/doi/10.1207/s15430421tip4203_3)
- Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding language scaffolding learning: Teaching English language learners in the mainstream classroom*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- González, N. (2005). Beyond culture: The hybridity of funds of knowledge. In N. González, L. C. Moll & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge* (pp. 29–46). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gottlieb, M. (2006). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gottlieb, M. (2016). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges to educational equity: Connecting academic language proficiency to student achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

*31 January 2017*

- Gottlieb, M., & Hamayan, E. (2002). Assessing oral and written language proficiency: A guide for psychologists and teachers. In R. B. Vega (Ed.), *Serving English language learners with disabilities* (pp. 13-17). Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Gottlieb, M. Katz, A., & Earnst-Slavit, G. (2009). Paper to practice: Implementing TESOL's preK-12 English language proficiency standards. Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association.
- Hamayan, E., Marler, B., Sánchez-López, C., & Damico, J. (2013). *Special education considerations for English language learners: Delivering a continuum of services*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.
- Hammond, Z. (2016). *Culturally responsive teaching & the brain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hanson, H., Bisht, B., & Greenberg Motamedi, J. (2016). Advanced course enrollment and performance among English learner students in Washington state (REL 2017–187). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Haynes, J. (2007). *Getting started with English language learners: How educators can meet the challenge*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ISBN 978-1-4166-0519-5.
- He, Y., Prater, K., & Steed, T. (2011). Moving beyond “just good teaching”: ESL professional development for all teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(1), 7-18.
- Henderson, J. G. (2001). *Reflective teaching: Professional artistry through inquiry*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Heritage, M. (2008). *Learning progressions: Supporting instruction and formative assessment*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Hill, J., & Miller, K. (2013). *Classroom instruction that works with English language learners* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Honigfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2010). *Collaboration and co-teaching: Strategies for English learners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Honigfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2013). *Common Core for the not-so-common learner: English language arts strategies, grades 6-12*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

## Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs

31 January 2017

- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2014). *Collaboration and co-teaching: Strategies for English learners. A Leader's Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Howard, J., & Major, J. (2004). Guidelines for designing effective English language teaching materials. *The TESOLANZ Journal*, 12, 50–58.
- Kennedy, T. J. (2006). Language learning and its impact on the brain: Connecting language learning through the mind through content-based instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 471–486.
- Kersaint, G., Thompson, D., & Petkova, M. (2013). *Teaching mathematics to English language learners*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Kim, J., Olson, C. B., Scarcella, R., Kramer, J., Pearson, M., van Dyk, D., & Land, R. (2011). A randomized experiment of a cognitive strategies approach to text-based analytical writing for mainstreamed Latino English language learners in grades 6 to 12. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 4(3), 231–263. doi:10.1080/19345747.2010.523513
- Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, S. E., & Kelley, J. G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(2), 196–228. doi:10.1598/RRQ.45.2.3
- Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Kelley, J., & Harris, J. (2014). Effects of academic vocabulary instruction for linguistically diverse adolescents: Evidence from a randomized field trial. *American Educational Research Journal*.
- Liang, L. A., Peterson, C. A., & Graves, M. F. (2005). Investigating two approaches to fostering children's comprehension of literature. *Reading Psychology*, 26(4–5), 387–400.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- McManus, S. (2008). Attributes of effective formative assessment. Paper prepared for the Council of Chief State School Officers.

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

- McNamara, D. and Kintsch, W. (1996). Learning from texts: Effects of prior knowledge and text coherence. *Discourse Processes* 22(3), 247–288.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 2, 132-141.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). English language learners in public schools. Retrieved from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator\\_cgf.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp)
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA), Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). (2015). Fast Facts: English Learners (ELs) and NAEP. Retrieved from: [http://www.ncela.us/files/fast\\_facts/OELA\\_FastFacts\\_ELsandNAEP.pdf](http://www.ncela.us/files/fast_facts/OELA_FastFacts_ELsandNAEP.pdf)
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3D&tabid=7>
- National Education Association (NEA). (2015). All in!: How educators can advocate for English language learners. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.colorincolorado.org/sites/default/files/ELL\\_AdvocacyGuide2015.pdf](http://www.colorincolorado.org/sites/default/files/ELL_AdvocacyGuide2015.pdf)
- National Governors Association for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010b).
- Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. Appendix A: Research supporting key elements of the standards. Glossary of key terms. Retrieved from [http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Appendix\\_A.pdf](http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Appendix_A.pdf)
- Nieto, S. (2003). *What keeps teachers going?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528.
- Nutta, J., Bautista, N., & Butler, M. (2011). *Teaching science to English language learners*. New York: Routledge.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2012), "What is equity in education?", in *Education at a Glance 2012: Highlights*, OECD Publishing.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag\\_highlights-2012-29-en](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag_highlights-2012-29-en)
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–30.  
doi:10.1515/applirev-2015-0014
- Paradis, J. (2010). The interface between bilingual development and specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 31, 3-28.
- Paradis, J., Crago, M., Genesee, F., & Rice, M. (2003). Bilingual children with specific language impairment: How do they compare with their monolingual peers? *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 46, 1–15.
- Reagan, T. G., Case, C. W., & Brubacher, J. W. (2000). *Becoming a reflective educator: How to build a culture of inquiry in the schools* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Restrepo, M.A, Castilla, A.P, Schwanenflugel, P. J., Neuharth-Pritchett, S., Hamilton, C. E., & Arboleda, A. (2010). Effects of a supplemental Spanish oral language program on sentence length, complexity, and grammaticality in Spanish-speaking children attending English-only preschools” *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, January 2010, Vol. 41, Issue 1, p. 3–13.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Riches, C., & Genesee, F. (2006). Cross-linguistic and cross-modal aspects of literacy development. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 64–108). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Riggio, R. E., & Tan, S. J. (Eds.) (2014). *Leader interpersonal and influence skills: The soft skills of leadership*. New York: Routledge/Psychology Press.
- Rivera, C., Acosta, B., & Shafer Willner, L. (2008). *Guide for the refinement of state assessment policies for accommodating English language learners*. Prepared for the LEP Partnership, U.S. Department of Education. Arlington, VA: The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education.

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

- Robertson, K. & Lafond, S. (2008). How to support ELL students with interrupted formal education. Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/how-support-ell-students-interrupted-formal-education-sifes>
- Saifer, S., Edwards, K. Ellis, D., Ko, L., & Stuczynski, A. (2011). *Culturally responsive standards-based teaching: Classroom to community and back (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin & Education Northwest.
- Sampson, J. F., & Collins, B. A. (2012, April). *Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research policy and practice of teacher effectiveness*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535608.pdf>
- Scarcella, R. (2008). Academic language: Clarifying terms. *AccELLerate!*, (1)1, 5-6.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2005). Helping content area teachers work with academic language: Promoting English language learners' literacy in history (Final report: Individual Research Grant Award #03-03CY-061G-D). Santa Barbara, CA: UC Linguistic Minority Research Institute.
- Schoën, D. A. (1996). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sehler, A., Fleischman, H., Hopstock, P., Stephenson, T., Pendzick, M., & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities* (vol. I Research Report). Arlington, VA: Development Associates.
- Selinker, L (1972). "Interlanguage". *International Review of Applied Linguistics*. 10: 209–241.
- Shafer Willner, L. S., Rivera, C., & Acosta, B. D. (2008). *Descriptive study of state assessment policies for accommodating English language learners*. Arlington, VA: George Washington University Center for Excellence in Education.
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2010). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(2), 201–217.
- Sousa, D. A. (2006). *How the brain learns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Staehr Fenner, D. (2014). *Advocating for English Learners: A guide for educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

Staehr Fenner, D., & Snyder S. (2017). *Unlocking English learners' potential: Strategies for making content accessible*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Stand for Children Oregon. (2014). *Best practices for communicating with parents of English language learners*. Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved from <https://stand.org/sites/default/files/Oregon/Stand%20ELL%20Report.pdf>

Súarez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). "New" mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched [Focus Issue]. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 820–836.

Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved from [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice\\_guides/english\\_learners\\_pg\\_040114.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/english_learners_pg_040114.pdf)

Tedick, D. J., & Cammarata, L. (2012). Content and language integration in K–12 contexts: Student outcomes, teacher practices, and stakeholder perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45, 528–533.

TESOL International Association. (2010). *Standards for the recognition of initial TESOL programs in P-12 ESL teacher education*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.tesol.org/docs/books/the-revised-tesol-ncate-standards-for-the-recognition-of-initial-tesol-programs-in-p-12-esl-teacher-education-\(2010-pdf\).pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.tesol.org/docs/books/the-revised-tesol-ncate-standards-for-the-recognition-of-initial-tesol-programs-in-p-12-esl-teacher-education-(2010-pdf).pdf?sfvrsn=2)

TESOL International Association. (2013, April). *Implementing the Common Core State Standards for ELs: The Changing Role of the ESL Teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

TESOL International Association. (2016). *The preparation of the ESL educator in the era of College- and Career-readiness Standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/advocacy/ccr-standards-convening\\_final2.pdf?sfvrsn=2](https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/advocacy/ccr-standards-convening_final2.pdf?sfvrsn=2)

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Washington DC: Author. *Future ready learning: Reimagining the role of technology in education, 2016 National Education Technology Plan*. Retrieved from <https://tech.ed.gov/netp/>

U.S. Department of Justice & U.S. Department of Education. (2015). Information for limited English

**Draft 2017 TESOL Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs**

31 January 2017

- proficient (LEP) parents and guardians and for the schools and school districts that communicate with them. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-lep-parents-201501.pdf>
- Valdés, G., Kibler, A., & Walqui, A. (2014). *Changes in the expertise of ESL professionals: Knowledge and action in an era of new standards*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association.
- Valdez Pierce, L. (2003). *Assessing English language learners*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Valencia, R. R. (1997). Conceptualizing the notion of deficit thinking. In R.R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 1-12). London: Palmer Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interactions between learning and development. In M Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.) *Readings on the development of children*, (pp. 33-40). New York, NY: Scientific American Books.
- Walker, C.L., & Stone, K. (2011). Preparing teachers to reach English language learners: Pre-service and in-service initiatives. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms* (pp. 127-142). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- WIDA. (2015). SLIFE: Students with limited or interrupted formal education. Retrieved from <https://www.wida.us/professionaldev/educatorresources/focus.aspx>
- Zacarian, D. (2012) *Serving English learners: Laws, policies, and regulations*. Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org/pdfs/policy/ELL-Policy-Guide.pdf>
- Zwiers, J. (2014). *Building academic language: Meeting Common Core Standards across disciplines*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.