

Beginning Teacher Standards: Impact on Second-Language Learners and Implications for Teacher Preparation

By Ronald W. Solórzano & Daniel G. Solórzano

Introduction

In recent articles, Daniel G. Solórzano and Ronald W. Solórzano (1995) and Richard Valencia and Daniel G. Solórzano (1997) noted the low educational attainment of Latino/Chicano students and presented a theoretical discussion of the possible reasons for the low achievement. One argument described the "cultural deficit" reasoning that students lacked the (cultural) background for school success, thus blaming students and their culture for subsequent low achievement. This argument would presume that Latino students would need to go through some type of cultural metamorphosis to be successful in school. Although this reasoning was dismissed by the authors, they did point out that this philosophy often "...gets transferred to the classroom and to students by teachers who are professionally trained in colleges—specifically by those trained in a teacher education curriculum that reflects an individualistic and cultural deficit explanation of low minority educational attainment" (Solórzano & Solórzano,

Ronald W. Solórzano is an associate professor of education at Occidental College, Los Angeles, California; Daniel G. Solórzano is an associate professor and head of the Division of Social Sciences and Comparative Education in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Beginning Teacher Standards

1995, p. 298). This article focuses on how colleges and school districts might prepare and train teachers to challenge this perspective in order to make classrooms successful places for all children—including second-language learners.

With this in mind, this article addresses the issue of preservice and inservice preparation of beginning teachers and identifies areas of teaching that can challenge the cultural deficit model by examining the role teaching standards play in addressing the needs of second-language learners. We will do this by,

- u Describing demographic changes taking place in the classroom—beginning with a national perspective then focusing on California where the LEP Spanish speaking student enrollment is the largest;
- u Briefly reviewing the literature of “effective” teaching practices—spawned by the recent calls for beginning teacher standards; and
- u Identifying a teaching standards framework and analyzing its potential to inform instructional practices that will benefit beginning teachers in classrooms with second language learners.

Demographic Condition of Students and Teachers

One of the more critical aspects of any research or policy project is to carefully define the population both conceptually and operationally. For Latinos this becomes complicated because of the lack of knowledge most researchers, policymakers, and practitioners have about this group.¹ Another problem emerges when data for subgroups is required and only general information on Latinos is provided. This is especially true for those who are gathering data at either the school, district, state, or national levels. At most elementary and secondary education sites, data are not collected for specific subpopulation groups but are aggregated into the overall Latino category. Likewise, it is important to note that the Latino population has significant subgroup differences that should be disentangled (see Portes & Truelove 1987; Valencia 1991). It should also be noted that within each of these subpopulations there are significant differences by generational status, language usage, social class, and gender. Recognizing these group differences is critical for those who teach, plan to teach, or prepare those who teach second-language learners.

Nationally, seven states contain the largest limited-English-proficient (LEP)² student enrollments: California (1,262,982), Texas (454,883), New York (210,198), Florida (153,841), Illinois (107,084), Arizona (98,128), and New Mexico (80,850) (NCBE, 1996). Of all the languages spoken by LEP students, Spanish is the most commonly used, representing almost 73 percent of the total. Judging from these data, one can see that California overwhelmingly enrolls the most LEP Spanish-speaking students. In fact, of the top 20 school districts nationally that reported LEP student enrollments for the 1993-1994 school year, California contained 12, with the Los Angeles Unified School District topping the list with 291,527 or 45.6 percent of

the total district student population (NCBE, 1995). Because of these data, it is clear that California will be challenged to meet the needs of its many second-language learners. A closer review of California's demographics illustrates this situation.

If we were to travel through the state of California, we would find that most Latinos are located in geographical areas from the Sacramento-San Francisco region south to the Mexican border. However, they are concentrated in the five major metropolitan areas of San Diego, Los Angeles-Orange County, Fresno-San Joaquin Valley, Sacramento-Stockton, and San Francisco-San Jose-Oakland. Overall, in 1990, Latinos and Whites were 26 and 57 percent of the State's population respectively, with Chicanos being 80 percent of the Latino figure. Using conservative and traditional growth indicators of age, fertility, and immigration, Latinos will comprise 32 percent of the state population by the year 2000. In the year 2020, they should overtake Whites as the largest group in the state and reach the 50 percent mark by the year 2040 (Fay, 1995). Indeed, the Latino median age is 24.6 compared to 35.9 for Whites, while the number of children born to each Latina is 2.9 compared to 1.8 for White women (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993). In fact, if we used a less conservative projection, these population changes would be even more rapid.

In 1990, 45 percent of the California Latino population was foreign born and 77 percent of all Latinos spoke a language other than English in the home (presumably Spanish). On the other hand, Whites were 7 percent foreign born and 8 percent of all Whites spoke another language in their home (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993). Of those Latinos over 25 years of age, only 45 percent were high school graduates yet only 7 percent had a bachelors degree. This compares to 86 percent of Whites receiving a high school diploma and 28 percent having a baccalaureate degree.

In 1993-1994, while Latinos were 37 percent of all California K-12 students, they represented only 9 percent of the teaching staff. In comparison, Whites accounted for 42 percent of the state's students and 81 percent of all teachers (Fay, 1995). By the year 2000, student figures are expected to reverse, with Latinos being 45 percent and Whites 34 percent of the K-12 student population (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1994; Los Angeles County Office of Education, 1994). However, in 1989, only 8 percent of all graduating credentialed K-12 teachers from the California State University system were Latino and 84 percent were White, and a dramatic increase in the Latino K-12 teacher population is not predicted (Los Angeles County Office of Education, 1994; TRC, 1993).

In 1989-1990, California enrolled 39 percent of all U.S. students identified as LEP and reported that LEP students spoke 46 different primary languages, with Spanish being the primary language for 76 percent of these students (McDonnell & Hill, 1993). In 1989-1990, it was projected that a 20 percent increase was needed in credentialed bilingual teachers to meet the needs of LEP students in California, where they totaled over one million (LMRI, 1995; Los Angeles County Office of Education, 1991). In fact, when analyzing California language census data, the

Beginning Teacher Standards

Linguistic Minority Research Institute (LMRI) reported that "...less than 30 percent of the LEP students were receiving what might be called bilingual instruction, while slightly over half of the LEP students were receiving instruction from a teacher without the appropriate training or credentials or receiving English-only instruction" (italics added) (p. 1). The figure for LEP students receiving native language instruction remained virtually the same (29.7 percent) in 1997 (LMRI, 1997).

While California certainly represents an anomaly in that its LEP student enrollments far exceed those of most other states, the issue of preparing teachers to teach second-language learners is shared by all states with LEP students. Table 1 compares national data with California and Los Angeles County data on selected demographic variables which indicate that nationally Latinos are a young group of mostly non-English speakers with over one-fourth living below the poverty level. For California it is clear—from these and other data cited above—that:

- u Latinos make up the largest minority public school K-12 population;
- u Spanish is by far the most commonly used second language; and
- u The shortage of bilingual and Latino/Chicano teachers will persist, thus raising the question of the quality of instruction for second-language learners—especially critical as test scores for those students remain dismal.

Hence, it is imperative that all teachers be prepared to reach and teach this culturally and linguistically diverse group and that state and national teaching standards inform and support this effort. The next section will briefly review the literature on effective teaching practices which usually inform standards developed and used as a guide for beginning teachers.

Effective Teaching Practices:

A Precursor to Teaching Standards

Standards and frameworks for effective teaching have been informed by a long history of classroom-based research. Much of what we know about effective teaching today has been well documented in reviews of these studies (see Dwyer, 1993; Hoffman, 1986; Rupley, Wise, & Logan, 1986; Solórzano, 1987).

Rather than go into a comprehensive review, we will identify some major findings uncovered in literature reviews relative to effective teacher practices and reflected in teaching standards. In some cases, these findings are a result of classic studies conducted years ago, but still hold relevance in today's classrooms. For example, William H. Rupley, Beth S. Wise, and John W. Logan (1986) pointed out over a decade ago the comprehensive and complex nature of researching effective teaching by noting that various studies focused on such areas as: verbal behaviors of teachers, questioning techniques of teachers, the effect of classroom settings on

Table 1.
Selected Social and Educational Characteristics of United States,
California, and Los Angeles County Education

	African American	Native American	Asian American	Latino	White
United States					
% of Population	11.8	0.8	2.8	8.8	75.8
Median Age	28.2	26.7	30.0	25.5	34.9
% of K-12 Enroll.	16.6	1.1	3.6	12.7	66.1
% of F.T. Public					
School Teachers	7.4	0.8	1.1	4.2	86.5
% Below Poverty	31.9	30.9	14.1	28.1	10.7
% Foreign Born	4.9	2.3	63.1	35.8	3.3
% Speak Other Lang.	6.3	23.8	73.3	77.8	5.7
% Not Speak					
English Well	2.4	9.2	38.4	39.4	1.8
California					
% of Population	7.1	0.7	9.2	25.4	57.4
Median Age	28.8	29.7	30.5	24.6	35.9
% of K-12 Enroll.	8.7	0.8	11.2	37.1	42.3
% of F.T. Public					
School Teachers	5.4	0.8	4.5	8.7	80.7
% Below Poverty	21.1	18.6	14.3	21.6	7.3
% Foreign Born	4.5	4.4	37.6	45.0	6.8
% Speak Other Lang.	7.4	17.1	68.0	77.1	8.3
% Not Speak					
English Well	2.3	5.5	42.1	43.1	2.6
Los Angeles County					
% of Population	10.5	0.3	10.2	37.8	40.8
Median Age	30.0	30.4	31.7	24.6	37.6
% of K-12 Enroll.	12.1	0.3	11.0	54.2	22.5
% of F.T. Public					
School Teachers	11.7	0.6	7.1	13.0	67.6
% Below Poverty	21.1	17.1	13.2	22.9	7.1
% Foreign Born	5.6	9.6	68.9	53.3	12.3
% Speak Other Lang.	8.0	25.9	80.8	84.0	13.8
% Not Speak					
English Well	2.9	10.2	44.4	50.1	5.0

Note: Population, Median age, poverty, foreign-born, and language data are taken from 1990 U.S. Census sources. K-12 enrollment and teacher data are 1993-1994 data.

Sources: See Note 7.

Beginning Teacher Standards

instruction, instructional pace, and instructional patterns.

Elizabeth Perrott (1982) described studies that found effective teachers to be those who asked questions, accepted pupils' feelings, acknowledged pupils' ideas, and praised and encouraged pupils. Furthermore, effective teachers were enthusiastic, businesslike and task oriented, clear when presenting instructional content, and resourceful by using a variety of instructional materials and procedures. The importance of teachers maximizing students' time on task in classrooms by keeping them actively engaged in productive work and minimizing wasted time and "dead spots" has been reported (Berliner, 1975; Rupley et al., 1986).

Affective qualities of teachers such as "warmth," or encouragement, or having high expectations to the point of "overteaching" have also been found to be valuable teaching practices (Brophy & Everston, 1974). Supporting this latter point, researchers have found that "high achievement" teachers communicated higher performance expectations to students and demanded more work and achievement from them (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

Teachers' attitudes about their teaching and professionalism have also been examined relative to good teaching. Taking responsibility for student learning is a simple but effective trait known as "teacher efficacy." Taking both the credit and criticism relative to student learning, these teachers are acknowledged for their students' successes, yet take responsibility for finding ways to teach those students having problems in the classroom (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Finding new ways to do things involves some reflection on one's part. In fact, the ability to reflect on one's performance is an important teacher characteristic. James G. Henderson (1992) describes the reflective teacher as one who has "an ethic of caring, a constructivist approach to teaching, and artistic problem solving" capabilities (p.2). He describes constructivist teachers as those who concern themselves with subject matter but in addition they focus on the relationship between what is being taught, students' past experiences, and students' personal purposes for learning.

What teachers do before they engage students has also been identified as significant to effective teaching. For instance, Carol A. Dwyer (1993) reviews an extensive literature that relates to the importance of teacher planning activities as indicators of good teaching (McDiarmid, 1991; Shulman, 1987).

Although these past "effective practices" studies shed important light on teaching, many did not include samples with second-language learners (Solórzano, 1987), thus were devoid of a linguistically and culturally diverse classroom context. Interpretations of such studies, while adding to our understanding of good teaching, need to be examined in more depth relative to the context of teaching and learning in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Ana M. Villegas (1991) reports on research that suggests that learning takes place in a "cultural context." She goes on to note that "built into this context are subtle and invisible expectations regarding the manner in which individuals are to go about learning." This cultural context is an important consideration for second-language learners, especially when seen in

the light of previous research on effective teaching practices. For example, Robert D. Milk (1985) reports on four effective bilingual instructional strategies: (1) the use of active teaching behaviors that result in high accumulation of academic learning time for students; (2) the active use of cultural referents from the LEP students' home culture during instruction; (3) the use of two languages to mediate instruction; and (4) the integration of English language development with regular in-class instruction (*Italics added*) (p. 659). Although similar to other research cited, the cultural context is identified here relative to effective bilingual teaching practices—an important distinction for second-language learners.

How do we reconcile and integrate past "effective practices" research with the current need to be sensitive to cultural and linguistic contexts? How do teachers begin to understand this cultural context? How do they plan instruction to take advantage of this context in order to see it as a strength and not a deficit? How do we teach preservice and beginning teachers to use these practices? And, most importantly, how do policymakers ensure that standards reflect second-language learners' cultural and linguistic contexts? These are questions that can be addressed by identifying a framework for effective teaching and analyzing it in a second-language learning context. This will be done in the next section.

Identifying Standards for Teaching

Implications for Teachers of Second Language Learners

Research has informed the practice of teaching by identifying teacher traits and successful classroom practices. The implication for preservice and inservice teacher educators is to: (a) impart this knowledge to beginning teachers in some meaningful way in a context relevant to their student population; and (b) to monitor and assess beginning teachers' progress towards effective teaching vis a vis agreed-upon standards. As a starting point, a framework that includes most of the knowledge base from past research and subsequent standards on teaching is needed.

A number of organizations/agencies have attempted to tackle this issue of setting standards for beginning teacher performance (Ingwerson, 1994). For example, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) lists "outcome-based" standards for teachers that reference their knowledge in the following areas: readiness for school, student development, curriculum, instruction, school improvement, school, home, and community, technology, support services, and, resource management.

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) presents "model standards for beginning teachers." The ten "principles" include: structures of the discipline, how children learn, how students differ in their learning, instructional strategies, environment, communication techniques, planning, assessment, reflection, and collegial relationships.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) provides

Beginning Teacher Standards

for eleven “early adolescence/generalist” standards. They include: knowledge of young adolescents, knowledge of subject matter, instructional resources, learning environment, meaningful learning, multiple paths to knowledge, social development, assessment, reflective practice, family partnerships, and collaboration with colleagues.

In California, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) developed the “California Standards for the Teaching Profession.” The standards are divided into six areas: (1) Engaging and supporting all students in learning; (2) Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning; (3) Understanding and organizing subject matter for student learning; (4) Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for all students; (5) Assessing student learning; and (6) Developing as a professional educator (CTC, 1997).

Finally, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) developed a framework entitled Pathwise (initially called Praxis III).³ Described by Dwyer (1993), this framework is used as a basis for beginning teacher training in several school districts in California. In fact, the Pathwise domains have been embedded into the “California Standards for the Teaching Profession”—mentioned above—through a close working relationship among district and CTC personnel, teacher educators, and beginning teachers. The framework is informed by effective teaching research and a culturally responsive pedagogy as described by Villegas (1991) and others (see Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995). This pedagogy takes into consideration students’ cultural background knowledge and experiences and integrates it in a meaningful way into classroom instruction. Dwyer (1993) points out “Recognition and implementation of this constructivist point of view is a major mechanism for ensuring equitable teaching of students of all backgrounds ...” (p. 37).

The Pathwise framework consists of four “domains” of effective teaching with related criteria embedded within each domain. They are,

- Domain A. Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning
- Domain B. Creating an Environment for Student Learning
- Domain C. Teaching for Student Learning, and
- Domain D. Teacher Professionalism.

There are a total of 19 criteria embedded in these domains (e.g., A1-5, B1-5, etc.) which relate to some facet of teaching and related research literature (see Appendix for full listing of criteria). For example, the Pathwise criteria address the importance of students’ cultural traits and background as resources for instruction (Villegas, 1991) in Domain A (e.g., A1 Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students’ background knowledge and experience). Pathwise also speaks to the issue of teacher expectations (Rupley et al., 1986) in Domain B (e.g., B3 Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student). The issue of minimizing wasted time and “deadspots” in the classroom (Rupley et al., 1986) is addressed in Domain C (e.g., C5 Using instructional time effectively). Finally Pathwise addresses the

importance of teacher efficacy (Ashton & Webb, 1986) in Domain D (e.g., D2 Demonstrating a sense of efficacy). Other Pathwise criteria have also been grounded in past research on effective teaching practices (Dwyer, 1993).

Although generally well received in the field, one concern school and district personnel have had with Pathwise is its relevance to preparation of beginning teachers involved with teaching second-language learners. This is an important issue in California, as described earlier in this article. Second-language learners present a unique challenge to educators, with some school districts doing better than others in providing educational services to this group of students. As a result, second-language learners receive a wide range of instructional services from no support whatsoever (submersion) to various amounts of sheltered instruction in English, to native language instruction when in bilingual classrooms. The question becomes, how does the Pathwise framework facilitate or relate to the instructional context for second-language learners? Further, how does this framework become a useful preparation tool for future teachers entering classrooms with large numbers of second-language learners?

It is clear that a framework that informs practice relative to the cultural context of teaching and learning is especially relevant to this discussion of second-language learners. Yet standards specifically for teaching second-language learners do not exist. The Pathwise framework shows promise for imparting knowledge about effective teaching practices for second-language learners to beginning teachers, and is already used to various degrees in California—with second-language learners. Thus, it seems appropriate to use it as a starting point for further investigation for teaching linguistically diverse students.

With these issues in mind, we will explore the relationship between the Pathwise framework and instructional approaches used with second-language learners. In order to focus our discussion, we identify only those Pathwise criteria that, in our view, most directly relate to the teaching of second-language learners. At times we will reference what classroom support providers⁴ may need to keep in mind when visiting beginning or student teachers' classrooms. Further, as we review the relevance of each criterion to second-language learners, our purpose is not to provide a cookbook of sheltered activities, since other methods texts handle this quite well (Oller, 1993). Our purpose is to examine the relevance of selected Pathwise criteria to second-language learners and to second-language instruction and suggest how support providers can assist beginning teachers in the classroom. When used as a training vehicle for beginning and preservice teachers, the relevance of these relationships is significant.

We organize our analyses of the Pathwise beginning teacher framework by noting each domain, followed by the selected criteria which are accompanied by a brief explanation of each criterion provided by Dwyer (1993).

Domain A:

Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning

In a basic sense, this domain addresses the activities that teachers must do before they teach in the classroom. This domain focuses on how "...teachers use their understanding of students and subject matter to decide on learning goals... activities...materials..." (p. 35). Dwyer (1993) identifies five criteria in this domain. Three were selected for discussion since they relate directly to teachers of second language learners. They are,

- Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences (A1);
- Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate to the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson (A4); and,
- Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson (A5).

Becoming Familiar with Relevant Aspects
of Students' Background Knowledge and Experiences

This criterion asks beginning teachers to understand why it is important to learn about students' backgrounds and knowledge and to describe procedures for obtaining this information.

This teaching concept is crucial for teachers or beginning teachers who have a cultural and linguistic background different from those they teach. Data show that around 80 percent of California's teaching force is White, while over half of the K-12 students come from either culturally or linguistically diverse backgrounds. This trend is expected to continue since data on teacher preparation candidates enrolled in California colleges and universities also reflect these numbers relative to White teachers, with Latino teachers comprising only 11 percent and Black teachers only 5 percent of the future teacher force (CTC, 1994).

As stated earlier, over one million students are identified as limited-English-proficient in California alone. If, as Villegas (1991) suggests, teaching and learning occur in a cultural context, it is important that teachers become familiar with the specific contexts in their classrooms. Thus, how do teachers learn about the cultural backgrounds and experiences of different students? How a teacher learns about, interprets, and accepts cultural experiences for middle class white students and how they do this for culturally and linguistically diverse students is both different and challenging—especially in times of anti-immigrant sentiments. As Lynne T. Diaz-Rico and Kathryn Z. Weed (1995) point out, "Teachers who lack a solid foundation of cultural knowledge are often found guilty of trivializing the cultural content of the curriculum" (p. 257).

Whereas teachers who teach students from their same cultural and linguistic background might have a road map to guide their pursuit of students' background knowledge and experiences, students from different backgrounds require a different road map. Teachers in such diverse classroom settings will have to reconcile their own race/ethnicity and associated beliefs and prejudices with those of their students. With this in mind, teachers must make a concerted effort to learn about their students. Preservice and inservice teacher preparation programs have to remind teachers to use additional resources to find out about their students' backgrounds and develop an understanding that these children may not share their view of the world. Additional sources for this information could include friends, other teachers at their school, teacher assistants, peers, community, and family.

In planning instruction, teachers can build on what children bring with them to the instructional setting, including their cultural framework for organizing, learning, and presenting knowledge. Students bring an oral language history in their native language that—together with other literacy abilities—forms their schema (i.e., background experiences) (Beard, 1972; Mason & Au, 1990) up to that point in time. Teachers need to find a way to develop students' native language literacy, use this background for future learning in both first (L1) and second (L2) language, and shelter their subsequent English language instruction. Being culturally responsive (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 1995; Villegas, 1991) to children's backgrounds and experiences in organizing classroom instruction forms the key basis for teaching second-language learners.

Second-language learners bring a different schema that includes a different language and cultural background than that of middle-class White monolingual students. Teachers will have to identify and reference the different schemas when planning instruction. No doubt knowledge of students' native language will provide teachers the opportunity to learn more about student background knowledge and experiences. However, where this is impossible, teachers must seek out other means (e.g., student peers, older siblings, volunteers, community members) to learn more about their students' knowledge base in order to plan meaningful educational experiences.

Creating or Selecting Teaching Methods, Learning Activities,
and Instructional Materials or Other Resources That Are Appropriate
to the Students and That Are Aligned with the Goals of the Lesson

This criterion addresses the teacher's ability to choose appropriate methods, activities, and materials that are aligned with the goals of the lesson and to differentiate these methods, activities, and materials where necessary.

Methods. Much has been written about the appropriateness of teaching methods vis a vis language minority students (Cummins, 1981; Díaz-Rico & Weed, 1995; Freeman & Freeman, 1994; Genesee, 1994). Bilingual methods have been shown to be an effective teaching method for second-language learners yielding

Beginning Teacher Standards

favorable test outcomes (Cummins, 1981; Krashen & Biber, 1988; Thomas & Collier, 1997). In the best-case scenario, teachers assess students' native-language literacy levels and provide appropriate instruction. Usually, some balance of a literature-based whole language approach and phonics are appropriate teaching methods in any language. However, the difference in this criterion for second-language learners is in the planning for two languages. That is, teachers have to assess students' second-language abilities and provide appropriate instruction. In bilingual classrooms, students usually receive new academic content/concept instruction in their native language while initially learning their second language in less demanding situations during the school day.

In many cases, school districts will not have the option of developing native language proficiency as a bridge to second-language acquisition—even though this option is the most desirable. In these cases there are not enough bilingual teachers to fill the classrooms of not only Spanish but of the various languages spoken in our schools today. The Linguistic Minority Research Institute (LMRI, 1997) reports on the 1997 California Language Census data, indicating that in California about 15,000 teachers have been certified to teach bilingually to serve over 1.3 million limited-English-proficient students. This information calls into question the quality of instructional services to LEP students. Far too often the alternative to bilingual instruction is that second-language learners are “tracked” by their English-language proficiency. They are often segregated into classes where they receive very little interaction with their English-speaking peers while ironically receiving no native-language instruction either, thus they are left in situations devoid of English-speaking models. This has a detrimental affect on the quality of their instruction and their relationships with their peers. Both the social and academic lives of second-language learners need to be developed in the classroom. These students cannot afford to fall further behind in content areas while learning the English language.

Therefore, teachers must learn alternative methods aimed at including some form of Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE).⁵ The LMRI (1997) data indicate that over 30,000 teachers have been trained to teach English-language development (ELD) and SDAIE to LEP students. The SDAIE method, (also referred to as sheltering), unfortunately bypasses the students' native language resources and L1 background knowledge for subsequent L2 learning, yet nonetheless represents a well-thought-out method for providing special English instruction to students who need special assistance in learning a second language. This method is an extremely important element that teaching standards need to address relative to second-language learners. According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995), SDAIE instruction has four goals for students: (1) to learn English; (2) to learn content; (3) to practice higher level thinking skills; and (4) to advance literacy skills (p. 115). This emphasis is certainly a departure from earlier English-as-a-second-language (ESL) methods that stressed oral language grammar, rote drills, and sentence structure (Williams & Snipper, 1990). A cautionary note, however, is

in order. A certain level of English proficiency is necessary for SDAIE strategies to be most effective.

Given these goals for SDAIE instruction, determining the balance of content and language instruction is still a challenge. Students are at various levels of English and native language proficiency, so determining the best mix and level of sheltering can still be complicated. Further, as Mimi Met (1995) suggests, “instructional activities and related materials must be both context-embedded and cognitively demanding” (p. 165). Context-embedded (Cummins, 1981) activities provide “supports” for the lesson (e.g., pictures, hands-on, immediate and relevant context) thus making the content more comprehensible yet still challenging. Teachers need to plan how they will organize teaching methods with these two goals in mind.

Activities. Beginning teachers will have to learn to plan activities for native and second-language instruction. In the absence of a bilingual instructional strategy, teachers must develop activities that engage second-language learners with the content and language necessary to function at their grade level expectations. Second-language teachers need to combine both academic content and language activities that are appropriate and challenging to students. Further, beginning teachers will need to embed second-language support in their activities by using cooperative groupings to include bilingual pairings with English-speaking peers, and by using teacher assistants, team teachers, and other resources available to connect content to learners.

Materials. Finding materials in students’ native languages can be problematic if the language is not widely used. Spanish materials are more available than those for the less-used languages. However, one way around this dilemma—at least initially—is the use of the language experience approach (LEA). Sarah Hudelson (1995) notes that learners and teachers should be involved in sharing their own stories. She continues, “narrative appears to be a fundamental process of the human mind, a basic way of making sense of the world,” (p. 142). Denise McKeon (1995) states that, “language used to communicate about familiar objects and concepts generally places less of a cognitive load on learners than language about complex notions or unfamiliar abstract ideas” (p. 24). In this case, teachers plan on using students’ experiences in providing a context-embedded situation while providing challenging purposes for writing. When building upon and developing the oral backgrounds of students, the language experience approach is appropriate for both native-language and second-language instruction (Solórzano, 1991).

Instructional materials and activities appropriate to second-language instruction need to be specially prepared so as to ensure comprehensibility. Met (1995) points out that “...those who educate through a second language must add special criteria for selecting materials” (p. 165). This special preparation does not mean that easier or less challenging concepts are covered in favor of grade-level standards, but that materials are challenging, relevant, and at grade-level. The special challenge to beginning teachers is in the preparation of materials (e.g., changing format, print

Beginning Teacher Standards

and vocabulary, outlining text, use of timelines, visual arts, and drama), to make them comprehensible to second-language learners.

To sum up this section, it is clear that teachers will have to plan methods, activities, and materials for two languages when teaching in a bilingual program. However, in a structured immersion program, special care on selecting and preparing materials, activities and delivery of instruction must also take place. Further, classroom support providers need to be made aware that even if they see “good instruction” delivered to students, this still might not be appropriate for second-language learners. For example, materials that otherwise look appropriate for English speaking students would not be appropriate for second-language learners if the material is not sheltered. This is a unique aspect of Pathwise that needs to be addressed for second-language learners: evaluating the appropriateness of English language activities using materials that are not modified and thus not comprehensible to students. Second-language teachers have to, in a sense, “double plan.” Met (1995) points out this unique charge of second language teachers as “... sequencing objectives, planning for language growth, identifying instructional activities that make content accessible, selecting instructional material appropriate to students’ needs, and planning for assessment” (p. 161).

Creating or Selecting Evaluation Strategies That Are Appropriate for the Students and That Are Aligned with the Goals of the Lesson

This criterion asks beginning teachers to have well-designed evaluation strategies that are systematic and appropriate to students.

This evaluation criterion pervades the total instructional program for second-language learners. There are at least two major components of this criterion relative to second-language learners: (1) the way in which students display their knowledge of the content area and (2) the language in which they do so.

Pathwise training materials point out the importance of culturally-sensitive evaluation strategies—especially for students of limited-English proficiency. Additionally, beginning teachers should use evaluation strategies that allow children to display their knowledge of a topic or activity in ways that they have been accustomed to in their homes and communities. Indeed, Villegas (1991) points to research describing the “cultural difference” theory for explaining the underachievement of minorities that points to a “cultural disjuncture” between home and school manifested in differences such as language use and cognitive styles. The difference in the ways that second-language learners not only learn but display their knowledge, and the ways that schools require students to display that knowledge, poses enormous problems in the validity of such assessments.

Keeping this in mind, beginning teachers should be sensitive to evaluating student performance by showcasing cooperative group efforts, written work, journals, or portfolio and/or authentic displays of knowledge, instead of the traditional individualistic oral or written response. Ultimately children can be

taught to display their knowledge in a variety of formats, yet initially and as an ongoing process, students should be allowed to display their knowledge in ways that are consistent with their personal background experiences in order to get the best possible assessment of their true abilities.

In addition to displaying knowledge in culturally-sensitive formats, second-language learners also need to use the language they know best when being assessed, except of course, if second-language skills are the focus of the assessment. The crucial questions for LEP assessment are: are we assessing content or language? And, are we assessing what we are teaching? In the former case, second-language learners are often given content area tests, yet because of the lack of second-language knowledge (especially at the higher-ordered cognitive levels) students are prevented from truly understanding the directions, procedures, or context needed to successfully answer or articulate responses to test items. In this case, language skills are interfering with a true reading of students' abilities. As such, language proficiency, rather than content area knowledge or higher-ordered thinking skills, is being tested.

Related to the issue of assessing language or content is the ultimate congruence of assessment and instruction. For example, second-language learners receiving primarily oral language instruction (e.g., pronunciation, syntax) should not be tested or assessed in content areas requiring higher cognitive skills (e.g., inference, evaluation). Unfortunately, in the rush to transition second-language learners to an English-only curriculum, many schools use standardized English language tests which assess higher-ordered thinking skills (i.e., Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills) as transition criteria, when in fact students have only received instruction in English oral language skills via drills and practices. In this case, students are not being tested on what they are being taught. Beginning teachers will need to pay special attention to testing what they teach.

Domain B:

Creating an Environment for Student learning

This domain relates to the "...social and emotional components of learning" that take place in the classroom between students and teacher, and among students. The classroom environment is important because it sets the tone for subsequent learning. The environment is characterized by how the classroom feels to students and how the teacher promotes the sense of caring (Henderson, 1992), fairness, and acceptance towards students' backgrounds. When students come from a different culture and language background, how does the classroom accept them as equals in the learning process and integrate them into the classroom community, and how does the classroom lower the affective filter (Krashen, 1981) to promote second-language learning? Important to this concept is the acceptance of the students' native language. As stated earlier, this could be difficult in times of anti-immigrant

Beginning Teacher Standards

sentiments in the community at-large where on the one hand instructional strategies emphasize students' language and experiences as the basis of instruction, while, on the other hand, students' language status in the political world is unduly low, (e.g., anti-immigrant, English-only, and anti-bilingual education initiatives).

In contrast to the planning criteria described in Domain A, where much of the teacher activities take place before actual teaching, support providers can observe the "environment" classroom contexts and behaviors described in Domain B. Classroom support providers can see or sense the fairness, rapport, and interaction between students and teacher and among students while in the classroom. The following three criteria were selected from this domain for further discussion on second language learning and teaching,

- Creating a climate that promotes fairness (B1);
- Establishing and maintaining rapport with students (B2); and
- Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student (B3).

Creating a Climate That Promotes Fairness

This criterion discusses the teacher's ability to be fair with students and encourages students to be fair with each other.

Support providers will have to determine how the classroom climate promotes the acceptance of students' language and culture through the teacher's interaction with students and the interaction among students themselves. Again, this is a unique feature in second-language-learning classrooms since there are two languages present where the status of each language needs to be treated fairly. How the language is used (integrated into instruction and other purposes), encouraged (by teacher and students), or, how it is discouraged or neglected (by teachers and students), all relate to the fair treatment and status of language.

For example, even though teachers may not speak the language of the students, second-language learners still need access to learning. Basic to this access is communication. However, by not being able to communicate with second-language learners, some teachers give these students different assignments, or group them together for menial busy work. Thus, oftentimes the language is discouraged, not integrated into instruction and curriculum, and thus relegated to second-class status.

Indeed, language status is visible to students and teachers alike. Dorothy Legarreta-Marcaida (1981) suggests that "...bilingual students quickly learn the relative prestige of their primary language vis a vis the dominant language, English" (p. 100). She suggests that students see the use of the English language by the teacher in various important contexts (e.g., speaking with other adults, the principal, and other colleagues), which suggests a higher status. Students also observe the differential use of the students' native language for electives while using the English language for "core" subjects. Some schools have instituted a "mixing" period where second-language learners interact with their English-speaking peers for non-core classes while keeping the core courses linguistically segregated. In many cases,

students receive instruction from bilingual teacher assistants (BTAs). Although this may be the only comprehensible communication students receive in the classroom, the students realize that the teacher assistant's status is low relative to the teacher.

Interestingly, as Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) point out, "...in modern U.S. culture, the social value and prestige of speaking a second language varies with socioeconomic position; it also varies as to the second language that is spoken" (p. 42). The authors go on to state that Spanish-speaking students do not necessarily need Spanish as a foreign language, but their social status as Spanish speakers is paradoxically lower than that of mainstream U.S. students who acquire Spanish as a foreign language. In fact, Spanish-speaking children will enter schools where their native language will be ignored and discouraged only to find themselves taking high school Spanish or college Spanish to fulfill a foreign language requirement. This dilemma for second-language learners is not only ironic, it is unfair.

As reported earlier, language and culture are inextricably linked. In fact, Shirley B. Heath (1986) argues that language learning is cultural learning. David E. Freeman and Yvonne S. Freeman (1994) ask what one gets when one learns a language. They argue that one gets "...a new world view and a way to talk about that world view" (p. 75). Second-language students' "world view" needs to be acknowledged in a fair manner in the classroom. Thus, students' language and cultural status in the classroom turns out to be an important fairness issue because it concerns accepting second-language learners' "world view."

Establishing and Maintaining Rapport with Students

This criterion speaks to the teacher's ability to establish rapport with students in ways that are appropriate to students' diverse backgrounds and needs.

This criterion is significant because of its emphasis on showing respect for cultural and linguistic diversity and the important role of respect for students. This respect not only builds rapport, but addresses the affective areas of second-language learning. For example, one way of establishing rapport with second-language learners is for the teacher to lower the anxiety level for speech production in the students' second language. With students' anxiety level down, they can build their self-confidence and motivation for learning the second language. The affective filter hypothesis (Krashen, 1981) suggests that students who are "on the defensive" will not receive input into the "language acquisition device" (p. 40). Student anxiety, however, affects output as well. Students who are not comfortable in class and feel intimidated by the teacher will also have problems with output (i.e., speech in the second language).

Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) discuss the sociocultural context of second language learning by asking:

Do students feel that their language and culture are accepted and validated by the school? Does the structure of the school mirror the students' mode of cognition?

Beginning Teacher Standards

A well-meaning teacher, with the most up-to-date pedagogy, may still fail to foster achievement if students are socially and culturally uncomfortable with, resistant to, or alienated from schooling. (p. 40)

The concepts mentioned above are rapport issues in the classroom: the sense of acceptance, validation, and comfort level between the teacher and student.

Another way for second-language teachers to show rapport is by talking to students in their native language. In bilingual programs with healthy dosages of native- and second-language instruction, this is not an issue. However, in programs with minimal use of students' L1, use of the child's native language should be for positive purposes rather than trivial ones (Legarreta-Marcaida, 1981). This is obviously difficult when teachers do not speak the student's language. Thus, building rapport with students means building trust where teachers allow students to speak in their native language in the classroom in various situations. Respecting students' language and their right to use it is one way of building trust and ultimately—rapport.

Communicating Challenging Learning Expectations To Each Student

This criterion deals with the teacher's ability to encourage students to meet challenging learning experiences.

When students are instructed in their native language, the content and purpose of instruction must be academically challenging. Mere translations from English to students' native language may not be appropriate in all situations. The expectations should be that students learn academic content at "grade-level and beyond" in their native language, while concomitantly learning to carry over this native language knowledge to the second language.

When learning a second language, expectations get clouded relative to students' "level" in the second language. For example, generally, second-language learners receive primarily oral language learning and little, if any, content instruction. In fact, in many cases, these students do not receive academic content instruction until they have reached a specific oral language proficiency level in English. It is no wonder that these children do poorly on tests of content and higher-order thinking skills when most of their waking hours in the classroom are spent learning about the English language, rather than learning language through grade appropriate content.

Recently, teachers have begun to integrate content into their language lessons in the hopes of providing students the opportunity to keep up with grade-level content demands. Even though materials and methods have been sheltered to make the input comprehensible to students, the lesson is not "watered down" for second-language learners. This is an important expectation concept for second-language instruction. Even though students do not speak English, they can still learn higher-order thinking skills through a modified (sheltered) instructional approach.

Research cited earlier suggests that teachers' perceptions of students' abilities

determine the way they teach and organize instruction. Support providers will need to examine how teaching methods and organizational structure increase or decrease teachers' expectations for their students' academic growth. Well-meaning teachers may feel that they are doing a service to second-language learners by not providing them with demanding academic content or higher-order thinking skills so as to not place a heavy cognitive load on them—at least until they learn English. This scenario, however, would be an obvious example of low expectations for second-language learners.

Watering down of academic content needs to be directly addressed, *vis a vis* this criterion, relative to second-language learners. Further, the idea of consciously designing instruction that integrates content and language as learning goals and expectations for second-language learners needs to be directly addressed and assessed in beginning teachers.

Domain C:

Teaching for Student Learning

Teaching is an interactive process where teachers and students work together to engage and learn content; and additionally for second-language learners—to learn the language. Thus, this domain focuses "...on the act of teaching and its overall goal: helping students to connect with the content" (Dwyer, 1993; p. 80), and encouraging them to go beyond their current knowledge base. With regards to teacher training, support providers will be in a position to observe these criteria as they get played out in the student teacher or beginning teacher's classroom. Three criteria are selected and discussed from this domain relative to second language learners—they are,

- Making content comprehensible to students (C2);
- Encouraging students to extend their thinking (C3); and
- Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands (C4).

Making Content Comprehensible to Students

This criterion speaks to the teacher's capability to make content comprehensible and to provide lessons that have a "coherent and logical structure."

Central to this criterion is the ability to communicate with students. Yet merely communicating with students is not enough to satisfy this criterion or any other criterion for effective teaching. Teachers need to use language and other means (i.e., methods, resources) to make the academic content understandable. For students who do not speak English, this criterion is certainly a challenge during instruction conducted entirely in English. Bilingual programs satisfy the first condition of communication—but not necessarily the second—comprehensibility. Instruction

Beginning Teacher Standards

in the students' native language only provides the potential that subsequent methods will make content comprehensible. While "sink or swim" programs still exist, the absence of communication with the student seriously compromises this criterion.

Where bilingual programs do not exist, structured immersion programs attempt to communicate with students to make content comprehensible. In fact, making content comprehensible is the centerpiece of SDAIE (sheltered) instruction. Traditional teaching methods are not enough for second-language learners. Care must be taken that materials and concepts are presented in a special way to encourage comprehension. In fact, the total classroom needs to be sheltered—to include materials, methods, environment, and routines. Table 2 illustrates this concept that will be elaborated in the following sections.

Materials. Materials used in sheltered programs need to be carefully selected and modified. In addition to the relevancy criteria, materials need to be prepared beforehand to determine how they will be presented and sheltered. Patton O. Tabors and Catherine E. Snow (1994) ask the question "...what would a preschool classroom look like where language acquisition was the main goal guiding curriculum planning and classroom activities?" This question is pertinent to all (i.e., K- 12) second-language classrooms. In this case, how can materials (e.g., texts, readers, basals, etc.) be modified to make them more comprehensible to students? Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) suggest that teachers can supply "...an advanced organizer for text that brings out the key topics and concepts, either in outline form, as focus questions, or in the form of concept maps" (p. 122). They also recommend that text components be grouped by concepts.

Further, teachers can do the following:

- u Conduct pre-reading activities with students to encourage their expectations of the storyline by talking about the topic or title, cover illustrations, endpapers, title page, author, and dust jacket information, and by asking students to predict the story content (Galda, Cullinan, & Strickland, 1993);
- u Create advanced organizers for large amounts of text by inserting own headings, sub-headings, and illustrations;
- u Pre-read the material and break the text down into "chewable" parts; and
- u Paraphrase or expose the main idea of the text/story up front, while students read for details or supporting evidence. Primary grade teachers can use big books to motivate children to read or listen to read alouds. In either case, materials as well as teaching methods need to be modified—not "watered down"—in the sheltered classroom.

In preparation for teaching second-language learners, teachers should remember the complementary relationship between sheltering and challenging instruc-

Table 2
Components of the Sheltered Classroom

Materials	Methods	Environment	Routines
pre-read text	preview concepts	physical features	calendar activities
pre-organize text	speech adjustment	label furniture	lunch count
provide text organizers, e.g., headings, outlines, summaries, etc.	review concepts	label doors, clocks	attendance
provide graphic organizers, e.g., icons, symbols, etc.	embed relevant context	label chalkboard	homework
provide illustrations	elaborate & paraphrase	bilingual bulletin boards	monitors
highlight vocabulary	monitoring & questioning	label lights, windows	opening activities
chunk text	use of multi-modal activities	label text books	current events
use big books	mapping/webbing	bilingual rules, posters	grouping patterns
use sentence strips	use of native language	student work	flag salute
use flash cards	pairing & other language	affective features	lining up
story maps	& content grouping strategies	expectations	classroom policies, rules, procedures, etc.
content/materials	use of BTAs, peers, & other resources	rapport, fairness	
embedded in relevant context	language embedded in content (LEA)	acceptance of language/culture	
		constructivist/empowering	

tion. Second-language learners will not have the language necessary to plow through dense context-reduced text (see Cummins, 1981), but rather will need the type of language support mentioned above to make the lesson comprehensible yet still challenging.

Methods. In bilingual classrooms, the primary language is used to teach academic content. A balance of whole-language and phonetic approaches mentioned earlier are appropriate strategies for native-language instruction as are language-experience approaches. In a bilingual program, teachers are planning for both languages; thus, English needs to be addressed as well. The SDAIE content-based approaches discussed below are appropriate for these learners' second-language instruction.

In structured immersion classrooms, SDAIE methods are used. Several researchers have described "methods that work" for second language learners (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 1995; Freeman & Freeman, 1994; Genesee, 1994; Oller, 1993). Making content comprehensible means sheltering and scaffolding instruction more than one would need to do for native-English-speaking students. Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) describe four means for providing comprehensible input: (1) embedding language within a meaningful context; (2) modifying the language presented to the student; (3) judiciously using paraphrase and repetition; and (4) involving the students in multimodal activities (p. 74).

Relative to implementing content area instruction, Diaz-Rico and Weed suggest three steps: preparation, presentation, and practice. During preparation teachers examine students' background knowledge (schema) relative to the concept or topic covered. Methods such as the KWLH (what I Know; what I Want to know; what I've Learned; How I learned it), graphic organizers, and semantic webs help second-language learners organize their experiences and background knowledge around the concept covered. During the presentation, teachers use manipulatives, visuals, graphs, pictures, maps, and modified speech (slow, repetitive) to include the use of verbal markers (e.g., for example, note this, this is important, remember this). Making students aware of text structure and style of various types of texts is also an important sheltering teaching strategy. During practice, students actively participate in experiments and other hands-on activities. Students can work in small cooperative groups to practice and/or reinforce concepts taught previously. It is important that second-language learners interact and/or be grouped with English-speaking students. This provides them with an English-speaking model, relieves language tension and status problems, builds potential friendships, and allows sharing of knowledge in both languages where appropriate.

Another teaching method relevant to second-language learners—and discussed relative to native-language instruction above—is the language experience approach (Dixon & Nessel, 1983). LEA represents a constructivist strategy of teaching by including many of the components of a culturally responsive pedagogy. For example, this approach embeds students' background knowledge and experi-

ences by eliciting stories based on the learner's own experiences. The "material" is relevant because the story is of interest and based on experiences of the learner. The approach is learner centered since the learner generates the discourse and story. This method is culturally relevant because it represents the learner's background context and language. Finally, the method has the potential for incorporating higher-order skills because activities include language, content, and context (e.g., oral discourse on topic, writing, reading and any other purpose deemed important by the learner and teacher).

Methods for teaching second-language learners should be examined (and assessed) relative to the integration of academic content and language. This is a special consideration for second-language classrooms and for this assessment criterion. As Donna M. Brinton, Marguerite A. Snow, and Marjorie B. Wesche (1993) note, "... content-based instruction aims at eliminating the artificial separation between language instruction and subject matter classes..." (p. 137).

Classroom Environment. In addition to preparing specially designed direct lessons, the classroom environment also needs to be sheltered and made comprehensible to second-language students. For example, teachers can label the structural elements of the classroom (e.g., door, ceiling, lights, chalkboard, window, desk, calendar, clock, table). Students will see these labels every day and come to recognize them. The fact that these labels are provided in a concrete context and can be related to teachers' instructional commands such as close the door, open the window, sit at your desk, and/or go to the table, will enable students to internalize the vocabulary and—most importantly—their functions. The classroom appearance can also be sheltered through posters in the students' native language depicting cultural events and locations.

In addition to the physical appearance that goes with this component, new teachers need to address the affective nature of the classroom environment. The sense of community, caring, and respect that students have—not only for their teacher (and the teacher for them), but among themselves as well. Beginning teachers will need to remember that rapport, fairness, and high expectations for students adds to the classroom sense of "community" and can affect student achievement and behavior. These affective areas may be missed or slighted in teacher preparation programs.

Routines. Classroom routines and procedures by their very nature contain context-embedded (Cummins, 1981) activities. How teachers organize these activities for second-language learners can be a beneficial daily language and content learning activity. Ann M. Salomone (1993) notes that "...the meaningful communication inherent in daily 'housekeeping' tasks of all second-language teachers can become a significant enhancement of the second-language learning process" (p. 130). She goes on to state that "Recognizing that classroom directions are sometimes the most meaning-based communications of their day, second-language teachers should exploit these inherently meaningful situations by structurally

Beginning Teacher Standards

clarifying their L2 use as much as possible" (p. 133).

Therefore, how teachers take advantage of these routines in their classrooms can be important to making content comprehensible and could be part of this assessment criterion. As Tabors and Snow (1994) pointed out in their study of a second language classroom,

The organizational aspect of the classroom that proved most helpful for the second language learners was the fact that the teachers had established a consistent set of routines for the children. These routines meant that, with a little observation, the second language learning children could pick up cues as to what to do and when, using the English-speaking children as models. The daily schedule of arrival, free play, clean-up, snack time, outside play, and circle time gave the second language learners a set of activity structures to acquire...that immediately allowed them to act like members of the group... (Italics added) (p. 115)

In sum, the classroom activity structures become predictable, thus allowing second-language learners to understand the classroom routine and become part of the group.

Taken in their totality (i.e., materials, methods, classroom environment, and routines), it is clear that—because of the unique influence on learning that knowing two languages has on students—special teaching and management methods are needed to make content comprehensible to second-language learners that differ from those needed for English-speaking students. In essence, the total classroom experience needs to be sheltered as Table 2 demonstrates.

Encouraging Students To Extend Their Thinking

This criterion includes the ability of teachers to provide instructional activities designed to actively encourage students to think independently, creatively, or critically about the content being taught.

This criterion has special relevance for second-language learners, but assessing its presence (or absence) depends on how teachers organize their sheltered approaches to teaching and whether classroom observers can recognize and understand the nuances of sheltering instruction. For example, one major issue in sheltering instruction referenced earlier is the "dumbing down" of content and concepts. In many cases, monolingual English-speaking teachers do not require second-language learners to think critically—for example, by using open-ended questions or questions with "no right answers." Instead, children are usually provided with rote memory oral language exercises that do not extend their thinking into the higher order skills. Classroom observers would need to determine how the materials and methods have been made comprehensible to students and whether they remain at a high level of thinking. Language development activities as well as content activities need to be organized in such a way that they encourage second-language learners to extend their thinking.

Even during oral language development activities, a centerpiece of ESL

instruction, second-language learners can be challenged to extend thinking through listening activities (O'Malley, Chamot, & Walker, 1987). Total Physical Response (TPR) activities are also effective in determining students' listening skill capabilities (Asher, Kusudo, & de la Torre, 1993).

Finally, Dwyer (1993) refers to several studies that

...argue that the lower academic performance of some minority students is...a result of a "watered-down" curriculum that precludes the development of higher-order thinking. They therefore urge teachers of ethnically and linguistically diverse students to be certain to provide instruction that encourages students to extend their thinking. (*Italics added*) (p. 91)

Students proceed through developmental stages while learning a second language (Terrel, 1981). Before their speech emergence stage, they can be challenged academically through listening activities that require non-verbal responses. Once students begin to speak the second language, they can respond to higher-order prompts by providing a single word or short phrases. In either case, the listening activities can be structured to extend and monitor students' thinking and comprehension abilities.

Monitoring Students' Understanding
of Content Through a Variety of Means,
Providing Feedback to Students to Assist Learning,
and Adjusting Learning Activities as the Situation Demands

This criterion addresses the monitoring of students' understanding to include—where appropriate—adjustments to activities, and the use of substantial and specific feedback.

Since the crux of specially-designed academic instruction in English techniques is to make input comprehensible, monitoring the success (or failure) of such techniques is essential. Monitoring student understanding is also important here for speech pre-emergence students (Terrel, 1981), where students participate in listening activities and demonstrate their understanding by TPR activities or other non-verbal responses.

Support providers need to recognize how beginning teachers use knowledge of students' language capabilities to reinforce or shelter concepts. In some cases, teachers might use students' native language to emphasize a point or check for understanding. The teacher might also need the assistance of a bilingual teacher aide (BTA) or peer to discern whether the child understood an important point or procedure. The extent to which this assistance (i.e., use of BTAs) is organized and used to monitor second-language learners' understanding of content and language is crucial to this criterion. The fact that students are actively engaged with content will help teachers discern whether students are learning. This "performance-based" aspect of teaching gives teachers immediate feedback on students' understanding

Beginning Teacher Standards

and ultimate performance.

In sum, the use of students' native language for monitoring understanding is crucial here as is the teacher's use of school/classroom resources in this effort to provide an effective learning experience for students. Activities that allow students to "perform" or show what they can do or know provides an immediate monitoring device for teachers.

Domain D:

Teacher Professionalism

Teachers are professionals. As such, they reflect on their performance and devise ways to improve upon it. They take responsibility for all students' learning in their classrooms and they use all available resources (e.g., materials, colleagues), to improve instruction for their students. Three criteria are covered in this section vis a vis second-language learners,

- Demonstrating a sense of efficacy (D2),
- Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students (D3), and,
- Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning (D4).

Demonstrating a Sense of Efficacy

This criterion addresses the teacher's ability to help students find ways to meet the learning goals including specific actions to be taken.

As mentioned at the beginning of this article, we (Solórzano & Solórzano, 1995) have previously discussed the various explanations for Chicano underachievement. One of the more widely used explanations identified was the cultural deficit model. This model suggests that students' culture (and language) was basically to blame for school failure. In past years, this model was operationalized upon students by characterizing them as culturally disadvantaged or housing academic efforts intended to improve their learning in remedial or compensatory programs. Teachers can reject this model as an "excuse" for student failure and take more responsibility themselves for student learning. This latter approach enhances teacher efficacy. In essence, support providers have to determine how beginning teachers explain students' failure to learn content in class, and the extent to which culture and language are used to explain that failure.

The multiplicity of languages in one classroom certainly makes teaching a challenge. Teachers could easily throw up their arms in resignation, concluding that the task is simply impossible. In fact some teachers do. Yet we know that teachers with efficacy look for resources to communicate with their second-language students. Teachers make sure that the rapport and fairness issues are dealt with to make students "feel at home," even though simple oral communication between students and the teacher is difficult. The "ethic of caring" (Henderson, 1992) can

be communicated in non-verbal forms. Teachers with efficacy do not adhere to the “sink or swim” teaching philosophy where students are left to their own devices to understand instruction and teachers and schools blame the student’s language for subsequent failure.

This criterion of efficacy is challenging for monolingual English-speaking teachers working with second-language learners. Yet the research shows and classroom practices verify that with proper grade-level and/or school-wide planning, teachers can make a difference in students’ academic progress and lives, no matter what language they speak. In fact, this team planning approach is directly addressed in the next criterion.

Building Professional Relationships with Colleagues To Share Teaching Insights and To Coordinate Learning Activities for Students

This criterion deals with the teacher’s knowledge of resources and his/her attempts to communicate with colleagues on matters of learning and instruction.

As mentioned throughout this article, students who come to school with a language other than English should receive some model of bilingual education. However, scarce resources (i.e., bilingual teachers, materials) make this option difficult to implement. Nonetheless, native-language support should be solicited in second-language classrooms. This support is absolutely critical in second-language-learning classrooms. Many schools have used the services of trained bilingual teacher assistants (BTAs) to help fill the language void. BTAs take on a special importance in bilingual and second-language-learning classrooms, and as such, should be given close consideration in this criterion. Teachers need to understand this unique role of BTAs and plan accordingly. Student peers, tutors, volunteers, and parents are valuable classroom resources. Support providers need to determine whether the teacher has made use of these resources to benefit the second-language learner.

Bilingual teachers at the school site are valuable resources. With this in mind, some schools provide team-teaching organizational structures to provide bilingual or structured immersion instruction. Other programs departmentalize by grade level to provide native-language or second-language instruction. Thus, seeking out team teaching, grade-level/school, or departmental models to take advantage of language resources to educate second-language learners is an important element of this criterion.

Furthermore, teachers prepared in bilingual and sheltered methods need to share their expertise with their colleagues. This can be done at conferences, in-services, and district/school level workshops. It is crucial that those knowledgeable in this area write, publish, and teach others (especially beginning teachers) how to provide a beneficial learning experience for second-language learners.

In sum, the use of supporting personnel in the classroom is a major distinction that this criterion makes relative to English-only and second-language classrooms.

Beginning Teacher Standards

Support providers must look for evidence of team teaching and the use of language resources (within and outside the school) that facilitate second-language learning.

Communicating with Parents or Guardians about Student Learning

This criterion addresses the teacher's knowledge of forms of communication to parents for various purposes.

Parent involvement in schools is challenging no matter what language is spoken in the home. This is true especially in middle and high schools. However, when the teacher and parent speak different languages, the challenge heightens. In fact, teachers really need to draw on their own resources—in addition to the schools'—to not just communicate with, but encourage parents to get involved. This criterion adds an additional challenge to teachers to seek out and communicate with second-language learners' parents.

Parents raise their children, speak and listen to them, and provide them with experiences and interpretations of the world around them. Essentially parents are the child's first teachers. Their children's schema before they start school is largely developed through this interaction between parent and child. This interaction—regardless of the language spoken—is critical to early literacy development and should be encouraged, not impeded.

A unique element of this Pathwise criterion for parents of second-language learners is the socio-political context of the community. Many second-language parents are intimidated by U.S. institutions like schools and defer to them. Some might be worried because most communication from school has been negative (e.g., grade failure, discipline or communication problem). Some parents are also worried about the politics of language that gets played out from time to time in new laws affecting immigrants. Thus, important to communicating with parents of second-language children is the nature of the message. That is, in the same manner that teachers establish a rapport with students, they should do so with parents as well. The teacher's message to parents should be: "It's okay to speak and read to your child in your native language." "It's okay to come and visit and get involved in school and your child's education." And, "It's okay (and your right) to question the education your son or daughter is receiving in school." Effective teachers are not intimidated by parents' participation or inquiries about schooling, and in fact, welcome such communication.

Discussion

Creating effective schools for second-language learners certainly entails a comprehensive effort on the part of all major stakeholders at the state, district, and school level. However, the classroom is ultimately where connections to learning take place between the teacher and student and among students. Indeed, the challenge at the classroom level is amplified by the need for more teachers as

witnessed in California's push for a 20:1 decreased class-size policy at the elementary level. This policy, coupled with the increases in language-diverse student enrollments, adds to the importance of preparing beginning teachers to meet the needs of this population. It is usually beginning or new teachers who are assigned classrooms with large numbers of second-language learners. Thus, we need teachers to not merely fill these classes, but teach this culturally and linguistically diverse group of students.

The review of the literature certainly suggests teacher practices that can impact students, and teaching standards have by-and-large embraced these practices. Imparting these qualities to new teachers is what colleges, universities, and numerous governing bodies and agencies have been trying to do for years. But a cautionary note is in order here. However useful these teacher standards might be, they still need to clarify in more detail how the teaching skills and methods will affect language-diverse students.

The Pathwise standards examined in this article do reflect good teaching practices. Although many may argue that "good teaching is good for all students," we need to differentiate methodologies for those students who share America's dreams but not America's "traditional" experiences and background. So, even though education in America attempts to find common ground in its curricula and texts, it also needs to embrace diversity without feeling culturally challenged. That is, although students' language and culture may be different, teachers must accept them and expect them to learn. By doing this, teachers ensure that diverse students all receive the same opportunity to learn the skills and concepts that will prepare them for future opportunities and career choices. Thus, the consequences for society—as well as for teacher preparation institutions—are indeed significant.

The Pathwise standards reviewed in this article are in many ways similar to all other standards developed by governing boards and state departments of education. Thus, all such standards will need to be analyzed for their relevance to second-language learners as well as monolingual English-speaking students. In fact, beginning teachers and support providers need to be able to identify those areas where the standards specifically address this language diversity while supporting beginning teachers in integrating meaningful activities into the curriculum. It is the translation of teaching standards into viable methods and activities that will make them relevant and useful to beginning teachers and ultimately to the implementation of successful educational experiences for second-language learners.⁶

Notes

1. For instance, the term Latino is an overarching, umbrella, or pan-ethnic term that represents persons of Latin American ancestry who reside in the United States (Hays-Bautista & Chapa, 1987). Under this umbrella are such groups as Chicanos or Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, El Salvadoreans, and other Latin Americans.
2. The commonly used term is limited-English proficient (LEP). The authors choose to use

Beginning Teacher Standards

- a more positive descriptor: second-language learners—the second language being learned in this case is English.
3. Pathwise was originally developed under the name Praxis III by Educational Testing Service. It has since been modified at the request of the field (e.g., California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment [BTSA] programs) to be more user-friendly, less time-consuming, and more interactive.
 4. There are several terms used today to describe the type of support beginning teachers and student teachers receive. Mentor teacher is the traditional reference to this type of support for beginning teachers, yet support also comes from team teachers, support providers, and assessors—not to mention school site administrators and coordinators. Student teachers receive assistance from master teachers or supervising teachers and college supervisors. So as one can see, there are several names for those who support beginning teachers in the classroom—whether they have had special training and compensation (e.g., mentor teachers) or not. To simplify terms and acknowledge all of those who assist beginning teachers, we use the generic term: support provider.
 5. SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English) is often used synonymously with the term “sheltered instruction.” We will do the same here even though we would like to propose the distinction that SDAIE can relate to a comprehensive curriculum design for second-language learners (i.e., scope and sequence of study), whereas sheltered instruction can relate to the delivery of the smallest unit of curriculum instruction (i.e., one lesson), and not necessarily be tied to a larger scope and sequence.
 6. The authors would like to thank Lynn Klem (Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey), Phyllis Levy (Pathwise Trainer, California), and Luis Valentino (assistant principal at Logan Elementary School, Los Angeles Unified School District) for their careful review of earlier drafts of this article and for their thoughtful suggestions. The authors, however, take full responsibility for the ultimate contents of the article.
 7. Sources for Table 1:
National Center for Educational Statistics. *The Condition of Education: 1995*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1995.
Digest of Educational Statistics: 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1995, & U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992.
1990 Census of Population: General Population Characteristics, United States (1990 CP-1-1). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office & U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993.
1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics, United States (1990 CP-2-1). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office & U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993.
1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics, California (1990 CP-2-6). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office & U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993.
Fay, J. (Ed). *California Almanac, 7th Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Pacific Data Resources, 1995.
Los Angeles County Office of Education. *The Condition of Public Education in Los Angeles County, 1994*. Downey, CA: Los Angeles County Office of Education, 1994.

References

- Asher, J.J., Kusudo, J.A. & de la Torre, R. (1993). Learning a second language through commands: The second field test. In J.W. Oller (Ed.), *Methods that work: Ideas for literacy and language teachers* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 13-21.
- Ashton, P.T., & Webb, R.B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and*

- student achievement. New York: Longman.
- Beard, R. M. (1972). *An outline of Piaget's developmental psychology for students and teachers*. New York: New American Library.
- Berliner, D.C. (1975). *The beginning teacher evaluation study: Overview and selected findings, 1974-1975*. Paper presented at the National Invitational Conference on Teacher Effects: An Examination by Decision -Makers and Researchers. Austin, TX.
- Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A. & Wesche, M.B. (1993). *Content-based second language instruction*. In J.W. Oller (Ed.), *Methods that work: Ideas for literacy and language teachers* (2nd. ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 136-142.
- Brophy J.E., & Everston, C.M. (1974). *Process-product correlations in the Texas Effectiveness Study, final report*. Report No. 74-4. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1994). *Teachers for California's schools in the 21st century: Recruitment and support programs*. Sacramento, CA: Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1997). *California standards for the teaching profession*. Sacramento, CA: Commission on Teacher Credentialing & California Department of Education.
- Cummins, J. (1981). *The Role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students*. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 3-49.
- Díaz-Rico, L.T., & Weed, K.Z. (1995). *The crosscultural, language, and academic development handbook: A complete k-12 reference guide*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dixon, C.N., & Nessel, D. (1983). *Language experience approach to reading (and writing): LEA for ESL*. Hayward, CA: The Alemany Press.
- Dwyer, C.A. (1993). *Development of the knowledge base for the Praxis III: Classroom performance assessments, assessment criteria*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Fay, J. (1995). *The California almanac*. (7th ed.). Santa Barbara, CA: Pacific Data Sources.
- Freeman, D.E., & Freeman, Y.S. (1994). *Between worlds: Access to second language acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Galda, L, Cullinan, B.E., & Strickland, D.S (1993). *Language, literacy and the child*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Genesee, F. (1994). *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayes-Bautista, D., & Chapa, J. (1987). *Latino terminology: Conceptual bases for standardized terminology*. *American Journal of Public Health*, 77, 61-68.
- Heath, S.B. (1986). *Socialcultural contexts of language development*. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination & Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 143-186.
- Henderson, J.G. (1992). *Reflective teaching: Becoming an inquiring educator*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hoffman, J.V. (Ed.). (1986). *Effective teaching of reading: Research and practice*. Newark,

Beginning Teacher Standards

- DE: International Reading Association.
- Hudelson, S. (1995). Literacy development of second language children. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 129-158.
- Ingwerson, L. (1994). *A comparative view: NBPTS, Praxis III, INTASC, NASDTEC*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Krashen, S.D. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 51-79.
- Krashen, S., & Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento, CA: California Association For Bilingual Education.
- Legarreta-Marcaida, D. (1981). Effective use of the primary language in the classroom. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 83-116.
- Linguistic Minority Research Institute. (1995, September). California LEP enrollment continues slow growth in 1995. University of California LMRI newsletter. 5, 1-2.
- Linguistic Minority Research Institute. (1997, September). California LEP enrollment slows but continues to rise. University of California LMRI newsletter. 7, 1-2.
- Los Angeles County Office of Education. (1991). *The condition of public education in Los Angeles county 1990-91: Annual statistical review*. Downey, CA: Los Angeles County Office of Education.
- Los Angeles County Office of Education. (1994). *The condition of public education in Los Angeles county 1994*. Downey, CA: Los Angeles County Office of Education.
- Mason, J. M., & Au, K. H. (1990). *Reading instruction for today*. (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- McDiarmid, G.W. (1991). What teachers need to know about cultural diversity: Restoring subject matter to the picture. In M.M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teaching academic subjects to diverse learners*. New York: Teachers College Press, 257-269.
- McDonnell, L., & Hill, P. (1993). *Newcomers in American schools: Meeting the educational needs of immigrant youth*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- McKeon, D. (1995). Language, culture, and schooling. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 15-32.
- Met, M. (1995). Teaching content through a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 159-182.
- Milk, R. (1985). The changing role of ESL in bilingual education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(4), 657-672.
- National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (1995). The changing face of America's schools. *Forum* 18 (4), 5-7.
- National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (December 6, 1996). Summary report of the survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services 1994-1995. SEA Report 1994-95. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

- Oller, J.W. (1993). *Methods that work: Ideas for literacy and language teachers.* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., & Walker, C. (1987). *The role of learning strategies in second language acquisition: A Model for research in listening comprehension.* Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Perrott, E. (1982) *Effective teaching: A practical guide to improving your teaching.* New York: Longman.
- Portes, A., & Truelove, C. (1987). Making sense of diversity: Recent research on Hispanic minorities in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13, 359-385.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Rupley, W.H., Wise, B.S., & Logan, J.W. (1986) Research in effective teaching: An overview of its development. In J.V. Hoffman (Ed.), *Effective teaching of reading: Research and practice.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 3-36.
- Salomone, A.M. (1993). Immersion teachers: What can we learn from them? In J.W. Oller (Ed.), *Methods that work: Ideas for literacy and language teachers* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 129-135.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, (1), 1-22.
- Solórzano, R.W. (1987). *School and student components and their effect on Hispanic fifth grade achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Solórzano, R.W. (1991). *Parent and child literacy intervention model (PACLIM).* Report submitted to the National Council of La Raza. Pasadena, CA: Educational Testing Service.
- Solórzano D.G., & Solórzano, R.W. (1995). The Chicano educational experience: A framework for effective schools in Chicano communities. *Educational Policy*, 9, (3), 293-314.
- Tabors, P. & Snow, C.E. (1994). *English as a second language in preschool programs.* In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 103-125.
- Terrel, T.D. (1981). The natural approach in bilingual education. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.* Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 117-146.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, The George Washington University.
- Tomas Rivera Center. (1993). *Resolving a crisis in education: Latino teachers for tomorrow's classrooms.* Claremont, CA: Tomas Rivera Center.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1993). *1990 census of population: Social and economic characteristics, California, section 1.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Valencia, R. (Ed.). (1991). *Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agenda for the 1990s.* New York: Falmer Press.
- Valencia, R., & Solórzano, D.G. (1997) Contemporary deficit thinking. In R. Valencia (Ed.) *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice.* New York: Falmer Press, 160-210.
- Villegas, A.M. (1991). *Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990's and beyond.* Princeton,

Beginning Teacher Standards

NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Williams, J.D., & Snipper, G.C. (1990). Literacy and bilingualism. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Appendix

Pathwise Teacher Performance Assessment Domains and Criteria

© Educational Testing Service

Domain A Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning.

- A1: Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of student's background knowledge and experiences.
- A2: Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate to the students.
- A3: Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future.
- A4: Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate to the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson.
- A5: Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson.

Domain B Creating an Environment for Student Learning.

- B1: Creating a climate that promotes fairness.
- B2: Establishing and maintaining rapport with students.
- B3: Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student.
- B4: Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior.
- B5: Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible.

Domain C Teaching For Student Learning.

- C1: Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students.
- C2: Making content comprehensible to students.
- C3: Encouraging students to extend their thinking.
- C4: Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands.
- C5: Using instructional time effectively.

Domain D Teacher Professionalism.

- D1: Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met.
- D2: Demonstrating a sense of efficacy.
- D3: Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students.
- D4: Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning.