

**STUDENT TEACHING: IUP SPANISH EDUCATION K-12**  
**STUDENT TEACHING COMPETENCIES**

	<b>Exceeds 4</b>	<b>Acceptable-High 3</b>	<b>Acceptable-Low 2</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>
1. Integration of standards in planning, instruction, assessment [ACTFL/NCATE Standard 1, 4]	Candidates use the goal areas and standards of the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century</i> , as well as their state standards, as the basis for design of unit/lesson plans, instruction, and assessments. The 5 goal areas, including the 3 modes of communication, are central to planning, instruction, and assessment.	Candidates create unit/lesson plan objectives that address specific goal areas and standards (national & state). They create and teach lessons that address multiple goal areas. They design standards-based activities and assessments and adapt instructional materials and activities to address specific standards.	Candidates create unit/lesson plan objectives that address specific goal areas and standards (national & state). They create and teach lessons that address primarily the Communication goal area. And/or they tend to adapt instructional materials and activities to address specific standards instead of designing new materials and activities.	Candidates apply goal areas and standards (both national and state) to their planning, instruction, and assessment to the extent that their instructional materials do so. They may focus on only the Communication goal area, and primarily on one mode of communication at a time in instruction, activities, and assessments.
2. Supportive classroom environment [ACTFL/NCATE Standard 3]	Candidates exhibit ease and flexibility in using their knowledge of language acquisition theories as the basis for strategies that facilitate language acquisition, including the use of the target language, negotiation of meaning, IRF, and interaction. Candidates consistently use information about their students' language levels, backgrounds, and learning styles to plan and implement instruction.	Candidates use upon their knowledge of language acquisition theories to implement strategies that facilitate language acquisition, including the use of target language input, negotiation of meaning, IRF, and interaction. They use a variety of techniques to address specific learning needs of their students.	Candidates use their knowledge of language acquisition theories to support language acquisition, including the use of target language input and interaction. Use of IRF and negotiation of meaning may be lacking. And/or they make minimal attempts to address specific learning needs of their students.	Candidates use instructional strategies that do not consistently connect to theoretical knowledge. Candidates tend not to address student differences in planning and in implementing instruction.

<p>3. Satisfactory proficiency level [ACTFL/NCATE Standard 1, 3]</p>	<p>Having exceeded the exit oral proficiency level of Advanced Low, candidates speak in the target language at least 90% of the time in the classroom without major patterns of errors. A key component of their classes is their spontaneous interaction with students in the target language. Target language use in created instructional materials and assessments is virtually error-free.</p>	<p>Having met the exit oral proficiency level of Advanced Low, candidates speak in the target language at least 90% of the time in the classroom without major patterns of errors. They designate times for spontaneous interaction with students in the target language. Target language use in created instructional materials and assessments is highly accurate with no major patterns of errors.</p>	<p>Having met the exit oral proficiency level of Advanced Low, candidates use the target language at least 75% of the time and/or they speak with several patterns of errors. There are sporadic opportunities for spontaneous interaction. Target language use in created instructional materials and/or assessments may have patterns of errors.</p>	<p>Although they have met the exit oral proficiency level of Advanced Low, candidates use the target language in the classroom to a minimal extent and/or they speak with major patterns of errors. And/or they may avoid spontaneous interaction with students in the target language. And/or target language use in created instructional materials and/or assessments may have major patterns of errors.</p>
<p>4. Opportunities for meaningful communication [ACTFL/NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4]</p>	<p>Meaningful interaction is at the heart of language instruction. Candidates engage students in communicative and interesting activities and tasks on a regular basis. All classroom interaction reflects engaging contexts that are personalized to the interests of students and reflect curricular goals. Candidates optimize the use of questioning and task-based activities according to instructional objectives.</p>	<p>Candidates design activities in which students have opportunities to interact meaningfully with one another. Activities are standards-based and have meaningful contexts that reflect curricular themes and students' interests. Candidates use task-based activities to elicit language beyond word level from students.</p>	<p>Candidates design activities in which students have opportunities to interact meaningfully with one another. The majority of activities are standards-based and have meaningful contexts. Candidates tend to use questioning to elicit language beyond word level from students.</p>	<p>Candidates provide limited opportunities for communicative activities. These activities and meaningful contexts are those that occur in instructional materials. And/or candidates rely on questioning as the primary strategy for eliciting language.</p>

<p>5. Negotiation of meaning [ACTFL/NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4]</p>	<p>Negotiation of meaning is an integral part of classroom interaction. Candidates negotiate meaning regularly with students. They teach students to use negotiation when communicating with others.</p>	<p>Candidates plan opportunities to negotiate meaning with students. They teach students a variety of ways to negotiate meaning with others and provide opportunities for them to do so in classroom activities.</p>	<p>Candidates negotiate meaning with students when spontaneous communication occurs. They teach students a few expressions for negotiating meaning such as “<i>Could you repeat that, please?</i>”, and they provide limited opportunities for them to negotiate meaning.</p>	<p>Since most classroom interaction is planned, candidates do not regularly negotiate meaning with students. They may teach students a few expressions for negotiating meaning, such as “<i>Could you repeat that, please?</i>”</p>
<p>6. Vocabulary in context [ACTFL/NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4]</p>	<p>Candidates engage students in acquiring new vocabulary through a variety of creative and original hands-on activities (e.g., TPR, technology, games).</p>	<p>Candidates present and practice vocabulary in meaningful contexts and provide opportunities for students to internalize new vocabulary through active participation such as TPR and manipulation of objects, visuals, realia, etc.</p>	<p>Candidates present and practice vocabulary in meaningful contexts but provide limited opportunities for students to internalize vocabulary through active participation.</p>	<p>Candidates resort to rote learning of vocabulary in activities that are devoid of a meaningful context.</p>
<p>7. Grammar as vehicle for communication [ACTFL/NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4]</p>	<p>Candidates exhibit a detailed understanding of the grammatical system of the target language. They systematically embed grammatical structures in classroom activities that reflect real-world functions and contexts. They help students to become comfortable in engaging in discovery learning and in co-constructing grammatical principles.</p>	<p>Candidates exhibit a satisfactory understanding of the grammatical system of the target language. They present and practice grammar in real-world functions and contexts. They guide students to co-construct grammatical principles.</p>	<p>Candidates exhibit a satisfactory understanding of the grammatical system of the target language. While they present and practice grammar in real-world functions and contexts, they tend to use a teacher-directed approach in imparting grammatical knowledge. Students have limited opportunities to co-construct grammatical principles.</p>	<p>Candidates’ understanding of the grammatical system of the target language may be lacking. And/or they may resort to rote learning of grammatical rules in a vacuum. And/or they may use a teacher-directed approach in imparting grammatical knowledge without involving students in co-constructing this knowledge.</p>

<p>8. Oral interpersonal communication  <a href="#">[ACTFL/NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4]</a></p>	<p>Pair and group activities are a central part of each lesson. Candidates provide appropriate instructions, monitoring, and follow-up. Virtually all tasks feature an information gap where students do not know ahead of time how their classmates will respond.</p>	<p>Candidates conduct meaningful pair and group activities on a regular basis. They provide appropriate instructions, monitoring, and follow-up. Most tasks feature an information gap where students do not know ahead of time how their classmates will respond.</p>	<p>Candidates incorporate pair and group activities when called for in the textbook. Some aspect(s) of pair/group activities may be lacking such as instructions, monitoring, and follow-up. Tasks may not consistently feature an information gap.</p>	<p>Candidates use primarily whole-class instruction. Or they use pair and group activities that are devoid of meaningful contexts and/or an information gap. Instructions, monitoring, and/or follow-up may be ineffective.</p>
<p>9. Interpreting authentic texts  <a href="#">[ACTFL/NCATE Standards 2, 3, 4]</a></p>	<p>Candidates interpret authentic texts (audio, video, printed) and use them extensively as the basis for instruction and assessment. They teach students strategies for interpreting texts so that they may apply them to new texts. They design interpretive tasks according to the level and interests of students.</p>	<p>Candidates interpret authentic texts (audio, video, printed) and integrate them into instruction and assessment. They guide students in interpreting texts (i.e., through previewing activities, identifying main ideas, using contextual clues). They design interpretive tasks according to the level and interests of students.</p>	<p>Candidates interpret authentic texts (audio, video, printed) and integrate some texts into instruction and assessment. They provide guidance, although at times it may be lacking. They give some attention to level and interests of students.</p>	<p>Since candidates often exhibit difficulty interpreting authentic texts (audio, video, printed), they tend to use mainly those texts that appear in the textbook. And/or candidates use a traditional approach to exploring texts (e.g., translation, decoding words). They may edit the text instead of the task to bring the text to the level of students.</p>
<p>10. Written interpersonal &amp; presentational communication  <a href="#">[ACTFL/NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4]</a></p>	<p>Candidates integrate written interpersonal and presentational tasks in creative ways into work on oral communication and the other goal areas. They use a process approach to writing and engage students in cooperative writing (i.e., peer editing). They provide appropriate feedback to students on content and accuracy of the message and help students to become responsible for improving their writing.</p>	<p>Candidates design both written interpersonal and presentational tasks within meaningful contexts. They use a process approach to writing and engage students in cooperative writing (i.e., peer editing). They provide appropriate feedback to students on content and accuracy of the message.</p>	<p>Candidates tend to design either written interpersonal or written presentational tasks, but not both. They use a process approach to writing, but may not engage students in cooperative writing (i.e., peer editing). They provide appropriate feedback to students on content and accuracy of the message.</p>	<p>Candidates tend to ignore writing in their planning and/or written tasks are mechanical and devoid of real-world contexts. And/or candidates' approach does not include a writing process. Feedback to students may be lacking and/or inappropriate (e.g., an over-emphasis on grammatical accuracy).</p>

<p>11. Cultural products, practices, perspectives [ACTFL/NCATE Standards 2, 4]</p>	<p>Candidates use a systematic approach for integrating culture into instruction and/or they use culture as the content for language instruction. They give students the tools for analyzing ways in which cultural products, practices, and perspectives are connected in the target culture.</p>	<p>Candidates use the standards framework to integrate culture into lessons and units of instruction. They engage students in exploring the products and practices that relate to specific perspectives of the target culture.</p>	<p>Candidates use the standards framework to integrate culture into lessons and units of instruction. Focus tends to be on products and practices rather than on perspectives.</p>	<p>Candidates integrate into instruction discrete pieces of cultural information, either found in instructional materials or acquired through study and/or personal experiences. They expect students to learn discrete pieces of information about the target culture.</p>
<p>12. Contextualized assessment [ACTFL/NCATE Standard 5]</p>	<p>Candidates design standards-based performance assessments based upon current research-based models (e.g., Integrated Performance Assessments), with attention to global proficiency. The majority of assessments have an oral interpersonal component. Candidates use assessment results to improve instruction and learning, and they work with students individually to help them identify gaps in their knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>Candidates design assessments that feature meaningful tasks and attention to global performance/proficiency. Assessments include personalized tasks and integration of the three modes and other goal areas (e.g., Cultures, Connections). Candidates conduct assessment of oral interpersonal communication. Candidates use insights gained from assessment results to improve instruction and learning.</p>	<p>Candidates design assessments that feature meaningful tasks. Assessments include personalized tasks and tend to focus on the Communication goal area. Candidates conduct assessment of oral interpersonal communication. Candidates may use assessment results to conduct whole-class remediation or review.</p>	<p>Candidates design assessments that focus on discrete linguistic points and/or individual skills. And/or assessment tasks may occur in a context devoid of meaning or personalization. And/or there may be no assessment of oral interpersonal communication. And/or candidates use assessment results mainly for purposes of assigning grades.</p>
<p>13. Connection to school subjects [ACTFL/NCATE Standards 2, 4]</p>	<p>Candidates implement a content-based approach to language instruction that is based on the integration of language and subject-area content. Candidates guide their students in acquiring new information through exploration of target-language texts.</p>	<p>Candidates integrate concepts from other subject areas such as math, science, social studies, art, and music into their lessons. They teach students strategies for learning this new content in the foreign language.</p>	<p>Candidates integrate information from other subject areas such as math, science, social studies, art, and music into their lessons. They may teach students a few strategies for learning this new content in the foreign language.</p>	<p>Candidates integrate discrete pieces of information from other subject areas into their lessons to the extent that they appear in instructional materials.</p>

<p>14. Interaction with FL communities [ACTFL/NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4]</p>	<p>Candidates use connections to target-language communities (e.g., field trips, interaction with native speakers, Skype and other technologies) as a key component of their planning and instruction.</p>	<p>Candidates provide opportunities for their students to connect to target-language communities, through a variety of means such as Skype and other technologies, guest speakers, etc.</p>	<p>Candidates provide opportunities for their students to connect to target-language communities, mostly through technology and authentic materials.</p>	<p>Candidates help their students connect to target-language communities to the extent that their textbook program provides these opportunities.</p>
<p>15. Professionalism in school &amp; community; participation in profession [ACTFL/NCATE Standard 3, 6]</p>	<p>Candidates communicate and interact effectively with parents, fellow teachers, and staff at school. They use reflection as the basis for improving their students' learning. Candidates seek opportunities for continued professional growth. They are members of at least one foreign language professional organization.</p>	<p>Candidates communicate and interact effectively with fellow teachers and staff at school. They engage in reflection to improve their teaching and their students' learning. Candidates participate in professional development opportunities that are offered to them.</p>	<p>Candidates communicate and interact effectively with fellow teachers and staff at school. They may engage in reflection mostly to fulfill a requirement. They participate in required professional development opportunities.</p>	<p>Candidates have some difficulty communicating and interacting with fellow teachers and staff at school. And/or their reflections may be superficial and lacking a connection to theoretical frameworks. Candidates' professional development may be limited to responding to the suggestions that others make regarding the candidates' own professional growth.</p>

Revised April 2013