

A Profiling Grid for Language Teachers

Brian North

EAQUALS

(European Association for Quality Language Services)

Introduction

The EAQUALS Profiling Grid for Language Teachers seeks to summarise the key features of qualifications and competences at different stages of a language teacher's development. The current version is given as an appendix to this paper. It is a "grid" because it has two axes. One axis is provided by three broad stages of development "*Basic*," "*Independent*" and "*Proficient*", which deliberately echo the three broad levels (A, B and C) of the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe 2001) and which, as in the CEFR, are each split into two in order to give 6 bands, labelled in the Grid T1 to T6. At the Basic stage, teaching knowledge and competence is holistic and in the process of being acquired; the aim of a "Basic" teacher is to make it to T3. By T5, however, development in certain directions may well be noticeable; there are many different ways to be a proficient teacher. "Proficient" teachers may also acquire specialised skills in certain "supplementary" areas.

The second axis is provided by four broad categories intended to reflect the main aspects of a language teacher's profile: "*Language*" (proficiency / awareness), "*Qualifications*" (qualifications / teaching practice / experience), "*Core Competencies*" (methodology knowledge and skills / planning / interaction management / assessment) and "*Complementary skills*" (teacher development / digital literacy). Some people may have high-level core competencies yet lack significant formal qualifications. Others may have high-level paper qualifications but be lacking in experience and core competencies. Complementary skills may develop during a person's career, or may reflect existing talents brought to the profession.

The EAQUALS Grid has a number of possible applications, as Richard Rossner outlines in his paper. It provides a framework of categories defined at different stages.

Frameworks and Assessment Grids

The Grid provides a framework of stages of development, not an assessment grid suitable for assessing the quality of a teacher's teaching. One needs to make a distinction between frameworks and criteria grids for performance assessment. Oral language proficiency is often assessed with the aid of an assessment grid that defines certain categories (e.g. accuracy, fluency, pronunciation) at different performance bands, with a definition in each cell of the resulting table; similar grids are frequently used for assessing writing. On some grids the entire range of proficiency is covered and the performance bands represent proficiency levels, like A1—C2. More frequently, however, the grid will be used to assess performance in an assessment task set at a particular level, e.g. B1. In such a case, a range of "grades" for performance at this level is frequently given; often the wording of the descriptors for the grades are normed around a middle band representing a "pass" at the target level, with possibly a further couple of grades defining good and exceptional performances and a couple more below the norm describing grades of unsatisfactory performance.

Frameworks of qualifications are often summarised in grids with word tables that at first sight look just like assessment criteria grids. Early frameworks, such as the British NCVQ (National Council for Vocational Qualifications) Frameworks were initially presented as a ladder, with one holistic definition

per level). Increasingly, however, frameworks are presented in grids with the levels on the vertical axis and the categories – often for skill areas – on the horizontal axis.

Framework grids, with simplified descriptors expressed in concrete “I can” terms, are sometimes used for self-assessment. This is the case with CEFR Table 2, the self-assessment grid I wrote in 1996 that is now used in the Passport of the Council of Europe’s European Language Portfolio and in the related “Europass” sponsored by the European Union. In that grid, unlike with most performance assessment grids, the levels are presented in a more user-friendly left-to-right order, with the different categories presented down a landscape page. Table 1 shows the entries for levels B1 and B2. The EAQUALS Profiling Grid for Language Teachers is consciously inspired by CEFR Table 2. The Grid originally presented the descriptors in “I can” formulation, but this has since been replaced with bullet points.

		B1	B2
U N D E R S T A N D I N G	Listening	I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. I can understand the main point of many radio or TV programmes on current affairs or topics of personal or professional interest when the delivery is relatively slow and clear.	I can understand extended speech and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programmes. I can understand the majority of films in standard dialect.
	Reading	I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.	I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular stances or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.
S P E A K I N G	Spoken Interaction	I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).	I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views.
	Spoken Production	I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.
W R I T I N G	Writing	I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions.	I can write clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects related to my interests. I can write an essay or report, passing on information or giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view. I can write letters highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences.

Table 1: CEFR Table 2: Self-assessment Grid, Levels B1 & B2

The EAQUALS grid is inspired by the CEFR and Portfolio in more than just a technical manner of presenting descriptors. The main aims of the CEFR are, as stated right at the beginning, to encourage the use of a common metalanguage, reflection on current practice and the agreement of common reference points in order to map qualifications. All three points are as relevant to language teacher education as they are to language teaching and learning.

The Forefather of the EAQUALS Grid

The EAQUALS grid has its origin in a Eurocentres project that required the evaluation of a large number of non-native English language teachers in Brazil. One instrument that I developed for this purpose in 1997 (so shortly after developing what became CEFR Table 2) was a pair of grids for evaluating teachers: one a performance assessment grid, the other a professional profiling grid. The former considered key aspects of a teacher's performance such their rapport with the class, their projection of their personality to inspire students, plus more "objective" factors like their ability to answer student queries adequately, called "Language Awareness," and their classroom management skills, called "Technique". Grade 3 (the "norm") on this evaluative grid is presented in a 2003 version in Table 2. The grid was originally used to evaluate a teacher after an observation lesson, in addition to a more conventional observation sheet that followed the phases of the lesson, the setting and the achievement of objectives, etc.

PROJECTION	SENSITIVITY	TECHNIQUE	LANGUAGE AWARENESS	RAPPORT
Can keep class attention fully when using appropriate material.	Is sensitive to the class as a whole and gives all individuals an equal chance to participate.	Lessons show competent phasing of teacher-directed activity and student-student interaction.	Handles difficult grammatical questions adequately but not always comprehensively.	Has good rapport with the class as a whole.

Table 2: Eurocentres Teaching Profile Grid: Grade 3

The companion grid was completed beforehand by the teacher; it recorded their view of their experience and broader professional issues. Grade 3 is shown in Table 3.

EXPERIENCE	QUALIFICATIONS	COMPUTER LITERACY	PROFESSIONALISM	MENTORING AND TEAMWORK
I have taught all levels successfully except either Proficiency or Beginners. I am familiar with the full range of ELT materials and can criticise them effectively from practical and theoretical perspectives.	Degree plus DELTA or PGCE TEFL	I can write properly formatted material in Microsoft word. I can get material from the internet.	I readily move from task to task. I am willing and able to adapt to change, show resourcefulness, and maintain perspective in difficult situations. I support management and colleagues effectively.	I share my ideas and help colleagues find suitable material. I take an active interest in what is happening in the school, attend training sessions, participate in observation programmes and sometimes lead social programme activities.

Table 3: Eurocentres Professional Profile Grid: Grade 3

The first grid uses categories that an observer can evaluate; the second grid uses categories that a teacher can self-assess or that a director of studies can evaluate, on the basis of their knowledge of the teacher.

These two grids were presented to a small group in a session at EAQUALS 2005 conference in Athens with the question: should we develop something out of this? The response was great interest plus a reservation about the first grid with regard to the subjectivity of judgements on projection, rapport, and sensitivity, which are personality factors. The clear brief from EAQUALS colleagues was to produce a profiling grid, not an assessment grid, and to stick to categories that could be more objectively evaluated, excluding personality factors. Therefore I took the other categories as the starting point for developing the EAQUALS grid.

The Development of Frameworks

The USA recently demonstrated how not to develop a Framework. In the No Child Left Behind (2001) initiative launched by President George W. Bush, the key second language element – the English language ability immigrant children need to be successful at school – was undefined, with the result that it has been equated in many contexts with “English Language Arts” (= creative writing for native-speaking children). No attempt was made to create a common framework of reference; each state went its own way. No relationship was clarified between the word “proficient” (tests were to demonstrate that students were proficient) and the established expression “mastery” (the traditional pass/fail concept of criterion-referenced assessment popular in the States since the 1960s). No guidance was given on the number of grades to be reported by tests – other than that there had to be at least one grade about “proficient” to reward excellence. Commercial companies were then contracted to produce tests. The result, according to Chaloub-Deville (2008) and Perie (2008) is a veritable jungle of tests and reporting scales that cannot be related to each other or to any common construct as regards what they test or the way they report test results.

Things in Europe tend to happen more slowly, but in a more coordinated fashion. If one looks at the way the CEFR developed, there was first a phase focused on developing a framework of objectives by defining categories and lists of sub-components. This process started with the publication of *The Threshold Level* (van Ek 1976; republished as van Ek and Trim 1990/2001 and now translated into over 50 languages), was delayed 10 years when first proposals for a unit-credit scheme were rejected at an intergovernmental Symposium in Ludwigshafen in 1977 (Trim 1978), and revived in the early 1990s after the successful Rüşchlikon Symposium (Council of Europe 1992). It is significant that the idea of levels was not very present in these early phases: the focus was on educational objectives. In the preparation for the Rüşchlikon Symposium, Eurocentres developed the idea of a European Language Portfolio, with results reported onto a common European scale of descriptors for different levels. The original concept was relatively simple with three main scales (Reception, Interaction, Production), each divided into three sub-scales – a grand total of 12 scales (North 1992).

It was towards the end of the Rüşchlikon Symposium that the descriptor scale (in the simpler Portfolio) was related to the objectives (in the more complex framework). As a result, the concepts of common levels and of descriptor scales were taken out of the Portfolio and put at the heart of the Framework. An official Working Party then oversaw the development of the text by an authoring group, a research project developed and scaled the descriptors for the CEFR and Portfolio (North 2000; North and Schneider 1998) – and the CEFR has 54 (rather than 12) descriptor scales as a result, since as many categories in the CEFR scheme as feasible were scaled. Care was taken throughout to involve national governments and international examination bodies and a manual to help them to relate language qualifications to the Framework was provided in a pilot edition in 2003 and reissued in 2009 (Council of Europe 2009).

It is interesting the way a similar path seems to be being followed in the development of a common framework for teacher education and development. On the one hand, there is the development of a framework of objectives in the European Profile (Kelly, M. and Grenfell M 2004) and in the development of the student teacher portfolio, EPOSTL (Newby et al 2006). Both these developments concern the definition of objectives for tertiary level initial teacher training for teachers in the mainstream education system. On the other hand there is the development of a profiling scheme intended to trace the different

stages of a teacher's development – in the EAQUALS Grid. The former perspective – objectives – has only one axis: categories of objectives that are relevant. The second perspective – profiling progress – has two axes: categories plus stages of development. In addition, an evaluative and comparative aspect is present in a profiling grid; one band is higher than another band because the competence displayed at the higher band is "better". This evaluative aspect leads to a focus on observable, practical skills that can be defined in bands of increasing competence – as was the case with the learner's European Language Portfolio.

The European Profile

The full name of the European Profile is: "European Profile for Language Teacher Education - A Frame of Reference." It describes 40 areas grouped into four sections:

- Structure: elements of a trainee teacher's learning environment;
- Knowledge and Understanding: background knowledge in terms of language proficiency, knowledge about language and learning, technical – ICT– training, curricula, evaluation;
- Strategies and Skills: practical knowhow in terms of methodology, etc;
- Values: intercultural, collaborative values that teachers should be trained to promote in their teaching.

"Strategies and Skills" is the section which by its practical focus relates most closely to the approach taken in the EAQUALS Grid. In that section the following 13 areas are outlined.

- ways of adapting teaching approaches to the educational context and individual needs of learners
- critical evaluation, development and practical application of teaching materials and resources
- methods of learning to learn
- development of reflective practice and self-evaluation
- development of independent language learning strategies
- ways of maintaining and enhancing ongoing personal language competence
- the practical application of curricula and syllabuses
- peer observation and peer review
- developing relationships with educational institutions in appropriate countries
- action research
- incorporating research into teaching
- Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)
- use of the European Language Portfolio for self-evaluation

The approach is essentially the laying out of terrain in a reference document. Compared to the EAQUALS Grid, there is very little about classroom skills in action. Lesson planning and classroom management are not actually mentioned at all, nor is modelling language, dealing with learner queries or error correction.

European Portfolio (EPOSTL)

The EPOSTL (formerly STP "Student Teacher Portfolio") takes a different approach. Rather than describing areas it lists descriptors grouped in seven areas: Context; Methodology; Resources; Lesson Planning; Conducting a Lesson; Independent Learning, and Assessment of Learning. The authors state that they were inspired by the CEFR (for "Can do" descriptors), by the European Language Portfolio (for a three-part structure: Passport, Biography, Dossier), and by the European Profile discussed above. The authors say: "At the core of the STP are the 190 descriptors of didactic competences which comprise the biography section. These descriptors may be regarded as a set of core competences which language teachers should strive to attain." (Newby et al: 2). The aim of EPOSTL is thus more similar to the EAQUALS Grid, but it focuses on one stage of teacher development: initial training. The breakdown under the seven areas is as follows:

Context

- A. Curriculum
- B. Aims and Needs
- C. The Role of the Language Teacher

D. Institutional Resources and Constraints

Methodology

- A. Speaking/Spoken Interaction
- B. Writing/Written Interaction
- C. Listening
- D. Reading
- E. Grammar
- F. Vocabulary
- G. Culture

Resources

Lesson Planning

- A. Identification of Learning Objectives
- B. Lesson Content
- C. Organisation

Conducting a Lesson

- A. Using Lesson Plans
- B. Content
- C. Interaction with Learners
- D. Classroom Management
- E. Classroom Language

Independent Learning

- A. Learner Autonomy
- B. Homework
- C. Projects
- D. Portfolios
- E. Virtual Learning
- F. Extra-curricular Activities

Assessment of Learning

- A. Designing Assessment Tools
- B. Evaluation
- C. Self- and Peer Assessment
- D. Language Performance
- E. Culture
- F. Error Analysis

Some of the descriptors operate at a very general level (e.g. *I can design language courses around the requirements of the national and local curricula*). Others are practically focused, more like the EAQUALS ones (e.g. *I can select and design different activities to help learners to become aware of and use different text types - telephone conversations, transactions, speeches etc., or I can plan my lessons to take into account the different pace at which learners work.*) Because of the way the checklists are organised, there is a degree of repetition in the formulation. Under "Methodology: Speaking/Spoken Interaction", for example, there are 12 descriptors, of which 8 have the pattern: "*I can select and design activities*" The result is a set of interesting descriptors, but it does have the air of an endless "To Do" list. It is designed for students in full-time training, and in that context is probably very useful as an awareness raising tool and as a way of tracking and recording achievements. I find it is a little more difficult to imagine practising teachers or directors of studies dealing with 190 descriptors, however.

The EAQUALS Profiling Grid

The aim of the Grid is to describe qualifications and practical competences that one could expect at stages of a teacher's development, with commonly agreed reference points – like the levels of the CEFR. The concept was that, as with the European Language Portfolio (ELP), the summary grid would be

supported by more detailed checklists for different stages or for different categories. The idea was that teachers might plot their profiles and consider the objectives represented by the descriptors for the next competence band; qualifications were used as reference points for bands as in the CEFR/ELP.

The bands are currently labelled "T1" to "T6." The descriptors reflect increasing knowledge, skills and experience as one moves up the bands. T1 and T2 ("Basic") refers to teachers in training. At this stage, teaching knowledge and competence is holistic and in the process of being acquired. T3 and T4 ("Independent") refer to teachers who have a minimum standard for teaching a language. T5 and T6 ("Proficient") refers to more experienced teachers who will probably have a noticeably jagged profile as they may well have tended to develop or specialise in certain areas rather than others. To give a feel for the different bands, it might be useful to look at the descriptors for "Language Awareness," mainly focused on dealing with classroom queries.

At T1, the teacher can: *"answer simple queries with the help of reference works."* They cannot act independently.

At T2, one can *"answer queries related to simple, high frequency structures."* On home ground, the trainee teacher can cope with questions.

At T3 the newly qualified teacher can *give correct models of usage on most occasions* (though they may sometimes oversimplify the language or present something that is not actually what a native speaker would say) and they can *"answer most language queries satisfactorily at A1-B1, using reference sources as necessary."* In other words, they can operate independently at lower levels, but it is still a good idea that they check both the models they give and their answers to queries.

At T4 the teacher can still *"give correct models of usage on most occasions"* that is to say, still cannot cope with everything, and can *"answer language queries adequately though not always comprehensively, using reference sources as necessary."* Here we see an echo of the Eurocentres descriptor shown in Table 2.

By T5 the teacher is fully competent in this area and can *"give correct examples of usage on all occasions"* and *answer language queries reliably."*

At T6 the teacher can *"provide clear explanations"* and *"teach usage and register at all levels,"* but more significantly they can *"understand what is confusing learners"* and *"give comprehensive, accurate answers to queries"*. A fully proficient language teacher can understand problems that learners are having and can answer questions that the learners may well not be capable of formulating themselves.

As mentioned in the Introduction, the grid provides a profile across a rich set of categories. In addition to "Language Awareness" "*Language*" also includes, for non-native speakers, "Language Proficiency." "*Qualifications*" covers formal qualifications, teaching practice and experience.

The main qualitative descriptors are to be found in "*Core Competences*." This covers "Methodology knowledge and skills", "Planning", "Interaction Management" and "Assessment". In addition, there might be an argument for including the skills referred to in "Language Awareness" in "*Core Competences*".

In addition to the "*Core Competences*" there are two "*Complementary Skills*" defined: "Teacher Development" and "Digital Literacy". Other complementary skills could also be imagined, but these two are perhaps the closest to a teacher's core tasks. As one becomes more experienced it is natural to become involved in mentoring and also to lead some teacher development sessions for colleagues. And today no teacher can get away without some degree of digital literacy. Other supplementary skills could include learner counselling, managing staff, school administration, language testing and quality management.

Perhaps it would be worth highlighting the "Core Competences" for T4 and the more experienced T5 as they are currently defined. These are shown in Table 4.

	T4	T5
Methodology: knowledge and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ familiarity with learning theory, learning styles and learning strategies ▪ identify the theoretical rationale behind a wide range of techniques and materials, with which familiar ▪ evaluate appropriateness of techniques and materials in different teaching situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ good familiarity with teaching approaches, learning styles, strategies ▪ provide theoretical rationale for teaching approach and for a very wide range of techniques / materials ▪ evaluate materials effectively from practical and theoretical perspectives
Lesson and Course Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ analyse individual learners' needs in detail, including learning-to-learn ▪ plan clear main and supplementary objectives for lessons ▪ provide a rationale for lesson stages ▪ select/design supplementary activities ▪ ensure lesson-to-lesson coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ plan a balanced, varied scheme of work for a module based on detailed needs analysis ▪ design tasks to exploit linguistic and communicative potential of materials ▪ design multi-level tasks to meet individual needs and lesson objectives
Interaction Management and Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ set up a varied and balanced sequence of class, group and pair work appropriate to the lesson objectives ▪ monitor individual and group work effectively providing or eliciting appropriate feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ set up group interaction focused on multiple learning objectives ▪ monitor individual and group performances accurately and thoroughly ▪ give various forms of relevant individual feedback
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ conduct tests and interviews if given material to do so ▪ train learners to code their errors to increase language awareness ▪ design or select appropriate quizzes, revision activities, and progress tests ▪ CEFR standardisation experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ coordinate placement testing and progress assessment (oral & written) ▪ use video & home work marking codes to help learners recognise strengths / weaknesses ▪ use CEFR criteria reliably to assess spoken and written proficiency

Table 4: Core Competences: T4-T5

There is, no doubt, further work to be done on the descriptors, but I think readers will agree that the grid is an interesting project. Once we have a finalised set of categories, and a set of descriptors defining them with which the project group are satisfied, then some validation exercises will need to be undertaken. These could include asking informants to sort sub-scales into order and report any problems, and asking teachers to self assess themselves and report on their experience.

Aspects Missing in the Current Version

One point that does need emphasising is that the Grid as it currently stands does not provide a profile of "a good teacher." Firstly, the more evaluative, personality factors included in the original Eurocentres grids (Sensitivity, Rapport, Projection) have been deliberately excluded. Yet one of my mentors when I first started working for Eurocentres 30 years ago, John Andrews, once said that being a good teacher was 70% about personality. If someone has a weak personality which they cannot project, is insensitive and cannot build rapport, then they may be very knowledgeable, well-qualified and have a lot of skills –

but how can they be a good teacher?

Values (such as those in the European Profile) have not been included either. Should they be? At the recent Lisbon meeting of the EAQUALS Special Interest Project concerned with developing a Framework based on the Grid in order to compare and situate teacher training qualifications, there was the suggestion that various aspects of Professionalism should be included. One could envisage descriptors for areas such as "Responsibility," "Personal Development" and "Teamwork," for example. At the meeting in Siena that is the subject of this set of papers, the discussion focused more on intercultural and educational values such as "Giving Value to Cultural Diversity (openness to "the other"); "Promotion of Plurilingualism" and "Empowerment of Learners (affirmation of individuality)". Again one can envisage descriptors for these areas. Indeed the empowerment of learners is treated well in the EPOSTL. But is it feasible or desirable to define such aspects at different bands of competence? *Can* they in fact be defined at six bands of competence?

The issue is very similar to the issue as regards socio-cultural competences and interculturalism in relation to the CEFR. Descriptors for Levels A1-C2 are lacking from the CEFR for these areas, not because they are unimportant, but because it makes little sense to define six or more bands of competence in these areas. Firstly, the objectives will surely be similar at all language levels; secondly, these characteristics are completely independent of language proficiency: one could be C2 with very low socio- and intercultural competence; one could be A2 with very high socio- and intercultural competence. The same complications apply to teacher competence with regard to "Giving Value to Cultural Diversity (openness to "the other"); "Promotion of Plurilingualism" and the "Empowerment of Learners (affirmation of individuality)."

The Future

Another question is that if it is felt that Values should be included, and if it proves possible to define such values at, for example, the three broad stages "Basic," "Independent" and "Proficient," should the grid then be re-organised to reflect the more conventional distinction between "Knowledge," "Skills" and Values?

- Knowledge, for example, could include "Language Proficiency" (as now), a re-defined "Language Awareness" more focused on the nature of language, as taught in teacher training courses, and "Theories of Learning and of Second Language Acquisition."
- Skills would be the current "*Core Competences*", perhaps including a section of "Language in Class" covering the current definitions for "Language Awareness", but broadened to include the giving of instructions, prompts and feedback, plus the "*Complementary Skills*" - either as they are or extended.
- Values could be treated differently, with descriptors just for the three broad stages, as discussed above.
- Qualifications could continue to be divided into "Formal Training," "Teaching Practice" and "Experience."

These are questions that could perhaps be addressed at the next meeting on "Training, Quality and Certification in Foreign Language Teaching" by the TQAC network.

Meanwhile, a small working group, including Richard Rossner and myself, is meeting in May 2009 to discuss these issues arising from the 2009 TQAC meeting and consider draft formulations of content for "Knowledge" and "Values". The first drafts are based partly on internal Eurocentres documents, as before, this time influenced by the content of Cambridge ESOL qualifications for language teachers, and partly on descriptors for these areas in the EPOSTL. The outcome, hopefully the "final" shape of the EAQUALS Profiling Grid with descriptors fit for an initial validation workshop, could perhaps be presented at the next TQAC meeting.

References

- Chaloub-Deville, M. (2008): Standards-Based Assessment in the U.S.: Social and Educational Impact. Paper given at the 3rd International ALTE Conference "The Social and Educational Impact of Language Assessment," Cambridge 10-12 April 2008.
- Council of Europe (1992): *Transparency and Coherence in Language Learning in Europe: Objectives, assessment and certification. Symposium held in Rüschlikon, 10–16 November 1991.* (Report edited by North, Brian). Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-operation.
- Council of Europe (2001): *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (2009): *Relating Language Examinations to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR). A Manual.*
<http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic>
- Kelly, M. and Grenfell, M. (2004): European Profile for Language Teacher Education.
http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/profilebroch_en.pdf
- Newby, D., Allan, R., Fenner, A., Jones, B., Komorowska, H. and Soghikyan, K. (2006): The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages, EPOSTL <http://www.ecml.at/mtp2/FTE/pdf/STPExtract.pdf>
- No Child Left Behind (2001): Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425.
- North, B. (1992): European Language Portfolio: Some Options for a Working Approach to Design Scales for Proficiency. In: Council of Europe 1992, 158–174. Republished in Schärer R. and North B. *Towards a Common European Framework for Reporting Language Competency*, NFLC Occasional Paper, National Foreign Language Center, Washington D.C., April 1992.
- North, B. (2000): *The Development of a Common Framework Scale of Language Proficiency.* New York, Peter Lang.
- North, B. and Schneider, G. (1998): Scaling Descriptors for Language Proficiency Scales. *Language Testing* 15/2: 217-262.
- Perie, M. (2008): A Guide to Developing and Understanding Performance-based Descriptors. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*. Winter 2008: 15-29.
- Trim, John L.M. (1978): *Some Possible Lines of Development of an Overall Structure for a European Unit / Credit Scheme for Foreign Language Learning by Adults.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- van Ek, Jan A. (1976): *The Threshold level in a European Unit/credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- van Ek, J.A; Trim, J.L.M., (2001): *Threshold 1990*, Cambridge, CUP, ISBN 0-521-56707-8.

		BASIC		INDEPENDENT		PROFICIENT	
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6
LANGUAGE	Language Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> studying the language at tertiary level B1 proficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> studying the language at tertiary level B2 proficiency 	a B2 certificate in the language; oral competence at C1 level	a C1 examination certificate (eg CAE); oral competence at C2 level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> degree in the language, or: a C2 examination certificate (eg CPE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> native speaker, or: language degree or C2 certificate plus a natural command of the language
	Language Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> answer simple queries with the help of reference works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> answer queries related to simple, high frequency structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> give correct models of usage on most occasions answer most language queries satisfactorily at A1-B1, using reference sources as necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> give correct models of usage on most occasions answer language queries adequately though not always comprehensively, using reference sources as necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> give correct examples of usage on all occasions answer language queries reliably 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide clear explanations teach usage and register at all levels understand what is confusing learners give comprehensive, accurate answers to queries
QUALIFICATIONS	Language Teacher Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> taking a certificate in teaching the target language, or: following an internal training course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 30 hours documented, structured training in language awareness and methodology of teaching the target language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 60 hours of documented, structured training in teaching the target language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> degree in the target language, or: internationally recognised (min. 100 hour) certificate in teaching the target language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> degree or degree module in teaching the target language, or: internationally recognised (min. 100 hour) certificate in teaching the target language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> masters degree or module in language teaching or applied linguistics or: postgraduate or professional diploma in teaching the language (min. 200 hours)
	Language Teaching Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> experience of team-teaching or of acting as a teacher's assistant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> experience of supervision and assessment while teaching phases of lessons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 2 hours of documented, assessed teaching practice has been observed & had feedback on some actual teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 6 hours of documented, assessed teaching practice has been observed & had feedback on at least 5 hrs of real teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 12 hours of documented, assessed teaching practice has been observed & had feedback on at least 8 hours of teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 18 hours of documented, assessed teaching practice has been observed & had feedback on at least 12 hours of teaching
	Teaching Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> taught some lessons or parts of lessons at one or two levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> own class(es) but limited experience which only includes teaching at lower levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 200 hours, documented teaching experience taught a range of levels up to B1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 800 hours, documented teaching experience taught all levels except C1 & C2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 2,400 hours, documented teaching experience taught all levels except C2, examination or specialised classes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 4,000 hours, documented teaching experience taught all levels successfully, general, exam and specialised
CORE COMPETENCIES	Methodology: knowledge and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sensitisation to learning theories and features of language familiarity with a limited range of techniques and materials for one or two levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> basic understanding of learning theories and features of language familiarity with techniques and materials for 2+ levels select new techniques & materials with advice from colleagues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarity with theories of language learning and with learning styles familiarity with an expanding range of techniques and materials choose which to apply based on the needs of a particular group evaluate usefulness of techniques and materials in teaching context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarity with learning theory, learning styles and learning strategies identify the theoretical rationale behind a wide range of techniques and materials, with which familiar evaluate appropriateness of techniques and materials in different teaching situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> good familiarity with teaching approaches, learning styles, strategies provide theoretical rationale for teaching approach and for a very wide range of techniques / materials evaluate materials effectively from practical and theoretical perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed knowledge of theories of language and learning select an optimum combination of techniques to suit each type of learner and learning situation & provide clear theoretical rationale for decisions
	Lesson and Course Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> work with lesson plans in teachers' notes to published materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use published or in-house materials to develop plans for different types of lessons plan phases and timing of various lesson types 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use a syllabus and specified materials to prepare lesson plans that are well-balanced and meet the needs of the group; adjust these plans as required take account of lesson outcomes in planning next lesson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse individual learners' needs in detail, including learning-to-learn plan clear main and supplementary objectives for lessons provide a rationale for lesson stages select/design supplementary activities ensure lesson-to-lesson coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> plan a balanced, varied scheme of work for a module based on detailed needs analysis design tasks to exploit linguistic and communicative potential of materials design multi-level tasks to meet individual needs and lesson objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> plan an entire course with recycling and revision create or select appropriate activities for balanced learning modules with communicative and linguistic content design multi-level tasks to meet individual needs and lesson objectives
	Interaction Management and Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alternate between whole class teaching and pair practice following suggestions in a teachers' guide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> manage teacher-class interaction effectively give clear instructions for pair and group work monitor the resulting activity give clear feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> set up pairs and groups efficiently ensure all learners are involved in productive pair and group work monitor performance at all times bring the class back together and manage feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> set up a varied and balanced sequence of class, group and pair work appropriate to the lesson objectives monitor individual and group work effectively providing or eliciting appropriate feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> set up group interaction focused on multiple learning objectives monitor individual and group performances accurately and thoroughly give various forms of relevant individual feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> facilitate task-based learning manage learner-centred, multi-level group work derive appropriate action points from monitoring and analysis of the interaction
	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supervise and mark class quizzes and progress tests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supervise and mark tests write a class quiz or revision activity to revise recent work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> select suitable progress tests and set up and supervise them use the results and simple oral and written tasks to assess learners' progress and things to work on use a homework marking code to increase language awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> conduct tests and interviews if given material to do so train learners to code their errors to increase language awareness design or select appropriate quizzes, revision activities, and progress tests CEFR standardisation experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> coordinate placement testing and progress assessment (oral & written) use video & hw codes to help learners recognise strengths / weaknesses use CEFR criteria reliably to assess spoken and written proficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> write progress tests develop assessment tasks run CEFR standardisation sessions use video & hw codes to help learners recognise strengths / weaknesses use CEFR criteria reliably to assess spoken and written proficiency
COMPLEMENT-ARY SKILLS	Teacher Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> take part in training sessions cooperate with colleagues with set tasks regularly observe real teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> take an active part in group work during training liaise well with other teachers observe & team-teach with teachers at restricted levels act on observation feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> take an active part in various kinds of in-service training/development actively seek advice from colleagues and relevant books observe colleagues at various levels act on colleagues' feedback on serial observations of own teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop awareness and competence through professional reading lead discussions sometimes and exchange ideas about materials and techniques seek opportunities to be observed and receive feedback on own teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> act as mentor to less experienced colleagues lead a training session or even series of sessions given materials to use and distance support from a colleague seek opportunities for peer-observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> create a series of training modules for less experienced teachers run a teacher CPD programme take part in institutional or (inter) national projects observe colleagues and provide effective feedback
	Digital Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> write a worksheet following conventions follow menus to operate software download from resource sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> search effectively for material on the internet select and download from resource sites organize materials in hierarchically structured folders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use data projectors for class lessons with internet, DVD etc use software for handling images, DVDs, sound files use a camcorder to record tasks set a class an exercise with CALL materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> create lessons with downloaded texts, pictures, graphics, etc. devise tasks using internet-based media such as wikis, blogs, webquests set & supervise individual CALL work coordinate project work with media (camcorder, internet downloads etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use PowerPoint for presentations, including animation train students to select and use CALL exercises effectively use authoring program to create CALL troubleshoot with basic equipment (e.g. data projector, printer). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> show colleagues how to use new soft/hardware, incl. authoring programs design blended learning modules use any standard Windows software, including media, video editing troubleshoot hardware