From Standards for Classical Language Learning to World-Readiness Standards: What's New and How They Can Improve Classroom Instruction

Bartolo Natoli
Randolph-Macon College

Abstract

With the introduction of the 1997 *Standards for Classical Language Learning*, Classics instructors from across the country were provided with a consistent set of Standards on which to base their curriculum. Nearly twenty years later, these Standards have undergone major revisions, led by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). In concert with ACTFL's Standards project, classical associations from across the country have come together and formed a task force to further adapt the ACTFL *World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* and to revise the 1997 Standards for the next generations of students. This paper seeks to accomplish two goals. First, it will delineate the differences between the 1997 Standards and the current version, providing the rationale for why the changes have been made due to shifts in pedagogical thinking and in culture, more broadly. Secondly, it will outline several ways in which the new Standards can have a direct, positive effect on daily classroom instruction. Particular attention will be paid to the new focus on proficiency vs. performance, the increased emphasis on 21st century skills, and the refashioning of the language of the Standards to reflect changes in pedagogical practice.

Keywords

Standards, Latin, language proficiency

Over the past three and a half decades, the standards movement has reimagined and reshaped the landscape of public education across the United States. Beginning in the 1980s, this movement has shifted the focus of education to ensuring learners met a minimum proficiency, or standard, in academic subjects. Rather than ranking learner performance against a normative sample, standards-based education aimed at measuring learners against a concrete standard of proficiency or mastery. As a result, the entire framework of public education began to shift, with individual disciplines taught in public schools scrambling to develop standards documents that

Natoli, Bartolo. "From *Standards for Classical Language Learning* to *World-Readiness Standards*: What's New and How They Can Improve Classroom Instruction." *Teaching Classical Languages* 9.1 (2018): 1-18. ISSN 2160-2220.

laid out concrete, measurable outcomes to serve as evidence of learner achievement of proficiency. The field of Classical Studies has been no exception to this movement. In 1997, a task force convened by the American Philological Association (APA)[1] and the American Classical League (ACL) crafted and published the *Standards for Classical Language Learning*, a document that would set the foundation for standards-based education in Latin and Greek classrooms for the next twenty years.

Recently, however, the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has led a systematic review of the nation's standards documents with the explicit goal of updating them to better reflect changes in pedagogical theory and practice since the turn of the millennium. As a result, a new task force was assembled and an updated 2017 Standards document for classical language learning will soon be published in the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*.

This paper will review these updated 2017 Standards with an explicit focus on the major updates that have been made from the original 1997 Standards for Classical Language Learning. The following discussion will be divided into two broad sections. First, a brief and overarching history of the standards movement in Classical Studies will be provided, the chief value of which will be to review the original 1997 Standards and to frame the 2017 Standards within the progression of standards development in America. Second, a detailed discussion of the 2017 Standards will be undertaken, a discussion that will focus on the major updates that have been made in the 2017 Standards, with the rationale behind why such changes were made.

A Brief History of the Standards

More than thirty-five years ago, the trajectory of public education in the United States was permanently changed. *A Nation at Risk*, a 1983 report commissioned by the Department of Education, painted a bleak picture of the K-12 landscape in America, as the performance of American students on assessments, such as the SAT, had plummeted between 1963-1980, and consistent, quality education was shown to be lacking in many parts of the country. As a result of the report, the US Federal Government began to devise ways by which to stem the tide and to improve the quality of education across all subjects. One of the chief expressions of this federal push came in the form of the standards movement.

1 The American Philological Association is now known as the Society for Classical Studies (SCS).

Beginning with the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* of the G. H. W. Bush administration and stretching across the entirety of the 1990s, academic standards were formulated for so-called 'core' courses (e.g., English, math, social studies, science, and history). These standards described in clear terms what learners should know and be able to do in each subject at each grade level. This movement towards clear and consistent standards reached a culmination in 2001 with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), a revision of the federal Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965.

However, during this same decade, although standards had been drafted for 'core' courses, other elective courses, such as art, music, physical education, and foreign languages were entirely excluded. Therefore, in 1996, representatives from ACTFL and associations representing ten classical and modern languages developed their own Standards document for K-12 instruction entitled *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for a 21st Century.*[2] The expressed hope was that these language Standards would raise the study of foreign languages to a position of importance similar to the 'core' courses.

In 1997, the major national bodies of the study of Classics, the American Classical League (ACL) and the American Philological Association (APA), in conjunction with other regional bodies, such as the Classical Association of the Middle West and South (CAMWS), the Classical Association of New England (CANE), and the Classical Association of the Atlantic States (CAAS), created a task force on classical language learning, consisting of Latin and Greek instructors from both the K-12 and post-secondary levels.[3] This task force was charged both with reviewing the 1997 *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* and with using it to craft a Classics-focused, foundational document that clearly articulated the academic and performance standards for learners in the Latin and Greek classroom. The resulting document included the first standards for classical languages, dividing them into five overarching goals, commonly referred to as the five C's: 1. Communication; 2. Culture; 3. Connections; 4. Comparisons; 5. Communities (Fig. 1).[4]

---

2 Summarized from the ACTFL website.

3 The 1997 Task Force consisted of: Richard Gascoyne, Martha Abbott, Z. Philip Ambrose, Cathy Daugherty, Sally Davis, Terry Klein, Glenn Knudsvig, Robert LaBouve, Nancy Lister, Karen Lee Singh, Kathryn Thomas, and Richard F. Thomas.

4 For a more thorough history of the development of the National Standards for Latin and Greek, see Abbott, Davis, and Gascoyne.

Goal	*Description*
1. Communication	Learners will communicate in a classical language.
2. Cultures	Learners will gain knowledge and understanding of Greco-Roman culture.
3. Connections	Learners will connect with other disciplines and expand knowledge.
4. Comparisons	Learners will develop insight into their own language and culture.
5. Communities	Learners will participate in wider communities of language and culture.

Fig. 1. Description of the Five Goal Areas in the 1997 *Standards for Classical Language Learning*[5]

The first two goals, Communication and Culture, formed the foundation of these Standards, as they aimed at increasing learner knowledge of and proficiency in both classical language and culture. Goals three and four, Connections and Comparisons, focused on helping learners connect their linguistic and cultural knowledge both to what they were experiencing in their own language and culture and to what they were learning in their other classes. Lastly, the final goal, Communities, looked to helping learners transform the connections they made into a deeper appreciation of and interaction with a multicultural, globalized world.

These 1997 Standards formed the basis for instruction of Latin and Greek on the K-12 level for the next twenty years with virtually no changes. However, in 2015, the American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL) initiated a "refreshing"[6] of the modern language standards under the title: *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*.[7] Therefore, another task force was formed with representatives from ACL, SCS, AIA, CAMWS, CAAS, CANE, the Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest (CAPN), and others to reformulate the *Classical*

5 Adapted from the 1997 *Standards for Classical Language Learning.*

6 ACTFL's Executive Director, Marty Abbott, said in a press release, "These refreshed *Standards* are familiar in their organization around the original five goal areas, but the descriptors point to what is new, identifying the critical thinking skills and creativity that one needs to acquire a new language."

7 The *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* is available for purchase online.

Language Standards.[8] The resulting document contains the revised *Standards for Classical Language Learning*.[9]

In very broad terms, the revised *Standards for Classical Language Learning* do not seek to refashion, redesign, or replace the original 1997 Standards and the Five C's. Instead, the explicit goal of the new Standards is simply to update the Five C's to better reflect twenty years of changes in pedagogical theory and, more importantly, in classroom practice.[10] Over the twenty years since the original Standards, there have been many such changes, but two are particularly noteworthy. First, there has been a noticeable shift away from learning techniques featuring drill and rote memorization towards active learning methods that emphasize critical thinking and collaboration (i.e., 21st century skills). Second, in classical languages (and particularly in Latin), there has been a growth in the variety of methodological approaches to teaching language, with grammar-translation and reading approaches being joined and supplemented by spoken and comprehensible input (CI) methods, to name but a few.[11] These two major pedagogical shifts underpin many of the changes found in the new Standards for Classical Languages, and they must be kept in mind as each standard is examined in detail below.

The New Standards

As stated above, the new Standards do not aim to create a major departure from the concept and content of the 1997 Standards, but only to update them to reflect the changes in classroom theory and practice over the last two decades. However, this updating still has resulted in a number of noteworthy changes (see Appendix). Therefore, the remainder of this paper will be devoted to a detailed discussion of these changes. In particular, four major changes will be addressed:

- Explicit attention to the development of literacy and the skills of communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity;

8 The 2015 Task Force consisted of: Kathy Elifrits, Mary English, Sherwin Little, Chris Amanna, Kevin Ballestrini, Nava Cohen, John Gruber-Miller, Ian Hochberg, Liane Houghtalin, Thomas Howell, Bartolo Natoli, Teresa Ramsby, Logan Searl, and Karin Suzadail.

9 More information about the 2017 Standards can be found on the ACL Website.

10 A synoptic comparison handout of the 1997 and 2017 Standards can be found in the Appendix.

11 Research on these newer methodologies is abundant, but seminal pieces include Carlon on applying second language acquisition to the teaching of Latin, Patrick on Comprehensible Input, McCaffrey and Hoyos on the Reading method, and May on grammar-translation.

- Use of sample performance indicators, organized by level of instruction, to describe the progression of a learner's performance in the modes of communication;
- Inclusion of sample progress indicators identified by performance range to be adaptable to any beginning point and any program model; and
- Equal coverage of a large variety of teaching methodologies (e.g., grammar-translation, reading, active Latin, etc.).

The first of these changes can be seen throughout the new Standards, but perhaps most easily in a comparison of the 5th C (Communities), as described in the 1997 Standards and in the new ones (Fig. 2).

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997) **Standard 5.1:** Students use their knowledge of Latin or Greek in a multilingual world. **Standard 5.2:** Students use their knowledge of Greco-Roman culture in a world of diverse cultures.
Standards for Classical Language Learning (2017) **Standard 5.1:** Learners use the language both within and beyond the classroom to interact and collaborate in their community and the globalized world. **Standard 5.2:** Learners set goals and reflect on their progress in using languages for enjoyment, enrichment, and advancement.

Fig. 2. Comparison of the 1997 and 2017 Standards: Standard 5, Communities

The 1997 version presents a broad, somewhat repetitive standard: students are to use their knowledge of Classical languages and cultures in the world, but no more direction than that is given. In the 2017 Standards, however, much more explicit terms are laid out, all of which focus on the 21st century skills of communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity. Standard 5.1 identifies collaboration as an explicit goal ("Learners use the language . . . to interact and collaborate"). Likewise, Standard 5.2 aims to increase critical thinking by shifting the student's focus to intentional self-reflection and metacognitive awareness of the learning process ("Learners set goals and reflect on their progress"). Such a shift

in focus towards collaboration, self-reflection, and metacognition creates a more dynamic, reciprocal relationship between learners and content in which the learner is the primary actor responsible for the learning. Take, for example, the following activity:

> *In an effort to help learners practice composition skills and to interact with other Latin learners, an instructor develops a lesson in which learners participate in a Latin chat using Twitter. Learners log on, tweet back and forth in Latin with each other and with learners from around the world.*

In terms of the Standards, this activity clearly meets with Standards 5.1 and 5.2 from the 1997 Standards, as learners are using their Latin to connect with others from communities different than their own. However, in the 2017 Standards, the activity only meets Standard 5.1, falling short of 5.2. The major shortcoming is that the activity lacks learner input in goals and active reflection. In other terms, the activity remains rather teacher-centered and does not engage learner voice and choice. To better align with the new Standards, the activity could be amended in two ways: 1) give learners a variety of choices for the activity (e.g., different media), and 2) include a reflection assignment at the conclusion of the activity. Such shifts activate learner choice, provide avenues for learner creativity and expression, foster learner metacognition and reflection, and generally make learners much more active participants.

In the end, the content remains essentially unchanged: learners still use Latin to communicate with others; however, the framework of the lesson has been adjusted to make learners more active participants who are responsible for their learning. It is hoped that such a shift in focus to critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and metacognition will help bring students into the 21st century, will better align the new Standards with current practice, and will make it easier for instructors to show administrators that learning and growth are occurring in the classroom.

The second major change in the new Standards is the development of updated, more nuanced Performance Ranges meant to be adaptable to any beginning point and any program model. To illustrate this change, let us turn our attention to the Communication and Cultures C's. In the 1997 Standards, only three performance ranges were given: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. However, these headings

were too broad in two main ways: 1) a lack of a differentiation between learners on different instructional levels and 2) a lack of detailed progression by learners within each performance range. To this first point, consider the 2nd Standard focusing on culture (Fig. 3).

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)
Standard 2.1: Students demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives of Greek or Roman culture as revealed in the practices of the Greeks or Romans.
Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced
Standard 2.2: Students demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives of Greek or Roman culture as revealed in the products of the Greeks or Romans.
Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced

Standards for Classical Language Learning (2017)
Standard 2.1: Learners use Latin or Greek to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the cultures studied.
Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary)
Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary)
Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary)
Standard 2.2: Learners use Latin or Greek to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the products and perspectives of the cultures studied.
Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary)
Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary)
Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary)

Fig. 3. Comparison of the 1997 and 2017 Standards: Standard 2, Culture

In the 1997 Standards, an intermediate learner on the postsecondary level is grouped together with an intermediate learner on the elementary level. This is problematic, as we know elementary learners should not be expected to perform at the same level as postsecondary learners; therefore, the new Standards aim to address this by adding more differentiation within each performance level, noting whether a novice learner, for example, is on the elementary, middle/high, or postsecondary level.

To the second point, namely the lack of progression allowed within a performance range, let us turn to the Communication C (Fig. 4).

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)
Standard 1.1: Students read, understand, and interpret Latin or Greek.
Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced
Standard 1.2: Students use orally, listen to, and write Latin or Greek as part of the language learning process.
Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced

Standards for Classical Language Learning (2017)
Standard 1.1: Learners understand, interpret, and analyze what is read, heard, or viewed on a variety of topics.
Interpretive Reading **OR** Interpretative Listening
Novice (Low, Middle, High)
Intermediate (Low, Middle, High)
Advanced (Low, Middle, High)
Superior
Standard 1.2: Learners interact and negotiate meaning in spoken, signed, or written conversations to share information, reactions, feelings, and opinions.
Interpersonal
Novice (Low, Middle, High)
Intermediate (Low, Middle, High)
Advanced (Low, Middle, High)
Superior
Standard 1.3: Learners present information, concepts, and ideas to narrate, describe, inform, explain, and persuade, on a variety of topics using appropriate media and adapting to various audiences of listeners, readers, or viewers.
Presentation Writing **OR** Presentational Speaking
Novice (Low, Middle, High)
Intermediate (Low, Middle, High)
Advanced (Low, Middle, High)
Superior

Fig. 4. Comparison of the 1997 and 2017 Standards: Standard 1, Communication

As we saw with Goal 2: Culture, the 1997 Standards limited its performance ranges to beginning, intermediate, and advanced. However, there is no way to measure learner progression within each of these ranges. For example, a learner who just performed to the lowest fringe of the intermediate range cannot be distinguished

from a learner on the upper-most edge of the intermediate range. Even though these two learners have vastly different levels of proficiency, there is no way to distinguish them with the 1997 Standards. Moreover, there is no way to track learner growth from the lower fringe to the higher fringe of the intermediate level. Hence, there is also no way for instructors to show to administrators that any growth has occurred. Therefore, to solve some of these problems, the new Standards adopted a different set of ranges, aligning the new ranges with the proficiency guidelines from ACTFL's 2012 Proficiency Guidelines for modern languages.[12] These guidelines add further differentiation within each performance range. Now, the three large ranges are subdivided into low, middle, and high levels (e.g., Intermediate Low, Intermediate Middle, Intermediate High). Moreover, a Superior level has been added to include learning occurring on the postgraduate level and beyond. With such subdivisions, tracking learner proficiency and growth becomes much more accurate and dynamic.

The third major change in the new Standards is the inclusion of specific, scaffolded sample progress indicators to give instructors examples of what measurable actions learners should be able to do within each of these performance ranges. A good example of how these measurable progress indicators can assist instruction can be seen in the Connections C, Standard 3.1. Below are the progress indicators for beginning/novice learners for Standard 3.1, as described in both the 1997 and 2017 Standards (Fig. 5).

In the 1997 Standards, although the progress indicators provide examples of student performance, they are problematic in two respects. First, they use non-specific language that can be difficult to employ for measuring learning or proficiency (e.g., "use"). Second, like the 1997 performance ranges, they do not differentiate between learners on various instructional levels (i.e., a beginning K-5 learner will perform differently than a beginning post-secondary learner).

Both of these issues are addressed in the 2017 Standards, as the new progress indicators provide clear, measurable examples of student performance on a variety of instructional levels. The language employed is more closely aligned to learning objective terminology and is much more specific and measurable (e.g., identify, label, interpret, recognize). Likewise, instead of one or two blanket indicators for all beginning learners, the new Standards provide sample performance indicators for different instructional age-groups.

12 A PDF of the Proficiency Guidelines can be downloaded directly from ACTFL.

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)
Standard 3.1: Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through their study of the classical languages.
Beginning

- Students use their knowledge of Latin or Greek in understanding a specialized vocabulary in such fields as government and politics.
- Students recognize and use Roman numerals and the vocabulary associated with counting.

Standards for Classical Language Learning (2017)
Standard 3.1: Learners build, reinforce, and expand their knowledge of other disciplines while using the language to develop critical thinking and to solve problems creatively
Novice, Elementary Learners:

- Learners in grades pre-K-5 recognize and use Roman numerals and the vocabulary associated with counting.
- Learners in grades pre-K-5 label objects or concepts that are used in their other classes, including animals, weather symbols, a calendar, or maps using Latin or Greek words.

Novice, Middle/High Learners:

- Learners interpret the main idea(s) from infographics showing statistics of populations of cities and countries, popularity of various cultural activities.
- Learners research schools in the Greek and Roman worlds and compare them to their own school.

Novice, Postsecondary Learners:

- Learners identify, label, and describe works of art from antiquity or later works that depict classical themes.
- Learners identify and label cities, topographical features, and historical events on maps.

Fig. 5. Comparison of the 1997 and 2017 Standards: Standard 3, Connections

Such specific and scaffolded indicators can greatly assist instructors in assessing a learner's proficiency level. If a Latin instructor on the secondary level can see evidence that learners compare schools in the Greek and Roman worlds to the

learners' own school, the instructor has a clear indication that the learners are performing on the novice level and can begin to challenge themselves to improve to an intermediate performance level. Moreover, such indicators can also be quite informative for the learners themselves, as they can easily be transformed into Can-Do statements with which learners can self-assess. For example, before any formative or summative assessment instructors can hand out a simple review sheet with a Can-Do checklist to help guide learner studying. As they are able to perform these tasks, learners can then feel more prepared for a classroom assessment.

The fourth change is, perhaps, the most noticeable and the one of most interest to instructors of classical languages, as it has to do with the Communication C, the prime standard in the entire Standards document. In the Communication C from the 1997 Standards, reading Latin or Greek was placed in a more privileged position than speaking, writing, and listening to the language. Such a privileging can be seen in the fact that within the 1997 version of the Communication C, reading Latin/Greek is given one Standard to itself, whereas listening to, speaking, and writing Latin/Greek are combined into another (Fig. 4).

The reasoning for such a privileging is quite clear: the ultimate goal for the vast majority of instructors of Latin and Greek is that students read Latin/Greek texts, not necessarily that they speak the languages fluently or that they compose the next great Latin epic. However, the focus that the 1997 Standards placed on reading was in need of revision in 2017, not because reading was no longer a primary goal, but because a focus on reading at the expense of other modalities no longer matched current theory or practice. Latin and Greek instructors now use far more instructional methods to achieve the goal of proficiency in the language, many of which are not explicitly based in the analysis of texts. Therefore, the new Standards sought to make a few changes to better capture current practice while simultaneously keeping reading proficiency as a major goal (Fig. 4).

To do so, the 2017 Standards adopted the language of the three modes of communication from ACTFL's 2012 Proficiency Guidelines and reorganized the Communication standard into an equal division of modalities: Interpretative, Interpersonal, and Presentational.[13] These three forms of communication cover everything that students do with a language and the variety of instructional methods for teaching the language. The *Interpretive mode* deals with analysis of a written or spoken text. The proverbial 'bread and butter' of Classical language instruction,

13 See note 11 above.

close-reading and analysis of texts, is housed here. The *Interpersonal mode* deals with the conversational, spontaneous medium. Newer pedagogical models, such as spoken Latin and Comprehensible Input, find standard coverage under this heading. Finally, the *Presentational mode* covers the use of written or spoken language to present information. The more traditional methodology of prose and verse composition can find a home in this modality.

By such a reorganization of the Communication standard, the new Standards hope to better reflect what is going on in the classroom and provide more coverage for a multiplicity of methodologies under the Standards. Note, however, that the new Standards do not seek to privilege one method over another or to dictate which method(s) an instructor must use. The Standards should simply be considered a roadmap that outlines the variety of roads available to instructors.[14] All roads are equally valid, and instructors do not have to go down all of them in their classroom. Instructors are free to pick and choose the methods that are best for their learners, as instructors know their students best. Moreover, learners will likely exhibit different levels of proficiency based on their own aptitude and the modalities and methodologies emphasized by the instructor. The balanced modalities of the new Standards now make it possible for instructors to account for all of these possibilities, for they offer progress indicators and can-do statements with which instructors can more accurately assess learner proficiency and gain measurable evidence of learner growth regardless of instructional method.

In sum, these four major changes are aimed at better aligning the Standards with current classroom practice and making life easier for Classics instructors on all instructional levels. Equal coverage of communicative modalities provides more help for instructors in assessing learners in a variety of ways. Explicit and nuanced progress indicators and performance ranges help to improve the accuracy of assessments of learner proficiency and growth. Moreover, the updating of the language of the Standards to focus on skills of communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking help to bring the Standards into the 21st century. However, as with all Standards, this document is meant only as an aid to instructors, not as a mandate for how to teach one's students, for instructors know best how to best reach the learners in their classrooms. These updated Standards are an important tool to help instructors better shine the spotlight on the learning already occurring in their classrooms. If we are lucky, these new Standards will follow in the footsteps of the 1997

14 Special thanks to Sherwin Little for this illustrative and enlightening metaphor.

Standards and help provide direction for the field of Classical pedagogy for the next two decades and beyond.

Works Cited

Abbott, Martha, et al. "National Standards and Curriculum Guidelines." *Latin for the 21st Century: From Concept to Classroom*. Ed. Richard A. LaFleur. Boston: Addison Wesley, 1997. 44-58.

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Latin Teacher Training and Certification. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: American Classical League and American Philological Association, 2010.

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Standards for Classical Learning. *Standards for Classical Language Learning*. Oxford, OH: American Classical League, 1997.

American Classical League and Society for Classical Studies Joint Task Force on Standards for Classical Language Learning. *Standards for Classical Language Learning*. Rev. ed. Draft. Hamilton, OH: American Classical League, 2017.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. *National Standards Collaborative Board Releases World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*. Alexandria, VA: The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2015.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. *Proficiency Guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2012.

Carlon, Jacqueline. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing Latin Instruction and Securing its Place in Curricula." *Teaching Classical Languages* 4.2 (2013): 106-122.

Hoyos, Dexter. *Latin, How to Read it Fluently: A Practical Manual*. CANE Instructional Materials: Resources for Latin Teachers and Classics Professors, 1997.

May, James. "The Grammar-Translation Approach to College Latin." *Latin for the 21st Century: From Concept to Classroom*. Ed. Richard A. LaFleur. Boston: Addison Wesley, 1997. 148-161.

McCaffrey, Daniel. "Reading Latin Effectively and the Need for Cognitive Strategies." *When Dead Tongues Speak: Teaching Beginning Greek and Latin*. Ed. John Gruber-Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. 113-133.

The National Standards Collaborative Board. *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*. 4th ed. Alexandria, VA: National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015.

Patrick, Robert. "Making Sense of Comprehensible Input in the Latin Classroom." *Teaching Classical Languages* 6.1 (2015): 108-136.

United States. National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk*: The Imperative for Educational Reform. An Open Letter to the American People. A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983.

United States Congress. *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. H.R. 1804-2.

Appendix
Comparison of the 1997 and 2017 *Standards for Classical Language Learning*

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)	*Standards for Classical Language Learning* (2017)
I. Communication 1.1 Students read, understand, and interpret Latin or Greek. Beginning Intermediate Advanced 1.2 Students use orally, listen to, and write Latin or Greek as part of the language learning process. Beginning Intermediate Advanced	**I. Communication** 1.1 Learners understand, interpret, and analyze what is read, heard, or viewed on a variety of topics. Interpretive Reading **OR** Interpretive Listening Novice (Low, Middle, High) Intermediate (Low, Middle, High) Advanced (Low, Middle, High) Superior 1.2 Learners interact and negotiate meaning in spoken, signed, or written conversations to share information, reactions, feelings, and opinions. Interpersonal Novice (Low, Middle, High) Intermediate (Low, Middle, High) Advanced (Low, Middle, High) Superior 1.3 Learners present information, concepts, and ideas to narrate, describe, inform, explain, and persuade, on a variety of topics using appropriate media and adapting to various audiences of listeners, readers, or viewers. Presentational Writing **OR** Presentational Speaking Novice (Low, Middle, High) Intermediate (Low, Middle, High) Advanced (Low, Middle, High) Superior

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)	*Standards for Classical Language Learning* (2017)
II. Cultures 2.1 Students demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives of Greek of Roman culture as revealed in the practices of the Greeks or Romans. Beginning Intermediate Advanced 2.2 Students demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives of Greek or Roman culture as revealed in the products of the Greeks or Romans. Beginning Intermediate Advanced	**II. Cultures** 2.1 Learners use Latin or Greek to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the cultures studied. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary) 2.2 Learners use Latin or Greek to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the products and perspectives of the cultures studied. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary)

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)	*Standards for Classical Language Learning* (2017)
III. Connections 3.1 Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through their study of classical languages. Beginning Intermediate Advanced 3.2 Students expand their knowledge through the reading of Latin or Greek and the study of ancient culture. Beginning Intermediate Advanced	**III. Connections** 3.1 Learners build, reinforce, and expand their knowledge of other disciplines while using the language to develop critical thinking and to solve problems creatively. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary) 3.2 Learners access and evaluate information and diverse perspectives that are available through the language and its culture. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary)

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)	*Standards for Classical Language Learning* (2017)
IV. Comparisons 4.1 Students recognize and use elements of the Latin and Greek language to increase knowledge of their own language. Beginning Intermediate Advanced 4.2 Students compare and contrast their own culture with that of the Greco-Roman world. Beginning Intermediate Advanced	**IV. Comparisons** 4.1 Learners use Classical languages to investigate, explain, and reflect on the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary) 4.2 Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary)

Standards for Classical Language Learning (1997)	*Standards for Classical Language Learning* (2017)
V. Communities 5.1 Students use their knowledge of Latin or Greek in a multilingual world. Beginning Intermediate Advanced 5.2 Students use their knowledge of Greco-Roman culture in a world of diverse cultures. Beginning Intermediate Advanced	**V. Communities** 5.1 Learners use the language both within and beyond the classroom to interact and collaborate in their community and the globalized world. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary) 5.2 Learners set goals and reflect on their progress in using languages for enjoyment, enrichment, and advancement. Novice (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Intermediate (Elementary, Middle/High, Postsecondary) Advanced (Middle/High, Postsecondary)