The Teachers We Need

Transforming World Language Education in the United States

STARTALK
Start Talking!

National Foreign Language Center
University of Maryland

Ingold, C. W., & Wang, S. C. (2010). *The teachers we need: Transforming world language education in the United States.* College Park, MD: National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland. Retrieved from: http://www.nflc.org/publications/the_teachers_we_need.pdf

The Teachers We Need

Transforming World Language Education in the United States

Table of Contents

List of Organizations

AAHL	Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages	cal.org/heritage
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages	actfl.org
	Asia Society	asiasociety.org
CAL	Center for Applied Linguistics	cal.org
CCSSO	Council of Chief State School Officers	ccsso.org
ETS	Educational Testing Service	ets.org
ILR	Interagency Language Roundtable	ilr.gov
INACOL	International Association for K–12 Online Learning	inacol.org
INTASC	Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium	ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_(InTASC).html
MLA	Modern Language Association	mla.org
NADSFL	National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Languages	nadsfl.org
NAFSA	NAFSA: Association of International Educators	nafsa.org
NASDTEC	National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification	nasdtec.org
NBPTS	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	nbpts.org
NCAC	National Center for Alternative Certification	teach-now.org
NCEI	National Center for Education Information	ncei.com
NCATE	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education	ncate.org
NCSSFL	National Council of State Supervisors for Languages	ncssfl.org
NEA	National Education Association	nea.org
NFLC	National Foreign Language Center	nflc.org
NHLRC	National Heritage Language Resource Center	nhlrc.ucla.edu
	STARTALK	startalk.umd.edu
TEAC	Teacher Education Accreditation Council	teac.org

Acknowledgements

This white paper and the accompanying *Resource Guide to Developing Linguistic and Cultural Competency in the United States* would not have been possible without the contributions of numerous individuals and organizations. We first extend our thanks to the federal government, which, through the STARTALK project, provided support for both the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit and this white paper.

We also want to recognize our co-organizers of the December 2008 meeting, "Meeting the Challenge of World Language Teacher Shortages": the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Asia Society, and the meeting participants, including Marty Abbott, Selena Cantor, Yvonne Chan, Kin Chee, Mary Curran, Kathy DeFelice, Jennifer Eddy, Michael Everson, Mary Ann Hansen, Wafa Hassan, Phyllis Jacobson, John Melick, Rita Oleksak, David Paradise, Gregg Roberts, Debbie Robinson, Paul Sandrock, Lisa Stooksberry, Elvira Swender, Frank Tang, Carla Valadez, Jacque Van Houten, Juefei Wang, and government observers.

In particular, we would like to express our special thanks to Dr. Gene Wilhoit and Lois Adams-Rogers from the Council of Chief State School Officers, Vivien Stewart and Jeff Wang from Asia Society, and Dr. Emily Feistritzer for their leadership and collaboration. A heartfelt thank you also goes to Dr. Michael Everson for drafting an initial version of this paper.

The Council of Chief State School Officers was also a partner in the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, held in December 2009. Charles Kolb, president of the Committee for Economic Development, and Andre Lewis, deputy assistant secretary for international and foreign language education of the US Department of Education, delivered the keynote speeches. Plenary speakers included Marty Abbott, Lois Adams-Rogers, Thomas Keith Cothrun, Emily Feistritzer, Rebecca Garland, Janet Glass, Phyllis Jacobson, Peter McWalters, Kathleen Paliokas, Nancy Rhodes, Vance Rugaard, Vivien Stewart, and Toni Theisen. In all, twenty-five states, including California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia sent representatives or teams to the 2009 summit, as did a number of national organizations: the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), Educational Testing Service (ETS), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NADSFL), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Center for Alternative Certification (NCAC), the National Center for Education Information (NCEI), and the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL). Without their valuable input, this paper could not have been written.

We would also like to acknowledge the staff of the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) at the University of Maryland, who have labored many hours to transform discussions, ideas, data, and research findings into the substantive content in this white paper and resource guide. Special thanks go to the research and writing teams, including Dr. Frederick Jackson, Dr. Mouna Mana, Jenny Kirkbride, Rachel Liau, Bruce Evans, and Julia Leverone; the production team, including Maura Elford, Brian Wyler, Matt Jenkins, John Cords, Bryan Anderson, and Dan Brown; and the management team, including Betsy Hart, Christopher Frey, and Scott Nichols. Special thanks to Kathy Kilday for her editorial skills and patience.

This project has truly been a team effort, and we are grateful for the tireless work and thoughtful contributions of all participants. It is our shared vision for a linguistically and culturally competent citizenry of the United States that brings all of us together.

Executive Summary

This white paper serves as a roadmap for state and local governments and education agencies, teacher preparation programs, professional organizations, and the federal government in their efforts to transform world language education and the teacher supply system in their respective arenas. It draws upon the collective expertise and recent work of leading professionals and organizations in the fields of world language education and teacher certification, many of whom participated in two national meetings devoted to world language education and teacher preparation in December 2008 and December 2009, respectively. More than one hundred participants, including teams from twenty-five states and the District of Columbia, professional organizations, and federal agencies, attended the second meeting, the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit. This white paper incorporates discussions from both meetings.[1]

This paper analyzes data collected from a range of resources, including a national survey of states and the District of Columbia and comparisons between home practices and policies and those found internationally, namely in the European Union, emerging powers, and top industrialized countries.

Data for this paper were also collected from the STARTALK project, a federally-funded initiative administered by the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) at the University of Maryland. STARTALK promotes summer programs for teacher training and student language learning in critical languages in K–16 educational settings and in heritage communities throughout the United States. Since 2007, STARTALK has served 7,937 students and 2,659 teachers of critical languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Dari, Hindi, Persian, Russian, Swahili, Turkish, and Urdu in forty-two states and the District of Columbia. It is expected that by the end of 2013 every state and territory in the United States will have at least one STARTALK program in one or more languages.

Based on these sources of data, this paper demonstrates not only the changing need for linguistic and cultural competency for the global age, but also the world language education gap that has developed in the United States over the past few decades. In order to develop globally competitive language education, the United States must adopt a new agenda that is inclusive, nationally-advocated, state-implemented, and results-oriented.

The language education policy derived from this agenda will provide the opportunity for all US students to develop biliteracy in English and at least one other language, regardless of their first language. Enacting an additive language policy will enable the United States to meet its language needs while capitalizing on the linguistic and cultural resources present in the US population. Students whose native language is English will have expanded access to opportunities to learn another world language, and English language learners will develop competency in their native language or a third language while raising their academic achievements in other subject areas through their mastery of English.

This additive language policy should have five goals:

1. Increase the number and effectiveness of language education programs
2. Expand the range of languages offered
3. Begin language instruction at a younger age and continue through a longer, articulated sequence
4. Establish clear expectations for students' language learning outcomes
5. Expand access and opportunities to learn via both traditional and innovative delivery systems

With the goals and objectives required for implementing an additive language policy laid out, the need for a responsive and flexible world language teacher supply system to support this new language learning system becomes clear. This redesigned world language teacher supply system will draw into the field a full range of prospective teachers, including native speakers of English and of other languages as well as traditional college students and mid-career changers. It will produce highly effective teachers in sufficient

[1] *More information about the summit, including select speaker presentations, can be found at http://startalk.umd.edu/2009/meetings/certification/*

numbers to supply US programs in a wide range of languages and program types. The supply system will be responsive to certification requirements that are standards-, competency-, and performance-based, and it will ensure a high degree of reciprocity and portability across state lines.

For all world language teachers, regardless of whether they are pre-service, practicing, or master teachers, this system will generate training, experience, and professional development that are rigorous and adaptable to individual needs. It will also ensure opportunities for continuous professional development and for collaboration among teachers to allow them to grow and thrive throughout a rewarding career.

While the task of transforming the world language teacher supply system is daunting, we can start by addressing three groups of questions:

- What does it mean to be a highly effective world language teacher? What are the competencies (such as linguistic proficiency, content knowledge, and pedagogical skills) that world language teachers must possess and demonstrate to enable their students to attain high learning outcomes?
- What does it take to produce a highly effective world language teacher? Given an expanded and heterogeneous pool of prospective teachers, what kinds of preparation and certification programs must be in place to produce a sufficient number of effective world language teachers who can meet the increasing demand for varied world language programs?
- How can the United States leverage resources across state, local, and institutional boundaries to ensure that the supply of world language teachers meets the demand?

Answering these questions will require a concerted effort on the national and state levels to engage stakeholders and policymakers from all areas of education in rigorous discussions. Due to the decentralized nature of our K–12 education, practical solutions may reside at the local, state, or regional level. This paper provides an in-depth analysis of the following aspects of the teacher supply system and highlights innovations that have been developed in various communities across the United States:

1. Teacher competencies
2. Certification
3. Pools of prospective teachers
4. Capacity and quality of teacher preparation programs
5. Clinical experiences and professional development
6. Data collection and evaluation
7. Partnerships and consortia to leverage resources

The issues are indeed complex and deeply rooted in the educational system. Nonetheless, we have many resources and models with which to overhaul the teacher supply system and transform world language education in the United States. We have a rich body of research documenting the benefits of acquiring a second language, the processes through which second language acquisition occurs, and the value of innovative program types in supporting second language acquisition. We have nationally agreed-upon world language student and teacher standards as well as internationally comparable proficiency scales to guide the process. We have access to pools of world language teacher candidates readily available in our communities. A number of states, school districts, and universities across the nation are beginning to offer models for strategic planning, innovative programs for students and teachers, and alternative routes to certification.

Many of these innovations can be adapted, expanded, and leveraged to meet the pressing need for a transformed world language education system. This white paper points out such innovations and sketches a blueprint for further actions. Recommendations for state governments and education agencies, local education agencies, institutions of higher education, teacher preparation programs, national and professional organizations and institutes, and the federal government are also outlined. *The Resource Guide to Developing Linguistic and Cultural Competency in the United States*, containing studies, survey results, and examples of best practices drawn from the sources of information mentioned above accompanies the white paper. This document is available from the STARTALK and NFLC

websites. The NFLC welcomes reader feedback and contributions of additional information.

The task at hand is challenging, but we have no excuse for not engaging it. Our future relies on our actions now. With a clear vision, long-term commitment, unwavering political will, and a determination to collaborate, our nation must and will close the world language education gap.

Catherine Ingold, PhD

Director, National Foreign Language Center
University of Maryland
Principal Investigator, STARTALK

Shuhan C. Wang, PhD

Deputy Director, National Foreign Language Center
University of Maryland
Co-Principal Investigator, STARTALK

World Language Education:
An Imperative for the Global Age

> *More than ever before, students from around the globe are learning to adapt to change and to capitalize on expanding opportunities to become multilingual and learn to use mathematics, science, and technological skills in ways that meet or exceed the levels of current American students. We must take a constructive, positive, and innovative approach to prepare our children in a similar fashion, increasing the rigor of our academic standards, and thereby ensuring that all students are prepared to succeed in the global society.*
>
> *—Council of Chief State School Officers, 2006*

Adapting to a Changing World

In the 21st century, societies increasingly compete on the basis of the quality of their intellectual capital. To participate effectively in today's globalized, knowledge-based economy, the United States needs innovative, creative, and entrepreneurial citizens. Our workforce must manage complexity, adapt to change, solve multifaceted problems, and work effectively with people from other nations and cultures. Across all fields—business, education, art, science, technology, engineering, math, health, law, and social services—linguistic ability and transcultural competence have become fundamental skills that workers and leaders in an interconnected world must possess.

> *The National Education Association (NEA), in its 2010 policy brief* Global Competence Is a 21st Century Imperative, *identifies four key elements that constitute global competence: international awareness, appreciation of cultural diversity, competitive skills, and proficiency in foreign languages.*

Interlinked economies demand collaboration across linguistic, cultural, national, and regional boundaries, and international cooperative efforts are increasingly needed to address the challenges facing many nations today. The need for individuals to know more than one language is especially acute when citizens and organizations from different nations come together to respond to critical issues. Climate change, scarcity of natural resources, pandemics, the environment, international migration and trade, terrorism, and humanitarian crises are examples of issues that must be addressed collaboratively.

While some have argued that English is the de facto lingua franca in addressing such concerns, results of the latest survey of Internet use conducted by Internet World Stats indicate that use of other languages in the global electronic environment is quickly surpassing the use of English. The survey found that approximately 73 percent of the world's nearly 2 billion Internet users do not use English.[2] The fastest-growing languages in use on the web are Chinese, Russian, and Arabic; since 2000, their use on the Internet has increased 1277, 1826, and 2501 percent, respectively.[3] Participation in today's global society requires effective and culturally informed communication in a wide range of world languages.

World language education in the United States, however, is inadequate to meet the challenges of contemporary life. Compared to the language education of other nations, the United States trails behind: we do not offer equitable opportunity and access for world language learning for all students, particularly those in urban and rural areas; for those students who have the opportunity to learn, we start too late, with too little time to allow most of them to build proficiency; and our programs are often limited to traditionally taught European languages. The key to transforming world language education in the United States is a sufficient number of effective world language teachers. Our outdated, fragmented, and inflexible system for producing world language teachers must be replaced by an expanded system responsive to our nation's needs in the global age.

---

[2] *Miniwatts Marketing Group, 2010.*

[3] *Growth rates measured from 2000–2010; English language use grew 281 percent in the same period.*

The needs of a global age demand an adaptive response from the United States. We must strengthen our ability to collaborate, compete, and solve problems across borders through competency in languages and cultures other than our own.

The Need for Linguistic and Cultural Competency

In 2009, the Office of International Education of the US Department of Education consulted with federal agencies to collect information about areas of national need, and nine cabinet-level agencies specified individual languages for which developing national capacity is critical to their missions.[4] These languages range from the widely taught Spanish and French to the less commonly taught Chinese, Korean, and Japanese and to rarely taught languages such as Hindi, Pashto, Urdu, and Vietnamese. Similarly, the Committee for Economic Development (CED), in its report titled *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security,* confirmed the central importance of language skills and transcultural competency:

> To confront the twenty-first century challenges to our economy and national security, our education system must be strengthened to increase the foreign language skills and cultural awareness of our students. America's continued global leadership will depend on our students' abilities to interact with the world community both inside and outside our borders.[5]

Skills in more than one language have also been shown to yield economic advantages for the individual and for society, particularly in the field of business.[6] Researchers have shown that proficiency in a world language enhances career opportunities for individuals and gives businesses a competitive edge.[7] In fact, language proficiency is a highly sought-after skill in a wide range of careers. An ongoing series of articles in the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) publication *The Language Educator*[8] has described the need for Americans with significant foreign language ability in the following seven fields: national security; health care; legal interpretation; business and industry; travel, tourism, and hospitality; first response and law enforcement; and international development. Likewise, more than eighty US government agencies have identified one hundred languages in which they require individuals with skills.[9] To meet the needs of government and business, the United States must ensure that its citizens attain proficiency in world languages.

> *Most of the growth potential for US businesses lies in overseas markets. Already, one in five US manufacturing jobs is tied to exports. In 2004, 58 percent of the growth in the earnings of US businesses came from overseas. Foreign consumers, the majority of whom primarily speak languages other than English, represent significant business opportunities for American producers, as the United States is home to less than five percent of the world's population. And trade is shifting to different parts of the world; our annual trade with Asia is now approaching $800 billion—outpacing our trade with Europe.*
>
> *—Committee for Economic Development, 2006*

Moreover, effective world language education is of documented value in developing essential traits for our future workforce. Children who are exposed to a foreign language early in childhood show stronger listening and memory skills and achieve higher levels of cognitive development sooner than their peers, and they seem to develop more innovative thinking, better creative skills, more advanced problem solving skills, and higher order analytical skills compared to monolingual peers.[10] This is especially true for students in immersion or dual language programs, who learn content via another language. Research has consistently demonstrated that these students outperform their peers in English language arts

[4] *US Department of Education, 2009a.*

[5] *Committee for Economic Development, 2006.*

[6] *Grosse et al, 1998; Robbins et al., 1998.*

[7] *Carreira & Armengol, 2001; Helliwell, 1999; Lena & Reason Moll, 2000.*

[8] *Koning, 2009, 2010a, 2010b.*

[9] *Crump, 2001.*

[10] *Bamford & Mizokawa, 1991; Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994; Cummins, 1981; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Fuchsen, 1989; Hakuta, 1986; Lapkin et al., 1990.*

and math.[11] In fact, children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds who study a world language have been shown to make the most significant gains.[12] If children begin to study foreign languages at an early age and continue for several years, they are more likely to develop high levels of proficiency and acquire the tools to communicate in culturally appropriate ways.[13] This intercultural competence not only broadens perspectives and enriches lives, but also leads to a better sense of respect and tolerance for different peoples. These transcultural communication skills are crucial to a student's development as a global citizen of the 21st century.[14]

> *In a 2005 survey conducted by NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 90 percent of US respondents stated that it is important to ensure that future generations have the skills and knowledge needed for a more interconnected world, and 92 percent indicated that knowledge of other languages offers a competitive advantage in career opportunities.*

Thus, an additive approach to language education, especially one that promotes biliteracy from an early age, is essential to the development of key skills and content knowledge that today's students need to succeed academically and negotiate the demands of a globalized economy. However, our current education system does not prioritize the learning of languages and the cultures that form their context. Without significant changes in language education, the United States will not produce graduates who are ready to participate in the global economy.

A World Language Education Gap

Our global competitors place a high premium on world language education as part of the foundation for developing a 21st century skill set. Twenty-two of the top industrialized nations have implemented mandatory policies that require students to learn another language and culture beginning in elementary school.[15] In 2005, the European Commission published a white paper establishing the goal that all European Union (EU) citizens should develop proficiency in three languages: their native language and two additional languages. In 2005, 50 percent of Europeans over age fifteen reported that they could converse in at least one language besides their mother tongue.[16] In contrast, 82 percent of US residents are monolingual, and the United States is the only industrialized country where language study is, for the most part, optional rather than mandatory and where second language study begins, in most cases, at age fourteen. In fact, in the 2008–2009 academic year, only eleven states—Delaware, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, and Wyoming—and the District of Columbia required language study at any point in a student's K–12 education,[17] whereas the study of at least one world language in addition to the student's native language is compulsory in eleven countries (Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Russia, Singapore, and the United Kingdom). Eight countries require the study of two additional world languages (Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden), and the Netherlands requires that its students study three additional world languages.[18]

> *Mandatory second language study begins in the Netherlands at age five; in Norway, Singapore, Thailand, and Ireland at age six; in Finland, Italy, Sweden, and the United Kingdom at age seven; in Austria, Belgium, China, India, Russia, and Spain at age eight; and in Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Israel, and Japan at age ten, according to the 2000 report from the Center for Applied Linguistics,* Foreign Language Teaching: What the US Can Learn From Other Countries.

[11] *Holobow et al., 1987; Swain & Lapkin, 1991.*

[12] *Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004.*

[13] *Carpenter & Torney, 1974; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Dahl, 2004.*

[14] *Miller, 2009.*

[15] *Pufahl et al., 2000.*

[16] *European Commission, 2005.*

[17] *Wang et al., 2009.*

[18] *Pufahl et al., 2000.*

A Missing Skill Set

Like science, math, and technology, the ability to communicate in both English and another world language, along with intercultural skills with which to engage people from different corners of the world are part of the new basic skill set needed for an increasingly multilingual and entrepreneurial world. Yet meaningful language study is largely missing from US educational programs. Additionally, students' learning outcomes in language study are not part of the accountability plan of most states or the federal government. Currently, state-mandated assessments and the National Assessment of Educational Progress measure student achievement only in English language arts and math. As a society, the United States has failed to prioritize the skills needed for success in the 21st century and commit to effective language education.

> *Eighty-five percent of respondents to the 39th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools said that learning a second language is important, and 70 percent said that instruction should begin in elementary school.*

The degree to which the United States has fallen behind other industrialized nations in language education is evident in the small and shrinking number of its language programs. Data from the most recent national survey of world language study in elementary and secondary schools conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) show that from 1997 to 2008 the percentage of US elementary schools (both public and private) offering world language courses declined from 31 to 25 percent.[19] Worse, while 51 percent of private elementary schools offer world language instruction, a mere 15 percent of public elementary schools do so.[20] During the same period, the percentage of middle schools teaching world languages also dropped from 78 to 58 percent. The percentage of high schools offering world language courses held steady at 91 percent, but in 2000, only 43.6 percent of high school students were enrolled in foreign language courses, according to the National Center for Educational Statistics.[21] Students in economically distressed or remote rural areas are further disadvantaged by having far fewer opportunities to study world languages.[22]

Even when language programs are available, many do not help students attain a functional level of proficiency useful in work settings.[23] Generally, few language education programs in the United States are consistently structured with the goal of building proficiency. The typical two years of study in high school is too little to build meaningful proficiency and begins too late to capitalize on the early years in which children learn languages most easily. Among public elementary schools that do offer language instruction, almost half used the Foreign Language Exploratory/Experience (FLEX) program model, which aims at providing a "taste" of the language and culture, rather than purposeful time on task for developing proficiency.[24]

As a result, few students in the United States have access to a continuous, articulated program of study. A 1999 CAL survey reported that "only a quarter of the elementary schools with foreign language programs reported that their students are placed in middle school or high school classes where the course content and objectives are designed specifically to provide continuity from their previous level."[25] In 2010, CAL reported that this number had increased to 39 percent, but that still means that more than 60 percent of the schools that did teach a foreign language nonetheless had no systematic process to ensure articulation from one level of instruction to the next.[26] On a more positive note, from 1997 to 2008 the proportion of high schools reporting an articulated sequence of language study between middle school and high school more than doubled, to 55 percent, among those high schools whose students had studied a language in middle school, according to the 2010 CAL report.[27]

[19] *Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010.*

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] *US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2000.*

[22] *Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010.*

[23] *For descriptions of language proficiency levels and the amount of time needed to attain them, see the* Resource Guide to Developing Linguistic and Cultural Competency in the United States.

[24] *Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010.*

[25] *Rhodes & Branaman, 1999.*

[26] *Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010.*

[27] *Ibid.*

Despite that bright spot, because language learning is cumulative, the late start and short duration of most world language education programs make US students far less likely than their European, East Asian, or South Asian peers to leave school with personally or professionally useful world language skills.

Finally, despite the recognition that competence in a wide range of languages is critical to our global success, most US students have access to a small and increasingly narrow range of language course offerings. According to the 2010 CAL report, of the elementary schools providing world language instruction in 2008, the vast majority—88 percent—offer Spanish. At the secondary school level, 93 percent of schools at which world language instruction is available teach Spanish.[28] The report noted that although the percentage of schools that offered courses in Arabic and Chinese increased slightly, the percentage of schools offering French, German, Japanese, and Russian decreased significantly. Globally competitive world language education must ensure a range of choices of both traditionally taught languages, such as Spanish, French, and German, and emerging important world languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the United States cannot compete globally without addressing this enormous world language education gap. The urgent need for improved world language skills requires a revision of the current educational priorities that devalue world languages and cross-cultural literacy.

[28] *Ibid.*

An Agenda for Transforming World Language Education

In order to develop globally competitive language education, the United States must adopt a new agenda for world language education that is inclusive, nationally-advocated, state-implemented, and results-oriented. The language education policy implementing this agenda will provide the opportunity for all US students to develop biliteracy in English and at least one other language, regardless of their first language. Enacting an additive language policy will enable the United States to meet its language needs while capitalizing on the linguistic and cultural resources present in the US population. Students whose native language is English will have expanded access to opportunities to learn another world language and English language learners will develop competency in their native language or a third language while raising their academic achievements in other subject areas through their mastery of English.

The National Heritage Language Resource Center at UCLA and the Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages, headquartered at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, DC, offer research and information on ways to help heritage language speakers develop into biliterate adults. For more information, visit their websites at:

http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu

and

www.cal.org/heritage

Goals and Objectives of an Additive Language Policy

This additive language policy should have five goals: (1) increase the number and effectiveness of language education programs; (2) expand the range of languages offered; (3) begin language instruction at a younger age and continue through a longer, articulated sequence; (4) establish clear expectations for students' language learning outcomes; and (5) expand access and opportunity to learn via both traditional and innovative delivery systems.

Some essential questions may be asked in relation to each goal. The responses to these questions may form the basis for a state or locality to develop specific, achievable, and measureable objectives for reaching these goals within a reasonable timeline.

Goal 1. Increase the number and effectiveness of language education programs

- What is the current number of language programs in a given locality? What would it take to increase this number by 5 percent (or another desired percentage) in three years or five years?
- How effective are these language programs? Are there data demonstrating students' proficiency and literacy in the target language? Are there other indicators that provide evidence of student learning? How can the programs increase their efficacy? (See Goal 4.)

Under the leadership of Mayor Richard Daley, the city of Chicago has expanded Chinese, Arabic, and Hindi language programs to more than fifty schools in 2010, with 13,000 students studying Chinese alone. At the same time, the city is working to strengthen its existing French, German, Hebrew, Latin, Russian, and Spanish programs.

Goal 2. Expand the range of languages offered

- What languages are being offered in elementary, middle, and/or high schools?
- What demographic, social, cultural, and economic factors influence the offering of a certain world language?
- If a world language is identified as important but is not offered in school, what actions must be taken in

order to offer it?

- What local resources (such as the presence of a heritage language community) exist that would enable a language to be offered?

Michigan, with leadership from Flagship programs, has greatly expanded access to longer sequences of Arabic, notably serving its large heritage population of Arabic speakers along with other language learners. For more information, visit the Michigan Flagship website at:

http://www.umich.edu/~nearest/arabic/flagship.html

Goal 3. Begin language instruction at a younger age and continue through a longer, articulated sequence

- What percentage of primary school students has the opportunity to begin intensive language study? What percentage of students is enrolled in a Foreign Language in Elementary School program for more than 150 minutes per week or an immersion or dual language program?
- What percentage of students enrolls in multiyear sequences? What are the sequences in terms of grade levels?
- What percentage of schools or districts offers multiyear sequences of language study?
- How many institutions of higher education offer continuity of language study by placing students who began in K–12 in advanced courses? What are the placement data by language?
- How many students in higher education enroll in language-intensive study abroad or internships, and what is the statistical breakdown according to language?

Oregon and Ohio are addressing the issues of K–16 articulation of language learning through their Chinese Flagship programs. For more information, visit their websites at:

http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/chinese#UOREGON

and

http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/chinese#OSU

Under former governor—now US Ambassador to China—Jon Huntsman, Utah has mandated the establishment and implementation of one hundred dual language immersion elementary programs in Chinese, French, and Spanish from 2009 through 2014 through its Critical Languages Program. For more information, consult Rule R277-488 in the Utah Administrative Code at:

http://www.rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r277/r277-488.htm

Goal 4. Establish clear expectations for students' language learning outcomes

- What are the learning outcomes related to grade level expectations established by the local school district, state, or nationally recognized performance guidelines?
- Do students receive credit by examination or by course credit hours?
- Do heritage language students receive credit for their proficiency in the heritage language?
- How many students in higher education attain desired levels of proficiency, by language? Do they receive any recognition for their language proficiency?

To offer "an incentive for students and districts to set a language goal of more intense rigor resulting in the attainment of real-world relevant language skills," Minnesota has created the Minnesota World Language Certificate and the Minnesota World Language High Achievement Certificate. For more information, consult the 2008 Legislative Report on Minnesota World Language Proficiency Certificates *at:*

http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/groups/Communications/documents/Report/033751.pdf

Goal 5. Expand access and opportunity to learn via both traditional and innovative delivery systems

- What foreign language program types and delivery models are available in a given locality? For what languages are these program types and delivery models available?
- What would it take to expand the program types, multiyear sequences, and delivery models for a given world language?

To date 201 immersion programs in eighty-nine school districts across California have been established, strengthened, or expanded through funding support provided through ten FLAP grants.

With the goals and objectives required for implementing an additive language policy laid out, the need for a responsive and flexible world language teacher supply system to support this new language learning system becomes clear.

A World Language Teacher Supply System for the 21st Century

The key to successfully implementing globally competitive world language education in the United States lies in redesigning the world language teacher supply system. A 21st century world language teacher supply system will draw into the field a full range of prospective teachers, including native speakers of English and of other languages, as well as traditional college students and mid-career changers. It will produce highly effective teachers in sufficient numbers to supply US programs in a wide range of languages and program types. The supply system will be responsive to certification requirements that are standards-, competency-, and performance-based, and it will ensure a high degree of reciprocity and portability across state lines.

For all world language teachers, regardless of whether they are pre-service, practicing, or master teachers, this system will generate training, experience, and professional development that are rigorous and adaptable to individual needs. It will also ensure opportunities for continuous professional development and for collaboration among teachers to allow them to grow and thrive throughout a rewarding career.

A Mismatch Between an Outdated Supply System and New Demands

Our current world language teacher supply system was designed for a past era when most foreign language teachers were needed in traditional high schools for mostly European-based classical or modern languages. Most of the task of preparing teachers has fallen on the shoulders of teacher education programs housed in institutions of higher education, whose criteria for teacher preparation were designed to meet state certification requirements. States have established their certification requirements according to the perceived needs for and desired qualifications of foreign language teachers. These perceptions were, in turn, often based on the types of courses and preparation programs that the teacher education programs in the state have been willing and able to provide. When geographic mobility was not high, state-by-state certification could suffice because most teachers did not move across state lines. This may be a somewhat simplified description of the situation, but the data gathered for this paper show that it is largely accurate.

The inadequacy of this outdated system for meeting the present and future demand for effective world language teachers becomes apparent when it is placed in the context of rapidly accelerating globalization. Because world languages have been marginalized in the K–12 education system, however, the mismatch between the world language teacher supply system and the demand for world language teachers has not generated much concern in the public discourse. If we are serious about producing linguistically and culturally competent global workers and professionals, we must transform the world language teacher supply system for the 21st century.

> *Thirty-six states and the District of Columbia have identified foreign languages, world languages, or languages other than English as teacher shortage areas.*
>
> *—US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, 2009.*

Expansion and Transformation

In order to redesign the world language teacher supply system to align with the demands of an expanded and responsive world language education system, we must identify what the new system should look like. We must be clear about the desired output of the system: the competencies, experiences, and other characteristics of world language teachers that the system must produce. We also need to address critical factors that influence the teacher supply system, including the available pools of teacher candidates, the content and

process of teacher preparation, the means of assessing teacher candidates and certifying their credentials, and the evaluation of the efficacy of the system via data collection on teacher performance, including student learning outcomes. We must also specify ways in which scarce resources can be shared across state and regional boundaries. While the task of transforming the world language teacher supply system is daunting, we can start by addressing three groups of questions:

- What does it mean to be a highly effective world language teacher? What are the competencies (such as linguistic proficiency, content knowledge, and pedagogical skills) that world language teachers must possess and demonstrate to enable their students to attain high learning outcomes?
- What does it take to produce a highly effective world language teacher? Given an expanded and heterogeneous pool of prospective teachers, what kinds of preparation and certification programs must be in place to produce a sufficient number of effective world language teachers who can meet the increasing demand for varied world language programs?
- How can the United States leverage resources across state, local, and institutional boundaries to ensure that the supply of world language teachers meets the demand?

Answering these questions will require a concerted and inclusive effort on the national and state levels to engage stakeholders and policymakers from all areas of education in rigorous discussions. Due to the decentralized nature of our K–12 education, practical solutions may reside at the local, state, or regional level. While decisions may need to be localized, our purpose here is to point out what ought to be considered in the process of redesigning the world language teacher supply system. We will present the following aspects of the teacher supply system and highlight innovations that have been developed in various communities across the United States:

8. Teacher competencies
9. Certification
10. Pools of prospective teachers
11. Capacity and quality of teacher preparation programs
12. Clinical experiences and professional development
13. Data collection and evaluation
14. Partnerships and consortia to leverage resources

1. Teacher Competencies

There is already an emerging consensus about the competencies effective world language teachers must possess. They must acquire and demonstrate adequate proficiency in the language they will teach, an understanding of the structure of the language and the culture(s) where the language is spoken, knowledge of second language acquisition and learner development, and pedagogical skills appropriate to the setting in which they will be teaching.

The language teaching community has developed a body of empirically-based knowledge and expertise that can be used to define and measure teacher competencies. Available tools include nationally-recognized standards for student learning, teachers, and teacher preparation programs; language proficiency scales and assessment tools; and assessment tools to measure teachers' subject matter knowledge and pedagogical skills.

Standards for Teachers. There are several sets of nationally-recognized world language teacher standards that define the body of knowledge, skills, disposition, and experience that a prospective teacher must acquire and demonstrate, including those developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC),[29] the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS),[30] and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in cooperation with ACTFL.[31] These standards address different stages of teacher

[29] *The INTASC Principles can be accessed at http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/Model_Core_Teaching_Standards.html*

[30] *The NBPTS Core Propositions can be accessed at http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards*

[31] *The ACTFL/NCATE program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers are available online at http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageID=3384*

development and align well with one another. The ACTFL/NCATE Standards for accrediting teacher education programs detail what the graduates of their programs should know and be able to do; the INTASC Principles apply to beginning teachers who are in their first to third year of teaching; and the NBPTS Core Propositions target experienced and effective teachers in various content areas. A comparison of the ACTFL/NCATE Standards, INTASC Principles, and NBPTS Core Propositions is provided in the Appendix.

Standards for Teacher Preparation Programs. Teacher education accreditation bodies such as NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)[32] have guidelines regarding the qualities that graduates of teacher education programs must possess and demonstrate. Both the ACTFL/NCATE and TEAC accrediting agencies define the core body of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills, and dispositions that language educators need, and they require multiple measures for program accreditation.

Foreign Language Content Standards for Students. World language teachers must know and be able to implement standards-based instruction for their students. ACTFL's *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*,[33] first published in 1996, defined five goal areas for student outcomes, known as the "5 Cs": communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities. Currently, standards exist for Arabic, Chinese, Classics (Latin and Greek), French, German, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish, with initiatives underway for other languages. As of 2007, over thirty state and regional foreign language professional organizations had endorsed these standards.

In the last year, state leaders have launched the Common Core State Standards Initiative[34] to define the knowledge and skills that all K–12 students should obtain in preparation for college or work. To date, thirty-four states and the District of Columbia have adopted these standards for mathematics and English language arts. The inclusion of world languages in the Common Core State Standards Initiative would signify that we as a society are serious about developing students' linguistic and cultural competency as part of a world-class education.

> *The states that have adopted the Common Core Standards are Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The District of Columbia has also adopted the standards. For more information, visit:*
>
> ***http://www.corestandards.org***

Language Proficiency Scales. Language proficiency has been defined as "the ability of an individual to carry out in appropriate ways communicative tasks which are typically encountered in cultures where the language is natively spoken."[35] It is important to point out that this definition emphasizes real-life communication skills that demonstrate how well an individual can function in another culture where the language is used.

Although language study is generally a marginalized subject in US schools, the federal government has invested heavily in developing an infrastructure for producing the language-competent professionals that the government needs. One important product of this investment is the nationally and internationally recognized language proficiency scale established by the federal government's Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR). ACTFL subsequently developed its Proficiency Guidelines for academic purposes based on the ILR scale. Both the ILR scale and the ACTFL Guidelines contain detailed descriptions of the base levels in the four component skills included

[32] *The TEAC principles for teacher education programs are available online at http://www.teac.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/quality-principles-for-teacher-education-programs.pdf*

[33] *ACTFL, National standards for foreign language education, (n. d.).*

[34] *To learn more about the Common Core Standards Initiative, visit www.corestandards.org*

[35] *Egan, 1999.*

in language proficiency—listening, reading, speaking, and writing.[36] These scales provide a solid basis for meaningful assessment of learner outcomes. They can be found in the accompanying *Resource Guide to Developing Linguistic and Cultural Competency in the United States.*

Language Proficiency Assessment Tools. A major concern is ensuring that prospective teachers attain the level of language proficiency needed for effectiveness in the classroom, particularly in the most difficult languages for English speakers to learn. ACTFL has pointed out that world language teachers need to be able to teach a variety of levels of students and carry out specific instructional tasks in the target language. They must be able to use language for real-life purposes and model the language for students, with the end result of moving them to a higher level of proficiency.[37] In dual language and immersion environments, teachers must be able to teach the content of the elementary school curriculum in the foreign language, a task that requires a high level of proficiency.

Nationally recognized assessments to measure teacher candidates' language proficiency are available. For example, the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) and the Writing Proficiency Test (WPT) developed by ACTFL can be used as measures of a teacher candidate's competency in the language of his or her choice. The PRAXIS series of tests developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) offers another language proficiency and cultural knowledge assessment tool for prospective French, German, and Spanish teachers.[38]

One major task related to setting a required proficiency level or passing score for teacher candidates is to determine a level of proficiency that is fair and equitable for prospective teachers across languages. Different languages require varying amounts of time and effort to reach the same proficiency level because of the linguistic and cultural distances between the target language and English. The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) of the US Department of State has established three categories of languages to differentiate the amount of time required to reach a defined level of proficiency. Category I languages, such as French, German, and Spanish, are closest to English and comparatively faster for native English speakers to learn. Category II languages, such as Hindi, Pashto, and Russian, have significant linguistic and cultural differences from English and require more time to learn, whereas Category III languages like Arabic, Chinese, and Korean are the most different from English and consequently require the most time to learn, especially reading and writing skills.

Traditionally, most states require teacher candidates to show credit hours in language study as evidence of language proficiency. In recent years, an increasing number of states have begun to allow teacher candidates to use test scores to demonstrate that they have the language proficiency required. To date, sixteen states allow teacher candidates to take the ACTFL's OPI and WPT to provide evidence of their language proficiency. Although there is no uniformly accepted minimum score, the emerging consensus in the field is that all language teachers should attain, at a minimum, Advanced Low proficiency on the ACTFL rating scale in speaking. In writing, teachers should attain Advanced Low proficiency for FSI Category I languages and Intermediate High for FSI Category II or III languages. For those languages that have PRAXIS tests, each state works with ETS to set its own passing scores for each language.[39]

> *States currently using ACTFL proficiency tests for teacher certification are Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming.*

However, some states have also developed their own tests of language proficiency. Assessments for twenty languages, including Arabic, Chinese, Korean, and Persian Farsi, are available in the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET): Languages Other Than English.[40] In Georgia, prospective teachers can demonstrate their proficiency in American Sign Language (ASL), Spanish, French, German, or Latin through the Georgia Assessment for the

[36] *Herzog, 2004.*

[37] *Hamlyn, 2009.*

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] *For more information about the PRAXIS language tests, see http://www.ets.org/praxis*

[40] *For more information about the CSET series of tests, visit http://www.cset.nesinc.com*

Certification of Educators (GACE). (These languages, as well as thirteen others, are available for permit or certification through the use of the ACTFL OPI/WPT as well.) Georgia is also considering the use of external proficiency assessments to help teachers meet continuing education requirements and the development of certification for dual-language teachers.

Subject Matter Competence Assessment Tools. Some states have standards relating to subject matter competence and pedagogical competence for all teachers, including world language teachers. For instance, California has defined subject matter competence for world language teachers in five key areas: general linguistics, linguistics of the target language, literary and cultural texts and traditions, cultural analysis and comparisons, and integrated target language skills.[41] A prospective teacher's subject matter knowledge in all five areas is assessed through the CSET test.

Pedagogical Competence Assessment Tools. Some states have also begun to develop methods to assess a prospective teacher's pedagogical competence. California has developed a comprehensive set of standards for beginning teachers, known as the Teaching Performance Expectations, and a portfolio system of assessment.[42] The Teaching Performance Expectations cover six domains: making subject matter comprehensible to students, engaging and supporting students in learning, planning instruction and designing learning experiences, creating and maintaining effective learning environments, assessing student learning, and professional development.[43]

As of January 2010, Washington requires prospective language teachers to take the Washington Educator Skills Test—Endorsement for World Languages, developed by Pearson. Competency expectations include child and adolescent development, individuality and diversity, language and culture, language acquisition and teaching, learning environment, assessment, language competency and proficiency, and professional development.[44]

A number of other states require world language teacher candidates to take the ETS PRAXIS test in pedagogy. Detailed information on this topic can be found in the *Resource Guide to Developing Linguistic and Cultural Competency in the United States* and in annual state reports available on the NCSSFL website.

The International Association for K–12 Online Learning recently published the National Standards for Quality Online Teaching that can serve as a reference and a tool for measuring the effectiveness of online teachers.[45]

2. Certification

Certification is a core aspect of the world language teacher supply system that must be reviewed and revised in light of new demands for a wider array of languages, program types, and delivery models. Upon examination, a number of issues quickly emerge. A state's current certification requirements may be based on outdated assumptions about the qualifications needed by teachers for a limited number of languages and a narrow range of program models. Categories of certificates and licenses vary widely from state to state and are difficult to navigate, align, and compare. These non-standardized categories and requirements create confusion and a lack of portability from state to state. Prospective teachers may have difficulty obtaining accurate information about requirements, particularly when certification regulatory agencies do not reside in the state department of education or public instruction. Finally, rigid requirements may unintentionally exclude qualified candidates from non-traditional backgrounds who possess strong language skills but need different preparatory training in order to teach.

[41] *Jacobson, 2009.*

[42] *Ibid.*

[43] *To see the complete Teaching Performance Expectations, visit http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TPA-files/CandidateHandbook-AppendixA-TPEs.pdf*

[44] *For more information about Washington's teacher assessment, go to http://www.k12.wa.us/certification/teacher/teachertesting.aspx*

[45] *The standards are available at http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/NACOL%20Standards%20Quality%20Online%20Teaching.pdf*

The teacher shortage in world languages is influenced by a series of issues confronted on the way to certification: first off, bilingualism, or even "content competency," is not easily accomplished, especially on a fast-track "alternative" certification route. On the other hand, "traditional" licensure routes can be tedious and discouraging for a native speaker, and as far as licensure exams go, he or she may run into difficulties due to cultural differences. Furthermore, availability of alternative programs in specific languages is not consistent state-to-state, which becomes a greater issue when individual states will not accept teachers prepared by alternative routes in other states, and then matching the level of licensure as well as the grade span with other states is an additional obstacle.

—Vance Ruugard, Executive Director, Office of Teacher Licensing, Tennessee Department of Education and President, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification

To address these issues, states must redefine their certification and licensure requirements so that they are based on agreed-upon standards for teacher performance and incorporate the language proficiency level and pedagogical skills required for success. Many states, including California, Delaware, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Utah, and Wisconsin, have revised their world language teacher certification requirements from older models based on course completion to new models based on standards, competency, and performance. In addition, states should provide alternative routes to certification (ACRs) to recruit teachers from non-traditional pools and rapidly increase the supply of world language teachers.

Alternative Routes to Certification (ACRs). The federal government, in its Race to the Top Executive Summary, defines alternative certification routes as "pathways to certification that are authorized under the State's laws or regulations, that allow the establishment and operation of teacher and administrator preparation programs in the State, and that have the following characteristics (in addition to standard features such as demonstration of subject-matter mastery, and high-quality instruction in pedagogy and in addressing the needs of all students in the classroom including English language learners and students with disabilities):

- can be provided by various types of qualified providers, including both institutions of higher education and other providers operating independently from institutions of higher education;
- are selective in accepting candidates;
- provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective mentoring and coaching;
- significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses; and upon completion, award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs award upon completion."[46]

The National Center for Education Information, in its report entitled Alternative Teacher Certification: A State by State Analysis 2005*, offers the following profile of teacher candidates pursuing alternative routes to certification:*

- *80 percent already had a bachelors degree or higher in a field other than education*
- *47 percent had a non-education job before they entered the ACR program*
- *7 percent were age thirty or older*
- *32 percent were racial or ethnic minorities (while 10 percent of the US teacher population were racial or ethnic minorities)*
- *37 percent were men (while 25 percent of the US teacher population were men)*

In many states, ACRs have already become an attractive alternative to traditional certification models because they respond to a number of factors affecting the nation's teacher workforce, including the rising retirement rates of baby-boom generation teachers, the unacceptably high attrition rates for beginning teachers, and the requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act that teachers attain "highly qualified" status. According to data from the National Center for Education Information (NCEI), more than half of current ACR programs have been established within

[46] *US Department of Education, 2009b.*

the last fifteen years[47] and now as many as one-third of new teacher hires come from ACR programs.[48] This trend indicates that ACR programs represent a long-term component of teacher supply across the United States.

> *In Delaware, a bachelor's degree in any subject may now qualify native speakers of languages other than English to teach their language through the state's ACR program. Naturally, non-US degrees must be appropriately translated, and candidates must meet all program requirements, but this shows a concerted effort to make certification more attainable. For more information, visit:*
>
> ***http://www.udel.edu/artc/prospectivecandidates/whoiseligible.html***

Presently, every state has at least one ACR program, with 130 state alternate routes and 600 ACR programs being implemented. Approximately 62,000 individuals across all disciplines were issued certificates to teach through ACRs in 2007–08.[49] ACR programs have been able to streamline certification for teachers of high-demand content areas and for specific high-need schools, and well-crafted ACR programs offer great promise for tapping non-traditional sources of prospective world language teachers. One promising response to the existing shortage of world language teachers is to adapt successful ACR models.

The National Center for Alternative Certification (NCAC) has identified, through many years of research, several characteristics common to successful ACR models: (1) they are "specifically designed to recruit, prepare, and license talented individuals who already have at least a bachelor's degree—and often career experience—in fields other than education";(2) they are "field-based programs that allow participants to gain on-the-job training"; (3) they allow for "coursework or equivalent experiences in professional education studies before and during teaching"; (4) they involve "mentor teachers and/or other support personnel"; and (5) they have "high performance standards for completion of the programs."[50] The NCAC also notes that "multiple program models can be offered by a university, college, community college, school district, regional service center, state department, or consortium."[51]

Effective ACR models will be accessible to a wider range of prospective teachers, including mid-career adults with existing jobs and family obligations as well as recent college graduates who did not go through teacher education programs. Stakeholders must work together to create a process that aligns the requirements for preparation or coursework with a candidate's background and existing knowledge and skills. Similarly, effective ACRs will be flexible enough to eliminate unnecessary requirements, such as credit hours in a world language for prospective teachers whose tested proficiency and prior education provide evidence of their skills, but also comprehensive enough to provide additional support, such as English enhancement or orientation to US school practices and policies for candidates whose prior education may have occurred in other countries.

When developing ACRs, it is imperative that local schools, districts, state departments of education and certification agencies, teacher preparation programs, and institutions of higher education work together within and across state boundaries to address the thorny issues of accessibility, flexibility, and portability. Whenever possible, stakeholders should collaborate to create multistate consortia that can examine existing certification and/or ACR systems and consider ways to customize them for world language teachers, with the eventual goal of establishing a standardized multistate or even national credentialing system for beginning world language teachers.

> *New Jersey has demonstrated exemplary collaboration and partnerships in developing its Alternative Certification Route.*

[47] *Chait & McLaughlin, 2009.*

[48] *Feistritzer & Chester, 2002.*

[49] *Feistritzer, 2009a.*

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] *Feistritzer, 2009b.*

3. Pools of Prospective Teachers

Language teacher recruitment has traditionally focused on university language majors who receive training through formal teacher education programs, but this already limited pool of recruits has been shrinking—and for less-commonly-taught languages, this recruitment pool is almost nonexistent. According to a 2006 survey by the Modern Language Association (MLA), while modern language undergraduate enrollments in colleges and universities have risen by 12.9 percent in the past ten years, it is still the case that only 8.6 percent of all students in higher education were enrolled in foreign language classes. More than half of these were enrolled in Spanish, with only about 11 percent of language enrollees studying critical languages. Overall, barely 1 percent of students were enrolled in all the critical languages at all levels combined. At the graduate level, the number of students enrolled in language study was lower in 2006 than in 1974, despite the fact that the total number of graduate students had almost doubled.[52]

While we need to continue to attract young talent to our traditional teacher education programs, we must tap into new and expanded pools of prospective world language teachers. In the short term, guest teachers—those who come from other countries to teach their native language to US students—can help fill the gap.

One successful guest teacher program is the Chinese Guest Teacher Program, the product of a partnership between the College Board and Hanban (Confucius Institute Headquarters), in collaboration with NCCSFL and the Chinese Language Association of Secondary-Elementary Schools. Over the last four years, the College Board has brought over 325 Chinese guest teachers to teach Chinese language and culture in schools across the United States.[53] The Embassies of Spain and France are other important sponsors of guest teacher programs. The US Department of State and a small number of private sector recruiting agencies bring in guest teachers as well.

Successful guest teacher programs require effective communication between the states and source countries. Well-crafted procedures for recruitment, selection, placement, and hosting must also be put in place. In addition, the US Department of State can assist by streamlining visa processing for visiting teachers within the context of security assurance. Most importantly, states must devise clear regulations for guest teacher certification and establish a support system for the teachers.[54]

Although guest teachers bring short-term relief to the world language teacher shortage problem, long-term solutions must focus on preparing teachers who can remain in US classrooms for the span of an entire career. We have at hand large numbers of highly educated mid-career professionals who are proficient speakers of world languages. For example, former Peace Corps volunteers, government employees, or military personnel seeking alternative career paths can be recruited and trained as teachers. Programs are already in place in twenty-six states to recruit individuals making mid-career changes for positions as world language teachers.[55]

Increasingly, the United States is recognizing native and heritage speakers of critical languages as major resources for expanding our world language capability. Out of the 31 million foreign-born residents of the United States who speak a language other than English, over 8 million hold a bachelor's, master's, or other professional degree, according to the 2000 US census. In fact, heritage language teachers who live in our local communities are the single largest source of teachers of less commonly taught languages.[56] Data collected from STARTALK programs reveal that STARTALK teacher candidates in Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Persian, Swahili, Turkish, and Urdu were predominantly native and heritage speakers of the language and mostly college-educated, though not necessarily in disciplines related to language teaching.[57] Some have had prior language teaching experience in a range of contexts. As heritage language communities and the organizations that serve them will be an important source of new world language teachers, states and districts will need to consider ways to reach out to these communities and build partnerships with them. Special programs are already in place in sixteen states to recruit heritage language speakers.[58]

---

[52] *Furman et al., 2007.*

[53] *For more information about the Chinese Guest Teacher Program, visit www.collegeboard.com/guestteacher*

[54] *Wang, 2009.*

[55] *Wang et al., 2009.*

[56] *Wang, 2009.*

[57] *Ibid.*

[58] *Wang et al., 2009.*

Expanding the pool to include these newly identified groups of individuals will allow the teacher supply system to more quickly address the increasing need for more teachers in more diverse languages. However, it is important to note that these non-traditional teacher candidates bring different skills sets and different educational needs to the table. Just as states will need to revise their certification requirements and paths to certification to accommodate these new groups of prospective teachers, teacher preparation programs will need to redesign their course offerings to address the diverse needs of a heterogeneous pool of candidates.

4. Capacity and Quality of Teacher Preparation Programs

The capacity and quality of teacher preparation programs is another aspect of the teacher supply system that must be addressed. At present, the United States does not generate enough world language teachers to meet current, let alone future, needs. Most of the existing language teacher education programs still recruit university language majors and prepare them to teach French, German, Latin, or Spanish in a high school environment. But the fastest-growing programs offer emerging critical languages and innovative delivery models, and non-traditional candidates are our largest source of prospective teachers. The mismatch between demand and supply is clear. It is essential, therefore, to restructure teacher preparation programs to meet the needs of a diverse teacher pool and a variety of language education settings.

First, it is imperative to increase the capacity of the world language teacher supply system to produce teachers in a wide variety of emerging important world languages. According to survey data gathered by the NFLC, while the United States has 451 teacher preparation programs for Spanish, 373 programs for French, 235 programs for German, and 77 programs for Latin, there are only 50 such programs for Chinese and 8 for Arabic. Only a handful of programs exist nationwide for many other critically important languages, including Farsi, Hindi, and Korean.

Second, teacher preparation programs need to collaborate with language departments and state certification agencies to define language proficiency and other requirements for university students who plan to pursue careers as world language teachers. Despite traditional differences in perspective on teacher preparation, these stakeholders have an opportunity to adapt current requirements in response to emerging needs and a growing body of research on teacher effectiveness.[59]

> *North Carolina is piloting several online courses for preparing world language teachers. The Objectives of Teaching World Languages Online course addresses techniques for fostering student independence as language learners, using technology tools to target specific skills, creating authentic language learning activities, and identifying opportunities and techniques for monitoring student progress. The Virtual Chinese Mentoring Course focuses on lesson and curriculum planning; classroom management; and communication with colleagues, administrators, and parents. North Carolina also provides an alternative licensure option online through its Virtual Public School. For more information, visit these websites:*
>
> ***http://www.learnnc.org/courses/catalog/world-languagesonline***
>
> ***http://blogs.learnnc.org/blog/2009/08/06/virtual-mentoring-chinese-virtual-mentoring-for-nc-chinese-teachers/***
>
> ***http://www.ncvps.org/***

Third, teacher preparation programs must address the needs of diverse candidates. The inflexibility of the traditional language teacher preparation system often results in the exclusion of many potential new teachers, including mid-career professionals and native and heritage language speakers. The needs, knowledge, skills, and experiences of these prospective teachers differ significantly from those of traditional language teacher candidates. For example, prospective teachers who are educated native speakers of the language they want to teach and who grew up and attended schools outside the United States do not need traditional language course credits, but they may need English enhancement, and they almost certainly need the opportunity to learn about the culture and practices of US schools, including student behaviors and school discipline, regulations, teacher norms, and how to deal with parents and administrators. They also need to know the structure of their native language

[59] *Tedick, 2009.*

and how languages are learned and taught. They, like other novice teachers, need the opportunity to work with skilled and experienced teachers who can provide expert mentoring.

Finally, teacher preparation programs must prepare teachers for a wide variety of innovative delivery models, including immersion, dual language, and Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs. An effective immersion, dual language, or FLES teacher must be familiar not only with the target language and pedagogy but also with the elementary school curriculum in all content areas. In addition, teachers must have a sound understanding of the physiological, cognitive, and social development of young children.

> *California, Hawaii, Louisiana, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, and Virginia have well-established and/or extensive dual language and immersion programs.*

Specific training for teaching in distance, online, or blended learning models must also be incorporated into teacher training programs. Prospective teachers need clinical experiences such as the opportunity to serve as online conversation coaches in order to gain first-hand experience in facilitating communication virtually. They need to know how to manage a virtual classroom while understanding the characteristics of each student and tending to the individual needs. Training in both technological and pedagogical skills is particularly important for teachers who will work in this promising delivery mode.

Given the complexity of the teacher's role in new program types and delivery models, it is critical to bring together education professionals from various domains, including elementary and secondary education, world languages, and instructional technology, to engage in rigorous discussions on how best to prepare prospective teachers for these new challenges.

5. Clinical Experiences and Professional Development

Clinical Experiences. One problematic issue is the integration of relevant clinical or student teaching experiences into the teacher preparation curriculum. These clinical experiences are often limited and often occur late in the teacher preparation program. Emerging research on effective teacher preparation[60] shows that a variety of clinical experiences throughout the teacher preparation program, collaboration with peers, mentoring by experienced teachers, and a well-designed practicum are essential to effective teacher preparation and eventual success and retention. Graduates of teacher education programs consistently indicate that clinical experience is the single most important element in a teacher's preparation, and principals and teacher preparation program alumni agree that two of the most important steps needed for improving teacher education are a better balance between coursework and field experiences and a longer duration of student teaching.[61] However, most teacher preparation programs—in all subject areas—fall short. There is no consensus on what constitutes a "good" student teaching experience: the primary standard that programs generally rely on is that students must teach for a set number of days. Teaching opportunities are assigned to prospective teachers only after all course work has been taken, when the opportunity for feedback and improvement is limited.

The student teaching experience itself poses administrative, logistical, and financial challenges for the prospective teacher. Requirements for a specific type of certificate may be confusing and likely differ from state to state. A candidate may have to complete more than one type of student teaching experience in order to satisfy the certification requirements, yet this may not be clearly defined. For example, some states allow a student teacher to "split teach" a semester-long clinical experience between K–6 and 6–12 levels, while other states require separate teaching experiences for each separate level. It may be difficult to identify a suitable program for student teaching in a given local area. This is especially true for candidates who need to prepare to teach less commonly taught languages or to teach in a wide

[60] *Darling-Hammond, 2009.*

[61] *Levine, 2006.*

range of delivery models, such as immersion, dual language, or distance learning, as there are relatively few established programs. Even when programs exist locally, their instructors may not be certified to serve as cooperating teachers who can supervise a clinical experience. As a result, prospective teachers must sometimes travel out of town or even out of state to participate in relevant student teaching opportunities. This commitment often drains students' financial and logistical resources, as few students are compensated for the student teaching experience. According to the Library of Congress's 2004 *Congressional Research Service Report, Teacher Recruitment and Retention: Current Programs and Legislation in the 108th Congress*, only twenty-four states awarded loans and scholarships or waived licensing fees in an effort to recruit and retain teachers.[62]

The need to provide meaningful and accessible clinical experiences is one of the biggest challenges in world language teacher preparation and certification. We must collaborate and seek multifaceted solutions in order to establish effective models for providing meaningful clinical experiences that do not burden prospective teachers financially or logistically.

> *Data from STARTALK suggest that the opportunity to participate in a well-designed clinical experience in the context of a summer program is an important contribution of this project to world language teacher preparation.*

Professional Development. To maintain enthusiasm, reduce isolation, and increase effectiveness, teachers need opportunities for professional development. Research has consistently shown that professional development, including mentoring and other forms of peer collaboration, has an important and positive effect on teacher effectiveness as well as teacher retention.[63] According to the 1999 report from the National Center for Education Statistics, *Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers*, "increased time spent in professional development and collaborative activities was associated with the perception of significant improvements in teaching . . . teachers who participated in common planning periods for team teachers at least once a week were more likely than those who participated a few times a year to report that participation improved their teaching a lot."[64] The report also noted while only 19 percent of teachers participating in the survey had been formally mentored by another teacher, 70 percent of teachers who were mentored reported significant improvements in their teaching.[65] Among nine proposed strategies for improving teacher education, principals and alumni surveyed for the 2006 report *Educating School Teachers* ranked mentoring of teachers as the second most important, after striking a better balance between subject matter preparation and field experience. However, the same survey found that only fifteen states required and financed mentoring programs.[66]

Researchers have noted that unless pre-service preparation, induction, and professional development are fully integrated, prospective teachers face a "fragmented and conceptually impoverished path toward becoming a skilled professional."[67] For this reason, New Jersey created a Higher Education Task Force, bringing researchers and practitioners together to design and maintain a system for improving teacher quality.

California views certification as a continuum that leads from initial credentialing to accomplished practice. The state has developed a professional induction program aimed at providing new teachers with individualized support from mentors. Information gathered during a prospective teacher's Teaching Performance Assessment is used during the induction period to give formative feedback so that teachers can improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities.[68]

[62] *Kuenzi, 2004.*

[63] *Levine, 2006; US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999.*

[64] *US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999.*

[65] *Ibid.*

[66] *Levine, 2006.*

[67] *Feiman-Nemser, 2001, in Campesino, 2009.*

[68] *For more information on California's induction standards, see http://www.btsa.ca.gov/FACT/assessment-files/E1Descriptionsof PracticeShortVersion.pdf*

6. Data Collection and Evaluation

In order to focus their resources and assess the impact of their efforts, stakeholders should establish a means of systematic and ongoing data collection about the status and effectiveness of their world language teacher supply system. Information should be gathered about each key component area of the supply system. Some guiding questions for each area follow.

Information to Gather on Teacher Competencies

- What world language program types and delivery models are desired or being implemented in the state? What are the teacher competencies required for success in these program types and delivery models?
- What standards are currently in use in the state to define requirements for teachers and teacher preparation programs? Do these adequately define the knowledge and skills needed by world language teachers in the state's current or future world language programs?
- What tools does the state use to assess whether teacher candidates meet state requirements for language proficiency, subject matter competence, and pedagogical skills? Do these reflect the most up-to-date research on effective teaching and language learning?

Information to Gather on Certification

- Do the state's current certification requirements for world language teachers reflect the qualifications needed for the range of languages, program types, and delivery models desired in the state? Are they based on agreed-upon standards for competence and performance?
- What paths to certification are already available in the state? If alternative routes to certification are available for world language teachers, are they accessible to a diverse pool of candidates? Do the state's requirements unintentionally exclude candidates from non-traditional backgrounds with high levels of proficiency in the desired target languages?
- Is the certification system flexible? Can certification requirements be aligned with a candidate's background and existing knowledge and skills? Can competence in certain areas be demonstrated through examination or performance assessment, thereby eliminating unnecessary requirements?
- Does the state have reciprocity with other states for world language teacher certification?

Information to Gather on Pools of Prospective Teachers

- What efforts are currently being made to expand the pool of world language teacher candidates?
- What heritage communities are present in the state, and what efforts are being made to recruit from those communities?
- What community and professional organizations can become partners with the state to expand the pool of prospective teachers?

Information to Gather on the Capacity and Quality of Teacher Preparation Programs

- What is the current number of world language teacher education programs in the state, including ACR programs for world languages? What is the current output of the world language teacher supply system in the state? How many teachers are needed to staff current and future world language education programs in the state? By how much does the state need to increase its capacity?
- Which languages does the state offer or wish to offer in its elementary and secondary school systems? Which languages are being offered at universities with world language teacher preparation programs? In what languages can prospective world language teachers be certified? If a world language is identified as important but no world language preparation program for that language is offered in the state, what actions must be taken in order to offer it?
- What types of language education programs does the state offer or wish to offer? Do the state's current

preparation requirements for world language teachers reflect the qualifications needed for the range of program types and delivery models desired in the state?

- How effective are the state's world language teacher education programs? Do teacher candidates receive credit by performance assessment or by course credit hours? Are there data demonstrating the target language proficiency of teacher candidates? Are there data demonstrating the subject matter and pedagogical competence of these graduates? Are there other indicators that provide evidence of desired outcomes? How could the programs increase their efficacy?
- How flexible are the state's world language teacher education programs? Do they provide tailored training to meet teacher candidates' needs? Can students take courses online or on a varied schedule?

Information to Gather on Clinical Experiences and Professional Development

- What clinical experiences are currently offered through the state's world language teacher preparation programs? Are these clinical experiences effectively integrated into the teacher preparation program? Are they sufficient in number and duration to provide prospective teachers ample opportunities for hands-on engagement and constructive feedback? Are there data demonstrating the effectiveness of clinical experiences?
- What induction programs exist for new teachers in the state? Are there induction programs specifically geared toward new world language teachers? Are there data on the effectiveness of the state's induction programs?
- What formal mentoring programs are available during a new teacher's first three years of employment?
- What ongoing professional development opportunities exist for world language teachers?
- Are mentoring, induction, and professional development programs structured to provide continuity and individualized feedback and to make connections with the challenges teachers face in the classroom?

7. Partnerships and Consortia to Leverage Resources

Significant efforts are currently underway at state and local levels to reform and expand the world language teacher supply system and thereby expand world language offerings in our schools. These efforts are led not only by educators but by parents, who are increasingly demanding enhanced language programs,[69] as are mayors, governors, and business leaders interested in international investment and better access to international markets. While each locality and state has its own constraints, each also has unique social, cultural, and economic interests and potential resources that can be leveraged and adjusted to local conditions. Throughout the process, it is essential that stakeholders actively seek ways to collaborate within and across states and districts to leverage scarce resources. Each constituency concerned with world language education has valuable contributions and partnerships to offer to the process. A concerted multistate, multisector approach is essential to building a national supply of highly effective world language teachers.

Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Utah have formed multisector task forces to develop strategic plans for expanding their world language capacity, while Kansas and New York have developed task force reports specifically for enhancing their Chinese language capacity. More information is available at these websites:

Ohio: http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/downloads/Ohio_language_roadmap.pdf

Oregon: http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/downloads/Oregon_language_roadmap.pdf

Texas: http://texaslanguagesummit.org/roadmap/

Utah: http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/images/documents/utah%20language%20road%20for%20the%2021st%20century.pdf

Kansas: http://www.kansasintheworld.org/kcies/pdf/chinataskforce.pdf

New York: http://www.chinainstitute.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.ViewPage&PageID=845

[69] *Rose & Gallup, 2007.*

As a starting point, the process needs to engage all key members of the alliance that will be necessary for implementation, including educators and policymakers at the state and local levels; schools of education, language departments in colleges and universities, and other providers of teacher training; world language teacher associations; heritage communities that are sources of prospective teachers; and parent and business associations committed to educational opportunity and quality for their communities.

The federal government can also assist by facilitating interstate collaboration and providing resources for the development of multistate or national world language teacher certification, including benchmarking and measurement of teacher competency. Likewise, the federal government can bolster recruitment and certification efforts nationwide by establishing an information clearinghouse on world language education that provides prospective teachers with a central source of information on teacher preparation programs; financial assistance; certification or licensure process, requirements, and contact information for each state; and job opportunities.

Recommendations

To transform the world language teacher supply system and world language education in the United States, all stakeholders must take specific and concrete action. Listed below are recommendations for state governments and education agencies, local education agencies, institutions of higher education, teacher preparation programs, national and professional organizations and institutes, and the federal government. These recommendations overlap because responsibility for many of these activities varies across jurisdictions and is often shared.

State Governments and Education Agencies

- Establish state-level policy and a strategic plan to expand world language programs and enhance their effectiveness
- Implement steps to establish or expand language programs in schools, especially to encourage early start, articulated longer sequences, and research-based program designs
- Conduct systematic assessment of student language learning to inform strategies to increase program and teacher effectiveness
- Develop multistate consortia for language learning, including the use of distance learning technologies and virtual collaboration tools
- Build state capacity for world language teacher recruitment, development, accreditation and evaluation, and retention, including guest teachers
- Review and modify the existing world language certification system to ensure that it is standards-, competency-, and performance-based
- Establish effective and responsive alternative certification routes and programs, in partnership with local and state education agencies and teacher preparation programs
- Develop multistate consortia with interstate agreements for teacher certification requirements in order to ensure both high standards and portability

Local Education Agencies

- Establish district-level policy and a strategic plan to expand world language programs and enhance their effectiveness
- Implement steps to establish or expand language programs in schools, especially to encourage early start, articulated longer sequences, and research-based program designs
- Conduct assessment of student language learning
- Build local capacity for world language teacher recruitment, development, accreditation and evaluation, and retention, in conjunction with state and regional efforts, including guest teachers
- Establish effective and responsive alternative certification routes and programs, in partnership with state education agencies and teacher preparation programs

Institutions of Higher Education

- Conduct local, regional, national, and international research and development projects to enhance language education, planning, policy, and practice
- Expand or enhance foreign language program offerings in each institution
- Develop strategies to increase the percentage of students enrolled in language programs, especially at advanced levels and in language-oriented study abroad programs
- Use student outcomes assessment to improve language program effectiveness
- Build capacity for world language teacher recruitment, development, accreditation and evaluation, and retention, including designing and offering alternative certification routes and programs

Teacher Preparation Programs

- Build capacity for world language teacher recruitment, development, accreditation and evaluation, and retention, including designing and offering alternative certification routes and programs
- Enhance effectiveness of teacher preparation consistent with research findings

National and Professional Organizations and Institutes

- Provide coordination and leadership to promote world language education in your sphere of influence
- Provide technical assistance and expertise in policy formation, common core standards development for world languages, program development, research, and data collection
- Conduct or assist in local, regional, national, and international research and development projects to enhance language policy and planning, language learning and teaching, and language teacher development

Federal Government

- Provide leadership to promote an additive language policy
- Provide national coordination to ensure interagency synergies and to avoid gaps or duplication of effort
- Facilitate interstate dialogue on the following topics:
  - Development of common student learning standards
  - Encouragement of teacher certification portability
  - Adoption of common teacher certification standards
  - Sharing of information and resources
- Provide incentives to the following constituencies:
  - State education agencies, local education agencies, institutions of higher education, teacher preparation programs, national and professional organizations and institutes to carry out their respective roles and activities in building national language capacity
  - Individual students and teachers for meaningful language learning and teacher education activities, including study abroad
- Collect and disseminate data on the following topics:
  - Number of schools with language programs
  - Type and duration of language programs
  - Range of languages taught
  - Student enrollments and persistence in longer sequences
  - Student language learning outcomes at various benchmarks
  - Number and types of teacher preparation programs per language
  - Teacher training enrollments
  - Production and retention of certified teachers
- Disseminate research findings and best practices in the following areas:
  - Language learning and teaching
  - Language teacher preparation and development

Conclusion

The STARTALK program began in 2006 and offered its first programs in 2007. From that time until the writing of this white paper in 2010, the consensus on the need to strengthen world language education in US schools has continued to broaden and deepen.

There is widening recognition that the quality of our public education will materially affect our nation's international status and the long-term prosperity of our society. Better understood, as well, is the essential role of languages in a "world-class" US education and in overall student achievement. While support for stronger language programs in schools is far from universal, the momentum is clearly in the direction of a curriculum for the global age that provides to every child the opportunity to be proficient in English and at least one other language: toward an "additive" language education policy that builds on the language skills that children bring to the classroom.

The variety of languages being learned in the US is slowly expanding as well, albeit from a small base—especially in states that have adopted strong policies and strategic plans for world language education. Joining French, German, and Spanish are increasing numbers of programs in Arabic, Chinese, and nearly a dozen other languages prominent in world events. But if these programs are to produce the multilingual, professionally biliterate workforce that our nation needs, they must be equipped with the necessities for successful language learning: they need highly effective teachers in every language classroom.

Research cited in this document indicates that the single most important school-based factor for student achievement is a highly effective teacher. But the United States has a widespread shortage of teachers, including world language teachers. The United States does not currently produce enough teachers to staff even our current modest offerings in world languages. Our current supply system gives scant attention to world language teachers, sometimes shortchanging them in language skills and in the pedagogical skills that can only be developed through teaching practice with expert mentoring and guidance.

With a greater variety of languages being taught, with forward-looking states targeting meaningful language learning outcomes for their students, the current fragmented teacher supply system must give way to a coherent, rigorous, and efficient system that shares resources across state and regional lines, a system that prepares a varied pool of promising teacher candidates to teach an expanding array of languages to students with varied backgrounds and abilities, from every ethnic group and socioeconomic stratum, and in schools from the inner city through the suburbs to rural America.

The new generation of language teachers will help their students develop professionally useful skills in English and other languages. They will accomplish this in programs that start early, make effective use of technology, incorporate meaningful assessment and evidence-based methodologies, and continue through longer sequences of articulated instruction. Some of these teachers will be native speakers of English who have learned other languages to high levels of proficiency, others will be native or heritage speakers of the language being taught, and some will have acquired English as a second language. All will need rigorous preparation, will have to demonstrate their skills and knowledge through meaningful assessments, and will benefit from continuing opportunities for professional development and reflection with mentors and peers.

They will arrive in America's language classrooms through the systematic, coordinated efforts of state and local governments and state and local education agencies, with leadership, coordination, and incentives from federal agencies and with the support of a range of professional organizations and research and resource centers. They will remain in those classrooms because they have the support and encouragement of parents, peer teachers, and supervisors, and because they have ongoing opportunities to grow and develop as professionals.

As technology forecaster Paul Saffo tells us, "Never mistake a clear view for a short distance." The distance is not short, but we do know the way. Moreover, our experience in the STARTALK program has shown clearly that across our nation there are hosts of committed, competent, and forward-looking colleagues ready to take the next steps in the journey toward a language-competent America.

Glossary

additive approach. In language education, an orientation that values and cultivates the learning of new languages in addition to the dominant or majority language. This approach emphasizes the value of linguistic and cultural diversity and the inclusion of diverse heritage language learners. Contrast this with the subtractive (or assimilative) approach, which prioritizes the learning of one dominant or majority language and discourages the use or learning of other languages.

articulated sequence. An educational program that offers learners continuity between multiple levels of instruction, where specific learning goals at each level build upon the performance objectives of the preceding level, creating a meaningful sequence that allows learners to progressively develop their proficiency. Articulation also entails coordination of the program's curriculum between multiple classes of any one level, and it includes the integration of the program with other disciplines in the school or larger learning environment.

biliteracy. Personally or professionally useful oral and literacy skills in English and another language.

blended learning. The combination of different modes of delivery, typically joining electronic or mobile learning resources with other educational resources that involve interpersonal interaction, such as classroom teaching.

certificate. A teaching credential that indicates completion of state requirements for teaching and also specifies what category of teaching (e.g., early childhood, secondary, etc.) and/or what specific content area the teacher is licensed to teach. The term certificate is often used interchangeably with license. See also license.

cooperating teacher. A teacher who contracts with a teacher training institution to oversee trainees' student teaching experiences as part of the trainees' teacher preparation program. Also known as a supervising teacher.

dual language. Teaching students literacy and content in two languages, with the objective that students will attain biliteracy.

Foreign Language Exploratory/Experience Program (FLEX). An educational model that introduces language learning and cultural awareness through exposure to the basic vocabulary of one or more languages over a relatively short period of instruction (six to nine weeks), or less than sixty minutes per week throughout the academic year. This model is also known as "exploratory," and is usually implemented in elementary or middle school settings; FLEX programs are intended to generate interest in culture and language, and they are not intended to be part of an articulated instructional sequence in world languages. Students who complete a FLEX program may opt to enroll in a beginning-level world language program.

Foreign Language in Elementary Schools (FLES). An elementary school instructional model that aims to develop learners' proficiency in a world language. The initial instructional focus is on speaking skills, along with cultural knowledge and a gradual introduction to literacy. Programs of this type may link language learning with the other content areas of the early elementary school curriculum. Classes are taught by qualified foreign language teachers, and programs vary widely in the frequency and duration of foreign language class meetings.

exploratory model. See Foreign Language Exploratory Program (FLEX).

guest teacher. A foreign educator who holds an official teaching credential from his or her country of origin, and who legally resides in the United States, under a Memorandum of Understanding with a state Board of Education, for the specific purpose of teaching in that state's public schools.

heritage language (speaker/community). A language other than the dominant/majority language that is cultivated by individuals and/or communities with ties to that language's culture of origin. Heritage language speakers include individuals with varying degrees of exposure to, or fluency in, the heritage language from family or community maintenance of the language. Heritage language communities are groups constituted of heritage language speakers who use and/or make efforts to maintain and teach the heritage language.

immersion. An educational model in which general academic content (content areas considered primary in the school curriculum) is taught in the target language. Language proficiency (in the target language) and content area knowledge are of equal importance in this model. Individual programs determine the grade level at which English is introduced as an instructional area, gradually increasing the time allotted to English instruction in later grades. Partial immersion programs differ in the amount of time and number of classes devoted to the target language and in the use of English as a medium of instruction.

less - commonly - taught languages (LCTLs). Languages other than the three most commonly taught world or foreign languages in the United States: Spanish, French, and German. Arabic, Chinese, and Korean are examples of LCTLs.

license. A document authorizing the licensee to teach. Specific certification designations for a teaching license are determined by each state (e.g., provisional or emergency, two to three year, etc.). A teaching license is granted with certification for specific levels (e.g., early childhood, elementary, etc.) and content areas (e.g., math, science, etc.). See also certificate.

native speaker. A speaker for whom the target language is his or her first language.

proficiency. How well a person functions in a given language, typically measured by the degree and complexity of a person's communicative abilities in the target language.

target language. In language education, a language other than one's native language (or other than the majority/dominant language) that is the object of study.

transcultural (cross-cultural, intercultural) competence. The ability to interact effectively and knowledgeably with people from different cultures.

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (n.d.). *National standards for foreign language education.* Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3392

Asia Society and China Institute. (2009). *Developing global competence for a changing world: Learning Chinese in New York schools.* Report of the New York Task Force on Chinese Language and Culture Initiatives. New York: Asia Society.

Bamford, K. W., & Mizokawa, D. T. (1991). Additive-bilingual (immersion) education: Cognitive and language development. *Language Learning, 41*, 413-429.

Bialystok, E., & Hakuta, K. (1994). *In other words: The science and psychology of second language acquisition.* New York: Basic Books.

Campesino, C. (2009) Improving teacher education and preparation: What can institutions of higher education do to improve teacher education and preparation? A view from the Garden State: New Jersey. Presentation given at the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, Arlington, VA. Available at http://startalk.umd.edu/2009/meetings/certification/

Carpenter, J. A., & Torney, J. V. (1974). Beyond the melting pot. In P. M. Markun (Ed.), *Childhood and intercultural education: Overview and research* (pp. 14-24). Washington, DC: Association for Childhood Education International.

Carreira, M. C., & Armengol, R. (2001). Professional opportunities for heritage language speakers. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 109-142). McHenry, IL, and Washington, DC: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Chait, R., & McLaughlin, M. (2009). *Realizing the promise: How state policy can support alternative certification programs.* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/02/pdf/alternative_certification.pdf

City of Chicago Mayor's Press Office. (2009, October 9). Daley, school officials announce expansion of Arabic language program [press release]. Chicago, IL: City of Chicago. Retrieved from http://egov.cityofchicago.org/city/webportal/portalContentItemAction.do?displayBack =null&contenTypeName=COC_EDITORIAL&topChannelName=HomePage&contentOID=537062736

Committee for Economic Development (2006). *Education for global leadership: The importance of international studies and foreign language education for US economic and national security.* Retrieved from http://www.ced.org/images/library/reports/education/report_foreignlanguages.pdf

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2006). *Global education policy statement.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://beta.ccsso.org/Documents/2006/Global_Education_Policy_statement_2006.pdf

Crump, T. (2001). *Translating and interpreting in the federal government.* Alexandria, VA: American Translators Association.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.* Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

Curtain, H., & Dahlberg, C. A. (2004). *Languages and children—making the match. New languages for young learners, grades K-8.* (3rd edition). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Dahl, S. (2004). *Intercultural research: The current state of knowledge.* Middlesex University Business School Discussion Paper No. 26. London: Middlesex University Business School.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). *Thoughts on teacher preparation.* Retrieved from Edutopia.org website: http://www.edutopia.org/linda-darling-hammond-teacher-preparation#graph6

Egan, K. (1999, March). Speaking: A critical skill and a challenge. *CALICO Journal 6*(3). Retrieved from: https://www.calico.org/a-615-Speaking%20A%20Critical%20Skill%20and%20a%20Challenge%20.html

European Commission. (2005). Europeans and languages. *Eurobarometer, 64*(3). Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_237.en.pdf

Fasciano, H. (2009, December 10). Innovative paths to certification. Presentation given at the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, Arlington, VA. Available at http://startalk.umd.edu/2009/meetings/certification/

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6)1013-1055.

Feistritzer C. E., & Chester, D. T. (2002). *Alternative teacher certification: A state-by-state analysis 2002.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information.

Feistritzer, C. E. (2005). *Alternative teacher certification: A state by state analysis 2005.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Feistritzer, C. E. (2009a). *Alternative teacher certification: A state-by-state analysis 2009.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Feistritzer, C. E. (2009b). Alternate routes to teacher certification. PowerPoint presentation given at the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, Arlington, VA.

Fuchsen, M. (1989). Starting language early: A rationale. *FLESNEWS, 2*(3) 1, 6-7.

Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2007). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, fall 2006. Retrieved from the Modern Language Association website: http://www.mla.org/pdf/06enrollmentsurvey_final.pdf

Grosse, C. U., Critz, M., & Tuman, W. (1998). The economic utility of foreign language study. *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 457-472.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism.* New York: Basic Books.

Hamlyn, H. (2009, December 9). The use of ACTFL proficiency assessments for teacher certification. Presentation given at the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, Arlington, VA. Available at http://startalk.umd.edu/2009/meetings/certification/

Helliwell, J. (1999). Language and trade. In A. Breton (Ed.), *Exploring the economics of language* (p. 26). Ottawa: Department of Heritage.

Herzog, M. (2004). *An overview of the history of the ILR language proficiency skill level descriptions and scale.* Retrieved from Interagency Language Roundtable website: http://www.govtilr.org/Skills/IRL%20Scale%20History.htm

Holobow, N., Genesee, F., Lambert, W., Gastright, J., & Met, M. (1987). Effectiveness of partial French immersion for children from different social class and ethnic backgrounds. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 8*, 137-152.

Jacobson, P. (2009, December 9). Moving from effective input to successful output. Presentation given at the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, Arlington, VA. Available at http://startalk.umd.edu/2009/meetings/certification/

Koning, P. (2009, February). Career focus: Using languages in national security. *The Language Educator, 4*(2), 32.

Koning, P. (2010a, January). Career focus: Using languages in business and industry. *The Language Educator, 5*(1), 46.

Koning, P. (2010b, April). Career focus: Using languages in education. *The Language Educator, 5*(3), 32.

Kuenzi, J. J. (2004). Teacher recruitment and retention: Current programs and legislation in the 108th congress. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress. Retrieved from: http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metacrs5865/m1/

Lapkin, S., Swain, M., & Shapson, S. M. (1990). French immersion research agenda for the 90s. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 46*(4), 638 674.

Lena, M., & Reason Moll, J. (2000). *The globalization of the professions in the United States and Canada: A survey and analysis.* Washington, DC: The Center for Quality Assurance in International Education.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers* (p. 39, 41-42). Washington, DC: The Educating Schools Project. Retrieved from http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Educating_Teachers_Report.pdf

Miller, D. B. (2009). Applying cultural knowledge to design problems: Notes for the US military about challenges and opportunities [lecture for US Training and Doctrine Command's "Culture Summit" 2009]. Retrieved from http://www.unidir.org/pdf/activites/pdf6-act337.pdf

Miniwatts Marketing Group. (2010, June 30). *Internet world users by language* [data compiled by Internet World Stats]. Retrieved from Internet World Stats website: http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats7.htm.

Minnesota Department of Education. (2008, February). Minnesota world language proficiency certificates: Report to the legislature. Retrieved from: http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/groups/Communications/documents/Report/033751.pdf

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2006). *Americans call for leadership on international education: A national survey on preparation for a global society.* Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators. Available at: http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/public_policy_document/international_education_6/americans_call_for_leadership/

National Education Association Policy and Practice Department. (2010). *Global competence is a 21st century imperative.* Washington, DC: National Education Association. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/PB28_GlobalCompetence.pdf

Pufahl, I., Rhodes, N., & Christian, D. (2000). *Foreign language teaching: What the US can learn from other countries.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Rhodes, N., & Branaman, L. E. (1999). *Foreign language instruction in the United States: A national survey of elementary and secondary schools.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Rhodes, N. C., & Pufahl, I. (2010). *Foreign language teaching in US schools: Results of a national survey.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Roberts, G. (2009, December 9). State world language demand: West Virginia and Utah. Presentation given at the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, Arlington, VA. Available at: http://startalk.umd.edu/2009/meetings/certification/

Robbins, J. E., Abramson, J., & Hollingshead, C. A. (1998). Relationships between foreign languages and interest in global business courses and careers. *Global Business Languages,* 23-32.

Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2007). The 39th annual Phi Delta Kappan/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(1) 33-48.

Ruugard, V. (2009, December 9). The new pool of world language teachers and meeting their needs. Plenary presentation presented at the National World Language Teacher Certification Summit, Arlington, VA. Available at: http://startalk.umd.edu/2009/meetings/certification/

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1991). Additive bilingualism and French immersion education: The roles of language proficiency and literacy. In A. Reynolds (Ed.), *Bilingualism, multiculturalism, and second language learning: The McGill conference in honour of Wallace E. Lambert.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tedick, D. J. (2009). K–12 Language teacher preparation: Problems and possibilities. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(2), 263-267.

US Department of Education. (2009a, September 18). *Consultation with federal agencies on areas of national need.* [data collected annually to comply with The Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315)]. Retrieved from: http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/consultation-2010.pdf

US Department of Education. (2009b, November). Race to the top executive summary. Retrieved from: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/frss/publications/1999080/indesx.asp?sectionid=1

US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). Enrollment in foreign language courses compared with enrollment in grades 9 through 12 in public secondary schools: Selected years, fall 1948 through fall 2000 [data set]. Retrieved from: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_056.asp

US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2009, March). Teacher shortage areas nationwide listing 1990-91 thru 2009-10. Retrieved from: http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.pdf

Wang, S. C. (2009). Preparing and supporting teachers of less commonly taught languages. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(2) 282-287.

Wang, S.C., Evans, B., & Liau, R. (2009). *National world language education survey: A state of the states report in 2009.* Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center and National Council of State Supervisors for Languages.

Appendix

NBPTS Core Propositions, INTASC Principles, and ACTFL/NCATE Standards

The table below summarizes and aligns the NBPTS Core Propositions, INTASC Principles, and ACTFL/NCATE Standards. Because the TEAC Principles reflect a different philosophical approach, they cannot be easily incorporated into this comparison chart and therefore they have not been not included. Interested readers should visit http://www.teac.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/quality-principles-for-teacher-education-programs.pdf for more information.

	NBPTS Standards (for experienced teachers)	***INTASC Principles*** (for new teachers)	***ACTFL/NCATE Standards*** (for pre-service teachers)
Preparing for Student Learning	#1 Knowledge of Students (Learner Development, Diversity of Learners) #1 Fairness	#2 Learner Development	
	#1 Knowledge of Culture #2 Content Knowledge (Language & Culture)	#1 Content Knowledge (Language & Culture)	#1a Language Proficiency #1b Understanding Linguistics #1c Language Comparisons #2a Cultural Understandings #2b Literary, Cultural Texts & Traditions #2c Integrating Other Disciplines in Instruction
	#2 Knowledge of Language Acquisition	#1 Content Knowledge (Language & Culture) #2 Learner Development	#3a Language Acquisition
Advancing Student Learning	#2 Multiple Paths to Learning	#3 Diversity of Learners	#3b Instructional Practices, Language Outcomes & Learner Diversity
	#2 Instructional Resources #3 Learning Environment #5 Articulation of Curriculum & Instruction	#4 Instructional Strategies #5 Learning Environment #7 Planning for Instruction	#4a Standards-based Planning #4b Standards-based Instruction #4c Selection & Developing Materials
	#3 Assessment	#8 Assessment	#5a Knowing and Using Assessment #5b Reflecting on Assessment #5c Reporting Assessment Results
Supporting Student Learning	#4 Reflection as Professional Growth #5 Schools, Families & Communities #5 Professional Community #5 Advocacy for Education in World Languages	#6 Communication #9 Reflective Practice & Professional Development #10 Community	#6a Professional Development #6b Advocacy for Foreign Language Learning