DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 071 24 FL 001 722

AUTHOR	Sheppard, Douglas C.
TITLE	Certifying Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages for American Public Schools--1969.
INSTITUTION	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, New York, N.Y.; Modern Language Association, New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 70
CONTRACT	OEC-1-6-002034-1625
NOTE	17p.; Preprint from Foreign Language Annals, v3 n4 May 1970
AVAILABLE FROM	MLA/ACTFL Materials Center, 62 Fifth Ave., New York, New York 10011 ($.50)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.95
DESCRIPTORS	College Credits, Credentials, Credit Courses, Elementary Schools, Equivalency Tests, Instructional Program Divisions, *Language Instruction, *Modern Languages, *Public Schools, Questionnaires, Secondary Schools, State Surveys, Supervisor Qualifications, *Surveys, *Teacher Certification, Teacher Education, Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

This survey of state certification practices and requirements for modern foreign languages reports on standard credit and hour requirements for elementary, secondary, supervisory, and coordinator certification. It also discusses the "approved program" option, proficiency testing, foreign language in the elementary school (FLES), reciprocal certification, licensing for differentiated staffing, and state and municipality relationships. The questionnaire used in the survey is included with a state-by-state tabulation of responses. (RL)

Certifying Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages for American Public Schools -- 1969

Douglas C. Sheppard

Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
Modern Language Association of America
62 Fifth Avenue
New York 10011

Certifying Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages for American Public Schools—1969

Douglas C. Sheppard

ABSTRACT: In this survey of State certification practices and requirements for modern foreign languages, an attempt has been made not only to report the standard credit and hour requirements for various certificates and endorsements, but also to call attention to, and suggest the significance of, developments such as the "approved program" option, proficiency testing, FLES, reciprocity, licensing for differentiated staffing, and State-municipality relationships. The Modern Language Association of America last sponsored a study of this nature just ten years ago.

CERTIFICATION (the attesting to one's competence) and Licensure (permission to practice) have long been thorny problems in American public life. Even in strongly centralized systems such as those of many European countries where an agency of government decrees who shall be allowed to teach and what his preparation shall be, the problems are not really resolved; they are merely concealed from public view.

The basic question in a non-authoritarian system is this: How and by whom shall it be determined that an aspirant is qualified to teach? On the one hand, it seems reasonable that in any profession those who practice ought best to know what skills and knowledge are required. And yet it is in the nature of guilds to become self-serving, to protect their own. Where education is largely a public trust, as in the United States, shouldn't the people's surrogates (i.e., congresses, boards of education, state departments, etc.) look after their constituents' interests and assure standards? And finally, what should be the relationship between desiderata in teacher training and the realities of supply and demand?

These, and other problems in various guises, have plagued American education since its inception. When one reads of "new" orientations in teacher preparation and certification, such as the approved-program approach, refinement of the certificates, authorization to employ paraprofessionals, greater involvement of the professional organizations, reciprocity, and the like, it may seem as though *plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.* And yet, whatever else may be more apparent than real regarding the present situation in certification, two things seem indisputable: 1) the population

DOUGLAS C. SHEPPARD (Ph.D., Univ. of Wisconsin) is Director of Foreign Language Teacher Training at West Virginia University. He has taught at SUNY, Buffalo, and at the Univ. of Montana, where he was Chairman of the foreign language department. Professor Sheppard is a member of the Board of Directors of the Northeast Conference and is the Chairman of ACTFL's Professional Preparation Committee. Among his publications are: "Those Who Are About to Teach: Some Observations on Attitudes," *Language Federation Bulletin* (Nov. 1968), "Educational Standards—Educational Politics," with Albert Marckwardt and Michael Shugrue, *Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association* (Spring 1969), and "High School-College Intervisitation: Report of an Experiment and Recommendations for Similar Projects," with Joseph M. Vocolo, *MLJ* (Nov. 1966).

explosion and increased urbanization are forcing a change, and 2) the profession *is* seeking to make the change constructive. Several events of recent years show the sense of urgency with which the situation is charged.

In 1963 Dr. James B. Conant gave the hornet's nest a resounding thump with his *The Education of American Teachers*. Recognizing the dangers of distortion inherent in summarizations, I will attempt to synthesize Conant's thesis as follows: Teacher-training programs (and, by extension, license to teach) should be left to the discretion of the faculties of liberal arts colleges. The normal-school concept, with its strong bias to "Education," has proven unsatisfactory. Quality in education cannot be assured by legislation or governmental fiat; witness the failure of state education departments to solve the problem with centralized controls. Nor is any satisfactory solution to be found in quasi official professional organizations such as NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education), whose very *raison d'être* vitiates their effectiveness.

Mr. Conant's affirmations provoked many cogent demurrers. Perhaps the most comprehensive of these may be expressed as a question: What as yet untried miracle is likely to assure that liberal arts faculties, caught up as they are in the "publish-or-perish" syndrome, will take any more interest in, or acquire any greater knowledge of, teacher training than they have in the past? To this Mr. Conant had already generally replied: They will. Trust them. They will rise to the challenge if their reputations are at stake.

In June 1967, T. M. Stinnett wrote in the *Review of Educational Research*:

> The unexpectedly large teacher shortage which became evident with the opening of schools in the fall of 1966 doubtlessly adds new impetus to the perennial furry of criticism leveled at certification requirements . . . This situation will result in demands, among others, for reform. . . . Already there are renewed appeals to adjust certification to allow personnel with substandard preparation into the classroom, presumably by still greater resort to emergency credentialing.[1]

Then, after reporting upon several matters of general current significance in certification, Stinnett adduced the following "Observable Trends":

1. NCATE has undergone some changes in response to criticism.
2. The states are steadily reducing the number of separately named certificates.
3. The approved-program approach continues to be strengthened.
4. Professional practices acts are emerging in various states.
5. There is a continued drive for workable nationwide reciprocity in teacher certification.
6. Institutions continue to receive greater autonomy in the development of their teacher education programs.
7. National examinations are being used increasingly in teacher-education programs, in certification after self-study, and in measurement of prerequisites to certification.[2]

Somewhat more than a year later, the U. S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, II, called attention to Massachusetts as one of those states in which significant innovations were developing.[3] And in the *Phi Delta Kappan* for April 1969, Lindley J. Stiles, professor of education for interdisciplinary studies at Northwestern University and director of the Massachusetts study, wrote:

> If a radically new certification plan is adopted by the legislature this month, as now appears virtually certain, Massachusetts will set a rational pattern for the rest of the nation. Certification will be keyed to a plan for differentiated staffing, with four kinds of licenses: internship, associate teacher, professional, and specialist. It will be based on demonstrated knowledge and performance, not transcript record.[4]

Elsewhere in the report, Professor Stiles recommended wider utilization of paraprofessionals and communications technology, extensive supervised clinical practice for novices, certification based on demonstrated knowledge and

[1] Chapter iii: "Teacher Certification," p. 248.

[2] Ibid., pp. 256–257.

[3] "The People Who Serve Education: A Report on the State of the Education Professions by the U. S. Commissioner of Education, 1968" (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p 17.

[4] "Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts," p. 477. The author of the present report has been advised by one of the respondents that a general reform bill of the Massachusetts Teachers Association has been rejected by the State Legislature.

professional performance rather than transcript record, alternate procedures for certification, encouragement of colleges and universities to concentrate upon supervisors of clinical practice rather than actual supervision of trainees, and increased effort of school systems and institutions of higher learning to experiment with ways to redesign learning more closely related to the task to be performed. He closed by saying:

> The basic concepts that teaching competence can be defined and judged by professionals, that levels of teaching abilities can be defined, that school systems should take major responsibility for clinical training, that programs of preparation should be aimed at developing specialized teaching talents needed for different kinds of learners, that interdisciplinary and cooperative approaches hold greatest promise, and that states should provide leadership and financial support for the preparation of educational personnel—such concepts have nationwide significance.[5]

The last comprehensive study of certification in foreign languages was that of Anna Balakian, published in 1961.[6] After calling attention to the Modern Language Association's long-standing interest in teacher preparation and certification, Miss Balakian indicated that there were certain problems to which her inquiry was principally directed, among them being the following:

1. To ascertain whether any progress had been made in the last few years toward a more homogeneous standard of measurement of the competence of teacher applicants in the field of modern foreign languages in the various states.
2. To determine whether in this connection any of the recommendations of the MLA for the evaluation of competence had affected state certification.
3. To discover to what extent the unqualified were still actively engaged in this teaching field.

From the State Certification Directors she had attempted to ascertain:

1. Whether the credit-hour requirements stated in pertinent documents included *all* the applicant's formal preparation in the language.
2. To what extent *speaking knowledge* was taken into account for purposes of certification.
3. What was being done (or contemplated) about licensing persons with competence but non-standard formal preparation (e.g., foreigners).

For our purposes, Miss Balakian's most significant findings were the following:

1. It was impossible to determine what the minimum credit-hour requirements given in State Certification Manuals, and other similar documents, represented. Some states accepted only credits beyond the "basic course" (usually, but not in all instances, the first two college years), some accepted all college credits in the foreign language, and others as much as six hours of high school credit. Most states were in a process of raising their requirements.[7]
2. The determination of audiolingual competencies was left to the educational institutions. None of the states had established machinery for that procedure.
3. There were clearly discernible inclinations to shift the responsibility for accreditation of applicants from State Certification Boards to institutions of higher learning.[8]
4. Information concerning the certification of aliens was scarce, fragmentary, and frequently contradictory. A few states had established committees to consider the problem.[9]
5. A number of cities enjoyed at least a degree of autonomy in their licensing. Almost without exception their requirements for certifi-

[5] Ibid., p. 480.

[6] "Certification Requirements for Modern Foreign Language Teachers in American Public Schools (1959–60)," *PMLA*, 76 (May 1961), 20–35.

[7] This is in accord with Stinnett, p. 249: "Although the specialization requirements have been significantly increased in recent years, this trend may be expected to continue with the proliferation of larger high schools."

[8] Likewise in accord with Stinnett. Note that there are two ways, principally, in which this may be accomplished: 1) The state certification agency simply accepts the assurance, either explicit or implicit, of the institution that the candidate is qualified to teach; or 2) the state indicates in general what the nature of the training should be, and the institutions then submit plans or courses of study designed to implement the general guidelines of the state office. This latter is most commonly known as the "approved program" approach, and it is rather widely implemented at the present time.

[9] In this regard one should realize that almost every state (perhaps all of them) has recourse to an "emergency" certificate. The emergency certificate, or endorsement, was used a good deal in the days when FLES programs were being initiated without sufficient certified personnel.

cation were more stringent than those of the state.

6. FLES teachers were primarily those who held general Elementary certificates, those with endorsed Secondary certificates, and others (e.g., college professors, native speakers) on emergency certificates. At the time, the controversy revolved around the question: Is FLES to be integrated with other subject matter by a generalist as are language arts, social studies, arithmetic, etc., or is it to be taught by specialists as are music and art?[10]

In January 1969, I sent a thirty-seven-item questionnaire to the chief certification officer of each of the fifty states, to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands (there was no reply from the latter two), and to others believed to have accurate knowledge of the situation. Of the one hundred questionnaires sent out, seventy-four were completed and returned. Only three of the state certification officers did not respond. In a number of instances other people contacted deferred to the certification officials.

The letter that accompanied the questionnaire assured the potential respondents that the purpose of this report was entirely professional; that no invidious comparisons were to be drawn, no confidences betrayed or information knowingly misrepresented, and that the sole purpose of the report was as a service to the profession. If the latter goal is achieved, it will be owing in no small part to the cooperation of those people whose time, effort, and consideration are reflected in these pages.

Although the present report was not designed precisely as follow-up to the Balakain study, nor to reflect upon the findings and opinions of persons such as Stiles, Stinnett, and Conant, it becomes immediately apparent that all are interrelated. *Vis-à-vis* Balakian, for example, such problems as FLES, the certification of aliens, credit hours versus demonstrated proficiencies, and the nature of teacher-training programs continue to be important—and worrisome. Other things, such as the reconsideration of certificates in line with role and preparation, and the ever-increasing necessity for greater standardization because of mobility and population shift to urban centers, not so much in evidence in 1961, are very much with us in 1970.

With these things in mind, then, we designed the present study to elicit to the extent possible information principally about the following:

1. Has there been any significant shift in this decade away from the credit-hour qualifications in the direction of demonstrated ability to teach or supervise? (Information concerning the use of the Modern Language Association Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students was especially sought.)

2. What is the circumstance concerning FLES? Does it appear to be well established, as evidenced by a separate certificate or endorsement to a general certificate, or does it continue on tenuous ground?

3. With local initiative and in-service training assuming such importance, to what extent have certification agencies moved toward certificates for subject-matter supervisers, and what is the nature of their preparation?

4. Has any progress been made toward more widespread standardization of requirements, that is, has any significant number of states entered into formal reciprocal agreements?

According to Stinnett, an observable trend in teacher certification as of 1967 was, "The steady diminution in the number of separately named certificates issued by the states."[11] In the questionnaire we asked for the kinds of certificates issued in each state for foreign language teachers. The variety of certificates, kinds of endorsements, and divergencies of interpretations are so great that it is not apparent—at least in regard to foreign languages—that either inter- or intrastate standardization is much more of a reality now than it was ten years ago.

We discovered, for instance, that a "permanent" certificate in some states is really the equivalent of a "life" certificate in other states and of a "provisional" or "temporary" certificate in still others. In a few instances there is a scale of unlabeled endorsements tied to academic preparation and experience. In addition, only twelve of the states reporting indicate unequivocally that they are signatories to some

[10] "It is obvious that one or the other of these two premises will prevail," Balakian wrote, p. 33, but cf. the section of the present report concerning the continuing uncertainties about FLES.

[11] P. 257.

kind of reciprocal agreement. Those states are Delaware, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Utah.[12]

In most instances, the state certification officers indicated that a person from out-of-state would be certified if his preparation "appears to be essentially equal to, or better than, that of persons certified within your (i.e., this) jurisdiction." However, in fact one can rarely move from one state to another—even from one metropolitan area to another within a state—without encountering distinct requirements for certification.

In ten of the states certificates are issued or endorsed "for one foreign language *only*." An equal number certify for general instruction with subject area unspecified, and fifteen certify for one or more foreign language(s) on a single certificate. In the remaining fourteen responding to this question, combinations of the above were reported or there was disagreement among the respondents.

According to the chief certification officers, certification may be obtained in two states through approved programs at institutions of higher learning within the state only. Eight extend that to include reciprocal agreements with other states or countries. Sixteen issue their certificates through the state certifying agency. The remainder—who reported—either utilize some distinct procedure or follow a combination of the above.

Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, and Wisconsin report that they issue a certificate (or endorsement) for the teaching of foreign language in junior high school or middle school. The remainder presumably use either the general (no subject matter specified) or endorse (subject matter specified) Elementary and/or Secondary certificates.[13]

If there is one constant in certification that essentially everyone acknowledges, it is that there is no practical way to equate teaching performance with the number of credit hours that appears on the transcript of a person applying for certification. State certification officials have known this for years, but given the number of applicants in all disciplines, it would be impossible, they point out, to ascertain capability through special tests or observed performance.[14] Nevertheless, Stinnett points to the increased "use of national examinations in teacher education programs, in certification after self-study, and in measurement of prerequisities to certification" as an observable trend.[15]

Do any of the states permit a person to teach a foreign language under "blanket" certification, that is, without specification of subject area? Yes, apparently quite a few do. At any rate, Alaska, California, Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, North Dakota, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Utah, and Washington replied in the affirmative, while there was a difference of opinion from Idaho, Minnesota, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, and Texas.

The number of semester hours of language and/or literature required for the first certificate varies from fifteen to thirty-five, yet as we observed with regard to the Balakian report, it is impossible to know what those ciphers really mean. Eighteen of the respondents said that they did accept pre-collegiate preparation. Sixteen reported that it is possible to be certified on the basis of demonstrated proficiencies alone, although a full half of these qualified their affirmation with something like, "if the college or university attests to it." Only seven of the respondents stated unequivocally that some evidence of demonstrated proficiency was

[12] There was divergence of opinion from Connecticut, New Mexico, Ohio, and Texas.

[13] The majority of the states still do not make an administrative distinction for Junior High School or Middle School, a typical designation being, Grades 1–6: Elementary; Grades 7–12, Secondary.

[14] In 1961, Margaret Lindsey, reporting for the National Commission on TEPS, called attention to the incredible complexity of teacher licensure as opposed to that of other professions. Not only are there fifty different state teacher education accrediting and certificating agencies, she pointed out, there are also "six regional accrediting agencies, more than eleven hundred institutions of higher education purporting to conduct teacher education programs, and approximately 120,000 elementary and secondary schools employing those who complete the varying types of teacher preparing curricula." See "New Horizons for the Teaching Profession: A Report of the Task Force on New Horizons in Teacher Education and Professional Standards" (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association of the United States), pp. 115–116.

[15] P. 257.

required, and several of the states so reported use the approved-program approach.

As long ago as 1962, Theodore Andersson protested the inadequacy of modern foreign language teacher preparation programs in many of our colleges and universities, and the failure of state departments of education to do anything to remedy the situation, although the instruments were available in the statement of qualifications by the MLA Steering Committee and the MLA Proficiency Tests.[16]

The former indicate in behavioral terms how an individual should be able to perform in the skills of a foreign language in order to be classified as Superior, Good, or Minimal, and the latter provide an instrument with which to measure Listening Comprehension, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Applied Linguistics, Civilization and Culture, and Professional Preparation.

The Tests, which were the product of a cooperative effort of the Modern Language Association and Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, under contract from the U. S. Office of Education, were several years in the planning and norming. They have been normed extensively, mainly—although not exclusively—on elementary and secondary school language teachers who have attended the NDEA Institutes. It has been stated that, for an instrument of this nature, designed to measure kinds of performances which are not readily susceptible to objective definition and control, the MLA Proficiency Tests are surprisingly valid and reliable.[17]

For a number of years there have been voices raised in favor of the utilization of the Proficiency Tests, both for the certification of modern foreign language teachers and for their training. Thus, at an invitational conference held at the Modern Language Association offices in New York City on 12–13 December 1963, a consultant from the New York State Education Department, Norman D. Kurland, advised that " . . . one future use of the MLA Proficiency Tests will be to open a path to language teaching for persons with native or near native language ability who could not otherwise meet certification requirements,"[18] and one of the recommendations of the section on foreign languages of the 1965 National TEPS Conference was, "that all future foreign language teachers be subjected to the new MLA proficiency tests (or some equivalent) before graduating from college, to make sure that they have adequate language competence when starting out on their careers."[19]

Although the practice is not widespread, objective-type tests have been used in certification for a number of years. Several of the states, for example, use the National Teacher Examinations in one way or another for purposes of certification.

For some time the MLA Proficiency Tests have been a part of the State of New York's college equivalency program. In a letter dated 1 August 1968, Donald J. Nolan of the Division of Teacher Education and Certification of the State Education Department advised interested persons that the use of the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests as a means of achieving certification in New York State had recently been reviewed. The result of the review was updating of the score utilization and greater explicitness with regard to obtaining certification through the Tests. The extent of the commitment to this alternative to courses and credits is revealed in the recommendation to persons in colleges and universities concerned with the preparation of foreign language teachers: "The Department strongly recommends use of the MLA Tests as part of your foreign language program." But perhaps the most daring feature of the New York innovation is the acceptance of passing score on the

[16] "The Teacher of Modern Foreign Languages," in *The Education of the Secondary School Teacher* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1962), p. 178.

[17] See Miriam M. Bryan, "The MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests: Tests with a New Look and a New Purpose," *The DFL Bulletin*, 6 (Dec. 1966), 6–8, and Wilmarth H. Starr, "MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students," *PMLA*, 77, No. 4, Pt. 2 (Sept. 1962), 31–42.

[18] "MLA Proficiency Tests: Possibilities for Future Uses," a working paper prepared for the Modern Language Association Invitational Conference, 12–13 Dec. 1963, by Norman D. Kurland, Consultant, College Proficiency Examinations, New York State Education Dept., p. 2.

[19] "The Foreign Language Specialist and the Beginning Teacher," Report on the Section meeting at the National TEPS Conference, 25 June 1965, New York N. Y., p. 2.

professional preparation section of the Tests in lieu of a methods course.

For a time Pennsylvania was the only state to require that all persons seeking certification to teach a modern foreign language take the MLA Proficiency Tests. However, as of June 1969, that requirement was dropped in Pennsylvania. While there is no necessary cause-and-effect relationship, it is coincidental that this decision comes at a time when researchers in the Commonwealth State, Dr. Philip D. Smith, Jr., and associates, report that their investigations have shown no positive correlation (rather, some indication of negative correlation) between student achievement in foreign languages and their teachers' scores on the Proficiency Tests. However, the Smith et al. reports have come under heavy attack, and it seems clear that the evidence is not yet all in.[20]

Through the questionnaire we hoped to get some indication of the manner in which most certification agencies determine "readiness to teach." Specifically, we wanted to know to what extent the MLA Proficiency Tests (or other similar instruments) were being used. Consequently, the first question in this regard was whether a "Methods" class specifically related to the language(s) to be taught was required. Eighteen respondents replied affirmatively, twenty-three negatively, and six were at variance in their opinions. Curiously, to the next question, "Is a 'General Methods' class acceptable?" eight of those who had answered "yes" to the previous question about the special methods class also responded affirmatively to this question.

When asked whether it is possible to be certified on the basis of demonstrated proficiencies alone, only Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, New York, and Vermont said "yes." A few thought that their colleges and universities might make such provision through their approved programs. The majority, however, still will not certify without some evidence of college course work. Eight of the respondents indicated that they do require some evidence of demonstrated proficiency, and five more say that it is inherent in the training programs. The "demonstrated proficiencies" are identified primarily as the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, with some incidental reference to other competencies.

Finally came the questions about the MLA Proficiency Tests. When asked whether these Tests were in any way used for purposes of certification, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Nevada, New York, Pennsylvania (apparently subsequently changed), Virginia, and West Virginia replied in the affirmative. California, Maine, Ohio, Oregon, and Vermont said "yes, but . . . ," and there was some difference of opinion among the persons consulted in Minnesota. The remaining states apparently make no use of the Tests.

When asked whether it was their understanding that the MLA Proficiency Tests are widely used in institutions of higher learning having approved programs, only five certification officials answered in the affirmative, and there was some difference of opinion from other respondents.

There is one instance (i.e., Vermont) where it is reported that institutions of higher learning do grant credit, or waive course requirements, for acceptable scores on the Professional Preparation part of the MLA Proficiency Tests, or similar device. It will be recalled, however (although not so reported on the New York State return), that that state is now prepared to accept a satisfactory score on the Professional Preparation section of the Tests in lieu of a Methods course.

The Elementary School Teacher of Modern Foreign Language

It seems safe to say that nothing in foreign language ever so captured the imagination of the American public as did FLES (Foreign Languages in the Elementary School). Advised that the optimum time to learn foreign languages is when one is young, and that European children begin the study of foreign languages in the grades, American parents avidly read about the "new breakthrough" in their newspapers and magazines, and attended PTA meetings in unprecedented numbers to hear young scholars sing *Sur le Pont d'Avignon*, or bring to life that ubiquitous legend, *Los tres osos*. It is no secret that the dream of Americans made truly bi-

[20] For information concerning the *Reports*, and assessments thereof, see the Oct. 1969 issue of the *Modern Language Journal* and *Foreign Language Annals*, Dec. 1969.

lingual through school training in languages wrested more concessions from tightfisted congressmen than did all the rest of the foreign language "renaissance" put together. Nor is it too much of an exaggeration to say that the ability and willingness of an administrator to innovate came to be judged, at least in part, by whether or not he had a FLES program. And FLES programs were initiated everywhere! The admonitions of caution were as so many voices crying in the wilderness.

Now, of course, FLES is on very uncertain ground. For all of the truth of the concept that America desperately needs people who are proficient in foreign languages and that proficiency cannot be obtained in three or four high school or college years, it is possible that FLES will not escape severe emasculation. The sense of urgency that existed in 1958 is gone. Too many programs turned out badly. The profession (notwithstanding the MLA's profound interest in the matter) has been slow to lend it support.

Of late, reason has begun to prevail. The MLA's early recommendation that FLES programs be initiated only where circumstances were right for it is beginning to be taken seriously. The tone of those who speak for FLES is more authoritative, less strident. The real experts have closed ranks. Their meetings are more professional, less reminiscent of a gathering of *aficionados*. And where there are good FLES programs in the country, they are very good, demonstrating that the honest claims made for long-sequence training can be borne out.

But what of the actual situation of licensing teachers for FLES? Is there any widespread evidence that state agencies have paid much attention to the urgent recommendations that the elementary school teacher of foreign languages' preparation be distinct from, and every bit as sound as, that of the secondary school teacher?

California, Connecticut, and Delaware report that they issue a distinct certificate for FLES. The remainder apparently certify either with the general elementary certificate or an endorsement to the secondary certificate, although it is difficult to interpret the returns on this matter because of general confusion and lack of consensus among the respondents.

When asked whether the formal preparation or demonstrated proficiencies required for certification to teach foreign languages in the elementary school are (a) about the same as those for secondary, (b) less than those for secondary, (c) more than those for secondary, or (d) decidedly different from those for secondary, thirty-one of the respondents said, "about the same," three said "less," none "more," one "decidedly different," and in six instances, the respondents could not agree.[21]

Thirty replied that they felt there had been a change in the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools within their jurisdiction, seven thought not, nine did not answer (presumably for lack of information), and in two instances the respondents were of differing opinions.

It is gratifying to see that in those instances where the respondents replied affirmatively regarding a perceived change in the nature of FLES programs, by far the greater number felt that "more programs have been implemented, in general the programs are better, articulation has been worked out with Junior High and High School programs, or some programs were dropped but the situation now seems to have stabilized." Very few selected the "except for a few isolated instances, foreign language in the elementary school never caught on here." However, the number of respondents who did not reply to the question (i.e., fifteen), as well as considerable difference of opinion among respondents, seems to bear out the belief (supported by other evidence) that FLES programs are not extensive or highly regarded in many states.

Supervision

Several things point to the increasing importance of the role of the supervisor in American education. For one thing, knowledge is becom-

[21] It is interesting to note that the most marked differences of opinions between respondents—usually the certification official and the supervisor of foreign languages—occurred with regard to FLES and the nature of training programs in colleges and universities, the replies of the certification officers being more sanguine in almost every instance.

ing so esoteric, and administrative responsibilities so complex, that delegated initiative and responsibility are all but necessary in many school systems. Moreover, the tendency to restructure education along the lines of other professions, particularly Medicine, with kinds of teaching responsibilities and degrees of competency formally recognized (e.g., intern, master teacher, supervisor, etc.), is very strong at the present time. In these latter years of the National Defense Education Act, there have been several institutes for foreign language supervisors.

Most states have long certified for administrative supervision. A separate certificate, or endorsement, for the subject-matter supervisor is rarer, although it is apparent that this will change in the near future.

To our question, "Do you issue a certificate specifically for supervisors of foreign languages as opposed to a general certificate for instructional supervisors," the answer was "yes" from Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Texas, and West Virginia. The remainder replied in the negative, did not respond to the question, or there was a difference of opinion among the respondents.

Colorado (Master's degree required), Oregon (Master's +15 quarter hours), Texas (30 hours beyond the baccalaureate), and West Virginia (Master's) make the supervisor's certification available through approved programs at institutions of higher learning within the state; Maine (no indication of specific requirement), Minnesota (no indication), Montana (Master's), and Puerto Rico (no indication) certify through the state agency; Georgia (Master's +15 hours), Illinois (no indication), and Mississippi (Master's +21 hours) allow either route.

Illinois and Mississippi do not require evidence of successful foreign language teaching for the supervisor's certificate. Georgia, Maine, and Puerto Rico do, but the amount of experience is not specified. Colorado, Montana, Oregon, Texas, and West Virginia require a minimum of three years. Minnesota did not respond to this question. Only Puerto Rico and West Virginia require experience as a supervisor, or as a supervision intern. Each requires a minimum of two years.

Reciprocity

Let us suppose that a person certified to teach a modern foreign language in the public secondary schools of one state decides to move to another state. Is it likely that he will be allowed to teach at his new residence without further academic preparation? The chances are that he will not, except on an emergency or temporary basis, unless he happens to have moved within a severely limited number of states (such as the eleven that are signatories to the Northeast Reciprocity Compact) which have reciprocal agreements. Indeed there is every likelihood that a certificate issued by the state will not be recognized in certain municipalities of the very same state. Not infrequently, the applicant will find that the skill or knowledge required for the new certification bears no apparent relationship to the teaching field for which he is seeking certification.

This lack of standardization and of reciprocity is, of course, a severe hindrance to a nation in which as many as one-fourth of all families move to a new address each year,[22] but while there have been attempts to make reciprocity more widespread,[23] and even recommendations to standardize completely certification requirements throughout the nation, it has always been—and undoubtedly will continue to be—difficult to counter effectively arguments in favor of state, and even local, autonomy. As one state official said to me: "Unless you can figure out some way of assuring standardization on behavioral terms, forget it. The inevitable result would be a sort of Gresham's Law, with the poor programs crowding out the good ones."

Delaware, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Oregon, Tennessee, and Utah report that they have a formal agreement with other certifying agencies for reciprocal licensing, the latter three through NCATE. With the possible exception of Connecticut, New Mexico, Ohio, and Texas, where the situation is not clear because of respondent disagreement, it appears that the other states have no rec-

[22] See Stinnett, p. 250.
[23] Idem.

iprocity agreements and none contemplated in the immediate future.[24]

Conclusion

Formal certification statements are like college catalogues. Almost never do they reflect the true nature of practices and requirements. This is not so much a matter of deliberate attempt to confuse and conceal, however, as it is a combination of lack of clear-cut autonomy, the omnipresent desiderata-reality dichotomy, and the incapacity of bureaucratic semantics to convey highly complex situations. Subject to the inaccuracies and limitations of all generalizations, the following appear to characterize the current state of certification in foreign languages:

1. Anyone who possesses skills that are badly enough needed in a given school, or district, can be certified, if only on an emergency basis.

2. Generally speaking, the requirements for employment (not necessarily for certification) are more severe in suburban and metropolitan areas than in rural, although there is some counterbalancing force exerted by demand. A person moving from one state to another, or to certain metropolitan areas, must expect that his current certification status will not be automatically accepted.

3. Although state departments may retain the authority to license, responsibility for the precise nature of training is now largely in the hands of college and university faculties. However, notwithstanding the model provided by the NDEA Institutes, as well as various guidelines from such professional organizations as the MLA, there is no widespread consensus concerning the optimum nature or implementation of teacher training programs.

4. Perhaps the most innovative and exciting development—very limited and tentative at present—is the search for a truly different solution such as that of other professions, in particular, to encourage schools to become training centers where students, interns, practitioners, supervisors, teacher trainers, and researchers will all work together.

5. Modern foreign languages, somewhat more than a decade after their "rebirth," are in a state of evaluation. There are pros (e.g., the NDEA Institutes, vitality and increasing maturity of the professional structure, continued research, some excellent long-sequence programs) and cons (e.g., failure of the colleges to assume leadership, internal divisiveness, the national inclination to isolationism). Taken all in all, the tenor in certification seems to be "wait and see," but the pressure of growth and educational dynamism may not permit extensive or lengthy retention of the *status quo*.

[24] But cf. the following from Missouri: "There are twenty-eight states that grant reciprocity privileges in the certification of teachers who are graduates of NCATE accredited institutions. They are: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia."

Appendix A

CERTIFICATION OR LICENSING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Please check the appropriate responses

1.1 The administrative jurisdiction for which you are reporting is
[ ] state [ ] local
[ ] other (please explain) _____

1.2 Your legal authority for teacher certification (or licensing) is/are
[ ] state legislature [ ] state board of education
[ ] local board of education [ ] other _____

1.3 Kinds of certificates issued for foreign language teachers are
[ ] life
[ ] permanent (renewable), valid for _____ years
[ ] provisional, valid for _____ years
[ ] probationary, valid for _____ years
[ ] emergency (temporary), valid for _____ years
[ ] special (i.e., for foreign language, art, music, etc.)
[ ] other (please explain) _____

1.4 Certificates issued under this authority are
[ ] for one foreign language only (i.e., each language to be taught requires a separate certificate)
[ ] for general instruction with subject areas unspecified
[ ] for one or more foreign languages
[ ] other (please explain) _____

1.5 Certification may be obtained through
[ ] approved programs at institutions of higher learning within the state only
[ ] approved programs at institutions within the state and/or through reciprocal agreements with other states/countries
[ ] the state certifying agency
[ ] local certifying agencies
[ ] other (please explain) _____

1.6 Certificates are issued
[ ] elementary (Note that this means full and separate certification, not endorsement to the secondary certificate nor to the general elementary certificate)
[ ] junior high or middle school
[ ] secondary
[ ] supervision or coordination
[ ] other (please explain) _____

SECONDARY: Grades _____ through _____

2.1 May one teach a foreign language under "blanket" certification, that is, without the subject area specified? [ ] yes [ ] no

2.2 How many semester hours of *content* (i.e., the language and/or literature) are required for the first certificate? _____
For each subsequent certificate? (Please specify certificates and hours) _____

2.3 Is any proportion of language to literature specified? If "yes," please explain _____

2.4 Do you accept pre-collegiate preparation? [ ] yes [ ] no If "yes," please explain _____

2.5 How many semester hours of *professional* (e.g., educational psychology, practice teaching) are required for the first certificate? _____ For each subsequent certificate? (Please specify certificates and hours) _____

2.6 Do you require a "Methods" class specifically related to the language(s) to be taught? [ ] yes [ ] no

Appendix A—Continued

2.7 Is a "General Methods" class acceptable for this certification? [ ] yes [ ] no

2.8 Is "Practice Teaching" required? [ ] yes [ ] no
How many hours minimum? _____

2.9 Is it possible to be certified on the basis of demonstrated proficiencies alone? [ ] yes [ ] no

2.10 Do you require some evidence of demonstrated proficiency? [ ] yes [ ] no If "yes," please explain _____

Answer only if you replied "yes" to the last question

2.11 Proficiency is determined by
[ ] personal interview
[ ] an "in-system" test or tests
[ ] a standardized test or tests (Please give the name of the test used) _____

2.12 Skills and competencies evaluated are
[ ] listening [ ] speaking [ ] reading [ ] writing
[ ] other(s) (Please specify) _____

2.13 Do you use in any way for purposes of certification the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students? [ ] yes [ ] no If "yes," please explain briefly _____

2.14 In the case of certification through "approved programs" in institutions of higher learning, is it your belief that the Modern Language Association Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students are widely used in your state? [ ] yes [ ] no

2.15 Do you know of any instances within your jurisdiction of institutions which grant credit, or waive course requirements (e.g., the Methods class), for acceptable scores on the Professional Preparation part of the MLA Proficiency Tests, or other similar tests? [ ] yes [ ] no If "yes," please explain _____

2.16 Is endorsement for Junior High School/Middle School teachers different from that for Secondary? [ ] yes [ ] no If "yes," please explain _____

ELEMENTARY: Grades _____ through _____

3.1 Certification for the teaching of a foreign language in the elementary school is
[ ] by endorsement to the secondary certificate
[ ] through the general elementary certificate, with specification of subject area
[ ] entirely separate from the secondary certificate and the general elementary certificate

3.2 The formal preparation and/or demonstrated proficiencies required for certification to teach foreign languages in the elementary school are
[ ] about the same as those for secondary
[ ] less than those for secondary
[ ] more than those for secondary
[ ] decidedly different from those for secondary (Please explain) _____

3.3 Do you feel that there has been a change with regard to the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools within your jurisdiction in the past five years? [ ] yes [ ] no

3.4 If "yes," do you feel that the nature of the change is
[ ] more programs have been implemented
[ ] in general, the programs are better
[ ] articulation has been worked out with Junior High and High School programs
[ ] some programs were dropped but the situation now seems to have stabilized
[ ] except for a few isolated instances, foreign language in the elementary school never caught on here

Appendix A—Continued

[ ] other (Please explain) _____

_____

SUPERVISION OR COORDINATION

4.1 Do you issue a certificate specifically for supervisors of foreign languages as opposed to a general certificate for instructional supervisors? [ ] yes [ ] no
If "yes,"

4.2 The supervisor's certificate may be obtained
[ ] through approved programs at institutions of higher learning within the state
[ ] through the state certifying agency
[ ] other (Please explain) _____

4.3 If through an approved program, how many hours beyond the bachelor's degree are required?

_____

4.4 In general, are demonstrated proficiencies in speaking, reading, and writing one or more foreign languages required? [ ] yes [ ] no

4.5 Is evidence of successful foreign language teaching required? [ ] yes [ ] no If "yes," how many years? _____

4.6 Is experience as a supervisor, or as a supervision intern, required? [ ] yes [ ] no
If "yes," how many hours? _____

RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION

5.1 Do you have a formal agreement with other certifying agencies for reciprocal licensing? [ ] yes [ ] no

5.2 If "yes," briefly with whom do you have this agreement and what is the nature of it?

5.3 What is your practice with regard to persons certified in other jurisdiction (primarily from other states) who seek certification from you?
[ ] you will certify them if their preparation appears to be essentially equal to, or better than, that of persons certified within your jurisdiction
[ ] you will certify them if they perform satisfactorily on a qualifying examination (Please indicate the name or nature of the examination) _____
[ ] you require that they obtain additional academic training (Please indicate the nature of this additional training) _____

_____

INNOVATIONS

6.1 If you are in the process of planning or implementing any significant innovations with regard to certification or licensing of foreign language teachers or supervisors, please describe them briefly.

6.2 Any pertinent documents that you wish to attach, or narrative statements to include, will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Appendix B

	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.10	2.11	2.12	2.13	2.14	2.15	2.16
Alabama	no	18	no	no	21	no	yes	yes	yes	no			no	no	no	no
Alaska	yes		no	no	18 Sec 24 El	no	yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no	no
Arizona	no	30 **18**[1]	no	yes	22 Sec 24 El	no	yes	6	no	no			no	no	no	no
Arkansas	no	18	no	no	18	yes no		6	yes no	yes no			no	no	no	no
California	yes	15 24[2]	no	no	6-8	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	c	skills	yes	no	no	no
Colorado[3]	yes		no		18	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	abc	all	no	no	no	no
Connecticut	no	24	no	yes	18	no	yes	yes	no	no			yes	no	no	no
Delaware	no	30	no	no	18	yes	yes	6	yes	yes	MLA	all	yes	no	no	no
Dist. of Columbia	no	30		no	15	yes	no	yes	no	yes	a	skills	no	no	no	yes
Florida	no	30	no	no	20	yes	no	6	no	no			no	no	no	no
Georgia	no	35	yes	yes	30	no	yes	10	yes	yes	c	all	yes	no	no	no
Hawaii[4]		24			18											
Idaho	no yes	20	no	yes	20	yes no	yes	6	yes no	no			no	no	no	no
Illinois	yes	32		yes	16	no	yes	5	no	no			no	yes	no	no
Indiana	no	24	no	no	18	no	yes	3	yes	no			no	no	no	yes
Iowa	no	30	no		20	no	yes	5	no				no	no	no	
Kansas	no	24	no	no	20 Sec 24 El	no	yes	5	no	no			no	no	no	yes
Kentucky	yes	18 5 yr	no	no	17	no	yes	8	yes	yes			no	no	no	yes
Louisiana[4]		24			18 Sec 24 El			4								
Maine	yes	30	no	no	18	no	yes	yes	yes	no			yes	no	no	no
Maryland	no	24	no	yes	18	yes	no	8 6	no	no			no	no	no	no
Massachusetts	no	18	no	no	12	no	yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no	no
Michigan	no	20 **15**	no	no	20	no **yes**	no	5	no				no	no **yes**	no	no
Minnesota	no	**20**	no	no	27 18	yes	yes no	6-9	no				**yes**	no	yes no	no
Mississippi	no	18	no	yes	18	yes	no	6	no	no			no		no	no
Missouri	no	24 15	no	yes	8 18	no	yes	yes	no	no				no	no	yes
Montana	no	20	no	yes	16	no		yes					no	no	no	no

[1] Bold face indicates variant information from a source or sources other than that of the chief certification official's office.

[2] The cipher to the left is for the first (e.g., "provisional") certificate or endorsement; that to the right, for a subsequent (e.g., "permanent") certificate or endorsement.

[3] Uses the "approved program" arrangement.

[4] The questionnaire was not returned. Information was derived from Elizabeth H. Woellner and M. Aurilla Wood, *Requirements for Certification or Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges*, 32nd ed. (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1967), pp. 51-52.

Appendix B—(continued)

	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.10	2.11	2.12	2.13	2.14	2.15	2.16
Nebraska	no		no	yes		yes	no	yes	no	no			no	no	no	no
Nevada	yes	18 6	no	no	18 6	no	yes	4	yes	yes no	c	all	yes no	no	no	no
New Hampshire	no	18 12	no	no	18 12	yes	yes	6	no	no			no	no	no	no
New Jersey	no	24 18	no	no	21	no yes	yes no	yes	no	no			no		no	no
New Mexico	no	24	no	no	18	yes	no yes	6	yes	no			no	no	yes no	no
New York	no	24	no	yes	12+	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	ac	skills	yes			no
North Carolina	no yes	30 30	12 12 9 9	no	18	yes	no yes	6	no	no			no	yes no	no	no
North Dakota	yes	16	no	yes	16	no	yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no	no
Ohio	yes no	26		no yes	18 17	no	yes	yes	yes no	no	c		yes no	no	no	no
Oklahoma	no	18		no	12 6	yes	yes no	6	no	no			no	no	no	no
Oregon	no	30	no	no	14	yes	no	yes	yes	yes			yes	no	no	no
Pennsylvania	no	24		no	18	yes	yes	6	no	no yes	c	skills	yes	yes	no	
Puerto Rico	yes	36	no	no	6	yes	yes	1 sem.	no	no			no	no	no	no
Rhode Island	no	18 36	no	no	18	no yes	yes	6	no	yes	b a	skills	no	no	no	no
South Carolina[5]		18 12			18			6								
South Dakota	yes	18	no	yes	20	no	yes	6	no	no			no	no	no	no
Tennessee	no		no	yes	24		yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no	no
Texas	no yes	24	no	no	18	no	yes	6	no					no	no	no
Utah	yes	27 15	no	no	21	yes	yes	8	no	no			no	no	no	no
Vermont	no	30			6	no	yes	200	yes	yes			yes	yes	yes	no
Virginia	no	30 30 24	no	yes	9 15	no	yes	no 6	no yes	yes	c	all	yes	no	no	no
Washington[5]	yes		no	no												
West Virginia	no	30 30 6	no		20 20 6	yes	no	6		yes	c	all	yes	no	no	no
Wisconsin	no	22			18	yes	no	5	no	yes			no	yes	no	no
Wyoming	no	24 5	no	yes	20	no	yes	yes	no				no	no	no	no

[5] The questionnaire was not filled out. Information here presented was extracted from materials provided.