

STATE OF TEACHER TRAINING AND INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH –GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION: DUKE UNIVERSITY.
JANUARY 24, 2003

Breakout Group One: International Education and Teacher Training in the US and Challenges and Prospects for International/Area Studies Outreach

Three presentations were formally presented in this breakout session:

- ***The State of Teacher Training for K-12 Teacher Education***, by Ann Schneider, International Education Consultant
- ***International Education and Teacher Preparation in the U.S.*** by John Heyl, Old Dominion University and JoAnn McCarthy, University of South Florida (presented by John Heyl)
- ***International/Area Studies Outreach: Current Challenges and Future Prospects***, by Jonathan Friedlander, UCLA, Valerie McGinley Marshall, Tulane University, and John Metzler, Michigan State University (presented by Jonathan Friedlander)

It must be noted that this session had three papers presented (instead of one, like the other sessions), which significantly reduced the time available for discussion, critique, and consensus recommendations from the more than 30 individuals who attended this session. Indeed, we had less than 30 minutes of high quality group discussion. Consequently, most of the recommendations put forward in this report come directly from the three papers.

The three papers complimented each other. However, the first two papers dealt specifically with the problematic of internationalizing pre-service training for K-12 teachers, while the third paper dealt with issues related to international/area studies outreach to in-service teachers. For purposes of clarity the report will be divided into two sections: internationalizing teacher education, and international/area studies outreach

I. Internationalizing K-12 Teacher Education (Pre-Service)

Advocates of international/area studies education have long recognized the central importance of teacher education through pre-and in-service training for realizing our agenda for education of a globally competent citizenry. However, endeavors to internationalize teacher training have overwhelmingly concentrated on in-service training. International/area studies professionals have encountered resistance in their attempts to work with pre-service teacher preparation programs, even within their own universities. Moreover, while there has been an abundance of anecdotal evidence of the state of international education in K-12 teacher preparation there have been few rigorous studies that have researched this issue.

The two papers on teacher preparation presented at this session provide valuable insights based on the study of teacher preparation through interviews at 24 institutions (Schneider

paper) and the more concentrated study of teacher preparation at three geographically diverse universities (Heyl, et al, paper). These papers will not be summarized since they will be available in the conference proceedings. However, it should be noted that their key findings do enhance the understanding of the state of international education in K-12 teacher preparation and inform the following recommendations.

Both papers present evidence that international education is insufficient in most teacher preparation programs in the U.S. For example:

- State and professional accrediting agencies rarely require or encourage international or foreign language competency for licensure.
- Few universities/colleges require significant international course work to fulfill general education requirements for TE students. Yet, evidence reported in the two studies indicates that, if at all, it is primarily in the general education and content/major subject courses that TE students receive international content.
- Institutional barriers still prevent active collaboration (or even communication) between colleges (Arts and Letters/Sciences) and departments where education majors fulfill their general education and subject content requirements and colleges of education. These barriers or misunderstandings make it difficult to initiate requirements for greater international content for education majors.
- As reported in the Heyl, et al, study, as many as 50 percent of education majors may be transfer students from community colleges, where, for the most part there are few, if any international requirements.
- Few of the 27 teacher education programs surveyed for these two studies appear to mandate international content in any of the required education courses.
- Very few opportunities are provided for education majors to study abroad or to fulfill part of their internship/student teaching in an international setting; this is true even for students working for certification in foreign languages. (Nationally, less than one percent of education majors participate in such programs.)
- Schneider provides compelling evidence that the advising services for education majors do not provide students with information on international educational opportunities (on-campus course work, study abroad opportunities, or international internships).

Recommendations

Based on their studies the authors of both studies presented a number of well-articulated and thoughtful recommendations. Unfortunately, given the lack of time for discussion, noted above, the attendees did not have adequate opportunity to respond to all of the recommendations. Consequently, listed below is a selection of the main recommendations related to internationalizing teacher education. Readers can access the entire list of the authors' recommendations in their respective papers.

1. For State Governments/Agencies:

- Include international components in requirements for endorsements and

certification; and

- Revise regulations about practice teaching, if necessary, to permit pre-service internships in other countries for at least part of the student teaching experience.

2. For Accrediting Agencies:

- Include requirements for international exposure through coursework, foreign language study, faculty qualification, and study and internships abroad, in accreditation criteria for teacher education programs, and particularly for foreign language teachers.

3. For Professional Organizations:

- Give increased attention to needs and strategies for improving international components in testing standards and in the preparation of teachers in publications and at meetings.

4. For institutions of higher education generally:

- Review and assess the full range of campus resources for international exposure, and their accessibility, particularly for students in teacher education programs;
- Add formal international components to student advisory services, beginning in the pre-application phase, to assure the feasibility of maximum international exposure within the normal time-to-degree constraints;
- Provide training on international needs and students' options for both faculty and professional advisors;
- Foster development of internationally oriented curriculum, through individual faculty grants, through workshops for both Arts and Sciences and Education faculty (together), and through the hiring of internationally-trained faculty;
- Require an increased number of international/area studies courses within the general education requirements;
- Strengthen requirements for foreign language training to a minimum of two full college years for all undergraduates, with a goal of attaining at least conversational proficiency in a second language; and

- Review policy and practice for the integration of study abroad and international internships in the curriculum, with respect to both general education and major field requirements;

5. For Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education:

- Explore ways to integrate study and internships abroad into the training of teachers particularly in the social sciences and humanities;
- Investigate ways to develop endowments to provide partial scholarships to support study and internships abroad for education majors;
- Add requirements for significant foreign language competence to the training for prospective K-12 teachers in all humanities and social science fields;
- Require that prospective foreign language teachers have at least a semester of overseas experience in an area where “their” language is spoken;
- Strengthen the international components of academic and career advising services, in cooperation with other university advising services; and

6. For outside funders

- Provide funding for a wide variety of activities—including such activities as advising—that can strengthen the options available for, and known to, all undergraduates who might consider teaching careers;
- Increase attention to solutions for the demand and supply problems of foreign language teachers, at all levels of instruction (K-12 and postsecondary);
- Seriously consider offering FLAS fellowships to undergraduates committed to teaching foreign languages at the K-12 level (strongly supported by members of the audience); and
- Disseminate more widely, and particularly to the teacher education community, information about the funding available to strengthen and initiate international studies and foreign language programs that can be available in the training of prospective teachers.

II. International/Area Studies Outreach To In-Service Teachers: Current Challenges and Future Prospects

The Friedlander, et al, paper/presentation looks more broadly at challenges and prospects of international/area studies outreach to the K-12 community within the context of the renewed focus at the Federal level on K-12 education. The paper/presentation is divided into three sections. The first section traces the history of

international/area studies outreach by NRCs over the past three decades. The second section provides a summary and necessary recognition of the outreach efforts of the 114 NRCs and 14 NFLRCs to the K-12 community.¹ Section three of the paper/presentation focuses on the challenges that confront international/area studies outreach endeavors today and in the immediate future.

This paper, and the subsequent group discussion, gave special attention to the contextual factors that simultaneously constrain, direct, and provide opportunities for outreach to the K-12 community, locally, at the state level, and nationally. Three contextual factors in particular were privileged by the paper and discussion.

1. *Aftermath of September 11th and Globalization.* The tragic events of September 11th resulted in recognition among policy makers, educators and the general public of the low level of global understanding/competency among the U.S. population, and in a consequent effort to increase global/international content in educational systems with special emphasis on the K-12 level. This tendency towards a greater emphasis on international/global education reinforced a growing awareness with the K-12 community and state/federal policy makers of the realities of globalization and consequent demands for a globally educated and competent citizenry.
2. *State and national standards, achievement benchmarks, and assessment:* The past decade has witnessed the growth of mandatory standards and achievement benchmarks for all subjects (including the social studies) and levels of K-12 education. Most state standards for the social studies have some emphasis on the international/global education and area studies, but the standards and performance benchmarks for international/area studies are often inadequate. And the accompanying emphasis on student performance and assessment all too often result in teachers feeling pressure to teach to the standards/tests. In combination, these factors can frustrate outreach professionals' attempts to increase the depth and breadth of international/area studies education.
3. *No Child Left Behind.* Perhaps the most immediate contextual factor impacting the future of NRC K-12 outreach is the "no child left behind" policy. Few academic educators and internationalists, in principle, fault policy initiatives aimed at improving educational services to America's children. However, as indicated by lively discussion among educators from the floor, as currently articulated the "no child left behind" policy provides real challenges (as well as potential opportunities) for international/area studies outreach. This policy has resulted in a overwhelming emphasis on literacy and numeracy and the preparation of students for assessment tests with little emphasis on the social

¹ The limited space allowed this report does not allow for summary of the exemplary outreach initiatives catalogued in this paper. Readers are encouraged to bourse the list of outreach programming provided in the Friedlander, et al, paper. Nationally, (and even with the NRCs and host universities) outreach professionals feel that they receive little recognition for their outstanding outreach efforts.

studies and humanities. Strong anecdotal evidence shared from the floor support the authors' recent experience that the "no child left behind" policy has resulted in a decline of interest in their services, even among teachers who previously had a strong interest in international/area studies education but who now feel obligated to concentrate on the *basics*.

Recommendations:

1. Give recognition to the NRCs/NFLRCs that have developed effective programming for K-12 educators and students along with adequate support for collaborative outreach initiatives such as the International Studies Outreach Website to be launched summer, 2003.
2. In an effort to increase the depth and breadth of international/areas studies content in K-12 education we recommend that a concerted effort be made by NRCs/NFLRCs (with support from the U.S. Department of Education and professional organizations) to engage state level offices responsible for establishing standards and performance benchmarks in the humanities, social studies, and foreign language instruction.
3. Similarly, in an effort to increase the depth and breadth of international/areas studies content in K-12 education, we recommend that a concerted effort be made by NRCs (with support from the U.S. Department of Education) to actively engage state and national professional organizations for social studies, humanities, and foreign language education.
4. Recognizing that NRCs/NFLRCs have not always privileged outreach endeavor and that it is important to increase the effectiveness and impact of NRC/NFLRC outreach, in the re-authorization process it is recommended that serious consideration be given to increasing the number (and percentage) of points allocated to outreach in the triennial Title VI competition.
5. In recognizing the educational potential of the world wide web it is recommended that NRCs/NFLRCs be encouraged to develop innovative web-based projects for K-12 educators and students.
6. Finally, recognizing that fulfillment of the prior recommendations (and indeed, effective outreach programming) is dependent on a dedicated, skilled, and professional outreach staff, we strongly encourage NRCs/NFLRCs and the U.S. Department of Education to support the professionalization of NRC/NFLRC outreach staff.² Effective engagement with federal and state organs and

² To our knowledge, no data exists on the background experience and qualifications of NRC/NFLRC outreach coordinators/directors. However, anecdotal evidence strongly suggest that a significant percentage of NRCs/NFLRCs do not have full-time outreach staff. All too often, outreach is either a small part the responsibilities of an associate/assistant director or of a half-time graduate student.

professional organization is dependent, inter alia, on the professional bona fides of the NRC personnel with whom they interact.