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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of the project

The former Australian Department of Education Science and Training (DEST) commissioned the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) to prepare this Report of the Review of Teacher Education for Languages Teachers (the Report) in July 2006.

The primary target audience for the Report is the Ministerial Council on Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) Languages Education Working Party (the Working Party), languages education policy makers and program administrators at national and State and Territory levels, school leaders, languages educators in schools and universities, teacher registration authorities and teacher education and re-training providers.

The Review was conducted in two phases: The first phase comprised a literature review and document analysis that highlighted relevant research and provided a context for Phase 2 (Chapter Two).

In the second phase, researchers documented and analysed the existing qualification requirements for languages teachers, and the provision of teacher education and re-training opportunities for primary and secondary languages teachers. Strategies were formulated and recommendations developed to improve access to, and the quality of, preparation for languages teachers, including re-training.

The Report is intended to be used as a basis for decision–making and policy formulation by DEST in consultation with the Working Party.

The word ‘languages’, as used in the National Statement and Plan, does include Indigenous languages but does not include English. However, the focus of this report does not include Indigenous languages as they are being examined in another report – A project to investigate the current provision of Indigenous language programmes in schools.

Project aims

The aims of the project were to:

(a) Obtain a comprehensive national picture of teacher education and re-training opportunities for the preparation of primary and secondary languages teachers, including:
   - Course entry requirements
   - Content and structure; and
   - Structural impediments relating to the development of teachers’ linguistic and pedagogical competency.
(b) Determine the extent to which existing provision of teacher education and re-training opportunities for primary and secondary languages teachers prepares them for their profession; and
(c) Develop strategies to improve access to, and the quality of, preparation for primary and secondary languages teachers. This includes exploring the potential application of the Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures developed by the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) as part of the development of Standards for Teachers of Indonesian Project, funded under the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) strategy.
Project methodology

Phase 1 of the project included:

- A literature review and document analysis (Chapter Two)
- The establishment of the Project Advisory Group

Phase 2 was informed by the literature review and document analysis and complemented by extensive data collection from a range of stakeholders, including providers of courses in teacher education and re-training, language teacher professional associations, government and non-government providers of language education, and languages educators in schools and universities. Data on current teacher supply and skills requirements for teaching languages, and existing provisions for teacher education and re-training courses for primary and secondary languages teachers, including courses provided through distance education, was gathered by means of a comprehensive web search and face to face, telephone and email contact with a range of stakeholders in every State and Territory.

A brief discussion document, drawn mainly from the literature review and document analysis, was developed in consultation with the PAG to stimulate and structure the discussions (Appendix 4).

Existing qualification requirements of employers and state teacher registration bodies were documented and analysed (Appendix 3). The provision of teacher education and re-training opportunities for primary and secondary languages teachers was also documented and analysed (Appendix 1), and researchers prepared case studies of four teacher education courses, chosen on the basis of their innovation and accessibility in preparing languages teachers (Chapter Six).

The Report

The Report provides detailed information on the activities and findings of the Review and Evaluation. It addresses the project aims outlined above. It also:

(a) Investigates the potential for application of the Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures developed by the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) to teacher education and re-training courses in adequately preparing teachers for on-going professional development and learning;
(b) Identifies structural impediments that affect the quality of teacher education and re-training for primary and secondary languages teachers, particularly in relation to development of teachers’ linguistic and pedagogical competence; and
(c) Recommends actions for improving access to, and the quality of, preparation for primary and secondary languages teachers, including re-training opportunities.

Key findings

Low value placed on languages and cultures in the Australian community

This issue was raised by virtually every respondent in the consultation process conducted as part of Phase 2 of the project. For a variety of reasons that are beyond the scope of this project, the wider Australian community was perceived as unfriendly, or at best, indifferent towards languages and language learning. Many of the findings of this Report can only be understood in this context.
Variations in supply and demand for languages teachers

A complex picture emerged in relation to this issue across sectors and geographical locations. While some respondents reported shortages in particular languages and geographical areas, respondents who represented Independent schools said that they experienced few difficulties in finding well qualified staff. Catholic and government school principals and teacher educators reported an oversupply of teachers of some languages in the larger cities and towns. Primary school principals reported shortfalls in languages teachers in rural and remote areas. If a teacher of one language left it was often necessary to employ a teacher of a different language if a school wished to continue to teach languages. The difficulties experienced in finding languages teachers for some primary schools were said to be exacerbated by the poor conditions in which many languages teachers worked. Itinerancy and associated problems were mentioned as common concerns. A number of respondents suggested a need for improved communication between the major stakeholders involved in making decisions about supply and skill requirements of languages teachers, especially employers, universities, and government funding agencies.

More disincentives than incentives for people to train as languages teachers

Incentives included following up a personal interest in languages and, in some states, bonus points in the Tertiary Entrance Rank (TER) or equivalent. Opportunities to study abroad through scholarships such as those offered under the Endeavour Programme also acted as incentives for people to study languages. However, disincentives heavily outweighed incentives. Disincentives for people to train as languages teachers include:

- Perceived low status of teaching in general and languages teaching in particular - languages educators reported that their most talented students were looking towards professions of ‘higher status’ than teaching, such as law and diplomacy. Teacher educators said that most teacher education students preferred to teach subjects like English and Mathematics, or, for primary teachers, generalist subjects.
- Perceptions of lack of a career path for languages teachers - some respondents felt that teachers who chose to teach languages were marginalised, and that this affected their career advancement.
- Lack of support and resources for itinerant languages teachers - many problems connected with itinerancy were reported. These acted as powerful disincentives against languages teaching in primary schools. Itinerancy and related problems were causing some primary languages teachers to return to mainstream teaching.
- Perceptions that funds for languages programs were drying up, and that employment may be at risk.
- Perceptions that certain languages ‘go in and out of fashion so that people think they are training for a job that may be short lived’. (Teacher comment)
- Perceived difficulty of languages teaching, especially in junior secondary school and/or culturally diverse classrooms.

Lack of incentives and opportunity for re-training

The chief disincentive for re-training was lack of financial support. Teacher educators reported lack of interest in courses which offered opportunities for re-training within regular degree programs. Few courses were designed primarily to re-train teachers as languages teachers.
Lack of sufficient time, within the ‘crowded curriculum’ of teacher education courses, for the study of languages pedagogy

Most pre-service primary and secondary languages teachers studied one or two semester units of languages teaching methodology in their teacher education courses (average time 40 hours per unit.) (Appendix 1) Teacher educators found this time insufficient, but said it was a problem not easily solved, especially in the one year post graduate courses. Double degrees appeared to offer more flexibility in terms of time.

Inadequately funded teacher education curriculum

Insufficient Australian Government funds for teacher education courses result in insufficient money to support units which are ‘optional’ or ‘non mainstream’. These units are perceived to be in competition with, rather than complementary to literacy in English because too few people understand and are prepared to argue that literacy is enhanced through the sustained development of an additional language.

Insufficient language specific teaching methodology

Languages educators and teacher educators agreed that teaching methodology was more effective when it was language specific. However, this was often impossible because of the variety of language backgrounds among students and the small numbers per language in many teacher education courses.

The ‘languages gap’ in courses

University teacher educators and languages educators pointed to the ‘gap’ that occurs between students’ formal study of a language and undertaking teacher training. Language learning skills and proficiency frequently decline when the languages are not being used on a regular basis. Separating study of the language from study of languages pedagogy creates an artificial hiatus, and ignores the holistic nature of languages teaching. The flexibility of double degrees may open up avenues for addressing this problem.

Inconsistent teacher education course staffing, so that the balance between research and practice is not consistently maintained.

Increasing numbers of teacher educators are employed casually or sessionally. Most are exemplary school teaching practitioners, but they frequently lack the time, expertise, or, in some cases, the interest to actively engage in research or to familiarise themselves in any depth with current issues and developments in languages research and pedagogy. This may lead to the perpetuation of outmoded approaches to languages teaching and learning. Sessional/casual staff do bring a great deal of practical knowledge and experience to their university teaching, but this needs to be balanced and supported by a sound research base and the commitment of tenured teacher educators. Some languages educators commented that they preferred to teach in languages departments in faculties other than education because of better employment security and greater opportunities to conduct and supervise research.

Insufficient time spent on the study of state curriculum and syllabus documents

In many cases, the school curriculum that trainee teachers are, in theory, being prepared to teach, is covered in as little as one hour of a 40 hour unit. The languages documents present not only a description of content, but also a conceptual approach to the teaching of languages. In preparation for their work in schools, languages teacher education students need a solid understanding of these
documents, so this omission, where it exists, is serious. Graduate teachers and their principals reported that they were under prepared in this important area. The shortfall here mirrors the overall shortage of hours in teacher education. This is related to the issue of insufficient funding.

The extent of teacher education students’ knowledge of language and culture at the entry and exit points of their teacher education courses is, in many cases, unknown. Some teacher education faculties do not believe that they are accountable for students’ language proficiency and cultural knowledge, their area being ‘methodology’.

Most teacher education faculties accept students for training as languages teachers on the assumption that a minor or major study of the language, usually taken in a languages department in another faculty, or its ‘equivalent’ guarantees proficiency. One teacher educator referred to this as ‘one hell of an assumption.’

Languages teacher education methodology units are usually generic, rather than language specific. No formal assessment of language proficiency and cultural knowledge is carried out in most teacher education faculties. Few education faculties in Australian universities would be in a position to provide defensible guarantees that their graduates met high standards in language speaking, reading, writing and cultural knowledge.

Unsatisfactory practicum arrangements

Days spent in the practicum varied between 22 days and more than 100 days. Practicum structures also varied from course to course. Most teacher educators reported difficulties in finding practicum places for students. Secondary pre-service languages teachers spent only 50% of the practicum in languages teaching or observation (because they are required to have two ‘methods’).

In many instances, practicum arrangements do not allow for sufficient integration of theory and practice.

Key Features of the Case Studies

It is not within the scope of this Review to “rank” pre-service language teacher education courses in any way. Nor would it be possible to select the “top ten” or the “top twenty”. The four case studies selected for inclusion in this Review were chosen because they provide examples of innovative and accessible courses in teacher education and/or re-training opportunities for language teachers in preparing them for the profession.

The four case studies are:

1. Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) - Central Queensland University (CQU)
2. Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages - James Cook University (JCU)
3. Bachelor of Education (primary) Italian Teaching Method Units - University of Notre Dame Australia (UNDA)
4. Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education - Victoria University (VU)

The special features of these case studies are:

Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) - Central Queensland University (CQU)

- Close partnership with schools and mentor teachers
- Concurrent language and pedagogical studies
- Language specific methodology
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- In-country experience
- Accessibility
- Links with professional standards

Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages - James Cook University (JCU)

- Accessibility
- Concurrent language and pedagogical study
- In-country experience
- Cross-institutional studies
- The practicum experience

Bachelor of Education (primary) Italian Teaching Method Units - University of Notre Dame Australia (UNDA)

- Variety of pathways
- Partnership and funding arrangements
- Links to curriculum framework
- Language specific methodology
- Concurrent language and pedagogical study

Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education - Victoria University (VU)

- Benchmarking of curriculum and alignment with standards
- Close partnership between students and mentor teachers at schools
- Accessibility

Limitations of the study

The main sources of evidence for the study were face to face interviews, telephone and email contact with stakeholders, and web searches. In accordance with the aims of the study these sources have provided a comprehensive national picture of teacher education and re-training opportunities for languages teachers, and of the extent to which existing provision prepares them for their profession. However, when data are gathered through such means it is often difficult to know how to weigh the evidence and strike the right balance between various perceptions.

Internationally, there is growing recognition that graduate competence is an important measure of course effectiveness. The scope of the study did not allow for a thorough investigation of the capabilities of graduate languages teachers in terms of their language and pedagogical proficiency. For these reasons we have recommended (Recommendation 6) that more systematic data about the capabilities of graduate languages teachers be collected through, for example, representative surveys of key stakeholders such as school principals and new teachers.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are not scaled or priorities in any way. They are grouped according to the target bodies:

1. The Australian Government and State and Territory Governments
2. Universities and university national groups (the Australian Council of Deans of Education and Universities Australia)
3. State and Territory teacher registration bodies
4. The Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations
The Australian Government and State and Territory Governments

Recommendation 1

That the Australian Government expand core funding for the discipline of education in universities, on the proviso that all primary pre-service teachers be required to study at least one unit of a widely taught language other than English as part of their teacher education course, in order to be able to more effectively co-operate with teachers specialising in the teaching of that language through an enhanced understanding of the processes and challenges of learning additional languages.

Explanation

Teacher education courses for primary school teachers customarily include the study of specialist areas such as Art and Music. This enables the classroom teacher to work productively with the specialists and to ensure that the specialist areas are integrated into the curriculum. The rationale for including these specialist areas should also apply to languages.

Recommendation 2

That the Australian Government provide tagged funding to enable universities to make places available for selected native speakers of a language who are not yet undertaking a full teaching degree to study language teaching methodology. This could be done by offering special study units or by allowing native speakers (or equivalent) to enrol in existing methodology units and obtain credits towards a full teaching degree which could be ‘banked’ should they decide to embark on a degree within a specified period of time. The units should include providing opportunities for teacher education students educated outside of Australia to gain insight into Australian cultures of schooling.

Explanation

Australia has a largely untapped pool of people who are native speakers of various languages. Many such people teach in after hours ethnic and community schools and have special status with state teacher registration bodies. (e.g. special ‘permission to teach’). Many have been educated to tertiary level in other countries.

Allowing such people access to appropriate language teaching methodology units in language teacher education courses would (a) enhance the current work of people who are already teaching in after hours ethnic and community schools (b) introduce them to a tertiary environment and encourage later participation in tertiary study (c) act as an incentive to undertake a full teaching degree. Their language knowledge and proficiency would also enhance the language opportunities of non-native speaker students in the unit. Extra provision, through seminars, and tutorials and practicum experiences, could be made to allow native speaker students educated outside of Australia to gain insight into Australian cultures of schooling.

Recommendation 3

That the Australian Government commission a study of practising languages teachers who commenced their study of the language(s) they are teaching ab initio, and that, if this study shows these teachers to be effective, funding be committed to increasing the number of ab initio language courses for prospective languages teachers.

Explanation

At present there is no evidence, apart from anecdotal, about the effectiveness of ab initio courses in the preparation of languages teachers. Some languages educators have expressed reservations
about the effectiveness of these courses. A need exists for sound judgements, grounded in appropriate research, to be made on this issue.

Provided that the research demonstrated the effectiveness of ab initio courses in the training of languages teachers, the introduction of more such opportunities for pre-service would increase the pool of languages teachers.

**Recommendation 4**

That the **Australian Government** provide tagged funding to enable groups responsible for language teaching in universities (languages educators) and teacher educators to establish and maintain regular formal contact and collaboration.

**Explanation**

Many university based respondents noted that communication between academic languages staff (e.g. teachers in Arts/Humanities faculties) and education teaching staff was minimal, and usually came about in an ad hoc fashion as the result of extra effort on the part of some individuals. At worst, this resulted in disjunctions of various kinds between language study and study of pedagogy, including lack of common and complementary aims, incomplete knowledge on the part of education faculty staff about levels of students’ language proficiency, and failure to ensure the integration of knowledge of languages and cultures with pedagogical studies. These problems could be largely overcome if academic staff in languages departments and teacher education staff had opportunities to plan jointly and to consult on a regular basis.

**Recommendation 5**

That the **Australian Government**, in parallel with the expansion of funding to support the practicum experience, provide additional tagged funding to allow institutions that offer courses in language teacher education to incorporate a unit or units of study based on a period of in-country experience, as a compulsory component of the languages teaching qualification.

**Explanation**

Discussions with a variety of respondents in the consultation phase of this project showed that opportunities for in-country language study operated as incentives to attract people to become languages teachers. It was also clear that time spent in the country was of immense benefit in terms not only of becoming proficient in using the language, but also of learning to understand the culture and developing intercultural understanding and competence. In-country experience also allows the pre-service teacher to establish networks and contacts (including use of ICT) with the target culture and to gather materials and resources for use in the languages classroom.

**Recommendation 6**

That the **Australian Government** commission a longitudinal study of the effectiveness of different models of teacher education for languages teachers in different universities, and that this study should include the collection of systematic data about the capabilities of graduates, of languages teacher education courses. It should follow cohorts of students from selection to courses through pre-service preparation and the first five years of their careers.

**Explanation**

The House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training Report on the inquiry into teacher education, *Top of the Class*, published in February 2007 draws attention to the fact that ‘there is simply not a sufficiently rich body of research evidence to enable it to come to any firm conclusions about the overall quality of teacher education in Australia (HRSC Report, p. 5). An effective way of finding out which approaches best prepare languages teachers
for their profession would be to conduct a longitudinal study that would follow cohorts of students from the start of their training through the four (or more) years of their teaching degree and into the first five years of their teaching. The study would require the development of tools and processes for gathering data about teachers’ effectiveness in real school settings.

**Recommendation 7**

That the Australian and State and Territory Governments provide more financial incentives to some pre-service languages education teachers on a basis to be determined to encourage students to train as languages teachers and to commit to languages teaching for longer periods. These incentives could include HECS waiver, partial or full scholarships, or substantial assistance in gaining in-country experience.

**Explanation**

Financial incentives to individuals provide a powerful means of increasing the pool of people studying to become languages teachers. It is vital to provide as wide as possible a supply of potential language teachers.

**Recommendation 8**

That Australian and State and Territory Governments provide financial and other incentives for practising teachers who are not language teachers to enable them to re-train as languages teachers, on the condition that they and their employers commit to an amount of time, equivalent to their years of study as languages teachers, after graduation.

**Explanation**

Providing incentives for successful practising teachers who would be willing to undertake additional training as languages teachers would increase the pool of qualified language teachers, and would bring the benefits of their existing expertise to languages teaching. Under the NALSAS strategy this approach was successful in increasing the number of teachers of some Asian languages.

**Recommendation 9**

That Australian State and Territory Government education departments provide funding to establish and maintain regular formal contact between stakeholders in language teacher education, including schools, universities, regulatory bodies, teachers’ professional associations, employers, and after hours/ethnic schools, and to disseminate the results of such contact.

**Explanation**

A common theme during many consultations was the lack of communication opportunities between different stakeholder groups. Some state education departments host meetings of a representative group of stakeholders in languages teaching and language teacher education. This model promotes contact between stakeholders, assists the dissemination of information among the different groups, and provides a platform for joint initiatives.

**Recommendation 10**

That Australian State and Territory Government education departments maintain, and share with universities, regularly and consistently updated data bases and other relevant information on language teachers in individual schools. In return for such information, universities should commit to cooperative practices in languages teacher placements.
Explanation
State government education departments now collect comprehensive data about languages teaching, including the languages that are taught at individual schools and the overall qualifications of their teachers. Making this data available to university languages teacher educators would reduce the need for them to rely on their own networks to place students in the practicum.

Universities and national university groups

Recommendation 11

That the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE) take note of, and provide as models to all universities which train languages teachers, the innovative strategies used by some education faculties to forge strong links and partnerships with schools to establish collaborative approaches to languages teacher education, especially in relation to the practicum, and that they suggest mechanisms for sharing these strategies.

Explanation
Theory should not be separated from practice. Theoretical studies of languages learning and language acquisition and practical experience of teaching in the classroom need to be understood holistically. Case studies in this Report suggest innovative ways in which provision has been made for pre-service languages teachers to work for extended periods/regular days in schools, working on common projects with regular classroom teachers. There are many such examples which should be shared with all stakeholders.

Recommendation 12

That Universities Australia negotiate ways in which Education faculties integrate studies of language and culture with professional studies of teaching, to reduce or eliminate the ‘languages gap’ that occurs when languages are studied at a significantly earlier period than studies of pedagogy, through the promotion of co-operative ventures to provide language-specific languages teaching methodology units. Every effort should be made to ensure that languages studies are taken concurrently with teacher education studies, and that languages teaching methodology units are language specific.

Explanation
The study of languages and culture and of how languages are taught should be understood holistically, rather than as separate categories of knowledge. By integrating professional studies of teaching with study of languages and culture, pre-service teachers have the opportunity to reflect on their own learning as they study how to promote the learning of school students. By continuing to study a language as they learn to teach it they will develop a critical awareness of their own learning processes. This will greatly enhance their studies in languages education.

The ‘rust factor’ that can occur when there is a significant time lapse between languages study and study of teaching emerged as an issue of concern during the consultation phase of this project. Language learning skills and proficiency frequently decline when the language is not being used on a regular basis. Active use of language skills - reading a variety of texts, speaking, watching news programs or movies in the language - are essential to maintaining and enhancing language proficiency.

Language and language learning skills can lapse when the language is not being used. Concurrent study of language and culture and pedagogy will address this problem.
State and Territory Registration Bodies

Recommendation 13

That State and Territory teacher registration bodies work with State and Territory based Committees of Deans of Education to revise accreditation and other quality assurance mechanisms to ensure that teacher educators have comprehensive information about students’ knowledge of language and culture at the point of entry to the languages teacher education course, and that teacher education faculties have defensible means of guaranteeing that their exit students have demonstrated acceptable standards of achievement in their knowledge of the language and culture they propose to teach.

Explanation
Knowledge of subject/content is now recognised as an essential element of quality teaching at all year levels. The subject/content of a languages teacher’s knowledge base is knowledge of the language and culture to be taught. Education faculty staff need to ensure that they have defensible means of guaranteeing that their graduates meet acceptable standards of subject/content knowledge. This does not mean that the education faculties should teach languages and culture. It does mean that they accept responsibility for knowing the language and culture achievement levels of their students at entry and exit points of languages teacher education courses, and for guaranteeing quality in this area as part of awarding the degree.

Recommendation 14

That Australian State and Territory teacher registration bodies work with State and Territory based Committees of Deans of Education in making inclusion of the study of the relevant state Languages other than English curriculum a condition of approving teacher education courses for specialist languages teachers.

Explanation
Since the completion of the Australian national curriculum Statements and Profiles in eight Key Learning Areas, including languages other than English in the mid-1990s, great progress has been made in developing state curriculum and syllabi for the study of languages in schools. These documents, which are broadly similar from state to state, describe a professional consensus of what school students can be expected to know, understand and be able to do at each level of their schooling.

The consultations and course mapping carried out during this project showed that coverage of state language curricula in languages teacher education courses was uneven, and that many graduates began their careers ill equipped in this area. Since these documents describe what teachers will be expected to teach, knowing content is clearly essential preparation for languages teachers.

The Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations

Recommendation 15

That MCEETYA work with the AFMLTA to support the development of graduate standards for languages teachers, consistent with other national standards initiatives, including the National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching, that can be used in establishing acceptable national accreditation procedures for teacher education courses. This will entail an understanding that the standards will be used to assess the preparedness of languages teachers to practise their profession.
Explanation
Accreditation is an endorsement by an independent external agency that a professional preparation course is adequate for the purposes of a profession and its clientele. Proposals for the national accreditation of teacher education courses (Teaching Australia and AFTRA), are currently in the consultation phase. The Teaching Australia proposal envisages accreditation based on specialised areas of teaching, or stages of schooling. It also calls for members of the profession to take a high profile in making decisions about the standards expected of teachers as they enter the profession, as well as (program) standards expected of teacher preparation courses.

Graduate standards for languages teachers developed by the AFMLTA would serve two main purposes:
1. Professional learning of pre-service languages teachers and guidance of teacher education courses;
2. Professional involvement in decisions being made about the accreditation expectations and requirements of courses for languages teachers and their graduates

In venturing into this complex field the AFMLTA would find useful the body of work that has already been carried out by professional associations and statutory bodies in several overseas countries. The extensive work carried out by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in conjunction with the Specialty Areas Studies Board of NCATE would be of particular value. (See also Ingvarson Elliot, Kleinhenz and McKenzie, 2006).
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the project

The origins of this project can be traced to a number of initiatives in languages and languages education that have occurred in Australia over the past twenty years. In 1989 the *National Goals for Schooling in the 21st Century* identified Languages other than English as one of the eight Key Learning Areas to be included in Australian school curriculum. This provided fresh impetus for the study of languages, which had traditionally occurred mainly in secondary schools, to increase in primary schools, and this development, in turn, led to a strong demand for appropriately trained and qualified primary school languages teachers.

In 2002 a Review of the Commonwealth Languages Other than English Programme\(^1\) identified teacher supply and demand and quality of teaching as probably the most significant issues affecting languages education in Australian schools. The Review highlighted shortcomings in the quality of courses that prepared languages teachers for their profession. These issues were again highlighted in a review of languages education in Australian schools conducted by MCEETYA in 2003, as part of the consultation process in developing the *National Statement for Languages in Australian Schools* (National Statement) and the *National Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005-2008* (National Plan).

*The Final report on the development of the Standards for Teachers of Indonesian Project* noted several ‘areas of concern’ in the pre-service education of language teachers:

- The generic nature of languages curriculum units/lack of language specific work
- Limited time for prospective primary languages teachers to study a language within ‘crowded’ Bachelor of Education programs
- Lack of systematic provision for language teaching in the practicum (Liddicoat et al 2005 pp. 43-44).

In 2005, *The National Statement* and the *National Plan* were distributed to all schools and stakeholders in languages education. These documents emphasise that quality programs in schools depend on quality, well trained teachers.

In late 2005, the former DEST approved eight significant national projects, recommended by the MCEETYA Languages Education Working Party (the Working Party). Membership of the Working Party comprises representatives of educational jurisdictions with direct reporting responsibilities to Ministers of Education. This project is one of the eight, all of which are being monitored by the Working Party. Most will conclude in 2007. The projects are:

- Project 1: National coordination and quality assurance of ethnic schools.
- Project 2: Enhancing the quality of Indigenous languages programmes through improved training and support for speakers of Australian Indigenous languages working in Australian schools.
- Project 3: Investigation into the state and nature of languages education in Australian schools, including the policy drivers and inhibitors that help or hinder the effective delivery of languages programmes.
- Project 4: Development of a nationally coordinated promotion strategy.
- Project 5: Review of teacher education for languages teachers.

---

• Project 7: ‘Leading Languages’ – a professional learning program for school principals and leaders.
• Project 8: National Seminar on Languages Education for Key Stakeholders. This event was held on the 30th and 31st October, 2006.

Further projects have since been approved:

• Professional standards project, to develop and implement a nationally coordinated professional learning programme for languages teachers.
• A second phase of funding for improving the national coordination and quality assurance of languages programmes in after-hours ethnic schools.
• A second National Seminar on languages education, to be held in November 2007.
• The collection and analysis of student participation data.

Complementing these national projects is a national professional learning program, the Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning in Practice (ILTLP) Programme. The main aim of this programme is to develop languages teachers’ knowledge and understanding of intercultural language teaching and learning, with a particular focus on long-term planning and programming.

Concerns about the quality of teacher education for languages teachers are situated within a broader debate about teacher education. A search of Australian literature reveals few rigorous studies of the extent to which teacher education courses vary in effectiveness. In Victoria, the recent report of the Parliamentary Education and Training Committee Inquiry (2005) into the Suitability of Pre-service Teacher Training, *Step In Step Out* (Education and Training Committee, 2005) concluded that there is:

> a wide variation in the standards within teacher education institutions and the skills and expertise of graduates of different courses (p. xvii)


### 1.1 Scope and aims of the project

The primary target audience for this Final Report on the Review of Teacher Education for Languages Teachers (the Report) is the MCEETYA Working Party established to oversee the implementation of the *National Plan*. Other audiences are languages education policy makers, program administrators at national and state and territory level, languages teacher educators, languages teachers and other key stakeholders, such as teacher registration authorities and teacher education and re-training providers.

Information was obtained from a wide range of sources, including universities, representatives of DEST, state and territory education departments, the Catholic and independent school sectors, representatives of state and territory registration bodies, providers of out of school hours community/ethnic languages education, both government and private, and recently graduated languages teachers and their principals. A broad national picture of teacher education for languages teachers and of the main issues with teacher education for languages teachers was obtained. This broad picture and a detailed discussion of the issues are presented in the body of the Report.
Variation in languages teacher quality, linked to the differential capacities of schools to attract and retain quality teachers, was a recurrent theme in our investigations. Teacher quality is a major factor that explains the variation in student achievement in all key learning areas including languages. The characteristics and attributes of pre-service education programs for languages teachers have a major influence on the quality of teaching in schools. This study has carried out extensive research into many facets of pre-service teacher education to provide useful advice to guide policy directed at improving the quality of languages teacher education and learning opportunities in languages.

A particular focus of the project was the relevance and possible applications of professional teaching standards in teacher education programs, especially the Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures (The AFMLTA Standards) published by the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) in 2005. Although these standards describe the work of ‘accomplished’ rather than graduate level teaching, they have potential to guide languages teacher education course development. The project also investigated standards developed in other contexts and countries, especially professional entry or graduate level standards which can be used to serve the twin purposes of pre-service teachers’ professional learning and assurance of the quality of course provision.

The National Statement points out that Australia’s diverse linguistic and cultural environment provides a fertile recruiting ground for languages teachers. This applies to Indigenous languages and to the over 150 languages which are the product of over 200 years of migration. The National Statement recognised that this is indeed ‘a valuable base from which to develop the linguistic capabilities necessary for Australia to be successful in the international community in the 21st century’ (National Statement p. 3).

This project aimed to:

- obtain a comprehensive national picture of teacher education and re-training opportunities for the preparation of primary and secondary languages teachers, including course entry requirements, content and structure, and structural impediments relating to the development of teachers’ linguistic and pedagogical competency;
- determine the extent to which existing provision of teacher education and re-training opportunities for primary and secondary languages teachers prepares them for their profession; and
- develop strategies to improve access to, and the quality of, preparation for primary and secondary languages teachers, including exploration of the potential application of the Standards for Language Teaching and programme standards developed in the final Report on the Development of Standards for Indonesian Project.

1.2 Research methodology

The project consisted of a review and evaluation of teacher education for languages teachers (‘Review and evaluation’), and the development, publication and distribution of this Report.

The first phase of the project comprised the establishment of the Project Advisory Group (PAG) and the first meeting of the PAG, and the preparation of the literature review and document analysis (Chapter Two).

Four meetings of the PAG, including three teleconferences and one face to face meeting, were held between July 2006 and July 2007.
Collection of information from identified stakeholders commenced in the second phase of the project. This phase included gathering and mapping the details of teacher education courses across Australia (Appendix 1), and the details of employers’ and registration bodies’ qualification and other requirements for languages teaching in all Australian States and Territories (Appendix 3).

An initial web-search of teacher education courses was followed up with email and telephone contact with all Australian universities that provide pre-service teacher education programs, including those which do not provide opportunities for prospective teachers to undertake study in the teaching of languages.

1.2.1 Consultations

Phase 2 included extensive consultation with stakeholders, carried out by three ACER researchers, in all Australian states and territories. All participants were given a discussion document and focus questions (Appendix 4). Stakeholders included: languages teacher educators in selected universities in all states and territories; representatives of DEST; representatives of state and territory education departments; representatives of the Catholic and independent education sectors; representatives of state and territory registration bodies; representatives of Modern Languages teacher associations; providers of out of hours/community/ethnic languages education; and recently graduated languages teachers and their principals. As many as possible of these consultations were held face to face. Some additional contact and follow up was done by telephone.

1.2.2 Preparation of case studies (Chapter Six)

On the basis of information gathered and consultation with PAG members, four examples of teacher education programs that were innovative in their approaches and had achieved a degree of success in overcoming structural impediments, such as difficulties in providing for language specificity, were identified. These were

Case study 1: Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) Primary and Secondary Program - Central Queensland University:

Case study 2: Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages - James Cook University

Case study 3: Bachelor of Education Primary Years - University of Notre Dame Australia

Case study 4: Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education - Victoria University

The four case studies included information about:

- The University
- The Course
- Course entry requirements
- Course structure
- Course content
- Staffing
- The practicum
- Assessment
- Feedback/evaluation
- The special features of the course
1.2.3 **The Final Report**

The Final Report integrates information from the literature and document analysis, mapping of pre-service teacher education courses for languages teachers, mapping of requirements necessary to become a languages teacher, consultations with stakeholders, case studies and advice from the PAG. It is structured to address the aims of the project. Members of the PAG and the former DEST received a draft of the Final Report for comment and feedback.

1.3 **Outline of each chapter**

The Report has six chapters:

This chapter describes the background and context of the project. It recognises some significant milestones, including the 1989 identification of languages other than English as one of the nationally agreed Key Learning Areas in the Australian school curriculum; the 2002 *Review of the Commonwealth Languages Other than English Programme*; and the review of languages education in Australian schools that was conducted by the MCEETYA as part of the consultation process in developing the *National Statement* and *National Plan 2005-2008*. This chapter also describes where the project fits in with the suite of significant national projects currently being funded through the School Languages Programme to assist the implementation of the *National Statement* and *National Plan*.

Chapter One also describes the scope and aims of the project. It identifies, as the target audience, the Working Party established to oversee the implementation of the National Plan, and other stakeholders. It concludes with an overview of the research methodology.

**Chapter Two: Literature Review and document analysis**

The literature review and document analysis (the Review) is based on a wide range of literature and documents, including major reports, evaluations and policy statements.

After a brief historical overview, the Review draws on the report *Languages at the Crossroads* (Nicholas, Moore, Clyne, and Pauwels, 1993) to show how teacher preparation courses for primary and secondary languages teachers have traditionally been structured through degrees and diplomas offered by Australian universities. In light of more recent research carried out by Liddicoat et al (2005) it suggests that basic course structures have changed little since 1993, with most teacher education students studying in single or combined degree courses of four years duration, or in graduate diplomas of one or two years. Details of current course components, drawn from published course descriptions, which are typical of most undergraduate degree courses for prospective languages teachers are charted in this section, as are the most common practicum arrangements.

The discussion of course quality in this section uses information about student enrolments and related research findings on students’ perceptions of their teacher education courses that were presented in *The Survey of Final Teacher Education Students* (Department of Education Science and Training 2006). Further information about course quality was sourced from the HRSC Report. The HRSC Report was also the source of the most up to date information about current funding of teacher education courses.

This section of the Review also draws on literature about the various approaches to teaching languages that teachers have used over time, and their relationships with pre-service teacher education for languages teachers. It notes that intercultural learning is a key development in languages teaching and learning in the 21st century, referring mainly to the work of Byram, Kramsch, Lo Bianco, Liddicoat, Crozet and Scarino.
The knowledge base of languages teaching – what languages teachers should know and be able to do - is central to any discussion of the content of courses of study for prospective language teachers. Section 2.3.1 of the literature review considers this issue in depth. It revisits the well known work of such writers as Shulman, Lortie, Rozenholtz, Little, Huberman and McAninch, which described the fragility of teachers’ professional knowledge, and suggested ways of strengthening, the teaching knowledge base. It describes how these writers’ work led to the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) in the USA, and the statement of the five core principles which underpin the work of the Board. It notes that these principles are reflected in sets of professional teaching standards that have been developed by agencies such as employers of teachers, regulatory bodies and teachers’ professional associations around the world.

With regard to the specialised knowledge base of languages teaching, the Review refers to the NBPTS Standards for World Languages other than English, which were developed in a co-operative venture with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), as one example of an explication of the elements of language teachers’ professional knowledge and skills. Other examples of a knowledge base for languages teachers included in this section are taken from work by Day and Conkin, Freeman and Johnson, Wright and Bolitho, Ellis, and Liddicoat.

Understanding what constitutes quality teaching is also of central importance to language teacher education course development. The Review discusses a recent and influential paper by Fenstermacher and Richardson (2005), which addressed the question of how ‘success’- i.e. bringing about positive student learning outcomes - is part of the definition of ‘quality’ teaching. This discussion raises interesting questions as to what successful languages learning outcomes for school students might be, and how prospective teachers should be taught how to identify and assess them. It is also of interest because it queries the extent to which the learning achievements of pre-service teacher education students – appropriately measured – should be taken into account when considering ‘quality’ teaching in universities that prepare people to teach in schools. It is relevant, in particular, to the Report’s discussion of possible course accreditation mechanisms.

Part of the brief for this project was to explore the potential application of the AFMLTA Standards. The Literature Review examines a range of literature and documents on this issue. These include the seminal work of Shulman and the NBPTS in the USA, and recent work in Australia by Skilbeck and Connell, Ramsey, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, Liddicoat and Scarino. Also discussed are the standards initiatives of Australian state teacher registration bodies, the Australian College of Educators (ACE), various teachers’ professional associations, including the AFMLTA, and MCEETYA.

The Review then points to the distinction between generic and subject/levels of schooling standards that describe teachers’ knowledge and skills in specific areas of the curriculum – including languages - and stages of schooling (e.g. Early Childhood). It also distinguishes between sets of standards that describe teachers’ work at various levels, such as ‘graduate’ standards’ and ‘accomplished’ standards.

The NBPTS Standards for World Languages other than English, and the AFMLTA Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures are examined and discussed in detail. The discussion notes that these examples describe the work of teachers at an ‘accomplished’ level, and that this should be taken into account in any consideration of how they may be applied to assist the development of teacher education courses.
The Literature Review refers to the work of Ingvarson, Kleinhenz, Darling-Hammond, and Scarino, Papademetre and Dellit in a discussion that revolves around the definition of ‘standard’ as a:

(a) statement of what is known and valued and
(b) a measure. The central question that arises from this discussion is whether standards should pertain only to the first part of the definition, or to both.

The Review also considers sets of graduate standards that have been developed (partly) for the purpose of accrediting teacher pre-service education courses by regulatory bodies in England, Scotland, Canada, America, New Zealand, and Australia, pointing out that nearly all of these standards are generic, rather than subject/year level specific.

To our knowledge the only substantial accreditation of teacher pre-service education programs that uses subject specific standards is that of the National Committee for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in the USA. The Review provides a comprehensive discussion and analysis of the NCATE procedures for accrediting languages teacher education courses using the NCATE approved American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Languages Teachers, which describe the knowledge and skills expected of pre-service languages teacher education students at course exit points. It shows how NCATE approval of courses for languages teachers is contingent upon universities being able to show that their students meet these standards.

This chapter closes with a Summary of the main points in the Review.

Chapter Three: Language teacher education and re-training in Australia

Chapter Three is a factual chapter based on the Mapping of Teacher Education Courses in Australian Universities (Appendix 1). It describes course structure, course content and practicum arrangements. It also provides details of course entry requirements, special provision for teachers who are re-training as languages teachers, student enrolments for 2006 and 2007 and the special features of some courses.

Chapter Four: Issues in teacher education for languages teachers

Chapter Four deals with some of the main issues that emerged in the course of the project. These relate to:

- A need to place much higher value on languages in the wider Australian community
- Variation in supply and skill requirements of graduate teachers
- More disincentives than incentives for people to train as languages teachers
- Lack of incentives and opportunities for re-training
- Insufficient funding for languages
- Lack of communication between education faculties and languages departments in other faculties that educate pre-service languages teachers
- Lack of communication between universities, schools and employers
- Separation of languages study from study of pedagogy: the ‘Languages gap’ in courses
- The generic, rather than language specific, nature of languages teaching method units
- Is the knowledge of university teacher educators up to date?
- Are courses up to date?
- Sessional and casual staff
- Lack of research in languages teacher education
- Interacting with state curriculum and syllabus documents
• Teacher education students’ knowledge of language and culture at entry and exit points of their courses.
• Issues with the practicum
• Learning how to use ICT effectively
• Offering languages education through distance delivery
• Potential applications of the AFMLTA standards
• Accreditation of pre-services languages programs
• Extent to which existing courses prepare students for their profession
• Structural impediments that affect the quality of teacher education and re-training for languages teachers

Chapter Five: Options for strengthening the quality of teacher education for languages teachers

This chapter considers some options for strengthening teacher education courses for languages teachers. These include:

• Giving further consideration to potential applications of the AFMLTA Standards to teacher education courses
• Encouraging education faculties to accept greater responsibility for the languages and cultural knowledge and proficiency of their students
• Supporting current initiatives to nationally accredit teacher education courses
• Encouraging greater communication and collaboration between university languages departments, teacher education faculties, and primary and secondary schools, with a view to ensuring that languages and teaching methodology are studied concurrently, and that students’ new knowledge is embedded and extended in classroom practice.
• Investigating how the numbers of tenured/permanent languages teacher educators in teacher education faculties may be increased, in order to halt the trend towards over reliance on sessional and casual teaching staff.

This chapter also considers some strategies to improve access to, and the quality of, preparation for languages teachers.

Discussion in this chapter leads into the case studies described in Chapter Six

Chapter Six: Case studies

Four case studies of teacher education courses for languages teachers are included in this chapter. They are:

Case study 1: Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) Primary and Secondary Program - Central Queensland University:

Case study 2: Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages - James Cook University

Case study 3: Bachelor of Education Primary Years - University of Notre Dame Australia

Case study 4: Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education - Victoria University
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

2.0 Introduction

The purpose of this literature review and document analysis is to provide information and a context for the Final Report of the Review of Teacher Education for Languages Teachers conducted by ACER for the Department of Education Science and Training in 2006-2007. By highlighting the literature and research findings most relevant to the project, the review aims to produce new insights into the central issues and to establish a broad contextual framework for the work of the project.

A wide range of resources and documents, including major reports, evaluations and policy statements, has been investigated. This range covers the domains of: teacher education; languages teaching theory; intercultural language learning; languages teacher education; teaching knowledge and quality; professional teaching standards; standards for teachers of languages, and the applications of standards, including accreditation of teacher preparation courses.

The review begins with a brief historical examination of major shifts in thinking about languages and languages teacher education and their interrelationship with languages policies over time. It then examines and discusses literature and documents relating to languages teacher education programs in Australian universities, including entry requirements, course content and structure, and the relationships between various curriculum approaches to language teaching and teacher preparation courses. It draws attention to documented issues of concern, such as insufficient language-specific content in languages teacher education programs, insufficient provision of languages teacher education for primary teachers, and communication difficulties between faculties that teach languages and Education faculties that teach ‘method’.

Teacher education courses for languages teachers are built on program developers’ knowledge and assumptions about what teachers should be expected to know and be able to do. The review draws from the vast store of literature on the knowledge base of teaching to discuss what is generally expected of teacher education students in terms of knowledge and skills development, and how these expectations are reflected in teacher preparation courses. Issues of teacher quality, including how teacher quality is to be determined, and the various issues that impact on teacher quality are discussed in light of the most recent literature on the topic. The review also draws on recent research findings that reveal the perceptions of beginning teachers and/or their supervisors of the quality of their courses.

In accordance with one of the main aims of the project - to explore the potential application of the Standards for Languages Teaching and Programme Standards developed in the Final Report on the development of Standards for Teachers of Indonesian Project - the final sections of the review draw on the extensive national and international standards literature and various policy documents, including The National Statement from the Teaching Profession on Teacher Standards Quality and Professionalism published by the Australian College of Educators (ACE) in May 2003. National and international examples of standards, including the standards developed by teachers’ subject associations in Australia, are provided and discussed. Particular attention is paid to the AFMLTA Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures (the AFMLTA Standards); the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Standards for Teachers of World Languages Other Than English; and the Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers prepared by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and approved by the Specialty Areas Studies Board of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The review closes with an exploration of the literature relating to possible uses and applications of standards for the twin
purposes of enhancing professional learning and providing assurance of quality, including accreditation of pre-service teacher education courses.

2.1 Historical Context

We were not able to find any systematic studies that traced the history of languages teacher education courses in Australia. Cross and Gearon (2004) noted that:

The field of second language teacher education, whether focussing on pre-service or in-service training has a broad and chequered history. Pedagogy has tended to be driven by the linguistic theories of the day rather than educational research into second language teaching itself as it occurs in natural, realistic settings.

Gearon recently commented on the dearth of research into languages teacher education:

Indeed a recent search for Australian research into languages teacher education revealed only two Ph. D theses in this area, one from La Trobe which concerned primary EFL teachers in Indonesia, and the second from Curtin which examined teacher education for primary teachers of Japanese. Such a dearth of research in this field is one of the reasons I used the expression ‘the Cinderella of teacher education courses.’ (Gearon, 2007)

However, we do know that, to varying extents, teacher education programs for languages teachers reflect contemporary attitudes, theories, and prevailing ideas in languages and languages education. Knowing how ideas about languages and languages education in Australia have changed over the past century therefore helps us to understand changes in teacher education that have occurred in the same period. The following brief historical overview is intended to provide a contextual underpinning and background for the later sections of the Review.

2.1.1 The first half of the 20th century

Before the second world war and into the 1950s and 1960s ‘modern’ languages, such as French and German, were taught in schools and universities in ways similar to traditional methods of teaching Latin and Ancient Greek. The teaching emphasis in both modern and classical languages was on grammar and translation and the study of literary texts. Very little importance was attached to learning to speak a language, as this was seen as an intellectually inferior activity that was too closely associated with ‘mercantile’ goals and pursuits (Wykes, 1958, 1966; Wykes & King, 1968) (See also Martin, 2005). Until the last decades of the 20th century, the study of languages in schools was seen as an ‘academic and elitist area study’ suitable only for the most academically able students (Tedesco, 2006).

These perspectives were reflected in language courses taught in faculties such as Arts, and also in the ‘method’ courses of graduate teacher preparation courses, the most common example of which was the Diploma of Education (Dip. Ed.). The Dip Ed. was, almost exclusively, the professional path for prospective secondary school languages teachers.

Very few primary school teachers taught a language (other than English) until the 1980s.

2.1.2 Changes in the post war period

For the great majority of schools, post war changes in school structure and curriculum, together with increasing diversity in the Australian community led to vastly altered perceptions of languages and their place in schools. However, these changes in perception were relatively slow to
be reflected in the courses offered by most pre-service education courses for prospective languages teachers.

An important shift was a series of major school curriculum reforms that started in the 1960s and were designed to cater for increasingly diverse groups of students as comprehensive secondary education was made much more widely available. Under these reforms, the study of languages in some schools became optional, as schools were given more autonomy in deciding which subjects should be offered.

A related change was that, in the late 1960s, Australia’s older universities decided to waive existing regulations that prescribed the successful completion of a language for University Matriculation. (The newer universities all began without this requirement). The intent of this change, in an era of increased democratisation, was to remove perceptions of perceived elitism in the study of languages. Its main results, however, may have been to weaken the status of languages in universities and to make languages teaching a less favoured career option for prospective teachers. In the two following decades, the number of students who studied a language at Year 12 fell from 40% to 12 %. (Department of Education Training and Youth Affairs (DEETYA), 1998).

2.1.3 The 1980s and 1990s

In 1987 the first national policy on languages was published (Lo Bianco, 1987). This document, which has been described as expressing ‘a philosophy of linguistic and cultural pluralism’ (Scarino, 1998), was Australia’s first policy on languages and also the first of such policies in any English speaking country. It offered a broad educational, social and cultural rationale for the study of languages. It was also influential in providing a national direction and in advocating the study of a second language for all students, and language maintenance for students of non-English speaking and Indigenous backgrounds (Tedesco, 2006). More funds were allocated to encourage languages teaching and, in 1989, the National Languages Institute of Australia was created. The design and implementation of languages teaching, however, were still decided at state, district and local school levels, as national initiatives were redefined and re-interpreted by the different government authorities (Clyne, 1991 pp. 213-45; Lo Bianco, Liddicoat, & Crozet, 1999; Ozlins, 1993 pp. 242-9).

In 1987, the Commonwealth Department of Education became part of the new Department of Employment, Education and Training under Minister John Dawkins, who was an economist. In the major restructures of the tertiary sector that followed Dawkins’ appointment, the profile of languages changed, with Japanese displacing French as the most popular language, and significant increases occurring in Asian and some European languages. New languages, such as Vietnamese first made their appearance in the tertiary sector (Martin, 2005 pp. 66). This opened up opportunities for native speakers of these languages to be trained to teach in mainstream schools.

The National goals for Schooling and moves towards the establishment of a National Curriculum

In April 1989, the Commonwealth, State and Territory governments agreed on and endorsed ten goals for schooling in Australia. Subsequently, Ministers for Education agreed that there should be eight key learning areas, and that Languages Other Than English (LOTE) should be one of those areas. This decision represented an endorsement of the place of languages in all school curricula, including the primary school curriculum. The corollary was that pre-service education courses for primary school teachers might be expected to include language study on an equal footing with the other seven key learning areas. This, by and large, did not happen, but the options to study language teaching as part of four year teaching degrees for primary teachers were considerably expanded in the following decade in most Australian universities.

The National Statement on Languages Other Than English for Australian Schools, written in the 1990s, included three ‘communicating’ strands for language learning, one for each of ‘oral
interaction’, ‘reading and responding’ and ‘writing’. It acknowledged three categories of languages: European, Asian and Community and it added Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages and Auslan, stressing that there should be no ‘artificial distinctions’ or implication of a ‘hierarchy’ of languages.

The four ‘specific quality demands’ made of teachers in this Statement were:

- Teachers must cater for the range of language learners.
- Teachers must cater for the proper learning environment for all language learners.
- Teachers must possess proficiency in the language.
- Teachers need expertise in sociocultural knowledge, skills and attitudes.

In 1996, the Australian Literacy Council (Australian Language and Literacy Council, 1996) noted, in a lengthy report on teacher supply and quality, that the ‘endorsement of diversity’ in the National Statement on Languages other than English had major implications for the supply and demand of languages teachers.

This report also noted that:

The document leaves the reader in no doubt that language proficiency is the primary objective of language education.

Communicating in language is the central focus of the outcomes of all language learning. The three strands are interdependent and interrelated and apply to language learning in all years of schooling. Effective communication is enhanced by an understanding of the relationship between language and its sociocultural context (Australian Language and Literacy Council, 1996 p. 10).

The report went on to state:

Yet report after report...has demonstrated the truth...that Australia just does not have – nor is likely to have in the immediate future, without a drastic change in policy and practice – sufficient numbers of language teachers with appropriate language proficiency, as well as the other qualities necessary for the quality provision of language teaching (Australian Language and Literacy Council, 1996 p. 50).

In a later section of the Report, which dealt with issues of pre-service teacher education, the writers stated their view that greater attention should be paid to developing language proficiency in prospective teachers:

Only in perhaps four institutions are graduating students expected to demonstrate, through formal testing, a standard of proficiency other than the academic requirements inherent in passing their course.

The Council views this to be an entirely unsatisfactory situation. National, State and Territory goals and objectives for language education can be delivered effectively only by teachers who have expertise in language proficiency, cultural and other knowledge, and pedagogical practice (Australian Language and Literacy Council, 1996).

In 1994, the Council of Australian Governments released the Report, Asian Languages and Australia’s Economic Future (Council of Australian Governments, 1994). This Report recommended the study of Japanese, Chinese, Indonesian and Korean in primary schools. The
study of some ‘community’ languages, notably Modern Greek, began to decline (largely because of generational change) so that these languages began to lose their influence in universities and fewer opportunities were available for prospective teachers of those languages to study them.

1994 was also the year in when *The National Asian languages and Studies in Australian Schools Strategy* (NALSAS), which promoted four Asian languages, Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Indonesian, was implemented. By 2000, more than three quarters of a million students, just over 23 per cent of all Australian students were studying a NALSAS language. Exposure to a NALSAS language was highest at Year 7 (41%), but dropped sharply to only 4.4% in Years 11 and 12 (Department of Education Science and Training, 2002) *Review of the Australian Government Languages Other than English Programme (LOTE)* Report.

### 2.1.4 The current context

*The National Statement and National Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005-2008* (Ministerial Council for Education Employment and Training (MCEETYA), 2005) (*National Statement and National Plan*) sets a new direction for language teaching in Australia. In accordance with new understandings that underpin similar initiatives in other OECD countries, it emphasises ‘intercultural understanding’:

> (Intercultural understanding) involves the integration of language, culture and learning. Intercultural language learning helps learners to know and understand the world around them, and to understand commonality and difference, global connections and patterns. Learners will view the world, not from a single perspective of their own first language and culture, but from the multiple perspectives gained through the study of subsequent languages and cultures. ²

The rationale offered for teaching languages in the Statement is that learning languages:

- Enriches our learners intellectually, educationally and culturally
- Enables our learning to communicate across cultures
- Contributes to social cohesiveness through better communication and understanding
- Further develops the existing linguistic and cultural resources in our community
- Contributes to our strategic, economic and international development
- Enhances employment and career prospects for the individual (Ministerial Council for Education Employment and Training (MCEETYA), 2005 p. 2).

The National Statement affirms the place of languages education in school curriculum. It emphasises Australia’s diverse linguistic and cultural environment, and the need to build on the advantages it affords. It also recognises the importance of the ‘many active Indigenous languages, dialects, creoles, pidgin and Aboriginal English dialects spoken in Australia’ (Ministerial Council for Education Employment and Training (MCEETYA), 2005 p. 3). Languages learning is no longer to be conceived in terms of providing for an elite minority of academically able students. All students should be given the opportunity to learn a language, or languages, from their primary school years through to the final years of secondary schooling.

The National Statement details certain features of quality languages education. It recognises the central importance of quality teaching, and supportive teaching conditions. Teachers need to be well trained and have opportunities for professional learning throughout their careers.

---

² This concept is further discussed later in this Review.
The cumulative nature of language learning is given prominence, as is the importance of whole school commitment to languages education. The former entails that sufficient time be made available, and suitable timetabling arrangements be in place to ensure continuous and sustained programs.

With regard to the choice of languages, the Statement is explicit in confirming that ‘all languages are equally valid.’ When decisions are being made as to which languages should be taught, a variety of factors, such as local contexts and teacher availability, needs to be considered. It is not envisaged that mainstream schools should provide all languages learning. Complementary provision by government schools of languages, distance education, and out of school hours ethnic/community languages schools is expected.

The National Plan is an initial Plan that reflects an agreed commitment by all State and Territory Ministers of Education to act together to address areas of common concern. Its aims are to:

- Establish long-term directions for languages education
- Advance the implementation of high quality and sustainable programs
- Maximise collaboration in the use of national state and territory resources
- Provide flexibility in implementation by individual jurisdictions.

All of the six strands, objectives and underpinning principles of the Plan involve providing opportunities for students to learn from appropriately qualified and competent teachers. The Plan therefore has the potential to directly influence the quality of teacher education for languages teachers. The Strand 2 objective, for example - ‘To enhance the provision of appropriately qualified teachers of languages in order to work towards addressing issues related to supply and demand (Ministerial Council for Education Employment and Training (MCEETYA), 2005 p. 2)’ - envisages this ‘action’: ‘To Review the content and structure of teacher education courses with a view to improving access to, and the quality of, preparation for language teachers.’

This ‘action’ is the driver of the present project. Other ‘actions’ from the Plan currently underpin the development of concurrent DEST projects in the languages area.

2.2 Languages Teacher Education Programs in Australian Universities

2.2.1 Course content and structure

The Report *Languages at the Crossroads* (Nicholas, Moore, Clyne, & Pauwels, 1993) (*The Nicholas Report*) states that courses for prospective languages teachers in Australia fall into three basic ‘patterns’ (Nicholas et al., 1993 pp. 59-60). In the first, students study languages separately from courses that prepare them for teaching. First they study languages as part of an academic degree program, and then they supplement that study with a course of study in teaching and languages teaching method (usually one year), which qualifies them to teach. Depending on the nature of individual programs, the teaching methodology courses approach prior knowledge of the language in different ways. Allowance may or may not be made, for example, for differences between students who have studied a language at tertiary level as beginners and those who have undertaken more advanced studies in languages. The Report found that, in general, courses do not systematically distinguish between different types of ‘non-beginners.’

In the second pattern, language study and language teaching methodology are integrated within the Education faculty in a longer (usually four year) course.

In the third pattern, which is similar in duration to the second, teachers study a language or languages in a separate section or faculty of the university (usually faculties of Arts or
Humanities), and the Education faculty supplements this study with appropriate units in languages teaching methodology. If a language is not available at a particular university, students are sometimes able to study it at another institution. The teaching methodology units are not usually offered until later years of the course.

The Nicholas Report notes that the largest group of students who take up these studies are graduates of Year 12 languages programs. Other groups include ‘beginner’ or languages students, who commence their languages studies ‘ab-initio’ at tertiary level, and ‘background’ speakers of the language.

Most prospective secondary school languages teachers follow the first pattern – three years of language study in a first degree followed by a one year graduate program, most commonly a Diploma of Education. Intending primary school teachers study language as part of the (usually four year) education degree that qualifies them to teach.

Nicholas et al (1993) identify ‘tension between language as an area of specialist understanding and language teaching being required to integrate with the general teaching of the general curriculum’ as a key issue for the pre-service education of languages teachers. These writers point out that while secondary school languages teachers have traditionally been seen as specialists in a particular language or languages, primary school teachers who teach languages are seen differently. They are seen either as specialist language teachers who have no responsibility for teaching other areas of the curriculum, or generalist teachers with varying degrees of proficiency in a language who are able to integrate the study of a language or languages into the general curriculum.

In the institutions surveyed as part of the Final Report on the Development of Standards for Teachers of Indonesian Project, Liddicoat et al (2005) found that students seeking to enrol as languages teachers enrol in one of three types of ‘awards’:

- A Bachelor of Education (primary) or Bachelor of Education (secondary) degree;
- A combined or double degree, typically a Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education, and
- A post-graduate degree, usually a one-year Diploma of Education, but also in some instances, a two year-post graduate Diploma or Master of Teaching degree.

Like the Nicholas Report (published some ten years earlier) the survey found that most prospective secondary languages teachers continue to take the Graduate Diploma of Education path. However, some Graduate Diploma courses now have a P-10 focus and are designed to meet the needs of primary and secondary teachers. Undergraduate bachelors’ degrees, whether completed singly or as double degrees, offer both primary and secondary specialisation (Liddicoat et al., 2005 p. 37).

Liddicoat et al (2005 p. 37) noted that the following components are typical of most undergraduate degree courses for prospective languages teachers:

- Language study units (4-6+ semester units per language);
- Units in other discipline areas and in education, with the emphasis varying according to the principal orientation of the degree;
- Language teaching curriculum units (1-3 semester units, depending on the degree of teaching specialisation in languages and the award);
- School experience (practicum) of between 45-100 days, depending on the degree course.

They also found that while several universities that prepare primary and secondary teachers, notably the University of Sydney and Monash University, offer discrete language curriculum units, the common trend seems to be for language teaching curriculum units to be generic in nature. They
also seem to be designed to cater for prospective teachers of a range of Asian and European languages (and sometimes also ESL) and different levels of teaching (primary, secondary and even tertiary) (Liddicoat et al., 2005 p. 39).

2.2.2 The practicum

*Top of the Class, the Report on the Inquiry into Teacher Education* prepared by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training (2007), (HRSC Report) presents the most recent information on the practicum component of teacher education courses. The discussion leading to recommendation 6 (pp 66-81) notes that, according to DEST’s *Survey of Final Year Teacher Education Students* (2006) requirements or expectations for State/Territory registration as a teacher are:

- ACT: a minimum of six weeks (30 days) supervised school teaching practice.
- VIC: a minimum of 45 days supervised teaching practice.
- NSW: no legal minimum but the Department of Education strongly advises a minimum of 20 days for Diploma of Education students (one year) and a minimum of 80 days for a four year qualification.
- NT: 45 days
- WA: a minimum of 45 days
- QLD: recommend not less than 100 days with a minimum of 80 days in schools and other equivalent educational settings
- SA: New legislation is being drafted. The usual is 80-100 days.
- TAS: 45 days (HRSC Report p. 68)

Many submissions to the report argued that the length of practicum should be increased. Many stressed that the quality of the practicum was more important than the number of days.

The Standing Committee found that most universities have ‘block placements’ in which students spend some weeks in a school. Other arrangements include placing students in schools one day a week over periods of one or two semesters, and ‘internships’ where students spend an extended period of time in one school (p. 69).

The Committee noted that the practicum is consistently rated highly by graduates, but that there are many problems. In summary these are listed as:

- A shortage of practicum placements and increasing reluctance on the part of many teachers to supervise practicum students. This problem is particularly acute in subject and geographical areas where there are teacher shortages.
- A ‘weak link’ between the practicum and theoretical components of teacher education courses, which is largely a result of poor communication between teacher education institutions and schools.
- Uneven quality of supervising and mentoring teachers
- Inadequate funding
- Difficulties with remote and rural placements

The Report tabled fourteen ‘desired characteristics’ of quality practice in the practicum as identified by Dr Vivian Eyers in a commissioned report for Teaching Australia (Eyers, 2005), noting that in order to achieve these characteristics, the partnership arrangements between universities and schools would need to improve. The report recommended that the Australian Government should establish a National Teacher Education Partnership Fund which should distribute up to $20 million per annum for three years, with subsequent funding determined on the basis of the achievements of the first three years (recommendation 6, p. 81).
2.2.3 Student enrolments and related research findings

The Survey of Final Year Teacher Education Students (Department of Education Science and Training, 2006) provides the most up to date information on the number of students whose courses qualified them to teach in a ‘specialist’ area. The target population for this survey was all final year education students who enrolled in courses for ‘Initial Teacher Training’ at Australian higher education institutions in 2005.

Almost half the participants in this survey (59 per cent) were enrolled in ‘Bachelor level’ courses. Of the remainder, 39 per cent were enrolled in ‘Graduate level’ courses (including Post Graduate Diploma, Post Graduate Bachelor, Masters and Graduate Certificate) and two per cent in ‘Combined courses’. Over half the respondents indicated that they would be qualified to teach a specific subject specialisation.

Other findings presented in this report that are relevant to the present study were:

- 82 per cent of respondents listed ‘wanted to make a difference’ as a major attraction to a teaching course;
- Respondents were most positive about the ‘value of the practicum’ when asked for their opinion on their teacher education experience. The vast majority (91 per cent) rated the value of the practicum as ‘above average’ or ‘excellent’.
- The majority (95 per cent) of respondents undertook ‘blocks of teaching practice where they spent all week in a school/classroom environment’ for the practical experience component of their teaching courses. Over half (56 per cent) undertook ‘formal observation sessions’ during their first year, and 31 per cent undertook regular formal observation sessions throughout their course, often during the first week of a practicum ‘block’.
- Practicum arrangements varied significantly according to institution. Almost two-thirds had their first experience of delivering a classroom lesson during their first year. Some students had their first classroom experience in the fourth year of their course.
- Respondents identified ‘experienced and enthusiastic supervising teachers and mentors who have been well-informed on their roles and responsibilities’ as the most important factor in gaining practical experience. Other factors such as ‘practicum blocks each semester’ and ‘a mix of observation and teaching days at schools throughout the course’ were also regarded as very important. The majority of students indicated that they had undertaken units in which the major subject area was Using ICT (71 percent), Literacy (67 per cent), Special Needs students (66 per cent) and Behaviour Management (64 per cent). The majority (80 per cent) indicated that they would consider teaching in rural/remote or hard-to-staff schools.
- The majority of respondents supported ‘national standards for teachers and school leaders’, ‘national school qualifications’ and ‘nationally consistent curriculum.’ They were less supportive of ‘knowledge and skills-based pay for teachers’ and ‘performance-based pay.’

2.2.4 Course quality

Data on the quality of teacher education

A search of Australian literature reveals few rigorous studies on the quality of teacher education. In Victoria, the recent report of the Parliamentary Education and Training Committee Inquiry (2005) into the suitability of Pre-Service Training, Step Up, Step In, Step Out, concluded that there is:
A wide variation in the standards within teacher education institutions and the skills and expertise of graduates of different courses (p. xviii).

This report also noted that there was little consistency across institutions in how they incorporated Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT) standards and Education Department guidelines into their courses. It also reported widespread dissatisfaction with the quality of teacher education currently being offered in Victoria.

Under the heading: Does the data on the quality of teacher education suggest a cause for concern? the HRSC Report noted that ‘recent surveys of beginning teachers and/or supervisors and principals present a mixed picture of the effectiveness of teacher education’ (p. 7)

The report provided the following information, based on available data:

A recent survey of beginning teachers (see Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training, 2007 p. 8) by the Australian Education Union (AEU) found that 38 per cent of respondents were satisfied with their pre-service education, 40 per cent rated it as preparing them ‘well’ or ‘very well’ for the reality of teaching and 22 per cent rated it as ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’:

- In a study on the transition of beginning teachers into teaching, beginning teachers and their supervisors were asked for a general assessment of how well teacher education courses prepare beginning teachers for their first year of teaching. The results showed that 29.6% of supervisors and 44.6% of teachers felt that teachers were prepared ‘well’ or ‘very well’; 45.2% of supervisors and 36.1% of teachers felt that teachers were prepared ‘adequately’; and 25% of supervisors and 19.3% of teachers felt teachers were ‘not very well’ or ‘poorly’ prepared.
- Figures taken from a recent survey of beginning teachers in Queensland as part of an evaluation of the Bachelor of Learning Management degree at Central Queensland University showed that 20-40% of new teachers ‘felt ill-prepared across a range of dimensions.’ Of the fifty eight items surveyed, principals believed that teachers had been well prepared in only eight.

In a range of other survey data, issues consistently raised included:

- Aspects of the school-based professional experience components of courses;
- The weakness of the link between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’;
- The perceived lack of relevance of some of the theoretical components of courses; and
- The capacity of beginning teachers to deal adequately with classroom management issues, to perform assessment and reporting tasks and to communicate with parents.

2.2.5 Funding of teacher education: current context

Since 2005, the Australian Government has funded universities and providers of higher education through annually negotiated funding agreements. Universities also receive funds through the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS). Since 2005, providers of higher education in areas other than teaching and nursing have been able to set the student contributions up to 25% above the 2004 HECS rates. Funds are distributed to ‘funding clusters’ which include ‘Education’ and ‘Foreign Languages, Visual and Performing Arts’ In 2005, the Australian Government introduced a practicum loading for education, which equated to $686 per Equivalent Full Time Student Load (EFTSL) (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Educational and Vocational Committee 2007, pp 104-105.)
The Commonwealth Contribution Amount (EFTS) for the Foreign Languages and Visual and Performing Arts funding cluster, in 2007 is $9037. The amount for the Education cluster is $7252.

In seeking evidence on the issue of funding of teacher education, the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Educational and Vocational Committee (HRSC Report 2007) found that the evidence was ‘very mixed’:

Many submissions suggested, mostly on the basis of anecdotal evidence, that funds for teacher education were in effect being used by universities to cross-subsidise other areas. The Committee also received evidence that suggested general satisfaction with internal funding arrangements. Some contributors suggested that education was being cross-subsidised by other areas of the university (Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training, 2007 p. 106).

The Committee concluded:

The issues of the adequacy of the funding of teacher education courses by university administrations was of enough concern for it to be included in the terms of reference for this inquiry. There is simply not enough transparency in the system to enable the Committee to make a proper assessment of the matter. That this is the case is itself a matter of concern (Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training, 2007 p. 107).

The HRSC Report notes that many submissions to the Committee’s enquiry expressed concerns about funding levels for teacher education:

All viewed the funding level as inadequate and many singled the issue out as the most important in the inquiry. Submissions described the inadequacy of funding as having serious consequences for teacher education. These include: a significant rise in staff-student ratios; increased workloads of staff; limiting capacity to build strong partnerships with schools; limiting capacity to innovate; limiting the number of places that can be offered in teacher education; limiting the capacity to properly resource the school experience component of the courses; preventing maximising the use of information and communications technologies; and hampering the ability to attract quality staff (p. 108).

A number of submissions to the HRSC Report claimed that funding for education programs had never reflected the real costs of preparing teachers. One submission (University of Western Sydney, submission No 152, p. 11) claimed that funding was based on a ‘chalk and talk notation’ of teaching, and failed to allow for significant expenditure on resources, especially ICT technology. This and many other submissions also noted a severe shortfall in funding for the practicum.

The HRSC Report stated (p. 110) that, as part of the Our Universities: Backing Australia’s Future package of higher education reforms, teaching had been identified as an initial key area of national priority. One of the measures put in place to support this move was to fix the student contribution rate for unites of study undertaken in education at 2004 levels (indexed). The financial consequence of this ‘capping’ of HECS is that teacher education has been disadvantaged in relation to other areas of study.

The Committee recommended (Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training, 2007 Report Recommendation 11, p. 113), that the Australian Government should commission an evaluation of the effect on teacher education courses of
capping the student contribution rate. It also recommended, as part of the same recommendation, that the Commonwealth Contribution Amount for an EFTSL in the Education cluster should be increased from $7,241 to $9,037, the same as for the Foreign Languages, Visual and Performing Arts cluster. It recommended further that the Australian Government should ‘review the mechanism for determining the level of funding that the Australian government contributes towards student places in different disciplines and develop an alternative mechanism which more accurately reflect the real costs of delivering those places’ (p. 113)

The HRSC Report noted major concerns about the practicum loading, introduced in 2005, which is allocated on the basis of ‘taught load.’ Many Education courses have only have only 50% of the full taught load of Education courses, yet they bear 100% of the cost of the practicum. As submission 55 from the University of Ballarat stated:

If Education courses were taught totally within the Faculties of Education they’d be getting much more per student for the practicum costs yet they’d be doing the same amount of practicum.

The Committee recommended (Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training, 2007 Report Recommendation 12, p. 117) that the Australian Government should examine the cost of providing the practicum and increase the amount of the loading to fully reflect practicum costs. It also recommended that the amount of funding for the practicum should be calculated on the basis of quantum of placement rather than taught load, and that the Government should ‘pay the practicum component separately to universities and require them to acquit it separately as part of their financial reporting requirements’ (HRSC Report p.117).

The Australian Government announced in the 2007 Budget that it would be providing an additional $77 million to universities over the next four years to improve teacher education programs so that all three and four year bachelor degree teacher education students receive a minimum of 120 days in-school teaching experience, and meet new entry level teaching standards. (See Budget media release at http://www.dest.gov.au/ministers/bishop/budget07/bud24_07.htm)

2.2.6 Approaches to teaching languages: relationship between the various approaches and pre-service education for languages teachers

What teachers learn as part of their teacher education courses obviously relates closely to what they will eventually need to know, value and be able to do, in order to work effectively with their own students in their own classrooms. This in turn depends upon research-based and practical knowledge about how languages are best taught and learnt.

Before the ‘communicative revolution’, which originated in Britain in the 1970s, most classroom languages teachers used mainly ‘grammar translation’ or ‘audio lingual’ methods. Not surprisingly, these methods were also the focus of teacher education courses. While these methods were, in some ways, suited to the ‘academic’ students who took languages to Matriculation level in those days, they ‘blatantly failed to produce learners with sufficient competence to be able to speak a foreign language’ (Klein, 2002).

As the shortcomings of these approaches became obvious, a major shift occurred, in which the main goal of languages learning was defined as enabling students to be communicatively competent:

Whereas the explicit aim of grammar-based foreign language syllabuses was to familiarise foreign language learners with the structures and forms of the target language, communicatively-oriented, or functional-notional syllabuses (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983) placed major emphasis on the communicative purposes(s) of a
particular speech act. They focused on what people want to do or what they want to achieve through speech (Klein, 2002 p. 3).

New teaching approaches that emphasised active and purposeful use of the language followed this shift, and these became the ‘communicative’ approaches that were, and are still, taught in most teacher education courses for languages teachers. These communicative approaches, however, proved to be not altogether the unqualified success their proponents had claimed. To correct deficiencies in languages comprehension and oral proficiency that were becoming apparent in primary school children in English schools, a module *language awareness* was introduced into the (English) primary school curriculum in 1984 (Hawkins, 1984).

The concept of language awareness was eventually developed in other countries, including Germany and France (Bourgnignon & Candelier, 1984; Gnutzman, 1995, 1997). Rampillion and Zimmermann (1997) included the concept in their training course. These writers identified aspects of awareness: ‘language awareness’, which referred to meta-cognitive reflections on language learning; ‘communicative awareness’ (communication strategies); and ‘learning awareness’ (awareness and knowledge of how language is processed and inferences are made).

Researchers continue to debate the precise nature and applications of language awareness, but there is general agreement that developing an understanding of its meaning and applications is an important part of the professional knowledge base of languages teachers. For this reason, the study of ‘language awareness’ is included in most teacher education courses for languages teachers.

### 2.2.7 Intercultural language learning

Intercultural language learning is a key development in languages learning in the twenty-first century. This concept underpins the MCEETYA National Statement and National Plan.

While study of ‘culture’ has long been a traditional component of most languages syllabuses, it is only comparatively recently that the achievement of ‘intercultural competence’ has been recognised as a major aim of language learning and teaching. Kramsch (1993) makes the critical distinction between simply *knowing about* another culture and knowing the culture from within through learning the language. Byram (2000 p. 2) conceptualises a person who has ‘some degree of intercultural competence’ as one who can see relationships among different cultures and can interpret or ‘mediate’ them in terms of each other. Byram identifies five ‘elements’ of intercultural competence:

1. **Attitudes:** curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one’s own
2. **Knowledge:** of social groups and their products and practices in one’s own and in one’s interlocutor’s country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction
3. **Skills of interpreting and relating:** ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents from one’s own
4. **Skills of discovery and interaction:** ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to impart knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction
5. **Critical cultural awareness/political education:** an ability to evaluate critically, and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and product in ones own and other cultures and countries.

Byram (1997) traces the origins of the concept of intercultural competence in the Anglophone world to Hymes’ critique of Chomsky and, in the Germanaphone literature, by Habermas. Hymes was concerned with analysing social interaction and communication within one language and group. Application of the basic ideas of the intercultural concept of languages learning across more
than one language and culture was taken up by other writers, including Canale and Swain (1980) in North America and van Ek (1986) in Europe.

Byram notes (1997 p. 31) that many ‘complexities’ have become apparent in scholarly debates around notions of intercultural competence, and that these should not be forgotten. However, he is adamant about the need to develop a model for intercultural competence that is ‘accessible to and useful for teachers of foreign languages working within particular traditions and conceptualisations of their role as instructors and educators.’

Byram (1997 p. 70) draws an important distinction between Intercultural Competence and Intercultural Communicative Competence. Individuals can express Intercultural Competence while using their own language. These individuals can prove themselves to be interculturally competent by showing a full understanding and appreciation of cultural difference, by using relevant skills and knowledge, and by enjoying intercultural interaction. Byram argues that the experience of learning a language will be useful in situations that require Intercultural Competence, even though the person may not be using that language on a particular occasion. The examples he provides are useful for understanding the concept – using a translated document which requires knowledge of the other culture in order to interpret its meaning accurately; or using legal documents, business agreements, dubbed television programs or even food recipes.

Intercultural Communicative Competence, on the other hand, says Byram, occurs when a person interacts with someone from another culture in a foreign language. This involves, of course, much more than using grammatically correct language:

They are able to negotiate a mode of communication and interaction which is satisfactory to themselves and the other and they are able to act as mediator between people of different cultural origins. Their knowledge of another culture is linked to their language competence through their ability to use language appropriately – sociolinguistic and discourse competence – and their awareness of the specific meaning, values and connotations of the language. They also have a basis for acquiring new languages and cultural understandings as a consequence of the skills they have acquired in the first (Byram, 1997 p. 71).

Lo Bianco et al (Lo Bianco et al., 1999 p. 11) agree that languages learning is not the only way to achieve intercultural competence. However, they argue strongly that learning a second language ‘can certainly claim to be the most complete and versatile tool available to understand and to experience how language and culture shape one’s and others’ world views’. The aims of ‘multicultural’ education - tolerance, peace and cross cultural understanding mean that certain changes in personal cultural/linguistic behaviour are necessary. These kinds of changes are ‘more likely to occur through intercultural language teaching than multicultural education divorced from language study.’

The Report on intercultural language learning (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003) was commissioned by the Australian Government to ‘investigate and disseminate research on good practice for the integration of socio-cultural elements into language teaching’ (p.2). It addresses ‘the interrelationship of languages and cultures in the learning, teaching assessment and evaluation of languages in Australian schools,’ arguing that a critical dimension of understanding language in use is that language is inseparable from its social and cultural context (p.1).

This report provides a framework for designing intercultural language learning curriculum, based on five principles: ‘active construction, making connections, social interaction, reflection and responsibility. It states that:
Ultimately, intercultural language learning involves teachers developing an overall stance, a way of thinking and doing in relation to curriculum, teaching, learning, assessing, and evaluating languages and encouraging such a stance in students, towards the development of intercultural sensitivity (p. 1).

Liddicoat et al analysed curriculum documents used in each State and Territory to determine the extent and nature of cultural learning content. They found that approaches across the various documents were not consistent and that they generally lacked a coherent framework for conceptualising language and culture. They concluded that:

There is clearly a need for an explicit conceptual framework which promotes teachers’ engagement with an intercultural language teaching approach to curriculum, teaching, learning, and assessment. Such a framework can also provide a basis for further work in understanding how such learning develops over time and according to context.

The report pointed to a need for more research on the nature of the acquisition of intercultural competence and also to the need to develop suitable resources for school curriculum programs. It stated that intercultural teaching and learning should be part of teachers’ professional learning:

Professional learning is an essential part of the development of intercultural language teaching and learning and teachers have indicated that it is essential for the implementation of intercultural language teaching and learning in the classroom. For this to be effective intercultural language teaching and learning needs to be addressed in both pre-service and in-service professional learning programs (p. 100).

In their discussion of languages teachers’ ‘content knowledge’, Liddicoat et al (2005) point out that traditional conceptions have emphasised ‘language proficiency’ at the expense of more complex and sophisticated notions of the expertise required of languages teachers. Linguistic accuracy, they argue, is only one component of proficiency: the experience of learning, using and ‘knowing’ a second language provides an individual with a kind and level of language knowledge that is different from that of a native speaker of the language. A person who has had the experience of acquiring another language ‘knows experientially what is involved in using a second language for communication, and how to communicate using a more limited language proficiency.’ (Liddicoat et al., 2005 p. 9)

For this reason, they suggest, attempts to measure teacher proficiency solely on the basis of language proficiency are misplaced. If language teaching is about more than the transmission of the linguistic code, teachers’ knowledge must include an intercultural dimension. (Liddicoat et al., 2005 p. 9)

2.2.8 Major imperatives for developing intercultural competence

It is not by accident that the notion of striving for intercultural competence has assumed such importance for the teaching and learning of languages at this point in world history. Crozet et al (1999) identify two major imperatives of modern times that are contributing to the general recognition of its significance: - multiculturalism and globalisation.

These writers see multiculturalism as a necessary result of ‘vast movements of people that will be recognised by future historians as one of the defining features of the twentieth century.’ (Lo Bianco et al., 1999 p. 6) As the idea of preserving an ‘uncontested’ national culture becomes increasingly unsustainable, they argue, so the need to develop intercultural understanding among the citizens of the multi-culture becomes stronger.
Previously national education systems, and indeed foreign language teaching, assumed that education and national language education in particular was solely concerned with inculcating a secure, uncontested national culture. This assumption is no longer reliable since many nations are defining themselves as multicultural. For these reasons, curricula and language teaching programs aim to include among the languages that are offered languages spoken ‘within’ the national community by minorities. For reasons of advancing intercultural communication and harmony, language education programs are asked to serve these wider social goals. So in addition to ‘grammar’/language per se these programs are now expected to enhance cultural relations and cultural understanding among fellow citizens. (Lo Bianco et al., 1999 p. 6)

The second major imperative is ‘globalisation’, conceptualised by Crozet et al as ‘the manifold ways in which the nations of the world are becoming enmeshed in a single global system’. National and international institutions, especially financial markets have become so ‘enmeshed’, say these writers, that economists, business people and financial planners now speak of the ‘borderless world (Ohmae, 1994). The Chaos Theory notion of a butterfly flapping its wings in one part of the world and setting off an earthquake in another would seem, they suggest, to be ‘literally true’ for the stock markets. Globalisation extends well beyond financial spheres into areas such as education, tourism, entertainment, cinema, publications and music.

At innumerable levels, previously discrete systems of endeavour are being meshed into hybrid new varieties influenced by the instantaneous capacity for communication via the telecommunications revolution. (Ohmae, 1994 p. 7)

Crozet et al argue that these two forces have intersected with concerns of language teachers and linguists to move culture from the periphery to the centre of languages teaching and learning. One reason for the limited success of language teaching, they suggest, may well be that ‘culture’ has been misunderstood as either ‘exotic’ or as ‘high’ culture, able to be taught separately from language.

These observations are relevant in English-speaking countries which, like Australia, have historically been slow to accept the need to develop intercultural communicative competence in their citizens. New understandings about the importance of languages are evident in the United States of America, for example:

The United States is inextricably linked to economic, social, political, and cultural realities around the world. Possession of the linguistic and cultural insights that come with study of world languages other than English is a requisite for citizens in the twenty-first century who wish to participate in the global community and marketplace and the worldwide neighbourhood.

Cultural pluralism continues to characterise and enrich the United States. The diverse student body that finds its way to the nation’s schools not only represents exciting challenges to educators but also is a valuable resource that affords the nation an opportunity to maintain and enhance its linguistic and cultural richness. (NBPTS, 2001 p. 1)

The project: Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning in Practice (ILTLP) encompasses a practical and structured approach to teacher professional development. Developed and managed by the Research Centre for Languages and Cultures Education (RCLCE) at the University of South Australia, and funded by the former DEST, the project aims to extend teachers’ understanding of and engagement in intercultural languages learning. The project involves primary and secondary
languages teachers, academics, researchers, educational administrators and the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations as the national professional body. It runs from July 2006 to December 2007.

Further information and comprehensive set of printed materials has been developed to support to project. The online resources are available on the project website. (http://www.iltlp.unisa.edu.au)

2.3 What Should Teachers of Languages Know and Be Able To Do? Implications for Languages Teacher Education Courses

2.3.1 The professional knowledge base

Teacher education programs for languages teachers critically need to reflect the best of what is known about teaching in general, and languages teaching in particular. This involves incorporating new knowledge generated from both research and ‘the wisdom of practice’ (Shulman, 1986). The development of a knowledge base of teaching, however, has been slow and problematic. Studies by Jackson (1968); Lortie (1975); Little (1990; Little, 1993); Grant & Sleeter (1985); Rosenholtz (1989), and Huberman (1993) found little evidence of shared knowledge or ‘a technical culture’ among teachers. McAninch (1993) coined the expression: ‘clinical consciousness’ to describe teachers’ ‘worldview’ as being characterised by pragmatism, individualism and a general disinclination to develop or share new knowledge. This orientation, she said, ‘has several specific weaknesses that greatly limit the capacity of individual teachers and the occupation as a whole to advance. (McAninch, 1993 p.60)

In a seminal work, Shulman (1987 p. 12) claimed that much of the ‘proposed’ knowledge base of teaching was yet to be discovered. There was sufficient reason to believe, he said, that the knowledge base of teaching was still at a relatively primitive stage:

Our current ‘blueprint’ for the knowledge base of teaching has many cells or categories with only the most rudimentary place holders, much like the chemist’s periodic table of half a century ago. As we proceed, we will know that something in principle can be known about a particular aspect of teaching, but we will not know yet what that principle of practice entails. At base, however, we believe that scholars and expert teachers are able to define, describe, and reproduce ‘good teaching’. (Shulman, 1987, p. 12)

Fenstermacher (1994 p. 15), acknowledged the work of Shulman and its part in ‘launching’ the extensive research program that attempted to find an answer to the question of what knowledge is essential to teaching. Teacher knowledge, he said, has both ‘formal’ (similar to Shulman’s ‘scholarly research’) and ‘practical’ (‘wisdom of practice’) aspects. Teachers are both producers and users of knowledge about teaching. We have not acknowledged existing teachers’ knowledge, he claimed, quoting Clandinin (1986 pp. 8-9), partly because of our failure to recognise and to develop ways of thinking about the knowledge teachers derive from practice. The critical epistemological point is that both formal and practical knowledge about teaching, if they are to count as knowledge, must be justified:

There is much merit in believing that teachers know a great deal and in seeking to learn what they know, but that merit is corrupted and demeaned when it is implied that this knowledge is not subject to justification or cannot or should not be justified. The challenge for teacher knowledge research is not simply one of showing us that teachers think, believe, or have opinions but that they know. And even more importantly, that they know that they know. (Fenstermacher, 1994 p. 51)
2.3.2 The five core principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

The policy statement of the United States National Board for Professional Teaching Standards *What Teachers Should Know and be Able to Do* goes some way towards establishing a professional knowledge base for teaching. It identifies, in a generic sense, five critical ‘principles’ of exemplary teaching practice, on the basis of which more specific attributes can be extrapolated. They are:

1. **Teachers are committed to students and their learning.**

Accomplished teachers are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They act on the belief that all students can learn. They treat students equitably, recognising the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and taking account of these differences in their practice. They adjust their practice, as appropriate, on the basis of observation and knowledge of their students’ interests, abilities, skills, knowledge, family circumstances and peer relationships.

Accomplished teachers understand how students develop and learn. They incorporate the prevailing theories of cognition and intelligence in their practice. They are aware of the influence of context and culture on behaviour. They develop students’ cognitive capacity and their respect for learning. Equally important, they foster students’ self-esteem, motivation, character, civic responsibility and their respect for individual, cultural, religious and racial differences.

2. **Teachers know the subjects they teach, and how to teach those subjects to students.**

Accomplished teachers have a rich understanding of the subject(s) they teach and appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organised, linked to other disciplines and applied to real-world settings. While faithfully representing the collective wisdom of our culture and upholding the value of disciplinary knowledge, they also develop the critical and analytical capacities of their students.

Accomplished teachers command specialised knowledge of how to convey and reveal subject matter to students. They are aware of the preconceptions and background knowledge that students typically bring to each subject and of strategies and instructional materials that can be of assistance. They understand where difficulties are likely to arise and modify their practice accordingly. Their instructional repertoire allows them to create multiple paths to the subjects they teach, and they are adept at teaching students how to pose and solve their own problems.

3. **Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.**

Accomplished teachers create, enrich, maintain, and alter instructional settings to capture and sustain the interest of their students and to make the most effective use of time. They are also adept at engaging students and adults to assist their teaching and at enlisting their colleagues’ knowledge and expertise to complement their own.

Accomplished teachers command a range of generic instructional techniques, and know when to employ them, and can implement them as needed. They are devoted to high quality practice and know how to offer each student the opportunity to succeed.

Accomplished teachers know how to engage groups of students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organise instruction so as to meet the schools’ goals for students. They are adept at setting norms for social interaction among students and
between students and teachers. They understand how to motivate students to learn and how to maintain their interest even in the face of temporary setbacks.

Accomplished teachers can assess the progress of individual students as well as that of the class as a whole. They employ multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding and can clearly explain student performance to students, parents and administrators.

4. **Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.**

Accomplished teachers are models of educated persons, exemplifying the virtues they seek to inspire in students – curiosity, tolerance, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity and appreciation of cultural differences. They demonstrate capacities that are prerequisite for intellectual growth: the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation.

Accomplished teachers draw on their knowledge of human development, subject matter and instruction, and their understanding of their students to make principled judgements about sound practice. Their decisions are not only grounded in the literature, but also in their experience. They engage in lifelong learning, which they seek to encourage in their students.

Striving to strengthen their teaching, accomplished teachers examine their practice critically, expand their repertoire, deepen their knowledge, sharpen their judgment and adapt their teaching to new findings, ideas and theories.

5. **Teachers are members of learning communities.**

Accomplished teachers contribute to the effectiveness of the school by working collaboratively with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development. They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of school resources in light of their understanding of state and local educational objectives. They are knowledgeable about specialised school and community resources that can be engaged for their students’ benefit, and are skilled at employing such resources as needed.

Accomplished teachers find ways to work collaboratively and creatively with parents, engaging them productively in the work of the school.

Most work in the field of professional teaching standards, including Australian initiatives of subject teachers’ associations, employers and teacher registration authorities, can be traced, directly or indirectly, to the seminal work of Shulman and the NBPTS.

2.3.3 **The place and meaning of subject content knowledge**

The second NBPTS principle is of particular interest to those who are involved in developing courses for prospective teachers of languages. It reflects the research findings (Hill, Rowan and Ball, 2005), (Hawley & Valli, 1999), that teachers who have a sound knowledge of the subject they teach are more effective than those who do not.

The curriculum of all teacher education courses should (but often does not) include knowledge of subject content, since this is part of the core of what successful languages teachers need to know and understand. However, the question of what kinds of subject content knowledge should be included in a professional knowledge base for language teachers is still somewhat contested, with some writers emphasising certain elements, e.g. language proficiency, over others. Having agreed
standards, developed by and for the profession, is one way of establishing consensus about what should ‘count’ as the subject content knowledge of languages teachers.

### 2.3.4 Models of a knowledge base for languages teachers

The five NBPTS principles form a platform upon which professional teaching standards in many subjects and for different levels of schooling have been developed. The NBPTS *Standards for World Languages Other Than English* build upon this platform to articulate a knowledge base for accomplished languages language teachers which is the result of a broad consensus reached by the professional teachers of languages across the USA. These standards, which are aligned with the standards of the American National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and standards prepared by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), are discussed in detail below.

Day and Conklin (1992) proposed that a knowledge base for second languages teachers (using English in this example) would have four ‘types of knowledge’:

1. **Content knowledge** of the subject matter (what ESL/EFL teachers teach; e.g., English language) as represented by courses in syntax, semantics, phonology and pragmatics and literary and cultural aspects of the English language.
2. **Pedagogic knowledge**: knowledge of generic teaching strategies, beliefs and practices, regardless of the focus of the subject matter (how we teach); e.g. classroom management, motivation, decision making.
3. **Pedagogic content knowledge**: the specialised knowledge of how to represent content knowledge in diverse ways that students can understand; the knowledge of how students come to understand the subject matter, what difficulties they are likely to encounter when learning it, what misconceptions interfere with learning, and how to overcome these problems.
4. **Support knowledge**: the knowledge of the various disciplines that inform our approach to the teaching and learning of English: e.g. psycholinguistics, linguistics, second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, research methods.

Day examined four models of teacher education courses in relation to the four identified ‘knowledges’ of the ‘knowledge base’ of second language teacher education:

- The Apprentice-Expert Model
- The Rationalist Model
- The Case Studies Model
- The Integrative Model

Quoting Ur (1992) and Wallace (1991), Day noted that the ‘rationalist’ model which was described by Ur as the ‘rationalist learn the theory and apply it model’ is ‘probably still the most prevalent model underlying most training or education programs for the professions...’ (Wallace, 1991 p. 8). Writing about second language teacher education courses, he expressed concerns about the separation of research from practice that occurs under this model:

Under this model, a rather unusual situation has developed. Those who are engaged in teacher education are not the ones who actually teach English. These persons, often located in universities, are involved in creating and teaching the knowledge base but they have relatively little direct contact with the practice of teaching English. Perhaps as a result of both the location - universities – and the task – the creation of teaching of a knowledge base – a status distinction has evolved (R. Day, 1993 p. 6).
While he found the rationalist model to be ‘an excellent source of content and support knowledge’, Day found that it had serious shortcomings in relation to pedagogic knowledge, as it relied too heavily on developing students’ theoretical understanding of pedagogic content knowledge, without providing sufficient opportunities for practical experience. He argued for a model which would integrate the four models discussed in his paper:

I propose that the ideal curriculum for a second language teacher education program is one which integrates experiential and received knowledge in some systematic fashion. The integrative approach, which combines aspects of the apprentice –expert, the rationalist and the case studies models with reflective practice, comes the closest to having this potential.

The integrative model can systematically incorporate the strengths of the other three models, allowing us to ensure an adequate coverage of the four types of knowledge that form the knowledge base. In addition, it offers our students an approach to practicing their profession that could last them for a lifetime of professional growth and development.

Freeman and Johnson (1998) argue for a reconceptualisation of the knowledge base of teacher education that focuses on three ‘domains’ (a) the nature of the teacher-learner, (b) the nature of schools and schooling and (c) the nature of language teaching, ‘which includes pedagogical thinking and activity, the subject matter and the content, and language learning’, (Freeman & Johnson, 1998 p. 106). A major concern of these writers is to overcome the ‘compartmentalisation’ of the knowledge base of professional preparation programs for languages teachers which they ‘suspect’ occurs in North American Universities. They emphasise the importance of teacher-learners’ experiential knowledge, reflection, and the influence of sociocultural processes on second language learning:

To thus articulate this knowledge base, we as teacher educators must begin with the activity of language teaching and learning; the school and classroom contexts in which it is practiced, and the experience, knowledge, and beliefs of the teacher as a participant. However, insofar as teaching and what is taught are inseparable, we must also understand what makes our teaching language teaching. This will undoubtedly involve discipline-derived understandings from applied linguistics, SLA, psychology, and curriculum development, among other areas, in a deeper examination of our subject matter – language – as it becomes classroom content. (Freeman & Johnson, 1998 p. 412)

Wright & Bolitho (1997) identify two aspects of the content knowledge of language teachers: Language teachers, they claim, need to be:

(a) proficient users and  
(b) skilled analysts of the language.

A proficient user of a language is able to read and speak a language as a competent user. A skilled analyst has knowledge of syntax, lexical properties, generic structures, pragmatic realisations and literacy conventions.

To these two aspects, Ellis (2003) adds two more:

(c)The teacher’s knowledge/experience of formal learning of the content (English or a second language) and  
(d) The teacher’s knowledge of a second language and second language use.
Ellis points out that a native speaker’s knowledge of content (the language) is acquired differently from that of teachers of other disciplines. The knowledge and experience that native speakers bring to the teaching of language are, therefore, different from the knowledge and experience of a non-native speaker who has learnt a language as a second language, or from the knowledge and experience of another subject:

Teachers of biology must have acquired knowledge about biology as learners in order to teach it...they have essentially travelled the same route as their students, going from a state of knowing little of the subject matter to a state of expertise in it. ...It is not possible to have ‘biology as a first language’, so the content has inevitably been learned in a conscious way. (Ellis, 2003 p. 5)

Ellis argues that the experience of learning a second language and the actual knowledge of a second language are likely to be ‘a rich source of insights’ for a teacher of languages. This concept of ‘insight’:

...incorporates Clandinin and Connelly’s (1987 p. 490) ‘personal practical knowledge: knowledge which is experiential, embodied, and reconstructed out of the narratives of a teacher’s life... An insight is an understanding gained from personal experience that allows us to see how previously understood realities could be different. It illuminates something previously unseen, makes sense of something previously gained from personal experience that allows us to see how previously understood realities could be different... A sociolinguistic example is of a person who grows up in Australia speaking a first language other than English and encountering English for the first time at primary school, and who will have different insights about language, about family and about schooling than a person who grew up speaking English from birth. If both of those people then enrol in a TESOL course and study second language acquisition and bilingualism, we might expect the insights derived from their experiences to interact differently with the theoretical knowledge they gain from lectures and from reading, and hence influence the formation of their professional beliefs. (Ellis, 2003 p. 10)

These insights, along with knowledge and beliefs, become important aspects of the knowledge base.

2.3.5 The place of language proficiency in the professional knowledge base for languages teaching

In virtually all considerations of a knowledge base for teachers of languages, language itself is a focus point and a key element of content. It would appear to be beyond question that those who learn to become teachers of a language should aim to become competent readers, writers and speakers of the language. However, as the discussions above demonstrate, many writers see language proficiency as a necessary but not sufficient component of the knowledge base. Nor is the notion of proficiency a single or simple concept As noted by Liddicoat et al (2005 p. 7), with reference to Chastain, (1989):

linguistic accuracy is only one component of proficiency and the assumption that there exists a unitary proficiency is a fundamentally flawed understanding of the nature of linguistic competence.

It is important to note that a knowledge base has no validity until it is shared and accepted among members of a profession. Virtually anyone can suggest elements of a knowledge base for languages teachers – and there have been many attempts. But it is only when such elements can
demonstrate a sound basis in research and professional practice, and when they have been collaboratively accepted by members of a profession that they can be truly said to have progressed beyond a ‘folk wisdom’ stage to become constituent parts of a genuine professional knowledge base which will underpin the content of teacher education courses and provide consistency across jurisdictions and institutions. This critical point is taken up further in the discussion on standards, below.

2.4 ‘Quality Teaching’ ‘Good Teaching’ and ‘Successful Teaching’ - Implications for Pre-Service Languages Teacher Education Programs

Consideration of the question of what constitutes ‘quality’ in teaching is important to those who develop language teacher education courses. Scriven’s observation that ‘conceptually incompetent researchers’ build vast research programs on ‘a foundation of conceptual sand’ can also be applied to the development of teacher education courses, which need to build on firm conceptual foundations and understandings of what is meant by ‘quality’ in teaching. (Scriven, 1988)

Liddicoat et al (2005) distinguish between ‘quality teachers’ and ‘quality teaching’. The first, they say, refers to ‘issues relevant to teachers’ knowledge and practices in languages teaching, while the second ‘sees that effective teaching relies on many factors of which the knowledge base of teachers is only one.’ (Liddicoat et al., 2005 p. 6).

Highly skilled teachers may be prevented from offering quality teaching by the situations in which they find themselves working – their teaching conditions, the fragmented nature of their employment, the restrictions placed on their language programs by timetabling, resources etc. (Liddicoat et al., 2005 p. 6)

This issue has been comprehensively examined in an influential article by Fenstermacher and Richardson (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005).

The authors set out to define ‘quality’ teaching and ways in which it may be recognised:

What constitutes the keen insight and quality judgement needed to pick out instances of quality teaching? Can we unpack the conceptual subtleties of quality teaching so that we can proceed in consistent and systematic ways to identify and foster it, or are we required instead to acknowledge its elusive nature and depend on some sort of cultivated intuition to reveal quality teaching?

While cautioning against ‘sliding’ into the conceptual fallacy that teaching could only be said to be occurring when students were learning, these writers suggest that quality teaching might entail successful teaching, i.e. teaching that had caused learning to occur:

Quality teaching could be understood as teaching that produces learning. In other words, there can indeed be a task sense of teaching, but any assertion that such teaching is quality teaching depends on students learning what the teachers is teaching, To keep these ideas clearly sorted, we label this sense of teaching successful teaching. (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005)

If we accept Fenstermacher et al’s argument that quality teaching entails at least some degree of ‘successful’ student learning it will be important to be clear about what we expect in terms of that learning. What do we want languages students to be successful in? No-one can make a judgement about ‘success’ if the goals of learning are unclear in the first place. And if the goals for student learning are not clear, the goals of teacher education courses will also be unclear.
2.5 Professional Teaching Standards

As previously noted in this paper, the teaching profession has long suffered from the uncertainty of its knowledge base, and this has had serious consequences for courses that prepare teachers to practise their profession. Historically, the take-up of research and innovation in teaching has been inadequate, and there has been uncertainty about what teachers should be expected to keep up with. Few, if any, recognisable structures or vehicles through which the knowledge base could be developed and codified have been established. Significantly, the problem of how to achieve a research and practice based consensus on what constitutes quality in teaching has not yet been satisfactorily resolved. This is particularly the case for languages teaching, largely because the area is so complex and diverse, but also because the often isolated conditions in which languages teachers work make it difficult to achieve the necessary consensus on the scope and content of the knowledge base.

Professional teaching standards are, arguably, the most effective means yet developed to describe the knowledge skills and dispositions that are required for effective teaching. As such, they lie at the heart of what pre-service teachers need to learn in their pre-service training. Writers of teaching standards articulate a vision of quality learning that guides the detailed work of describing what teachers should know, believe and be able to do. A nationally consistent vision of teaching, expressed in research based, professionally agreed teaching standards, provides a platform for the development of nationally consistent, high quality teacher education courses.

2.5.1 From competencies to standards

Following the work of Shulman (1986; 1987), awareness of the complexity and sophistication of teachers’ work has grown exponentially. Older lists of competencies that contained items such as: ‘uses a range of teaching strategies’ are now seen to be inadequate representations of the expertise that good teachers bring to the classroom. Modern standards writers constantly press researchers about the latest research developments. They understand the complexity that standards must reflect if they are to be an effective guide to professional learning.

Interest in teaching standards gained momentum in the 1990s. In some cases, this was because of the inspirational nature of standards that started to appear in the 1980s from teacher subject associations such as the National Council for the Teaching of Mathematics (NCTM) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) in the USA. The NCTM was one of the first to develop teaching standards designed to support the implementation of its demanding curriculum standards.

This research and development work on standards also made it clearer that accomplished teaching was the outcome of a long-term process of professional learning and experience, not a bundle of personality traits. The research showed that the capacity to assess teaching performance against standards, whether self- or peer-assessment, was the gateway to more useful feedback and more effective professional learning for teachers.

2.5.2 Teaching standards and the profession of teaching in Australia: the involvement of teachers’ professional associations

The level of activity and debate on profession-wide standards accelerated in the new millennium. In Australia, teacher subject associations in English, literacy, mathematics and science were successful in gaining grants from the Australian Research Council to develop advanced teaching standards and investigate methods for using those standards as a guide to professional learning and the assessment of practice (e.g. Ingvarson & Wright, 1999).
The Australian College of Educators built on this work and orchestrated a major collaborative effort over three years in pursuit of a common and unifying approach to teaching standards. This work was brought together in the *National Statement from the Teaching Profession on Teacher Standards, Quality and Professionalism (The National Statement)*, agreed to by more than twenty teacher associations and unions in May 2003. The *National Statement* sets out a valuable list of principles to guide the development of standards by the profession. It makes the point that *standards are tools for action* – tools with which the profession can exercise greater responsibility for the quality of teaching and learning in schools.

### 2.5.3 Recent developments at national, state and territory levels

In 2002, the Ramsey report, *Quality Matters: Revitalising teaching: critical times, critical choices*, was published by the New South Wales Department of Education (Ramsey, 2002). By emphasising the need to provide quality opportunities for students to learn, it emphasised the fundamental dependence of government on teacher commitment to, and ownership of, professional standards. This entailed recognition that there was an irreducible shared responsibility between government and the profession to ensure that students received quality opportunities for learning:

> Good teaching does not come through imposed requirements but through the individual teachers’ commitment to high professional standards. The important changes needed in teaching are those that teachers must make for themselves. They are not changes that governments can mandate or unions can achieve through their industrial activities. [The way] to revitalise teaching is to make it possible for teachers to draw on the deep well of their own professionalism (Ramsey, 2002).

**State teacher registration bodies**

While several Australian states have required teachers to be registered with a registration authority since at least the 1970s, major developments in the area of teacher registration and standards development have occurred in recent years. Over the past decade, most Australian state education authorities have strengthened the legislation related to existing registration authorities or have established new authorities. The new bodies include Institutes and Colleges of teaching with remit to promote the professional interests of teachers and protect the interests of the community in matters related to education. The Victorian Institute of Teaching, for example, is the statutory authority for the regulation and promotion of the teaching profession in Victoria. It was established by an Act of Parliament in 2001 and its functions are typical of these authorities. These functions include:

- Registration to ensure only qualified teachers are employed in Victorian schools
- Promotion of the profession of teaching to the wider community
- Procedures for renewal of registration
- Working with teachers to develop standards of professional practice
- Supporting teachers in their first year of teaching with a structured induction program
- Approving and accrediting pre-service teacher education courses that prepare teachers
- Investigation of instances of serious misconduct, serious incompetence or lack of fitness to teach.

While the respective legislation is different in different states, each registration body has been given the power and responsibility to register teachers who are employed, or who seek employment, in the public and private education sectors. Registration is based on professional standards established by each body. In 2005 these bodies came together to form the Australasian Forum of Teacher Registration and Accreditation Agencies (AFTRAA), which gained official recognition from MCEETYA in 2006. Mutual recognition agreements are now in place among
AFTRAA members, so that a teacher registered in one state or territory is eligible to teach in other states or territories. (See Appendix 3.)

Teaching Australia (TA)

In the lead up to the National Statement from the Teaching Profession, professional associations recognised that the newly established national body, the National Institute for Quality Teaching and School Leadership (NIQTSL), had significant potential to enable them to provide professional leadership in areas that they could not provide for themselves separately. These included, for example, facilitating conversations within the profession on the development and potential uses of national standards for advanced teaching and school leadership, by the profession and for the profession, throughout Australia.

NIQTSL, which changed its name to Teaching Australia Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (TA) in 2006, provided leadership in bringing together many professional associations and other stakeholders who, for many years, had been interested in the development and application of teaching standards. In 2005, for example, it hosted a national conference which demonstrated that there were significant groups of Australian teachers with high levels of expertise who were committed to developing their own professional standards.

2.5.4 Some examples of professional teaching standards developed in Australia

Since the late 1980s, various groups and agencies in Australia have been interested in expressing the elements of accomplished teaching in the form of professional teaching standards. In 1996 the Australian Teaching Council published the National Competency Framework for Beginning Teachers. With the subsequent shift in discourse from ‘competencies’ to ‘standards’, writers of standards began to pay more attention to a broad range of factors and considerations beyond basic skills, such as teachers’ knowledge of subject content and student learning, their values and dispositions. Across the country employers, teacher registration bodies, members of subject associations, teacher educators and other stakeholders participated in standards design processes of various kinds and for various purposes. The following list provides some examples of work that has been completed over the past ten or so years:

- The Professional Teaching Standards Framework (New South Wales Institute of Teachers)
- The Professional Standards for Teachers (Education Department Queensland)
- The School Excellence Initiative standards (Department of Education Australian Capital Territory)
- The Professional Standards for Teachers (The Department of Education and Training Victoria)
- The Standards of Professional Practice for full Registration (Victorian Institute of Teaching)
- The Western Australian Competency Framework for Teachers (Department of Education (Western Australia)
- Competencies (aligned with Competency Framework) for the Level 3 Classroom Teacher status (Department of Education Western Australia)
- Criteria for the Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) Tasmania
- Tasmanian Professional Teaching Standards Framework (draft for consultation)
- Standards (accredited as graduate certificates through the Australian Recognition Framework) in
  - Teaching of literacy
  - Teaching of numeracy
  - School leadership
  - Managing Student Behaviour; and Inclusive practice (Tasmania)
• Criteria for the Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) South Australia
• Standards for Teachers of Exemplary Practice (TEP) Northern Territory
• The Standards for Teachers of English Language and Literacy in Australia (STELLA) (English and Literacy teachers subject associations)
• Standards for Excellence in Teaching Mathematics in Australian Schools (Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers)
• The national Professional Standards for Highly Accomplished Teachers of Science (Australian Science Teachers Association).
• Standards of Professional Excellence for Teacher Librarians
• Professional standards for accomplished teaching of languages and cultures
• Standards for the teaching of ESL students by TESOL specialists

2.5.5 Standards developed at a national level: The National Statement from the Teaching Profession on Teacher Standards Quality and Professionalism

The Australian College of Educators (ACE) published *The National Statement from the Teaching Profession on Teacher Standards Quality and Professionalism* in May 2003. (Australian College of Educators (ACE), 2003) This was completed following an extensive period of consultation with teachers and their professional associations, and in collaboration and co-operation with the work of the Teacher Quality and Educational Leadership Taskforce (TQELT) of the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). The purpose of the Statement was to identify common and agreed understandings about professional standards and their relationship to teacher quality and teacher professionalism.


The Framework provides an organising structure that establishes, at a national level, agreed foundational dimensions and elements of ‘good teaching’ under the headings: Professional Knowledge; Professional Practice; Professional Values; and Professional Relationships. These serve as broad organising categories within which the content of standards can be developed.

2.5.6 Three examples of standards developed in Australia by teachers’ national subject associations

In 1999, Monash University initiated three projects, in collaboration with four teachers’ professional associations: the Australian Science Teachers Association (ASTA), the Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers (AAMT), the Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE) and the Australian Literacy Educators Association (ALEA). Groups of teachers and other stakeholders working on these projects developed sets of advanced professional standards for teachers of English/literacy, mathematics and science. Collectively, the projects provided a platform for further standards initiatives from other professional associations, including the AFMLTA

Commonalities in the three sets of standards

Participants in each of these three Australian standards projects wanted to develop new standards models that would express the distinctive knowledge and practice of teachers who taught in specific subject areas/fields. Each set out to develop standards that would explore and identify the
complex pedagogical knowledge of their disciplines, and would provide a vehicle for teachers to develop as professionals. As advanced standards, the standards would be representations of excellent practice to which all teachers might aspire.

Teachers’ practical knowledge and skills were fundamental in all three projects. The Mathematics group, for example, set up ‘Teacher Focus Groups’ in four states (Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and South Australia) and all materials were validated through broad consultative processes.

The projects worked separately in a deliberate effort to ensure that the results met the needs and expressed the intentions of the professional communities involved. However, people most closely involved in the projects had opportunities to share their work. At a national Professional Standards Workshop held in Adelaide in March 2001, participants were able to identify certain ‘commonalities’. They agreed that:

The broad frameworks for the three sets of professional standards are very similar in terms of the domains seen as important. All have a strong commitment to teachers as reflective practitioners and expect teachers to work positively in professional communities. Narratives, vignettes and other examples from individual teachers’ work are seen to be important precursors to describing the standards. There is a common commitment that the standards be relevant for teachers from K-12, and that they be accessible and useful for teachers in the wide variety of teaching contexts present in Australian schools and other settings in which teaching and learning take place. As a result, consideration of context and how to ensure that professional standards ‘speak to’ all teachers is a major focus for the projects – the standards have to ensure that the professional standards do not lead to ‘standardisation’ of teaching practice, something that the three projects are determined to avoid (Althorp, Cockburn, Hayes, & Morony, 2001)

*Differences*

While the standards writers in all three projects recognised that teachers’ accounts of their practice needed to be part of the standards development processes, there were differences in the ways in which these accounts were approached and used. From the start of the standards development processes, the ASTA and the AAMT envisaged that their standards would eventually be part of a national professional learning and certification system. They gave attention, therefore to establishing guidelines for teachers about the kinds of evidence they should provide if they wanted to demonstrate that they had met the standards. The developers of the English and Literacy standards chose not to proceed down this path. Instead, English and Literacy teachers were encouraged to read the standards and see them as a springboard for writing narratives that described specific instances of their teaching as a form of self-reflection and means of gaining feedback from colleagues about aspects of their teaching. In practice, this is a similar process to that which the mathematics and science standards developers envisaged for the preparation of portfolio entries in which teachers showed how their practice met the standards. The difference is that it is not intended that the (English and Literacy) activities will be formally assessed, and the teachers who complete them will not receive formal recognition or a credential.

**2.6 Professional Standards for Languages Teachers**

As Liddicoat et al (2005 p. 24) note, ‘Professional standards for accomplished language teachers have not been widely developed, although many governments have minimum standards for registration of teachers, including language teachers.’ Most of these standards, in most countries, are generic. Examples include standards developed by the General Teaching Councils in England and Scotland, and the New Zealand Teachers Council. Such standards may be suitable for certain
regulatory purposes, such as registration and licensing, but it is now becoming widely recognised that if standards are to be really useful for teachers’ professional learning, including teacher education programs, they need to ‘drill down’ past the generic level to describe what teachers know and can do in the various complex areas of their disciplines and fields of teaching. The work of an Early Childhood teacher, for example, is very different from that of a teacher of Year 12 Physics, and standards need to reflect such differences, although, of course, certain elements will always be common to the work of teaching across the board.

A great deal of standards development work in recent years has been carried out in the USA. Liddicoat et al (2005 p. 24) refer to the standards developed by the Foreign Language Standards Collaborative in conjunction with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL Foreign Language Standards Writing Team, 2002). These standards have now been approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and are used in a process of teacher education program review by trained ACTFL/NCATE reviewers. (These standards and the ways in which they are being used are discussed below.)

2.6.1 The NBPTS Standards for World Languages Other Than English

The most comprehensive set of professional teaching standards for accomplished languages teaching was developed in the USA under the auspices of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The NBPTS standards are linked to the ACTFL/NCATE standards and to the standards created by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), which are used by individual states when making decisions about teacher licensing. This alignment of standards results from deliberate and comprehensive efforts on the part of many educators in many fields to ensure that:

...these sets of interlocking standards create a developmental continuum for teachers, from pre-service teacher education through licensing and induction, through advanced study and ongoing professional development that includes, but is not limited to, advanced certification.’ (L. Darling-Hammond, 1999)

The fourteen NBPTS World Languages Other Than English standards (NBPTS, 2001) were developed on the basis of the five common NBPTS ‘core propositions’ detailed above. They are ordered under four headings:

Preparing for Student Learning
- Knowledge of Students
- Knowledge of Special Education
- Communications
- Diversity
- Knowledge of Subject Matter

Advancing Student Learning
- Meaningful Learning
- Multiple Paths to Knowledge
- Social Development

Supporting Student Learning
- Assessment
- Learning Environment
- Instructional Resources
- Family Partnerships

Professional Development and Outreach
- Reflective Practice
- Contributing to the Profession and to Education
More detail about these NBPTS World Languages Other Than English standards can be found via http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/standards_by_cert?ID=16&x=45&y=5

**Prose descriptions**

Each standard is articulated in a prose statement of about one thousand words. For example, Standard 3 *Knowledge of language* discusses ‘classical languages’, ‘languages using ideographs’, such as Japanese, Chinese, or non roman alphabets such as Arabic and Hindu’ and ‘native languages.’ This standard also sets out some parameters for language ‘proficiency’ (NBPTS, 2001 p. 15).

Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English exemplify a high degree of proficiency in the languages they teach. In the case of modern languages, accomplished teachers speak the languages with sufficient accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics, and they tailor their speech to meet the needs of the different levels of students in their classrooms. They can read with considerable comprehension a variety of literary texts and expository prose on unfamiliar subjects. Accomplished teachers can express themselves through formal and informal writings on practical, social, and professional topics. (NBPTS, 2001 p. 15)

Clearly, however, while the NBPTS standards are explicit about the need for languages teachers to have proficiency in languages they teach, they do not emphasise proficiency at the expense of other attributes. Standard IV, *Knowledge of Culture*, for example, describes how intercultural understanding is developed holistically through language study.

Throughout a sequence of language learning, teachers provide opportunities to help shape students’ understanding of how culture and language interact. They acquaint students with key cultural traits and concepts and help them to synthesise and interpret this information in sensitive and meaningful ways (NBPTS, 2001 p. 19).

And:

Students of accomplished teachers come to appreciate the concept of culture as neither monolithic nor static and realise that developing insights into cultural phenomena – whether of one’s own culture or of another region – is a life long process (NBPTS, 2001 p. 19).

The developers of the NBPTS standards for World Languages Other Than English recognise and acknowledge that context and environment influence the work of languages teachers:

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards recognises that not all teachers of world languages other than English practice in ideal environments with well-equipped classrooms, reasonable class sizes, or even physically conducive surroundings.

Such contextual factors are also taken into account in the assessment processes for certification.

The aim of the developers of the *Standards for World Languages Other Than English* was to arrive at a professional consensus on the characteristics of accomplished teaching of languages, based on research and the ‘wisdom of practice’, and to provide a profile of the accomplished languages teacher. As with other fields of study, the *Standards for World Languages Other Than English*
English were developed by a Standards Committee established under the auspices of the Board. The Committee was made up of fifteen members who met regularly for over a year.

...The uniqueness of the world languages field was evident in the personalities and contributions of these extraordinary educators. In particular, the leadership of Chair Thomas Keith Cothurn and Vice Chair Marcial Rosenbusch prompted the group to achieve its mission in developing substantial standards that are representative of the field...³

At various points in its development, the Standards document was reviewed by the Standards and Development Group of the NBPTS, ‘a diverse group of educators’ who made suggestions about how drafts could be strengthened. This group approved the final version for publication.

The Acknowledgements section of the Standards document recognises the work done by many educators in the consultation phase of the document:

Hundreds of individuals not directly associated with NBPTS aided the development of World Languages Other Than English Standards. Teachers of world languages and other scholars, state and local officials, and representatives of disciplinary organisations reviewed a draft of the standards document when it was disseminated nationwide during a public comment period (NBPTS, 2001 p. 65).

2.6.2 The AFMLTA Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures

The Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) has recently (2005) developed a set of professional standards for languages teaching. These standards provide the most comprehensive description to date of the knowledge and skills of Australian languages teachers at an ‘accomplished’ level.

The standards are grouped under eight headings:

- Educational theory and practice
- Language and culture
- Language pedagogy
- Ethics and responsibility
- Professional relationships
- Active engagement with wider context
- Advocacy
- Personal characteristics

Between two and eight standards appear under each heading, making a total of thirty-eight standards.

³ Thomas Keith Cothurn, is a German teacher at Las Cruces High School in New Mexico. Marcial Rosenbusch is the Director of the National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Centre at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. Other members of the Committee included academic staff and professors from Bryn Mawr College, the University of South Florida, California State University, and Stanford University. Teachers on the Committee were drawn from several High Schools, a Junior High School and a Middle School. One member was Director of Foreign Languages in a large District Public Schools administration.
The standards are expressed in prose statements of approximately twelve to fifty words. For example, under ‘Active engagement with wider context’:

Accomplished languages and cultures teachers actively engage with the social, political, economic and technological climate of the times.

Under Language and culture:

Accomplished languages and cultures teachers are both users and teachers of linguistic and cultural knowledge

And under Languages Pedagogy:

(Accomplished teachers) have a view of curriculum in which planning, teaching, resourcing, assessing, evaluating and renewing are done coherently according to a principled approach to languages and cultures teaching. Accomplished teaching is reflected by an ability to explain the choices being made in planning and teaching.

Each group of standards is accompanied by Suggested Questions for Reflection e.g. ‘How do you increase understanding of the importance of diversity in your community? and How do you connect language learning to what is happening in the contemporary world?”

The full standards document is available on the AFMLTA website.

The AFMLTA standards grew out of the Development of Standards for Teachers of Indonesian Project. This project aimed to develop standards that described the work of ‘accomplished’ languages teachers, but it was expected that teachers at all levels would find them appropriate ‘to understand their teaching and identify ways of further developing their work as teachers (Liddicoat et al., 2005 p. iv). The method followed was to develop standards for language teaching generally, and to annotate them for teachers of Indonesian so that they could be understood in a language specific context.

Liddicoat et al (2005 p. iv) note that the ‘input’ of the program had three sources:

1. A literature review
2. Generative consultation with the profession:
   - A survey of language teachers’ professional associations; and
   - Focus groups of language teachers.
3. A survey of pre-service language teacher education

The project team of seven people included languages teachers and academics. The team developed draft standards using the three sources of input. These were sent for consultation to relevant stakeholders. Using feedback from the consultation, the standards were re-drafted and a set of guidelines was developed for their use. The standards were then independently evaluated.

The standards were developed as (1) standards for teaching and (2) program standards. The standards for teaching were described above. The program standards are described below.

The AFMLTA program standards

The AFMLTA professional standards for accomplished teaching are accompanied by a set of ‘program standards’. These standards were written in recognition of the necessity to establish conditions for effective teaching as noted by such writers as Fenstermacher and Richardson (See
above). They refer to such aspects as: continuity of learning programs; appropriate timetabling; suitable provision of dedicated space; and manageable class sizes.

2.6.3 The use of subject specific standards in initial teacher education

Sets of standards that describe the knowledge and skills of accomplished teachers in specific areas and disciplines, including languages, are likely to be of great use to developers of courses for initial teacher education. Because they provide a ‘map’ of the essential and agreed features of the professional knowledge base they have strong potential to guide the selection of course content. They are hardly suitable for use as tools to assess graduating teachers, however, since the level they describe is not that of a neophyte, but of experienced and accomplished teaching. The issue of using standards to assess graduating teachers is taken up in the following section.

2.7 Uses and Applications of Standards

Professional teaching standards may be understood as statements of what is known and valued. They may also be used as measures that identify levels – ‘standards’ - of performance. Debate about how standards should be used often centres on whether and how they may be used as tools to assess the work of teachers.

Scarino, Papademetre and Dellit (2004) put forward two ‘meanings’ for standards: the first is that of a ‘guideline of good practice or a code of ethics which many professions develop and adopt to guide the work of the profession’. (Scarino et al., 2004) The second meaning ‘relates to expected performance of individuals in relation to an external benchmark.’ They further state that standards for teaching ‘should pertain’ to the sense of standard as in the first meaning. The implication, with regard to the use of standards in teacher education courses, is that standards may be used as guidelines in the development of courses, but that they should not be used as measures to assess the competence of teacher education students – upon graduation, for example. Most modern teacher course accreditation bodies, including NCATE, would not accept this view.

Darling-Hammond (1988; 1999) sees this question somewhat differently from Scarino, Papademetre and Dellit. Teachers need to be accountable, she argues, and standards developed by the profession should form the basis of a process of accountability in which the profession takes responsibility for the performance of its members. This view is reflected in NCATE’s use of standards to accredit teacher education courses. Because, under NCATE procedures, trainee teachers are assessed against the standards, and because institutions must show that their students meet the standards in order for those institutions to gain accreditation, the standards have a much stronger influence than if they were used only as course guidelines.

The view that standards should not be used to measure the performance of teachers, or even student teachers, often stems from a justifiable concern that teachers may be unfairly judged on a on the basis of set of narrow measures that undervalue and ‘standardise’ complex work. Darling Hammond addresses this concern by drawing an important distinction between ‘bureaucratic’ accountability and ‘professional’ accountability.

Bureaucratic accountability ensures that rules will be promulgated and compliance with these rules will be monitored. The promise bureaucratic accountability makes is that violators of the rules will be apprehended and consequences will be administered for non-compliance (L. Darling-Hammond, 1988)

Under a professional model of accountability, by contrast, Darling Hammond believes that teachers could be held accountable, not by employers or governments, but by the profession itself.
The professional conception emphasises the appropriateness of teaching decisions to the goals and contexts of instruction and the needs of students. It envisions (teacher) evaluation not as a discrete annual event staged to determine whether teachers adequately administer the expected procedures, but as a constant feature of organisational life for practitioners who inquire continually into the usefulness of their actions and revise their plans in light of these enquiries. (L. Darling-Hammond, 1989 p. 12)

‘Standards’ used for bureaucratic purposes necessarily tend to be simple and deceptively easy to measure. They may indeed give rise to unfair and unproductive judgements. Professional standards, by contrast, are much more complex, developed by practitioners to reflect the best that is known about teaching in particular fields on the basis of research and practice. Assessing a teacher against such standards is an infinitely more complex task, one that cannot be carried out by non-teacher administrators, but only by professionals in the field who have the necessary knowledge and skill.

Importantly, in developing and using their own standards through their professional associations, teachers also extend and improve their own practice and actively contribute to the growth of the knowledge base.

However, Liddicoat et al (2005) express concern that standards may be improperly used by governments and employing authorities to control teachers:

One of the most important political questions surrounding standards is the perception of how the standards will be used. The development of standards for teaching in Australia has been based on an agenda of accountability or quality assurance. Much of the discourse of quality assurance seems to imply that quality is in some way lacking in current practice and that standards are required to introduce quality. Such a view fails to recognise both the quality and complexity of teaching practice.

Extrapolating this view to the application of standards, Liddicoat et al state that it would not be appropriate for the AFMLTA to assume a teacher evaluation role:

In the listing of elements the project may undertake, certain elements are in conflict with the role and functions of the AFMLTA as a professional association, notably assessing teachers and awarding credentials. Not only are these in conflict with the role and functions of the Association, but they are also highly problematic in that they would lead to accreditation of only a small segment of the profession and only in one language, Indonesian.

The AFMLTA standards document (Professional Standards for accomplished teaching of languages and cultures AFMLTA 2005) explicitly states that the standards are not intended for use in evaluating teachers’ performance:

The standards are designed to assist teachers to understand and develop their own practice. They are intended as a guide for thinking through one’s current professional work and identifying needs for future development. Any mismatch between a teacher’s current position and the standards then is to be seen as an opportunity for learning rather than as a failure to meet the standards expected of a teacher.

4 The AFMLTA Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures which developed from the Development of Standards for Indonesian project are not language specific. The project focused on writing standards at a more generic level, exemplified through Indonesian.
The standards are not designed or intended for use in evaluating teachers’ performance, but as a framework for understanding teachers’ professionalism.

The statement does not totally close the door on the idea of evaluation however. It continues:

...teachers may use them to assist in developing portfolios for use in applications for promotion or for professional evaluation (our emphasis) (Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, 2005)

2.7.1 Standards and educational policy

In the past couple of decades, some policy makers and educators have taken up the views of Darling-Hammond and other writers regarding ‘bureaucratic’ versus ‘professional’ accountability and the development and application of standards. One such writer is Sykes (1991 p. 84) who argues that professionalism relies on trust. We rely on professionals, he says, they perform vital services for us, and the quality of those services can only be guaranteed by a community of peer professionals. In exchange for guarantees of quality, other professions have been ceded the degree of autonomy necessary to establish these bases of quality, and to make judgements accordingly. Authorities, most notably the State, which, in a democracy, safeguards the public interest, may exercise certain regulatory and protective functions over the collective work of professionals. They may and do, for example, demand that doctors hold a degree from a recognised university, but professionals, as workers, essentially and inevitably regulate themselves. Sykes then refers to the ‘classic bargain’ typically made between professionals and authorities: a high degree of professional freedom in return for assurances that the profession guarantees to regulate itself.

Hargreaves and Goodson (1996 p. 3) note that, in recent years, changes in the ‘steering mechanisms’ used by the State to regulate education have resulted in governments sponsoring professional as opposed to bureaucratic ways of organising the work of teachers. While moves towards allowing the teaching profession to regulate itself are partly the result of the State’s unwillingness, in a time of shrinking bureaucracies, to manage teachers’ work directly, these moves are ‘not entirely cynical in their origins and consequences’:

The empowering effects of these professionalising tendencies for building strong senses of professional competence and community among teachers should not be underestimated (Talbert & McLaughlin, 1994). Teacher professionalism may well mark a shift in the mechanisms of state steering (through self regulation of means) and in opportunities for empowerment as well. How these twin tendencies play out in practice is an important subject for investigation and analysis (Hargreaves & Goodson, 1996 pp. 3-4).

In Australia, the Ramsey Report concurred with this line of thinking. It recommended (Ramsey, 2002 - Recommendation 2, p. 158) that in developing professional teaching standards, the New South Wales Institute of Teachers:

- Establish, articulate and promulgate a clear purpose for such standards
- Establish effective processes for the development, validation and assessment of such standards based on appropriate models of teacher development
- Make the standards simple, transparent and easily accessible to all teachers
- Consult widely to ensure ownership of and commitment to such standards by teachers
- Determine requirements for teachers to maintain their accreditation or to be discredited if they do not fulfil the required performance and ethical standards
2.7.2 Support for Standards in Top of the Class

Top of the Class, the Report on the inquiry into teacher education, House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training (HRSC Report) presents the most recent findings on teacher education in Australia. It strongly supports research-evidence and standards-based teacher education and evaluation of teacher education programs.

The Committee notes concerns held by some stakeholders that standards may be seen as ‘standardising’ teacher education courses. (This concern was expressed in the Final report on the Development of Standards for Teachers of Indonesian Project, Liddicoat et al 2005, p.2.) The Committee asserted that this was not its intention - ‘in promoting standards it is not promoting a single model of teacher education or a national teacher education curriculum.’ P. 20.

The report went on to assert (p. 20) that ‘standards, accompanied by well constructed means of assessing the degree to which they have been met (our emphasis) can provide for great flexibility, innovation and diversity’.

As in Liddicoat et al (2005), the HRSC Report recognised the value of standards for guiding professional learning at all stages of teachers’ careers, including their pre-service education.

Standards are of value to teachers, employing authorities, governments, students and parents. Standards guide all involved in teacher education during their initial preparation and beyond; standards act as benchmarks against which the effectiveness of teacher education courses and the performance of teachers can be assessed; standards provide guidance for the allocation of resources; standards support induction and mentoring process; standards help teachers shape their ongoing professional learning and guide education systems in the provision of ongoing learning opportunities and materials.

By comparing the above statement with the following paragraph by Scarino, Papademetre & Dellit, (2004) quoted Liddicoat et al (2005, p. 2) in the essential point of difference between the two reports becomes clearer:

It is worth considering different meanings attached to standards. Of several different meanings associated with the concept of ‘standard’ we highlight two. The first relates to good practice or a code of ethics which many professions develop and adopt to guide the work of the profession, for example, the code of practice for doctors or accountants. The second relates to the expected performance of individuals in relation to an external benchmark. It is the first sense of standard that should pertain in the development of Standards in teaching (Scarino et. al. 2004, p.2).

The HRSC Report is unequivocal that standards, as well as being useful in the first sense mentioned by Scarino et. al. (2004), can and should also be used according to the second sense or meaning noted – and apparently rejected - by these writers, as benchmarks against which performance can be measured.

In this context it is also worth noting that the ‘other professions’ referred to by Scarino et. al. (2004) do in fact use professional standards to provide formal endorsement that graduates of professional education programs possess the competencies necessary to practice. The roles of the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia (AACA), for example, are to:

- Promote common academic standards throughout Australia for registration;
- Assess architectural education;
• Coordinate acceptable standards of architectural education for mutual recognition agreements;
• Define acceptable standards for practical experience for registration; and
• Provide for the examination for persons seeking registration.

Similar roles are performed by the Australian Psychological Accreditation Council (APAC); the Australian Medical Council’s Accreditation Committee; the Engineers Australia Accreditation Board; and the national professional associations in accountancy (Certified Practising Accountants (CPA) and the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Australia (ICAA)) (Ingvarson, Elliot, Kleinhenz and McKenzie, 2006, p. 55).

The HRSC Report notes that, with the development of professional standards for teaching and the establishment of state teacher registration boards:

Jurisdictions are increasingly moving towards tying the full registration of teachers to a requirement that they demonstrate that they have met the professional standards for teaching at competence level (the terminology may vary). Registration requirements for provisional registration typically require applicants to provide evidence of having successfully completed a teacher education course that has been approved or endorsed by the registration authority (p. 21).

Accreditation is defined in the HRSC Report as ‘an endorsement that a teacher education program produces graduates who can meet provisional registration standards.’ (p. 22). The Committee strongly supported the use of professional standards for both registering teachers and accrediting teacher education courses (p. 23).

The HRSC Report provides the following rationale for linking professional teaching standards to the process of registering teachers:

• Linking professional standards to the teacher registration process at different levels supports teacher education at each of its different stages;
• Linking graduate or entry standards to the granting of provisional registration provides clear goals for the design of teacher education programs;
• Linking standards of professional competence to full registration guides beginning teachers, their mentors, principals, and employing authorities on what must be achieved in order to gain full registration and therefore helps to identify the type of professional development that beginning teachers need to undertake and;
• Linking standards of professional accomplishment and professional leadership to registration at higher levels provides encouragement and reward for teachers’ participation in on-going professional learning and engagement in roles that help prepare the next generation of teachers or that deepen the knowledge of teaching and learning (p. 23).

The HRSC Report asserts that standards should be linked to accreditation:

Just as the linking of professional teaching standards to the registration process strengthens the registration process, so should the linking of standards to the accreditation of teacher education courses strengthen the accreditation process. Standards have value not only in informing the design of teacher education courses but also in acting as a benchmark for accreditation bodies to use in assessing how well teacher education courses are preparing their students (p. 24).

The HRSC Report proposed that a national system of teacher education should be established in Australia. It noted that the Hobart Forum of Teacher Education submitted that members of other
professions, such as medicine, law and accounting, played a major role in determining standards and accountability requirements. It noted too that the Hobart Forum suggested the establishment of an appropriate national authority ‘to bring together the varied interests and to ensure a strong voice for the profession’.

2.8 Accreditation of Pre-Service Language Teacher Education Programs

The term ‘accreditation’ used in relation to a university professional preparation program is generally understood to mean an endorsement by an independent agency that the program prepares graduates who are competent to begin practice.

About forty Australian universities and institutions of higher education currently offer pre-service education courses in teaching (e.g. Bachelor of Education and Diploma of Education). Various state-based arrangements currently operate to approve or accredit these courses. Beyond the minimum requirement of four years – usually a four year course in education or a degree plus a one or two year education course – processes for endorsing pre-service courses vary considerably from state to state.

Successful accreditation processes identify the extent to which professional preparation programs are fulfilling their main purposes. A search of Australian literature reveals few rigorous studies of the effectiveness of teacher education courses. The HRSC Report called for more systematic methods of gathering data about the outcomes of teacher education courses. The report also draws attention to the need for more comparable standards-based measures of the outcomes of teacher education courses.

Importantly, the HRSC Report asserted that: ‘Thorough assessment of teacher education courses will demand the development of tools and processes for evaluating the quality of graduates’ teaching in real school settings.’ (p. 7) In this respect, the Committee was ‘encouraged’ by recent ACER research that developed standards and instruments to assess the effectiveness of a teacher education program by assessing the performance of graduate teachers (Ingvarson et al 2005 (a) and Ingvarson et al 2005(b)).

The Committee examined ‘the highly regarded course accreditation system run by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in the United States as an example of a quality voluntary national accreditation system. In the opinion of the Committee, however, a mandatory system, developed under the auspices of Teaching Australia would be more effective. Its third recommendation was that:

...the Australian government continue to support the work of Teaching Australia in developing a national system of accreditation. The establishment of a high quality system will take some time and the co-operation of state and territory registration authorities. The Australian Government should ensure that sufficient resources are committed to allow for the time needed to reach agreement. Once the national system of accreditation has been established, the Australian Government should require universities in receipt of Commonwealth funding to have their teacher education courses accredited by the national accreditation body. (HRSC Report, p. 34)

The HRSC Report noted the ‘major significance’ of the moves made by most jurisdictions in Australia to establish ‘formal or informal’ processes for accrediting teacher education courses. However, it also asserted the view of the Committee that ‘much would be gained by integrating teacher registration and the accreditation of teacher education courses into a national system of teacher education’ (p. 19).
In consultations carried out in Australian universities as part of a review by ACER on behalf of Teaching Australia (Ingvarson, Elliott, Kleinhenz, & McKenzie, 2006), and also in the consultations that have formed part of the present project, several participants from universities pointed to the rigorous internal processes for course approval that universities already carry out. These people were concerned that any new processes should not involve duplication of effort and unnecessary work.

2.8.1 International trends in accreditation

The recent OECD review, Teachers Matter: Attracting Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers (OECD, 2005), identified a number of emerging issues in relation to pre-service teacher education, particularly concerns that theory should be brought closer to practice. In relation to course accreditation, it pointed out that accreditation criteria need to change from focusing on ‘inputs’ – course content and teaching method – to outcomes: i.e. the demonstrated knowledge and skills of graduates:

Accreditation criteria should focus more on the outcomes of teacher education programs than on inputs, curriculum and processes. A focus on the latter elements runs the risk of consolidating conventional wisdom about how best to prepare teachers, thereby leading to greater uniformity of programs and reducing the scope for innovation. In any event it is what trainee teachers learn and can do that should be the policy focus. How they get to that point is better left to the teacher education programs and other programs for teacher preparation (OECD, 2005 p. 1130).

Accreditation of university courses has traditionally, been based on the quality of provision. This approach can lead to a focus on the minutiae of elements such as course outlines and student assessment procedures. Increasingly, accreditation is based on the quality of outcomes, i.e. graduate knowledge and competence. Units of study are designed with particular standards in mind, so that students and the academic staff are clear about what is expected at the end of the course.

In England, Scotland, Canada, America, New Zealand, and some Australian states ‘graduate standards’ have now been developed to describe what graduates of teacher education courses can be expected to know and do. The standards for ‘Qualified Teacher Status’ developed by the Training and Development Agency in England are one example. Part of the evidence for accreditation is the proportion of graduates who have demonstrated that they have met the graduating standards of the accrediting body.

It is important to note that most graduate standards are generic. No set of standards that describe the knowledge and skills of new graduates of initial teacher education programs in specific subject or other areas (e.g. Early Childhood) has yet been written in Australia. Lessons can be learned, however, from the development and use of subject and area specific ‘graduating’ standards, including standards for languages, in the USA under the National Council for the Accreditation (NCATE).

2.8.2 The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (USA)

Every state in the USA has legislation in place that requires that university teacher education programs are approved. There are also independent not-for-profit national agencies that offer voluntary accreditation. Best known and best accepted of these agencies is the National Council for Teacher Accreditation (NCATE). NCATE has been established for over fifty years. In 2001 it accredited about six hundred of the country’s thirteen hundred education courses, and these produced more than two thirds of the country’s teachers (L. Darling-Hammond, 2001 p. 753). A number of states require their universities to have NCATE accreditation in addition to their own
individual state-based arrangements, which are usually based on generic standards and criteria, and are ‘inputs’ focused.

In recent years NCATE has moved rapidly towards a system of outcomes based accreditation:

In the past it was sufficient to demonstrate that candidates had complete coursework which covered content stipulated under the various standards, but under the new NCATE/state guidelines program completers must also demonstrate mastery of educational precepts in a P-12 setting the performance of an institution’s program completers and graduates and the performance of students will be expected to meet acceptable standards in the national accreditation and state approval processes (Conn, 1999).

Candidates at NCATE accredited schools of education in the new millennium will experience a focus on performance unlike any seen by candidates in the 20th century. Beginning with the NCATE 2000 standards, institutions accredited by NCATE will be expected to show mastery of the content knowledge in their fields and to demonstrate that they can teach effectively. Administrators will be expected to demonstrate that they can create an environment conducive to student learning. All candidates will understand the criteria by which their professional competence will be judged. Multiple assessments of candidates will be the rule. Institutions will set benchmark levels of performance, based on exemplars provided by NCATE affiliated professional associations (Wise, 2000).

The NCATE program standards

The NCATE standards are designed primarily for the accreditation of colleges and departments of education, but they also define what is to be expected of newly graduated teachers. Because of this, their influence on the shaping of courses is powerful. Like the NBPTS and INTASC standards, with which they are aligned, they are ‘field specific’, rather than generic. This is based firstly on a belief that the depth and complexity of teachers’ professional knowledge is best represented by standards that are closely linked with the content of what is being taught. Secondly, considerations about what is taught, and how it is best taught, which are an essential part of standards development processes, should bear a close relation to individual subject disciplines and stages of schooling.

All NCATE standards are developed and articulated by groups with a majority of teachers under the aegis of the Standards Committee of the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board. The standards are revised every five years to ensure that they reflect research and state of the art education practice. Much of this work is carried out by teachers’ professional associations whose work guides the design and delivery of pre-service teacher education programs. Thus the National Council for Teaching of Mathematics, the National Science Teachers Association and seventeen other specialty associations set professional standards for their respective disciplines, and NCATE incorporates these standards into its accreditation programs.

As previously noted, the NCATE standards are aligned with the INTASC standards and the NBPTS standards. They are also aligned with various sets of state licensure standards. All of these standards create expectations that teachers, upon graduation, will be able to provide evidence of their competence to teach. All are professional standards that have been created by representative bodies that have a majority of teacher members.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has been a constituent member of NCATE since 1999. It is one of thirty three Specialised Professional Associations (SPAs) which work in partnership with NCATE.
NCATE incorporated the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles into its work in 1995, bringing the SPAs into the movement toward unified standards and beginning the alignment of accreditation and licensing across states. All of the SPAs have now endorsed a performance-based system in which candidates graduating from teacher education programs must be able to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and dispositions. An institution provides this information through a process of program review that is web-based, grounded in assessment, and reviewed by trained ACTFL/NCATE program reviewers (Glisan et al., 2004 p. 2).

The NCATE program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers begin with a description of ‘requirements’ for programs which prepare teachers to teach languages. Appendix 5 provides a description of the standards and supporting information on which students are assessed.

**Becoming accredited with NCATE**

To become accredited/maintain accreditation, institutions prepare a ‘Program Report’. All institutions that offer undergraduate and/or graduate programs in foreign languages must respond to the program and teacher candidate standards. They must demonstrate that the students have been assessed against all six standards, including a description of the assessments and rubrics that were used to assess each student. The Report is submitted electronically. A template of the Report format is available on line. The assessors are expert teacher and teacher education professionals.

The HRSC Report recommended ‘the highly regarded course accreditation system run by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in the United States’ as an example of a quality voluntary national accreditation system. As noted above, the NCATE system works on the basis of nationally agreed graduate standards in specific areas. For languages, these standards are those developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and approved by NCATE.

Current proposals for the accreditation of teacher preparation courses in Australian Universities are discussed later in this report (see Section 4.19).

### 2.9 Summary and Conclusion

The literature and documents discussed and analysed in this Review show that, over the past fifty years, major shifts in thinking about languages and the teaching of languages to school students have occurred in most OECD countries. The study of languages in schools, once thought of as a subject for the academic elite, is now believed to be a necessary part of the education of all young people from primary school to the end of secondary school. Although many commentators have claimed that the reality does not usually meet the rhetoric in this respect, this does not alter the fact that major changes – which may even be described as a paradigm shift – have occurred. These changes are well reflected in documents such as the National Statement for Languages Education in Australian Schools and the National Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005-2008. They relate to the changes that have occurred in Australian society as a result of post Second World War and later migration and to the cultural and economic effects of globalisation, which have brought all countries so much closer to each other in recent years.

Changes in conceived purposes for languages teaching have also brought about major curriculum change. Whilst formerly all languages were taught like the ‘dead’ languages of Latin and Ancient Greek, with heavy emphasis on grammar and translation, the ‘communicative revolution’, which began in Britain in the 1970s, emphasised effective written and spoken communication in the language. This significantly altered the nature of language teachers’ work and, consequently, the content of languages teacher education courses.
The notion of building ‘intercultural competence’ has emerged as a key development in languages learning in the 21st century. Writers like Kramsch and Byram make the critical distinction between simply knowing about another culture and knowing the culture from within through the language. This work has been strongly carried forward in Australia by a number of academics, including Scarino, Liddicoat, Crozet and Papademetre. The extent to which the concept is reflected in most teacher education courses is yet to be determined.

The Nicholas Report (Nicholas et. al. 1993) and subsequent documents show that courses for prospective languages teachers in Australian universities fall into three basic patterns – the post Graduate Diploma of Education model, in which students study language teaching ‘method’ in the Education Faculty after studying language in their first degree; the model in which languages study and languages teaching methodology are integrated within the Education Faculty (usually a four year course) and the model where students study a language in a separate section or faculty of the university and the Education Faculty supplements this study with separate units in languages teaching methodology. These are often ‘double degree’ courses.

Consideration of the various approaches to how languages should be taught in schools raises the obvious question of what teacher education students should be expected to know and do upon graduation. This review has drawn on the vast literature on the knowledge base of teaching and analyses of ‘quality’ in teaching. It notes how, in a seminal work, Shulman (1987) identified ‘formal educational scholarship’; ‘scholarship in content disciplines’, ‘educational materials’ and ‘structures; and ‘wisdom of practice’, as four major ‘sources’ of a knowledge base for teaching. It then describes some of the efforts of educators in Australia, the USA and other countries to build upon the foundations laid by Shulman and others, by articulating what they believe teachers generally, and languages teachers in particular, should know and be able to do. Much of this work has been driven by research that shows teachers to be the major influence on successful student learning, research that has caused the issue of ‘quality’ teaching to have high priority on national education agendas (Minner, 2001; Ranborn, Maurer, & McLean, 2001; Zumwalt, 2000).

Some of the most effective work in the domain of articulating a teaching knowledge base has been carried out in the arena of professional teaching standards. Professional teaching standards are distinguished from standards or criteria designed and used by employers to manage teachers work. They are developed by practitioners, on the basis of consensus about necessary teaching skills and knowledge, and they are ‘owned’ by the profession, in that the profession decides how they are used. The review outlines recent developments in the standards debates, including more recent moves, on the part of governments and employers to encourage the teachers to develop and take responsibility for their own quality assurance mechanisms, similar to members of other professions. It draws upon recent policy statements and reports, as well as the work of several national subject associations Australian College of Educators and Teaching Australia. It examines and analyses the NBPTS Standards for Teachers of World Languages Other Than English and the Standards for Teachers of Languages and Culture developed by the AFMLTA.

The development of the AFMLTA Standards for Teachers of Languages and Culture represents a major step in describing a knowledge base for the profession of languages teaching. However, certain questions, particularly those regarding the relative emphasis to be placed, in practical applications of the standards, on certain elements of the knowledge base as expressed in the standards remain the subject of professional debate. One important such element concerns the meaning and relative significance of ‘language proficiency’. Examples of national and international literature discussed in this review confirm a common-sense perception that teachers need to be highly proficient in reading, writing and speaking the language or languages they are helping students to learn. This does not mean that language proficiency is the only – or even the most important - element in a teachers’ repertoire of knowledge and skills. The conclusion drawn in this review, on the basis of thorough interrogation of the literature, is that high levels of
language proficiency 5 properly understood on the basis of professional consensus, are a necessary, but not sufficient component of the knowledge base of languages teachers.

The inclusion of the notion of intercultural competence in the standards, and in national languages policy, was shown to be a welcome initiative that is in tune with the times. Like the issue of language proficiency, it has been shown in this review to be a necessary but not sufficient element of languages teacher knowledge. It is, of its nature, a holistic concept which cannot be ‘placed in a box’ all by itself. The same can be said of most, if not all, elements. The standards capture many identifiable, often subtle commonalities in the art and craft of languages teaching. The challenge is to recognise their essentially seamless nature and to implement them accordingly.

Section 2.8 of the Review describes ‘accreditation’ as a key mechanism for assuring the quality of university preparation courses in the professions and engaging members of a profession in decisions about the standards expected of those about to enter the profession, including details of skills and knowledge expected. This section describes course approval mechanisms currently operating in Australian states and territories through Colleges and Institutes of Education. It also describes and discusses the highly regarded work of NCATE in the USA, which has moved recently from traditional means of evaluating course quality toward a performance based system that requires teacher education institutions to consider a wide range of teachers’ knowledge, skills and dispositions and to demonstrate through rigorous means that graduating students have attained the necessary standards.

The question of how to use professional teaching standards, including accreditation of teacher education courses, has been widely discussed in the literature. The review draws attention to the distinction made by Darling-Hammond and other researchers between standards and related assessments that are developed and used for purposes of ‘bureaucratic’ accountability, and those which serve purposes of ‘professional’ accountability, where professions undertake to play a largely self-regulating role. Both uses entail assessment of teachers’ work, the first by governments or employing agencies, the second by the profession itself.

The AFMLTA has expressed the view (Liddicoat et. al 2005) that assessing teachers is in conflict with the association’s role and functions. This view is based on an understandable concern that standards may be improperly used by certain agencies. However, the concept of assessing teachers professionally through various forms of peer assessment as a measure of quality assurance (as in other professions) appears to be gaining acceptance. It is supported in significant reports and documents, such as the Ramsey Report (2000) and, implicitly, the MCEETYA National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching. It has also been strongly canvassed in Top of the Class, the latest Report on the inquiry into teacher education.

The literature and documents reviewed in this analysis suggest that there are major questions to be resolved concerning whether and how standards are to be used for purposes of quality assurance in teaching generally and university languages teacher education in particular. Resolution of these questions, together with considerations of related issues concerning possible accreditation of university teacher education courses, is likely to have a significant influence on the provision of languages teacher education in Australian universities in the immediate future.

---

5‘Language proficiency’ is a somewhat contested concept, which can mean different things to different people. There is room for continued debate on this issue, which, ideally, would be resolved through professional consensus, and expressed in later, expanded versions of the AFMLTA standards. The NBPTS standards for Teachers of World Languages and the NCATE Standards for Foreign Language Teaching offer models for such an expanded view.
CHAPTER THREE: LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION AND RETRAINING IN AUSTRALIA

The information in this chapter has been prepared on the basis of consultations with stakeholders, the mapping of teacher registration bodies’ and employers’ requirements for languages teachers’ and the mapping of teacher education courses (see Appendix 1), which was prepared on the basis of a web-search of published course information, telephone conversations with teacher educators, and teacher educators responses to an information questionnaire.

About forty Australian universities and institutions of higher education currently offer pre-service education courses in teaching (e.g. Bachelor of Education and Diploma of Education).

Our investigation found that, to the best of our knowledge, around thirty-four of these universities and tertiary institutions include an option to study languages teaching.

3.0 Course entry requirements

Normal entry to teacher education courses is based on a Tertiary Entrance Ranking (TER) score or equivalent, which is calculated on the basis of students’ Year 12 results. Entry is competitive. The cut off points for entry vary from university to university, year to year and course to course.

Pre-service languages teacher education teachers usually undertake their study of languages in language departments in faculties outside the education faculty (most commonly Arts/Humanities faculties). A Year 12 pass in the language is generally stipulated as a pre-requisite for tertiary study in the language. For native speakers who have not studied the language at Year 12, there are various arrangements to assess ‘equivalence’. Some university language departments offer languages ab initio and some teacher education courses accept students who have begun their language study in these ab initio courses. Several languages educators and teacher educators believed that the language proficiency of these students was lower than that of students who had commenced university languages study following several years of languages study to Year 12, but this perception was not universally shared among stakeholders. It seems likely that ab initio students of languages who have substantial in-country or immersion experience, as in the Central Queensland University (CQU) Bachelor of Learning Management Japanese (BLM, Jpn) (case study 1) are at least as linguistically competent as students who commence their language studies after completing a language as a Year 12 subject.

International students may be required to achieve a satisfactory level in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS)

3.1 Course Structure

This study confirms the findings of recent research (Liddicoat et. al. 2005) that most people who wish to specialise as teachers of languages complete the requisite courses in one of three modes:

- A Bachelor of Education (or similar, e.g. Bachelor of Teaching) degree, primary or secondary (duration four years);
- A double degree, typically a Bachelor of Arts, Business or Science/Bachelor of Education of four or five years duration;
- A post graduate degree or diploma of education (e.g. Graduate Diploma of Education (Dip.Ed., Master of Teaching) of one or two years duration.

As Liddicoat et al (2005, p. 37) noted, primary teachers are expected to teach in most learning areas, so the notion of a ‘major teacher specialisation’ for primary languages teachers is
problematic. Like these researchers, we have taken the view that since ‘many primary teachers do
tend to operate as specialists in the primary context … pre-service training needs to take account
of this’ (Liddicoat et. al., 2005, p. 37). We have also considered, however, that primary teacher
education courses traditionally cover the whole primary school curriculum. Our review of four
year teacher education courses for primary school teachers showed that of the eight nationally
agreed Key Learning Areas, Languages, in many cases, is the only area that is taught as an
elective, or is not taught at all.

Concurrent language and methodology study is not the norm in Australian teacher education
faculties. Students who complete a one or two year post-graduate qualification, such as Dip. Ed.
have usually studied the language or languages for two or three years (four to six units) in their
undergraduate degree course, prior to starting their post-graduate studies in generic teaching
methodology. This can result in the ‘languages gap’ where students have not been engaged in
language study for a year or more when they commence their teaching methodology studies. The
language gap applies particularly to post graduate courses but can also occur in four year primary
and secondary teaching degrees.

Languages units in most teacher education courses were found to be generic rather than language
specific. This was mainly due to the numbers in each language being insufficient to form a group
(e.g. in one university the 12 students studying languages units in their B.Ed. degree courses came
from 8 different language backgrounds). However, a number of universities had addressed this
issue and made specific arrangements to offer language specific units.

Three of the four case studies included in this Review offer models of courses where languages
and teaching methodology are studied concurrently.

Concurrent language and methodology study in Italian, for example, is a feature of the University
of Notre Dame (UNDA) Bachelor of Education, primary years. Each of the four units offered in
the languages specialty pathway of this course requires four contact hours per week over a 13
week semester, two hours for in-depth Italian language study and two hours for Italian teaching
methodology (Case Study 3, Chapter Six).

The BLM (Jpn) offered at the University of Central Queensland offers concurrent, language
specific language and methodology studies in units which comprise four hours of lecture-type
delivery as well as well as 2 hour (2x1) conversation classes every week (Case Study 1, Chapter
Six).

Students who undertake The Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages (B.Ed. B. Lang.)
degree at James Cook University (JCU) study language and teaching methodology concurrently
for five years, one of which is a year abroad (Case Study 2, Chapter Six).

Language specific study is more problematic in the Victoria University’s Graduate Diploma in
Secondary Education (Case Study 4), because the students come from a variety of language
backgrounds. The issue is dealt with mainly through language specific tutorials and study groups.
Students also continue to practise their language through the university’s partnership arrangements
with schools.

3.2 Practicum

All teacher education courses reviewed included a practicum component. Length of the practicum
was found to vary from 22 to more than 100 days. Some teacher registration bodies stipulate a
minimum number of days for the practicum. (In Victoria, for example, the minimum is 45 days).
Various practicum arrangements are in place. These include block placements, special partnership
arrangements with schools, and internships. Many include longer periods of professional experience (not usually formally supervised teaching practice) in schools.

Secondary student teachers’ practicum experience usually includes substantial periods of teaching and observing languages classes in schools. However, it is common for only 50% of secondary practicum to be in languages, as most students are also required to have a second ‘teaching method’. Finding sufficient time for teaching and observing languages classes is even more difficult for students who are training to teach languages in primary schools, as these students are also expected to gain experience as generalists.

This issue is further discussed in Chapter Four.

3.3 Course content

Languages teacher education units in all teacher education degrees and diplomas tend to share certain common content, although we found some interesting variations. Content that was common to most languages units included:

- Research on the principles and theories of second language acquisition
- Second language learning pedagogy – theories and practices
- Designing, planning and implementing languages curriculum
- Student assessment
- Lesson planning
- Current issues in the teaching and learning of languages in schools
- Reflection on practice
- Use of materials and resources
- ICT in languages learning

There appeared to be considerable variation in the extent to which individual courses covered language development as a socio-cultural activity. Awareness of the importance of intercultural languages learning appeared to be growing in response to the National Statement and Plan and associated initiatives, especially the Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning in Practice (ILTLP) project.

In recent years State and Territory governments have overseen the development of curriculum in the eight nationally agreed Key Learning Areas. The languages curriculum documents reflect up to date content and a complex conceptual framework for languages teaching that graduate students are expected to know and understand when they begin to practise their profession. The significance of these documents for preparing languages teachers was not reflected in the content of most courses for pre-service languages teachers.

3.4 Application of the AFMLTA and other standards

All respondents participating in the consultations agreed that the AFMLTA standards were of value to guide course development. The standards were seen to provide a ‘roadmap’ of the various elements of knowledge and skills that could be expected of teachers. Some universities were auditing their courses against the AFMLTA standards to ensure that all areas were covered. Teaching staff at the Victoria University (VU) reported that they had ‘benchmarked’ their curriculum against both the AFMLTA standards and the Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT) standards for graduate teachers. They found both sets of standards helpful in reviewing and reorienting the curriculum, and for personal reflection on course content. The BLM course at CQU uses the Education Queensland professional teaching standards to guide and monitor courses. The ACER review of this course in 2005 used the Education Queensland standards to develop criteria
to assess the performance of graduate students in schools. This study found that the BLM course units covered the standards content, and that BLM graduates were able to meet the assessment criteria derived from the standards (Note that the ACER study focused on the BLM course as a whole, not specifically the languages course).

Graduate teachers in Victoria are ‘provisionally’ registered by the VIT in their first year of teaching. Award of full registration is dependent on the successful completion of a portfolio of tasks which require the teachers to demonstrate how they meet the eight VIT standards for full registration in the areas of ‘professional knowledge’, ‘professional practice’ and ‘professional engagement’. These standards, like those of other teacher registration bodies in Australia, are generic, but education faculties need to ensure that their graduates will be cognisant of the standards and sufficiently well prepared to meet assessment requirements. To gain full registration languages teachers, like other teachers in Victoria need to demonstrate, in their initial years of teaching, that they:

- Know how students learn and how to teach them effectively
- Know the content they teach
- Know their students
- Plan and assess for effective learning
- Create and maintain safe and challenging learning environments
- Use a range of strategies and resources to engage students in effective learning
- Reflect on, evaluate and improve their professional knowledge and practice
- Are active members of their profession

These Victorian standards for full registration are typical of standards developed in other states. They are well aligned with graduate and subject specific standards, including the AFMLTA standards, and provide a broad platform to guide teacher preparation course development. However, our study suggests that the extent to which relevant standards are used to guide courses in university education departments across Australia varies considerably.

3.5 Course Accreditation

As the ACER review of national trends in teacher accreditation (Ingvarson, Elliot and Kleinhenz 2006) showed, current practices for accrediting teacher education courses in Australia, unlike courses that prepare candidates for other professions, are not well established. Of the six states and two territories, only three states – New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland - have legislation requiring formal approval or accreditation of teacher education courses. Victoria, Queensland and New South Wales have formal processes of course review and course approval, based on subject specific guidelines and requirements. In the other states, course approval processes operate in much the same way as before the establishment of the teacher registration bodies – that is, according to the internal university quality assurance processes.

This issue is discussed in the literature review (Chapter Two) and in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER FOUR: ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION FOR LANGUAGES TEACHERS

4.0 A need to place much higher value on languages in the wider Australian community

Virtually every respondent consulted in the course of this Review highlighted the lack of importance and value placed on languages in the wider Australian community. While it is beyond the scope of this project to investigate this issue further, to discuss it at length, or to suggest remedies, we believe it is essential to note that many of the issues that face teacher education for languages teachers stem from a pervasive undervaluing of languages in education and in the wider Australian community. Project 4 in the suite of eight national languages projects of which this project is part, Development of a nationally coordinated promotion strategy will be of the highest importance in this regard. The completed Project 7: ‘Leading Languages’ – a professional learning program for school principals and leaders is also very significant.

4.1 Variation in supply and skill requirements of graduate teachers

The picture of supply and skill requirements gained during the consultation phase of the project was complex. In some languages in some urban areas there appeared to be an oversupply of teachers. In Brisbane, for example, one university respondent said that graduates in Italian had trouble finding employment. Respondents from the Independent school sector reported that they could usually attract graduates of high calibre. Government and Catholic schools, especially primary schools, reported difficulties in attracting languages teachers in some primary schools. One principal of a Catholic primary school said that when a qualified teacher was not available, schools ‘made do’ with unqualified teachers. The Principal expressed this by saying: ‘The teacher you have is the teacher you can get.’

A serious issue was the difficulty experienced by rural, remote and ‘difficult to staff’ schools in attracting languages teachers. Many of these teachers were itinerant part time (commuting between different schools) and distance was often an insurmountable problem. If a teacher left there was often no replacement available. One strategy employed in some schools – especially primary schools - to solve this problem was to change the language taught if one teacher left the school and another who could teach the same language was not available. This disruption was often exacerbated when the students again changed language upon entry to secondary school.

Principals and teachers in schools across Australia reported that teachers whose first language was not English often experienced problems with classroom discipline. Several principals commented that if they had to choose between a teacher with poor language skills but high classroom management skills, or a teacher with high language and low classroom management skills they would choose the former, and in fact had done so in some cases. This usually resulted in orderly classrooms where children learnt something of the country and culture but gained little in the way of language skills.

Further information in the area of languages teacher supply and demand is being collected as part of the Investigation into the State and Nature of Languages Education project, which aims to develop a detailed and comprehensive picture of the current provision of language education in Australian schooling. As part of this project a quantitative survey is being conducted to collect and analyse data from all jurisdictions (where available). This will include data on student participation in languages in schools, languages teachers, including numbers of teachers at primary and secondary levels across all language providers, number of teachers for each language, level of qualifications, and unmet demand for teachers of particular languages. Workforce planning areas in State/Territory education are being included in the consultation process.
4.2 More disincentives than incentives for people to train as languages teachers

Most respondents felt that disincentives outweighed incentives for people to train as languages teachers. Incentives included: following up a personal interest in languages, opportunities to study overseas, and in some states, bonus points in the Tertiary Education Rank (TER) or state equivalent score for university entrance. Respondents noted that financial incentives had decreased since the cessation of NALSAS funding.

Disincentives were mainly related to the low status of languages teachers, perceptions of lack of a career path, especially in primary schools, itinerancy and associated problems, lack of support in schools, and difficult working conditions. As one teacher, who graduated in 2004, put it:

Incentives are diminishing as perception is strong that funds for languages programs are drying up. Disincentives include (a) languages go in and out of fashion so some potential language teachers feel that they may spend years training for a job that may be short-lived (b) scarcity of full-time permanent positions (c) low salary, especially when considered that new teachers may be part-time or relief for years before gaining permanency, and then have no guarantee that they can teach what they are trained for.

Teachers and principals were eager to speak about the problems of itinerancy. They felt that these problems were discouraging young people from taking up careers as languages teachers and causing specialist languages teachers to return to mainstream classroom teaching. Teachers complained that they did not ‘belong’ in any school, and they were not provided with suitable teaching space, facilities or resources. Language teachers were sometimes seen as kind of ‘relief’ teacher, because they provided blocks of classroom release time for the regular classroom teachers, who rarely made time with them for discussion or joint planning:

Language teachers are marginalised in schools. Originally the normal classroom teacher was supposed to be in the classroom with the language teacher. But this does not usually happen. The language teacher is now often the [teacher who replaces a classroom teacher on other teachers]...peripatetic teachers are somehow not real teachers. Even if a teacher is based in a school, half an hour with classes twice a week equals big time burnout (Staffing officer, state department of education).

Graduate languages teachers, especially those who were itinerant, commonly lacked a (language teacher) mentor in their first year of teaching. They also lacked a regular collegiate support group and, in cases where they spent only a few hours per week in a school, they had no-one to empathise with, and experienced only a disjointed sense of collegiality. The result was burnout for some teachers, while others made the decision to return to regular classrooms or other teaching areas.

Another problem arising from language teacher itinerancy is that languages, in many cases, fail to become embedded in the curriculum and integrated with other subject areas, so that language teachers often fall out of step with other teachers, especially in curriculum planning. The resulting lack of status and legitimacy is a source of frustration for languages teachers. In some cases this frustration influences them to seek work in other areas of teaching.

Language teaching was also perceived as difficult, especially in junior secondary school classrooms with diverse student populations. More than one respondent remarked that some teachers with languages teaching qualifications conceal this fact for fear that they will be asked to teach a language.
It seems likely that, especially in some secondary schools, the insufficiency of some teachers’ knowledge of languages and their poor pedagogical skills are contributing to classroom discipline problems. Inept languages teachers present a poor model of languages teaching. A vicious circle is created in which inadequate teacher knowledge and skills result in inadequate student learning and skills. This model deters otherwise capable students from taking up the profession of languages teaching. The opposite is true in schools with competent languages teachers.

The limited time given to languages – approximately 30-60 minutes per week in most primary schools - also contributes to the frustration and disillusionment experienced by many languages teachers. Coupled with unrealistic expectations about what is achievable in this time, predicted failure often becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

School leadership emerged as a crucial issue, and this again ties in with the low value placed on languages in the wider community. Where support from the principal and school leadership team is lacking, the work of the language teachers becomes more difficult. Often, the lack of value and marginalisation of languages filters down to the students, who do not see the area as important. This contributes to ongoing problems of classroom management, and an unattractive image of language teachers that is not conducive to recruitment.

One teacher commented: ‘If the leadership does not value (languages) then the teacher is on a downward spiral’.

4.3 Lack of incentives and opportunities for re-training

Respondents commented on the lack of incentives for teachers to retrain as languages teachers. Chief amongst these was that teachers would have to bear most or all of the costs involved in extra study, including study leave and trips to countries where the target language was spoken. This was seen as being due to the decline in financial support since NALSAS funding ceased. Courses that were available and promoted under NALSAS had either ceased to operate or were too expensive for teachers to undertake.

We spoke to some teachers who had retrained as languages teachers under NALSAS. One of these teachers, who had retrained as a teacher of Indonesian (including study in Jogjakarta) remarked:

This course turned my life around. All of us who did the course felt valued. We were doing these things as teachers, working together. The (Education Department) valued what we were doing, and it was not just done on goodwill – too much can sometimes be done on goodwill.

Apart from cost, disincentives described included the general unattractiveness of languages teaching as a career, difficulty of access to suitable courses, and the uncertainty of employment in the future.

There are very few, if any, courses specifically designed for teachers who wish to retrain as languages teachers, although some courses offer opportunities for teachers to take individual languages teaching methodology units for re-training purposes. The Graduate Certificate in Languages Education, offered by the University of Adelaide provides an opportunity for some teachers to retrain as languages teachers, but two years post Year 12 study in a language is a pre-requisite. The flexible Facilitating Learning of Languages Other Than English (FLOTE) program could also provide opportunities for teachers who wish to retrain as languages teachers.
4.4 Insufficient funding for languages

Inadequate funding for teacher education courses was mentioned as a major issue by many respondents:

Policies are coming out left, right and centre, but no-one is coming up with the resources (School principal).

There was a widespread perception, particularly among languages educators and teacher educators that languages units in teacher education courses are being crowded out of the curriculum because there is insufficient money to support units that are perceived to be ‘optional’ or ‘non-mainstream.’ These units are perceived to be in competition with, rather than complementary to units in literacy in English because the funding providers do not recognise that literacy is enhanced through the sustained development of an additional language.

4.4.1 Should study of a language be made compulsory in primary teacher education courses?

A number of respondents pointed out that while study of other KLAs, including the specialist areas of Art and Music, was accepted as a part of the core of most primary teacher education courses, languages in these courses were studied either as an elective, leading to a ‘specialist’ qualification, or not at all. There seems to be no justification for this. Some teachers and principals believed that languages programs in schools were ‘struggling’ because classroom teachers had no knowledge of a language other than English and little awareness or understanding of other cultures. Some respondents felt that if every classroom teacher had studied and learnt to value at least one other language and culture, the work of specialist languages teachers would be more effective.

We would like there to be a requirement for (teacher education) students to have extra study in a LOTE and LOTE support. This is the only sustainable way in the long run for primary language programs. At the moment this study is encouraged rather than required (Education Officer, languages other than English, state Department of Education).

We could look at better ways of equipping generalist (primary) teachers. Why could they not be LOTE trained too? ...if pedagogy is understood, some basic language could be introduced – this would be helpful and effective (Education officer, languages other than English Catholic education office).

The University of Tasmania at Launceston provides one model of a course that attempts to address this issue. In the second year of the Bachelor of Education course for students who intend to become primary and early childhood teachers, a linguistic unit covers language development in first and subsequent languages, linguistics and understandings about language.

In the third year of the course all students complete a Languages Curriculum unit. This unit runs for two hours for six weeks. The unit aims to equip graduate students to support language programs in schools and to encourage future school leaders to be advocates for languages. 50% of the unit is devoted to ESL and 50% to LOTE. The community nature of LOTE learning is emphasised, as is a move away from the idea that all the classroom teacher can do is (as the lecturer who teaches the unit described it) ‘tinker at the edges.’ LOTE methodology covers ways in which classroom teachers can support a language teacher, e.g. by developing shared assessment strategies. The unit also covers sustainability, whole school approaches, allocations of time and resources and the cumulative nature of language learning. Also covered are cognitive
development, problem solving, metalinguistic awareness and access to other ways of thinking about the world.

A number of students in this B.Ed. course also do a specialist language unit in their fourth year of the course. The unit runs for two hours over twelve weeks. Entry to this unit requires pre-tertiary languages background studies and some in-country study, bi-lingual status, or language study in another faculty.

4.5 Lack of communication between education faculties and languages departments in other faculties that educate pre-service languages teachers

University respondents commented on the lack of opportunities for communication between the education faculty and the language department of the faculty in which students studied the language (e.g. Arts/Humanities). This was leading to very low levels of inter-faculty collaboration. In some instances, said one respondent, organisational structures were based on financial arrangements that undermined collaboration – ‘the more you collaborate, the less you get.’ Time was a major issue. University educators said that heavy workloads left little time for inter faculty collaboration. Inter-faculty initiatives were usually left to individuals to organise on an ad hoc basis.

4.6 Lack of communication between universities, schools and employers

Most respondents agreed that representatives of schools, employers and universities had limited opportunity to communicate. They agreed on the need for improved communication and collaboration, but gave time as the main reason why this did not happen. Forging closer partnerships between schools and universities, as in the four case study examples, would be one way of overcoming part of this problem. Another way is to follow the example of some state education departments, e.g. the Victorian education department, which arranges regular ‘Forums’ at which stakeholders in languages education meet to inform each other of current issues in their areas and to propose and follow up collaborative actions.

However, this, like the problem of lack of communication between education and other faculties involved in educating pre-service languages teachers, is ultimately a matter of having sufficient time.

4.7 Separation of languages study from study of pedagogy: the ‘Languages gap’ in courses

Some university respondents argued that teacher education courses were structured in ways that worked against the integration of languages and pedagogical proficiency. Students tended to study a language (usually outside of the Education faculty) during the first two years of their degree but in some courses did not undertake the ‘languages teaching method’ units until the final year of the education component of their course, so that the language ‘atrophied’ in the intervening period. This was particularly the case for graduate Dip. Ed. students. Structurally, these arrangements worked against the development of language proficiency. Many respondents commented that language expertise and educational expertise needed to be brought together.

4.8 The generic, rather than language specific, nature of languages teaching method units

Languages teaching method units in many courses, especially the post graduate diplomas and degrees, are generic, rather than language specific. In many teacher education faculties, the range of languages backgrounds among students makes it difficult to form language specific classes. A languages teacher education class of twelve or more students from eight or more different language backgrounds was found to be a not uncommon scenario. This gave rise to serious
methodological problems. As all teacher educators and languages researchers recognised, different languages call for different ways of teaching:

We’ve actually lost the ability to consider the language in depth. There are huge differences in what’s needed. What I need to know in French and Japanese is quite different, for the teaching of writing in particular...a student can read a newspaper quite early in a French course, but you can’t expect a third year Japanese student to read a newspaper. A core generic method needs individual language support. In a two hour block you can’t cover it. You need a Japanese speaker. With limited hours you can’t do it. The economic thing works against the quality thing. There are too few in language staff to justify the position. You have sessional staff, the curriculum is limited by the employment, you lose the development aspect and have a very pedestrian sort of course (Languages educator and researcher).

One languages teacher commented:

I am aghast that here in Victoria (and perhaps everywhere) that there is no language-specific methodology component to the LOTE Dip. Ed. course. The entire course is generic. There is no practising teacher seconded to provide practical advice about the target language. It flies in the face of logic that a trainee teacher of German receives no actual tuition in German throughout the Dip. Ed. course. It contributes to the fallacy that you can learn about other cultures and language without actually learning the language. Trainee teachers need to maintain their language skills and indeed learn the particular skills and vocabulary appropriate for teaching young people.

This is a major issue. If the student’s language is not strong, it will not be strengthened during the teacher training year(s) (Languages educator).

Some universities were found to be providing language specific method studies by offering tutorials taught by sessional teachers who were usually school teachers. In the case study examples other strategies were being explored.

4.9 Is the knowledge of university teacher educators up to date?

This issue was raised in relation to two possible sources of the knowledge base of teacher educators: (1) the practical world of schools and (2) research.

With regard to the first, respondents noted the lack of communication and collaborative work between universities and schools:

There is not enough connection between the universities and what is happening in classrooms. They (university teaching staff) don’t work with teachers or discuss what’s current. Why aren’t they contacting, communicating, asking? Where are university people getting their methodology? Who are they (universities) employing? What are their credentials? Do they design courses around state curriculum? Maybe they need In Service Education themselves (Education Consultant for independent schools).

With regard to research as a second source of the knowledge of teacher educators, teacher educators themselves said that staffing arrangements, heavy teaching loads and high numbers of sessional staff left little time or opportunity to conduct or learn from research.
4.10 Are courses up to date?

Up to date courses reflect current research into language learning and teaching. They also need to reflect curriculum and teaching practice in schools. Respondents in all universities reported staffing restrictions and heavy teaching loads in teacher education faculties. This placed limits on the time available for academic staff to conduct research, or to take practical measures, such as redesigning courses, to ensure that programs reflected the best of what is currently known about languages and language acquisition. Some teacher educators and languages researchers reported that many languages teacher education courses were ‘tired’, and not reflective of current international knowledge and research based best practice. This related, especially to the teaching of intercultural language learning and failure to integrate language, language acquisition theory and practice, especially in the practicum.

The methodology courses are not all that different from twenty to thirty years ago (Project officer, state department of education).

You could look at the names of the courses and see a very old set of ideas called ‘LOTE methods...This reduces professional knowledge to a bunch of methods and strategies... The focus of task based methodology is not sufficient for taking us into the future. We need to take the interculturaltion of graduate teachers into schools (University languages educator and researcher).

A languages educator who worked in a languages department outside the education faculty, believed that many teacher education courses continue to rely on theories of ‘communicative’ language learning as they were current in the 1980s:

A lot of tertiary education programs are actually out of date...It is 1980s communicative languages teaching, not terribly innovative (Languages educator and researcher).

The main areas in which (some) courses appeared to be lagging behind current best practice were:

- Intercultural language learning
- Integration of literacy
- Integration of theory and practice, especially in practicum arrangements
- Recognition and integration of state curriculum and syllabus documents
- Integration of ICT
- Understanding the broader educational goals and benefits of languages learning

4.11 Sessional and casual staff

The professional knowledge and expertise of individual tenured lecturers was reflected in some up to date, research based course content in some courses. However, some teacher educators, including sessional staff members, were critical of the high proportion of sessional and casual staff in languages teacher education faculties. Sessional teachers agreed that their area of expertise was teaching practice, not research, and that lower levels of scholarship and research placed education faculties at risk of falling behind in their knowledge of current research findings. This could place the quality and relevance of course content at risk.

On the other hand, many argued that having sessional staff had advantages, one of which was ensuring more up date ‘practical’ course content. Most sessional staff were reported to be exemplary classroom teachers who were able to bring ‘the wisdom of practice’ to their university
teaching. These people were also usually more familiar with the current school languages curriculum frameworks and syllabuses in each state. They were mindful of the need for student teachers to be familiar with these documents and to be proficient in the methods and strategies needed to implement them. Conversely, some academic staff who spent little or no time in schools came under criticism because they were seen to be ‘out of touch’ with current languages needs in schools.

4.12 Lack of research in languages teacher education

University educators expressed concern that the majority of languages teaching staff in education faculties did not engage in research or keep up to date with research carried out in other faculties. It was pointed out that whilst a Ph.D is required of staff in most university departments, many who teach languages education do not even have a Masters degree. Casualisation was the main contributor to this lack of a research presence. Casual staff were reported to be often not qualified or interested, or have the time to engage in research. Several talented scholars who wished to pursue research in languages and languages education preferred to work outside the education faculty.

Research in languages is also carried out in language departments in faculties other than education, such as Arts/Humanities. Apart from the fact that these faculties also need more funding, their research efforts are not always shared with education faculties that train languages teachers. According to some researchers and language teacher educators this is because existing funding models encourage competition rather than collaboration between faculties. The collaboration that does occur comes more from concern and care on the part of some individuals than from structural co-operative arrangements.

4.13 Interacting with state curriculum and syllabus documents

Over the past fifteen years, education departments in all states have published complex curriculum and syllabus documents and extensive support materials in all KLAs including languages. Many respondents from all sectors, including teacher educators, commented that insufficient time was provided in teacher education courses for study of these new curricula. This shortcoming, where it exists, is serious as these documents present not only a description of content, but also a conceptual approach to the teaching of languages, which the graduate teachers will need to understand when they start teaching.

There is a problem in the relationship between the tertiary and the school level. The tertiary level is very slow to react to the sorts of changes governments are implementing. First year educators are no more up to date than those being educated twenty years ago. There is a need to fill in the gaps in pre-service training. A good program should be teaching to the situation teachers find themselves in (but) the state curriculum is covered in one hour in a methodology unit. The curriculum is conceptually different, but there is no engagement with the curriculum stuff that goes into the documents. The impression is that teacher education is not very intellectual. If any profession should be, teacher education should be. (University languages educator and researcher)

4.14 Teacher education students’ knowledge of language and culture at entry and exit points of their courses.

All respondents agreed that knowledge of the subject/content i.e. languages and culture, that student teachers would eventually teach in schools, was very important. This accords with research findings that teachers who have a deep understanding of their subject matter are more effective than those who do not. (Hill, Rowan, & Ball, 2005) They are also more likely to engage students
in classroom discussion of subject matter and higher order thinking. (Grossman, 1990) Most
respondents agreed that proficiency in speaking, reading and writing the language or languages to
be taught was a significant—though not the only—element in the content/subject knowledge base
of a languages teacher. However, some education faculty staff said that this element was generally
assumed rather than assessed when students commenced their language teacher education studies,
since language study was usually carried out in another faculty or area of the university—or even,
in some cases another university altogether. As one university respondent put it: ‘Proficiency in
the language is assumed. And that’s one hell of an assumption!’

Another university respondent described the language proficiency requirements for teacher
education students in her university as ‘pretty arbitrary.’

All education faculties set pre-requisites for students who wished to take up language teaching
study in their education degrees. Most commonly, these were a major or minor of two or three
years post Year 12 study in the language. Some universities accepted students who had
commenced their study of the language at university as ‘beginners’. In one way this was seen as a
positive rather than negative factor, because it improved access to teacher education courses by
increasing the pool of applicants.

The problem appeared to be lack of information about students’ levels of language and cultures
knowledge and proficiency, and about how levels of achievement had been assessed in the other
faculties. This lack of information applied to all courses taken outside the education faculty, not
only to the ab initio courses. However, most teacher educators appeared to place more faith in the
rigour and quality of the post Year 12 major or minor language studies than the ab initio courses.
No data had been collected as to the relative merits of different language courses taken in faculties
outside education, and no criteria established upon which judgements might be made.

One possibility considered was to test students for language proficiency on entry to teacher
education courses. This was not a universally favoured option (although some people were
prepared to strongly argue a case for testing), but most teacher educators agreed that more
information, perhaps on the basis of other assessment instruments like portfolios of course work
and assignments, would be useful.

In the case of native speakers, language proficiency was often assumed, or regarded as
‘equivalent’ to a major or a minor in the language. All of this resulted in a wide variety of
language backgrounds and language proficiency among students studying language units in
education faculties. Some students might be native speakers, some native speakers whose
knowledge of the language was limited to a dialect, some might be English speaking background
students with a post Year 12 major or minor in the language, some might be students who had
started their language study as beginners, some might have spent some time using the language in
a variety of settings, including in-country experience, others might have little experience of using
the language, apart from academic study.

Assessing students’ language proficiency at the exit point of their teacher education courses
seemed, in some education faculties, to be regarded as a novel idea. Interestingly, it appeared that
most education faculties did not consider themselves to be accountable for the language
proficiency of their students—they saw their role as being to teach the pedagogy—the ‘method’
rather than the language itself, and it was often very difficult to integrate the two. One respondent
in a university where the government education system, the major employer of teachers in the
state, tested job applicants for their language proficiency commented:

  We warn them that they have to be able to pass the (employers’) test if they want
employment. We say to them: the onus is on you. Find yourself a native speaker, go
to New Caledonia or something. Most make the effort to do this (University teacher educator).

From our investigations it appeared that few education faculties in Australian universities would be in a position to provide defensible guarantees that their graduates met high standards in language speaking, reading, writing and cultural knowledge.

4.15 Issues with the practicum

Most teacher education staff reported difficulties in finding practicum places for their students. This was partly a funding issue, and partly because, especially in primary schools, there were insufficient numbers of language teachers who were qualified to train students. Even when practicum places were available, it was not certain that students would have sufficient time observing and teaching languages classes. As noted in Chapter Three, secondary teachers usually spend only 50% of practicum time on language teaching, and for primary teachers the issue is particularly problematic, since they are also expected to teach and observe generalist classes.

The Victoria University is one example of an innovative practicum model. Students are placed in one school for a whole year, in a mix of block rounds (2x4 weeks each) and fifteen to twenty single days, commencing at the start of the year. Students develop a partnership project that is seen to be of benefit to the educational program of the host school, such as an area of curriculum development or implementation. The university aims to place at least four students at each school so that they can work on a project as a team (See Case Study 4, Chapter Six)

Another example of an innovative practicum model is the BLM (Jpn) at CQU. Students in this program complete more than 100 days of practicum. The BLM practicum comprises 80 days in a combination of block and day visits. There is also a compulsory internship of 20 days which is additional to the professional experience requirements of the Queensland College of Teachers.

There are five separate practicum requirements in the BLM, and they are designated as Portal Tasks. These tasks directly link educational theory and practice. Portal Task 5 is the internship. It can only be commenced after the first three portal tasks have been completed.

Part of the BLM practicum is completed in Japan in a Japanese school. This does not entail additional funding because the host school Japanese principals and teachers find that the presence of the native speakers of English is beneficial for their school programs (See Case Study 1, Chapter Six).

As mentioned earlier, the Australian Government announced in the 2007 Budget that it would be providing an additional $77 million to universities over the next four years to improve teacher education programs so that all three and four year bachelor degree teacher education students receive a minimum of 120 days in-school teaching experience and meet new entry level teaching standards.

4.16 Learning how to use ICT effectively

ICT has changed the face of languages teaching in countries around the world, including Australia. The use of ICT in languages classrooms involves much more than technical knowledge about how to use the equipment. Arguably, ICT lends itself to languages teaching more than almost any other discipline. Teachers need the curriculum knowledge to deploy it in a variety of ways that include use of the internet, interactive whiteboards, email, voice email, language conferencing, and accessing, selecting, and using the growing range of languages software options.
Our investigations showed that most university education faculties are aware of the need to develop their students’ knowledge of ICT and its use in languages curriculum, but that actual coverage of ICT is uneven across different universities. Some courses, e.g. the ICT unit offered in the Graduate Diploma of Education at the University of Canberra, provide useful models for others to emulate.

Some languages educators and teacher educators commented on the need to provide more funding for the purchase of ICT hardware and software.

### 4.17 Offering languages education through distance delivery

One government education department respondent commented:

> Distance education in languages is no longer about distance. It’s about using the technology to bring languages to all children, even in schools that are not distant, and where language teachers are on site or not too far away.

We found this concept intriguing. It is beyond the scope of this project to investigate how languages might be taught to all students using distance education delivery methods, but it is important to note that not only school students, but also university students can make productive use of distance delivery mechanisms in languages learning. Certainly these should never be used or intended to replace quality languages teachers in schools or universities. However, the issue is one of which language teacher educators need to be keenly aware.

More and more people are choosing to take up the degree options offered by universities to study in the distance mode. Languages and languages teacher education courses are no exception, with several universities providing this choice.

The FLOTE (Facilitating Languages other than English) offers an interesting model of an online teacher education program for languages teachers. The FLOTE program was originally developed as a NALSAS initiative. The FLOTE suite of modules has been developed as an opportunity for personal learning, as a complete languages course undertaken cross-institutionally, or as a course sponsored by an education jurisdiction. It has wide relevance for undergraduate, graduate and practising teachers, and provides a significant opportunity for teachers to upskill or retrain as languages teachers.

FLOTE is multileveled, so that it can cater for language learning needs at all levels. It also provides facilities that allow participants to explore and discuss issues with colleagues or instructors. For example, the Professional Practicum allows for the exchange of videos of practice. The program has also contributed to the forging of close links with the languages departments at Murdoch University.

FLOTE is accessible throughout Australia. It has been used by the Tasmanian education department in the Graduate Certificate in Methodology and the Graduate diploma in Methodology, and there is currently an agreement with James Cook University. FLOTE can be part of a teacher education course, or people can choose to do individual units. The program operates on constructivist, reflective principles, and includes keeping a reflective journal.

### 4.18 Potential applications of the AFMLTA standards

The issue of the AFMLTA standards and their potential applications is comprehensively discussed in the literature review (Chapter Two) and in Chapter Five. Clearly the standards have great potential for guiding and aligning teacher education courses in all Australian universities. However, it needs to be remembered that the AFMLTA Standards describe ‘accomplished’
teaching, rather than teaching at graduate level. For this reason they are not suitable for use in accrediting teacher education courses for languages teachers or for assessing graduating languages teachers.

All respondents in our consultations were aware of the AFMLTA Standards. Some had studied them deeply, some had begun to explore their possible applications, some had merely ‘looked’ at them, but clearly the standards had gained strong support from most respondents in all sectors.

4.19 Accreditation of pre-services languages programs

Accreditation is recognition by an independent authority that a course of study is of sufficient quality to produce graduates who are competent to practice their profession. Most regulated professions in Australia have accreditation processes in place. To legally practice as a doctor in Australia, for example a person must be a graduate of a course that has been accredited by the Australian Medical Council. That person must also be registered by a state government medical board. Some professions that are not regulated have processes that allow practitioners to apply for membership of a professional body on the grounds that they are graduates of a course that has been approved by that body. Accountants, for example, must have graduated from a course approved by the CPA in order to gain membership of that body, and have access to the status it provides. Universities are under no obligation for their courses to meet CPA standards, but most voluntarily choose to become accredited because they attract more students that way, and because they support the professions in their efforts to ensure quality of practice.

Teaching is now a regulated profession in Australia, as nearly all states require teachers to be registered by a state body before they can practise. But there is, as yet, no national mechanism in this country to accredit teacher education courses. Of the eight states and territories in Australia, only Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland have instituted processes, through the state registration bodies, to approve teacher education courses (Appendix 3).

A recent ACER study, conducted for Teaching Australia, examined current procedures for the assessment and accreditation of teacher education courses (Ingvarson, Elliot, and Kleinhenz, 2006). The findings indicated that these procedures are generally weak as quality assurance mechanisms. Where they exist, current accreditation standards for teaching education programs in Australia are more likely to focus on inputs than outcomes. Few are based on objective data. None is based on common outcome measures of the quality of graduates or their competencies. There is thus no independent guarantee that the over 200 teacher education courses offered in universities across Australia produce graduates who meet appropriate standards of professional practice.

Internationally, there is a clear trend to develop national systems for accrediting teacher education courses that focus more on measures of outcomes than traditional measures based on course inputs. England and Scotland, for example, increasingly use accreditation standards that identify expected outcomes for beginning teachers. In England, for example, graduate teachers from different courses are observed in classrooms. Observers’ ratings have been used in making accreditation decisions.

As noted above, the recent OECD review of teacher policy, Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers (OECD, 2005), paid particular attention to initial teacher education. Consistent with the general trend, the OECD report pointed out that accreditation criteria need to move from an emphasis on ‘inputs’, such as curriculum and teaching processes, to more emphasis on outcome measures. These measures would be based on teaching standards that describe what graduates of the courses would know and be able to do.

Two proposals for a national system of accreditation for Australian teacher education institutions are currently on the table: One is from the Australasian Forum of Teacher Registration and
Accreditation Authorities. (AFTRAA), an association that is made up of the existing state registration bodies in Australia and the New Zealand Teachers Council. The AFTRAA Framework for the National Recognition of Approved Pre-service Teacher Education Programs proposes that a national system for accrediting teacher education courses be set up under the auspices of AFTRAA. The paper argues that AFTRAA, as the umbrella body of state registration authorities is the appropriate body to carry out an accreditation function. It notes that ‘in 2006, regulatory authorities in all jurisdictions have the approval or consideration of pre-service teacher education programs as part of their legislative brief’ (Australasian Forum of Teacher Registration and Accreditation Authorities, 2006 p.1).

AFTRAA’s proposal is that:

Each jurisdiction will assess the appropriateness of pre-service teacher education programs mainly on the basis of the jurisdiction’s published graduate level expectations of (the) Professional Elements of the (MCEETYA) National Framework

and

be consistent with: graduate standards prepared by colleague interstate teacher registration and accreditation authorities’ (Australasian Forum of Teacher Registration and Accreditation Authorities, 2006 p. 3)

The other proposal is from Teaching Australia, the National Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (TA). This proposal, which is now in the consultation phase, recommends a national system that would be carried out under Teaching Australia’s auspices as a national independent body. Accreditation would address two aspects—‘course input’, conceived of in terms of course content, teaching methodology and staffing, and ‘output’ or the quality of graduates. TA’s proposal is that courses would be accredited by specialisation, so that languages would have a different process from, say mathematics. This would entail the development of standards specific to each specialisation, and of assessment methods that would use those standards for the purpose of certifying courses. Most sets of domain or subject specific professional teaching standards that have been developed in Australia, including the AFMLTA standards, describe the knowledge and skills that can be expected of ‘accomplished’ teachers. Acceptance of Teaching Australia’s proposal would entail the development of similar standards at graduate level.

TA proposes:

To establish an Australia-wide system of accreditation of teacher preparation programs in universities and other higher education institutions, Teaching Australia will consult with professional associations and key stakeholders on the development of a national. voluntary, profession-driven accreditation process. This consultation will inform the design of the system of accreditation.

TA’s proposal recognises that:

The accreditation system must consider a balance of outcomes, content and delivery, and whether the inputs to the program, the program methodology and the assessment mechanism are sufficient to achieve the desired outcomes. Developing two broad types of accreditation standards – program standards for courses and professional standards for graduates – will provide a sound basis for accreditation and will provide guidance and support for program developers. (Teaching Australia - Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2006).

TA’s proposal also recognises that ‘there is a basic issue as to whether accreditation should be generic, or based on specialised areas of teaching or stages of schooling...’ (p. 6). It leaves the way open for professional organisations to have input into the development of graduate standards in specific areas. This issue is of serious interest to all teachers’ professional associations, including the AFMLTA, in Australia.
Both the AFTRAA and the TA proposals are similar in content. The main difference concerns which body should have carriage of the system.

The House of Representatives Standing Committee (the Committee) on Education and Vocational Training’s report *Top of the Class* (HRSC Report) took the view that ‘The accreditation of teacher education courses should be the responsibility of a national body.’ (p. 27). This view was shared by the Australian Council of Deans of Education (Australian Council of Deans of Education (Transcript of Evidence, 13 October 2006 p. 4 quoted in *Top of the Class* p. 32) The Committee recommended that:

...the Australian Government continue to support the work of Teaching Australia in developing a national system of accreditation. The establishment of a high quality system will take some time and the cooperation of state and territory registration authorities. The Australian Government should ensure that sufficient resources are committed to allow for the time needed to reach agreement. Once the national system of accreditation has been established, the Australian Government should require universities in receipt of Commonwealth funding to have their teacher education courses accredited by the national accreditation body. (p. 34).

The HRSC Report specifically mentioned the NCATE system of accreditation (p. 33) as a ‘highly regarded’ system. Should a national accreditation body choose to take NCATE as a model it would need to develop graduate standards in the various subject/domain areas, including languages, in collaboration with teachers’ professional bodies. This would also entail reaching agreement on assessment procedures among various stakeholders.

At this stage, TA is considering a voluntary accreditation system which, like NCATE, would allow universities that wished to offer an independent guarantee of course quality to opt in to its accreditation procedures. Teaching Australia does not currently have legislated responsibility to implement a mandatory system.

The HRSC favoured a mandatory approach:

Teaching Australia is well placed to host a national accreditation system. However, while there are examples of successful voluntary accreditation arrangements, the Committee considers that a mandatory approach would be more effective in delivering the benefits of a national accreditation system. Ultimately, teacher education courses in receipt of Commonwealth funding should be required to be accredited by the national teacher accreditation body (p. 30).

Clearly much work still needs to be done before the various stakeholders reach agreement on the issue of accreditation of teacher education courses. The views of teachers’ professional associations, including the AFMLTA, and other stakeholders, especially language teacher educators will be important in the processes that lead up to the establishment of a national accreditation system.

### 4.20 Extent to which existing courses prepare students for their profession

One effective measure of the extent to which existing courses prepare students for their profession is the perceptions of colleagues and principals. Representatives of Independent schools in this study were the most satisfied with the performance of graduate languages teachers. A high proportion of government and Catholic school principals, human resources and project officers in state education departments, and senior school staff, however, reported difficulties in finding graduate languages teachers of high quality.
Teachers are coming out without the skills to teach Year 12 (languages). They also often lack recent in-country experience and a modern view of the language. An exception is xxx university, where six months in-country experience is part of the BA in Asian Studies (State education department project officer).

At one interview with school based personnel, primary school principals agreed with the view expressed by one of their colleagues that:

The perception of principals and Area supervisors is that the quality of LOTE teaching (with some notable exceptions) is generally low. In primary schools the perception is that specialists may be experts in the language, but not in pedagogy. In this, they are similar to Music specialists. The problems are worse with teachers who are native speakers. They don’t understand Australian school cultures and there are many discipline problems. They have no concept of pedagogy. Principals don’t like it. (Primary school principal)

This comment reflects two often raised issues about languages teachers’ performance. They concerned two identifiable groups of teachers: those of English speaking background for whom the language taught was a second language, and teachers of non English speaking background who were teaching their first language.

Lack of languages proficiency in the first group – those of English speaking background - was raised as a problem by principals and employers. Some school principals and employers had low language proficiency expectations of, especially, primary languages teachers. Some said that, given the shortage of ‘good’ languages teachers, they were happy to employ teachers with limited knowledge of the language, but who could engage their students in various kinds of languages-related activities.

Respondents from schools in all states and most sectors reported that some teachers from an English speaking background had insufficient knowledge of the language and culture. Some teachers whose background was in the language they taught had native-speaker language proficiency, but lacked familiarity with the Australian education system and classroom management strategies.

Most principal respondents agreed that, if they were choosing a new languages teacher, they would prefer a teacher with good classroom management skills and poor language skills over a fluent speaker who could not manage a class.

In one state, a language ‘proficiency assessment’ uses the Australian Language Proficiency Rating Scales (ALPRS) to assess candidates’ proficiency in the language or languages to be taught. Prospective teachers must satisfy certain requirements of this test before they can gain permanent employment as languages teachers in government schools. Unless teachers are shown to be ‘adequate’ according to the three main indicators of the scale, they cannot gain permanency. Teachers who pass two out of three indicators may be employed on shorter term contracts but cannot gain permanency.

The experience of this employer is that it is not uncommon for teachers who have graduated from universities as languages teachers to fail the languages proficiency test. The officer interviewed said that this was a ‘huge problem’. She believed that differences in teacher quality could be traced to different courses and universities and, sometimes, to individual teacher educators:

Differences in teacher quality are observable among graduates of different universities. High quality teaching is often traceable to certain individual lecturers, or to senior people in the faculty, who can influence course development and delivery.
The influence of these individuals can be greater than that of the institution. In some cases, quality has been known to suffer when a particular individual has left the university. (Senior education department officer).

The main criticism of their teacher preparation courses made by graduate teachers themselves was that they felt inadequately prepared for the ‘realities’ of the classroom and school life. It was only in the practicum, they said, that they had the opportunity to integrate theory and practice, and the amount of time spent in the practicum and on languages teaching within the practicum was insufficient. Some graduate teachers also felt under prepared to teach the requisite state curricula.

The scope of this study did not allow for the systematic gathering of multiple sources of evidence about the extent to which courses effectively prepare languages teachers to practise their profession. There are at least three approaches by which this information might be gathered in follow up studies:

1. Measures of professional knowledge gained through assessment of graduates (e.g. tests and portfolios of evidence).
2. Classroom observation.
3. Surveys of perceptions of preparedness to teach, completed by graduate students themselves, colleagues, principals and others (e.g. parents, school students).

The concerns voiced by respondents in this study about the preparation of languages teachers would appear to warrant further investigation. Appropriate instruments would need to be developed for this purpose, in line with the three approaches listed above.

4.21 Structural impediments that affect the quality of teacher education and re-training for languages teachers

Many of the issues discussed in this chapter originate in structural impediments that affect the quality of teacher education and re-training for languages teachers.

Chief of these are:

- Insufficient funding for languages teacher education courses;
- Lack of appropriate resources, especially in ICT
- Lack of incentives for people to train and re-train as languages teachers
- The ‘crowded curriculum’ of many teacher education courses, and undervaluing of the place of languages in the curriculum;
- Lack of opportunities for communication and collaboration between languages educators, teacher educators and school teachers who supervise trainee teacher in schools;
- Lack of provision for formal communication between employers, universities and government funding agencies;
- Over reliance on the work of sessional/casual staff in teacher education faculties;
- Insufficient student numbers and varied languages backgrounds of students causing languages units in teacher education courses to be generic rather than language specific;
- Lack of adequate arrangements to accredit teacher education pre-service teacher education courses
CHAPTER FIVE: OPTIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THE QUALITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION FOR LANGUAGES TEACHERS

Following are a number of options for strengthening the quality of teacher education for languages teachers that the Working Party may wish to consider drawing to the attention of the relevant stakeholders:

1. Give further consideration to potential applications of the AFMLTA Standards to teacher education courses, and support the AFMLTA to develop aligned standards at a graduate level.

The AFMLTA standards represent a nationally agreed, research based professional consensus about what languages teachers should know, value, and be able to do. As such, they describe a knowledge base for languages teachers. Arguably, this knowledge base should underpin teacher education courses in universities across the country. For this reason all Australian teacher education faculties need to fully explore the applications of the standards, including their uses for assessment purposes.

It should be remembered, however that the AFMLTA Standards describe the knowledge and skills of languages teachers at an ‘accomplished’ level. They should be regarded as aspirational, not a description of what graduating languages teachers can be expected to know and do. Supporting the AFMLTA to develop a set of graduate standards, in alignment with the existing standards for accomplished teaching of languages and cultures, would provide teacher educators with more a more useful and appropriate tool to guide courses and assess graduate students’ competence to practise their profession.

2. Encourage education faculties to accept greater responsibility for the languages and cultural knowledge and proficiency of their students.

We were surprised, in speaking with some university teacher education staff, to discover that they did not consider the languages and cultural proficiency of their students to be their responsibility. ‘Teaching method’ units, which were their main area of concern, were often not language specific, and many students undertook these method studies a year or more later than their study of the language.

If teacher education courses were accredited on the basis of a set of graduate standards for languages teachers that included knowledge of subject content, the education faculties would need to provide guarantees that graduates met the relevant standards in languages proficiency and cultural knowledge. In the absence of external accreditation, other quality assurance procedures should be in place to ensure that graduates of languages teacher education courses have sufficient knowledge of the subject they are to teach, i.e. that they have sufficient knowledge of the language and culture.

This does not mean that languages should necessarily be taught in education faculties. It does mean, however, that wherever possible, teacher education courses should offer language specific units, or, at least, units that are aligned with particular languages and cultures. (It should be noted here that most university languages education staff already strive to allow for languages and cultural specificity in their courses).

It also seems reasonable to expect that, particularly at student entry and exit points, education faculty staff should have at hand comprehensive information about the languages and cultural proficiency of their students. Some respondents were opposed to the notion of testing as an
appropriate way to gain that information, but the possibility should not be excluded, as modern testing procedures now provide useful and wide ranging information which goes well beyond the older crude assessments of language proficiency. Other ways of assessing the languages and cultural proficiency of students could include portfolios and special language specific assignments assessed by people with knowledge of the language. Improving communication and collaborative work between languages teaching staff and languages teacher education staff would also assist in resolving this issue.

The current situation, which allows universities to provide specialist degrees in languages teaching without being accountable for how well a teacher can speak, write and read a language, or how well the teacher understands the cultural context of the language, is clearly not conducive to improving the quality of language teaching in this country.

3. Support current initiatives of state and national bodies to nationally accredit teacher education courses for languages teachers.

The most effective strategy to improve the quality of language teacher education courses in Australian universities would be to develop ways of ensuring, nationally, that graduates met graduate level professional languages and cultures standards developed and agreed to by the Australian languages teaching community, in co-operation with other stakeholders.

National accreditation of language teacher education courses, if it is to be achieved, must have the support of Australian languages teacher educators in all states, the AFMLTA and other stakeholders. This issue has been fully discussed in Chapters Two and Four of this Report.

4. Encourage greater communication and collaboration between university languages departments, teacher education faculties and schools, with a view to ensuring that languages and teaching methodology are studied concurrently, and that students’ new knowledge is embedded and extended in classroom practice.

Integration of languages and culture, pedagogical studies, and practical experience of classroom teaching, demands that languages educators, teacher educators and school teachers maintain ongoing contact with each other. Regular exchanges and collaborative partnerships between these three key groups of educators would ensure that languages and pedagogy remain in touch with classroom practice.

5. Consider ways in which the numbers of tenured/permanent languages teacher educators in teacher education faculties may be increased, and halt the trend towards over reliance on sessional and casual teaching staff.

Over reliance on sessional and casual teaching staff in education faculties results in insufficient capacity to conduct and supervise research, so that new knowledge does not easily find its way into teacher preparation courses. This means that courses can quickly become out of date. One example is the uneven coverage of intercultural language teaching and learning.

6. Commission further outcomes focused research to gather evidence about the effectiveness of language teacher education courses by, for example:

- surveying graduate teachers their principals, colleagues and others, e.g. parents and students;
- directly assessing the performance of graduate teachers through such means as classroom observation and structured portfolio tasks.
The HRSC Report called for more systematic means of gathering data about the outcomes of teacher education courses. In line with international developments, which increasingly use outcome measures to assess the quality of teacher education courses, the Working Party may consider commissioning research that would include the development of instruments to survey stakeholder perceptions about the competence of graduate languages teachers (including those of the graduates themselves) and to assess their performance by more direct means, such as classroom observation and structured portfolio tasks.

5.0 Strategies to improve access to, and the quality of, preparation for language teachers

5.0.1 Promote languages teaching as a profession through advertising campaigns targeted to specific groups

Indications from this and other projects suggest that languages teaching may well be as low in the hierarchy of teaching as teaching is in the hierarchy of the professions. Margaret Gearon, in a recent paper described languages teacher education as the ‘Cinderella of teacher education courses’ (Gearon, 2007).

One way of addressing this problem would be to initiate an advertising campaign to improve general perceptions of the attractiveness of languages teaching as a profession. A related strategy would be to target particular groups of people who might be expected to have an interest in becoming languages teachers. These people fall into two broad categories: people for whom English is a first language and who are attracted to the study of languages, and people for whom English is a second language and who are fluent in a language other than English.

School and university students of English speaking background who have studied languages could be specially targeted in a promotion campaign through the career advice agencies in the school or university. However, it is probable that many people who would like to study a language have never had the chance to do so. Providing greater opportunity for these people to study languages ab initio in university Arts and Humanities faculties would be of personal, cultural and intellectual benefit to them. It would also add to the languages and cultural capital of the Australian community. Entry requirements to languages teacher education courses could allow for the acceptance into courses for ab initio languages students who reached satisfactory levels of language proficiency. Demand for places in languages teacher education courses would be likely to increase as numbers of qualified applicants became greater. Offering opportunities for in-country language experience for these people would be an additional incentive.

People in the second category, those with native-speaker or equivalent proficiency in a language, could be encouraged to take up studies in teaching through, for example, a promotion campaign through ethnic community networks. Thousands of students study languages in out of school hours government and ethnic languages schools. These students and their teachers (many of whom are not registered but have been given ‘permission to teach’ by registration bodies) could also be the target of promotion campaigns that would encourage them to study additional languages and consider languages teaching as a career.

5.0.2 Improve financial and other incentives for senior school students to study languages to senior levels.

Providing more incentives for more senior school students to study languages would increase the pool of people qualified to access university languages study and languages teacher education courses. Incentives could include extending existing opportunities for bonus points for university entry, HECS waiver, scholarships, and opportunities for overseas study. Some incentives could be linked to requirements to teach for a specified period in hard to staff schools.
5.0.3 Provide more opportunities for non-registered teachers to study language teaching courses.

The Bachelor of Education course at the University of Notre Dame, Western Australia (case study 3) is one example of a course that allows unqualified people with languages expertise to study language teaching methodology units and to bank credits for these units which may encourage them to undertake further study.

The Short Course in LOTE Methodology for Teachers in Ethnic Schools offered by Monash University provides a model of a strategy that increases opportunities for people to improve their current work as non-registered language instructors, and to gain access to full training as registered languages teachers.

5.0.4 Encourage collaborative partnerships between schools and universities

Partnerships and co-operative ventures between schools and universities allow student teachers to have extended and more authentic teaching experiences in schools. They also allow school teachers to engage more effectively with the courses the student teachers are undertaking, and teacher educators to keep up to date with current school teaching practices, including curriculum development and implementation.

In the Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education (Grad. Dip. Ed. program offered at Victoria University (VU) (Case study 4) for example, pre-service teachers meet with a mentor teacher one day a week to work on a jointly decided project. Some projects have an ‘end product’ such as the ‘fashionista’ unit in Italian.

Trainee teachers in the Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) offered at Central Queensland University, are mentored throughout the course by Trained Learning Managers. These people are experienced teachers who have completed a mentoring program. In the ‘Portal tasks’, which are completed during professional experience, students design, implement and evaluate strategies and outcomes for individual groups under the guidance of the Trained Learning Manager. Classroom practice is closely linked to on-campus learning and theory, and students are required to demonstrate and apply their theoretical knowledge.

Encourage concurrent study of languages and pedagogy

Pedagogical studies of languages teaching are most effective when languages are studied concurrently with studies of teaching methodology. The joint Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages (B. Ed. B. Lang. course at James Cook University (JCU) (Case Study 2) allows for the concurrent development of languages and teaching skills. In the B. Lang there is extensive practical experience for language students, with large amounts of practical reading, writing and listening. The course offers intensive language experience including in-country immersion, together with pre-service training.

5.0.5 Improve communication between teacher educators and languages educators

Improving communication and collaboration between teacher educators and languages educators will take time and money. University languages educators and teacher educators reported severe constraints on their time and energy. These constraints often precluded them from engaging in collaborative ventures. It is rare, for example, for languages educators to be involved in students’ practical experiences of teaching languages in schools, or in special action research projects in teaching languages that involve student teachers. Special funding would need to be provided and targeted to this purpose. This could possibly be done, initially, on a project by project basis.
5.0.6 Audit teacher education languages courses against the AFMLTA standards

A first step in applying the AFMLTA Standards to current courses would be for education faculty languages teaching staff to conduct an audit of their present courses to establish the extent to which they cover the eight teacher standards and their respective elements. The standards document includes, for each standard, ‘suggested questions for reflection’. These questions, together with the standards and elements themselves, would form a useful basis for the professional discussions that would support the audit.

Following the audit, courses could be modified or extended to ensure that they cover all elements and reflect the range and vision of accomplished languages teaching that is described in the standards. Our investigations suggest that some existing courses would require little modification. However, others would need to be fleshed out to include certain elements, e.g. awareness of ‘the impact of languages and cultures on the local and global context and on how people understand their place in the world’, and ‘know and reflect on (teachers’) own values and ideological positions and demonstrate respect for the different values of learners’ communities and cultures.’ (AFMLTA Standards page 5).

Teacher educators and course developers could also consider using the standards to develop criteria to self-evaluate and monitor individual courses, units and activities on an ongoing basis. Again the ‘suggested questions for reflection’ could be useful in this respect.

One such example is where teacher educators in the Grad. Dip. Ed. course offered by Victoria University (Case Study 4) have ‘benchmarked’ courses against the AFMLTA standards and the VIT standards.

5.0.7 Use the AFMLTA standards as a basis to improve assessment of pre-service and graduate teachers.

As previously mentioned, the AFMLTA standards describe the knowledge and skills of teachers at an accomplished level. Using these standards as a basis for student assessment at graduate or pre-graduate level calls for caution. However, the AFMLTA standards could provide a basis for developing criteria to assess a variety of student assessment tasks at the appropriate levels. The model developed by the VIT, which uses three tasks to assess provisionally registered teachers against relevant (generic) VIT standards for fully registered teachers, provides a useful model that includes assessment rubrics.

Units in the Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education, Victoria University, (Case study 4) have been ‘benchmarked’ against the AFMLTA and VIT standards.

NCATE accreditation in the USA provides another useful standards based assessment model. On the reasoning that effective courses produce successful teachers, the NCATE model uses the standards developed by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) to assess graduates of languages courses. Universities provide NCATE with data that demonstrate successful outcomes for graduate students. A recent NCATE report illustrates the variety of ways in which different course providers collect this data, such as classroom observations by colleagues in schools, portfolio entries containing student work samples, case study write-ups of students, and surveys of graduates. (Mitchell, Allen, & Ehrenburg, 2006)
5.0.8 Audit courses against the various state curriculum and syllabus documents for languages.

Some graduate teachers and their principals and colleagues felt that graduate teachers were ill prepared to teach the required languages curriculum in schools. Course auditing processes could use the state languages curriculum and syllabus documents to check that courses were preparing teachers to teach the appropriate languages content and skills in schools. This study would be most effective when integrated into school teaching practice in the practicum. The B.Ed. course at Victoria University (Case study 4) provides one example of a course that has been ‘benchmarked’ against the Victorian languages curriculum frameworks and syllabi.

5.0.9 Provide professional learning opportunities for school principals and school leadership teams to learn about the AFMLTA Program Standards.

The AFMLTA Standards include ‘Program Standards’ that describe specific conditions for successful languages teaching in schools. These include appropriate timetabling arrangements, provision for continuity of learning, and dedicated, well resourced, languages learning spaces. The AFMLTA Program Standards place expectations on schools to ensure that workplace conditions support the teaching and learning of languages. Principals and senior school staff should be made aware of the AFMLTA program standards through appropriate professional learning activities.

The Program Standards could also be used to improve students’ experiences of the practicum. Practicum arrangements that acknowledged the program standards would help student teachers and school staff alike to learn the valuable lesson that appropriate working conditions are as necessary to successful teaching and learning as teacher knowledge and expertise. Developing this awareness could prevent early burnout and contribute to higher retention of languages teachers. This could build on the professional learning program for languages teachers based on the AFMLTA Standards being developed by the AFMLTA (discussed earlier).

5.0.10 Encourage in-country experience and the use of ICT to extend students’ knowledge of the target language and culture

Providing opportunities for students to have extended in-country experience as part of their teacher education courses is proving to be an invaluable strategy for improving the knowledge and skills of pre-service teachers. Appropriate funding, for example scholarships and incentives, would need to be established to enable all students to access these opportunities.

Trainee teachers in the Bachelor of Learning Management, Japanese (BLM (Jpn) course offered at Central Queensland University (CQU) spend approximately three months at a tertiary institution in Komatsu City, Japan. This three month program includes five weeks in-school experience at local primary schools. Students also have the opportunity to study at a selected Japanese university as exchange students for up to one academic year. They are enrolled at the Japanese university and they receive CQU credits for their study upon their return.

BLM (Jpn) students use a range of ICT options. Communication with students in Japan, using ICT, is a requirement in conversation classes.

Trainee teachers in the B.Ed. B.Lang course offered at JCU spend at least two semesters (fifth year of study) in an approved immersion languages program in a country where the language of study (French or Japanese) is spoken. In the case of French, they also have the opportunity to undertake shorter immersion programs in New Caledonia. Both the short and long term programs are credit bearing.
Like the BLM students at CQU, the JCU students make extensive use of ICT to maintain contact with overseas speakers of the target languages whom they have met in the course of their studies. JCU also works closely with Murdoch University, and offers cross institutional studies, using ICT distance learning. Students complete a LOTE methodology unit provided via the Facilitating the Learning of Languages Other Than English (FLOTE) program. The course is generic, rather than language specific, but students are referred to individual sites for language specific material.
CHAPTER SIX: CASE STUDIES

Four case studies were prepared for this review. These are:

- Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) - Central Queensland University (CQU)
- Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages - James Cook University (JCU)
- Bachelor of Education (primary) Italian Teaching Method Units - University of Notre Dame Australia (UNDA)
- Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education - Victoria University (VU)

The four case studies selected for inclusion in this review were chosen because they provide examples of innovative and accessible courses in teacher education, and/or re-training opportunities for languages teachers in preparing them for the profession.

Case study 1: Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) Primary and Secondary Program, Central Queensland University

http://www.cqu.edu.au/

This course was selected because it was developed in partnership with teachers and principals and students have extensive contact with schools. There is a large languages teaching component throughout the course, and concurrent language and pedagogical studies.

Glossary:

BLM(Jpn): Bachelor of Learning Management(Japanese)
CQU: Central Queensland University
DEST: Department of Education, Science and Training
IELTS: International English Language Testing System
JALC: Japanese Language and Culture
LOTE: Languages other than English
QTAC: Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre
TOEFL: Testing of English as a Foreign Language

The university:

Central Queensland University (CQU) was officially proclaimed through an Act of Parliament in 1991 and achieved full university status in 1992. The university was established as the Queensland University of Technology (Capricornia) in 1967, and later became the Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education in 1971, before becoming the University College of Central Queensland in 1990. The current name – Central Queensland University – was adopted in 1994.

CQU offers programs at a number of different campuses and delivery sites both in Australia and overseas. It has Queensland campuses in Rockhampton, Bundaberg, Gladstone, Mackay and Emerald, delivery sites on the Sunshine Coast, international campuses in Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne and the Gold Coast, and offshore delivery sites in New Zealand and Shanghai.

The university offers programs through three faculties: Arts, Humanities and Education; Business and Informatics; Sciences, Engineering and Health.
The course:

**Bachelor of Learning Management (Jpn) Primary and Secondary Program**

CQU offers the BLM pre-service teacher education programs in the School of Learning and Innovation in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Education at its Rockhampton campus. The BLM programs offered are: BLM (Primary), BLM (Sec/VET – Secondary and Vocational Education and Training), BLM (Early Childhood) and BLM (Japanese) The BLM(Japanese - Jpn) is a pre-service program for students aiming to become teachers of Japanese in either the primary or secondary sector in Queensland. The BLM programs replaced the previous suite of Bachelor of Education programs.

In 2006 45 students were enrolled in the BLM(Jpn) across all year levels. In 2007 42 students are enrolled.

**Course entry and requirements:**

Normal university entry requirements (QTAC) apply for domestic students. An IELTS score of 6 or TOEFL score of 550 (some individual score requirements also, depending on the applicant’s previous study) is required for international students.

There is no pre-requisite for Japanese language. All BLM(Jpn) students, including native background students from Japan, are required to complete the six Japanese language units as well as the pedagogical and educational units.

**Course structure:**

The program is offered at undergraduate level and is completed over four years (full-time) or may be fast-tracked in three years. CQU has a three term year, with each term being of twelve weeks duration. The program comprises 32 units of study/192 credit points. Students may follow either the primary or secondary program. For the secondary program, a second Discipline Study (Teaching Area) is required. For the primary program, general primary teaching areas are required.

**Course content:**

The BLM(Jpn.) includes professional educational studies, Japanese language studies, and specific Japanese language teaching methodology. Pre-service secondary teachers also complete content and methodology studies in a second discipline area. For both primary and secondary programs, students take units in cross curriculum and professional education areas plus language studies and language teaching methodology: The language and language pedagogy units are as follows:

- JALC10002 Japanese Life Style and Custom.
- JALC10003 Formal and Informal Japanese.
- JALC 10004 Colloquial communication in Japanese.
- JALC19001 Learning with Japanese University.
- JALC19002 Professional Teaching in Japan.
- LOTE11011 Second Language Teaching Methodologies.
- LOTE11035 LOTE Curriculum and Pedagogy.

Each of the above units carries six credit points. Each unit continues to develop the skills and knowledge gained in the previous unit(s).
JALC units have 4 hours lecture type delivery as well as 2 hours (2 x 1 hour) conversation classes every week. The conversation class encourages students to use the target language for authentic communication, with or without preparation. Since 2006, it has been a requirement for part of the conversation classes to be conducted via online chat video conference with university students in Japan. Each student has his/her own computer with a web camera which links with a partner (or partners) at Japanese universities for communication in the target language.

- **JALC 10001 Effective Communication in Japanese socio-cultural context.**

The aim of the unit is to develop Japanese language proficiency through content-based learning. Students learn about different aspects of Japanese culture in the Japanese language and enhance both cultural knowledge and cultural proficiency.

- **JALC10002 Japanese Life Style and Custom.**

This unit particularly will engage students in learning the target language while they are learning about life style and customs of the contemporary Japanese people.

- **JALC10003 Formal and Informal Japanese.**

While continuing to develop the language proficiency of students, the unit focuses mainly on life and education in Japan. There is a particular emphasis on different levels of formalities of the target language, and students are encouraged to use the target language with an appropriate level of formality depending on context in their life in Japan, including the educational settings in Japan.

- **JALC 10004 Colloquial communication in Japanese.**

While continuing to develop the language proficiency of students, the unit focuses mainly on the colloquial forms of the target language that young and elder generations use. Students are encouraged to participate in activities that would maximise the benefits of a stay in the target country.

- **JALC19001 Learning with Japanese University.**

This unit provides opportunities for students to attain Information Technology knowledge and skills and is specially designed for those in the Japanese field of education. It provides opportunities for students to communicate with Japanese university students using various technologies, including regular interaction via the computer video conference program. The participating students in Australia conduct research on various topics which cover contemporary Japan and discuss the issues with Japanese university students using the video conference chat program.

- **JALC19002 Professional Teaching in Japan.**

The aim of this unit is to provide students with the skills to communicate effectively in a range of contexts, especially Japanese school settings. Students are trained to prepare lessons in various discipline areas in Japanese, conduct the lessons in Japanese and reflect on the lessons in Japanese. This unit is a preparatory unit for the teaching practicum component of the program at schools in Japan (Portal Task 2)
LOTE11011 Second Language Teaching Methodologies.

This unit introduces students to issues specific to LOTE acquisition. A range of methodological approaches is investigated, as well as the role of the individual in the learning process, and the factors that contribute to different rates of success among second language learners. Students also learn about designing, implementing and evaluating LOTE learning programs.

LOTE11035 LOTE Curriculum and Pedagogy.

This unit is strongly linked to the previous unit (Second Language Teaching Methodologies). It relates specifically to the Year 4 – 10 Japanese syllabus and the Senior Japanese syllabus. The aim is for students to develop the ability to interpret and implement curriculum material according to pedagogic best practice and the ability to reflect upon and to critically analyse second language curriculum policy and associated practices.

Staffing:

Students receive intensive training in Japanese throughout the course by Japanese native-background lecturers who are also Queensland trained and registered teachers. There is also a teaching assistant who helps each lecturer to facilitate the conversation class in each JALC unit. The pedagogical components of the course are taught by members of the education faculty as well as by practicing LOTE teachers from local schools, who are contracted to deliver some classes on the Queensland Syllabus studies.

The practicum:

Students complete 100 days or more during the practicum. The BLM practicum comprises 80 days in a combination of block and day visits. There is also a compulsory internship of 20 days, which is additional to the professional experience requirements of the Queensland College of Teachers.

There are five separate practicum requirements, designated as Portal Tasks 1 to 5. The portal tasks directly link with units in educational theory and practice. Students in the secondary stream and primary stream have slightly different allocations of days across the portal tasks.

Portal Task 2 is completed in Japan in a Japanese primary school. The other portal tasks are completed in Queensland. Portal Tasks 4 and 5 are usually done together but students must complete all other units in order to commence Portal Tasks 4 and 5. Portal Task 5 is the internship and can only be commenced after the first three portal tasks have been completed.

The extended practicum does not entail additional funding, because the Japanese practicum component does not need to be funded. The host school Japanese principals and teachers find that the presence of the native speakers of English is beneficial for their school programs. After the five week practicum in Japan, students remain in Japan for an additional two months. This focussed in-country experience is a required component of the program.

Assessment:

In the Japanese language units (JALC courses), students are assessed from the three perspectives.

1) Japanese language proficiency at the end of each unit
2) Fortnight entry into the writing journal
3) Participation in the communication and interaction in class
The first two perspectives are evaluated using the Australian Language Proficiency Rating Scales (D. Ingram, E. Wylie, 1985) and used for providing feedback to students. The third perspective is graded on a ‘Pass or Fail’ basis.

Feedback/evaluation:

BLM (Jpn) students are particularly enthusiastic about the immersion component of their course. Comments include:

“I taught English to 3, 4 and 5 year old students at an immersion kindergarten [in Japan]. I loved my job! It was incredibly rewarding, my kids made me laugh so many times each day and I always felt welcome.

“I made some good friends and learnt a great deal about Japanese customs, culture and people. It was a great experience. If you are serious about improving your Japanese and like to travel I would definitely recommend spending a year in Japan.”

“The immersion program may seem daunting to those who have no in-country experience but hang in there. Once you lose your fear of making mistakes, and gain the confidence to start practising and experimenting, your proficiency will improve 100%. Ganbatte ne!! (Wishing you the best for your future study)”

Comments from teachers in Japan include:

“It was a great experience to have the CQU student at our school. It was very valuable not only for the students but also for the staff. In regional areas like [this city], it is rare to communicate with non-Japanese people. Finding differences between Japan and Australia was the greatest experience for us in having the CQU student teacher with us. I feel like Australia has become closer to Japan or to us.”

“The enthusiasm to become a Japanese teacher had affected the teachers at our school positively. Also both the staff and the students learnt again that the most important thing in communication is to use the language in ways that the audience could understand easily using gestures and visual clues.”

“Our students could learn English while learning Australian cultures, animals and people.”

In 2005 the BLM program as a whole was independently evaluated by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), which found that the program has a number of innovative features. Each unit of study, for example, “is justified in terms of its contribution to helping students meet specific criteria in the Queensland teaching standards.” (Ingvarson, Beavis, Danielson, Ellis, & Elliott, 2005 p. 14) The positive results in the BLM findings were attributed to emphasis on training in a core model of effective pedagogy, active engagement in learning how to use the model, strong linkages between theory and practice, an authentic partnership between schools, employing authorities and the university and standards-based teacher education. (Ingvarson et al., 2005, pp. pp. 79-83)

Special features:

- Close partnership with schools and mentor teachers

All BLM programs were developed in partnership with teachers and principals and have very close links with schools. Students have much more contact with schools than previously. Trained Learning Managers, who are experienced teachers who have completed a mentoring program,
mentor students throughout the course, assisted by other teachers. “Portal tasks”, completed during professional experience, are an important part of the students’ professional experience. For these tasks, students design, implement and evaluate strategies and outcomes for individual groups under the guidance of the mentor. Practice in the workplace is closely linked to on-campus learning and theory, with students required to demonstrate and apply theories learned in the course.

- **Concurrent language and pedagogical studies**

Japanese language and pedagogical studies are interwoven throughout this course. In the first year, students commence both Japanese language studies and pedagogical studies.

- **Language specific methodology:**

There is a very large languages teaching related component throughout the course. Part of the LOTE methodology component of the course is specifically related to the target language. This is possible because the cohort of pre-service teachers relates specifically to Japanese language teaching.

- **In-country experience:**

In-country experience is a required part of this program, including in-country experience in a target language school setting. Students interacting with Japanese university students in Japan use the internet voice chat software as part of their curriculum.

Students in BLM (Jpn) spend approx 3 months at a tertiary institution in Komatsu City, Japan, thereby being provided with the opportunity to develop their skills and understanding in teaching and learning Japanese. This 3 months program also includes the 5 weeks in-school field-work experience at local primary schools.

Students also have the opportunity to study at a selected Japanese university as exchange students for up to one academic year. Students are enrolled at the Japanese university and they receive CQU credits for their study upon their return.

Scholarship funds are available for both programs. The tuition fee is waived and living and travel expenses are partially or fully funded.

- **Accessibility:**

The structure of this program allows students to commence the study of Japanese *ab initio*. Four years of intensive language study are provided.

Staff find the mixture of Japanese native speakers and beginning Japanese language students to be beneficial to all students in the program: “For [Australian students without Japanese speaking background], being in with these native Japanese students in class is a great opportunity to interact/ask questions in Japanese. Many of the incoming students without any Japanese study background will develop very high proficiency of the target language by the end of the program. For the native background Japanese students, it turns out to be a different kind of opportunity to learn how the learners learn the target language.”
• **Links with professional standards:**

The ACER evaluation noted that the BLM course “appears to be a thoroughgoing example of standards-based teacher education.” It is linked to the Education Queensland Professional Standards for Teachers.

**Summary:**

The Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) is a four year (or accelerated three year) undergraduate degree for pre-service teachers of Japanese. It has both a primary and a secondary stream and is closely linked to professional teaching standards.

Students complete four years of language study, concurrently with pedagogical studies, including target language methodology. The course includes immersion in-country experience in the target language. Students are able to commence their Japanese language studies at beginning level. The BLM has close relationships with trained mentor teachers in schools both in Queensland and Japan, and a heavy emphasis on linking theory and practice. The teaching practicum is longer than the prescribed number of days and includes time spent in a Japanese school setting.

**Case study 2: Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages, James Cook University (JCU)**


This case study was selected because it offers concurrent language and pedagogical study, intensive language experience including in-country experience and a significant amount of practicum time.

**Glossary:**

- **FLOTE:** Facilitating the Learning of Languages other than English
- **ISLPR:** International Second Language Proficiency Ratings
- **IELTS:** International English Language Testing System
- **JCU:** James Cook University
- **QTAC:** Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre
- **TOEFL:** Test of English as a Foreign Language

**The university: James Cook University (JCU)**

James Cook University, proclaimed in 1970, is a multi-campus university in northern Queensland, with its main sites in Townsville and Cairns. Prior to 1970 it was a university college of the University of Queensland. In 1981 the Townsville College of Advanced Education amalgamated with JCU.

There are also other, smaller JCU sites in Mount Isa, Mackay and Thursday Island. Education providers in Sydney, Melbourne and Perth deliver partnership courses. JCU is also continuing to develop offshore facilities and partnerships.

**The course: Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages**

The joint Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages degree is an undergraduate five year degree. The Bachelor of Education may be either primary or secondary.

As a stand-alone degree, the Bachelor of Languages is an undergraduate four year degree and includes one year of approved overseas study in a country where the target language is spoken.
The Bachelor of Languages is offered through the School of Arts and Social Sciences. French and Japanese are offered on campus, full or part-time. There is flexible provision (distance material combined with on-campus tutorials) for Chinese (Mandarin) German and Italian. French, German and Japanese are offered at Townsville and French, Japanese, Chinese and Italian at Cairns.

Both the Bachelor of Education and the Bachelor of Languages are offered through the Faculty of Arts, Education and Social Sciences.

**Number of students enrolled:**

In 2006 12 students were enrolled in the Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages joint degree program. In 2007 17 students were enrolled in the program.

**Course entry and recruitment:**

Normal university entry requirements through QTAC apply, with English language testing requirements (International English Language Testing System IELTS (Level 7) and Test of English as a Foreign Language TOEFL, various requirements) and possibly other proof of proficiency for some international students.

Students can commence language studies at their appropriate level. Depending on their languages skills, students can enrol at foundation level (assumes no knowledge of the language) or basic level (post Year 12); for Japanese there is a third possibility, JA1101, which assumes some prior knowledge. Students who have adequate prior expertise are able to dispense with the lower units but do not receive credit for them.

**Course structure:**

Students in the five year B.Ed./B.Lang joint degree take courses in professional education studies, and language courses in either French or Japanese, over 4 years (‘levels’). The in-country immersion experience is completed during the fifth year of study.

German language offerings commenced at JCU in 2006, and Italian and Chinese, having been offered previously, re-commenced in 2007. While programs for the latter three languages are not yet fully in place, it is planned that they will follow the same pattern as French and Japanese. Partnership arrangements are also being developed. In the Bachelor of Languages component of the joint degree, students follow the normal sequence of subjects for a language based Arts degree, with the additional component of at least two semesters in the Study-abroad program (an immersion situation in a country where the language is spoken.)

Other in-country experience is offered through Immersion French 1 and Immersion French 2, which are short term immersion programs in New Caledonia. This program is offered in conjunction with Flinders University and, in 2007, probably with the University of New South Wales as well.

**Course Structure**

The course structure for the Bachelor of Languages program in French and Japanese follows, for sequential units over two semesters. These units are completed by all B.Ed/B.Lang students.

**Level 1:** Foundation or basic level French or Japanese
- 6 credit points/104 hours
- Elective subjects from Arts or Social Sciences

**Level 2:** Basic (6 credit points/104 hours) or Intermediate French or Japanese
Level 3: Overseas study for two semesters

Study Abroad Program (French or Japanese) For the joint degree, this is completed after the fourth year of study.

Level 4: Advanced level French, or Japanese

(12 credit points/104 hours)
Advanced level Japanese
(12 credit points/104 hours)
Elective subjects form Arts or Social Sciences

Immersion French 1: 3 credit points/30 hours
Immersion French 2: 6 credit points/30 hours.

Students usually only do one of the above units, depending on whether they have reached the end of their second or third year at university. The subjects are optional, as they incur an additional cost of $2500 to $3300 in addition to HECS.

For the B.Ed./B.Lang, students complete all Bachelor of Education units concurrently with their language studies for the first four years of their five year joint degree.

Course content:

B.Ed. component

Students take a range of general pre-service education units, with some variation in the primary and secondary streams. Both streams complete the following two language related units:

ED1421: Languages and Literacies in Education
This unit introduces students to the theory and practice of language in education. Topics include language and culture, and second language learning.

ED2990: Education for Cultural Diversity
This unit aims to help pre-service students to develop competencies needed for making decisions about learning in culturally diverse situations. The main focus for these themes is on Indigenous education.

In addition, both primary and secondary streams complete a language teaching methodology unit via distance learning. The subject EDU276 Second/Foreign languages and the Curriculum is studied through Murdoch University via Facilitating the Learning of Languages other than English (FLOTE) either as a 3 credit point equivalent subject (curriculum to Year 10) or as a 6 credit point subject (curriculum to Year 12).

B.Lang. component

The B.Ed./B.Lang places a strong emphasis on language proficiency and practical experience for pre-service language teachers.

In the B.Lang there is extensive practical experience for language students, with large amounts of practical reading, writing and listening experience. Integral to the course is the one year of study (fifth year for the joint degree) at an overseas university. One faculty member commented: “Getting them to [target language] proficiency is the main thrust.”
Courses are linked to defined learning outcomes. In the case of French, outcomes are loosely or notionally linked to the International Second Language Proficiency Rating (ISLPR) scale. (As a point of comparison, the Department of Immigration equates Level 2 on the ISLPR scale with a “functional” level of English (formerly Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating, ASLPR)). These levels range from approximately 0+ for Foundation French 1 to approximately 3 for Advanced French. The levels are used mainly as an indicator, with JCU having developed its own descriptors for each level. For Foundation French 1, outcomes include students being able to “give simple personal details”, perform a variety of tasks such as catching a train, and reading simple texts. For Advanced French 2, learning outcomes are linked to approximately 3 on the ISLPR scale. Students are, for instance, expected to be at a level of basic “vocational” proficiency and to have advanced to the level of detecting nuances such as irony and admiration from French language rather than extra-linguistic skills.

For the Immersion French units, learning outcomes include gaining insights into francophone culture(s), increasing political and social awareness of the situation in New Caledonia, and improving language skills.

Japanese language units are not linked to the ISLPR scale, except for Advanced Japanese 6, which is broadly linked to Level 3. As with French, descriptors vary with each unit. For Foundation Japanese 1, learning outcomes include being equipped with basic Japanese social skills, and the ability to read and write simple passages in hiragana and katakana. For Advanced Japanese 6, students are expected to engage easily in conversations with native speakers on a range of everyday and vocational topics and, if errors are made not be of a kind that would interfere with understanding, or “irritate or amuse native speakers of a similar socio-cultural background.”

For the Study-abroad Program, desired outcomes include the ability to communicate effectively, and all objectives of the courses taken at the overseas university. These courses are conducted in the target language. In some cases, students are placed in non-university settings, for example as a language assistant in a rural area without a nearby university. In these cases, students complete an independent project involving working and research in the local community and supervised via distance by JCU.

While overseas, students usually enrol in subjects such as language or literature courses for foreign students and teachers. JCU has specific arrangements in place with the University of Toulouse at Le Mirail in France and with universities in Hokkaido and Okinawa in Japan.

The major aim of the Study Abroad program is for students to become highly proficient in the target language.

Staffing:

Different components of the course are taught by university staff members in both the education and language faculties at JCU. On-line learning and/or distance learning is provided by members of university faculties in other institutions. During the year abroad, students are taught in the target language by staff members at the overseas university.

French and Japanese have sessional staff for tutoring in Cairns. As well, Foundation German, French, Italian and Chinese are taught in a mixed mode through the University of New England (UNE) with UNE providing the courses and tutoring provided at JCU.

The practicum:

Practical professional experience in schools and other settings begins in the first year of the Bachelor of Education component of the joint degree. Professional experience comprises 100 days
in total. Pre-service teachers complete a variety of professional experience placements. These consist mainly of block placements.

Assessment:

**B.Ed component:**
Assessment in units is by a range of examinations, presentations, essays, assignments, preparation and participation

**B.Lang.component:**
Assessment in both French and Japanese is by examination and assignments. For the French Immersion (New Caledonia) assessment is by interview, essay and assignments. For both the French and Japanese Study Abroad programs, the form of the assessment tasks is decided by negotiation between staff, students and the overseas university. Generally, this involves assessing linguistic skills, together with cultural sensitivity.

Students returning from overseas study are assessed through a series of tests and are usually then placed in the advanced levels of the target language. Tests might include, for example, responding to newspaper articles or television programs in the target language. The assessment includes an interview of about 45 minutes conducted in the target language.

Feedback/evaluation:

Student responses to courses are provided online through student satisfaction subject questionnaires. Each individual unit is also evaluated on a cyclical basis via student questionnaire.

The interview at the end of the overseas year is an additional useful feedback and evaluation tool. JCU is thereby able to address difficulties and aim for improvement in the program. The year overseas has also been very helpful for students when undertaking the language assessment test required for language teachers in Queensland.

Special features:

- **Accessibility**

  JCU provides a range of pathways for students to combine pre-service teacher training with languages training. The combined B.Ed./B.Lang. degree presents an attractive option to students in that on completion they will be awarded two full undergraduate degrees after five years. It is also an attractive option in that it incorporates overseas study, and that it allows for students to commence their language study at beginning level (*ab initio)*.

- **Concurrent language and pedagogical study**

  The joint B.Ed./B.Lang. degree offers intensive language experience including in-country immersion, together with pre-service teacher training. It allows for the concurrent development of language and teaching skills.

- **In-country experience**

  Students (at this stage students of French or Japanese) spend at least two semesters (fifth year of study) in an approved immersion languages program in a country where the language of study is spoken. In the case of French, they also have the opportunity to undertake shorter immersion programs in New Caledonia. Both the short and long immersion programs are credit bearing.
The year abroad is self-funded by students. The university offers four travel grants of $2500 each year, but these are open to students in all faculties. If language students have a teaching assistant position while overseas, they will receive an income. Students are also able to apply for a $5000 overseas study loan from the Commonwealth, but this will be added to their HECS debt.

For the New Caledonian program, there has been partial assistance from the French Embassy ($500 per student.) In 2006, the university provided assistance of $430 per student on a one-off basis for the New Caledonia program.

- Cross-institutional studies (Edu276) Facilitating Languages other than English (FLOTE)

JCU is accessing distance learning provided by another institution. The curriculum subject for pre-service language teachers is completed cross institutionally through Murdoch University (EDU 276 Second/Foreign Language and the Curriculum.) This is a general LOTE methodology unit provided via the Facilitating the Learning of Languages other than English (FLOTE) program. It is offered and completed on-line. JCU works closely with Murdoch in this area.

Students taking the unit are provided with a booklet and a CD outlining and explaining unit requirements. The course is self-paced, with students maintaining a journal throughout. The journal is assessed at the completion of the unit. Questions are also set and answered on-line. The LOTE methodology is general, with students also being referred to specific sites for language specific material. “The basic topics were pretty good. It was self-paced, we could do it whenever we wanted, although sometimes time allocation could be difficult. The part about using music and technology in LOTE was really very helpful.” This student commented that her practicum would be in August and that she would begin teaching after her immersion year, or the fifth year of study. With more experience she thinks the FLOTE site will be “even more helpful.”

This program was cited by one education faculty member as an example of inter-university cooperation: “Universities need to co-operate more. There is so much more movement nowadays, and the business of doing a degree at more than one university is often necessary. We need to share expertise.”

- The practicum experience

For the combined Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages degree, students do 80 days in schools plus 20 days community service education. The practicum is completed over four years.

Secondary pre-service teachers have one Secondary Area of Teaching to Year 12 (SAT 12) which is their language and one Secondary Area of Teaching to Year 10 (SAT10) which needs to be in a second Key Learning Area, e.g. English, Science or Mathematics. Usually the majority of their professional experience would be in the SAT 12.

The primary pre-service teachers are mainly located in the regular classroom, which would include their second language area, but they also do an additional ten days practicum after the initial 100 days. These ten days are reserved for language teaching and are undertaken only after the professional experience component (the 100 days) has been completed satisfactorily. In addition to these arrangements students who have passed their professional experience then have the opportunity to complete an internship in the form of a project developed in partnership with a school. The internship is voluntary, but offers valued skills and experience to students, increasing their attractiveness to potential employers.
For the community service component of the practicum, students work in educational or community setting, not necessarily a school. Students often choose an area related to their particular pathway in the course.

The School of Education is also developing a facilitator model for SAT 12 areas where there are only a few students. This approach allows for pre-service teachers to be linked up with practising teachers to ensure that they have a comprehensive introduction to their particular curriculum area of teaching. This arrangement is intended to be different to the one established through the student teacher/supervising teacher relationship.

**Summary:**

After five years, including an immersion year abroad, students are awarded the joint Bachelor or Education/Bachelor of Languages degree. Students have the opportunity to commence a language *ab initio* or at an advanced level. High proficiency in the target language is a major aim of the joint degree, with an immersion year in the target language comprising part of the course. The practicum comprises 100 days and pedagogical studies are offered concurrently with language studies. Pre-service primary students complete an additional language practicum. Partnership arrangements with other universities are allowing the university to extend its language teacher preparation offerings.

**Case study 3: Bachelor of Education (primary years): Italian Teaching Method Units, University of Notre Dame (UNDA)**

This course was selected because it offers a credit bearing language specialisation pathway within a Bachelor of Education while also providing Not for Degree language teacher training for primary teachers of Italian who are not formally qualified. The program is funded externally, with UNDA providing quality assurance.

**Glossary:**

B.Ed: Bachelor of Education  
IAWCC: Italo-Australian Welfare and Cultural Centre Inc  
LOTE: Languages other than English  
UNDA: University of Notre Dame  
WACOT: Western Australian College of Teachers

**The University: The University of Notre Dame Australia**

The University of Notre Dame Australia (UNDA) is a private Catholic university with three campuses: Fremantle, Broome and Sydney. The university was founded in 1989 through an Act of the Western Australian Parliament and commenced teaching at the Fremantle campus in 1992. The university’s Schools and Colleges include Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Health Sciences, Law, Medicine, Nursing, Philosophy and Theology. UNDA has a close relationship with the University of Notre Dame in Indiana, USA.

**The Course: Bachelor of Education – Primary: Italian Teaching Method**

The School of Education at the Fremantle campus of UNDA offers four Italian Teaching Method Units as a specialisation pathway within the four year (full time equivalent) undergraduate Bachelor of Education (Primary) course. This course is a general pre-service teacher education course.

The Italian Teaching Method Units are offered to two streams of students:
1. Pre-service primary teaching students in the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) course who take the units as a specialisation pathway. These students are completing a full B.Ed.

2. Not for Degree students who are currently teaching Italian language in insertion classes in schools. This group does not have formal teaching qualifications and students are teaching under a two year Limited Authority to Teach from the Western Australian College of Teachers (WACOT). They are employed by the Italo-Australian Welfare and Cultural Centre Inc. (IAWCC). These students are not undertaking the B.Ed. course.

The Italian Teaching Method units are one of a number of specialisation pathways running over the four years of the B.Ed. course. The other specialisation pathways are Mathematics, Science & Technology, English Literature & Theatre Arts, Theology, Society and Environment and Special Needs. Students taking Italian Teaching Method as a specialisation pathway take all four units offered. Each unit requires four contact hours per week over a 13 week semester, two hours for in-depth Italian language and two hours for “hands-on” Italian teaching methodology.

In 2006 twenty-five students were enrolled across the four years of the Italian Teaching Method specialisation pathway. In 2007 15 students were enrolled. The enrolments are lower this year (2007) because many of the IAWCC teachers have now completed the four units.

Prior to the introduction of the course, primary teaching students at UNDA did not have the opportunity to study language methodology as part of their tertiary qualifications. There was also little opportunity for native speakers of Italian teaching Italian in some primary schools to gain a language teaching qualification.

The introduction of the Italian Teaching Method course catered for the needs of the two groups. It now provides the opportunity for teachers of Italian already working in schools but without a formal qualification to undertake specific language methodology training. These teachers are generally native speakers of Italian. The course also provides the opportunity to tailor pre-service teacher education for “mainstream” UNDA students to a specific language and a specific language teaching methodology. In 2006 there was an intake of ten to twelve students, about half of whom were native speakers who were already teaching in primary schools and half who were enrolled in the B.Ed. course.

The Italian Teaching Method course commenced in 2004 as a result of an initiative by IAWCC, which approached Notre Dame with a view to their setting up a course to train teachers of Italian in methodology as well as language. Funds from the Italian government were used to set up the course and to pay associated costs, including staff salaries and administrative support. Notre Dame provides resources, facilities and quality assurance for the course.

The length of time for setting up this collaborative arrangement was about seven months, from July 2003 to February 2004. The final memorandum of understanding was signed by the Notre Dame Provost and a representative of IAWCC.

**Course entry and Requirements:**

The minimum requirement to enrol in Italian Teaching Method is Year 12 Italian or the equivalent, with this requirement being waived for native speakers.

Students entering the full Bachelor of Education degree course must satisfy minimum university entrance requirements.

‘Not for degree’ students may be enrolled in the Italian Teaching method course without having to meet normal university entrance requirements, but may not transfer this enrolment to any other
university courses without first satisfying such requirements. Students who satisfy these requirements after the Italian Teaching Method units have been completed will be given Advanced Standing for those units should they gain entry into the B.Ed. (Primary) course. Degree students receive credit towards the completion of their B.Ed. by way of fulfilling the normal specialisation pathway requirements (four units). Other degree students may take one or both of the first two units as electives.

The course is recognised by IAWCC as being a certified pathway to teaching Italian, and the IAWCC “Certificate in Italian Teaching Method” is provided on completion. This certificate recognises them as ‘specialist’ teachers of Italian in primary (and, currently) middle school. IWACC teachers who have completed this certificate receive a salary increment from IAWCC.

Course Structure:

The course comprises four sequential units.

Year 1, Semester 2: ED1301: LOTE Listening and Responding, and Speaking.
Year 2, Semester 2: ED1302: LOTE Viewing, Reading and Responding.
Year 3, Semester 2: ED1303: LOTE Writing.
Year 4, Semester 1: ED 1304: LOTE Cultural Understandings
   The System of the Target Language;
   Language Learning Strategies

All strands are integrated throughout the course.

The program has four contact hours per week over a thirteen week semester, rather than the usual three allocated to a 25 credit point unit.

Course content:

This course promotes the effective teaching of Italian in Australian schools. In the LOTE learning area in general, students learn to communicate effectively in Language other than English, to gain an understanding of other societies, to interact with people and cultures other than their own. They learn skills to use in future social, cultural and vocational areas. They also further develop their skills and understandings in English and in literacy in general.

Each of the four units is linked to the interrelated Learning Outcomes described in the Languages (LOT E) Learning Area of the Western Australian Curriculum Framework. There is an emphasis on required language levels and skills appropriate to primary year levels, and comparisons with approaches developed in Italy. Across the four units students have the opportunity to develop appropriate skills and strategies to ensure they can facilitate their students’ learning in each of the areas covered in the Learning Outcomes. All units are specific to the target language.

Unit One (ED 1301) focuses in particular on the first of these outcomes. It covers the teaching implications of the “Listening and Responding, and Speaking” outcome in Italian and focuses on a variety of communicative approaches. Students develop the skills to facilitate their students’ ability to comprehend and respond in written and oral form.

Unit Two (ED 1302) focuses in particular on the second of the Learning Outcomes. It covers the teaching implications of the “Viewing, Reading and Responding” outcome in Italian. Students develop the skills to facilitate their students’ ability to view and read a variety of texts in Italian, and to respond appropriately.
Unit Three (ED1303) focuses in particular on the third of the learning outcomes. It covers the teaching implications of the “Writing” outcome in Italian, focussing on the variety evident in this form of communication. Students taking this unit develop the skills to facilitate the ability to write for a range of purposes and in forms appropriate for audience and context.

Unit four (ED1304) focuses in particular on the fourth of the Learning Outcomes. It covers the teaching implications of the “Cultural Understanding” LOTE outcome and focuses on the socio-linguistic aspects of language teaching, understanding those features and incorporating them into language use, adapting language to suit audience and context. The other two Learning Outcomes, “The System of the Target Language” and “Language Learning Strategies” are also covered.

Staff:

Staff include a senior lecturer [in Italian] from the University of Western Australia, who provides the linguistic content component of the course. Lecturers and tutors from UNDA staff provide the pedagogical component of the course.

The Practicum:

For the B. Ed students, the pre-service practicum comprises 32 weeks over four years: two weeks in the first year and ten weeks in the second, third and fourth year. Italian language teaching may not always be available in the practicum school but students are strongly encouraged to include Italian language in their practicum experiences where possible.

Assessment:

Assessment in the course is by assignments, program writing, portfolio and oral and written examinations at the end of each unit.

Feedback/evaluation:

Each unit is evaluated annually to ascertain interest and effectiveness -. UNDA reports that “the program is working well, we are getting very good feedback.” Copies of student evaluations are also forwarded to IAWCC so that both unit content and teacher performance can be monitored.

The program is now in its fourth year, with the first group completing the four unit strand in 2006. B. Ed student placements in schools are for generalist teaching, and they may or may not be teaching Italian. Once the first set of graduates is in schools, UNDA will be soliciting feedback from them about how their Italian language skills are being utilised.

The Special Features of the Course:

- The variety of pathways

The course provides training in Italian Language Methodology for both pre-service teachers as part of their B.Ed. course and on a Not for Degree basis for background speakers of Italian who are currently teaching Italian but who are not fully qualified teachers and who may not meet entry requirements for B.Ed. enrolment. If Not for Degree students meet entry requirements for B.Ed. enrolment at a later date, they may convert course completion into advanced standing toward the B.Ed. or, in other words, “bank” their credit points for future use. UNDA sees this as a strength of the course in that it provides an alternative entry pathway into a full degree course.
• Partnership and funding arrangements

A key issue with regard to this program has been its funding by the Italian government. “The model works because money has been made available. The Italian government is very keen to support teachers in acquiring adequate skills in the teaching of the Italian language” (faculty member). This four unit language specific course is sponsored and funded by the IAWCC with the support of the Italian government, which provided funds to set up the course and to pay associated costs, including staff salaries. Notre Dame provides support staff, resources and facilities.

The support of the Italian consulate and government has been crucial to the success of the UNDA program. This collaborative arrangement has enabled the provision of a specialised language teaching pathway without cost to the university.

• Links to curriculum framework

This course has strong and clear links to Western Australian Curriculum Framework. “The four units pick out the LOTE strands and follow them as they are recognised and articulated in the Framework.” (Faculty member).

• Language specific methodology

UNDA sees another strength of this program as the language specific methodology. “It’s as specific as it gets with regard to the Italian language.” (Faculty member)

• Concurrent language and pedagogical study

The course also develops and maintains proficiency in the target language, with Italian language and Italian language teaching methodology being studied concurrently. There is no “language gap.” Italian language is studied throughout the four years, without the language “gap” or loss that can occur in teacher education courses. As background speakers of Italian (NFD students already in classrooms) are also in the group, students have further access to Italian language and culture.

Summary:

The Italian Teaching Method units run over four years. Study of the Italian language continues through the program. Language and pedagogical training are concurrent, with specific Italian language teaching methodology being provided. The course is based on the six LOTE outcomes as outlined in the WA Curriculum Framework.

A prerequisite for the course is Year 12 Italian or equivalent expertise. The program caters for degree students and also for practising teachers of Italian who may not be fully qualified. It may be taken as “not for degree”, with credits potentially being able to be “banked.” Thus alternative entry pathways are encouraged.

The partnership arrangements and the funding model in operation allowed for the introduction of this program on a cost neutral basis for the university. The Italian Teaching Method units are sponsored and funded by the Italo-Australian Welfare and Cultural Centre Inc (IAWCC).
Case study 4: Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education, Victoria University

http://www.vu.edu.au/

This course was selected because curriculum is benchmarked against both AFMLTA standards and VIT standards. It also has a Partnership Project whereby pre-service teachers work with a mentor teacher one day a week on a jointly decided project with block teaching rounds as part of a holistic school experience program.

Glossary:

AFMLTA: Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations
ICT: Information and Communication Technology
IELTS: International English Language Testing System
LOTE: Languages other than English
VELS: Victorian Essential Learning Standards
VCE: Victorian Certificate of Education
VIT: Victorian Institute of Teaching
VTAC: Victorian Tertiary Admissions Centre
VU: Victoria University

The University:

Founded in 1990, Victoria University has 16 campuses and sites in Melbourne, with its main campuses being in Footscray and St Albans, western suburbs of Melbourne. It was formerly known as the Victoria University of Technology. The institution has existed in various forms as an educational entity since 1916, undergoing various separations and mergers since that time.

The Course:

The Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education is offered through the School of Education in the Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development. It is a general pre-service graduate course with the following core units: the Social Context of Teaching and Learning, Approaches to Teaching and Learning and New Learning. Students also select Discipline Study/Teaching Method sequences for specialisation. The course prepares students to teach in one or more of the following areas: Mathematics, Science, Computing, English, Physical Education, Humanities, English as a Second Language and Languages other than English.

Twenty-six students were enrolled in languages teacher education units in 2006. Twenty-eight students are enrolled in 2007. This also includes a small number of Bachelor of Education (Primary) students. The current student group has eight different language backgrounds: French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Mandarin, Spanish and Vietnamese.

Course entry and requirements:

Prospective students are required to have completed an undergraduate degree. Application is through VTAC, with a supplementary VU form. Some students may be invited to attend an interview to clarify aspects of their application. Particular pre-requisites for languages teacher education study include: completion of a major field of post Year 12 study in a language as part of a university degree, or statement of equivalence. Language equivalency testing is conducted independently by university language faculties either at Victoria University (Japanese, Spanish and Vietnamese) or at another university, depending on the language. The generic form of the tests includes reading, writing and interview to determine oral proficiency. Students may undertake the
language equivalence test during the pre-service year, but cannot fulfil the requirements of the course, or gain teacher registration, until it is passed.

International students are required to have achieved IELTS Level 7 to gain entry into the course.

**Course structure:**

The Graduate Diploma in Education is a one year or equivalent part-time graduate course offered over two semesters. 96 credit points are required to complete the course. Full-time students choose two Discipline Study sequences (24 credit points for each sequence.) In theory, students could take a double language method (extended language method) if they chose to do so.

The LOTE methodology course comprises two sequential units, one each semester:

- AEG 1676 Teaching Languages other than English 1
- AEG1677 Teaching Languages other than English 2

Students attend methodology classes for three hours over twenty weeks.

**Course content:**

Students complete general pre-service teacher education studies and two methodology units.

General pre-service studies include the development of a “tool-box” of teaching strategies and management, including inquiry approaches, curriculum planning and materials development, assessment and reporting techniques and knowledge of aims, approaches and resources relevant to the unit of study, especially as outlined in related curriculum documents such as the Victorian Essential Learning Standards (VELS).

The language methodology units also cover current thinking in curriculum such as the Intercultural Language Teaching approach, various theories of learning and practical aspects such as classroom management techniques for the language teacher, incorporating technology as a tool and dealing with mixed levels in the classroom.

The discipline study includes:

- AEG 1676: the rationale for language teaching; theories of language learning and acquisition and how these relate to the school curriculum; methods and approaches in language teaching; developing and integrating language macroskills in the LOTE classroom; materials evaluation and developing materials; teaching mixed level classes; intercultural language teaching;

- AEG 1677: assessment issues, reporting; program organisation, unit planning; Victorian Essential Learning Standards (VELS); Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) LOTE.

The use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in language teaching is embedded into sessions throughout the course. Other topics include the application of theories of learning in the LOTE classroom such as De Bono’s Thinking Hats, Multiple Intelligences and Bloom’s Taxonomy.

**Staffing:**

The general pre-service units are taught by members of the School of Education. The co-ordinator of the LOTE methodology units is integrated into university staffing in the additional area of academic support. Often, some of the LOTE methodology students have contact with the co-
ordinator in both roles, with extra support thereby being provided in areas such as tertiary level academic skills.

The LOTE methodology co-ordinator and other staff members, in collaboration with Student Learning Services, also arrange intensive academic literacy skills programs specifically customised for Education students. These programs are delivered before the start of the academic year as a summer school and during semester break as a winter school. The provision of instruction in both academic skills and language teaching methodology is designed to ensure that students gain a thorough grounding in preparing for and managing the academic requirements of the Grad. Dip. Ed. or B.Ed.

The staff member who fills the dual role of academic support provider and LOTE methodology co-ordinator is also very active in the general field of language education on a state and national level. “Keeping abreast of initiatives and thinking in the field … maintaining an active dialogue with other members of the discipline makes me better able to perform my role as a teacher trainer and an advocate for language learning.”

The practicum:

Students are generally placed at one school for the whole year in a mix of block rounds (2 x 4 weeks each, one each semester) and fifteen to twenty single days, commencing at the start of the school year.

The school experience involves fifteen to twenty single days when pre-service teachers develop a Project Partnership. Students develop a Partnership Project that is seen to be of benefit to the educational program of the host school. This can be in an area of curriculum development or implementation. The university aims to place at least four students at each school so that they can work on a project as a team and provide maximum benefit to the school.

Assessment:

For the languages teaching units, the following components are assessed: Teaching Plan, Unit Plan, Individual Reflection and Partnership Inquiry in the form of a Practicum booklet and folio. Students are also required to submit a collection of teaching and learning artefacts (“Hurdle Tasks”, ungraded.) There are five discrete assessment instruments: 1.Seminar work, Preparation and Participation; 2.Rationale: essay and brochure; 3. series of lesson plans and evaluation; 4. Practicum booklet; 5. Project presentation and report. Some tasks are ICT based.

Feedback/evaluation:

The Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education conducts formal evaluations of subjects at the end of each semester. In addition, a focus group is convened for further input at the end of each year to facilitate evaluation of the whole course.

Pre-service students are asked to rate different ‘themes’ covered during the course such as preparation for putting together a unit of work and understanding of reporting and VCE issues. Students who have completed the LOTE component of the course are asked specific LOTE related questions such as how satisfied they were with their preparation to devise and implement a range of strategies and language learning activities to address certain issues such as dealing with mixed levels, engaging different cultural groups, engaging boys and girls in the language classroom framing lessons. They are also asked about their satisfaction about the information they received about different approaches such as adopting a constructivist approach, or theories such as multiple intelligences, and the preparation they received in organising lessons using the target language in the classroom and in organising the language syllabus. Student responses are enthusiastic and
positive. Recent feedback comments include: ‘I feel prepared to enter the classroom and teach LOTE.’ ‘I know some schools who specifically want to employ VU LOTE method graduates as language teachers.’ ‘This subject teaches us theories as well as how to use them in a realistic situation.’

Special features

- **Benchmarking of Curriculum**

Teaching staff have benchmarked curriculum against AFMLTA and VIT standards. They have found both sets of standards helpful in reviewing and reorienting the course curriculum and providing food for their own personal reflection on the effectiveness of courses. The course content has been informally audited against AFMLTA standards and VIT standards for beginning teachers and formal auditing is currently underway. The cohort of students in the language teaching units is described by staff as culturally diverse and as already having a high degree of intercultural literacy. The course strongly emphasises and further develops aspects of intercultural learning and communication.

In addition to professional LOTE teaching texts, required reading includes documents such as the Victorian Essential Learning Standards (VELS) and the Victorian Institute of Teaching Standards of Professional Practice for full registration. The co-ordinator aims to embed macro and microteaching skills specific to LOTE. There is also formal block study of the documents with, for example, one session of the languages units set aside for the introduction to VELS. This knowledge is then drawn upon and consolidated throughout the rest of the course to facilitate deep understanding of the document, its use and practical implications, as well as to develop practicing teacher confidence in interpreting such texts. “We are constantly in and out of documents, especially VELS.”

- **Close partnership between students and mentor teachers at schools**

The Project Partnership initiative forms the basis of the students’ professional experience. Project Partnership is an historic VU term that arose ten years ago because the university wanted to make pre-service school experience more in-depth than the traditional model, where most students have block experience in three different schools. Staff wanted students to become more engaged during the school experience in order to develop a deeper understanding of the relationship between the theory and practice of schooling.

Students spend one day per week working on a special project in their main field of study with a mentor teacher during the Grad Dip.Ed. and have two intensive block practicum modes during the year to assist in gaining more teaching experience with a mentor teacher.

As a current example, one host school has about 20 VU pre-service students, with several projects being undertaken. An example of the partnership at this school is a re-vamped middle school program for two days per week where middle school students, working with pre-service language teachers and their mentor teacher(s), are able to study one of several languages for a whole day. Cultural studies and language acquisition are interwoven under the guidance of the student teacher and mentor teacher. A yearly “end product” might also be part of the project, such as, in Italian, the *fashionista* unit. This unit involves preparing and presenting a complete fashion show presented in the target language by middle school students to the wider community.

Another example of a language study based Partnership Project was designed to engage boys in particular. The pre-service teacher designed it to integrate language study and ICT. It involved negotiating a topic with each student to develop an ICT based presentation on a topic of student interest that reflected an aspect of cultural significance, e.g. Art by the French Impressionists,
French sporting pastimes. During the Partnership Project, the pre-service teachers are responsible for the development of materials and strategies, which become part of their portfolio. A further example is the production by a group of students of a CD-Rom presenting the range of approaches to teaching between secondary schools and feeder schools, with the aim being to achieve synchronicity among schools in appropriate pedagogy.

VU staff believe that the Partnership program provides pre-service students with the opportunity to gain a deep understanding of what is happening in student development and in staffrooms over the course of a school year, the school itself and the needs of the students they are teaching in the school context. Pre-service teachers are seen as having the opportunity to develop more meaningful professional relationships with their mentors and other members of the school community. “It also gives them the chance to look at the application and practice of the [AFMLTA and VIT] standards. The Project Partnership component of the course aims to integrate theory and practice as a Praxis Inquiry.” The intensive nature of the practicum also allows for ongoing language teaching pre-service experience in the target language.

A further benefit of the Project Partnership arrangement is that it has made the practicum placement of students easier because there is only one placement per student each year, and the students contribute something tangible to the school program over the course of the year. However, it is more difficult to find placement for some languages than others. Placement in ‘out of hours’ language schools has assisted in this respect. VU has aimed for more communication with host schools than under previous arrangements. VU staff visit students once every three weeks.

- **Accessibility:**

The course is accessible to a variety of prospective LOTE teachers. The majority of students in this course have either completed a post Year 12 language course or are background speakers of the various target languages who have passed a language equivalency test administered by a university language faculty.

The student cohort includes–

- pre-service teachers who have completed post Year 12 language majors as part of an undergraduate degree
- pre-service teachers who have completed an undergraduate degree and who have passed a language equivalency test
- teachers who are teaching in rural and regional areas because they have expertise rather than qualifications in the field and who are in the process of upgrading qualifications (Career Change Program) Career Changers can commence teaching on a limited registration from the Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT) until they have satisfied all requirements of the course. The Career Change students are funded by the Department of Education and Training (Victoria).
- qualified practicing teachers in disciplines other than languages who have appropriate language expertise and who want a language teaching qualification (Distance Education Program).

The School of Education works closely with the Ethnic Schools Association and teachers from this sector enter into the Graduate Diploma of Education.
Summary:

VU’s Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education is a one year full time or equivalent part-time graduate diploma offering language teaching methodology to a range of students, including postgraduate students with a post Year 12 prior major language study and postgraduates without a major who pass a language equivalency test. It also offers language teaching methodology training opportunities for mature age career changers, ethnic school teachers, and re-training opportunities for teachers with appropriate language expertise who are qualified in other teaching areas.

In addition to its accessibility, particular features of this course include its benchmarking of curriculum and close alignment with various relevant standards and curriculum documents and its close partnership between students and mentor teachers in schools (the Project Partnership practicum).
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APPENDIX 1: MAPPING OF TEACHER EDUCATION COURSES

NOTES:

* Indicates that the questionnaire had been sent to the appropriate tertiary institution but that they did not complete it. The information has therefore been gathered via the internet.

INP indicates that the tertiary institution did send back a questionnaire, but some information was not provided.

NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS


**Bachelor of Teaching/Bachelor of Arts (Primary)**

**Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full-time or equivalent part-time (all courses)</td>
<td>B.ED: 337 BA/BA: 74; BA/BA: 45</td>
<td>B.ED: 422 BA/BA: 51; BA/BA: 106</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Yes. Concurrent language and pedagogical study</td>
<td>Yes, available but not compulsory and it includes credit bearing</td>
<td>22 days practicum in either one or two blocks</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

Year 12 or equivalent for Italian; either Year 12 or no previous study for Japanese.

**Course content**

Italian V1 to Italian V8, Japanese 1 to Japanese 4 (descriptions available online).
Language specific or general teaching units?
Language specific.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
36 hrs per semester unit.

Special features
Students have the opportunity to do part of their practicum in a school of the country of the LOTE.

TERTIARY INSTITUTION - AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY (ACU). (Melbourne) www.acu.edu.au
Graduate Diploma in Education (secondary)
Master of Teaching (secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Grad. Dip: One year full-time or equivalent part-time</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>Two professional experience units consisting of at least 45 days practicum and 20 days of community engagement.</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
A post Year 12 major in the LOTE or a statement of equivalence

Course content
Two curriculum units are selected from two different learning areas, including LOTE. In some cases, including LOTE, students may select four units from one area.
Units include LOTE methodology units covering a range of language related issues such as language acquisition research findings, of first and second language learning theories, and the principles of optimal classroom learning and teaching. Current national, state and system policies regarding language education are also covered. Other units include Current Issues in LOTE.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

INP

**Special features**

There is also wide range of LOTE related units. Students can take a double LOTE in choice of curriculum units.

---

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION - CHRISTIAN HERITAGE COLLEGE, MANSFIELD, BRISBANE** [www.chc.qld.edu.au](http://www.chc.qld.edu.au)

*Bachelor of Education Primary / Early years;*  
*Bachelor of Education Primary / Middle Years,*  
*Bachelor of Education Secondary / Middle Years, Bachelor of Education (Graduate Entry); and*  
*Combined degrees:*  
*BA/BED (Primary / Early Years), BA/BED (Primary / MIddle Years, BA/BED (Secondary / Middle Years).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>BED and BA/BED - 4 years BED (Graduate Entry) - 2 years</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Yes. It is available but not compulsory and includes community-based experiences.</td>
<td>Yes. In the elective LOTE unit only.</td>
<td>Four (4) Professional Experience Program (PEP) blocks of four (4) weeks (80 days) plus an eight week (40 day) Internship, as well as 20 days of community-based educational experiences spread over the preservice study</td>
<td>About 50% and generalistr with language teaching integrated. If a Secondary English preservcie students, 50% of the PEP will be in that curriculum area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Prerequisites
Year 12 including at least a Sound Achievement (SA), or equivalent, in Year 12 English.

Course content
General language education and two personal proficiencies / cross-curricular literacies units:

Core:
EL104 - Introduction to Teaching English
EL204 - Pedagogies of Teaching English
ED114 - Personal Proficiencies in Cross-curricular Literacies
ED217 - Using Cross-Curricular Literacies in the Classroom

Electives:
EL205 - Multimodality and Diversity in the Classroom
LOTE Studies Elective LT 104

Language specific or general teaching units?
The EL units are specific language education units while the Personal Proficiencies and Cross-curricular literacies units focus on the integration of: (i) Literacy, (ii) Numeracy, and (iii) ICTs.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
36 hours per semester (Contact)

Special features
The two core primary and middle units (EL104 and EL204) are included as part of the secondary pre-service student teachers English 'major' studies.
Two secondary curriculum units (SY201 and SY302) are also compulsory so that the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA) course design, implementation, assessment, moderation, program approval, monitoring, ... are addressed prior to graduation.

Current changes in QLD in relation to the QCAR developments are also being designed into these SY units.

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION - THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME AUSTRALIA (Fremantle) [www.nd.edu.au](http://www.nd.edu.au)**

*Bachelor of Education Primary Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years (full time equivalent)</td>
<td>311 in BEd Primary</td>
<td>270 in BEd Primary</td>
<td>25 across all four years of the study</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes. Concurrent language and pedagogical study</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Up to 32 weeks over four years language teaching is optional as available in practicum school but strongly encouraged.</td>
<td>Generalist language teaching integrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The School of Education at the Fremantle campus of UNDA offers four Italian Teaching Method Units as a specialisation pathway within the four year (full time equivalent) undergraduate Bachelor of Education (Primary) course. This course is a general pre-service teacher education course.

**Prerequisites**
Year 12 Italian or equivalent expertise. ‘Not for degree’ students may be enrolled in the Italian Teaching method course without having to meet normal university entrance requirements, but may not transfer this enrolment to any other university courses without first satisfying such requirements.

**Course content**
The course is a general pre-service teacher education course. It offers a number of specialisation pathways running over four years. Specialisation areas include Theology, Science and other learning areas, with Italian being the only language offered. Italian Teaching Method as part of BEd Primary undergraduate courses - BEd students may take four units as a specialisation pathway. Other degree students may take one or more of the units as electives. Students are awarded a certificate by the IAWCC (Italo-Australian Welfare and Cultural Centre Inc.) recognising them as ‘specialist’ teachers of Italian in primary and middle school. The course is based on the 6 LOTE outcomes as outlined in the WA Curriculum Framework. The first three units focus on the
first three sequenced LOTE outcomes. Unit four covers the three unsequenced LOTE outcomes. Year 1, Semester 2: ED1301: LOTE Listening & Responding & Speaking; Year 2, Semester 2: ED1302: LOTE Viewing, Reading & Responding; Year 3 Semester 2: ED1303: LOTE Writing; Year 4, Semester 1: ED 1304: LOTE Cultural understanding; the system of the target language; Language Learning Strategies.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Italian specific.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
26 hours language teaching and 26 hours methodology per unit.

**Special features**
This program is funded by the IAWCC with the support of the Italian government, which provided funds to set up the course and to pay associated costs, including staff salaries. Notre Dame provides highly qualified staff, resources and facilities. The program caters for degree students and also for teachers of Italian who may not be fully qualified. It may be taken as “not for degree”, with credits able to be “banked.” Thus alternative entry pathways are encouraged. The program has four hours per week over a thirteen week semester, rather than the usual three.

---

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME AUSTRALIA (Fremantle)**

*www.nd.edu.au*

*Bachelor of Education secondary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years (full-time equivalent)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, the students complete 8 units over the course of the four year degree. The duration of the units is generally 26 hours and students generally complete 1 - 2 units per</td>
<td>INP.</td>
<td>Up to 32 weeks over four years. Two weeks in Year 1, ten weeks in Year 2; ten weeks in Year 3 (with special focus on the Learning Area Major/Specialisation) ten weeks in Year 4 – the Teaching Internship, which provides for an integrated program of teaching in both Learning</td>
<td>About 50%. This does vary depending on the school experience concerned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Prerequisites**
Year 12 Italian or equivalent

**Course content**
General education and cross curriculum units plus four units of Learning Area Majors/Specialisations’. Italian is the languages Learning Area/Specialisation.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Combination.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
The students complete one nine week teaching method unit which is integrated with a school experience. The other teaching units are generic.

---

*THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME AUSTRALIA (Sydney) [www.nd.edu.au](http://www.nd.edu.au)*

*Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education (Secondary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate double degree</td>
<td>Four years (full-time equivalent)</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>Year 1 - Two weeks of classroom immersion and teacher assistance</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2 - Ten weeks of school experience – one school term – with special focus on one of the two Learning Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

124
**Prerequisites**
Students should have achieved a University Admissions Index (UAI) of 72.00 or higher.

**Course content**
The Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education (accelerated) curriculum is designed to provide an integration of theory and practice throughout all four years of the program. The units are taken in an essentially predetermined sequence.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
INP

| Year 3 | Ten weeks of school experience – one school term – with special focus on the second of the two Learning Area specialisations |
| Year 4 | Ten weeks of school experience – one school term – the Teaching Internship, which provides for an integrated program of teaching in both areas of specializations. |
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY INSTITUTIONS

*TERTIARY INSTITUTION – CURTIN UNIVERSITY  [www.curtin.edu.au]
Bachelor of Education Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full-time</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>Internship of one school term, or approximately ten weeks, where the student teacher has the major responsibility for a class of children, under supervision from the class teacher. There are opportunities for 'country practice' and a final practice in Canada.</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
INP

**Course content**
LOTE learning area as part of a 3rd year unit: *Social & Cultural Contexts in Curriculum*.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
INP
### Bachelor of Education Secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full-time</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

INP

**Course content**

Basic principles, concepts and procedures used in curriculum materials currently available. Practice in the selection and writing of objectives appropriate to different groups of students. Practice in developing learning sequences in the subject area. Principles for selecting materials and media. Difference between evaluation of student progress and of the course. Techniques for evaluating progress in the subject and in the classroom. Provision for evaluation in current curriculum materials and guides.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

INP
**Graduate Diploma in Education Secondary Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full time</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25 days per unit</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
A degree with major sequences in a language or languages. Additional admission requirement for all students - An overall Academic IELTS band score of 7.5.

**Course content**
Prospective languages teachers study specified Education units plus one or two languages methodology units. 6713 Secondary teaching studies G1 – General LOTE methodology. 6725 Secondary teaching studies G2 - Focuses on the ‘state of the art’ use of ICT in languages teaching and learning.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Combination.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Thirty-six.
Bachelor of Education in Middle School Teaching (K – 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full-time or equivalent part-time (maximum 20 semesters).</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Normal requirements for admission to an undergraduate course. Additional admission requirement for all students: An overall Academic IELTS band score of 7.5.

**Course content**
The course is designed for students who intend working in primary middle and secondary school settings. In addition to required units in literacy, mathematics, indigenous education and science, prospective language teachers study a ‘minor’ sequence (four semester units in the first two years) in one or more of Chinese Language (Beginning, Continuing, or Intermediate-Advanced). Spanish Language (Beginning, Continuing, or Intermediate-Advanced). Japanese Language (Beginning, Continuing, or Intermediate-Advanced). A Language Other Than English at another institution as approved by course convener.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
INP
## Bachelor of Education in Primary Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full-time or equivalent part-time (maximum 20 semesters).</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Normal requirements for admission to an undergraduate course. Additional admission requirement for all students: An overall Academic IELTS band score of 7.5.

**Course content**
In addition to requisite Education units the course includes study of all KLAs except languages.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
INP
**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA**  
[www.canberra.edu.au](http://www.canberra.edu.au)  
**Bachelor of Education in Primary Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Four semesters full-time, equivalent part-time, maximum 8 semesters.</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**  
A degree. Additional admission requirement for all students: An overall Academic IELTS band score of 7.5.

**Course content**  
In addition to requisite Education units the course includes study of all KLAs except languages.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**  
INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**  
INP
### Bachelor of Education in Secondary Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full-time or equivalent part-time; maximum 16 semesters</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes. Elective as a KLA minor.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teaching practicum in local school in language area. Practicum a minimum of three weeks</td>
<td>Minimum of three weeks of Professional Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Year 12 or equivalent.

**Course content**
This course provides a secondary teaching qualification for graduates whose undergraduate degree does not include a major sequence in an area teachable at the secondary level. The structure of the course allows prospective languages teachers to study a major sequence of units in one or more languages as well as the requisite units in teacher education.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Combination.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Four units x 36 hours per unit over duration of course
NEW SOUTH WALES INSTITUTIONS

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – CHARLES STURT UNIVERSITY [www.csu.edu.au]

Graduate Diploma in Education (secondary)
Graduate Certificate in languages other than English teaching
Bachelor of Education (secondary)
Bachelor of Education (primary – upgrade to 4th year))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and undergraduate</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

For the B.Ed (primary upgrade to 4th year) students undertaking LOTE must do EML 427 and 428 concurrently with first and then second year of Indonesian, Japanese or Modern Greek.

**Course content**

EML 497: Curriculum Method: LOTE 1. This subject introduces students to the pedagogy of languages other than English. EML 498: Curriculum Method: LOTE 2. This subject expands upon the fundamentals of teaching LOTE developed in EML497.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

INP
### TERTIARY INSTITUTION – MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY  [www.mq.edu.au](http://www.mq.edu.au)

**Graduate Diploma in Education (secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 days' practicum - 1 day a week and 2 x 10 day blocks</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Major in a language.

**Course content**

TEP 431: Languages in the secondary school I: This unit examines current approaches to language teaching theory and practice in their application to syllabus requirements in NSW Primary and Secondary schools.TEP 432: Languages in the secondary school II: This unit provides an extension of the work undertaken in TEP 431.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Mostly general but does offer one language specific workshop in Semester 1 for each language.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Thirty-nine hours per semester.

**Special features**
Please note that although this is classed as a Graduate Diploma in Education (Secondary), primary students who have a minor in a language (eg at least 8 cp at 200 level) also enrol in TEP 431 only and do an extra 10 days' primary language specific practicum over and above their generalist primary practicum. Secondary students with a minor in a language also only enrol in TEP 431 and do 10 days' language specific practicum. Secondary Japanese
students can also participate in an HSC Continuers' workshop at the Tanken Centre, which counts as 2 days towards their practicum. Pre-service teachers of Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Bahasa Indonesia can also apply to the Asia Education Foundation for scholarships.

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG [www.uow.edu.au](http://www.uow.edu.au)**

*Graduate Diploma in Education Primary, Secondary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full-time.</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>Total of 55 days taken in two three week blocks and one five week block.</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

Two years of study in post introductory French.

**Course content**

General education subjects plus French as a single curriculum/methodology subject. (Each student must undertake two curriculum/methodology subjects).

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

INP
Graduate Diploma in Education Secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full-time.</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40 Days</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
A first degree. Modern Languages Method requires ‘three ninths’ of a degree in study of the language.

**Course content**
*EDLA 965:12 - Modern Language Teaching Method:* This is a full year unit in the Grad Dip Ed and the BA/BTch, for intending high school teachers. (From 2008, EDLA 965:12 will be divided into two one-semester units - EDLA 985:6 + EDLA 986:6 - but will retain the same components.)

Students receive a package of study materials written by the unit co-ordinator, and also have access to a range of online articles and sites to challenge and support their learning.

These students attend a 4-day Residential School on campus - and the on-campus students also attend, to participate in the rich program that we can offer at this time (9 languages this year, plus visiting speakers).

At this School, we invite local LOTE teachers to present sessions on the full range of issues facing LOTE teachers today, as well as some contributions from other UNE staff. The students also make presentations as individuals and in their LOTE groups throughout the Res School.

This contact is continued during the year on an online Discussion Forum.

All students also undertake a (usually) 4-week Professional Experience placement in their LOTE at an appropriate school.

The three written assignments for this unit are:
(1) an analysis of a current LOTE textbook in terms of fostering communicative competence, practicality, etc;
(2) an account and evaluation of a range of assessment 'events' that they devise and carry out during their Professional Experience; and
(3) a unit of work of at least 6 hours, plus all materials.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
300 hours over two semesters.

**Special features**
Studies can be undertaken either on-campus or off-campus, but by far the majority of our students are off-campus students (in 2007, 35 out of our total 40 LOTE Method students).

---

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND**

**Bachelor of Teaching Primary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate coursework. May be taken on or off campus</td>
<td>Two years full-time. Up to eight years part time.</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 blocs x 20 days each over two years</td>
<td>Generalist with language teaching integrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Students are required to have completed at least two units of study in four of the following areas, or four units of study in one area and two units of study in two other areas as listed below:
(a) Mathematics
(b) Science and Technology  
(c) English or Linguistics  
(d) Personal Development, Health Education and Physical Education  
(e) Human Society and its Environment (e.g. Aboriginal Studies, Economics, Geography, History, Politics, Sociology, Studies in Religion)  
(f) Creative Arts (e.g. Drama, Music, Visual Arts, Dance)  
(g) A language other than English or Information Technology or Psychology  
(h) Education Studies.

**Course content**

The course includes general education and cross curriculum subjects and curriculum studies in six KLAs. Languages are not included in the six, but study of languages as part of a first degree is an acceptable pre-requisite for entry to the course. Students who have at least two years of a LOTE in their initial degree may also apply for EDLA 329/429 An Integrated Approach for Modern Language Teaching in Primary Schools to enable them to become a language teacher in a primary school. This unit can be taken as an Applied Education Elective in the BTeach (Primary). Students are encouraged to visit schools in their locality where there is a LOTE program if they can and to negotiate a practicum experience if possible.

The two assignments for this unit are intended to provide some insights into the differing roles of the 'specialist/visiting language teacher' (often itinerant, and servicing perhaps several classes/schools each week), and the classroom teacher integrating LOTE into his/her program.

Specifically, the two assignments are:
1. a program and sample unit of work (5 lessons) for a ‘specialist/visiting LOTE teacher’; and  
2. a rationale (in the form of a parent-teacher information evening presentation) plus a sample unit of work for a classroom teacher integrating LOTE into the general primary program.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

**General**

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

150 hours in one semester.

**Special features**

All students in this unit study off campus, and there is also an online Discussion Forum, but no Residential School.
Bachelor of Teaching Secondary

This award is part of the 4-year combined degree 'BA/BTch', which takes the same time to complete as a BA followed by a Grad Dip Ed, and the Education units of this award are virtually the same as those in the Grad Dip Ed.

The main difference is that, in the combined award, students begin their Education studies in the second year, rather than waiting till the fourth year after completing all their undergraduate studies. There is also a third 20-day Professional Experience placement in this award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate coursework.</td>
<td>Two years full-time. Up to eight years part time.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A total of 60 days, taken in three 20 day blocks.</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be taken on or off campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
A university degree or a three-year diploma acceptable to the Faculty. Modern Languages requires three-ninths of a degree of study of the language (‘background studies’)

**Course content**
*EDLA 965:12 - Modern Language Teaching Method:* This is a full year unit in the Grad Dip Ed and the BA/BTch, for intending high school teachers. (From 2008, EDLA 965:12 will be divided into two one-semester units - EDLA 985:6 + EDLA 986:6 - but will retain the same components.)

Students receive a package of study materials written by the unit co-ordinator, and also have access to a range of online articles and sites to challenge and support their learning.
These students attend a 4-day Residential School on campus - and the on-campus students also attend, to participate in the rich program that we can offer at this time (9 languages this year, plus visiting speakers).

At this School, we invite local LOTE teachers to present sessions on the full range of issues facing LOTE teachers today, as well as some contributions from other UNE staff. The students also make presentations as individuals and in their LOTE groups throughout the Res School.

This contact is continued during the year on an online Discussion Forum.

All students also undertake a (usually) 4-week Professional Experience placement in their LOTE at an appropriate school.

The three written assignments for this unit are:
(1) an analysis of a current LOTE textbook in terms of fostering communicative competence, practicality, etc;
(2) an account and evaluation of a range of assessment 'events' that they devise and carry out during their Professional Experience; and
(3) a unit of work of at least 6 hours, plus all materials.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
300 hours across two semesters.

**Special features**

Studies can be undertaken either on-campus or off-campus, but by far the majority of our students are off-campus students (in 2007, 35 out of our total 40 LOTE Method students).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Five years full-time</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes, Portfolio assessment task, requires them to document how they maintain and develop their language; school practicum field experiences; visiting mentor teachers for ‘specific’ content area study.</td>
<td>Yes, available occasionally, with grant funding such as Indonesian teachers to Indonesia in 2004 for 3 weeks, with UMAP funding; TESOL teachers to South Korea in 2005 and 2006 with private Korean funding</td>
<td>Semester 5 = 4 weeks; Semester 6 = 4 weeks; Semester 7 = 4 weeks; Semester 9 = internship ten weeks</td>
<td>Double method (two languages) all prac in language teaching situations; single method (one language) just one of the pracs, plus possibly the internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
(Minimum) two years post Year 12 HSC language study (or equivalent) concurrently within the Combined Degree (BA/BEd) program.

**Course content**
Education studies. Specialist discipline area studies including languages (studied in the Faculty of Arts) Languages (may be undertaken as a double-teaching method: Arabic, Chinese, Classical Hebrew, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Modern Greek). In the third year of the degree LTE students begin the full professional program in teaching and curriculum in the Faculty of Education. This includes curriculum study with particular concentration in languages together with continuing academic study.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Both general and specific.
How many hours spent on language teaching units?
Semester 5 = 28 hours; Semester 6 = 31 hours; Semester 7 = 31 hours.

Special features
Portfolio assessment task requires pre-service teachers to focus on how they will continue to maintain and develop their proficiency and competence in the TL. Mentor teachers for specific languages curriculum workshops 4 hours per semester.

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY  www.usyd.edu.au
Bachelor of Teaching  
Master of Teaching Secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Masters degree 2 years (4 semesters full time); Bachelor degree 15 months (3 semesters full time)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes. Portfolio assessment task, requires them to document how they maintain and develop their language; school practicum field experiences; visiting mentor teachers for ‘specific’ content area study.</td>
<td>Yes, available occasionally, with grant funding such as Indonesian teachers to Indonesia in 2004 for 3 weeks, with UMAP funding; TESOL teachers to South Korea in 2005 and 2006 with private Korean funding</td>
<td>Semester 1 and 2 = 20 days; Semester 3 = 20 days; Semester 4 = ten weeks</td>
<td>Double method (two languages) all prac in language teaching situations; single method (one language) just one of the prac, plus possibly the internship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
A first degree or equivalent with relevant study in the languages, or equivalent.
Course content
Education and Across curriculum areas of study plus 3 semester units of language method study for main method and 3 further semester units for second language method.

Language specific or general teaching units?
General and specific

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
Semester 1 = 28 hours; Semester 2 = 31 hours; Semester 3 = 31 hours (single language). Double if Double Languages Method.

Special features
Portfolio assessment task requires pre-service teachers to focus on how they will continue to maintain and develop their proficiency and competence in the TL. Mentor teachers for specific language workshops 4 hours per semester.

TERTIARY INSTITUTION –UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY www.usyd.edu.au
Bachelor of Education Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exposure to target language during course?
Yes, through assessment tasks, guest speakers, guest visits

In-country experience?
Yes. available occasionally, with grant funding such as Indonesian teachers to Indonesia in 2004 for 3 weeks, with UMAP funding; TESOL teachers to South Korea in 2005 and 2006 with private Korean funding

Practicum days
Year 1: 8 single days of observation Year 2: 1-15 days of practice teaching Year 3: 2-15 days of practice teaching Year 4: 45 days of practice teaching.

There is no mandate for the elective languages group to have a “second language” component in their prac in 4th year.

Prerequisites
For ‘special units’ in languages - entry to the first special unit requires ‘demonstrated proficiency’ in a language other than English. Entry to the second curriculum unit requires successful completion of the first.

**Course content**

Education studies plus discipline area studies. Two semester language teaching curriculum units ‘Teaching Other Languages’ offered as ‘special units’ in the 4th year.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

General (specific achieved through assessment tasks).

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

20 hours in Semester 7 and 20 hours in Semester 8.

---

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY**  
**Graduate Diploma in Languages Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full-time or two years part-time</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yes. Large number of background speakers and language specific methodology.</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

First degree. Proficiency in a language other than English equivalent to two years of post-elementary tertiary study. For international students whose first language is not English: an overall score of 6.0 in the IELTS with a minimum of 6.0 in the writing components.
Course content
This course aims to: enable students to achieve or consolidate specialist, professional competence as practitioners in teaching and programming for spoken and written languages; provide students with the relevant theoretical underpinning for this professional competence in a variety of contexts, and the ability to reflect critically on it; and develop students’ understanding of the linguistic demands of teaching and learning, and of issues in language development: Language teaching methodology: theory and practice of language teaching; overview of past and present trends in methodology; syllabus design and assessment; Development of an understanding of strategies that promote purposeful and communicative language use in relation to specific contexts for language teaching and learning; Features of good lesson and task design and the impact of learner-centred theories of teaching and learning on recent developments in the field. The following components of the course are examples of units relating specifically to languages teaching: 015128: Socio-political Contexts of Language, Literacy and Numeracy Education; 15122: Assessment, Programming and Evaluation; 015158: Language Development; 015164: Technology-enhanced Language Learning; 015421: Language Teaching Methodology.

Language specific or general teaching units?
INP

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
60

Special features
This course includes the general aspects to be expected in a pre-service teacher education course but focuses particularly on languages teaching. Thus there is a wide range of languages teaching based units. A main feature is the large number of background speakers in the course. The two main groups are Chinese and Japanese, with language specific methods for these groups. Note: UTS is moving to a graduate Bachelor of Teaching model in 2007, with the Grad Dip being a method in that course in 2008. The new course will be substantially longer – equivalent to three semesters in one year. From 2008 there will not be a stand alone course for language teacher education.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN SYDNEY [www.uws.edu.au]
*Master of Teaching Primary/Secondary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>c.6</td>
<td>c.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45 days as blocks - 23 days</td>
<td>Depends whether they have a second Method - if so, 50%; if not, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Degree with major in Language.

**Course content**
Secondary Method 1A/1B/2A/2B: LOTE- pedagogy of languages teaching and relevant NSW Syllabuses.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
13 hrs per semester.
## QUEENSLAND INSTITUTIONS

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION - BOND UNIVERSITY**  
[www.bond.edu.au](http://www.bond.edu.au)

*Major in Language Teaching (minimum 6 subjects in Applied Linguistics)*

*Diploma of Arts (LOTE) (8 Applied Linguistics Subjects)*

*Master of Arts in Teaching LOTE (8 Applied Linguistics Subjects, 2 compulsory: Epistemology and research methods, 2 optional: recommended subjects either in Education or in the language/culture area, e.g. Spanish Studies, French Studies)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate and Graduate</td>
<td>Length of courses vary between 1 and 6 semesters. See below**</td>
<td>139 enrolments in Applied Linguistics subjects (see attached for details) This is not the accurate number of students as some students choose the part-time options etc, but approximately around 25 students are enrolled in</td>
<td>193 enrolments in Applied Linguistics subjects. This is not the accurate number of students as some students choose the part-time options etc, but approximately around 25 students are enrolled in the programs at any time</td>
<td>Yes. It is optional and applies only to the Master programs where students are allowed to take two units of their choice. TESOL students may take courses in English as a Second language offered by Bond University. Also, students can take an option of studying two highest proficiency levels (5 and 6) in the countries where language are spoken.</td>
<td>Yes. It is available (not compulsory) for the students to study level 5 and 6 in the countries where languages are spoken. This option is open to students for all languages: French, Spanish, Mandarin Chinese and Japanese.</td>
<td>Apart from the Combined degree with Educational Practice, none of these programs are education programs. In order to be an accredited teacher students do a separate degree in Education where they specify a language teaching degree as one of their teaching options. Consequently, the practicum is contained to two subjects: Practical Language Teaching: 48 hrs per semester Internship: 12 days per semester</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major in Language Teaching: any length over 6 semesters depending on student enrolments
Graduate Certificate in TESOL: 1 semester
Postgraduate Diploma of LOTE: full-time minimum 2 semesters (4+4),
Postgraduate Diploma of TESOL: full-time minimum 2 semesters (4+4),
Master of Arts (Language Teaching LOTE): Minimum 3 semesters (4+4+4)
Master of Arts (Language Teaching TESOL): Minimum 3 semesters (4+4+4)
Combined degree of Master of Arts (Language Teaching TESOL) and Master of Educational Practice: minimum 5 semesters

**Prerequisites**
To be admitted to an undergraduate degree: Year 12 or equivalent,
To be admitted to a postgraduate degree: any undergraduate degree plus:
LOTE trainees are typically either native-speakers of the target language or possess an undergraduate degree in the target language and demonstrated fluency in the target language
TESOL students are allowed entry at 6.5 IELTS, upon the continuation of the Educational Practice Combined degree (if they choose it) they must have IELTS 7.0 English.

**Course content**
The program covers both theoretical and practical aspects of various aspects of language and culture teaching. Each subject introduces theoretical frameworks and practical applications of the theory, e.g. principles of language testing and how to apply these in making language tests. The titles of the subjects reflect the area covered:
- Language teaching methodology (traditional and current approaches to language teaching);
- Language acquisition (first and second language acquisition theories and learner variables)
- Syllabus design (frameworks of curriculum/syllabus and practical applications)
- Linguistics (introduction to language and theories of language)
- Sociolinguistics
- Practical language Teaching (Practicum)
- Internship in Language teaching
Graduate programs in language teaching provide specialist training theory and practice for teachers or those planning to become teachers of Languages other than English. This program provides the theoretical basis and practical language teacher training required by employers of language teachers, specialist language teaching colleges and many University language teaching centres in Australia and overseas.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
A combination: usually a language teaching theory or framework is explored and students then apply the theory to a language/culture specific context, that is also the reason why the only LOTE languages offered are the ones on offer at Bond, to allow for the close relationship between the language teachers and trainees.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Between 36-48 hrs per unit per semester (some subjects, e.g. Practical language teaching or language Acquisition require more contact time).

**Special features**
The programs at Bond University prepare the students in the specialised field of language teaching. The program stresses the relationship between theory and practice in language teaching approaches with the view of language as a cultural phenomenon.

Trainees work in very small groups and their multilingual and multicultural nature (in any group of 15 students there are usually 8-9 nationalities) determines the real-life discussion on what currently happens (and not just should happen) in language classrooms in many countries. This multicultural aspect of the program provides an ideal context for learning about real issues in the world's classrooms.

Very small classes also allow for a close interaction with LOTE and TESOL teachers at Bond, visits to classrooms, involvement in their preparation, etc. introducing trainees to the reality of language teacher's professional life. The small size of the groups also encourages very strong support for teachers beginners.
# TERTIARY INSTITUTION - GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY [www.gu.edu.au](http://www.gu.edu.au)

## a. Graduate Dip.Ed. Secondary LOTE
## b. Graduate Certificate in Applied Linguistics
## c. MA in Applied Linguistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course?</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>a. 1 year full time</td>
<td>a. in semester one 85 students and in semester two 79</td>
<td>a. in semester one 110 in semester two 93</td>
<td>a. 15 students (LOTE) in each semester</td>
<td>a. 15 students (LOTE) in each semester</td>
<td>No. Students are responsible for maintaining their proficiency in their own arrangement.</td>
<td>BEd students are encouraged to apply for scholarships and exchange programs (e.g. Endeavour scholarships for Asian languages). Griffith also provides opportunities for gaining international teaching experiences through teaching in Vietnam, in China or in Switzerland.</td>
<td>a. 5 weeks full time teaching in Qld schools per two semesters and 25 days of community and wider professional experience. The teaching overseas is recognised as wider professional experience</td>
<td>a. Approx. 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1 year part-time</td>
<td>h. in semester one 28 and in semester two 14</td>
<td>b. in semester one 29 in semester two 19</td>
<td>b. in semester one 23, in semester two 15</td>
<td>b. in semester one 29 in semester two 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1 year full time</td>
<td>c. in semester one 36 and in semester two 39</td>
<td>c. in semester one 44 and in semester two 42</td>
<td>c. in semester one 36, and in semester two 39</td>
<td>c. in semester one 44 and in semester two 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: The reason for the subdivision into semesters is because many students continue their studies in the second semester or in summer school courses and the overall student enrolments do not represent the real number of the students. The GradCert is directly articulated towards the MA and many students opt to continue their studies and complete the MA in Applied Linguistics, therefore their name appears on both lists. The GradCert numbers on the table represent only those who have not decided to continue their studies towards the MA.
Prerequisites
Applicants are accepted into the Grad Dip Ed (secondary LOTE) with an undergraduate degree within which they have a major in Italian, French, Spanish, German, Japanese, Indonesian, Chinese or Korean. For the Graduate Certificate and the Masters programs a teaching degree or another degree with at least one year teaching experience required.

Course content
In the Grad Dip Ed, there are two LOTE Curriculum courses (LOTE Curriculum Middle Phase and LOTE Curriculum Senior Phase) that focus on developing: students’ understanding of the socio-cultural contexts in which they will function as teachers, the role and place of languages within the school curriculum, the development of intercultural sensitivity and linguistic and cultural awareness, the range of language acquisition, learning and teaching theories that promote a better understanding of learning environments and effective language pedagogy. The two courses are strongly related to the students’ teaching practicum and students are expected to critically evaluate and reflect on their pedagogic and learning experiences.

The Graduate Certificate in Applied Linguistics is a program for qualified teachers who wish to extend their skills to the teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language or a language other than English (LOTE). The program develops skills at an advanced level and enhances professional standing. It aims to develop: an understanding of the linguistic theories which underpin modern approaches to second language teaching; an understanding of theories of second language acquisition; and expertise in the overall design of effective pedagogic approaches.

The MA in Applied Linguistics opens up a career in leadership positions in second language teaching institutions or leads to further Research Higher Degree (RHD) studies. In the latter case an MA (hons) needs to be completed, with 80 cp coursework and 40 cp thesis.

Language specific or general teaching units?
General lectures but the seminars and tutorials involve language specific presentations performed by the students. The students commence the programs with advanced language skills.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
Grad Dip Ed 27 hours per semester + practicum
Grad Cert and MA in Appl Ling 39 hours per semester + practicum.

Special features
The Graduate Certificate in Applied Linguistics and the MA in Applied Linguistics offer retraining or change of teaching domains for teachers. The special strength of these programs is that they provide opportunities for teachers to teach in international contexts (Vietnam, Switzerland China) and improve their not only their pedagogic skills but also improve their target language proficiency or learn a new language.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – CENTRAL QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY  www.cqu.edu.au
Bachelor of Learning Management (Japanese) Primary and Secondary Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course?</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years or accelerated three year program</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45 students across all year levels</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Concurrent language and pedagogical studies</td>
<td>The second practicum (five weeks) is completed in Japan in a Japanese primary school. After the practicum, students remain in Japan for an additional two months. Thus focused in-country experience is a required component of this course.</td>
<td>80 days plus final year internship of 25 days.</td>
<td>As indicated, a five week practicum is completed in Japan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Normal university entry requirements for domestic students, IELTS score of 6 or TOEFL score of 550 (some individual score requirements also) for international students. There is no pre-requisite for Japanese language. Students receive intensive training in Japanese throughout the course by Japanese native-background teaching staff.

Course content
The course includes general studies in education and curriculum with emphasis on managing students’ learning, combined with units of languages study. The purpose of this course is to introduce students to major and minor issues specific to the field of second/foreign language acquisition. Students investigate a wide range of methodological approaches to the learning of second language. As well, the role that the individual plays in the learning process and what factors contribute to differential success among second language learners are examined. Students develop skills in designing, implementing and evaluating programs of learning in languages. Students take units in cross curriculum and professional education areas plus:

- JALC10002 Japanese Life Style and Custom.
- JALC10003 Formal and Informal Japanese.
- JALC 10004 Colloquial communication in Japanese.
• JALC19001 Learning with Japanese University.
• JALC19002 Professional Teaching in Japan: 49 hours
• LOTE11011 Second Language Teaching Methodologies: 36 hours
• LOTE11035 LOTE Curriculum and Pedagogy: 54 hours

Language specific or general teaching units?
Combination

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
See above

Special features
The BLM courses were developed in partnership with teachers and principals and students have much more contact with schools than in the past. Trained Learning Managers who are experienced teachers mentor students throughout their course. There is a very large languages teaching related component throughout the course. Students will also have an opportunity to study at a Japanese university for up to one year with scholarship funds available. Students interact with Japanese university students in Japan using the internet voice chat software as part of their curriculum.

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY www.jcu.edu.au
Bachelor of Education (Primary)
Bachelor of Education (Secondary)
Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education
Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education - 4 years</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Concurrent language and pedagogical study.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Languages/Bachelor of Education includes one year of study abroad in an approved immersion program in a country where the language of study is spoken.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Languages/Bachelor of Education commences in the first year of the Bachelor of Education course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prerequisites
Normal university entry requirements through QTAC. Also alternative entry pathways. Depending on their languages skills, students can enrol in foundation or post Year 12 Japanese, French or German. From 2008, Italian and Chinese will have the same entry points. English language requirements for some international students: IELTS minimum 7.0, TOEFL minimum 577 (together with some minimum individual scores). Possibly other proof of proficiency. It is also possible to study to become a LOTE teacher through the one-year Graduate Diploma of Education providing the student complies with the entry requirements, namely a first degree with suitable teaching areas and proficiency in one of the approved languages taught in Queensland schools.

Course content
Bachelor of Education, primary or secondary - General education and cross curriculum studies plus 'specialisation' in French or Japanese, with other modes and cross institutional arrangements for other languages. The Bachelor of Languages can be taken as a joint degree with Bachelor of Education, primary or secondary. Students take courses in professional education studies and language courses in either French or Japanese over 4 years (‘levels’) (Other languages through other modes). Students spend at least two semesters (fifth year of study in joint degree) in an approved immersion languages program in a country where the language of study is spoken. (Language immersion program (24 units, 4 programs)). Units in professional education studies plus selected discipline (language) units from either French or Japanese on campus and German, Italian and Chinese (Mandarin) through other modes. (a combination of material supplied externally through the University of New England and taught on campus by UNE appointed tutors). In addition to professional education units at each level, students take: various language units (1 program) at level 1; 9 language units at level 2; 6-12 language units at level 3. In the Bachelor of Languages, the Study Abroad Program covers two semesters.
Language specific or general teaching units?
Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Languages allows for concurrent development of language and teaching skills.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
Done cross institutionally through Murdoch University via distance learning (student estimate: 2-3 hours per week.)

Special features
The combined degrees offer intensive language experience including in-country immersion, together with pre-service teacher training. The combined nature of the degree allows for concurrent development of language and teaching skills. JCU provides a range of pathways for students to combine pre-service teacher training with languages training. Note that the curriculum subject is done cross institutionally through Murdoch University (EDU 276 Second/Foreign Language and the Curriculum).

TERTIARY INSTITUTION - QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY (QUT) www.qut.edu.au
Bachelor of Education Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes. Concurrent language and pedagogical study. Depending on language level at entry, during the course at QUT, students will complete 6 or 8 units of their language. Each unit comprises approximately 36 hours. Native speakers are required to</td>
<td>Yes. QUT has provision for any Education student to undertake an overseas practicum, and Curriculum Studies staff encourage students to apply for scholarships, courses and exchanges in-country. (eg Endeavour schools)</td>
<td>Undergraduate teacher education 4 year course: 80 days plus 20 day internship. Primary LOTE pathway: These students are doing a 'mainstream' primary teacher education course. They can include LOTE into one 20 day practicum and then, if they choose, into their 20 day internship</td>
<td>Generalist with language teaching integrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
undertake the 2 highest level units.

Prerequisites
In the BEd, students who have studied their language through to Year 12 start in Level 3. This means they achieve Level 8 which is normally adequate preparation for the Education Queensland proficiency interview. Beginners start in Level 1 which assumes no (or very limited) previous experience of the language. This means that they complete Levels 1-6 in their degree program and will almost certainly need to take additional units or spend time in-country in order to achieve the required proficiency level.

Course content
In addition to professional studies in education, students who intend to work as languages teachers in the Primary Sector take the Primary LOTE Curriculum Studies unit. They can also take the Secondary LOTE curriculum Studies 2 unit, which focuses on language in the middle school, depending on their timetable. The Primary unit includes: • Language learning/teaching theory and current approaches to methodology in relation to current policy and practice • Study of the pedagogical implications of current syllabus developments and key issues related to course design, classroom practice and continuing professional development. Students are encouraged to consider language learning in terms of linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and cultural theory and to link this to practical classroom issues.

Language specific or general teaching units?
General.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
30 hours for compulsory unit. 15-27 for elective unit.

Special features
Students who complete the LOTE strand in the Primary BEd have dual qualifications and can become either a LOTE teacher or a regular classroom teacher.
### Prerequisites
In the BEd, students who have studied their language through to Year 12 start in Level 3. This means they achieve Level 8 which is normally adequate preparation for the Education Queensland proficiency interview. Beginners start in Level 1 which assumes no (or very limited) previous experience of the language. This means that they complete Levels 1-6 in their degree program and will almost certainly need to take additional units or spend time in-country in order to achieve the required proficiency level.
Course content
In addition to professional studies in education, students who wish to become specialist languages teachers in secondary schools undertake LOTE Curriculum Studies 1, 2 and 3. LOTE Curriculum Studies units focus on developing students’ understanding of language learning, the place of languages and literacies in the school curriculum and the role of the LOTE teacher in developing linguistic and cultural awareness. Both units encourage students to: understand and engage with a range of theories of language, language learning and language pedagogy; manage learning environments that are educationally productive for diverse sets of students and their learning needs; model and promote inquiring, cooperative and independent approaches to learning; demonstrate a capacity to draw on a range of teaching strategies in ways that align with pedagogical intentions. Both units consider aspects of language teaching such as effective pedagogy and assessment, learner strategies, the place of macro-skills, developing teaching sequences, intercultural literacy, use of classroom talk and of the target language. Students are encouraged to think about the strategies they could employ to respond to the diverse interests and abilities of all language learners. Assessment tasks encompass both theoretical and practical considerations and encourage linking of the two. The focus in both units is on upper middle/secondary languages programs in schools, and on planning learning experiences which support pupils’ involvement in multi-literate practices and develop their strategic language learning skills.

Language specific or general teaching units?
Largely general but with some language specific tutorials with practising teachers provided.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
93 hours in the year.
Graduate Diploma of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, QUT has provision for any Education student to undertake an overseas practicum, and Curriculum Studies staff encourage students to apply for scholarships, courses and exchanges in-country, (e.g. Endeavour scholarships)</td>
<td>2 blocks; one is 6 weeks, one is 4 weeks, plus observation days. Total 55 days</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Applicants are accepted into the Grad Dip Ed with a major in French, German, Japanese, Indonesian, Chinese or Italian. Native speakers of these languages are also encouraged to apply. Long term in-country experience is sometimes accepted if students can demonstrate a good level of literacy as well as oral skills.

**Course content**
LOTE Curriculum Studies 1,2 and 3 focus on developing students’ understanding of language learning, the place of languages and literacies in the school curriculum and the role of the LOTE teacher in developing linguistic and cultural awareness. Both units encourage students to: understand and engage with a range of theories of language, language learning and language pedagogy; manage learning environments that are educationally productive for diverse sets of students and their learning needs; model and promote inquiring, cooperative and independent approaches to learning; demonstrate a capacity to draw on a range of teaching strategies in ways that align with pedagogical intentions. Both units consider aspects of language teaching such as effective pedagogy and assessment, learner strategies, the place of macro-skills, developing teaching sequences, intercultural literacy, use of classroom talk and of the target language. Students are encouraged to think about the strategies they could employ to respond to the diverse interests and abilities of all language learners. Assessment tasks encompass both theoretical and practical considerations and encourage linking of the two. The focus in both units is on upper middle/
secondary languages programs in schools, and on planning learning experiences which support pupils’ involvement in multi-literate practices and develop their strategic language learning skills.

Language specific or general teaching units?
Largely general but with some language specific tutorials with practising teachers provided.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
93 hours in the year.

Special features
The Grad Dip Ed (Senior Years) prepares students to teach a language across the Upper Middle and Senior Years (Years 7-12 approximately).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The importance of in-school experience is emphasised. 45 days in two blocks</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
A first degree with a major deemed suitable for secondary school teaching.
(Includes languages)

Course content
Professional studies in education. Includes Teaching Modern Languages I & II

Language specific or general teaching units?
Japanese, French.
How many hours spent on language teaching units?
150

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND [www.usq.edu.au](http://www.usq.edu.au)
Available as a major within any of these programs:
- BA/B Ed
- Bachelor of Early Childhood (BECH) - BECh
- Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) (BEEC) - BEd(Early Childhood)
- Bachelor of Education (Further Education and Training) (BEFT) - BEd(FET)
- Bachelor of Education (Primary) (BEPR) - BEd(Primary)
- Bachelor of Education (Primary and Middle Schooling) (BPMU) - BEd(Primary&MiddleSchooling)
- Bachelor of Education (Senior and Middle Schooling) (BESM) - BEd(Senior&MiddleSchooling)
  
In 2006 it was available in:
- Bachelor of Education (Senior and Middle Schooling) (BESM) - BEd(Senior&MiddleSchooling)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years full time, Nine years part time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes. 48 hours when co-enrolled with language studies; 45% students have completed the language component when they enrol in the two semester languages education component of the major, because it is offered in 3rd and 4th year in the B</td>
<td>Yes. It is available but not compulsory and includes scholarships to Germany, China, Japan, France which many of the students seek out and obtain</td>
<td>115 days of ‘embedded’ professional experience. At least 80 days must occur in an approved educational environment under direct supervision. Students are required to undertake 35 days of Non Supervised Experience. The non supervised experiences are intended to (a) expand students’ understanding of the diverse contexts in which learning can take place and (b) raise awareness of factors that influence</td>
<td>Generalist with language teaching integrated. Secondary pre-service teachers have one practicum available for language teaching from the two major teaching areas students select. Primary pre-service teachers often do not gain prac. in language area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prerequisites
Completion of Year 12 or equivalent Year 12 English or equivalent.

Course content
General education and curriculum studies, plus the opportunity to major in several specialist areas, including Multicultural Education and Second Language teaching. The second language teaching major comprises four units in a language other than English plus EDU3481 Introduction to language and second language Teaching, and EDU3482 Second language Teaching Methodology.

Language specific or general teaching units?
General with specific language related exemplars.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
30 hours per semester.

Special features
Mentoring by local languages teachers through classroom visits and voluntary time spent with the teacher;
Prior Country Area program - 5 day program of voluntary participation in teaching languages and culture to students in years 9 &10 from Queensland rural schools;
Matching students with native speakers in the university for regular informal conversation;
Participation in the Languages and Cultural festival in Toowoomba working with school students and teachers in German, Japanese, French, Indonesian, Chinese.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF THE SUNSHINE COAST  [www.usc.edu.au]
Bachelor of Education/Bachelor of Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6 - 5 Japanese and 1 Indonesian</td>
<td>12 - 6 Japanese, 1 Indonesian and 5 Italian</td>
<td>Yes. 40 hours per semester</td>
<td>Yes. In-country studies are offered in all three languages. These intensive language and cultural courses are undertaken at universities based in Indonesia, Italy and Japan.</td>
<td>Generally five or six weeks continuous.</td>
<td>About 50%. Generalist with language teaching integrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Year 12 or equivalent.

Course content

Major Teaching Area: Indonesian, Italian and Japanese. For a major teaching area students must successfully complete the equivalent of 8 courses with 12 units (or a total of 96 units. Note that each In-Country course is the equivalent of 4 courses with 12 units (or a total of 48 units).

The three languages offered follow a similar developmental process:
1. Introduction to culture for social proficiency
2. An expanded social proficiency combined with an increased focus on language learning
3. Active language use in class.

For Indonesian an in-depth study of society, culture and politics is offered in INT256 Indonesia: Society, Culture and Politics. Indonesian world views and cultural values are explored throughout. Students are invited to focus on Australian dealings with Indonesians to conclude the course.
Language specific or general teaching units?
General lectures, specific tutorials.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
40 hours per semester.

Special features
The in-country experience is the enticement!

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND www.uq.edu.au
Graduate Diploma in Education (Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate - BArts/BEd</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>17 (4th year students)</td>
<td>12 (4th year students)</td>
<td>Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Spanish</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75 supervised practicum days; 20 days unsupervised practicum experience.</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate - Graduate Diploma in Education</td>
<td>One year full-time</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19 Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Spanish</td>
<td>Language maintenance (10 hours per semester)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75 supervised practicum days.</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Undergraduate – Senior English. Students are encouraged to only complete a major in a language if they have already had exposure to that language through previous school studies, time spent in a country that uses that language or if it is spokent at home. Before commencing the final year of the
program students complete a 30 minute proficiency interview to assess speaking, reading, writing and comprehension skills in that language. Graduate Completion of an appropriate undergraduate degree with a major in the language plus a 30 minute proficiency interview; or a native speaker.

Course content
Curriculum Foundation and Specialist Teaching Areas: Years 4-10 and Senior Syllabuses; work programs, units of work, lesson plans; selection, preparation & use of resources; teaching vocabulary, grammar & script; use of technology. Literacy; assessment & moderation; intercultural language learning; integrating languages across the curriculum; policies & motivation; networking.

Language specific or general teaching units?
Language specific units occur in the first three years of the dual degree program (equivalent of a major in the language). Graduate Diploma students are expected to have had a similar experience at a tertiary institution or its equivalent.

Dual degree students in their final year and Graduate Diploma students each have 3 hours per week (eighteen weeks in the year) on LOTE curriculum and 2 hours per week (eighteen weeks in the year) on specific language curriculum studies plus 10 hours per semester on language maintenance.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
3 hours per week (eighteen weeks in the year) on LOTE curriculum and 2 hours per week (eighteen weeks in the year) on specific language studies plus 10 hours per semester on language maintenance.
SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTIONS

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – FLINDERS UNIVERSITY  www.flinders.edu.au

Bachelor of Education JPP/Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Education MS/Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Education Sec/Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Education JPP Graduate Entry
Bachelor of Education Secondary Graduate Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate and graduate</td>
<td>4 years for double degrees 2 years for graduate entry degrees</td>
<td>350 commencing in above degrees</td>
<td>350 commencing in above degrees</td>
<td>BEd JP/P = 21 BEd Middle School/Secondary = 12</td>
<td>BEd JP/P = 23 BEd MS/Sec = 12</td>
<td>Yes. Only if they are completing a BEd/BA which requires continued target language study to complete the BA component of the double degree.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 x 20 days 1 x 4 week block 1 x 6 week block plus 10 days</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites

Two year post Year 12 with a preference for 3 years post Year 12.

Course content

Includes topics incorporating educational psychology and sociology, and those that focus on teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and students with special needs. Graduates will be qualified to teach across the primary years of schooling (Reception to year 7) and will be familiar with the eight key learning areas which include Society and Environment, Technology, Science, English, Languages, Mathematics, Health and Physical Education and the Arts.
EDUC 3505 Languages in the Integrated Curriculum (R-7)
This topic provides an introduction to the field of modern languages curriculum and pedagogy with particular emphasis on its application in Years R-7. The topic also offers a specialised study of the teaching of modern languages in the classroom with a particular focus on cross cultural and cross curriculum contexts. Students will also undertake a study of the theoretical and accountability frameworks that underpin the teaching of languages in South Australia and the role of languages in education for a sustainable future.

EDUC4804 Intercultural Pathways in R-7 Language pedagogy
This topic provides an introduction to the field of intercultural language teaching and the notion of intercultural competence in cross cultural contexts with particular emphasis on its application in Years R-7. The topic also offers a specialised study of the interwoven nature of language and culture and encourages research into how this awareness might enrich the teaching of genre in the language classroom with a particular focus on cultural, situational and cross curriculum contexts. Students will also undertake a study of ways in which information and communications technology can be integrated to enhance students' learning experiences through the use of computer assisted language learning.

EDUC3503 Curriculum Studies Specialisation 1 (Languages Middle School/Secondary)
This topic provides an introduction to the field of curriculum and pedagogy with particular emphasis on its application in Years 6-12. Students will undertake specialised study in the two curriculum specialisations they will teach at secondary level.

EDUC4700 Curriculum Studies Specialisation 2 (Languages Middle School/Secondary)
This topic provides an opportunity for students to further develop their knowledge and skills in curriculum and pedagogy with particular emphasis on its application in Years 6-12. Students will study in the two curriculum specialisations they will teach at secondary level.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

The languages units are a combination - all languages have the same course work but are language specific in the assessment requirements.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

28 hours for 3rd year topics EDUC 3505, EDUC3503; and 14 hours for 4th year topics EDUC4804, EDUC4700 because these are followed by school practicum experience.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE [www.adelaide.edu.au](http://www.adelaide.edu.au)
Graduate Diploma in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate and Graduate</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yes, the students are involved in a teaching practicum for 5 weeks each semester teaching in the target language.</td>
<td>Yes, teaching in the country is compulsory this year because it was very hard finding placements to all students.</td>
<td>Two blocks of five weeks through the year</td>
<td>About 50%. If they are teaching more than one subject they need to do their practicum in all areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Pass in a Level III language other than English course (Grad Dep Ed)

**Course content**
Numerous languages.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General during lectures, but specific in the tutorials, students work in groups.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Twenty-six hours.
**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE**  [www.adelaide.edu.au](http://www.adelaide.edu.au)

*Bachelor of Teaching with BA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yes, through their Degree</td>
<td>Yes, it is compulsory</td>
<td>This varies from year to year</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

Year 12.

**Course content**

Not provided.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

General during lectures and specific during tutorials.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

This depends on the year level.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA  www.unisa.edu.au

Graduate Certificate in Languages Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0.5 (EFSTL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Students require 4 years of tertiary study including a teaching qualification, with at least 2 years of post Year 12 study in a language.

Course content
Units include: Language, culture & second language learning; and the language curriculum: constructions & issues. Emphasis is on language development as a socio-cultural activity; conceptions of language and culture; second language acquisition; investigating language in context (spoken & written). Key concepts including language, culture, interaction, systems of linguistic meaning making, intercultural communication; variables of context, factors affecting learning, inter-language, learner differences. Units also focus on constructions of curriculum including its political, social, cultural and educational context; the curriculum as a theory of practice; theoretical bases for curriculum design; debates surrounding goals, objectives, outcomes; the concept of task; issues in sequencing and progression; pedagogies and resources; assessment; short and long-term programming; curriculum evaluation; the curriculum as interaction; analysis of specific learning and teaching contexts; curriculum and assessment frameworks; sociolinguistic profile of learners; classroom cultures, including learner differences.

Language specific or general teaching units?
General.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
26 hours per semester.

Special features
In-service award course; units are also available as non-award. Emphasis on language learning as a socio-cultural activity. This course provides an opportunity for practicing teachers to retrain as language teachers. An additional strength is that it is attached to the Research Centre for Languages and Cultures Education, with the connecting theme being interculturality.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA  www.unisa.edu.au
Masters of Education - Languages Specialisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1 year EFTSL</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Students require 4 years of tertiary study including a teaching qualification, with at least 2 years of post Year 12 study in a language.

**Course content**
Units include the units listed above and: Issues in Languages Assessment and Evaluation and Language Policy in Context. Key concepts in the assessment course include the political, social, cultural and educational context of assessment and evaluation; competing paradigms, functions and purposes of educational assessment and program evaluation; second language performance assessment; describing language ability; validity and reliability; the power of tests; impact of language testing; program evaluation. Key concepts in the languages policy course include linguistic and cultural diversity; policies for language, literacy, ESL and multiculturalism; English as a world language/world Englishes; indigenous languages and language ecology; language in post-colonial societies; the social, cultural, geographic, economic and political context of policies; critical policy-making; influences on educational languages policies; impact and consequences; access and equity in relation to language policy profile of learners; classroom cultures, including learner differences.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
26.

**Special features**
In-service award course; units are also available as non-award. Emphasis on language learning as a socio-cultural activity. This course provides an opportunity for practicing teachers to retrain as language teachers. An additional strength is that it is attached to the Research Centre for Languages and Cultures Education, with the connecting theme being interculturality.
### TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA  www.unisa.edu.au

**Bachelor of Education (Graduate Entry) Junior Primary MBEG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Minimum of one year language study.

**Course content**
General education units plus learning area specific OPTION; TEDU 1061 – Teaching Languages (other than English).

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
27 hours.
**Bachelor of Education (Graduate Entry) Primary and Middle LBPG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes. Application for Endeavour Fellowship encouraged.</td>
<td>Five week block</td>
<td>Depends on whether the practicum site teaches the language. Language practicum is not compulsory for enrolment in languages teaching course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Assumes a minimum of two years tertiary study of language.

**Course content**
TEDU 1061 – Teaching Languages (other than English).

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
27 hours (9 weeks x 3 hours pre practicum).
### Bachelor of Education (Undergraduate Entry) Junior Primary and Primary MBED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No. May be undertaking language study as part of degree prior to or at same time as teacher education course.</td>
<td>Yes. Application for Endeavour Fellowship encouraged.</td>
<td>Five week block</td>
<td>Depends on whether the practicum site teaches the language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prerequisites
Successful completion of at least one year of tertiary study of the language, or native speaker proficiency gained through education in the country are prerequisites for employment as language teacher (primary) in Education Department Schools in South Australia.

#### Course content
General education units plus learning area specific OPTION; TEDU 1061 – Teaching Languages (other than English).

#### Language specific or general teaching units?
General.

#### How many hours spent on language teaching units?
27 hours.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA www.unisa.edu.au

Bachelor of Education (Undergraduate Entry) Primary and Middle LBPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes. Application for Endeavour Fellowship encouraged.</td>
<td>Five week block</td>
<td>Depends on whether the practicum site teaches the language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Successful completion of at least one year of tertiary study of the language, or native speaker proficiency gained through education in the country are prerequisites for employment as language teacher (primary) in Education Department Schools in South Australia.

**Course content**
TEDU 1061 – Teaching Languages (other than English).

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
27 hours
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA [www.unisa.edu.au]
Bachelor of Education (Graduate Entry) Middle and Secondary LBGG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes. Application for Endeavour Fellowship encouraged.</td>
<td>Third semester s is week block (30days)</td>
<td>Third prac setting is primarily language (major) and minor learning area. actual proportion is negotiated within school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Secondary; Students are assumed to have completed an undergraduate degree in a second language, or have equivalent (or native speaker) proficiency in a second language.

**Course content**

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
21-33 hours per semester.

**Special features**
Strong focus on classroom interactions and intercultural approaches to language teaching.
TASMANIAN INSTITUTIONS

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA (Launceston) [www.utas.edu.au]
Bachelor of Education (ECE/Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4-years full-time, or equivalent part-time</td>
<td>Approx 200</td>
<td>Approx 200</td>
<td>180-200 in both second and third year, studying language education as part of curriculum units. 12 (fourth year – specialising in Languages (LOTE/ESL))</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Languages are studies in the Liberal Study component of the course</td>
<td>Nineteen weeks. Students negotiate a LOTE component, if possible, during the practicum.</td>
<td>Generalist with language teaching integrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Normal university entry requirements apply for the general degree. Entry to the language unit in fourth year requires pre-tertiary and/or in-country experience, bi-lingual status or language study in Liberal Studies.

Course content
General degree: professionalism, culture of schools, ethical issues, contexts of teaching, current educational theory and pedagogy, holistic stance on planning, delivery, resourcing, assessment and evaluation, reflection and renewal, cross-curriculum teaching and learning, child development. In the first two years, students undertake Liberal Study units in other faculties. All second year students do EPF250: a curriculum unit that includes language development - first and subsequent languages, linguistics and understanding about languages. All third year students do EPC350 a curriculum unit that
includes intercultural aspects of language and support for language programs, metalinguistic awareness. Covers LOTE and ESL. EPC451 Fourth year students may specialise in languages, including cumulative models of language teaching and learning and intercultural language learning, - holistic model of teaching and learning, embedding languages into the curriculum, advocacy and managing being a language teacher.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Each is 26 hours of face-to-face contact per semester plus independent study.

**Special features**
This program is developing a clear holistic approach to the teaching and support of languages programs and awareness in primary schools and to embedding languages in the primary curriculum. This approach extends over the four years of the course. Those students who opt into the fourth year unit develop specific understandings and skills in language teaching.

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA (Hobart)** [www.utas.edu.au](http://www.utas.edu.au)

*Bachelor of Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate pre-service course.</td>
<td>Two years</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>13 (8 first years; 5 second years)</td>
<td>13 (8 first years; 5 second years)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes. Students are eligible for the Endeavour Fellowship if becoming Asian Languages Teachers.</td>
<td>In two years: One block of 5 days over 5 weeks; practicum one – 2 weeks; practicum two – 4 weeks; practicum three – 4 weeks; practicum four – 7 weeks.</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
University year two completion or equivalent.
Course content

Language specific or general teaching units?
General.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
Four hours a week over eleven weeks (i.e. forty-four hours per semester).

Special features
Since Tasmania is a small system (Education Department) it is possible for the University students to take part in professional learning together with practising teachers. This term for example, the University students are taking part in the new syllabus documents consultation meetings that are taking place.
VICTORIAN INSTITUTIONS

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – DEAKIN UNIVERSITY www.deakin.edu.au

Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary)/Bachelor of Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>5 years full time or part time equivalent.</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22 days per year, in two blocks.</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
LOTE requirements. Students wishing to specialise in teaching Languages Other Than English (LOTE) within the Bachelor of Education (Primary) are advised to undertake the LOTE major sequence offered by the Arts Faculty and note the LOTE requirements outlined at the end of this section on pre-service courses.

Course content
The Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary) degree introduces students to the knowledge and competencies required by secondary teachers as well as providing students with a broad understanding of the practice of educators. The partner component provides students with a depth of knowledge in one or more fields of study within a Bachelor of Arts degree with the Faculty of Arts. Languages available for a major sequence of study at the Burwood Campus are Arabic, Indonesian and Chinese. Students undertake LOTE units during third and fourth year. (LOTE: Curriculum Study; LOTE: Materials Development).

Language specific or general teaching units?
General.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
For each unit of study students are expected to participate in at least 3 hours of formal contact each week of semester.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION – DEAKIN UNIVERSITY  www.deakin.edu.au  
Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4 years full time or part time equivalent.</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
A post Year 12 major study in the language. Native speakers of the language may seek a statement of equivalence from a Victorian University to verify that they meet the standard of a post Year 12 major study. Teachers wishing for recognition in languages that are not taught in Victorian universities and for which university statements of equivalence are not available, may seek equivalence accreditation with the DE&T, Victoria.

**Course content**
The Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary) degree introduces students to the knowledge and competencies required by secondary teachers as well as providing students with abroad understanding of the practice of educators. The partner component provides students with a depth of knowledge in one or more fields of study within a Bachelor of Arts degree with the Faculty of Arts. Languages available for a major sequence of study at the Burwood campus are Arabic, Indonesian and Chinese. Students undertake LOTE units during third and fourth year.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
INP.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
INP

**Special features**
The course seeks to offer students a balance of practical ad theoretical knowledge. While student numbers in LOTE were declining, there has recently been a small increase. An overhaul of the LOTE component of the course is now underway, with significant re-writing of course materials.
**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – LA TROBE UNIVERSITY**  
www.latrobe.edu.au  

**Graduate Diploma in LOTE Teaching**

(Students can also enrol in the Graduate Certificate in Education (majoring in LOTE teaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full time, or two to three years part time for the Graduate Diploma. Six months full time or 12 to 18 months part time for the Graduate Certificate.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No formal component</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>All. Practicum is specific to LOTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

Applicants should normally have a recognised teaching qualification of at least four years’ duration with either three years of university study of the LOTE, graduating at advanced level, or native speaker background.

**Course content**

This is an advanced professional qualification for teachers of languages other than English (LOTE). Graduates with appropriate initial teaching qualifications are qualified for employment in all LOTE teaching sectors. The course has a total of 120 credit points, including a year-long methodology unit (40 points), a 22 day teaching practicum (20 points) and a further 60 credit points accruing through in-depth study of a selection of units including second language acquisition, intercultural studies and curriculum and assessment. Core units: Language Teaching Practice, Bilingualism and Language Education, and Teaching Methodology. Three of the following electives are also taken: Intercultural Communication and Education; Language Curriculum, Materials Development and Assessment; Sociolinguistics in Language Teaching; Education and Cultural Diversity; Second Language Acquisition.
Language specific or general teaching units?
General.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
Thirty hours per semester.

Special features
The mixture of primary and secondary cohorts is considered a noteworthy feature, as it affords students insights into and experience with a number of broader educational issues. These include continuity of curriculum across P-12, transition issues from Years 6 to 7, and Middle Years. The multicultural nature of the student population is also used as an impetus for exploring aspects of intercultural awareness. The use of ICT in LOTE is also emphasised.

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – LA TROBE UNIVERSITY www.latrobe.edu.au

Graduate Diploma in Education (Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full time, or two years part time.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No formal component</td>
<td>Yes. Students with good teaching records have the option of undertaking an in-country practicum.</td>
<td>Three blocks, two, three and four weeks in duration to total 45 days</td>
<td>About 50% specific to LOTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Course structure. This course has a total of 120 credit points. EDU4PLA/EDU4PLB (LOTE method) (10 credit points) is an optional additional method and can be taken by those with the appropriate advanced major undergraduate qualifications in the Language Other than English.

Course content
EDU4PLA: In this unit students will gain a general introduction to the methodology and issues associated with the teaching of Languages Other Than English (LOTE) in the Primary School. Students consider the following issues: The content to be taught via LOTE; the place of a LOTE program in the total school curriculum; appropriate outcomes for LOTE teaching and learning; the role of English within a LOTE program; the role of the community in a LOTE program; the features of effective teacher talk; availability of materials and resources for LOTE teaching; how to develop an appropriate curriculum
for a LOTE program. EDU4PLB: This unit continues on from EDU4PLA. In this unit students will gain a general introduction to the methodology and issues associated with the teaching of Languages Other Than English (LOTE) in the Primary School. Students consider the following issues: The content to be taught via LOTE; the place of a LOTE program in the total school curriculum; appropriate outcomes for LOTE teaching and learning; the role of English within a LOTE program; the role of the community in a LOTE program; the features of effective teacher talk; availability of materials and resources for LOTE teaching; how to develop an appropriate curriculum for a LOTE program.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Combined.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
18 hours per semester - supplemented by general literacy work in Language Arts method.

**Special features**
Primary and secondary programs are taught in a common class. Regional campuses can optionally enrol in LOTE teaching method with an online component. Marta Rado Memorial Award for outstanding performance - one award only per annum regardless of program.

---

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – LA TROBE UNIVERSITY**

**Graduate Diploma in Education (Secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full time, or two years part time.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No formal component</td>
<td>Yes. Students with good teaching records have the option of undertaking an in-country practicum.</td>
<td>45 days in two blocks - one of four weeks and one of five weeks duration.</td>
<td>About 50% specific to LOTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Students must have an approved advanced level undergraduate advanced languages major or equivalent.
Course content
EDU4LOA: LOTE TEACHING METHOD A: This unit represents the first semester of the all-year unit. Topics covered in this unit include second language acquisition theories and principles, the nature and extent of cultural aspects of language learning, Language Other Than English (LOTE) policies and programs (federal and state), LOTE curriculum design (planning, implementation and evaluation), pedagogical and assessment strategies, promotion of LOTE in the community, resources, a comparison of first and second language acquisition. EDU4LOB: This unit represents the second semester of the all-year unit. Topics covered in this unit include second language acquisition theories and principles, the nature and extent of cultural aspects of language learning, Language Other Than English (LOTE) policies and programs (federal and state), LOTE curriculum design (planning, implementation and evaluation), pedagogical and assessment strategies, promotion of LOTE in the community, resources, a comparison of first and second language acquisition.

Language specific or general teaching units?
Combined.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
36 hours per semester.

Special features
Primary and secondary programs are taught in a common class. Regional campuses can optionally enrol in LOTE teaching method with an online component. Marta Rado Memorial Award for outstanding performance - one award only per annum regardless of program.
### TERTIARY INSTITUTION - UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE  www.unimelb.edu.au

**Bachelor of Education (Primary)**  
**Bachelor of Teaching (Primary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Primary): 4 years full time or equivalent part time. Bachelor of Teaching (Primary): 2 years full time for students who have completed an undergraduate degree; no part time available.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demand for these courses has been consistently low. In 2006, a total of 8 students were enrolled in LOTE specialisations within these courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22 days - generally one block of four weeks +</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Year 12 and three years of approved university language at post-VCE level. Applicants with other qualifications must arrange to have themselves assessed by a language department at an Australian university as being of equivalent proficiency.

**Course content**
Learning Area LOTE (Primary) Methodology and Curriculum Design: Modern Languages Education - As demand for LOTE specialisation within these courses has been, and remains, very low, students from both courses are combined within the one class. LOTE specialisations are undertaken as third or fourth year subjects in the Bachelor of Education, and during the second year of the Bachelor of Teaching. Students undertake a study of concepts and
practice in second language teaching and learning, with the emphasis on developing teachers as reflective practitioners, capable of fostering in their students communicative competence in a new language, and making the experience of language learning an educational one. Students are introduced to texts and materials commonly used in primary schools, and are taught a range of techniques for employing them. In addition to their LOTE practicum, students complete a 30 hour (2.5 hours x 12 weeks) LOTE methodology component. All the tasks which the students complete are linked to the language they will be teaching; however, due to small numbers, it is not possible to provide language specific components within the LOTE Methodology unit.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
The languages teaching units are general, however, class and assessment tasks are linked to the language students will be teaching.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Classes - 30 hour (2.5 hours x 12 weeks) in Semester 2. Practicum - 22 days.

**Special features**
Due to the major changes in course offerings and structures under the new model to be introduced from 2008, 2007 is the final intake year for the Bachelor of Teaching (Primary) at the University of Melbourne.)
It should be noted that in 2008 the Faculty will switch to a 3-semester Master of Teaching in place of the Grad. Dip Ed. The number of hours for LOTE method will remain the same, but the distribution across semesters will be 25-50-25, instead of the present 50-50 over two semesters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full-time.</td>
<td>Approximately 600 students enrolled in the Diploma in 2006</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Of about 600 students enrolled in the Diploma in 2006, 55 were doing LOTE Method</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.5 days per method in two blocks of 4 and 5 weeks, respectively.</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
Year 12 and three years of approved university language at post-VCE level. Applicants with other qualifications must arrange to have themselves assessed by a language department at an Australian university as being of equivalent proficiency.

**Course content**
Learning Area LOTE Modern Languages - A one-year full-time course for graduates that qualifies participants for registration and employment as secondary school teachers. The course provides studies in curriculum, education policy, information technology, language and literacy, and two learning area studies, which may be two different modern languages.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
Students are grouped with other student teachers of their language for weekly workshops comprising 3 or 4 different language groups, with a Workshop Leader experienced in teaching those LOTES - though in 2006 this was possible for only six of the eight languages offered. Language specific workshop material is provided for all languages. Where it is not possible to provide a Language Workshop leader in a specific LOTE on an ongoing basis, every
effort is made to run at least 1-2 workshops specifically on that LOTE. At other times students with related languages work together, e.g. those with Romance languages might discuss teaching the subjunctive and other verb system peculiarities.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

60 – There are 45 hours of face-to-face LOTE method class time, plus 9 hours of weekly set reading and Web-based Forum discussion. Students also take 6 hours of introduction to the nature of language in a compulsory subject for all Dip Ed students called Language and Education.

**Special features**

There is a strong emphasis on intercultural aspects of language teaching and the use of ICT. Some language specific methodology and a large range of languages: Chinese, French, German, Hebrew, Indonesian, Italian Japanese, Korean, Latin, Russian and Spanish.

---

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION - MONASH UNIVERSITY [www.monash.edu.au](http://www.monash.edu.au)**

**BA/BEd Primary and Double Method for Graduate Diploma in Education (secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and undergraduate</td>
<td>9 weeks at 3 hours per week</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Number of BA/BEd primary students in 2006 = 1. Number of Graduate Diploma of Education double language method students = 14</td>
<td>BA/BEd primary = 2; Grad Dip Ed double method = 12; Grad Dip Ed single LOTE method = 40; BA/BEd = 12</td>
<td>Yes. Concurrent language and pedagogical study for undergraduate BA/BEd students. No exposure to language study in the Graduate Diploma in Education.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 blocks of five weeks, one in Semester 1, and the other in August-September in Semester 2. A total of 22 days is dedicated to the language teaching component. Graduate Diploma of Education (Primary) students do their 22 days at the end of Semester 2, in November.</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Prerequisites**
Successful completion of a Year 12 language. Entry into 4th year LOTE method: A major post Year 12 in the language.

**Course content**
EDF 5488 LOTE Method 2A provides students with an overview of, and general rationale for, the teaching of a LOTE in primary schools. Topics include government language policy, current research in child second language acquisition/bilingualism, goals and models for teaching LOTE to young children; and factors to consider in establishing a primary LOTE program integrating it within the larger school curriculum. EDF 5489 LOTE Method 2B focuses on the practical skills and strategies involved in delivering LOTE programs in the primary school. Topics include strategies for: a) identifying learning needs and individual differences b) teaching literacy and oracy skills, c) developing metalinguistic and intercultural awareness; d) monitoring learners' progress and performance; e) selecting, adapting and creating materials, and designing units of work.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General language

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
24 to 27 hours per semester.

**Special features**
These two units are available to Graduate Diploma in Education (double language method) students as their second specialism or curriculum method area. They qualify them as language specialist teachers in Primary schools.
TERTIARY INSTITUTION - MONASH UNIVERSITY  www.monash.edu.au

BA/BEd Secondary and Double Method for Graduate Diploma in Education (secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BEd = 4 years; Grad Dip Ed = 1 year; both full time equivalent</td>
<td>Graduate and undergraduate</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Number of students in 2006 = 7; Number of students in the Graduate Diplomas in Education (Secondary) 2006 = 48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes. Concurrent language and pedagogical study for BA/BEd students. No language study in the Graduate Diploma of Education course.</td>
<td>Yes. In-country experience is available during the double degree as part of Monash's Study Abroad program, it is not compulsory.</td>
<td>Two blocks of 25 days for both BA/BEd fourth year and Graduate Diploma in Education students. One five week block in Semester 1 (April - May) and the other in Semester 2 (August - September).</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Successful completion of a Year 12 language. Entry into 4th year LOTE method: A major post Year 12 in the language. Grad Diploma in Education (Secondary) - LOTE A-3 year post Yr 12 major or its equivalent in the language.

Course content
EDF 5486: LOTE Method 1A introduces students to basic underlying principles of foreign/second language education in secondary schools. It incorporates a theoretical framework that underpins ways of approaching teaching and learning languages in monolingual and multilingual educational settings and focuses on a variety of techniques to trial with different types of LOTE classes. The unit includes the use and development of information and communication technologies suited to the relevant language of the students. EDF 5487 LOTE Method 1B builds on the concepts and knowledge introduced in EDF 5486. Studies develop further approaches to teaching and learning a language other than English as proposed by current curriculum documents for Years 7 to 12 by introducing students to ways of developing appropriate units of work and suitable assessment tasks.
In-country experience
Students of Japanese are very strongly recommended to participate in the In-country experience program at some stage during their three year degree. In 2006, the Federal Government's program for study in the country of the language was open to fourth year and Graduate Diploma of Education students of Asian languages ONLY. One of the Indonesian method students gained a scholarship and went to Darwin in January 2007 to take part in the course offered.

Language specific or general teaching units?
General

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
24 to 27 per semester.

Special features
The course always addresses the most recent developments in languages curriculum requirements. Japanese method students have an extra class thanks to the Melbourne Centre for Japanese Language education. German method students receive invitations to Goethe Institute seminars. One of the students' tasks is to prepare a unit of work for disengaged Year 9 or 10 students in which multimedia and Multiple Intelligences must be used. Another requires them to design a Detailed Study for Year 12 students, including the assessment tasks and the rubrics for marking these according to the VCAA requirements.
Short course in LOTE Methodology for teachers in Ethnic Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>This is not part of a teacher training course. 10 weeks of 3 hours per week</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Number of students in 2006 = 80</td>
<td>These are not really teacher education units, but professional learning ones which COULD be used as teacher education units given the appropriate circumstance s</td>
<td>Yes. All teachers are native or near native speakers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Near native or native proficiency in the language to be taught. Current employment at a Community Language/Ethnic school.

Course content
LOTE Methodology Phase 1: Middle Years aims to provide teachers of learners aged 8 to 14 with the knowledge and skills to build on existing listening and speaking skills and in particular, to develop longer and more accurate written texts. The course focuses on planning for integrating the four macro skills and developing sequential lesson plans where new material is presented in a logical way and activities are structured to meet the needs and interests of the particular learners. LOTE Methodology Phase 1: Early Years aims to provide teachers of young learners (aged 4 to 7) with the knowledge and skills to build on existing listening and speaking skills in the language, and to develop beginning literacy. Internationally successful approaches to early years of schooling (Steiner, Reggio Emilia, the Gesture Approach, the Narrative Format Approach) are examined for their relevance and usefulness as models for early years’ teachers in Community Languages’ programs.
Language specific or general teaching units?
General across Community Languages teachers.

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
30 hours per 10 week semester.

Special features
Each short course of 30 hours over 10 weeks can attract 6 credit points if the participants meet all other university entrance requirements and are currently studying in a recognised undergraduate course at a Victorian university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full-time, two-years part-time</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>45 in two blocks</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
At least 3 years study of the language at university level.

Course content
CUED 1180 - LOTE Method A This unit is concerned with second language learning theories and practices for LOTE teaching settings. TESOL/LOTE Method A and Method B are complementary to each other. TESOL/LOTE Method A provides the theoretical background to the essentially practical orientation of TESOL/LOTE Method B. Through developing a sound rationale for the teaching of TESOL/LOTE based on the knowledge in second language acquisition research, students will learn about curriculum design and to construct lessons appropriate to the learners’ needs. As well, the current major teaching and learning issues will be reviewed. CUED 1195 ;This course is largely concerned with LOTE teaching approaches and is complementary to LOTE Method A. In the light of the theoretical basis built up through Method A, this course explores new perspectives and skills for TESOL/LOTE
teaching in the globalisation context. As well, this course is designed to equip students with skills to critically evaluate teaching approaches and resources, and to develop effective teaching and learning strategies and techniques, and to independently conduct TESOL/LOTE program design and evaluation.

Language specific or general teaching units?
INP

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
INP

TERTIARY INSTITUTION – VICTORIA UNIVERSITY www.vu.edu.au

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course duration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Student Nos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 equivalent F/T EFTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Student Nos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent F/T EFTSU =150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 language student Nos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 language student Nos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 language student Nos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-country experience?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicum days</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students complete two practicum rounds of 20 days, with 1 day per week during each semester for Project partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**
An undergraduate degree plus major field of post Year 12 study in a language as part of a university degree, or statement of equivalence. International students: IELTS Level 7.

**Course content**
This is a general pre-service course covering the social context of teaching and learning, approaches to teaching and learning and new learning. Students select Discipline Study sequences for specialisation. The languages units aim to help Pre-service teachers to develop an understanding of the following: the rationale for LOTE teaching and learning; theories of language acquisition; methods and approaches in language teaching; developing and integrating language macro-skills in the LOTE classroom; pronunciation, speaking & listening; reading, writing and teaching vocabulary and grammar. Whilst
emphasis will be on developing a 'tool box' of teaching strategies the broad set of values and beliefs that inform the teaching and design of this unit of curriculum will also be reflected upon and will inform the design of the graduating portfolio. The course will also cover the following: Techniques of teaching and classroom management, including inquiry approaches, small and large group projects, discussions, exposition, demonstration, coaching, audiovisual and computer assisted techniques, role play, negotiation. Techniques in curriculum planning, materials development, and resource selection, including the construction of program and lesson plans, the writing of units of work, and the evaluation of available texts and materials. Techniques in assessment and reporting, including learning outcome approaches and descriptive reporting; the construction and use of tests, observation schedules, and exercises such as concept mapping; the establishment of criteria of quality of performance; the organisation and use of student self-assessment and peer assessment. Knowledge of the aims, approaches and resources relevant to the unit of study, especially as outlined through the CSFII, Victorian Essential Learning Standards, VCAL and the VCE.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
General.

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
60 hours.

**Special features**
Teaching staff have benchmarked curriculum against AFMLTA and VIT standards. The majority of students in this course are background speakers of the target language. This course includes a Project Partnership initiative whereby students spend one day per week working on a special project in their main field of study with a mentor teacher. (This is in addition to the practicum.)
WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTIONS

*TERTIARY INSTITUTION – EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY  [www.ecu.edu.au]
Bachelor of Education Primary and Middle years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Four years of full time study or the equivalent part time</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites
Normal university entry requirements.

Course content
EDUCATION STUDIES - Studies in the theory of education, educational psychology, teaching studies and practice, and in specialised fields of education such as special education, educational management and aboriginal education. Education studies are compulsory units.
CURRICULUM STUDIES - Study of syllabuses and related teaching methods in the curricula of early childhood, the middle years of schooling and early adolescence. Curriculum studies may consist of compulsory or elective units.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
INP

---

*TERTIARY INSTITUTION – EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY [www.ecu.edu.au](http://www.ecu.edu.au)*

**Graduate Diploma of Education Primary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>INP</td>
<td>First semester requires one day per week in schools and block practicum placements. Second semester has a substantial block practicum.</td>
<td>INP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

Applicants who have successfully completed a Bachelor's degree from an approved tertiary institution may apply for a place in the Graduate Diploma of Education (Primary). Application may be made prior to the completion of the first degree course.
**Course content**

Students are required to have a total of 120 credit points to complete the course, as follows: Teaching Specialist Support; Foundations of Education; Language Education; Primary Maths Education; First Professional Practice; Second Professional Practice; Programming for Literacy and Numeracy; Foundations of Education 2; Primary Science Education; Teaching Society and Environment (Primary); and Final Professional Practice

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

INP

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

INP

**TERTIARY INSTITUTION – MURDOCH UNIVERSITY** [www.murdoch.edu.au](http://www.murdoch.edu.au)

*BEd (primary initial)*

*BEd (primary graduate)*

*DipEd (primary)*

*BEd (secondary initial)*

*BEd (secondary graduate)*

*Dip Ed (secondary)*

*Dip Ed (tertiary and Adult)*

*BEd Studies (for qualified teachers who want to retrain to teach languages)*

*Facilitating the learning of Languages Other Than English (FLOTE) professional development program allowing external, on-line study for both pre-service and in-service teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate, undergraduate and professional development</td>
<td>4 year initial BEd primary and sec; 5 year initial sec</td>
<td>Only in a position to provide enrolments</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes. If they are doing teaching and degree</td>
<td>Yes. Students (primary and secondary) who study</td>
<td>There are various combinations depending on the program of study.</td>
<td>Depends on program - primary = generalist with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including 1 yr in-country study; 2 year graduate BEd primary and secondary; 1 year Dip Eds primary, secondary, tertiary and adult; 1 year equivalent BEd Studies

in the Languages curriculum units. Secondary 35; Primary 33; Tertiary and Adult 2

concurrently or if trained teacher who is upskilling concurrently can include 6 or 12 months in-country study

Details can be provided by the Murdoch University School Experience Office 08 9360 2149. Also: Two of the modules offered through FLOTE are practicum modules: Professional practicum: Self-access language learning and Professional practicum: Action learning project. Participants have the opportunity to share experiences and critical reflections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
<th>Language teaching integrated; secondary major about 75%; secondary minor about 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Primary 2 years tertiary study of the language or equivalent; Secondary 3 years tertiary study or the equivalent.

**Course content**

EDU276 Second/Foreign Languages and the Curriculum (4 pts); EDU2761 Second / Foreign Languages and the Curriculum (2 pts); EDU2762 Second / Foreign Languages and the Curriculum (3 pts); the aim of these units is to provide intending teachers of a second or foreign language with necessary skills in the areas of curriculum design and implementation. The unit comprises the general study of language and the curriculum, together with providing some opportunity for working with specific language curricula. It examines language teaching practice, and gives students the opportunity to explore a variety of classroom techniques and approaches. EDU4/604 Issues in languages Education a (Masters unit); EDU4/606 Issues in languages Education B (Masters unit). These units allows students to select and explore issues associated with the teaching and learning of other languages. Students are able to select from a range of topics including second language acquisition, factors impacting on language teaching and learning, technology and language learning, language learning and intercultural competence, using a literacy approach to language learning and teaching language across the curriculum. Issues are examined and explored through action research and students are able to share and reflect through on-line forums. Plus FLOTE: The FLOTE approach is designed to allow participants to share experiences and to reflect on their own practice. The modules can be taken as part of a languages methodology training program, as part of a graduate program or as professional development modules. A variety of modules is offered, such as Information technology as a resource for learning and Teaching: The Internet, Dimensions of curriculum design: Assessment, The learning and teaching of scripts in languages, Factors impacting on successful language teaching and learning: Successful, sustainable language programs.
Language specific or general teaching units?
Essentially general with limited opportunities for students to work in language specific groups

How many hours spent on language teaching units?
Sec minor and primary 40 contact hours; Major 56 contact hours.

Special features
The FLOTE suite of modules has been developed in such a way that it is able to be accessed by participants Australia-wide either as private professional development, as a complete languages course undertaken cross-institutionally, or as a course sponsored by an educational jurisdiction. The modules offer great flexibility and are constantly being updated with additional modules able to be added (eg a module on leadership in languages education has just been added). The FLOTE on-line resources are able to be used by all students both those studying internally and externally. FLOTE is multileveled so that it can cater for both initial teacher ed + pd and post grad work FLOTE also provides facilities that allow participants to explore and discuss issues with colleagues or instructors. For example, the Professional Practicum allows for the exchange of videos of practice. In addition to the innovative approaches able to be offered because of FLOTE we also have very close links with the languages departments here at Murdoch University. Staff from the School of Education are involved with courses run by the Indonesian and Japanese departments and we are engaged in collaborative research. We have had these strong links for in excess of 15 years. We also work closely with key curriculum officers in the Education Department, at AISWA, and also the CEO and run professional development courses on a regular basis in conjunction with them. We are also exploring incentives for students from selected schools to study languages and education at Murdoch.

TERTIARY INSTITUTION –UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA www.uwa.edu.au
Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education Secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4.5 years full time or the part time equivalent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Preliminary figures for 2007 - 24</td>
<td>The following figures are based on the fourth year</td>
<td>The following figures are based on the fourth</td>
<td>During the first 3 year of the degree.</td>
<td>It is available but not compulsory - four $1,000 scholarships</td>
<td>The number of practicum days is 85 comprising - 5 days in Year 2 (one week block)</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of study - ENGLISH: 10 (8 majors and 2 minors)</td>
<td>year of study - ENGLISH: 11 (10 majors and 1 minor)</td>
<td>are offered for students who choose to complete a rural practicum.</td>
<td>5 days in Year 3 (one week block) 75 days in Year 4 (six weeks in Semester 1, nine weeks in Semester 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE: 3 (2 majors and 1 minor)</td>
<td>LOTE: 3 (1 major and 2 minors)</td>
<td>TESOL: 2 (1 major and 1 minor) (See comment below **)</td>
<td><strong>Language teacher education units are offered in the fourth year of the course. In the first three years of the course students focus on their Arts degree with some education units included. This allows students who choose not to proceed with Education to withdraw from the course in the third year and take out the Bachelor of Arts.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL: 2 (1 major and 1 minor) (See comment below **)</td>
<td>TESOL: 6 (3 majors and 3 minors) (See comment below **)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prerequisites**

TEE of 82+ and a pass in TEE English. Students may commence foreign language studies in their first year of university.

**Course content**

This is a pre-service secondary teacher education course. The compulsory core units include - Education in Australia, Youth Culture, Constructions of Teachers' Work, Educational Psychology, Introduction to Teaching, Language and Literacy, Aboriginal Education, Teaching and Learning Perspectives, Competencies for Teachers, and Social Justice and Special Education. In the fourth year, students choose their curriculum major and minor units based on the first three years of study. The following language teaching units are completed in the fourth year.

EDUC 8461: LOTE Curriculum I - Overview of LOTE secondary school curriculum; principles of and developments in language teaching; development of macro and micro skills in listening and speaking; evaluation, student assessment, lesson planning and teaching strategies.

EDUC 8471: LOTE Curriculum II - Overview of LOTE in upper secondary school and developments in language teaching and learning; development of micro and macro skills in listening and speaking; the use of teaching aids, text evaluation, student assessment, planning and teaching strategies; opportunities for reflection on teaching experience through analysis of lesson segments.
EDUC8561: English Curriculum I - This unit develops an understanding of Current Curriculum practices. Familiarity with Curriculum Framework is developed through active participation in workshops, focusing on strategies for effective teaching and learning, skills for planning and programming, the development of instructional materials and resources and the formulation of personal positions on issues relevant to English teaching.

EDUC8470 - English Curriculum II - This unit extends the understandings developed in the unit EDUC8460 English Curriculum I. Knowledge and skills relevant to the post-compulsory curriculum are developed through active participation in workshops. Pedagogical issues relevant to post-compulsory students are integrated.

EDUC8467: TESOL Curriculum I - This unit introduces the teaching of English as a second or foreign language (ESL) It deals with theoretical and practical concerns and helps pre-service teachers build their own coherent frameworks for language teaching as they explore fundamental questions and problems relating to English language teaching. While the main focus is on Year 8 to 10 ESL learners in mainstream and intensive language centers contexts, a broader introduction to other English language teaching situations is also provided.

EDUC8477: TESOL Curriculum II - This unit builds on EDUC8567 TESOL Curriculum I by extending the students' understanding of the English language learning requirements of TESOL students in a range of post-compulsory education situations. Students consolidate and augment their professional expertise by critically examining their own teaching performance in their first School Experience placement and by developing a personal portfolio.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**

LOTE - general
TESOL - specific

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**

During the first three years of the course students are required to complete a minimum of four units in their field of study for a minor (two first year and two second year units), and three years for a major (six units with a minimum of four units at second year and above). Each unit is 30 hours - two one-hour lectures and a one-hour tutorial per week.

Language teaching units are completed in the fourth year and comprise 25 hours in Semester 1 and Semester 2 for a major, and 25 hours in Semester 1 for a minor.

**Special features**

The GSE is in the process of developing a partnership approach with intensive English Centres for TESOL students. A resource library of videos with professional Tesol teachers in the classroom has also been developed and this is available on line to students.
## Tertiary Institution – University of Western Australia [www.uwa.edu.au](http://www.uwa.edu.au)

### Graduate Diploma in Education Secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Course duration</th>
<th>2006 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 Student Nos.</th>
<th>2006 language student Nos.</th>
<th>2007 language student Nos.</th>
<th>Exposure to target language during course? (formal component)</th>
<th>In-country experience?</th>
<th>Practicum days</th>
<th>Proportion of practicum days for language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>One year full-time or the part-time equivalent</td>
<td>177 Preliminary figures for 2007 - 158</td>
<td>ENGLISH: 21 (16 majors and 5 minors)</td>
<td>LOTE: 15 (11 majors and 4 minors)</td>
<td>TESOL: 31 (14 majors and 17 minors)</td>
<td>ENGLISH: 35 (25 majors and 10 minors)</td>
<td>LOTE: 9 (4 majors and 5 minors)</td>
<td>TESOL: 23 (11 majors and 12 minors)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prerequisites
LOTE - First degree with a major (3 years) or minor (2 years) field of study in Japanese, French, German, Indonesian or Italian. Advisable prior study: units in linguistics.

ENGLISH - First degree with a major (3 years) or minor (2 years) field of study in English, English Literature, Communication Studies, or Media Studies.

TESOL - First degree with a major (3 years) or minor (2 years) in the field of English, a foreign language or Linguistics.

### Course Content
This is a pre-service secondary teacher education course. The compulsory core units include Aboriginal Education, Teaching and Learning Perspectives, Competencies for Teachers, and Social Justice and Special Education. Students choose from a range of curriculum units (based on their undergraduate studies) and from a range of options including Educational Linguistics and Teaching Literacies.
EDUC 8461: LOTE Curriculum I - Overview of LOTE secondary school curriculum; principles of and developments in language teaching; development of macro and micro skills in listening and speaking; evaluation, student assessment, lesson planning and teaching strategies.

EDUC 8471: LOTE Curriculum II - Overview of LOTE in upper secondary school and developments in language teaching and learning; development of micro and macro skills in listening and speaking; the use of teaching aids, text evaluation, student assessment, planning and teaching strategies; opportunities for reflection on teaching experience through analysis of lesson segments.

EDUC 8561: English Curriculum I - Develops an understanding of Current Curriculum practices. Familiarity with Curriculum Framework is developed through active participation in workshops, focusing on strategies for effective teaching and learning, skills for planning and programming, the development of instructional materials and resources and the formulation of personal positions on issues relevant to English teaching.

EDUC 8470 - English Curriculum II - This unit extends the understandings developed in the unit EDUC8460 English Curriculum I. Knowledge and skills relevant to the post-compulsory curriculum are developed through active participation in workshops. Pedagogical issues relevant to post-compulsory students are integrated.

EDUC 8467: TESOL Curriculum I - This unit introduces the teaching of English as a second or foreign language (ESL) It deals with theoretical and practical concerns and helps pre-service teachers build their own coherent frameworks for language teaching as they explore fundamental questions and problems relating to English language teaching . While the main focus is on Year 8 to 10 ESL learners in mainstream and intensive language centers contexts, a broader introduction to other English language teaching situations is also provided.

EDUC 8477: TESOL Curriculum II - This unit builds on EDUC8567 TESOL Curriculum I by extending the students understanding of the English language learning requirements of TESOL students in a range of post-compulsory education situations. Students consolidate and augment their professional expertise by critically examining their own teaching performance in their first School Experience placement and by developing a personal portfolio.

**Language specific or general teaching units?**
LOTE - general
TESOL - specific

**How many hours spent on language teaching units?**
Major - 25 hours in Semester 1 and Semester 2
Minor - 25 hours in Semester 1

**Special features**
The GSE is in the process of developing a partnership approach with intensive English Centres for TESOL students. A resource library of videos with professional Tesol teachers in the classroom has also been developed and this is available online to students.
## TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS OFFERING TEACHER EDUCATION BUT NOT OFFERING LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avondale College (Institute of Higher Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Christian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabor College Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS TO GATHER MATERIAL FOR THE MAPPING DOCUMENT

The purpose of this document

As you are aware the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) is conducting a Review of Teacher Education for Languages Teachers for the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). The project aims to obtain a comprehensive national picture of teacher education and re-training opportunities for the preparation of primary and secondary languages teachers.

As part of this review we are preparing a mapping document listing all Australian tertiary institutions offering teacher education courses, indicating whether they include language teacher education courses and, for those that do, providing further details of the language teacher education courses or programs. This document will be published by DEST later this year.

We are asking all teacher training institutions in Australia to provide information for this document, and have included some of the information we have so far gathered for your institution. The Project Advisory Group has requested additional information. We would be most grateful if you could check all information for accuracy, amend if necessary, and provide us with the information we do not already have.

If you have more than one relevant program, could you please complete individual forms for each.

How to use this questionnaire

This is an electronic questionnaire. You can complete the questionnaire by typing directly into it. To complete the questionnaire electronically START by SAVING this document on to your own computer and work with this saved file.

To respond to the questions either place the cursor in the greyed area provided after each question. It looks like this [grey area]. Alternatively, press the ‘Tab’ key on your computer keyboard to move from one question to the next. Remember this means use the ‘Tab’ key only after you have finished typing in your response to a question. We strongly suggest you do a ‘save’ after each response to minimise loosing any of your work. There is no limit to how many words you can type within these grey areas. You can only type in the grey areas. If you wish to change something you have written simply delete the text and start again. You cannot delete or change the text outside the grey boxes. If any of the questions are not applicable to your institute, please indicate as such.

You do not need to complete the questionnaire in one sitting. You can stop at any time, save the file and re-open it again later. You can review and change anything you have entered at any time.

We thank you for your time and cooperation.
1. Name of tertiary institution

2. Name and type of teacher training course or program (e.g. BEd (Primary) or BA/BEd Combined degree)

3. Length or duration of course

4. Course type

(Please tick one option)

☐ Undergraduate  ☐ Graduate  ☐ Other, please specify ____

5. Does the course offer language(s) teacher education (excluding indigenous language(s), English, or English as a second language)?

☐ Yes (If ‘Yes’ please continue with the questionnaire)

☐ No (If ‘No’, we thank you for your time, please submit the form)

6. Students enrolled in the overall course in 2006 and 2007

Please answer both questions:

a. How many students enrolled in 2006?

b. How many students enrolled in 2007?

7. Students enrolled in the language teacher education units of the course for 2006 and 2007

Please answer both questions:

a. How many students enrolled in language teacher education units 2006?
b. How many students enrolled in language teacher education units 2007?

8. What are the prerequisites for the languages teacher education course (e.g. two years post Year 12, Year 12 or equivalent)?

9. Name (title/code) and brief description of content of languages teaching units.

10. Are the languages teaching units language specific, or general, or a combination?

11. How many hours are spent on the language teaching units (e.g. 26 hours per semester)?

12. Do students have exposure to, and/or study of, target language(s) during language teacher education course (formal component)?

☐ Yes (If ‘Yes’ please specify below)

Please specify (e.g. twenty-six hours of Japanese study per semester)

☐ No

13. Is in-country experience available/compulsory?

☐ Yes (If ‘Yes’ please specify below)

Please specify (e.g. it is available but not compulsory and includes…..)
14. Please specify the number of practicum days and when taken (e.g., two blocks of four weeks, two days each week throughout the year)

15. About what proportion of the practicum is for language teaching?

- All
- About 50%
- Generalist with language teaching integrated
- Other

Please specify

16. Please describe any special features, innovative approaches and/or incentives for language teachers/prospective language teachers
APPENDIX 3: MAPPING OF TEACHER REGISTRATION, QUALIFICATIONS AND EMPLOYMENT

A. Teacher registration

All registration/accreditation (NSW) bodies require all teachers to have completed 4 years of higher education with at least 1 year pre-service teacher education.

The various teacher registration authorities in South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory register teachers without distinguishing between category, sector, or the subjects they are qualified to teach. Thus there are no specific requirements set down for registration as a Language (or any other subject) teacher. As noted by one respondent - 'where teachers teach and what they teach depends on qualifications, training and experience and the requirements of the position. Employment is a matter for schools, not the [registration body].'

The Victorian Institute of Teaching has 'Specialist Area Guidelines', which 'set out what might be regarded as the minimum level of study applicable for preparation as a subject area teacher in Victorian government schools'. For LOTE, these reflect the qualifications for employment as a language teacher in the Victorian Department of Education and Training but were reviewed and accepted by the broad stakeholder group in Victoria in 2003.

At the time of writing, the New South Wales Institute of Teachers has draft subject content requirements for all subjects including Languages. Following endorsement, these requirements will be a condition of endorsement for programs of Initial Teacher Education in NSW. Accreditation at the point of employment is conditional on having undertaken an endorsed program.

The Queensland College of Teachers approves all pre-service teacher education programs in order for graduates to be eligible for teacher registration, which involves ensuring programs meet specified requirements from the Program Approval Guidelines. If a program is intended to prepare teachers for a specific subject area, including languages, there are certain requirements within the Program Approval Guidelines e.g.: ‘graduates of secondary teacher education programs must have a sound knowledge and understanding of the nature of the specialist areas that they prepare to teach’ (p 20). Graduates must meet the Queensland College of Teachers Professional Standards for Queensland Teachers.

There is currently no statutory agency for registering teachers in the Australian Capital Territory.

B. Teacher Education Accreditation

A review of national trends and practices in teacher education accreditation conducted by ACER (Ingvarson et al 2006) notes that current ‘processes for the implementation of accreditation of teacher education courses in Australia are not well established’. The minimum requirement for an initial teacher education qualification in all states and territories is a four year degree level course with at least one year pre-service teacher education at a recognised educational institution. However, beyond this agreed minimum requirement there is considerable variation in the processes for endorsing, approving or
To date, only three states have legislation requiring formal approval or accreditation of teacher education programs. Victoria and Queensland have implemented formal processes of review and approval; New South Wales is well-advanced in the process of refining entry standards and linked, formal processes for approving Initial Teacher Education programs. Draft subject content requirements for Initial Teacher Education courses have been prepared, and should be finalised by late 2007.

The establishment of teacher registration bodies in the states and the Northern Territory has made provisions for each state to approve, endorse or accredit teacher education programs. However, with the exceptions of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, the accreditation processes generally operate in much the same way as before the establishment of the registration bodies – ‘that is, internally, within the self-accrediting universities, complemented sometimes, by endorsements from the registration authorities and/or external procedures implemented by some employing bodies’.

C: Requirements of employers in each State and Territory

i) Government schools

The Table below provides an overview of the qualification requirements for employment in government schools in each state and territory, and outlines the procedures for gaining employment in government schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Employment procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Victoria        | The Victorian Department of Education and Training (DET) expects that teachers of languages in secondary schools:  
- are registered with the Victorian Institute of Teachers  
- have completed four years of appropriate tertiary study at a recognised tertiary institution (as follows):  
  - ‘appropriate tertiary study’ is defined as a three-year tertiary post Year 12 major in the language, or  
  - four years of study in a beginners tertiary language stream, or  
  - a Statement of Equivalence, issued by a Victorian University, plus a LOTE Methodology course, consisting of at least 60 hours of theory tuition and 22 days of Practicum. | Victorian government schools have considerable autonomy in the selection of staff. The online employment system can be used by schools to advertise vacancies, and by potential applicants seeking employment. Applications are made directly to schools. Schools peruse applications and shortlist, interview and select staff.  
Principals/senior staff are responsible for writing position descriptions in accordance with the needs and priorities of the school. |

The Victorian Department of Education and Training (DET) expects that teachers of languages in primary schools:
### New South Wales

The New South Wales Department of Education and Training (DET) requires that teachers of languages in secondary schools:

- are registered with the NSW Institute of Teachers
- have completed four years of appropriate tertiary study at a recognised tertiary institution which includes study of Years 7-12 teaching methodology and professional teaching experience in the subject/teaching area
- have two years of degree level study in a language at post-introductory or post-HSC level if they are to teach Languages as the main teaching subject
- have one year of degree level study in a language at post-introductory or post-HSC level if they are to teach Languages as an additional subject.

The New South Wales Department of Education and Training requires that teachers of languages in primary schools:

- are registered with the NSW Institute of Teachers
- have completed four years of appropriate tertiary study which includes study of Years K-6 teaching methodology and professional teaching experience in the subject/teaching area

### Victoria

- are registered with the Victorian Institute of Teachers
- have completed four years of appropriate tertiary study (as for secondary teachers – see above)

The DET has issued the following clarification, given that qualification and accreditation requirements have changed:

_In the case of otherwise qualified primary teachers with continuous service only, teachers who previously gained accreditation by a panel convened by the Department of Education & Training are also considered qualified. Likewise, secondary teachers with continuous service who completed a post Year 12 language sub-major prior to 1996 continue to be regarded as qualified._

Full time positions are centrally assigned by Staff Services Unit. Teachers wishing to apply for a full time position in NSW government schools apply online to the Staffing Services Unit – this unit of the DET undertakes all vetting of qualifications, background suitability checks, etc. The applicant is then assigned to an appropriate school.

Principals can employ casual or temporary teachers directly without going through the Staff Services Unit.
professional teaching experience in the subject/teaching area.

For classification as a primary teacher a degree should contain either one full academic year of study in four of the following areas; or two full academic years of study in one area and one full academic year of study in two other areas listed below:

- Maths, science and technology, and English are the preferred areas of study. Related areas of academic study may include: LOTE; personal development, health and PE, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>The South Australian Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS) requires that teachers of languages in primary and secondary schools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 | - are registered with the Teachers Registration Board of South Australia  
|                 | - have completed four years of appropriate tertiary study at a recognised tertiary institution, which includes study of teaching methodology and professional teaching experience in the subject/teaching area; and includes at least one year of tertiary studies in the target language.  
|                 | The one year requirement includes those who have only one year of a ‘Beginners’ tertiary course in the language, however, strictly speaking those with this qualification can only teach up to Year 8. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>The Queensland Department of Education, Training and the Arts requires that teachers of languages in primary and secondary schools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|            | - are registered with the Queensland College of Teachers  
|            | - have completed four years of appropriate tertiary study at a recognised tertiary institution;  
|            | - obtain a general teacher suitability rating;  
|            | - undertake a language proficiency assessment and obtain at least an 'adequate' proficiency rating in their LOTE, regardless of the |
|            | Since 2006, schools have been given greater autonomy in selecting their own permanent staff. Permanent positions are advertised online, and applicants apply directly to individual schools. Local selection panels convened from within schools shortlist, interview and select staff. Human Resources consultants act as brokers to ensure that correct procedures are followed.  
|            | Temporary employment positions are managed centrally. |
|            | The application process is managed centrally by the Teacher Applicant Centre of the Department of Education, Training and the Arts. Applications are processed centrally and are then accessible to the Staffing Officers in the 10 Regions and 26 districts.  
|            | Permanent or temporary positions are coordinated by district office personnel.  
|            | Casual or relief positions are coordinated by individual schools. |
Language proficiency assessment

The language proficiency assessment is conducted by a background speaker or highly proficient user of the language, accompanied by a second panelist who has experience in the language.

The assessment aims to determine the applicants’:

- general level of proficiency in the language
- potential to use the language for teaching purposes
- the assessment takes up to 100 minutes and comprises:
  - a short written task; (35 minutes)
  - (25 minute break)
  - an interview with the assessor and demonstration of ability to read and discuss a text (40 minutes)

The applicant is assigned a rating for each skill area (reading/writing/listening and speaking) as well as an overall rating.

Five proficiency levels for each skill area are outlined in the Standard Descriptors. These descriptors are adapted from the Australian Language Proficiency Rating Scales (1985) and the American Council for Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Guidelines (1987).

In the case of an applicant having more than one LOTE, an assessment is required for each language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>The Tasmanian Department of Education has the following essential requirements for teachers of languages in primary and secondary schools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS</strong>: Qualifications as established by the Tasmanian Industrial Commission in the Teaching Service (Tasmanian Public Sector) Award, 2005. Current certificate of registration; or provisional registration; or limited authority to teach granted by the Teachers Registration Board (Tasmania) in accordance with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All permanent vacancies and fixed-term vacancies of more than twelve months are advertised in the State Service Notices Section of the Tasmanian Government Gazette, which is available both online and in hard copy. Applications are made through Staffing Services in the Department of Education, which directs applications to schools. Schools shortlist, interview and select permanent staff. Fixed-term and relief teaching positions are managed centrally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provisions of the Teachers Registration Act 2000. A person with a limited authority to teach can only be employed on a fixed-term basis. The Commissioner has determined that the person nominated for this position is to satisfy a pre-employment check before taking up the appointment, promotion or transfer.

**DESIRABLE REQUIREMENTS:** Four years or more training as defined in the Teaching Service (Tasmanian Public Sector) Award 2005.

| Western Australia | The Department of Education and Training (DET) requires that teachers of languages in primary and secondary schools:
|                  | • are registered with the Western Australian College of Teaching
|                  | • have completed four years of appropriate tertiary study at a recognised tertiary institution which includes study of teaching methodology and professional teaching experience in the subject/teaching area.
|                  | The qualification requirements include those who have begun their study of a language at tertiary level. It is expected that language teachers will have completed a minimum of four units in their undergraduate degree. |
|                  | Most part- and full-time positions are filled by Staffing Consultants based in the Central Office of the Department of Education and Training. However, some schools are able to select staff (‘local selection’). |

| Northern Territory | The Northern Territory Department of Employment, Education and Training requires that teachers of languages in primary and secondary schools:
|                   | • are registered with the Teacher Registration Board
|                   | The qualification requirements for languages teachers are, of necessity, very flexible. Ideally, teachers would have a teaching degree or diploma with language/s methodology as a major. However, the reality is that many qualified teachers who have a second language background but no formal LOTE qualifications teach languages. The use of language speakers without methodology occurs if there is no alternative. |
|                   | Northern Territory government schools have considerable autonomy in the selection of staff. The online employment system can be used by schools to advertise vacancies, and by potential applicants seeking employment. Applications are made directly to schools. Schools peruse applications and shortlist, interview and select staff. |

<p>| Australian Capital Territory | At present, the Workforce Management section of the ACT Department of Education and Training does not assess the language proficiency of |
|                            | Teacher employment is a centrally driven process, whereby the Teacher Recruitment Unit within the Department of Education and |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>its teachers. No standard of proficiency is required.</th>
<th>Training manages the recruitment, background checks, review of qualifications, etc. Applicants receive a rating, and are assigned to schools in accordance with school requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Education and Training assesses each situation on a case-by-case basis. Each applicant needs to show that they are a qualified teacher, and then present evidence of their background in the language in question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ii) Independent schools and Catholic schools**  
Independent schools and Catholic schools have considerable autonomy in selecting teachers. In both sectors, teachers seeking employment are required to be qualified teachers and to be registered/accredited with the respective teacher registration/accreditation bodies and to demonstrate the required competencies. Individual schools may have a set of priorities they use in the employment of languages staff but these would be particular to their own context and needs.
APPENDIX 4: DISCUSSION DOCUMENT USED IN CONSULTATIONS

Introduction
This research project is being carried out by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) on behalf of the Department of Education Science and Training (DEST). It is one of a suite of national projects currently being funded through the School Languages Programme to assist the implementation of the MCEETYA National Statement and Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005-08. The investigations are being conducted by ACER researchers with the professional assistance of consultants from LaTrobe, Melbourne and Monash Universities.

This document has been prepared to inform key stakeholders of the purposes and key issues of this project, in preparation for face to face and telephone consultations to be held in October 2006. It consists of a project overview, and the focus questions for the consultations.

Project overview
The project consists of a review and evaluation of teacher education for languages teachers. Its final product will be a Report, to be completed in June 2007. The Report will provide a basis for decisions about future national initiatives to improve access to and the quality of preparation for primary and secondary languages teachers, and opportunities for re-training.

The project aims to:

1. Obtain a comprehensive national picture of teacher education and re-training opportunities for the preparation of primary and secondary languages teachers, including
   - Course entry requirements
   - Content and structure and
   - Structural impediments relating to the development of teachers’ linguistic and pedagogical competency

2. Determine the extent to which existing provision of teacher education and re-training opportunities for primary and secondary languages teachers prepares them for their profession; and

3. Develop strategies to improve access to, and the quality of, preparation for primary and secondary languages teachers. This will include exploring the potential application for the professional standards for accomplished teaching of languages and cultures developed by the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations (AFMLTA), as part of the Development of Standards for Teachers of Indonesian Project.

Consultations are being carried out by ACER researchers in all States and Territories. The researchers plan to consult with representatives of:

- DEST
- State education departments
- The Catholic and Independent schools sectors who are responsible for languages policy and human resources planning (languages teaching)
- Languages teacher educators in selected universities
- State teacher registration bodies
- Providers of out of hours ethnic languages education
- Primary and secondary principals and languages teachers
- State and national languages teachers associations
- Teaching Australia
As far as possible, consultations will be conducted face to face between ACER researchers and the various respondents in each State and Territory. Because of constraints of time and place, however, it is likely that there will also be a need for some telephone interviews.

Dates and times of consultations are currently being set up by ACER researchers. You may already have been contacted, if not you will receive a telephone call within the next couple of days.

The researchers would much appreciate the provision of any additional written information, documents etc. relevant to the focus questions at or before the consultation.

**Focus Questions**

The following focus questions, prepared on the basis of information from the draft Literature Review and Document Analysis, are provided as a guide for respondents.

The first set of questions (*Focus questions A*) will guide discussions with *all* respondents. The subsequent sets (*Additional Focus Questions B-H*) have been designed for specific stakeholder groups. However, all respondents are invited to comment on questions designed for groups other than their own if they so wish.

The questions are intended as a guide only. Our aim for each consultation is to ensure frank and free ranging discussion of all relevant issues.

**Focus questions A (These questions will be the basis of discussions with all respondents)**

We understand that you may not be able to answer all of these questions. However, in the discussions, we would like you to provide any information relevant to your organisation/position

1. What do you see as the key issues in regard to your State or Territory’s current needs for appropriately qualified and trained languages teachers?
2. What incentives are there for people to train as languages teachers in your State or Territory? What are the disincentives?
3. Do you believe there is a need, in your State or Territory, to review the content and structure of teacher education courses with a view to improving access to, and the quality of preparation for languages teachers?
4. What do you see as the main factors that (a) support (b) inhibit effective languages teaching in schools? How are these related to languages teacher education?
5. In what ways do schools and teacher education institutions co-operate to promote the effective preparation of languages teachers? How might this be improved?
6. Are you aware of any programs for training or re-training languages teachers that appear to be particularly successful? Could you describe them, saying why you think they are successful?
7. What kind of induction/support is available for new languages teachers in schools?
8. In what ways might the preparation of languages teachers benefit if professional teaching standards such as the AFMLTA *Professional standards for accomplished teaching of languages and cultures* were used to guide programs? (The standards can be downloaded from [www.afmlta.asn.au/afmlta/Standards%20for%20teachers.pdf](http://www.afmlta.asn.au/afmlta/Standards%20for%20teachers.pdf))
9. What provision is made, in your State or Territory for the preparation of teachers who teach in after hours Community languages/ethnic schools? Do you consider this provision to be sufficient and satisfactory? How might it be improved?

**Additional Focus questions B (for discussions with representatives of DEST, state and territory education departments, and the Catholic and Independent school sectors)**

1. In what ways is the preparation of languages teachers influenced by government and other (e.g. systemic) policies and initiatives at national and state levels?
2. What are the policy factors that contribute to or inhibit the successful implementation of languages teacher education courses and the supply of quality languages teachers?

3. How are needs for teachers of specific languages determined? What arrangements (e.g. appropriate data bases) are made for tracking these needs, and how are they communicated to teacher education institutions?

4. How do issues of teacher supply and demand influence the nature and kind of languages teacher preparation programs in universities?

5. How do issues of teacher supply and demand influence the quality of graduates of languages teacher education programs?

6. What opportunities, if any, are offered by your organisation for teachers to be retrained as languages teachers? Please describe, including details of pre-requisites etc.

Additional Focus Questions C (for discussions with languages teacher educators in selected universities)

1. What teacher education courses does your university provide for future primary and secondary school languages teachers (e.g. four year degree in education postgraduate degree, double degree)?

2. What links are there between the teacher education courses and languages study offered in other faculties, e.g. Arts?

3. What do you see as the main issues in providing quality preparation for languages teachers, generally, and in your university?

4. What factors facilitate/inhibit sound languages provision in your university?

5. Are you satisfied with the arrangements for practicum for languages students in your university? How could these arrangements be improved?

6. What are the entry requirements, including language proficiency, for students who wish to take up a course of study that will qualify them to teach a language, or languages?

7. What are the exit requirements for these students, including language proficiency and how are they determined?

8. What views and principles underlie the teaching of pedagogy/languages teaching methodology (e.g. intercultural language and learning approach)? Are courses aligned with professional teaching standards, e.g. the AFMLTA standards? If so, how?

   (The standards can be downloaded from www.afmlta.asn.au/afmlta/Standards%20for%20teachers.pdf)

9. In what ways do languages teacher education courses reflect the syllabus/curriculum requirements of schools and school systems?

10. What requirements are there for qualifications and experience of languages teacher education staff in your university?

11. What are the employment conditions (e.g. part time, tenured, sessional) of languages education teaching staff?

12. Are specific languages methodologies for particular languages (or language groups) used or is there a generic method for all languages?

13. What arrangements does your university have in place for evaluating courses for languages teachers?

14. Does your university offer opportunities for teachers to retrain as languages teachers? What are the relevant requirements

Additional Focus Questions D (For discussions with representatives of State and Territory Teacher Registration bodies)

1. How do teachers become registered as teachers in your State/Territory?

2. Could you advise us about (a) any special current requirements/guidelines you have for the registration of languages teachers and (b) any plans you have for developing such requirements in the future?

3. What is your present role with regard to the ‘accreditation’ of languages teacher education courses? What do you see as likely future developments in this area?
4. What is your view on the development and implementation of generic and subject specific professional teaching standards, especially ‘graduating standards’ for newly graduated teachers?
5. How is your role, as it relates to pre-service education for languages teachers, aligned with that of Teaching Australia, particularly in relation to the development and use of languages specific professional teaching standards?
6. In terms of teacher re-training, what are the minimum requirements?
7. What links exist between State/Territory registration authorities and ethnic schools authorities?

Additional Focus Questions E (for discussions with providers of out of hours community/ethnic education)

1. What do you see as the main issues in attracting and retaining suitably qualified ethnic/community languages teachers?
2. Approximately what percentage of your languages teaching staff is eligible for registration with the relevant teacher registration body in your State or Territory? What percentage is actually registered?
3. On what criteria do you select your teachers, and what selection processes are used?
4. What opportunities/special arrangements are available in your State or Territory for your teachers to upgrade their teaching qualifications to obtain full registration?

Additional Focus Questions F (For discussions with recently graduated languages teachers and their principals)

**Principals**
1. What do you see as the main issues in attracting and retaining suitably qualified languages teachers in your school?
2. Does your school play a role in languages teacher education, e.g. through offering practicum places? If so, could you comment on the arrangements, noting the factors that facilitate/impede useful working relationships between your school and the relevant teacher-education institution(s)?
3. In what areas have you found graduate languages teachers to have been well prepared for their teaching role?
4. Would you like to comment on any areas in which you feel improvement is warranted?

**Teachers**
1. When did you graduate as a languages teacher, and in what state?
2. What features of your pre-service languages teacher education best prepared you for your current role as a languages teacher?
3. What would you like to have had more of?
4. Were there any aspects of your pre-service languages teacher education that you would recommend changing? What were they? How might they be changed?
5. Was your pre-service languages teacher education well aligned with the curriculum you are now expected to teach? If not, which part(s) do you think were not relevant?
6. Was any reference made to professional teaching standards, especially the AFMLTA standards for teaching languages and cultures during your service languages teacher education? If so, how did you find this useful/not useful? (The standards can be downloaded from [www.afmlta.asn.au/afmlta/Standards%20for%20teachers.pdf](http://www.afmlta.asn.au/afmlta/Standards%20for%20teachers.pdf))
7. Did your pre-service languages teacher education provide you with the level of language proficiency you now feel you need?
8. Did your pre-service languages teacher education provide you with the level of pedagogical skill you now feel you need?
Additional Focus Questions G (For discussions with representatives of state and national languages teachers associations)

1. What do you see as your organisations role in addressing major issues in languages teacher education, nationally and in your own State or Territory?
2. What feedback do you receive from your members about the various aspects of pre-service education for languages teachers?
3. What is the level of support and awareness for the AFMLTA standards for languages teaching and cultures among your members? (The standards can be downloaded from www.afmlta.asn.au/afmlta/Standards%20for%20teachers.pdf)
4. Do you think these standards might be useful for improving the delivery of languages teacher education? How might this happen, and what role would your organisation play in the processes?

Additional Focus questions H (For discussions with representatives of Teaching Australia)

1. What is your present role with regard to the ‘accreditation’ of languages teacher education courses? What do you see as likely future developments in this area?
2. What is your view on the development and implementation of generic and subject specific professional teaching standards, especially ‘graduating standards’ for newly graduated teachers?
3. How is your role (as it relates to pre-service education for languages teachers) aligned with that of the State and Territory teacher registration bodies, particularly in relation to the development and use of professional teaching standards?
APPENDIX 5: A DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION ON WHICH STUDENTS ARE ASSESSED

NCATE requirements for Programs of Foreign Language Teacher Preparation

The preparation of foreign languages teachers is the joint responsibility of the faculty in foreign languages and education. In order for foreign language teacher candidates to attain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described in the ACTFL Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers, programs of foreign language teacher preparation must demonstrate that they include the components and characteristics described below:

1. The development of candidates’ foreign language proficiency in all areas of communication, with special emphasis on developing oral proficiency, in all language courses. Upper level courses should be taught in the foreign language.
2. An ongoing assessment of candidates’ oral proficiency and provision of diagnostic feedback to candidates concerning their progress in meeting required levels of proficiency.
3. Language, linguistics, culture, and literature components.
4. A methods course that deals specifically with the teaching of foreign languages, and that is taught by a qualified faculty member whose expertise is foreign language education and who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues.
5. Field experiences prior to student teaching that include experiences in foreign languages classrooms.
6. Field experiences, including student teaching, that are supervised by a qualified foreign language educator who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues in the field of foreign language education.
7. Opportunities for candidates to experience technology-enhanced instruction and to use technology in their own teaching.
8. Opportunities for candidates to participate in a structured study abroad program and/or intensive immersion experience in a target language community.

The NCATE ‘content and supporting standards’ for the preparation of languages teachers

The six ‘Content and Supporting Standards’ describe what graduates of teacher preparation programs in languages are expected to know and do:

**Six content standards at a glance**

Standard 1: Languages, Linguistics, Comparisons

Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary concepts

Standards 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional practice

Standard 4: Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction

Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures

Standard 6: Professionalism

(ACTFL Program standards for the preparation of Foreign language teachers ACTFL/NCATE 2002, p. 3)
For each of the six content standards there is substantial ‘supporting’ explanation which supplies research based information and references that relates to the standard. For example, for Standard 1: Language, Linguistics, comparisons:

- Candidates are able to communicate successfully in the three modes of communication – interpersonal, interpretive, presentations – in the target language they intend to teach. The heart of language instruction is the ability to teach students to communicate, which can only be possible if teachers themselves exemplify effective communicative skills. Undergirding effective implementation of the Standards for Foreign Languages Learning in the 21st Century is the expectation that teachers will provide effective oral and written input in the classroom (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1999 p. 4).

And

- Candidates who teach Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean (Group IV on the FSI scale) must speak at a minimum level of Intermediate-High as defined in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines-Speaking (1999) and explained further in the rubrics.

For standard 2.a. Demonstrating cultural understandings:

- Candidates acquire knowledge of cultural perspectives as they are reflected in the practices and products of the target language. That knowledge comes from direct study of culture, from literary texts, film and other media; and from direct experiences in the target culture. This knowledge and experience enable candidates to recognise and counteract cultural stereotypes. Candidates integrate textual and experiential knowledge into their instructional practice.

And

- Given that no one can be in possession of all the cultural concepts, contemporary and historical, it is important that teacher education candidates know how to investigate and hypothesise about the dynamic dimensions of culture. They pursue new insights into culture and expand their repertoire of knowledge by analysing new cultural information that allow learners to join communities in the target culture, including information contained in documents, interactions with native speakers, and social and institutional frameworks. (p.15)

Rubrics

Rubrics set out expectations for identified elements of the standards (about twelve elements for each standard) at three levels:

- Approaches standard
- Meets standard
- Exceeds standards

The rubrics look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Approaches standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural experience</td>
<td>Candidates’ experience with the target culture has been limited to travel/tourism or instruction.</td>
<td>Candidates have spent planned time in a target culture or community so that they have personal experience to support</td>
<td>Candidates interpret journals or observation from cultural informants which narrate or describe experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions for cultural learning</td>
<td>Candidates base their own and their students’ cultural work on familiar and factual cultural content.</td>
<td>Candidates integrate cultural insights with the target language in its communicative functions and content areas. They work to extend their knowledge of culture through independent work and interactions with native speakers.</td>
<td>Candidates emphasise cultural concepts as they teach language, analyse and synthesise cultural information from authentic sources in various media and in relation to specific communities or audiences. They work to build a large repertoire of cultural knowledge and experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence

Candidates are required to present evidence for assessment that they are able to meet the standards. For example, for Standard 1 (Language, Linguistics, Comparisons)

**Sample Candidate Evidence for Standard 1**

- Official or Upgraded Advisory Proficiency Interview (OPI) or the Texas Oral Proficiency Test (TOPT) (Candidates must have one of these)
- Analyses of video taped or audio taped oral presentations
- Samples of written interpersonal/presentational tasks
- Synthesis of interpretive tasks done (listening of news broadcast, reading of literary text, viewing of film), together with reflections
- Evidence of plan for continuous language and cultural growth
- Performance on examinations, demonstrating knowledge of linguistics
- Reports/papers/class work in which language comparisons are made
- Analyses of interviews demonstrating interaction with native speaker(s) of the target language
- Reflections on study abroad and/or immersion experiences and experiences in target language communities.
APPENDIX 6: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are not scaled or priorities in any way. They are grouped according to the target bodies:

1. The Australian Government and State and Territory Governments
2. Universities and university national groups (the Australian Council of Deans of Education and Universities Australia)
3. State and Territory teacher registration bodies
4. The Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations

The Australian Government and State and Territory Governments

**Recommendation 1**

That the **Australian Government** expand core funding for the discipline of education in universities, on the proviso that all primary pre-service teachers be required to study at least one unit of a widely taught language other than English as part of their teacher education course, in order to be able to more effectively co-operate with teachers specialising in the teaching of that language through an enhanced understanding of the processes and challenges of learning additional languages.

**Recommendation 2**

That the **Australian Government** provide tagged funding to enable universities to make places available for selected native speakers of a language who are not yet undertaking a full teaching degree to study language teaching methodology. This could be done by offering special study units or by allowing native speakers (or equivalent) to enrol in existing methodology units and obtain credits towards a full teaching degree which could be ‘banked’ should they decide to embark on a degree within a specified period of time. The units should include providing opportunities for teacher education students educated outside of Australia to gain insight into Australian cultures of schooling.

**Recommendation 3**

That the **Australian Government** commission a study of practising languages teachers who commenced their study of the language(s) they are teaching ab initio, and that, if this study shows these teachers to be effective, funding be committed to increasing the number of ab initio language courses for prospective languages teachers.

**Recommendation 4**

That the **Australian Government** provide tagged funding to enable groups responsible for language teaching in universities (languages educators) and teacher educators to establish and maintain regular formal contact and collaboration.

**Recommendation 5**

That the **Australian Government**, in parallel with the expansion of funding to support the practicum experience, provide additional tagged funding to allow institutions that offer courses in language teacher education to incorporate a unit or units of study based on a period of in-country experience, as a compulsory component of the languages teaching qualification.
Recommendation 6

That **the Australian Government** commission a longitudinal study of the effectiveness of different models of teacher education for languages teachers in different universities, and that this study should include the collection of systematic data about the capabilities of graduates, of languages teacher education courses. It should follow cohorts of students from selection to courses through pre-service preparation and the first five years of their careers.

Recommendation 7

That **the Australian and State and Territory Governments** provide more financial incentives to some pre-service languages education teachers on a basis to be determined to encourage students to train as languages teachers and to commit to languages teaching for longer periods. These incentives could include HECS waiver, partial or full scholarships, or substantial assistance in gaining in-country experience.

Recommendation 8

That **Australian and State and Territory Governments** provide financial and other incentives for practising teachers who are not language teachers to enable them to re-train as languages teachers, on the condition that they and their employers commit to an amount of time, equivalent to their years of study as languages teachers, after graduation.

Recommendation 9

That **Australian State and Territory Government education departments** provide funding to establish and maintain regular formal contact between stakeholders in language teacher education, including schools, universities, regulatory bodies, teachers’ professional associations, employers, and after hours/ethnic schools, and to disseminate the results of such contact.

Recommendation 10

That **Australian State and Territory Government education departments** maintain, and share with universities, regularly and consistently updated data bases and other relevant information on language teachers in individual schools. In return for such information, universities should commit to cooperative practices in languages teacher placements.

Universities and national university groups

Recommendation 11

That **the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE)** take note of, and provide as models to all universities which train languages teachers, the innovative strategies used by some education faculties to forge strong links and partnerships with schools to establish collaborative approaches to languages teacher education, especially in relation to the practicum, and that they suggest mechanisms for sharing these strategies.

Recommendation 12

That **Universities Australia** negotiate ways in which Education faculties integrate studies of language and culture with professional studies of teaching, to reduce or eliminate the ‘languages gap’ that occurs when languages are studied at a significantly earlier period than studies of pedagogy, through the promotion of co-operative ventures to provide language-specific languages teaching methodology units. Every effort
should be made to ensure that languages studies are taken concurrently with teacher education studies, and that languages teaching methodology units are language specific.

**State and Territory Registration Bodies**

**Recommendation 13**

That State and Territory teacher registration bodies work with State and Territory based Committees of Deans of Education to revise accreditation and other quality assurance mechanisms to ensure that teacher educators have comprehensive information about students’ knowledge of language and culture at the point of entry to the languages teacher education course, and that teacher education faculties have defensible means of guaranteeing that their exit students have demonstrated acceptable standards of achievement in their knowledge of the language and culture they propose to teach.

**Recommendation 14**

That Australian State and Territory teacher registration bodies work with State and Territory based Committees of Deans of Education in making inclusion of the study of the relevant state Languages other than English curriculum a condition of approving teacher education courses for specialist languages teachers.

**The Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations**

**Recommendation 15**

That MCEETYA work with the AFMLTA to support the development of graduate standards for languages teachers, consistent with other national standards initiatives, including the National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching, that can be used in establishing acceptable national accreditation procedures for teacher education courses. This will entail an understanding that the standards will be used to assess the preparedness of languages teachers to practise their profession.