

Perspectives on the New *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*

Introduction

John Gruber-Miller

After nearly two years of work, the new national *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* were approved by the Board of Directors of the American Philological Association and the Executive Committee of the American Classical League and were unveiled March 1, 2010.

The ACL/APA Task Force for Latin Teacher Training and Certification, a committee of both Latin teachers and college faculty involved in teacher training, developed the new Standards so that they would be aligned with the *Standards for Classical Language Learning* and with ACT-FL *Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* and the INTASC *Model Standards for Licensing Beginning Foreign Latin Teachers*. The Task Force also revised the document in light of comments from dozens of Latin teachers and teacher trainers during a five month comment period last spring and summer.

The new Standards will undoubtedly promote further discussion about what makes a good Latin teacher. There will be a plenary session at the ACL Summer Institute in June and a panel discussion at the APA next January to discuss the Standards. In addition, in this issue of *Teaching Classical Languages*, the editor has invited seven teachers and university professors from different backgrounds and with different teaching experience to offer their perspectives on the Standards. Those offering perspectives include two members of the Task Force (Ronnie Ancona and Lee Percy), a past President of the ACL (Ken Kitchell), a former World Languages District Supervisor (Cathy Daugherty), new Latin teachers (Cory Holec and Erik Collins), and a veteran Latin teacher (Bob Patrick).

The *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* may be found online at <http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep2010Stand.pdf>.

College Professors and the New *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*

Introduction

As a member of the Joint American Classical League-American Philological Association Task Force that developed *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*, I was intimately involved in the deliberation on and writing of the document. Although our Task Force included both college professors and secondary school teachers, my mind was initially focused on *Standards* as material to be used primarily for determining what a beginning secondary school Latin teacher should know and should be able to do. Documents like this one that include reference to things like the “Five Cs” as the goals of foreign language learning (Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities) are typically more geared to the world of secondary school teaching. Indeed many college professors of Classics are likely unfamiliar with such terms and their use in relation to Latin pedagogy.¹ What struck me, though, while working with the Task Force was how valuable this document could be not only for prospective and current secondary school Latin teachers and those charged officially with training and supervising them but also for any teacher of Latin, including those teaching at the college level.² As we worked out what we thought beginning teachers should know and be able to do I began to realize how much college faculty could benefit from entering into discussions of these issues as well. There is, I suspect, less overt analysis of Latin language teaching methodology and practices at the college level. If *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* describe what a Latin teacher should know and be able to do, that includes all of us who teach Latin. In what follows, I hope to show why every college professor of Classics should have an interest in *Standards*.

The “What” from Standards and the “Why” for Professors

As I see it, there are three basic reasons why college professors of Classics should know about the new *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*:

Reason #1. College professors are Latin teachers, too, and therefore we should have something to learn for our own teaching from these Standards for preparing Latin teachers.

Reason #2. Awareness of the Standards will make us more familiar with the kinds of secondary school Latin experiences our own college students may have had before entering our classrooms through increased familiarity with what the teachers of those students were expected to know and to be able to do. Such familiarity can help the “articulation” (the connection from one level to the next) of Latin teaching from the secondary school level to the college level.

Reason #3. Many of us who teach at the college level are directly or (more likely) indirectly and unconsciously “training,” through our own college teaching, the next generation of Latin teachers. (Some of us may be involved in official teacher training programs. Most are not.) Being

1 For further information on the “Five Cs and Classics,” see *Standards for Classical Language Learning*, which was developed in alignment with *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*.

2 Of course Latin teachers at the elementary level, as well, are part of the group to which I refer. My focus, though, will be on college professors.

informed about the standards that prospective Latin teachers will be expected to meet allows us to choose in what ways we may want to rethink some of our own teaching approaches to help them to meet those standards.

By offering one example from *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* in support of each of the reasons mentioned above, I hope to help college professors to see how they can and why they should engage with this new document. Of course the reasons I have provided do not constitute an “exclusive list,” nor are the examples more than suggestions. I am certain that other college professors will discover additional reasons for finding *Standards* of value to them and will focus on different parts of the document. I merely hope to show very briefly how these Standards can connect with the professional interests of those who teach at the college level.

Support for Reason #1 from Standard 2.a, Standards and Approaches

Beginning teachers demonstrate an awareness of the three primary approaches for teaching Latin in the U.S. today: grammar-translation, reading in context, and oral-aural. They know how to implement features of all three approaches in a variety of instructional situations. They know how to integrate Roman culture with language instruction. (11)

Self-consciousness about Latin teaching methods is just as important for teaching at the college level as it is for teaching at the secondary level. Note that the standard implies no endorsement of a particular methodology. Rather it states that the teacher should *be aware of* the major methodologies and should *know how to* implement them. Likewise, it does not dictate the extent to which Roman culture should be involved in language teaching. Rather it requires that the teacher *know how to* integrate it with language learning.

Many college teachers receive little instruction in language pedagogy in their graduate training. Often graduate students are unfamiliar with approaches other than those by which they were taught or those they are required to use if they teach language courses as graduate teaching assistants. This standard might provide added incentive for Ph.D. programs to incorporate training (informal or formal) in Latin (and Greek) language pedagogy to make their students both more marketable and more prepared to teach. Practically speaking, such awareness would make more likely a scenario in which a graduate student on the college job market, when asked what Latin approach he or she might adopt if given a choice and why, might be prepared with an informed response.³

Additionally, this standard could help college professors with their choices concerning textbooks and teaching approaches as well as the consequences of those choices. Knowing what an adopted approach lacks, and how to compensate for that, is as important as knowing its advantages. Awareness of this standard should encourage more comprehensive discussions about language learning and teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels, thus strengthening Latin teaching at *every* level.

³ The City University of New York Classics Ph.D. program, pending final approval, will be offering a 1-credit graduate level classics pedagogy course that would include such training.

Support for Reason #2 from Supporting Explanation: Standard 1.a on Pronouncing Latin accurately and with expression

They [the teachers] recognize the importance for themselves and their students of speaking and listening to Latin, and they can use simple greetings and classroom commands. (8)

This supporting explanation gets at the importance of speaking and listening as essential features for Latin language learning and teaching, as they are for the learning and teaching of any language. Utilizing these features in addition to reading and writing completes the picture of language production and reception. Many secondary school students will have experienced, at the very least, the use of some simple Latin expressions in their classrooms (both the saying of them and the hearing of them). Knowing this might encourage some college professors to consider incorporating a few Latin expressions into their own teaching, if this were compatible with their own pedagogical goals and strategies. (These could be as simple as “Salve,” “Scribe,” “Audi,” “Bene,” “Optime,” etc.) In addition, many college students who begin their Latin study in college are inexperienced with and shy about oral production of Latin. Incorporating some oral-aural experience can strengthen the more intuitive, less analytical, part of language learning that is of value in *any* Latin classroom. Finally, the added oral-aural work increases the chances that our college students will understand us in class when we *speak* Latin words even, for example, in a discussion conducted in English of a grammatical item.

Support for Reason #3 from Standard 1.a: Linguistic Knowledge and Proficiency

Beginning Latin teachers...pronounce Latin accurately and with expression and read poetry with attention to meter. (7)

If the Latin teacher is to meet this standard (a very important one since students cannot model their own Latin pronunciation properly unless they have someone to imitate), then he or she needs to be pronouncing Latin aloud correctly from the early stages of language study.⁴ This study may begin in secondary school or in college or, in some cases, even in primary school. We as college teachers will contribute to the success of the next generation of teachers by requiring our students, at a minimum, to read Latin aloud correctly and with expression. Of course regardless of whether our college students plan to enter the teaching ranks, this activity strengthens our students’ language acquisition by utilizing listening and speaking skills in addition to reading and writing skills.

I have quoted above the part of the standard that focuses on meter because for some students poetry provides an additional challenge, but pronouncing Latin prose correctly and with expression is of course equally important. In my college level poetry classes, at the intermediate level and above, I require my students to memorize a small chunk of Latin poetry (about 8 lines or so) from our course readings. This requires proper pronunciation and attention to meter. Many have never had to do this before. Consistently I find the students report that this is of value to

⁴ There are several possible “correct” pronunciations of Latin.

them—gets the words comfortable in their mouths and brains, makes the meter feel more natural, and connects them with those particular lines in an intimate way. This year, for the first time, my students recorded through Blackboard's [Wimba Voice Tools](#) a small chunk of Latin poetry they practiced and then read with expression. (In addition, I myself have recorded Latin selections for their listening purposes. In fact, several students chose to record the same lines I recorded myself.) These recordings required students to show through their phrasing and expressiveness how the poetry has meaning and how it can come alive as language. While the goals of these activities are ones I find meaningful for college students, I am not unaware that they are essential for the students who go on to teach Latin, for they, in turn, will be modeling the oral Latin for their own students. Knowing this particular Standard may encourage college professors of Latin to incorporate into their courses similar activities that meet both their own pedagogical goals *and* those of *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*.⁵

Conclusion

Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation is a useful guide for what Latin teachers at any level should be able to do. In addition, college professors, in particular, should find it important as an additional source of ideas and techniques for their own preparation in Latin pedagogy and for their teaching at the college level. Still further, it is informative about what secondary school Latin students may have experienced under the direction of Latin teachers who have met the standards. Finally, those of us who teach at the college level are all potentially involved in Latin teacher training, since we do not know which of our students will go on to teach Latin. Awareness of *Standards* may suggest ways in which we can meet and sometimes even rethink our own college-level teaching goals, while contributing to the development of the stated expectations for Latin teachers. Whether actively engaged in teacher-training or not, we can contribute to the preparation of the next generation of Latin teachers by addressing how what we do at the college level can support the *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* without any loss to our own goals and perhaps even with added benefits.

Ronnie Ancona

Hunter College and The Graduate Center, CUNY

Works Cited

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Latin Teacher Training and Certification. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: ACL and APA, 2010. (Available online at <<http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep-2010Stand.pdf>>.)

5 For a short PowerPoint on my use of audio, prepared as part of a technology and teaching presentation to Hunter College faculty and staff, see [Enhancing Latin 201 with Audio](#). The audio piece was part of a 2009 Faculty Innovations in Teaching with Technology Grant. [Description of Ronnie Ancona's FITT project](#). I am grateful to Hunter College for this award, which gave me the time and financial support to explore new technologies for the teaching of Latin. Of course there are many systems for recording and listening to Latin. I have only mentioned the one that I have had experience using myself.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*. New York: The National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996.

Task Force on Standards for Classical Language Learning. *Standards for Classical Language Learning*. Oxford, OH: American Classical League, 1997. (Available online at <<http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/standards.pdf>>.)

A Fourth-year Teacher's Perspective on *Standards*

With the help of a mentor well-versed in the meaning of each standard, *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* would have been a valuable resource to me through my first years of teaching. I started teaching with little formal education training; *Standards* would have made me aware of the gaps in my preparation and of how to address them. *Standards* would also have helped me to plan more wisely and make better decisions as I worked to develop a curriculum. Because I lacked the experience and knowledge needed to fully understand the significance of the various Standards or to put them into practice, I would have needed outside mentoring or additional explanation.

How Standards Might Have Helped Me as a New Teacher

When I first started teaching, I was deficient in many areas of the Standards. I entered the profession after studying law briefly, and three years after receiving my undergraduate degree in Classics. I was hired in October to start in January as a long-term substitute; I was in the middle of a law school semester, and had very little time to brush up on the language. I was eligible to teach because of New Jersey's Alternate Route to Certification, in which beginning teachers become fully certified while teaching; thus my only prior training in pedagogy was the single foreign language methodologies course I had taken in college, a course which was not designed for Latin teachers. I had studied Latin only in college, and was unaware of how different college and high school Latin classes are. Although I had the support of my college Classics department, I was to be the only Latin teacher in the district, teaching four levels, including AP Latin. Luckily, the teacher whom I replaced was very helpful, had developed an excellent program, and left me with an easily followed curriculum. I connected easily with my students, who were willing to work with me and who were quite bright and motivated. To succeed in a less favorable situation, a beginning teacher would find *Standards* very useful; it certainly would have helped me as well, specifically to understand as a whole the curriculum and teaching methods I had inherited.

For a beginning teacher in my position, with little pedagogical training and with gaps in content knowledge, *Standards* is meant to be “read as a description of a goal to be met within the first two or three years in the classroom” (4). I certainly worked diligently toward that goal, and at some point within my first two or three years I became proficient in the knowledge and skills *Standards* describes. I worked somewhat blindly, however, tackling the topics that seemed most urgent. In the days before I started work, for example, I read Caesar to refresh my language skills—I am unsure why I chose Caesar, as it was not a part of the school's curriculum—and researched the Roman holidays that occur in the second half of the school year. *Standards* and mentoring would have helped me to avoid some of the misguided, time-consuming efforts that I made to prepare myself.

Before I began teaching, I was aware of my weakness in content knowledge, but not of the specific areas that needed work. My lack of language proficiency was my glaring problem (Standard 1.a)—I was proficient in reading and was adept at analyzing texts, but my active language skills, such as composition and spoken proficiency, were weak. At the outset, I had the impression that being able to read and translate proficiently made me a qualified teacher—I was not aware, strange as it seems now, of how much I would need to be able to write in “idiomatic Latin” (Standard 1.a). I was not unable to write in Latin, but a refresher in composition, even through self-study, would have been very useful before entering the classroom. Specifically, since

grammar-translation was a major part of the curriculum, some practice in writing sample sentences would have been extremely helpful; writing engaging, memorable sentences, based on the specific grammar points students are learning and using the vocabulary and grammar they know, is a difficult art. I began to get the hang of writing such sentences as the year progressed, but while my sentences offered practice in the grammar point being studied, they tended not to provide review of known vocabulary and grammar, and they tended to be weak in variety and idiom. With some guidance my sentences could have been much better.

Although my knowledge of Greek and Roman culture (Standard 1.b) was strong in the specific areas that I had studied, I was relatively weak in the broad, general knowledge most useful for a high school teacher. I could tell students interesting facts and stories as they came up, and could even create a lesson or project based on some specific aspect of Greek and Roman culture, such as Roman law or the archeological sites in Rome, about which I was particularly knowledgeable. As with my language skills, I believed that my cultural knowledge was sufficient to make me well-prepared to enter the classroom. I was not, however, prepared to create a unit or design a course theme, or to teach to high school students the fundamentals of Roman history or of mythology. While I had a deep knowledge of certain myths (I had taken a course on Orpheus), I was ignorant of the details of most myths, and much of what I knew about myth was too theoretical to be presented to high school students without cushioning it with examples and activities. With the limited time I had before starting, I would not have been able to prepare myself fully in this content knowledge, but with proper guidance I might have at least learned how to create a unit on Hercules or the Punic Wars, and that would have given me a model.

I had other serious deficiencies of which I only gradually became aware. I was unaware of the variety of Latin teaching methodologies (Standard 2.a), and had not encountered grammatical sentence translation until I was in the classroom, using materials my predecessor had prepared. The concept of the grammar-translation method was not difficult to grasp, but knowing the difference between it and the reading method would have served me well. I learned Latin via the reading method and by grasping grammar and vocabulary inductively, while the methodology I was using to teach was a hybrid. The textbook was the *Cambridge Latin Course*, which was paired with a grammar packet along the lines of *Wheelock's Latin*. Students were accustomed to preparing written translations of the entire text while working through the grammar packet. Because this methodology was new to me, I was more frustrated and dismissive of it than I needed to have been, and spent unnecessary time attempting to compensate for what I believed were its shortcomings.

DEVELOPING A CURRICULUM

For the following school year, I took a permanent position at the district where I currently teach. With a colleague working on the upper levels, I began working to overhaul the district's elementary Latin curriculum. I had no idea how great a challenge creating a Latin curriculum would be, nor of how much my lack of experience would hinder me. Many new Latin teachers are similarly faced with reviving a fading program, which often will involve updating curricula; this is a particular issue for Latin teachers, who are often the only Latin teachers in their districts, if not rare in their geographical areas. *Standards* and wise mentoring would certainly make a major difference in this aspect of being a beginning Latin teacher.

As I attempted to develop a curriculum at my new district, not having an overall vision for how Latin should be taught (Standard 2.c) was a major problem. I also had no knowledge of the curriculum standards for Latin or for foreign language teaching (Standard 2.a). To digest and begin

to apply these to my classrooms would have taken some time; I would have needed some guidance to bridge the gap between the curriculum standards and the creative ideas I was developing on my own. As for planning the goals, methods and strategies of my courses (Standard 2.b), while it was easy to decide that I wanted students in a given course to know certain grammar points and be able to read certain texts, planning a course's methods and strategies was far more difficult. Because I had so little sense of how to create a curriculum, my first efforts were haphazard and largely unsuccessful.

My first attempt at a curriculum was a series of lessons following the textbook, and was more the result of the teaching habits I had developed than of thoughtful, wise planning. When I first began teaching, I had no concept of instructional strategies (Standard 2.b) beyond explaining a point of grammar or reviewing a text with students in class. I soon recognized this problem, and naturally I went about improving my daily lesson plans and creating more engaging activities. This approach was driven by my immediate needs to make sure my students were learning something, to control my classes, and to cast myself in a good light during observations. Although better daily plans and materials certainly improved student learning, I was mistaken to believe that they made up a curriculum in themselves.

Additionally, during my first full year of teaching I recommended that our students switch textbooks, from the *Cambridge Latin Course* to Hans Ørberg's *Lingua Latīna*, starting in February with Latin II (each course in our district lasts a half-year). For a more experienced teacher, this might have been manageable, but for me the transition was quite messy and disruptive to students' learning. I had learned Latin from *Lingua Latīna*, and thought that the transition would be fairly smooth: that students would prefer the new book, and that, with one semester of Latin under their belts, they would progress quickly through the easier material until they reached the level where they would have been without a transition. As a mentor might have predicted, however, the students missed their old textbook and found the new book difficult. Also, teaching with *Lingua Latīna* turned out to be much more challenging than I had anticipated; I had learned from it in college, so the learning process was far different for my students than it had been for me. We slowly made our way through the new book for the rest of the year, so that the students finished Latin II with the proficiency of first-year students. From this experience I finally learned the need for a cohesive instructional plan, and have learned to teach successfully using *Lingua Latīna*, a text which I love. I still regret, however, not knowing better than to switch texts mid-year.

Finally, my ability to be creative in lesson plans and introducing new materials had its limits, and as the school year wore on, my students got used to my style, yet had little sense of where I was taking them. By the end of the year, keeping students' attention was much more of a struggle than it needed to have been. I would have benefitted greatly had I taken the time sooner to implement a program of instruction: for example, TPR lessons and classroom conversations that build on each other, varied assessments that echo each other and build up key skills, and course themes. As I have developed the more constant elements of my courses, I have found it much easier to plan effective lessons, since a substantial part of each lesson furthers an overarching element. My students in turn have responded to the greater sense of continuity and direction. Being creative with my plans and materials is more natural and enjoyable, since the success of my courses depends less on how well each individual lesson performs. Although I needed to work out much of this on my own, some guidance in planning my courses would have spared me and my students unnecessary frustration. Unfortunately, until I began to form my understanding of how to plan a Latin course,

I did not realize how ignorant I had been; *Standards* and a mentor could have helped me develop more quickly in this respect.

MENTORING

In conjunction with a mentor who was thoroughly competent in the Standards, or as the basis for a training program, *Standards* would have been very helpful to me as I began my career. To get the most out of the Standards, a beginning teacher ought to have a mentor capable of translating them for practical classroom use. A mentor would be especially useful in suggesting the types of approaches and activities that would make Standard 2 (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skill) more accessible to the beginner. A beginning teacher typically has a wealth of approaches and activities at his or her disposal, but it can be quite challenging and time-consuming to incorporate them meaningfully and coherently; after all, the new Latin teacher is also seeking to fit his or her own nascent vision for teaching Latin into the mold of the textbook being used. A mentor would be able to help the beginner to tailor specific activities for his or her own classroom. *Standards* emphasizes that “teachers must be able to adapt existing materials . . . to their own preferred approach to their students’ learning needs;” a mentor would help to make that possible for the beginner (13). A mentor’s advice in overarching issues, such as developing a curriculum, would also be invaluable.

The high school where I teach offers a program of in-school mentoring for beginning teachers, as mandated by the state. In a school without an experienced Latin teacher to serve as a mentor, the beginning Latin teacher ought to have two mentors, one for assistance in-school and one for help with Latin teaching issues. The advice of my in-school mentor was quite helpful to me with issues such as classroom management and reaching out to parents; the advice of a mentor specific to Latin would not have overlapped, but would have given me needed support in my particular field.

The mentor might be a member of the Classics department at the college or university from which the teacher graduated, or might be an experienced teacher from another district. A mentoring program offered by state and regional classical associations would be useful in connecting beginners with mentors. If a prospective Latin teacher lined up a mentor before seeking a job, it would be possible to tout this in interviews; likewise, a record of mentoring could be used as evidence of progress to a school administrator.

In lieu of a mentor, an online resource center, developed with the Standards in mind, would have been very useful to me. Besides information and materials relating to the Standards, this could feature a tutorial, such that a beginning teacher would study an element of the Standards every two weeks or so. The beginning teacher would have time to digest and implement the material, and school administrators would have evidence of the teacher’s development. In the absence of such a resource or of a mentor, beginning teachers should absolutely be encouraged to take a course in Latin pedagogy. I took Dr. Richard LaFleur’s methodologies course online through the University of Georgia, but only after two years of teaching; although it was still quite useful to me as a means of reflecting on what I had learned through trial and error, the course would have served me best had I enrolled as a new teacher.

Although I have made clear that I could have used good mentoring, it was largely my own fault that I failed to reach out more, especially since my college Latin professors had made themselves available to me. I was very busy, and did not realize how much effort and frustration I could have prevented had I made more time for mentoring. I tended not to appreciate fully the problems I was facing until after I had resolved them on my own. Some encouragement would have been

useful; school administrators should always see to it that their new Latin teachers take advantage of opportunities to be mentored by an experienced Classics teacher. Given the special challenges of successfully teaching Latin and of developing a curriculum, new Latin teachers and their potential mentors should be sure to reach out to each other, making use of resources such as *Standards*.

Conclusion

Starting a teaching career is not easy, and teaching Latin has its own particular challenges. The *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*, combined with good mentoring, would provide new Latin teachers with the support and guidance they need for their first few years of teaching.

Erik J. Collins

Allentown High School, NJ

Mercer County Community College

Works Cited

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Latin Teacher Training and Certification. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: ACL and APA, 2010. (Available online at <<http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep-2010Stand.pdf>>.)

Cambridge Latin Course. 4th ed. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Ørberg, Hans. *Lingua Latina per se illustrata*. 2 vols. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing/R. Pullins Co., 2005.

Supervising Today's Latin Teacher: Answering a Concern

Quite early in the classic Rodgers and Hammerstein musical, *The Sound of Music*, the abbey nuns commiserate regarding an on-going dilemma: how to solve a problem like Maria. Specifically, how to prepare the novice Maria to become a full member of their Order. Their challenge is not unlike that facing the world language supervisor attempting to mentor a novice Latin instructor. Among the duties of world language supervisors is the provision of services, resources and instructional leadership to all world language teachers within the school division. The needs and challenges of each language are in some ways unique. This document serves to help supervisors evaluate what content is important and what skills are essential to the instruction of Latin in the 21st century. With the recent publication of *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* through the joint efforts of The American Classical League (ACL) and The American Philological Association (APA), world language supervisors now have the information to better meet the needs of both the beginning and experienced Latin teachers they serve.

While *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* is primarily intended for those preparing Latin teachers for employment and the future teachers themselves, the world language supervisor benefits equally through the information provided in this publication. The document clearly outlines “what a Latin teacher should know and be able to do at the beginning of his or her career” (3), defined as two or fewer years of experience. The Standards can also be interpreted as the goals toward which a beginning teacher works during the first two to three years of classroom teaching, the standard probationary period in most school divisions. In the past, countless Latin teachers have been ignored, left to their own devices, or worse yet, compared to their modern language counterparts. District supervisors now have a concrete beginning point from which to view, assist, and evaluate their Latin teachers. They have the basic tools necessary to provide meaningful supervision to their Latin teachers through their use of the *Standards for Classical Language Learning*.

Standard 1: Content Knowledge

WHAT SHOULD A BEGINNING LATIN TEACHER KNOW?

World language supervisors are often asked to assess a teacher's level of knowledge in the content area. Unless the supervisor has studied or taught Latin, the content knowledge which a beginning Latin teacher should demonstrate may be a total mystery. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* addresses this critical factor through Standard 1: Content Knowledge. This Standard notes in general terms basic language requirements, proficiency skills, inclusion of Roman culture, and connections between ancient and modern culture that the beginning Latin teacher should demonstrate. Subsections within this Standard outline specific behaviors with supporting explanations and real world examples.

Standard 1.a addresses the beginning Latin teacher's ability to read and understand commonly taught Latin authors/texts, as well as to pronounce and use oral Latin accurately. For the world language supervisor this spells out the importance of hearing oral Latin in the classroom, whether in the reading of texts or the use of classroom expressions. The Standard also speaks to

the ability of the beginning Latin teacher to write grammatically correct Latin using idioms and word order typical of the language. The world language supervisor will expect to see the teacher deciphering sentence structures, explaining them, and comparing grammatical elements in Latin to English. Knowledge of rhetorical devices and meter also fall under the content knowledge a beginning Latin teacher should incorporate into lessons.

Standard 1.b, in turn, requires the beginning Latin instructor to exhibit knowledge of the political and social history of Rome, geography, and culture. Latin literary culture, encompassing genres, major works and authors along with Greco-Roman myths, constitutes a necessary portion of the beginning Latin teacher's knowledge of the content. World language supervisors will see from this document that a knowledge of Roman material culture plays an important part in the content knowledge that a beginning Latin teacher should possess, as do the practices and perspectives of Roman culture. The teaching of Latin in the 21st century encompasses much more than the study of grammatical forms and the reading of textbook passages.

Standard 2: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skill

HOW SHOULD A BEGINNING LATIN TEACHER TEACH?

The world language supervisor works closely with teachers on improving methods and techniques related to foreign language instruction and acquisition. As such, the supervisor needs to have some idea of the instructional preparation the inexperienced teacher has had. Even though educational courses in teacher preparation programs are relatively similar throughout this nation, there are unique factors associated with the methods courses in specific content areas. In many world language teacher preparation programs both modern language and Latin students are still thrown together, even though their actual classroom practices emphasize different aspects of content. How should the beginning Latin teacher instruct students? Are there major approaches and methods used in Latin classes that differ from those used in the modern language class? Are there assessment tools/opportunities unique to the Latin classroom? Standard 2: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skill in *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* answers these questions not only for the beginning teacher and the teacher trainer, but for the world language supervisor.

As with Standard 1, Standard 2 goes into depth via specifics laid out in subsections. Standard 2.a presents information critical for understanding the beginning Latin teacher's instructional planning. This subsection clearly states the need to align Latin instruction with the existing national standards, *Standards for Classical Language Learning*, and with local and state standards, should they exist. The "five C's" (Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities) outlined in the national standards provide a framework for the beginning Latin teacher's integration of language, literature, and culture into the daily lessons of the class. Standard 2.a also introduces the reader to the three major approaches to teaching Latin and Roman culture most commonly used today: grammar-translation, reading in context, and oral-aural, along with supporting explanations for each. The approach used by a Latin teacher may be dictated in large part by the textbook series. However, the needs of the student population may also indicate the use of different approaches from time to time. What the world language supervisor sees as an approach on one visit could be replaced by another approach on a follow-up visit to the beginning Latin teacher's classroom. It is a practice that promotes maximum learning in the classroom, whether the Latin teacher is experienced or inexperienced.

Standard 2.b emphasizes the skills necessary for putting into practice curriculum standards and approaches to teaching, while utilizing a variety of strategies and evaluation tools to support the instruction. The information given in this standard closely aligns with the beginning skills a supervisor would expect of any world language teacher. Accordingly, this will be the area where the world language supervisors will be most confident in working with the beginning Latin teacher. As with teachers in all other content areas, the beginning Latin teacher brings to the classroom a knowledge of student learning styles. An ability to develop supplementary materials to support the instructional goals and the unique needs of a diversified classroom is expected. The beginning Latin teacher aims for active learning, rather than passive learning. Variety in instructional strategies is the practice. Connections and comparisons, both linguistically and culturally, are integral to the instruction. The beginning Latin teacher develops and uses assessment tools that align with the instruction and content in the course. Assessment options, unique to Latin at both the national and international levels, are outlined in Standard 2.b. Knowledge of these tools will definitely benefit the world language supervisor.

Standard 2.c focuses on the beginning Latin teacher's journey in developing an understanding of what it means to teach and to learn. Again, the content covered here is similar to that of most beginning teachers. Teachers entering the field understand that age, emotional maturity, diversity, ability, and culture/socio-economic background are all factors to address when planning lessons and setting goals for classes. So too, the beginning teacher knows that motivating students, establishing workable class routines, and addressing classroom management are requirements for every lesson planned.

At the end of the explanations on Standard 2 there is a special note concerning technology. The beginning Latin teacher is expected to incorporate technology into lessons, to provide students with information about technological support beyond the classroom, and to use technology in record keeping and the teacher's own lifelong learning endeavors. The beginning Latin teacher will not face any shortage of Internet materials to support instruction. The world language supervisor role will be to provide support, financial and/or technological, for the teacher in learning and using that technology should that be necessary.

The supporting explanations under Standard 2 give examples that will benefit the world language specialist, especially if called on to give feedback to a beginning Latin teacher on ways to approach planning a class, differentiating instruction, or assessing student progress.

Standard 3: Professional Development

WHAT PROFESSIONAL GROWTH EXPERIENCES ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE BEGINNING LATIN TEACHER?

World language supervisors and Mother Superior in "The Sound of Music" have much in common when working with beginning Latin teachers in their school districts. Both are there to offer guidance and support the novice. This is especially true when trying to direct the beginning teacher toward professional growth experiences. When the world language supervisor has not studied the same language as the beginning teacher, the supervisor may need additional information and resources before being able to help the new teacher. In *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* many difficulties which a world language supervisor might have experienced in the past

when working with the beginning Latin teacher may be eliminated. The supporting explanations under Standard 3 (no subsections with this standard) offer concrete examples that will assist the supervisor in guiding the beginning Latin teacher toward life-long goals in the content area. There is also information on study opportunities and professional organizations for the Latin teacher designed to extend their content knowledge, teaching skills, and build their Latin programs. Standard 3 offers suggestions on marketing the Latin program and the Latin teacher to the community, thus directly relaying the benefits of studying Latin to the community. While broad in scope this Standard is careful to note that beginning Latin teachers should start out with few outside professional activities and gradually add more as opportunities for professional growth and their experience in the field increases.

Cathy P. Daugherty

Adjunct Instructor, Classics, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, VA

Adjunct Instructor, Education, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, VA

Retired Latin Teacher and former World Language Specialist, Hanover County, VA

Works Cited

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Latin Teacher Training and Certification. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: ACL and APA, 2010. (Available online at <<http://www.aclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep-2010Stand.pdf>>.)

Hammerstein, Oscar II, lyr. "Maria." *The Sound of Music*. Dir. Robert Wise. Based on stage musical by Richard Rogers and Oscar Hammerstein II. 20th Century Fox, 1965.

Task Force on Standards for Classical Language Learning. *Standards for Classical Language Learning*. Oxford, OH: American Classical League, 1997. (Available online at <<http://www.aclassics.org/pdf/standards.pdf>>.)

Appendix: Sample Indicators of Proficiency

World language supervisors will find very useful the appendix where sample indicators of proficiency for each of the three standards addressed in *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* are given. Because most world language supervisors are required to observe the beginning teachers in their districts, either formally or informally, this section will prove beneficial in developing the evaluation tools used for these visits. (Attached to this article is a sample walkthrough observation form to accommodate world language supervisors as they observe beginning Latin teachers for evidence of Standard 1: Content Knowledge.)

Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation addresses the challenges that beginning Latin teachers and those either training or supervising them face. Through the three standards in this document all interested parties can come to a greater understanding of what the beginning Latin teacher should teach, how it should be taught, and how best to support these teachers as they move from entry level teaching to an experienced level. These Standards can help the world language

supervisor develop realistic expectations and support for the beginning Latin teacher – an answer to a concern many world language supervisors face.

WALKTHROUGH OBSERVATION/Latin		Teacher:	
School District:		School:	Date:
Observer:		Subject/Grade:	Time:
CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Linguistic Knowledge and Proficiency			
Item		OBSERVATIONS	Observed
<i>Evidence of knowledge of Latin</i>			
1	A. Reads and understands authentic or adopted Latin texts used with lesson		
2	B. Understands vocabulary used in lesson		
3	C. Literary genre/author used in lesson:		
	1) prose/ _____ 2) poetry _____		
	3) textbook generated Latin		
<i>Oral Latin Usage</i>			
4	A. Passages read aloud by teacher/students		
5	B. Use of simple greetings/classroom commands in target language		
<i>Written Latin used in lesson</i>			
6	A. Use of grammatically correct Latin		
7	B. Evidence of Latin word order used in written examples		
8	C. Evidence of Latin idiomatic expressions used in written examples		
<i>Evidence of knowledge of Latin structures</i>			
9	A. Uses standard grammatical terms		
10	B. Analyzes Latin words into stems and affixes		
11	C. Compares and contrasts Latin grammatical structures with those in English		
12	D. Demonstrates etymological connections between Latin and English words		
13	E. Notes use/meaning of rhetorical structures within Latin texts		
CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Cultural Knowledge and Awareness			
<i>Evidence of knowledge of Latin history, literature, myth</i>			
14	A. Demonstrates knowledge of history associated with Roman literature		
15	B. Familiar with literary genres and authors associated with Latin literature		
16	C. Familiar with major Greco-Roman myths		
<i>Evidence of knowledge of Roman material culture</i>			
17	A. Demonstrates knowledge of Roman material culture in lesson		
18	B. Uses realia to support lesson		
<i>Demonstrates knowledge of Roman cultural practices</i>			
19	A. Familiar with Roman private life		
20	B. Familiar with Roman public life, government, legal procedures		
<i>Demonstrates knowledge of Roman cultural perspectives</i>			
21	A. Evidence of understanding of Roman values via cultural products/practices		
22	B. Evidence of understanding of Roman point of view via cultural products/practices		

Perspectives on *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation: The Standards as Motivators*

After completing a four year undergraduate Latin education program, including a full semester of student teaching, and most of my first year of teaching, I had hoped that I would feel fully prepared for my second year of teaching. But I have come to realize that preparation is a constant in the teaching profession. The object is not to reach a state of full preparation but rather to direct and focus one's preparation towards ever greater proficiency in both Latin and teaching. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* provides such direction and such focus. The standards serve as goal posts, *metae*, to direct those interested in becoming Latin teachers towards necessary resources and information and to motivate those already teaching to continue on past the goals they may have already achieved.

Until pondering *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* I believed, erroneously, that before beginning to teach I would at some point feel ready—proficient in a fixed canon of names, philosophies, dates, and concepts. I attended St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota where I earned a BA in Latin and received a K-12 Minnesota Teaching License. I felt I should know everything necessary about Latin and educational theory. I did not. I completed a 12 week student teaching program with Ellen Sassenburg in Rochester, Minnesota. I felt I should be fully prepared for time within the classroom. I was not. I was hired for a Latin teaching position in Norfolk, Virginia. I felt I was ready, felt I had been educated and prepared and that was all I needed. I know better now.

So much in this, my first year of teaching, has been new to me, from the block schedule and itinerant teaching to the middle school mindset and the attitude towards education in my school district. This year I taught three sections of Latin I at one middle school and then one section of Latin II, one section of Latin I, and one section of Exploratory Latin at a second middle school, alternating between schools every day. My students in these two schools believe that information costs only their time and not their attention, their respect, or their effort. Even though I learned a great deal from college about educational theory, psychology, and philosophy, and even though I learned practices and procedures while student teaching, the schedules, abilities, attitudes, and expectations of my students in this first year of teaching have all been novel to me.

My initial reading of *Standards* was as a set of requirements that must be checked off a list by beginning teachers preparing for a teaching position, but I now see them as motivators. Rather than providing an exhaustive list of concepts, words, authors, images, and rules as I had expected, *Standards* sets out *metae* to be reached and surpassed. The list of requirements I had hoped *Standards* would provide would not have proven enough to get through this first year of teaching. It has only been through taking my previous knowledge and focusing it on further improvement in the areas of classroom management and student motivation that I have been able to successfully reach and teach my students. The function of *Standards* is to provide a structured framework that promotes the ability to focus on further improvement rather than to constrain teachers to a fixed list of concepts. The “Basics” section on page 3 of *Standards* demonstrates the need for goalposts rather than lists and lists. It is our own responsibility, as much as it pains me to say so, to determine the lists that we need to be able to check off, not *Standards*' responsibility. It is the place of *Standards*

to provide an understandable road map that will facilitate individual learning and encourage us as the learners by providing examples of what is standard knowledge (4).

I would, from here on out, like to make more specific comments on *Standards* and provide suggestions as to how it might be expanded.

Pedagogy: Technology

Standards does well to mention the importance of technology but fails to point out the financial and legal issues that constrain the use of technology in the classroom. Technology was a limited component of the education program of my college. Although I was lucky to have a full semester-long class devoted to the use of technology in the classroom, the focus was strictly on the development, publishing, and application of webquests—activities in which students are given a situation and various tasks that require them to travel from one website to another to gather information and resolve/complete the given situation or task. A nice example of a Latin webquest can be seen at this url: <http://www.vroma.org/~jhaughto/romanconsulquest.htm>

I have found these useful with my 6th grade Latin exploratory students for exploring the Roman villa and for a Roman “ghost” hunt before Halloween, but webquests are only a single application of an ever expanding list of digital and web-based media that teachers can and ought to draw from. Google Earth—<http://earth.google.com/>—allows students to understand the distance between their own communities and the Roman/Mediterranean world, and now with Google’s 3D images of such buildings as the Pantheon and Colosseum students can take a virtual stroll through a city several thousands of miles away. Students can also see that modern “Romans” drive cars not *carri*—something that my students were absolutely amazed to see, thinking that Italians still wore togas and spent their days between baths, circuses, and trips to mount Olympus.

Unfortunately, the obstacles to using technology are not mentioned in *Standards*. To begin with, Smartboards, LCD projectors, or well-placed internet connections do not fit into tight school budgets. Second, social networking sites, wikis, blogs, and media-sharing sites such as YouTube are often blocked and prohibited because of the possibility of legal liabilities and their resulting expenses. Third, there is no mention of how and when on-line resources such as pictures, maps, and activities can be used fairly and appropriately under copyright law.

In my district, for example, teachers are not allowed to put wikis on their school-run and school-monitored websites. I was told “not to touch Facebook with a ten-foot pole” when I asked the technology specialist if I could have my students change their Facebook pages into Latin, print them out, and share the Latin pages with each other. The issue with this exercise was not that the students could post something inappropriate or harmful on another student’s wall (an open forum for people to write thoughts and comments or provide links to other content) as I expected. Rather, the issue was that students might implicate or incriminate themselves in illegal or inappropriate activities.

Websites like YouTube, Schola, the iTunes store, and Latinum are blocked on our school servers because of the possibility of objectionable material being seen. In an education class in college I prepared and taught a practice lesson on Pompeian graffiti which began with students watching the clip from Monty Python’s *Life of Brian* in which a Roman guard corrects a Jewish rebel on the Latin grammar of his political graffiti. The lesson was both fun to create and fun to teach, but that lesson would have been impossible in my school today because The Monty Python clip was taken from Youtube. In short, beginning teachers should be aware of their school districts’

policies to avoid potential risk of harming a student through exposing them to harmful content on the web, to avoid any form of negligence that might result from web access by students, and to avoid any financial penalties that might be incurred.¹

Professional Development: Outreach

I appreciate the inclusion of community outreach in *Standards*. In an age of constricted budgets and national recession, more and more Latin programs are threatened. As a beginning Latin teacher I must be aware that my position as a Latin teacher is dependent on the image of the Latin program as seen by students, parents, and administrators. I am particularly fortunate this year to have been able to take my students to see the two movies *Percy Jackson and the Olympians: The Lightning Thief* and *Clash of the Titans*. While the accuracy and educational merit of these films continue to be debated, they have increased student interest in the subjects of mythology and history. Interest in any aspect of the subject increases the motivation to learn all aspects of the subject and thus is all good in my book. I am pleased that extra-curricular and community events are given such importance in *Standards*. By encouraging my students to attend films, festivals, and events that connect with Latin and the ancient world, I am fulfilling a difficult aspect of the teaching profession: community outreach.

Professional Development: Opportunities beyond the classroom

The most important and absolutely best decision that I have made all year has been to join the LatinTeach discussion list (www.latinteach.com), an invaluable resource. Unfortunately this list is only available for current Latin teachers, not for those working towards becoming a teacher. The energy, depth, and breadth of discussions are wonderful. I consider many of the participants, such as Dr. Hoyos, Dr. Traupman, and Dr. LaFleur, to be leaders in the field of classical pedagogy. I have been able to resolve difficult situations in my classroom through consulting LatinTeach. I have incorporated several archaeological posts into my lessons. I have also developed lesson plans and activity ideas from the posts on LatinTeach, and I have used the discussion group to stretch my own knowledge of Latin.

Exploring a resource such as LatinTeach or the social network eClassics (<http://eclassics.ning.com/>) opens doors to other Latin teachers, ideas, and websites. An exploration of such resources should begin early in one's preparation to become a teacher and should not only become possible when one is a hired teacher. Resources such as LatinTeach and eClassics are themselves like motivational goal posts that, once passed and utilized, lead to yet more resources.

Content Knowledge: Mythology

I would propose the addition of another bullet point under content knowledge: mythology. Beginning teachers should know Greek and Roman mythology, astronomy, and cosmology. Greco-Roman myth is mentioned only briefly on page 10 in the explanation of the literary cultural

¹ For more information on the legal aspects of social networking in a school community, explore the information provided on the following site: <http://blog.connected.info/2009/09/18/legal-aspects-of-social-networking-in-a-school-community-part-2/>.

products section. Detailed knowledge of mythology should not simply be a peripheral attribute but an important part of Standard 1.b Cultural Knowledge and Awareness for all beginning Latin teachers.

I have found that middle schoolers are fascinated by mythology and several of my students are able to retain facts of various myths more ably than I. When I was taking high school Latin, mythology was a large component, but I would frequently mix up and confuse stories with others and so paid little attention to mythology throughout college. None of my history or Latin courses in college, besides a class on the *Aeneid*, dealt with mythology, and so when I began teaching and students were asking me questions about what Athena and Arachne created in their weaving contests or what the names of the Hecatonchires were, I had a very steep learning curve to overcome to be able to answer them.

Though *Standards* allow for two to three years of actual teaching for teachers to work towards reaching the standards I feel that Latin teachers must have a detailed knowledge of Greco-Roman myth before they begin teaching. Myths can be used to connect to students and to create additional resources that motivate and excite the students, and can be incorporated into active learning situations such as skits or TPRS (Total Physical Response Storytelling).² Also as students disseminate the stories told in class, more and more students become interested in Latin. The sooner students are drawn into Latin and Roman culture and are motivated to learn, the easier it is to teach them and the stronger the Latin program will look to the administration.

Content Knowledge: Cultural Perspectives

Following closely on the heels of mythology in content knowledge comes knowledge of cultural perspectives. Understanding the cultural perspectives of the Greeks and Romans is absolutely essential. Differences in customs and social mores between the ancient and modern world are often uncomfortable to discuss because they are such politically and socially charged issues in today's society. *Standards* does well to address the issue of perspectives and how they might differ between then and now, there and here.

For example, the story of Narcissus and Echo demands a grasp of ancient social practices and, further, a serious consideration of how to explain those practices to a modern, juvenile audience. Unfortunately when the issue of homosexuality was broached in my middle school classroom, I had not considered this cultural aspect. I was unprepared to address the issue with my students. I had not read enough about the ancient perspectives on homosexuality and did not know exactly what the official policy was at my school for discussing homosexuality in class. Had I had *Standards* I might have thought to consider the inevitable discussion I would have to have with my students on this issue. I have since delved into the issue and addressed it competently with my students. Both this experience and *Standards* have brought to my attention the importance of being well versed in cultural perspectives both then and now, especially when it comes to taboo and politically charged subjects.

Content Knowledge: Proficiency in language skills

English is a hard language. I discovered just how little I knew about the English language during student teaching when trying to explain Latin grammar that made perfect sense in Latin

2 See Blaine Ray's website for more on TPRS: <http://www.blaineraytprs.com/pages.php?page=explanationpage>.

but none in English. When teaching relative pronouns, for example, I had to take a crash course in subordinate and coordinate clauses in English.

I am glad that Standard 1.a addresses the necessity of knowing how to explain Latin in English, yet it is very hard to measure whether one is or is not competent in explaining Latin in English. I would recommend that this integral aspect of teaching be addressed in greater depth in the Standard with a more specific example than simply comparing participles in the two languages (9). Also, it would be very helpful to mention, either in *Standards* themselves or in the Sample Indicators, resources that could be used such as Norma Goldman's *English Grammar for Students of Latin* or Anna Andresian's *Looking at Latin* in addition to the more serious resources such as Allen and Greenough. An expanded Sample Indicator should be added for this aspect of the first standard.

Conclusion

I am pleased with *Standards* and believe it will be very helpful for all those involved in Latin teacher preparation. The great caveat of any standards document is that the potential teacher reading the standards must take responsibility for his or her ability to meet the standards. I was myself not prepared to do so throughout my years in college and my time student teaching. I, like my own students today, expected a list of all the things I had to do to be ready. I was of the mindset that standards documents laid out a fixed level of proficiency and meeting those levels would make anyone a competent teacher. It is only now towards the end of my first year of teaching that I see and appreciate *Standards* as motivational markers on a longer journey of learning. We, as Latin teachers, must apply ourselves to first reaching, then surpassing, then expanding upon these three *Standards*. Just as charioteers racing in the circus turn around the *metae*, *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* ought to be seen as describing goal posts that gauge one's abilities and awareness and then motivate Latin teachers to learn more, delve deeper, and expand the learning and teaching process ever further.

Benjamin Cory Holec

Rosemont/Norview Middle Schools
Norfolk, VA

Works Cited

Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges. Ed. J. B. Greenough, G. L. Kittredge, A. A. Howard, B. L. D'Ooge. Boston: Ginn, 1903.

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Teacher Training and Standards. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: ACL and APA, 2010. (Available online at <http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep2010Stand.pdf>.)

Andresian, Anna. *Looking at Latin: A Grammar for Pre-College*. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Car-ducci, 2006.

Clash of the Titans. Dir. Louis Leterrier. Legendary Pictures and The Zanuck Company, 2010.

eClassics. Ed. Andrew Reinhard. May 2007. 23 May 2010, <<http://eclassics.ning.com/>>.

Facebook. <<http://www.facebook.com>>.

Goldman, Norma. *English Grammar for Students of Latin*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: Olivia and Hill Press, 2004.

Google Earth. <<http://earth.google.com>>.

Haughton, Jo Ann. *Becoming a Consul in the Roman Republic*. 5 Aug 2001. Web. 16 June 2010. <<http://www.vroma.org/~jhaughto/romanconsulquest.htm>>.

iTunes. <<http://www.apple.com/itunes>>.

LatinTeach List. Sharon Kazmierski, mod. Email discussion list. <<http://nxport.com/mailman/list-info/latinteach>>.

“Legal aspects of social networking in a school community.” Weblog entry. ConnectEd.info. 18 Sept 2009. Web. 18 June 2010. <<http://blog.connected.info/2009/09/18/legal-aspects-of-social-networking-in-a-school-community-part-2/>>.

Millner, Evan. *Latinum*. May 2007. 26 Feb. 2009, <<http://latinum.mypodcast.com/>>.

Monty Python’s *Life of Brian*. Dir. Terry Jones. HandMade Films, 1979.

Percy Jackson and the Olympians: The Lightning Thief. Dir. Chris Columbus. 1492 Pictures and Imprint Entertainment, 2010.

Ray, Blaine. *Blaine Ray Workshops: TPR Storytelling*. 2006. Web. 2 July 2010. <<http://www.blain-raytprs.com/pages.php?page=explanationpage>>.

Schola. Ed. Evan Millner. Trans. John Doublier. 26 Feb. 2009, <<http://schola.ning.com/>>.

YouTube. <<http://www.youtube.com>>.

On First Looking Into *Standards*: Reaction and Opinion

It is a distinct pleasure to witness the birth of *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*, a document that the field has long needed. As one who has worked for years with teachers and in the field of teacher training, I have often, when making a case for, or against, a rule or requirement that was proposed for Latin teacher certification, felt the need for a document to cite which says, “The best minds in our field have met and have decided that this is how we should train our teachers.” We all know that Latin teachers in training sometimes need to do their practicum with a Spanish teacher or that the lack of a specific methodology course in Latin on a given campus will require that candidates for Latin licensure are enrolled in the French methods course. The presence now of *Standards* should help make such situations easier by offering not only those in the field but those outside of it concrete guidelines by which to train the Latin teachers of the future.

It is also gratifying to see that the partnership between the ACL and the APA continues to expand, a living acknowledgement of the fact that, not unlike Simba in *The Lion King*, who was part of the “Circle of Life,” all of us who love the Classics are part of the “Circle of Latin.” What affects one affects us all. Such continued cooperation bodes well for the future of our field.

It is not surprising that this is an excellent document, for the members of the panel were judiciously chosen to represent a wide spectrum of experience and expertise. I will begin by pointing to some of the document’s most impressive strengths and will move on to a few places in which the document or its future iterations might seek to expand or improve. The fact that *Standards* will be updated in response to developments in education and licensure (and, one presumes the pressures that will emanate from governmental agencies bent on educational reform) is exciting, for it is vital that such documents remain relevant (5).

The most impressive traits of the document are its combination of balance and a practical sense of what happens in today’s classrooms. Let us discuss balance first, referring mostly to a balance of approaches. Most teachers have at some time or another engaged in a theoretical discussion with someone who refuses to consider any change in his or her methodology to meet the expectations of the other member of the conversation. About the only thing the two parties have in common is the clear belief that “It works for me; why should I change?” *Standards* is at pains to shun promoting one pedagogical approach over another. It does not, for example, insist that oral Latin is a *sine qua non* in a competent classroom. Neither does it give the impression that a competent Latin teacher can either effectively ignore the teaching of culture or spend more time on “the fun stuff” than on grammar and vocabulary. Such an emphasis on defining a competent Latin teacher as a well rounded entity will surely help licensing agencies—be they national, state, local or programmatic—create just such a balance as they write their own requirements.

Another sort of balance is found in the document when it has the opportunity to promote one aspect of Latin teaching at the expense of another, but refuses to do so. For example, the beginning Latin teacher should be able to “recognize how alliteration and meter enhance literal meaning” in a passage of the *Aeneid*. But the document does not declare that every Latin student must be taught every formal name of every rhetorical trope known to antiquity. Likewise, when it comes to grammar, the document does not come down in favor of requiring a beginning Latin teacher to be able to teach and provide the taxonomy for all the uses of the dative case.

The document is also a profoundly realistic sense of the day to day realities of the Latin classroom throughout the country. Such insight throughout the document speaks to the practical experience that can only be acquired by years of teaching and committee work. Indeed, it would be interesting to know the combined “teaching years” of the panel’s members. Such touches are everywhere. It is, after all, a fact that Latin teachers will be expected to know their state and local curricular standards and will be expected as well to write reports and create lesson plans that prove they are implementing them (Standard 2.a). Any teacher preparation program that ignores this reality sends its graduates forth into a world for which they are ill equipped. Equally realistic is the expectation that a beginning Latin teacher should “be able to read an oration of Cicero with appropriate lexical help” (8). As states move increasingly to standardized tests for certification, it is well for them to have this language before them. The earlier iterations of the Massachusetts version of such a test routinely included passages that required, but did not offer, lexical help and fully competent future teachers began their career with the unfamiliar taste of defeat in their mouths. It is simply a fact of life that much of the literature from Roman antiquity which has come down to us is very difficult to read and is not equivalent to reading a newspaper in German or a short story in Italian set in contemporary times.

The panel clearly also understands that most beginning teachers will not get far beyond using oral Latin for basic commands (8), should not be expected to teach their students to exhibit all the same skills at writing or speaking the target language as do teachers of modern foreign languages (15-16), and will increasingly face socially and culturally diverse student populations over the course of their careers (13, 16-17). Finally, the document reflects a clear understanding that today’s Latin teacher should expect multiple preparations and mixed ability classrooms as a fact of life (14) while at the same time being expected to create and maintain interest in Latin within the school and the local community (p.18-19). Such facts of life are well known to most Latin teachers in the field, but little understood by those who set licensure rules and regulations. Again, having the ability to cite the official position of the field’s two strongest organizations will provide important arguing points to those in the field who deal with licensure.

Despite the fact that it is aimed at teachers in training or those within the first two years of their teaching, *Standards* is also to be commended for insisting that becoming a competent teacher is not the same as maintaining that competence. As the document states, “It has been many years since Latin was a required subject at the center of liberal education” (19), and the fate of Latin’s continued existence in our schools demands that our teachers maintain their skills and become “life-long learners of Latin” and stay current with pedagogical trends (6, 19) and have a life-long commitment to staying relevant, viable, and attractive to potential students. Part of this attraction, of course, increasingly requires that teachers stay abreast of technological advances (17). Many of us who began with mimeograph machines and marveled at the dawn of photocopiers have now morphed into creatures who use wikis and blogs to teach Latin. What will our teachers of four decades hence be expected to do? *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* thus shows itself to be an admirable combination of theory and knowledge guided by experience. It should serve well as a guide both to those who train teachers and those who would hope to be so trained. Yet there are a few areas in which some improvement or amplification might be welcome. Some, no doubt, are the result of my own prejudices, but some others may be more crucial. I begin by stating that in no way do the following statements detract from the groundbreaking work of *Standards*. These comments are only suggestions of possible paths for future iterations of the document.

My first comment arises from years of working with such institutions as NCATE (The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) and state boards of elementary and secondary education. Such organizations have a tendency to think at the bullet point level. Thus, when Standard 1.a states that “Beginning Latin teachers are familiar with commonly taught Latin authors and texts,” this reader imagines organizations seizing upon the statement in its simpler form and ignoring the nuanced explanation (“Supporting Explanation”) that follows. The explanation makes it clear that teachers need to be able to *teach* such authors effectively, but the bullet point does not. This author therefore finds this bullet point too vague and open to misinterpretation with a potential for lessening the competency of future teachers. *Standards* puts appropriate weight on a teacher’s ability to “pronounce Latin accurately and with expression and read poetry with attention to meter” (Standard 1.a). It is therefore a bit regrettable that the document has chosen not to include long marks in its Latin, for long marks lie at the heart of helping a reader pronounce the language properly. The inclusion of a statement to the effect that a beginning teacher should be aware of the various schools of pronunciation in the field might also be of use. In a few places the document either uses jargon that is not explained or lapses into a vagueness that leaves the reader asking for more guidance. Standard 2.b, for example, deals in such vagueness when it states that beginning teachers “can plan the goals, methods, and pacing of their courses.” (11). This is far too vague and open to misinterpretation, as it seems to allow any teacher to justify any pace at which s/he chooses to progress. The Supporting Explanation does little to suggest an appropriate pace for a beginning teacher or for one judging such a teacher. What is a good pace for teaching *Ecce Romani* if the teacher is on the quarter system as opposed to the trimester system? What pace is relevant for middle-school students in *The Cambridge Latin Course* and what is suited for high school students? In short, the need to plan is evident and cannot be impeached. But a beginning teacher needs some guidance as to what is an appropriate pace. The document might thus benefit from some rephrasing to suggest that a beginning teacher is aware of the pace at which other teachers go through a given textbook and is capable of adapting this norm to her or his own students and situation. For this to be of value, of course, the field needs some standard pacing for the more commonly used textbooks. Beginning teachers, especially those who are the only teacher in a school or district, could benefit greatly from such guidance. The suggested curricula and syllabi collected by Sally Davis (67-73) could serve as a model for such guidance. In fact, it would be beneficial for this entire work and its predecessor, *The Classics in American Schools*, to be digitized and put on a resource page for teachers jointly kept by the ACL and APA. More on this shortly.

In the same standard we are told that “Beginning Latin Teachers (sic) understand and can use a variety of assessments to monitor and report student progress.” After a rather long digression in the Supporting Explanation (this section may well benefit from being rearranged to respond to the sub standards one by one rather than *en masse*) we are told that some assessment such as “exit tickets” and “large performance tasks” should be considered. Such terms smack of esoteric knowledge and need to be defined for those unfamiliar with them.

To move on, this reader found the “Note on Technology” both welcome and too short. It is imperative that future versions of this document have a way to point beginning teachers and those who train them to the latest developments in the field. Latin teachers are famous for the facility and cleverness they bring to bear in their utilization of what is sometimes called “technology.” They only need to be pointed in the right direction, shown a possibility upon which they can build. The pay site www.quia.com where one can create myriad on-line exercises or the existence of www.pbworks.com, where one can create, for free, a translation based wiki, need to be before the eyes

of those training teachers so that they will integrate such tools into their curricula. If one remembers that many of those doing the training of new teachers are at least one generation behind in their knowledge of things technological, then the argument becomes clearer. What I am suggesting is that this section be beefed up a bit in the actual document and that those behind the document become active in a movement to create a long overdue web page, jointly run by the APA and ACL, that can provide up to date links and brief descriptions of what is “out there” and how it can help. For an admittedly obsolete model of what this page might be, one can do worse than look at “New Computer and Technological Resources for Latin Language Instruction,” an electronic version of a panel presented by Barbara McManus in 2002 (<http://www.vroma.org/~bmcmanus/marylandtech2.html>).¹ Note that the APA web page still provides a link also to Maria Pantelia’s “Electronic Resources for Classicists: The Second Generation,” (<http://www.tlg.uci.edu/index/resources.html>) but this site too is in need of updating.

Such sites require constant vigilance to stay relevant and most individuals cannot devote a lifetime to the maintenance of such a page. Such a centralized resource needs to have the input of many organizations, needs to be updated frequently, and its existence must be widely publicized. One of the many joint committees of ACL and APA (e.g. National Committee for Latin and Greek or the ACL/APA Joint Committee On Classics In American Education) should be given the charge of creating and maintaining such a valuable resource. The field needs one reliable place to serve as a gateway site to the myriad treasures (blogs, pod casts, wikis, chat rooms, sites created by publishers to accompany major textbooks, and more) that can help a Latin teacher become more effective. Even though some networks on technology and the Classics such as eClassics (www.eclassics.ning.com) and Classroom 2.0 (www.classroom20.com), focusing on Web 2.0 applications, exist and have healthy memberships, this writer was unaware of them and is grateful to a reader of this paper for pointing them out. It is hoped that *Standards* will somehow spur a joint commitment into creating and maintaining a common resource which will make such lack of knowledge rarer in the future.

The Appendix, which provides sample indicators of proficiency, mixes together assessment vehicles for prospective teachers alongside those for teachers early in their career. Performance on oral exams or written papers may be useful for evaluating prospective teachers, but is almost non-existent for in-service teachers. This portion of the document would be more effective if the indicators were grouped according to the young teacher’s stage of development.

Finally, I would end by pointing out a certainly unintentional, but somewhat disturbing tendency for *Standards* to foster monolithic thinking. This is almost surely the result of the balance the document strives for and which I mentioned above, but it should be addressed. In sum, the document’s wording often fails to stress that the competent teacher uses several teaching methods in the space of a single class, week, semester and year. Consider the following statement:

Students bring different skills, abilities, and prior knowledge to the Latin classroom, and teachers must be able to adapt existing materials and mandated textbooks to match their preferred approach to their students’ learning needs. For example, a beginning teacher in an oral-aural classroom who discovers that many students in her class have particularly strong analytical skills may incorporate elements of the grammar-translation approach to appeal to these

1 Originally presented at the Pedagogical Workshop at the University of Maryland, 16 March 2002.

students' sense of order and structure. Another beginning teacher who discovers that most of his students are voracious first-language readers may choose to emphasize reading in context. For students with experience and comfort with an oral-aural approach, the beginning teacher may choose to emphasize oral-aural work even in a grammar-translation setting. (13)

This is fairly monolithic in that it implies that the teacher tests the waters, establishes the majority learning style of the class, and teaches in that way. It is, of course, not this way in reality. We utilize all sorts of methodologies in the span of a single class, attempting to reach as many diverse learning styles as we can. Compare this tendency toward monolithic thinking with the following statement:

Latin teachers should be able to articulate their approach to teaching and learning, and to explain how and why their ideas differ from those of others. They acknowledge the validity of approaches other than their own and can explain why they prefer the approach that they have chosen. (15)

I, for one, could not disagree more. Far too many old fashioned, dull, mulishly unchanging teachers cling to their outdated ways and yellowed notes with the simple justification that, as stated above, "it works for me," too rarely asking if it works for all their students. A broader approach is needed. A wider scope of vision should be required of all teachers, be they beginners or those coasting toward retirement. It is not the ability to explain one's monolithic approach that should be required but rather it should be that a teacher needs to be able to justify why s/he does not use any oral Latin at all or refuses to provide the students with grammatical charts or connected readings. A truly competent teacher is aware of all available teaching modes, is able to judge their efficacy for the students of a given era, and should then be ready to adapt such methods to his or her current teaching style which is, as *Standards* elsewhere seems to acknowledge, a fluid and constantly evolving entity.

None of this is to denigrate the great work and serious utility the current version of *Standards* possesses, but we must remember that even the United States Constitution has had twenty seven amendments. It is the role of future joint panels of the APA and ACL to attend to such matters. The ground rules for preserving Latin in our curricula change constantly and documents such as these will make the battle all the more possible as long as they continue to evolve with the times.

Kenneth F. Kitchell, Jr

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Works Cited

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Latin Teacher Training and Certification. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: ACL and APA, 2010. (Available online at <<http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep-2010Stand.pdf>>.).

Burns, Mary Ann and Joseph F O'Connor. *The Classics in American Schools. Teaching the Ancient World*. American Philological Pamphlets No. 8. Philadelphia: American Philological Association, 1987.

Classroom 2.0. Ed. Steve Hargadon. March 24, 2007. Web. 23 May 2010, <<http://www.classroom20.com/>>.

Davis, Sally. *Latin in American Schools. Teaching the Ancient World*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

eClassics. Ed. Andrew Reinhard. May 2007. Web. 23 May 2010, <<http://eclassics.ning.com/>>.

McManus, Barbara F. "New Computer and Technological Resources for Latin Language Instruction." *VRoma*. Ed. Barbara F. McManus and Suzanne Bonefas. 16 March 2002. Web. 23 May 2010, <<http://www.vroma.org/~bmcmanus/marylandtech2.html>>

Pantelia, Maria C. "Electronic Resources for Classicists: The Second Generation." *The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Ed. Maria C. Pantelia. 21 Jan. 2010. Web. 23 May 2010, <<http://www.tlg.uci.edu/index/resources.html>>.

PBWiki, Inc. *PBWorks*. 2005. Web. 23 May 2010, <<http://pbworks.com/>>.

Quia Corporation. *Quia Web*. 1998. Web. 23 May 2010, <<http://www.quia.com/web>>.

Preparing Latin Teachers for Second Language Acquisition

The newly published *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* includes several commendable components. I remain hopeful for the future of what this document could become for the preparation of Latin teachers, but this document in its current “final” form is not finished if it wishes to be helpful to the entire Latin teaching community. I suggest in this response that a revision of the document basing the Standards on Second Language Acquisition research (hereafter, SLA) will clarify for Latin teachers the variety of resources they have at their disposal as well as aid Latin teacher preparation programs in developing their objectives. *Standards* does, to its credit, urge that new Latin teachers be well versed in SLA research. Taking the added step to ground the language and directions of the document in that research would make it an extremely valuable tool for programs and teachers alike.

SLA research focuses primarily on what is happening within the student who is gaining ability in a second language, rather than on what the teacher does. The body of SLA research can help the Latin teacher attain a greater understanding of the various approaches that he or she may use and how that may impact the Latin student as a second-language learner. For example, SLA research indicates that there is a pattern to the acquisition of a second language around the use of pronouns in European languages. For a while, the learner may use the same pronoun for all persons simply as a process of acquiring the language (Ellis 1994, 96ff). Latin teachers almost universally notice how students, despite having drilled and reviewed verb endings and pronouns, continue to use the third person singular form of the verb even when the subject is “ego.” A teacher attuned to the findings of SLA will recognize this apparent error as a stage of learning and not as a hopeless case of student inability to learn.

On a larger scale, SLA research defines two aspects of progress in a second language that, while working together in the process, are not identical (Krashen 10). “Language acquisition” is the largely unconscious process that happens within students as they make progress in the language. Acquisition on this level is dependent on certain conditions in the learning environment: comprehensible input in the target language, interesting material, low stress levels, and language work that is slightly more advanced than the student’s current level of work.¹ “Language learning,” which may be the only way that a teacher unfamiliar with SLA research thinks about what the student is doing, is frequently used in SLA research to identify a student’s knowledge about the language, its grammatical structure and syntax. Unfortunately, students do not make progress in a second language through such learning about the language, however rigorous it may be. But at some point in the more advanced stages of second language progress, knowledge about the language’s grammatical structure and syntax becomes invaluable in the students’ ability to edit their own work in the language and to analyze another author’s work. In the last century of Latin instruction in the US, the focus has largely been on language learning as defined here, forcing Latin students into the mode of “editing” a language that they have not had adequate time and experience acquiring. I believe that this factor alone can account for the large attrition rates that Latin teachers report: their intermediate and advanced classes contain only a fraction of their original students in beginning level classes. Knowledge of SLA research and how to use it in teaching Latin could

1 These criteria for the acquisition process are explained in detail in Krashen ch. 2.

provide a new generation of Latin teachers with the tools they need to build large, strong and thriving Latin programs. SLA research can help teachers and their administrators convince a skeptical public that, in fact, any student can learn and make progress in Latin.

Opportunities to Strengthen *Standards*

By recommending a beginning teacher be familiar with SLA research, the committee places value on such research for the Latin teaching and universities which prepare Latin teachers. SLA research suggests significant changes from the traditional way Latin teachers have taught and Latin students have learned the language in the last century. Future teachers and those who prepare them should expect and receive concrete direction from this report both in the way the document itself makes use of SLA research and with specific bibliographical recommendations. The document, therefore, could supply a bibliography of SLA research and list of organizations recommended for Latin teacher training. Even for programs whose ultimate goal is reading Latin and not speaking it, SLA research has deep implications for teaching and learning.² Just as translation and reverse-translation exercises can help the student gain a tighter grasp of grammatical structures, so speaking Latin is essential to helping students acquire the language in the first place. A revision of *Standards* could help Latin teachers understand that both kinds of activity are necessary in every classroom with all kinds of students. Since language acquisition is about what is happening in the student, teachers have to be able to provide all of the varieties of learning activities to help students achieve those experiences.

STANDARD 1.A

Standard 1: Content Knowledge calls for “knowledge of Latin” and “proficiency in the language skills necessary for teaching it” (7) without ever making the clear distinction, current in SLA research, between knowledge about the language and acquisition of the language itself (Krashen 10). The Standard’s language suggests that the Latin teacher should acquire basic abilities in the Latin language. Further commentary regarding this Standard (8-9), however, indicates the document has slipped into the arena of knowledge about the language. In listing examples of the Standard, the document does not include speaking in Latin for communication. For acquisition to take place, the Latin teacher must be ready, willing and able to speak Latin with his/her students, at every level. SLA research does not make knowledge about the language and acquisition of the language mutually exclusive, but they are distinctly different dynamics inherent in learning a second language. *Standards* seems to imply, unintentionally I believe, that it is only interested in Latin teachers with knowledge about the language. This becomes problematic when the document affirms the oral-aural method as one of the three major methods a Latin teacher should be familiar with and able to use.

Standard 1.a, Linguistic Knowledge and Proficiency, refers to the beginning Latin teacher’s ability to “read” Latin and to “pronounce Latin accurately” (7). While those are essential skills, the document never defines what it means by “reading Latin” (further addressed below), and its only references to spoken Latin are “simple greetings and classroom commands” (8). Greetings

² Cf. full reference list at the end of this article. VanPatten (1996) offers research that ought to be of keen interest to Latin teachers who seek to help students experience meaningful connection to and through grammar structures, but unlike traditional programs that do not produce ability in the language, Van Patten is clear that input in the language is a necessary part of that process.

and commands will not provide the student the kinds of experiences needed for acquisition beyond the first few weeks of a Latin I class. A stronger statement about the necessity of spoken Latin for communication at every level would strengthen the link between *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* and both SLA research and national language standards which make communication the primary goal. Finally, more than half of the supporting explanation for Standard 1.a refers to grammar (8,9), which in SLA research constitutes “knowledge about” the language. If, as I am suggesting, the document could present a strong set of statements which balance the need for acquisition activities with the need for learning about Latin activities, *Standards* would provide real direction for Latin programs that aim to help every kind of learner make progress in the language.

STANDARD 1.B

The discussion of Standard 1b: Cultural Knowledge and Awareness, could seize an opportunity to demonstrate to teachers and to teacher preparation programs that cultural knowledge and awareness can often be accomplished with students in the language itself and not as a separate experience from acquiring the language. In SLA research, teaching the language’s culture and history is another way to increase exposure to vocabulary and language structures. There are two areas in which *Standards’* recommendation of SLA research could be strengthened.

First, *Standards* could explicitly note that in many of the school texts which make use of extensive readings of connected stories, the cultural context of the story becomes an experience of cultural history and knowledge. Teachers who take the opportunity to lead simple conversations in Latin about the cultural context (e.g. the Roman family, home, entertainment, government, etc.) are simultaneously teaching the culture and providing extended opportunities for language acquisition. Further, when teachers extend those conversations to compare and contrast Roman culture with modern American culture in Latin, students have in one classroom experience communication, culture, communities, and connections without ever leaving the Latin language or using English.

Second, few if any of the major textbooks in use offer cultural and historical studies in Latin at the student level. *Standards* could then sound the call to develop such materials. Developing cultural and historical materials in Latin would not require much research to find materials and models. Several older Latin texts now out of print, in fact, tell much of the history and culture associated with Latin in Latin itself.³ Such materials could be created in a very simple Latin which keeps the reading enjoyable and accessible for most Latin students at any level. This would extend cultural and historical information beyond the breadth of any particular textbook and provide students low-stress, comprehensible input in Latin, two criteria for language acquisition.

STANDARD 2

SLA research and how it is embraced in the document affects Standard 2: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills most poignantly. To its credit, the committee clearly acknowledges various approaches to language teaching and learning. The committee could strengthen and deepen the skill level of teachers by going a step further to demonstrate how the three primary approaches for teaching Latin relate to SLA research. The identified approaches used in the U.S. are “grammar-

³ I have in mind here older texts like *Using Latin* and *Our Latin Heritage*. Stories from these texts could almost be assembled into historical and cultural units at reading levels in Latin that would allow the teacher and class to remain in Latin almost completely. There are models for the creation of additional stories that weave culture and history into the telling of stories that abound in the now out of print *Puer Romanus*.

translation, reading in context, and oral-aural” (11). The document acknowledges that teachers have to consider who their students are and what skills and prior knowledge they possess as the teachers use their “preferred approach” (13). The document could clarify these approaches and their use by discussing what they are able to produce in student learning with reference to SLA research. Without this kind of clarification, *Standards* seems to imply that the use of the three approaches is simply a matter of preference.

The “grammar-translation” approach involves the student in critical thinking about the language and involves to a high degree what Krashen calls the internal “monitor” and the “affective filter” (*Principles and Practices* Internet ed. 15, 30). This approach has been the traditional approach in the US and abroad, and it is the method to which the findings of SLA research are most significant. Grammar-translation work engages students in critical thinking and is necessary when producing written and spoken language where high degrees of accuracy are needed. It is thus valuable for advanced learners, but largely hinders progress in acquiring the language for beginners. When used with beginners, the grammar-translation approach presumes Latin can only be taught and learned as critical thinking about the language. As such, it ties the teachers’ hands and excludes most students who are not logical-learners from the language learning process. If *Standards* were to place grammar-translation approaches in the context of the language monitor, useful in intermediate and advanced classrooms, it would strengthen that approach when it is appropriate to use it, and free teachers (but mostly students) from the interference of a method that is introduced too early in the acquisition process.

The “reading in context” approach focuses on meaning-cues from a written context. It depends heavily on appropriate level texts and involves the student in a largely passive role. In other words, the reading in context approach does not require the student to produce in the language. It is a useful approach and skill set for reading large amounts of material, and it is absolutely necessary, according to SLA research, for students to make significant advances in the language. However, there has to be sufficient reading material at a level lower than the student’s current ability which interests the student. Yet we do not have nearly enough easy, interesting readers for our many beginners. As a result, this approach runs short of material in even our best reading in context textbooks. Students too soon hit the brick wall of too-difficult reading. Teachers, very often focusing on what they are doing and less on what students are experiencing, complain that such texts “don’t have any grammar.” The reading in context approach is heavily dependent on textbooks and on the presumption that all students love to read, and this puts the good teacher and many able and eager students at a gross disadvantage when the method is used alone. However, when a reading approach text becomes the context for teacher and students to talk with each other in Latin about their stories, the level of activity in the classroom, comprehensible in Latin, making use of multiple repetitions of old and new vocabulary increases significantly. The document could help teachers know how to embrace such materials and exploit them to their students’ advantage by making this point overtly in its recommendations.

The oral-aural method is the label given to an approach largely referred to in the literature as the “communicative language approaches” (as there are several subsets of this method). In communicative language approaches⁴ the student begins from the start to associate meaning for things in the language itself, with as little reliance on English or the native language as possible. The goal from the outset is communicating meaning and understanding, whether through written texts or

4 See Omaggio-Hadley’s *Teaching Language in Context* for a history of language methodologies and a very helpful description of a repertoire of methods that she calls “communicative” approaches.

spoken language, through the second language without reference to the first language. The Latin teacher must be ready, willing and able to speak Latin in the classroom—early and often—for this approach to work. A revision of *Standards* could make it clear, based on SLA research, that Latin teachers who wish to help all kinds of learners acquire ability in Latin must be prepared to speak with their students in Latin about all manner of things in the classroom, about their stories, about students and their lives. The document could also reassure teachers who have never taught this way, with the most reassuring kind of language, that they can develop this ability over time beginning in small doses. After all, the beginning Latin student knows nothing, and teachers willing to develop their own speaking skills can make progress alongside their students. From the perspective of SLA research, it is essential that the teacher speak Latin for the student to have the experience needed to acquire ability in Latin. By addressing this as an essential for student success, the committee could encourage universities to make this a regular part of teacher preparation programs.

Recommendations

We who are Latin teachers, in general, have not had the advantage in our preparation programs to engage SLA research. Those of us who have studied it have had to seek it on our own and often justify to our administrators and colleagues why we have done so. After studying *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* and making my suggestions above, I see several needs this document could address if the sponsoring organizations and their joint committee are willing to continue the work. First, the Latin teaching community needs a comprehensive approach including the necessary role of these three named approaches and acknowledging their deficiencies when they are used in isolation or at the wrong times in the learning process. Such a comprehensive approach would weave them together as a whole taking guidance from SLA research.⁵ We have often allowed ourselves to fall into controversy over whether grammar-translation, reading, or oral methods are best, but in light of SLA research that is a misleading question. None of these are comprehensive approaches. They are each skill sets that must be used together, at the right time.

Second, we need a document which points to concrete resources, research, and methods. This document must go further to provide concrete guidance for strengthening teaching and learning Latin in our schools. I am suggesting that it do that by including in each of its sections clear application of SLA research. I have provided examples above as suggestions for those kinds of applications. If the document is not strengthened to clarify how SLA research applies to every one of its recommendations, the ambiguity, I fear, will only support a status quo mindset in both Latin teachers and preparation programs. The aims of SLA research are at the core of what we do.

Finally, we need such a document to encourage a little more humanity in the Latin teacher's experience. The document could acknowledge that we are in a strange time when most who are in the field teaching have been trained in methods which worked for us (grammar-translation) but

5 Bill VanPatten acknowledges the complexity of second language acquisition, lest any Latin teacher think that this is a push for anything less than serious language work. "Acquisition cannot be reduced to a single process. SLA is best conceived of as involving multiple processes that in turn may contain sub-processes that work at every stage of acquisition" (5).

which, according to various learning models,⁶ do not work for the normal student. For example, I mentioned earlier the problem of not defining what the document means by “reading Latin.” At this time in our history, when it is very likely that most Latin teachers were trained under grammar-translation approaches, it is also likely that most of us teachers learned to engage in what I will call “speed-parsing” when we “read” Latin. Speed-parsers have gained the skill to convert Latin very rapidly into English as we move across the Latin text. Speed-parsing is something intelligent, logical learners can learn to do rather easily, but which most normal human beings cannot do easily. The grammar-translation approach depends on the Latin student developing this speed-parsing method and never enables the normal student to read Latin as Latin. Without helping Latin teachers understand this kind of interior dynamic of speed-parsing, which makes us unusual and not at all like other kinds of learners, we risk failing to engage the majority of learners who comes through our doors, and we perpetuate ever smaller programs.

The continued growth and health of our Latin programs are at stake. My deep interest is for the way this document can help Latin teachers redevelop ourselves so we become more proficient Latin teachers to all kinds of learners. The days of selective, elite programs for the academically superior students are over. The American public has little tolerance for such selective systems and they want to know why Latin should be preserved at all when it caters to certain learners who already have many advantages over the typical student. Economic difficulties are moving school administrators to opt out of Latin, especially when they cannot see how it benefits most of their students. Latin teachers understand how Latin can benefit all students, but we have not mastered very well how to teach Latin to all kinds of students. Second language acquisition research is intelligent, evidence-based work which could empower Latin teachers to develop for ourselves first and then for our students ways to acquire this language we all love and wish to access for generations to come. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* can do this by applying consistently and accurately the findings of SLA research to its recommendations. I urge the committee to continue to work toward these ends and give to our teaching and teacher-preparation community the high standards and the concrete help it needs to achieve them.

Robert Patrick, Ph.D.

Parkview High School, Metro-Atlanta

Works Cited

American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Latin Teacher Training and Certification. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: ACL and APA, 2010. (Available online at <<http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep-2010Stand.pdf>>.)

Appleton, Reginald Bainbridge and William H.S. Jones. *Puer Romanus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. (Available for free online at *Archive.org*. 27 May, 2010. <http://www.archive.org/details/puerromanus00applrich>.)

⁶ I have in mind, in particular, the Multiple Intelligences approach which documents through clinical research nine different kinds of learning models. Logical intelligence (which makes grammar study easy and accessible) and verbal intelligence (which makes reading and writing easy and accessible) account for only a minority of students in any classroom unless we have screened all others out (Gardner).

- Ellis, Rod. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Gardner, Howard. *Multiple Intelligences: New Horizons and Practice*. New York: Basic Books, 2006.
- Hines, Lillian M. *Our Latin Heritage, Vols. I and II*. 3rd ed. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Press, 1981.
- Horn, Annabel, John Flagg Gummere, and Margaret M. Forbes. *Using Latin*. Glenview, Ill: Scott, Foresman, 1961.
- Krashen, Stephen. *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. (Available for free online at <http://www.sdkrashen.com>.)
- Ommagio-Hadley, Alice. *Teaching Language in Context*. 3rd ed. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 2001.
- VanPatten, Bill, ed. *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research and Commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 2004.

Appendix: Select Second Language Acquisition Bibliography

- Bygate, Martin, Peter Skehan, and Merrill Swain, eds. *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing*. Edinburgh: Longman, 2001.
- Doughty, Catherine, ed. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Ellis, Rod. *Understanding Second Language Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- . *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999
- Krashen, Stephen. *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. (Available for free online at <http://www.sdkrashen.com>.)
- . “Formal Grammar Instruction. Another Educator Comments.” *TESOL Quarterly* 26.2 (1992): 409-411.
- . *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. Berkley, 1981.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. *Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammmaring*. Boston: Heinle ELT, 2003.
- Long, Michael and Catherine Doughty, eds. *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Chichester, West Suxex, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2009.
- Long, Michael. *Problems in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge, 2007.

Masciantonio, Rudolph. "Stephen Krashen and the Classical Languages." *The Classical Journal*. 84.1 (1988): 53-56.

Ommagio-Hadley, Alice. *Teaching Language in Context*. 3rd ed. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 2001.

Smith, Frank. *The Book of Learning and Forgetting*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1998.

———. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. 6th ed. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge, 2004.

———. *Unspeakable Acts, Unnatural Practices: Flaws and Fallacies in Scientific Reading Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2003.

VanPatten, Bill, ed. *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research and Commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 2004.

Preparing Classicists or Preparing Humanists?

Anyone who follows the LatinTeach e-mail discussion list will be aware of a simmering controversy that comes to a boil from time to time. With relentless vigor, advocates of Latin-as-philology, grammar-translation methods, and reading very slowly enter the ring against enthusiastic advocates of Latin-as-language, oral-aural methods, and the Latin patrimony from antiquity to the present. Members of the philological camp often raise no objection when Latin is described as “dead.” To members of the other party, calling Latin “a dead language” counts as fighting words.

In any dispute, the least comfortable position is one that sees merit in both sides. That is mine in this controversy. I am a classical philologist by training and inclination, and my sympathies are with the philologists; nevertheless, I want to suggest here that philologists who train Latin teachers should pay more attention to the active skills of speaking and writing than is now the case. I also hope to sketch an historical context for thinking about the controversy between Latin-as-philology and Latin-as-language and to highlight parts of *Standards* that speak to both sides in it—although to one, as we shall see, more than to the other. I will end with a deliberately provocative suggestion.

Some imagine the controversy as a conflict between humanism and philology. As one contribution to the LatinTeach debate put it, “My own guess is that we took a bum steer when we dumped the Italian, naive-reading humanism for the German pseudo-scientific, research-oriented encyclopedism.” At least in method, the dichotomy may not be as sharp as the writer imagined, since Renaissance schoolboys began by learning paradigms and probably spent as much time in drill and recitation as any modern child in a strict grammar-translation class.¹ And Renaissance humanists were anything but naïve readers.

A look at the history of Classical Studies, however, bears out the idea that built into what we Latin teachers do is a tension between two traditions, one liberal or humanistic, looking to reading, writing, and speaking as sources of pleasure and shapers of mind and soul, and the other oriented toward or shaped by philological research. Although people who teach Latin are fond of imagining a long pedigree for our craft, the modern shape of Classical Studies and its institutions, in which most of us receive our training, does not emerge in America until after the Civil War. Beginning with the opening of the Johns Hopkins University in 1876 and the subsequent rise of the modern research university, Classical Studies in American higher education took on the shape we know. That shape is essentially Germanic, derived from the tradition of *Altertumswissenschaft* begun by F. A. Wolf, carried on by Böckh and Wilamowitz, and brought to this country by Gildersleeve.² Nearly every Latin teacher in America has at some point been trained by someone who attended seminars, wrote a dissertation, holds a Ph.D., and aspires to produce original research. These are the distinguishing marks not only of the American college and university teachers who prepare Latin teachers, but of Germanic classical philology in its American incarnation.

1 See for example Battista Guarino’s advice: after learning accurate pronunciation, students learned grammar, beginning with the memorization of declension and conjugation. *Quocirca nomina et verba declinare in primis pueri sciunt, sine quibus nullo modo pervenire ad intellectum sequentium possunt; nec semel tantum docuisse contentus sit praeceptor, sed saepe repetens iterumque memoriam in iis puerorum exerceat* (269).

2 For a brief account of this tradition, see L. Percy, *The Grammar of Our Civility: Classical Education in America*. On the German origins of academic practices, see W. Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*.

This dominant, philological tradition has never been without its critics. Laurence Veysey has outlined a conflict beginning in the early twentieth century between advocates of Germanic scientific study of the humanities and those who advanced an ideal distinguished by the names “liberal culture” or “humanism.” The partisans of culture, like their counterparts in the LatinTeach discussion, appealed to students’ experience and to joyful acquisition of knowledge as an aim of learning. In this early twentieth-century conflict, as Veysey writes,

the advocates of liberal culture constituted a minority in American academic circles. But the militant insistence of the humanists partly compensated for their paucity of numbers. . . . If they were unrepresentative of most of the larger universities, still they commanded the official platforms of some of the more ‘up-to-date’ small colleges. . . . (In the leading universities of the Atlantic seaboard, they did grow into a faction of major weight.) (182)

Although the advocates of culture in early twentieth-century American universities often invoked ancient Greece and Hellenism to justify their position, they found few friends among classicists. In the newly professional departments of Classics, the philological method reigned supreme, and it shaped the teaching of Latin and Greek and the preparation of Latin teachers.

Now, it seems, the humanists are back, and they have some good arguments. It makes very little sense to go through an entire 50-minute class, as I have seen some Latin teachers do, without teacher or students uttering a word of Latin. Students learn in different ways, and a classroom using all four skills, reading, writing, speaking, and listening, is likely to include more students than one that limits itself to one or two. There is more to Latin than the Romans (although it remains, I think, an open question whether the mere fact of being written in Latin is enough to put, say, Marsilio Ficino’s *Platonic Theology* under the same academic umbrella as Horace’s *Odes*). What Jeffrey Wills a dozen years ago called “the dirty secret of our field,” that most college Latin teachers’ oral skills are at the ACTFL “Intermediate Low” level (44), remains a scandal.

The real, attractive merits of the humanist position pose a challenge to philologists. “Latin” in schools is beginning to look like two subjects, one humanistic, with ties to world languages and cultures, and the other philological, with ties to the academic discipline of Classics and a focus on teaching students to think *about* Latin, not *in* Latin. Since Latin in colleges and universities remains for the most part the province of departments of Classics, and since classicists are interested in bringing students to the reading of complex texts of Greco-Roman culture as soon as possible (no matter how slow the reading), language instruction in higher education is likely to continue to be philological, and upper-level college Latin classes will continue to consist of statements in English about texts in Latin. It will be a great tragedy if an already small, often beleaguered subject splits in two, and if high school seniors excited by Latin taught as a world language and eager to continue find when they reach college that no such discipline exists. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* had to speak to the humanists’ case without compromising the fundamental principles of the academic discipline of Classics.

The controversy was very much part of discussions among the APA / ACL Joint Task Force as we drafted the standards. Neutrality was not an option. Attempting to give equal weight to both positions would surely have produced a bland, useless document. On balance (and not surprisingly, considering that the American *Philological* Association is one sponsor of it), the document comes down on the side of philology and classicism rather than humanistic use of Latin and the

Latin patrimony. The ability to “describe morphological, syntactical, and rhetorical structures of language” (7) is one of the five skills demanded of a beginning Latin teacher by Standard 1.a, Linguistic Knowledge and Proficiency, and the supporting explanation for that standard makes it clear that explaining similarities, differences, and connections between Latin and English is an important part of Latin instruction (9). The three subordinate standards under Standard 1.b, Cultural Knowledge and Awareness, refer to “the Roman world,” “Roman culture,” and “ancient Rome” (7) and the supporting explanation focuses on ancient Rome (8-9); the standard does, however, ask beginning teachers to be “aware that the cultural importance of Latin extends beyond the historical limits of ancient Rome” (7).

On the other hand, *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* does call for beginning Latin teachers to be able to use Latin. Standard 1.a asks them to “pronounce Latin accurately and with expression” and “write grammatically correct, idiomatic Latin” (7). The supporting explanation does not, it seems to me, set the bar very high for either of these tasks; it speaks only of “reading aloud,” using “simple greetings and classroom commands,” and writing sentences (8). Even those simple activities, however, are more than many Latin teachers now do.

Despite its conservative, classicist, philological tenor, *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* poses a challenge and presents an opportunity to classical philologists who teach Latin in colleges and universities. Giving students—all students, not merely those who aspire to become Latin teachers—the ability to “pronounce Latin accurately and consistently” and “generate Latin sentences” using specific grammatical constructions will not be enough to satisfy the new humanists, but it may be the catalyst for the recovery of a traditional practice of classical philology.

I mean writing Latin—not “composition,” the practice of translating from a modern language into Latin (although I am an advocate of that practice (1998, 35-42)), but real composition, writing in Latin what we intend to say. Recently I was going through some files in my study and came across a binder with papers that I had written when I was in graduate school between 1969 and 1972. Three of them were in Latin. These were not independent research papers of the kind students in a graduate course or seminar usually write, but rather short themes on assigned, conventional topics: the manuscript tradition of an author, the sources for an episode in history, and so on. The object in assigning them seems to have been to make sure that if on some future occasion I needed to say something academic in Latin, I could manage to do so.

I tell this anecdote not to suggest that graduate training was somehow more rigorous or more scholarly *consule Planco* (it wasn't), but to suggest that active use of Latin has been until fairly recently an accepted part of advanced training in classical philology. It was certainly so at the beginning, when F. A. Wolf's seminar students wrote papers in Latin (Clark 173); and scholarly articles in Latin, especially on textual matters, continue to appear from time to time—the most recent that I have been able to discover date from the 1990s (Eden, Livrea, and Cohee). The habit of writing in Latin (as distinct, I emphasize, from “composition”), though, has not been a routine part of a classical scholar's toolkit for at least a generation. Its near disappearance seems to have gone unremarked, although some people professed to be surprised when Oxford Classical Texts began to appear with prefaces in English. If the fairly mild recommendations for active Latin in *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* prompt classicists in colleges and universities to ask why they and their students no longer write Latin and to justify, if they can, their neglect, then the document will have accomplished at least one good thing. If undergraduates preparing to be teachers of Latin are someday expected to write something of their own, even if it is only a paragraph now and then, in the language that they hope to teach, the *Standards* will have done much more.

Lee T. Percy

The Episcopal Academy

Works Cited

- American Classical League and American Philological Association Joint Task Force on Latin Teacher Training and Certification. *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation*. Oxford, OH: ACL and APA, 2010. (Available online at <<http://www.aclclassics.org/pdf/LatTeachPrep-2010Stand.pdf>>.)
- Clark, William. *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Cohee, Peter. "Instauratio Sacrorum." *Hermes* 122.4 (1994): 451-468.
- Eden, P.T. "Adnotationes in P. Papini Stati *Thebaida* (II)." *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 51.5 (1998): 597-600.
- Guarino, Battista. "A Program of Teaching and Learning." *Humanist Educational Treatises* Ed. Craig W. Kallendorf. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- LatinTeach List*. Sharon Kazmierski, mod. Email discussion list. <<http://nxport.com/mailman/list-info/latinteach>>.
- Livrea, Enrico. "Parerga Cercidea II. P. Oxy. 1082 fragmenta minora." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 112 (1996): 47-55.
- Pearcy, Lee. *The Grammar of Our Civility: Classical Education in America*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005.
- . "Writing Latin in Schools and Colleges," *Classical World* 92.1 (1998): 35-42.
- Veysey, Laurence. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965
- Wills, Jeffrey. "Speaking Latin in Schools and Colleges." *The Classical World* 92.1 (1998): 27-34.