American Sign Language as a Foreign Language in U.S. High Schools: State of the Art

RUSSELL S. ROSEN
Columbia University
Teachers College
Program in the Teaching of American Sign Language as a Foreign Language
525 West 120th Street
Box 223
New York, New York 10027
Email: rrosen@exchange.tc.columbia.edu

The last 2 decades witnessed a growth in American Sign Language (ASL) as a foreign language in U.S. secondary schools. This overview of the current state of ASL as a foreign language in the schools consists of a history and a survey. The information on history was drawn from a study conducted by Rosen (2006). This history is followed by a national survey compiled by Rosen (2005) on U.S. secondary schools offering ASL for foreign language credit. The survey provided information on the number and distribution of schools, teachers, classes, students, departments, and the process for program implementation. The information is used to ascertain the current breadth and scope of, and to discern trends in, ASL as a foreign language in public high schools nationwide.

THE LAST TWO DECADES WITNESSED A growth in American Sign Language (ASL) as a foreign language in U.S. secondary schools. This overview of the current state of ASL as a foreign language in the schools consists of a history and a survey. The information on history was drawn from a study conducted by Rosen (2006). Outlined in the history are debates about the linguistic and foreign language status of ASL, the situation of deaf and hard of hearing students (D/HH) in public schools, governmental recognition of ASL as a language, and processes leading to its inclusion in schools. This history is followed by a national survey compiled by Rosen (2005) on U.S. secondary schools that offer ASL for foreign language credit. Information was sought for the following topical areas: number and distribution of schools, teachers, classes, students and departments, types of curricula and instruction, and the process for program implementation. Owing to space restrictions, survey results on curricula and instruction are not discussed here. The survey information is used to ascertain the current breadth and scope of, and to discern trends in, ASL as a foreign language in public high schools nationwide. Some survey results were compared to available data on other foreign languages. Such comparison helped determine the place of ASL in the foreign language domain within secondary schools. It is hoped here that the history and information from the survey will aid school administrators and educators in becoming aware of the situation of ASL as a foreign language and in implementing ASL classes in schools. The overview ends with a discussion of future trends and areas for future research.

The Modern Language Journal, 92, i, (2008)
0026-7902/08/10–38 $1.50/0
©2008 *The Modern Language Journal*

AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

The growth of ASL as a foreign language in U.S. secondary schools is documented by an increasing number of secondary schools that offer ASL for foreign language credit in order for students

to meet states' foreign language requirements for graduation. A national survey conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in 1996 showed that ASL was offered in 1% of the 1,650 surveyed U.S. secondary schools with foreign language programs, or 17 high schools, in 1987, and 2%, or 33 high schools, in 1997 (CAL, 1997). This represented a growth of almost 100% in 10 years.

This growth of ASL as a foreign language in schools is part of a general trend in educational institutions in adopting ASL for admission and graduation purposes. Welles (2002) studied foreign language enrollments in institutions of higher education. She found that 552 undergraduate colleges and universities in 2002 offered ASL classes (Welles, 2002). Student enrollment in ASL classes had grown from 1,602 students in 1990; 4,308 students in 1995; and 11,420 students in 1998; to 60,849 in 2002 (Welles, 2002). The growth rates were 3,698% from 1990 to 2002, and 432% from 1998 to 2002. In addition, Wilcox and Wilcox (1991) found that as of 1991, 48 U.S. colleges and universities accepted ASL as one of the foreign languages that meet the requirement for undergraduate admission. The number had grown to 66 in 1997 (Wilcox & Wilcox, 1997) and to 148 in 2006 (Wilcox, 2006). This represented a growth rate of 208% from 1991 to 2006.

The growth had its contested beginnings. The linguistic structures of ASL have not been researched until recently by Stokoe and associates (Stokoe, 1960; Stokoe, Casterline, & Croneberg, 1965) in the 1960s. By the 1970s and 1980s, ASL was declared as a unique language by several linguists (Baker-Schenk & Cokely, 1980; Klima & Bellugi, 1979; Liddell, 1980; Padden, 1981; Valli & Lucas, 1992; Wilbur, 1979). Linguists generally found that ASL, in spite of its distinct modality from spoken languages, carries several linguistic features that are similar to spoken languages (Fischer & Siple, 1990; Fromkin, 1988; Neidle et al., 2000; Sandler & Lillo-Martin, 2006). However, the "discovery" of ASL as a language was followed by arguments, particularly among government officials and school administrators, regarding ASL as a language and determining whether it should be offered for foreign language credit in schools.

There was initial resistance in governments and schools opposed to recognizing ASL as a language and to offering it for foreign language credit (Armstrong, 1988; Belka, 2000; Caccamise, Garretson, & Bellugi, 1981; Cooper, 1997; Fromkin, 1988; Sinnett, 1995; Wilcox, 1992; Wilcox & Wilcox, 1997). Arguments against ASL were based on the visual–manual nature and the geographical scope of ASL, and the disbelief in the existence of the community and culture of signing deaf people. Because of the visual–manual modality of ASL, government and education officials understood it as either a manual representation of English or a sophisticated form of gestures and pantomimes. Some officials and individuals felt that learning ASL is easier than learning spoken languages because it is in the manual form (Peterson, 1999; cf. Shroyer & Holmes, 1982). In addition, ASL was created in the United States and is used largely by American deaf people. As such, ASL is not seen as "foreign." The reasoning was that foreign languages originate in countries outside the United States, and foreign language students can visit the countries, use their languages, and study their cultures (Armstrong, 1988). In the case of ASL, there is not a foreign country to go to in order to use the language (Belka, 2000; Reagan, 2000).

Another argument against ASL in schools was that the existence of a separate Deaf community is problematic. Government and education officials consider deaf people first and foremost Americans and users of English. Their community is a subgroup of the larger American society and its culture a subculture of the American culture (Terstreip, 1993). Still another argument against ASL was that it has no written form (Wilcox & Wilbers, 1987). All spoken languages offered in secondary schools have written forms in addition to spoken forms. A final argument was that there is no cultural tradition in the Deaf community. All spoken foreign languages offered in schools carry a rich body of artistic and literary traditions that students can study. Since ASL does not have a written form, government and education officials argued that deaf people cannot have artistic and literary works nor possess cultural traditions (Wilcox & Wilbers, 1987). The beliefs that ASL consists of gestures, that it is a manual representation of English, easier to learn than spoken languages, and that it is a part of the same geographical entity as English, have led government and education officials to believe that ASL is not a foreign language, and that the Deaf community and culture do not exist.

The above arguments were counteracted by supporters of ASL as a foreign language (Battison & Carter, 1981; Chopin, 1988; Corwin & Wilcox, 1985; Wilbers, 1987, 1988; Wilcox, 1992; Wilcox & Wilbers, 1987; Wilcox & Wilcox, 1991, 1997). The supporters devised arguments that were drawn from linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociological, and anthropological research on ASL and the American Deaf community and culture. The arguments that ASL is a manual or gestural form of English

were countered by studies in ASL linguistics that pointed to phonological, morphological, and syntactical similarities and differences between ASL and spoken languages (Fromkin, 1988; Liddell, 1980; Neidle et al., 2000; Sandler & Lillo-Martin, 2006; Valli & Lucas, 1992). ASL contains, for instance, phonological binary opposites, morphological combinations, and word order that are comparable to the features and constructions of the world's spoken languages. The arguments that ASL has no cultural traditions, with a belief that it is due to a lack of a written form, were dispelled by several researchers (Davis, 1998; Frishberg, 1988; Padden & Humphries, 1988, 2005; Rutherford, 1988; Wilcox, 1992; Wilcox & Wilcox, 1997). They found that there is a rich body of cultural traditions in arts and literature that are recorded on videotapes, digital video device, and other visual media. Histories of Deaf people and their language, community, and culture have been researched since the 1980s (Baynton, 1996; Gannon, 1981; Lane, 1984; Padden & Humphries, 2005), and they show that the Deaf community not only has been created but also is evolving. Since the late 1980s, the Deaf culture has been investigated as a sociocultural phenomenon of deaf people containing ideologies, artifacts, and social structures that revolve around ASL, visualism, manualism, deafness, and deaf–hearing relations (Lane, Hoffmeister, & Bahan, 1996; Padden & Humphries, 1988, 2005).

Furthermore, the arguments that ASL is not a foreign language were based on notions of "foreign," "nation," and "community." The notions have been altered by the current international geopolitical situation. Ties between language and nation have been broken down by migration across geographical regions by the world's peoples and their speaking different languages and carrying different cultures. This leads to the relativization of "language" not in terms of "nation" but in terms of "community" of users. Individuals not using the language of the community are considered "foreign" and their language is considered a "foreign language" (Armstrong, 1988; Wilbers, 1987). For individuals who are not born or acculturated into the community, the language of the community needs to be learned (Reagan, 2000; Wallinger, 2000). That ASL is easy to learn compared to spoken languages because it is in a manual–gestural form had been dispelled by Shroyer and Holmes (1982), Kemp (1998a), and Peterson (1999). Kemp (1998a) conducted a study of the difficulties beginning students who speak have for learning ASL and found that the difficulties lay in the change in modality for processing languages. Students needed to shift away from their oral–aural languages and process ASL in its visual–manual form. As such, ASL is as difficult to master as any spoken language. Since ASL has similar universal principles of language as any spoken languages (cf. Neidle et al., 2000; Sandler & Lillo-Martin, 2006), learning ASL may aid students in mastering other languages (Kemp, 1998b; Peterson, 1999). For supporters of ASL as a foreign language, the evidence of ASL linguistics and Deaf community and culture in scholarly and literary studies, coupled with the post-colonialist notions of "foreign" in languages and communities, have in large part put the manual–gestural representation perspectives and the foreignness–nation arguments into disbelief.

The recognition of ASL as a language by Stokoe and colleagues, coupled with arguments in support of ASL as a foreign language, empowered scholars and advocates from the Deaf community to seek its adoption in state education departments and secondary schools.

AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Rosen's (2006) study outlined the history of the inclusion of ASL and Deaf community and culture in secondary schools. Through an examination of educational and historical documents, it was found that the impetus for introducing ASL for foreign language credit in public secondary schools was the presence of signing D/HH students in classrooms (Rosen, 2006). The mainstreaming of ASL and Deaf community and culture was initially framed by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) practices that privileged speech and hearing for students with deafness. It began with the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA; 89 Stat. 773, 1975), one of the earliest U.S. federal laws mandating the education of children who were disabled in public schools. The law established two definitions for deafness. *Deaf* refers to children who are unable to use hearing to receive information in classrooms. *Hard of hearing* refers to children who utilize hearing to receive information only with the use of amplification. Now renamed as the IDEA (20 U.S.C. Section 1400–1487), the EAHCA sets as one of its goals the integration of individuals with deafness into American society. The integration was conducted by placement of D/HH students in classrooms with hearing students. Prior to the passage of the laws, most D/HH students were placed in special schools for the deaf. The schools for the deaf largely

utilize sign languages, which have ranged from Manually Coded English to ASL, as the means of communication. It was hoped that the placement of D/HH students in classrooms with hearing students would provide an opportunity for the D/HH students to acquire the hearing and speaking communication skills they need to interact with the hearing students so that they could ultimately be mainstreamed effectively into American society. From 1977 to the present, D/HH students increasingly have been placed in general education classrooms with hearing student peers: 46% of D/HH students were placed in regular, local schools in 1977–1978; 61% in 1987–1988; 88% in 1999–2000; and 91% in 2002–2003 (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2004a).

However, the mainstreaming of signing D/HH[1] students in American schools created communication and language barriers between the D/HH and hearing students in public education classrooms. Studies since the passage of the laws consistently showed lack of opportunities for interaction between signing D/HH students and their hearing teachers and peers in public schools (Foster, 1989; Gaustad & Kluwin, 1992; Stinson & Liu, 1999). The communication situation of the signing D/HH students received attention from advocates, researchers, and the American Deaf community. They fought over the definitions, evaluation, instructional program, and placements of D/HH students with regard to communication needs and language preferences (Rosen, 2006). The language and communication difficulties shown by signing D/HH students in general education classrooms have turned IDEA into a battleground within which ideologies have been fought among political, educational, and Deaf community forces (Rosen, 2006).

Deaf community advocates, particularly representatives from the National Association of the Deaf (NAD), a national advocacy organization of deaf people in the United States, held meetings with representatives from the U.S. Congress and officials from the U.S. Department of Education, a cabinet-level entity of the U.S. government charged with the responsibility of implementing federal laws and overseeing educational practices in the nation. These advocates sought to alter notions of deafness and educational practices regarding language use in classrooms, placement, diagnosis, and evaluation (Rosen, 2006). The result of the meetings was a reconceptualization of deafness for educational purposes. In 1997 and 1999 reauthorizations of IDEA, the 1975 EAHCA "audist" practices were revised by deleting references to speech and hearing difficulties and their role in receiving linguistic information, and by including "language preferences" of D/HH students. One of the "language preferences" mentioned as primary instructional languages used by D/HH students was sign language. ASL was inserted as one of the languages used by D/HH students for the first time in the 1999 reauthorization of IDEA (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). As a consequence of changes in IDEA definitions and practices for signing D/HH students, public education schools found it difficult to ignore sign language, including ASL, as a primary language and preferred mode of communication for the students (Rosen, 2006).

One of the altered IDEA practices with signing D/HH students was the increased presence of sign language interpreters with signing D/HH students in mainstreamed settings. Their presence has increased since 1999, from 22.1% in 1999–2000 to 22.9% in 2001–2002, and 23.4% in 2002–2003 (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2004a). The presence has generated interest among hearing students and teachers in the lives, experiences, language, community, and culture of the signing D/HH students (Rosen, 2006). They increasingly request courses in ASL and the American Deaf community and culture (Rosen, 2006). As a result, general education schools accepted ASL as one of their languages. The presence of signing D/HH students and the hearing students' demand for classes in ASL have opened doors to inside and outside interests, which set into motion the creation of courses and programs in ASL as a foreign language in public general education schools (Rosen, 2006).

State legislatures and education departments needed to provide official approval in order for schools to offer ASL courses, which include information on the Deaf community and culture, for foreign language credit. Beginning in the 1980s, members from the Deaf community initiated the process for meeting with and securing approval from state legislatures and state education departments. However, the process varied across states. Different sources initiated the process for implementing state recognition of ASL for foreign language credit in schools, as Pfeffier (2003) found for Virginia, Loux (1996) for Nevada, Rosen (2005) for New York, and Selover (1988) and Clary (2004) for California, but followed a similar process for all in-house program and course approvals (Clary, 2004; Pfeffier, 2003). In some states, the NAD, in collaboration with the American Sign Language Teachers Association (ASLTA), a leading American organization of teachers of ASL, met with state education

departments and state legislatures and received approval (Rosen, 2006). In New York State, for instance, Empire State Association of the Deaf, a state chapter of the NAD, several representatives from the state chapter of ASLTA, and other community leaders met with members of the state legislature, received approval, drew up curriculum and assessment materials, and devised examinations for teacher certification and student diplomas (Rosen, 2006). In other states, community members and faculty from colleges and universities carried out the process. In California, a consortium of individual members of the Deaf community, such as Selover (1988), the California Association of the Deaf, educational institutions such as California State University at Northridge, and community organizations initiated the process. In Maryland, Nevada (Loux, 1996), Texas, and Washington, consortia of community organizations and leaders also underwent similar processes. In a few states, the process began at the political level. For instance, a memorandum written by a Virginia superintendent in 1988 led to the passage of a resolution recognizing ASL as a foreign language in the state assembly in 1998 (Pfeffier, 2003; Wallinger, 2000).

As a result of Deaf community mobilization, the number of states that formally recognized ASL as a foreign language has grown from 28 states in 1997 (Kreeft-Peyton, 1998) to 32 in 1999 (Jacobowitz, 1999) and to 38 in 2004 (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2004b). Table 1 shows the states that recognized ASL as a foreign language and the states that have legislation pending as of 2004 (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2004b).

The number of recognizing states had grown 36% in 7 years since Kreeft-Peyton's (1998) study. Two states had ASL legislation pending. State legislation for ASL had never been proposed in 10 states.

However, the offering of ASL for foreign language credit in high schools was not predicated on state education departments' recognition of ASL as a language. There were several states where ASL was not formally recognized but its schools offered ASL for foreign language credit. Table 1 shows that New Mexico, North Dakota, and Missouri were three of the states that have not formally recognized ASL as a foreign language. Nevertheless, there were high schools in these states that offered ASL for foreign language credit. The rationale was that high schools offer foreign languages in order to help their secondary students gain admission to college, which typically requires at least 2 years of foreign language study in secondary school. In addition, there were some states, such as Alabama and Iowa, that formally recognized ASL as a foreign language, but none of their public high schools offered ASL foreign language classes. These states typically did not require foreign languages for any of their high school diplomas. As such, there was no relationship between state recognition of ASL and ASL offerings in its high schools. There may be opportunity for more growth in the number of high schools offering ASL for foreign language credit regardless of state

TABLE 1
American Sign Language as a Foreign Language, 2004

Recognize ASL	ASL Recognition Pending	ASL Never Proposed to the State Legislature
Alabama	Arkansas	Delaware
Alaska	Missouri	Hawaii
Arizona		Idaho
California		Mississippi
Connecticut		Nebraska
Colorado		New Hampshire
Florida		New Mexico
Georgia		North Carolina
Illinois		North Dakota
Indiana		Wyoming
Iowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Montana		
Nevada		
New Jersey		
New York		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		

Note. Gallaudet Research Institute (2004).

education departments' recognition of ASL as a foreign language.

The results of Deaf community work in ensuring recognition of ASL and Deaf community and culture at the state government level were carried over to public high schools (Rosen, 2006). However, high school principals, foreign language departments, and school districts needed to provide support for implementing programs and courses in ASL as a foreign language in the schools. In addition, classes needed to be established, students enrolled, and teachers hired.

There were several studies of ASL classes and programs in secondary schools. Some of the studies focused on processes for program implementation that were previously described. Other studies looked at judgments by teachers and school administrators on the knowledge and skills that teachers of ASL ought to possess. In Pfeffier's (2003) study, school district administrators identified the following knowledge and skills as critical in hiring secondary school teachers of ASL: proficiency in ASL, knowledge of Deaf culture, and public relations skills in advocating for and disseminating information about ASL. Newell (1995a, 1995b) conducted a national survey of practicing teachers of ASL for ASLTA in 1993–1994. Survey participants identified the following knowledge and skills as vital for ASL teachers: knowledge and ability to explain ASL linguistic structures, proficiency in ASL, and knowledge of Deaf culture and history. Similar knowledge and skills expected of teachers of ASL also were found in Kanda and Fleischer (1988) and Stokoe (1995). ASLTA developed several position papers on teacher qualifications, suggesting that teachers need to possess a degree in ASL or Deaf Studies and ASLTA certification, be a member of ASLTA, and attend ASLTA conferences and workshops (Newell, 1995a, 1995b).

The studies on ASL in U.S. secondary schools are limited in scope. The CAL surveys focused only on the number of high schools with ASL classes for 2 years, 1987 and 1997. The studies on teachers and processes for program implementation differed in the scale of analysis. The studies on program implementation were restricted to public high schools in one state (Pfeffier, 2003; Selover, 1988) and in one county of another state (Clary, 2004). Some studies of practicing teachers of ASL were conducted at the state level (Clary, 2004; Pfeffier, 2003), and other studies at the national level (Newell, 1994, 1995a, 1995b; Kanda & Fleischer, 1988). The studies also present other limitations. The studies by Kanda and Fleischer (1988), Stokoe (1995), and ASLTA (Newell, 1994, 1995a) on knowledge and skills for ASL teachers utilized judgments by the ASL teachers and administrators, which may or may not reflect the actual knowledge and skills of ASL teachers. In addition, Newell (1994, 1995a, 1995b) conducted national surveys of practicing teachers, but in his studies, it is difficult to distinguish between data for the secondary school teachers and data for other teachers.

While there is growth in the number of secondary schools that offer ASL for foreign language credit, there is a lack of research at the national level regarding student enrollments, classes, levels of ASL courses, teacher preparation and qualifications, and the process for program implementation in secondary schools. The absence of a national study of ASL as a foreign language in secondary schools had impacted the implementation of ASL in the schools. A lack of knowledge among public school administrators nationwide regarding ASL as a language and ASL foreign language programs prevented the implementation of ASL programs and classes in secondary schools (Clary, 2004; Reagan, 2000; Wallinger, 2000). Pfeffier (2003) found that the greatest obstacles to the implementation and administration of ASL foreign language programs in Virginia's public secondary schools were a lack of awareness among school administrators in ASL as a foreign language, teacher qualifications, and the availability of qualified teachers. Clary (2004) also found a similar situation in southern California's public secondary schools.

The present study sought to remedy this by accessing information on classes, students, and teachers in secondary schools that offer ASL for foreign language credit. It is hoped here that such information will aid school administrators and educators to become aware of, and plan for implementing, ASL in secondary schools.

SURVEY OF ASL AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

To gather information on the schools, classes, students, and teachers of ASL as a foreign language, Rosen (2005) conducted a survey. As mentioned earlier, the purpose of the survey was to ascertain the breadth and scope of, and to discern trends in, ASL as a foreign language in public high schools nationwide in the following topical areas: number and distribution of schools, teachers, classes, students, and departments; types of

curriculum and instruction; and the process for program implementation.

For the survey, lists of schools that offered ASL classes for foreign language credit were requested and obtained from U.S. state education departments in late 2004 and early 2005. Out of the 50 states sent the request, 38 states responded, and 31 states provided the lists. Five responded saying that there were no high schools within their states that offered ASL foreign language programs. Two other states responded, but did not tabulate such lists. For the two states, an Internet search was conducted. However, this search proved to be unreliable because of incomplete information and frequent breakdown of Web sites. Lists containing names and addresses of close to 1,100 high schools with ASL foreign language programs were collected from the 31 respondent states. The lists included all types of high schools such as public, private, denominational, alternative, vocational–technical, specialized, and special education high schools. Because of financial and time constraints, the population of high schools with ASL foreign language programs was narrowed to a sample of public, general education high schools.

Questionnaires were drawn that sought information on the number of public general high schools that offer ASL within the states, the year ASL was implemented, order of establishment, student enrollments, number of teachers, types of ASL-related training teachers received, departments housing ASL classes, curricular materials and instructional approaches used by teachers, and the existence of an ASL club by the 2004–2005 academic year. The survey questionnaire is exhibited in Appendix A. Not all information in the survey was requested for the year of the survey. In order to discern trends on student enrollments, classes, and teachers, information on student enrollments, classes, and teachers was requested for the 2002–2003 to 2004–2005 school years. Information on program implementation was requested for the year of its implementation. Information for the projected year, 2005–2006, will not be discussed here since there was an insufficient number of responses. In addition, survey data on curriculum and instruction will not be discussed here because of space limitation. Responses to the question on whether ASL was given foreign language credit in a high school were used to eliminate high schools that do not grant ASL foreign language credit from analysis here.

Survey questionnaires were mailed in early 2005 to 628 schools in 31 states.[2] Out of the 628 schools from 31 states, 226 responded from 18 states. The response rates were 36% for respondents and 58% for the states. The responses were tabulated for analysis of trends. The following depiction of survey results was based on responses from the 226 respondent schools in 18 states. Trends on the national number of public high schools with ASL foreign language programs, student enrollments, classes, and teachers were based on information from the respondent public high schools and were multiplied in proportion to the number of high schools in the states to reflect the current status of ASL as a foreign language at the schools. Figures for some states may be skewed due to insufficient responses from high schools, and interpretation of results is made with this caveat.

Number of High Schools Offering ASL for Foreign Language Credit

The number of high schools with ASL foreign language programs was drawn from the lists provided by state education departments from 31 states. Table 2 shows the number of public high schools that offer ASL classes and programs for foreign language credit.

Survey results showed that the total number of such high schools in the United States was 701 as of the 2004–2005 academic year for the 31 states that provided the lists. The 701 high schools represented less than 64% of the 1,100 high schools of all types with ASL foreign language programs and classes in the United States.

The CAL survey showed 33 high schools in 1997. The growth rate in the number of high schools with ASL programs in 2004 compared with 1997 is more than 2100%. Not every state had the same number of high schools with ASL programs and classes. Washington State had the highest number of such high schools, followed by Texas, Florida, California, Ohio, and New York. Few states had only one high school, such as Alaska, Michigan, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Colorado, and North Carolina. No high schools with ASL foreign language programs were offered in Alabama, Delaware, Iowa, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

The figures on the number of high schools that offer ASL for foreign language credit are meaningful only when they are compared with the number of high schools that offer foreign languages. This comparison helps determine the presence of ASL as a foreign language in public secondary schools and is a measure of the penetration of ASL in secondary school foreign language programs. Based on available data on secondary school foreign language programs, unfortunately, it is not possible to discern the relative size of ASL

TABLE 2
Number of Public High Schools With ASL Classes, by State, as of 2004–2005 (not Including Charter, Denominational, Private, and Vocational Schools)

Washington	150
Texas	120
Florida	82
California	66
Ohio	63
New York	57
Virginia	32
Arizona	16
Indiana	13
Maine	13
New Jersey	11
Utah	9
Maryland	7
Massachusetts	7
New Mexico	7
West Virginia	7
Missouri	6
Illinois	5
Kansas	5
Kentucky	5
Connecticut	4
Minnesota	4
North Dakota	3
Wisconsin	2
Alaska	1
Michigan	1
Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	1
Vermont	1
Colorado	1
North Carolina	1
Alabama	0
Delaware	0
Iowa	0
Tennessee	0
Wyoming	0
National Total	701

programs. There were no national statistics in the early 2000s on high school foreign language programs. Only the states of California and Indiana provided statistics on their high schools with foreign language classes during the period. However, the statistics were not sufficient in scope and were not helpful in assessing the penetration of ASL in secondary school foreign language programs. California provided statistics on the number of schools, teachers, and foreign language classes at all levels, from kindergarten to secondary. Indiana provided statistics on student enrollments for all grades. Data from these statistics will be discussed in later sections on teachers, classes, and students.

The figures on the number of high schools with ASL classes are also meaningful in relation to prevailing high school diploma requirements within states. The question is whether offering ASL for foreign language credit in a state is dependent on whether foreign language is required for its high school diploma. Appendix B lists diploma requirements for foreign language by state. Some of the information was provided by Dounay (2002), and other information was gathered by Web search. The figure shown was current at the time of the survey, 2004–2005. There have been changes in state certification and degree requirements since the time of the survey. Information on current state requirements for high school diplomas is found on the Web site of the National Council of State Supervisors For Languages (http://www.NCSSFL.org).

To discern whether there is a relationship between the prevalence of ASL offerings in high school and foreign language requirements for state high school diplomas, information from state education regulations regarding foreign language requirements for diplomas from Appendix B were compared with information on state recognition of ASL as a foreign language from Table 1 and data on state offerings of ASL for foreign language credit from Table 2. The three tables showed that states varied in the types of diploma they award their graduating secondary students.

Some states offered only one diploma and other states offered more than one diploma. If a state offered only one diploma, it usually required basic academic skills courses such as English, math, science, and social studies, and allowed local school boards to add other requirements. In states that offered only basic diplomas, the determination as to whether to offer a foreign language as an additional requirement in schools often was left to the discretion of local school boards. If a state did not require foreign language for any of its diplomas, as found in states such as Arizona, Connecticut, and Illinois (which offer only one diploma) it did not mean that foreign languages, including ASL, were not offered in its high schools. Foreign languages often were required by the local school boards to allow students to earn credits for college admissions purposes and meet college admissions requirements. For instance, Illinois did not require foreign language for its high school diplomas, but its schools offered ASL for foreign language credit, which was indicated on student transcripts as "college readiness" credit. Arizona did not require foreign language for its high school diplomas, but its state education department allocated eight credits to local education agencies to add other requirements,

such as foreign language, including ASL, for its high school diplomas.

In addition, some states offered more than one type of high school diploma. The states that offered more than one diploma offered mostly a basic diploma with concentration in math, science, social studies, and English literacy, and an advanced diploma with additional requirements. The advanced diploma was typically college preparatory, and the state often mandated courses that allow its students meet college admissions requirements, such as foreign languages. States that required foreign language for its high school college-preparatory diplomas often offered ASL for foreign language credit. For instance, California, Indiana, New York, Ohio, and Virginia offered two diplomas, a basic diploma and a college-preparatory diploma. Foreign language credits were required only for the college-preparatory diplomas, and ASL was offered for foreign language credit in many of its high schools.

States that did not require foreign language for graduation and did not recognize ASL as a foreign language did not offer ASL for foreign language credit. Delaware and Wyoming are two examples.

Furthermore, while state boards of education set guidelines on graduation requirements for diplomas, only local school boards, such as school districts, formulated the requirements in credit units and designated diplomas on behalf of state boards of education. This explains the process of securing ASL as a foreign language at the school district level since the districts determined the requirements for its diplomas in accordance with state and local education laws.

Across states, it appears there was a disconnect between the foreign language requirements for high school diplomas and the offerings of ASL for foreign language credit. If a state required foreign language credit for its diplomas, or at least for its college-preparatory diplomas, it offered ASL classes for foreign language credit. States that offered one statewide diploma often did not require foreign language study. However, such states either offered foreign language classes, including ASL, to help students prepare for college admissions or they did not recognize or offer ASL.

The causal relationship between high school ASL and colleges granting foreign language credit for prior study for admission and graduation cannot be discerned from this survey, but increased high school enrollment in ASL classes seemed to parallel increased college enrollments. As of 2005, about 150 national research universities accepted high school credit courses in ASL for admission purposes (Wilcox, 2006), and, comparing the numbers from earlier and later years from Wilcox and Wilcox's lists (1997), the number of such colleges and universities was growing. Increases in both high school and college enrollments seemed to suggest that a growing number of colleges and universities were granting foreign language credit for high school courses.

In the following section, survey results are presented for the 226 public high schools from 18 states that responded to the questionnaire.

Establishment of ASL Foreign Language Programs

Respondents were asked about the process for implementing ASL foreign language programs in their high schools, with respect to who initiated and who followed up on the process for program implementation. The respondents were given six possible implementation steps with the idea that a different party would be responsible for each step. These parties could refer to teachers, parents, students, the principal, the school district, and the community. Two of the respondents added other parties, such as assistant principal and sign language interpreter.

Results from the survey showed that, nationwide, the process typically began with teachers from other fields who know ASL and want to teach ASL as a foreign language. These teachers took the first initiative and asked their students, either individually or collectively in groups such as an ASL club, about their interest in taking ASL courses for foreign language credit. The teachers and students then requested that their principals create courses in ASL for foreign language credit at schools. After their requests were received, the principals typically surveyed parents for their support of ASL foreign language programs. Once parents gave their support, the principals requested and secured approval from school districts. The school districts then surveyed interested community members and gave final approval for ASL foreign language programs.

However, survey results showed that there were variations across states and locales in the process for establishing ASL programs and classes in public secondary schools, both nonmainstreamed and mainstreamed with D/HH. In addition, not every state or school went through all parties. Any one group could initiate or support ASL as a foreign language in schools. The following are two examples of local advocacy and efforts leading to implementation of ASL programs in high schools,

both familiar to the author. In the first case, a chairperson of a Languages Other Than English (LOTE) department in a nonmainstreamed school was intrigued by the possibility of offering ASL for foreign language credit. He contacted the New York State Education Department for information on New York State diploma requirements for ASL as a foreign language and for assistance in locating teachers for the ASL classes. He met with the school principal, and the principal provided support for the initiative. The school principal contacted his school district and received support. An advertisement was placed, a teacher was hired, and ASL classes were formed. In the second case, an ASL interpreter in a mainstreamed high school with D/HH students queried the principal on whether the school could offer ASL to its students. The principal contacted the chairperson of its LOTE department. They had a meeting with the interpreter and decided on a survey to assess student interest. They received a petition with hundreds of signatures from the students. Seeing student interest, the LOTE chairperson provided support, and the principal contacted her school district for permission to create and offer credits for the ASL courses. She then formed two classes with 15 students each, with plans to add more courses as students moved to higher class levels.

Results imply that different sources contributed to program implementation. State and local variations such as needs, resources, availability, and willingness of players and schools shaped the process for the implementation of ASL programs. The finding that the processes of program implementation varied across states and localities is in agreement with the processes at the state level as described in Pfeffier (2003), Selover (1988), and Clary (2004).

As a result of efforts by members of the Deaf community, students, and their parents, as well as the support from principals and school districts, an increasing number of American public high schools established programs and classes in ASL as a foreign language over the years. There were also increases in the number of teachers and students in public high school ASL programs.

Departments Housing ASL Foreign Language Programs

The respondents also were asked to identify the departments under which ASL classes and programs were housed in the 2004–2005 academic year. They were given a list of departments in the questionnaire, which included foreign, modern, second, or world language department, special education department, vocational education department, extracurricular clubs, schools for the deaf, and other departments. The respondents identified all departments that applied.

Survey results showed that ASL classes in high schools were mostly housed in foreign language departments. Nationally, 78% of the ASL classes and programs were placed under the department of foreign, modern, second, or world languages. Less than 8% of ASL classes were housed in more than one department. In some states, such as Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, ASL classes and programs were placed exclusively in high school foreign language departments. In other states, such as New York, Florida, Texas, and California, the percentage of ASL classes and programs that were placed in foreign language departments ranged from the low 80s to the high 90s. The national percentages were skewed by a few states where ASL was prominently placed under departments other than foreign, modern, second, or world languages, such as Washington and Maine. In Maine, some high schools placed their ASL programs and classes in a school for the deaf. The responses indicated that no high school placed ASL programs and classes under extracurricular clubs such as an ASL or sign language club. That the ASL programs were largely placed in foreign, modern, second, or world language departments is a testament to the acceptance of ASL as a foreign language and to the recognition of ASL and the Deaf community and culture within public high schools.

Students and Classes

Student Enrollment in ASL Classes. The respondents were queried about the number of students enrolled in ASL foreign language classes for the academic years 2002–2003 to 2004–2005. Table 3 shows student enrollments in ASL classes. The figures for each state were then calculated to reflect the current national trend.

Survey results revealed that the number of students enrolled in ASL classes nationwide had risen exponentially. Nationally, 56,783 high school students enrolled in ASL classes in the school year 2002–2003, and 73,473 in 2004–2005. This represented a growth rate of 29.4% from 2002 to 2005. The states with the highest number of student enrollments in the most recent school year, 2004–2005, were Texas, Florida, California, and Washington. The states with the lowest number of student enrollments were Connecticut and Oregon. Almost all states showed increases in student

TABLE 3
Number of Students Enrolled in ASL Classes in Public High Schools, by Year

	Number of Students		
	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005
Arizona	2,446	2,446	2,446
California	8,132	9,178	11,174
Connecticut	71	71	71
Florida	10,614	11,103	12,656
Illinois	638	826	762
Indiana	2,180	2,233	2,375
Maine	1,117	1,794	1,563
Maryland	319	425	610
Massachusetts	230	230	592
New Jersey	248	564	773
New York	5,789	6,548	6,668
Ohio	4,222	6,090	6,009
Oregon	113	92	142
Pennsylvania	NA	NA	624
Texas	10,018	12,400	15,208
Utah	638	954	925
Virginia	2,868	2,868	2,737
Washington	7,140	7,374	8,139
National Total	56,783	65,196	73,473

Note. Figures are rounded to the nearest ones.

enrollments. The states with the highest rate of increase in student enrollments from 2002–2003 to 2004–2005 were New Jersey with 212%, followed by Texas with 51.7%, Utah with 45%, Ohio with 42.3%, and California with 37.4%. Except for Virginia, no state showed decreases in student enrollment between 2002–2003 and 2004–2005. Oregon showed a decline from 2002–2003 to 2003–2004, and Utah, Illinois, Maine, and Ohio showed a decline in 2004–2005 compared with 2003–2004. Arizona and Connecticut exhibited no growth in student enrollments across the years.

Data on student enrollment are meaningful when compared with population sizes of the states and student enrollments in other foreign languages. The question is whether student enrollment size is dependent on the population of the state and the number of high school students taking foreign language classes. Texas, for instance, was larger in population size and had more students taking ASL for foreign language than Connecticut, which suggests that enrollment size was dependent on the population of the state and the number of high school students taking foreign language classes. To tease out possible relationships between enrollment size for ASL and for other foreign languages and the states' population sizes, information on population sizes and total student enrollments for all foreign languages is required.

The latest survey on the number of students taking foreign language classes was conducted in 2000 by the National Center for Education Statistics and was found in its Educational Longitudinal Study of high school transcripts (United States Department of Education, 2006). This information was not useful for making comparisons with ASL student enrollments for the years covered in this survey. For the years since 2000, information on student enrollment in foreign language classes was requested from state education departments. Only California and Indiana provided such information. California was larger in population size than Indiana. In 2002–2003, there were 798,438 students in California taking foreign language classes, which increased to 817,942 in 2003–2004, and 830,565 in 2004–2005 (California Department of Education, 2006a). When these figures were compared with Table 3, it was calculated that only 1% of California students took ASL for foreign language credits in 2002–2003, which increased to 1.6% in 2004–2005. In Indiana, 121,192 students took foreign language classes in 2002–2003, which increased to 126,599 in 2003–2004, and 132,896 in 2004–2005 (Indiana Department of Education, 2006a). When these figures were compared with Table 3, it was calculated that 1.9% of the Indiana students took ASL for foreign language credit every year from 2002–2003 to 2004–2005. The percentages of students taking ASL for foreign language in these states have hovered around 1–2% of the total foreign language enrollment. Student enrollment in ASL classes in a state was directly proportional to the state's population size, as shown in the student enrollment numbers for California and Indiana. In these states, however, the proportion of students enrolling in ASL classes out of total student enrollments in all foreign languages was similar.

Special Education Students in ASL Classes. While there was demonstrated growth in the number of students taking ASL for foreign language credit, ASL courses also attracted a considerable percentage of special education students, that is, students who received special education services at their schools. Such students typically were designated in the schools as "504" students as defined in Section 504 of the U.S. Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which mandates schools to provide accommodations for students with disabilities. The growth in ASL classes provided opportunities for students with disabilities to interact with regular education students. According to respondents' comments in

TABLE 4
Percentage of Students in ASL Classes for Foreign Language Credit Identified as Special Education Students, by State, for the School Year 2004–2005

	Special Education Students 2004–2005
Arizona	5
California	8
Connecticut	25
Florida	6
Illinois	10
Indiana	11
Maine	10
Maryland	1
Massachusetts	34
New Jersey	16
New York	15
Ohio	12
Oregon	15
Pennsylvania	NA
Texas	14
Utah	10
Virginia	10
Washington	9
National	13

TABLE 5
Number of Classes in ASL in Secondary High Schools by Year

	Number of Classes		
	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005
Arizona	85	85	85
California	323	354	425
Connecticut	4	4	4
Florida	415	454	528
Illinois	32	43	39
Indiana	99	99	103
Maine	106	124	113
Maryland	11	14	29
Massachusetts	28	28	28
New Jersey	14	32	43
New York	330	347	351
Ohio	234	347	858
Oregon	7	7	7
Pennsylvania	21	21	21
Texas	642	748	822
Utah	21	32	43
Virginia	163	167	149
Washington	323	344	365
National Total	2,857	3,251	4,009

Note. Figures are rounded.

the survey, ASL courses attracted a relatively high percentage of special education students with deafness and learning and physical disabilities. Table 4 shows the percentage of special education students taking ASL classes for foreign language credit. The figures were only for the school year 2004–2005.

Nationally, 13% of the students in ASL classes were special education students. There were variations across states in the percentage of special education students in ASL classes. Massachusetts had the highest percentage of special education students in ASL classes, followed by Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Oregon. Maryland had the lowest percentage of special education students in ASL classes, followed by Arizona and Florida.

The percentage of ASL students who were D/HH could not be discerned from the respondents' comments. This study does not provide evidence for the impact of D/HH in ASL classes with hearing students on learning other foreign languages. Further, the impact of mainstreaming D/HH students in hearing classrooms on learning ASL and other languages could not be determined from the available survey results.

Number of ASL Classes. In concordance with the increase in student enrollments over the years, there was an increase in the number of ASL classes. Table 5 shows the number of ASL classes in public high schools for the academic years 2002–2003 to 2004–2005. The figures were recalculated to reflect the national total.

The number of ASL classes had grown nationally from 2,857 in 2002–2003 to 4,009 in 2004–2005. This represented a growth rate of 40.3% from 2002 to 2005. The states with the highest number of ASL classes in the last year of the survey, 2004–2005, were Ohio, followed by Texas, Florida, California, and Washington. Connecticut had the lowest number of ASL classes, followed by Oregon. Almost all states showed increases in the number of ASL classes. The states with the highest rate of increase in the number of ASL classes from 2002–2003 to 2004–2005 were Ohio with 266.7%, New Jersey with 207%, Utah with 104.8%, California with 31.6%, and Texas with 28%. The exceptions are Illinois, Maine, and Virginia, all of which showed a decline in 2004–2005 compared with 2003–2004. A few states, such as Arizona, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, exhibited no change in the number of ASL classes.

Figures on the number of ASL classes are meaningful when compared with the total number of classes in other foreign languages. Such comparison is a measure of the capacity for teaching ASL as a foreign language. However, there was no

information at the national level on the number of foreign language classes for the years covered in the survey. At the state level, only California provided information. For 2002–2003, California offered 26,377 foreign language classes, which decreased slightly to 26,372 classes in 2003–2004, and increased to 27,113 in 2004–2005 (California Department of Education, 2006a). The percentage of foreign language classes that are ASL classes in California in Table 5 increased from 1% in 2002–2003 to a little below 2% in 2004–2005. This suggests that, at least in California, the proportion of ASL classes compared to other foreign languages increased, but ASL's penetration into secondary foreign language programs was low.

Levels of ASL Classes. There was also an increase in the number of levels of ASL classes offered in public high schools. Each level corresponds to 1 year of study. For instance, if the response is two levels, it means 2 years of study. The respondents were asked about the number of levels of ASL classes for the academic years 2002–2003 to 2004–2005. Nationally, survey results showed that the average number of levels of ASL classes has grown from 2.3 levels in 2002–2003 to 2.4 in 2004–2005. This represented a growth rate of a little more than 4% from 2002 to 2005. In other words, an average of about 2 to 2.5 years of study in ASL was offered in public high schools nationwide. The states with the highest number of levels of ASL classes in the last school year of the survey, 2004–2005, were Pennsylvania with four levels, followed by Utah with more than three levels, and Virginia and Texas with close to three levels. Connecticut had the lowest number of levels of ASL classes, with one level, followed by Maine, with just under two levels. The states with the highest rate of increase in the number of levels of ASL classes from 2002–2003 to 2004–2005 were Maryland with 100% and California, Washington, New York, and Indiana with a range of 13% to 17%. Some states, such as New Jersey and Utah, showed declines. A few states, such as Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, exhibited no growth.

If the figures are compared with the information on diploma requirements shown in Appendix B, it can be seen that the number of levels of ASL classes was commensurate with the number of years of foreign language study required by state and local education boards. This was true for states that offered high school college-preparatory diplomas as well as for states that offered only basic diplomas with additional requirements for their college-bound students.

Teachers, Degrees, and Certifications

The following depicts survey results on the number of teachers; their highest degrees, fields of collegiate study, and teacher certification; courses and workshops they took; and years of teaching experience.

Number of FTE Teachers. The number of teachers of ASL also had increased over the years. Table 6 shows the number of ASL teachers, measured in FTE (full-time equivalency), which is a more accurate indicator of the employment situation of teachers than head counts, by states for the years 2002–2003 to 2004–2005. To reflect the national trend in the 701 high schools, the figures were totaled.

In 2002–2003, the number of FTE teachers nationwide was 592. The number of FTE teachers grew to 723 in 2004–2005. This represented an increase of 22% from 2002–2003 to 2004–2005. Texas had the highest number of FTE teachers across the years, followed by Florida, New York, and California. Connecticut had fewer than one FTE teacher from 2002 to 2005. The fastest growth

TABLE 6
Number of Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) Teachers, by State

	Teachers in FTE		
	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005
Arizona	21	21	21
California	62	71	86
Connecticut	1	1	1
Florida	96	92	110
Illinois	4	11	7
Indiana	21	25	25
Maine	19	23	23
Maryland	4	4	4
Massachusetts	6	6	6
New Jersey	4	11	12
New York	78	79	83
Ohio	50	63	80
Oregon	4	4	4
Pennsylvania	4	4	4
Texas	119	131	147
Utah	4	4	6
Virginia	39	39	39
Washington	59	61	66
National Total	592	648	723

Note. Figures are rounded.

in the number of FTEs between 2002–2003 and 2004–2005 was in New Jersey, which had a growth rate of 200%, followed by Ohio, with a 60% growth rate, and Utah with 50%. In many states, such as Maine, New York, and Washington, the number of FTEs had little growth. In other states, such as Arizona, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, the number had not grown at all. One state, Illinois, showed an increase in the number of FTEs from 2002–2003 but a decline from 2003–2004 to 2004–2005. It is suspected that the demonstrated lack of growth for these states was skewed by the low rate of responses to survey questionnaires; few schools in those states responded, and the figures reflected the FTE situation in the respondent schools.

The data on the number of FTEs are better understood as a proportion of total number of teachers, both in ASL and other foreign languages. The question is whether the proportion of teachers who were counted as FTEs is a function of capacity for teaching, student interest, and/or attitude toward ASL as a foreign language. To tease out possible relationships between the number of teacher FTEs and the capacity for teaching, student interest, and/or attitude toward ASL as a foreign language, respondents were asked about the number of teachers and FTEs. Several schools either provided FTEs without providing the number of teachers or provided the number of teachers without providing the number of FTEs. Schools elected to supply either the number of teachers or the number of FTEs because of confidentiality or certification issues. For the purpose of making a valid comparison between the number of teachers and FTEs, only the total number of teachers and FTEs were counted for a school if the school provided information on both in the survey questionnaire. Percentage statistics on FTEs by total number of ASL teachers were compiled.

The number of ASL teachers and FTEs was not the same. Nationally, the number of teachers exceeded the number of FTE positions, for an average of 0.91 FTE position per teacher. In other words, 91% of the reported ASL teaching positions were FTE. Of the 18 respondent states, Indiana, Maryland, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia carried a 100% FTE–teacher ratio. California, Florida, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Texas carried an FTE–teacher ratio that exceeded 90%. Connecticut had the lowest FTE–teacher ratio at 20%. The states with the lowest FTE–teacher ratio might experience attitudinal or student interest barriers to ASL as a foreign language. It appears that in these states the supply of teachers, as measured by total number, exceeded the demand for teachers as measured in FTE. In addition, it is clear that the number of FTEs did not necessarily correspond to the size of the state. California was larger than Maryland and Texas, but Maryland and Texas carried a higher FTE–teacher ratio than California. As such, the difference among states' FTE–teacher ratios did not reflect different population sizes, but may have reflected differences in attitudes, capacity for teaching, requirements for foreign language in secondary schools, and recognition of ASL as a foreign language.

There was no information at the national level on the number of foreign language teachers for the years 2003 to 2005. Only one state, California, provided such statistics. In 2002–2003, California had 5,238 foreign language teacher FTEs, which increased to 5,309 in 2003–2004 and 5,429 in 2004–2005 (California Department of Education, 2006b). When compared with the number of ASL teacher FTEs for the same years using the data in Table 6, only about 1% of foreign language teachers were teachers of ASL in 2002–2003, which increased to about 2% in 2004–2005. The figures show that the proportion of ASL teaching positions in relation to foreign language teaching positions increased over the years, but the penetration of ASL teaching positions in schools was low, at least in California.

The information on FTE teachers is also better understood as a proportion of total classes. The number of ASL classes taught by FTE teachers is a measure of teacher capacity for teaching ASL as a foreign language. Survey results showed that the national average number of classes per FTE teacher was five. However, the average number of classes per teacher varied by state. Maryland had the highest number of classes, six, per teacher. Connecticut had the lowest number, which was one class per teacher. Most states' averages fell between five to six classes per FTE teacher, but others fell between four to five classes. There was a discrepancy across states between the average number of classes per FTE teacher and per total number of teachers. This suggests that the states where the average number of classes per FTE was below the national average largely hired teachers either on a part-time basis or to teach other subjects in addition to ASL.

The question remains whether the teaching load for ASL teachers is comparable with the teaching load for other foreign language teachers. There was no national information on the number of classes per foreign language teacher. California was the only state that provided such information. On average, California foreign

TABLE 7
Percentages of Teachers With Highest Degrees

	Highest Degrees	
	BA/BS	MA/MS/MEd
Arizona	0	71
California	66	34
Connecticut	0	100
Florida	65	29
Illinois	33	67
Indiana	29	57
Maine	43	57
Maryland	0	50
Massachusetts	0	100
New Jersey	0	75
New York	8	92
Ohio	43	43
Oregon	0	100
Pennsylvania	0	100
Texas	48	40
Utah	0	100
Virginia	60	40
Washington	17	48
National	39	50

Note. Statistics are not extrapolated in this table. Figures are rounded. BA = Bachelor of Arts; BS = Bachelor of Science; MA = Master of Arts; MS = Master of Science; MEd = Master of Education.

language teachers taught about five classes in 2002–2005 (California Department of Education, 2006b). It appears that, at least in California, the number of classes per FTE teacher was similar for ASL and other foreign language teachers. A possibility existed that states' practices on FTE teaching course load were based on local education regulations and teacher union contracts with school districts.

Highest Degree Earned. Different levels of degrees were earned by ASL secondary school teachers. Table 7 shows the highest degrees earned by teachers for the 2004–2005 school year.

Nationally, just over a third of teachers of ASL in public high schools earned as their highest degree a bachelor's degree such as a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science; half the teachers earned a master's degree, such as a Master of Arts, Master of Science, or Master of Education. About a tenth of the teachers did not possess a collegiate degree.

The remaining question is whether teachers of ASL in a given state earned degrees to teach in secondary schools in commensuration with the state's minimum degree requirements of all of its secondary school teachers. Appendix C shows state requirements for teacher certification at the secondary level. There were variations across states in the highest degree level they required for teachers of secondary schools. If figures in Table 8 on ASL teachers' highest degree earned are compared with information in Appendix C on state requirements for teacher certification, it is seen that the highest degree earned by teachers of ASL was in agreement with state minimum degree requirements for secondary school teachers. States varied in the percentage of ASL teachers for each degree level in accordance with state minimum degree requirements for teachers. For instance, California, Florida, Texas, and Virginia required a minimum of a bachelor's degree and had a higher percentage of teachers with a bachelor's degree than a master's degree. In other states, only teachers with a master's degree were eligible to teach in secondary schools. For instance, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Utah were such states where 100% of ASL teachers possessed a master's degree. However, in some states, there was an equal percentage of teachers at each degree level; Ohio was one instance, and it required a minimum of a bachelor's degree to teach. Apparently, the hiring of teachers for ASL classes was largely contingent on the teachers' earning the highest degrees required for teacher certification in their states.

Fields of Collegiate Study. Respondents were asked about the fields of study in which ASL teachers earned their highest degrees by 2004–2005. Survey results revealed that at the national level, ASL teachers earned their highest degrees in either deafness- or disability-related fields, with a few in the field of ASL teaching. Half the teachers earned their highest degrees in deafness-related fields such as Deaf education, interpreter training programs (ITP), ASL studies, and Deaf studies. Thirty-five percent of teachers earned their highest degrees in the field of Deaf education, less than 8% in ASL studies, and 5% each in ITP and Deaf studies programs. Less than 7% of ASL teachers earned their highest degrees in disability-related fields other than deafness, such as special education. Four percent of the teachers earned their highest degrees in elementary education. The percentages of different fields of study in which ASL teachers earned their highest degrees varied across states. All ASL teachers in Pennsylvania earned their highest degrees in the field of ASL Studies. Oregon had the highest percentage of ASL teachers who studied Deaf education, followed by Illinois, Arizona, and Maine. The figures suggest that in these states, schools

TABLE 8
Percentages of Teachers in Certification Areas

	Certification								
	MultiCertif	DeafEd	ITP	ASL	ElemEd	SpEd	K–12	Other	ASLTA
Arizona	14	14	0	0	0	29	14	14	14
California	14	7	3	3	3	10	24	10	0
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Florida	23	35	0	0	7	19	7	35	6
Illinois	67	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
Indiana	29	29	14	14	0	0	14	14	29
Maine	0	14	14	14	0	0	0	43	29
Maryland	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Massachusetts	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	25	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
New York	68	44	4	76	16	20	24	8	0
Ohio	19	48	10	24	0	0	14	5	5
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	48	33	19	43	12	10	17	7	2
Utah	100	50	0	50	50	0	100	50	0
Virginia	30	20	20	10	0	10	20	20	30
Washington	22	4	9	0	9	13	43	30	0
National	79	28	8	22	7	11	21	16	6

Note. Statistics are not extrapolated in this table. Teachers frequently hold certification in more than one area. Figures are rounded and do not add up to 100%. MultiCertif = Multiple Certification; DeafEd = Deaf Education; ITP = Interpreter Training Programs; ASL = American Sign Language; ElemEd = Elementary Education; SpEd = Special Education; K–12 = Kindergarten through 12th grade; ASLTA = American Sign Language Teachers Association.

drew teachers mostly from deafness-related programs and services (cf. Rosen, 2006). However, there were exceptions. For instance, California had the lowest percentage of teachers from deafness-related fields. The rest came from a scattering of fields such as elementary education and noneducational fields. There were no states in which ASL teachers earned their highest degrees exclusively in areas other than deafness- or disability-related fields.

Teacher Certification. Most teachers of ASL hold more than one teacher certification. Table 8 shows the fields in which ASL teachers received teacher certification; figures were only for the 2004–2005 school year.

Nationally, close to 80% of teachers held more than one certification. Most of the ASL teachers held certification in Deaf education, followed by ASL teaching, K–12 general education, and areas other than deafness- or disability-related fields. Six percent of the teachers possessed ASLTA certificates. There was variation across states in the extent to which teachers of ASL were certified in the field of ASL teaching. In New York State, one of the few states that provided teacher certification in ASL as a foreign language by 2005, about three quarters of FTE teachers were certified in the field of ASL teaching. In Texas, less than half the teachers were certified. In New Jersey, only a quarter of the teachers were certified. The results suggest a dearth of teachers who were trained, qualified, and certified to teach ASL as a foreign language. They were largely trained in Deaf education, ASL and Deaf studies, or sign language interpreting.

Does teacher certification possessed by teachers of ASL correspond with state requirements for teacher certification for teachers of ASL as a foreign language? It was found that teacher certifications provided by state education departments were dependent on prevailing teacher qualifications and requirements for the states. As Appendix C shows, only the states of New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Utah required a master's degree; the other states required a bachelor's degree. In New York, Texas, Maryland, and Virginia, certification in ASL was required for those intending to teach it. In these states, there was a higher proportion of

teachers who possessed both the minimum education level mandated by those states and ASL teacher certifications. There was no teacher certification in ASL available in other states.

In the states where teaching certification in ASL was unavailable, an “endorsement in ASL” was added. An endorsement in ASL required the completion of content and pedagogical courses, and passing of content and pedagogical skills examinations. Transcript review was conducted to assess completion of pedagogical and content courses. As Appendix C shows, each state that underwent transcript review required a certain number of semester hours of coursework related to ASL. The coursework largely covered the following areas: ASL linguistics, second language acquisition, Deaf community and culture, Deaf studies, Deaf and ASL arts and literature, teaching methods, instructional planning and strategies, curriculum development, assessment, psychology of youth, psychology of learning, and principles of teaching and learning. States varied in the number of courses and credit hours required for endorsement. In Arizona, 30 credits of pedagogy and 24 credits of ASL-related courses were required. In Illinois, 16 credits of pedagogy courses and 32 credits of content courses were required. In New Jersey, 30 credit hours of content courses and 33 credits of pedagogy courses were required. In such states, in addition to coursework, a content skills examination needed to be taken. States varied in examinations: Arizona required the Arizona Basic Skills Test, Illinois required the Illinois Test of Basic Skills, and Massachusetts required a Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure. Maine, Oregon, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania required the Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test. Since these examinations assess basic skills in math and English literacy, many states, such as Florida, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Oregon, required that potential teachers of ASL demonstrate knowledge and skills in ASL and ASL pedagogy. They required that the potential teachers take a nationally recognized assessment instrument for conversational skills in ASL such as the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI).

For the states that provided teacher certification in ASL, teachers who possessed teacher certification in areas other than ASL, such as special education, Deaf education, and speech-language pathology, were allowed to add an endorsement in ASL after completing a certain number of courses and credit hours and taking the content certification exam in ASL. In addition, some states such as Florida, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Texas accepted ASLTA certification as an endorsement in lieu of coursework.

There was a variation across states on teacher qualifications to teach ASL as a foreign language in secondary schools, but there was a relationship between teacher qualifications and teacher certification requirements within states. In states that offered teacher certification in ASL as a foreign language, higher percentages of teachers possessed such certification. In states that did not offer such certification, but offered an endorsement, teachers mostly followed the state's requirements for endorsement. In states where there was no certification or endorsement, but ASL was recognized as a foreign language, an ASLTA certification was typically accepted.

There might be a relationship between the policies of the various states on foreign language teaching certification and the prevalence of ASL classes. It was apparent from the data in Table 5 and Appendix C that the prevalence of ASL classes was somewhat associated with state policies on foreign language teacher certification. There was a higher prevalence of ASL classes in states with ASL teacher certification or endorsement than in states that did not have ASL teacher certification or endorsement. For instance, New York had ASL teacher certification, and California, Ohio, Texas, and Florida have ASL endorsement. These states have a higher number of high schools offering ASL for foreign language credit than states such as Arizona that did not have ASL teacher certification or endorsement. However, the relationship between states' policies on teacher certification and prevalence of ASL classes may be spurious in some states. For instance, California did not have ASL certification or endorsement but had a higher prevalence of ASL classes than New York State, which required ASL teacher certification. If there was no teacher certification or endorsement in ASL in a state, and if the state did not recognize ASL, the state did not offer ASL for foreign language credit. An example was Delaware.

The provision of teacher certification and endorsement might be a function of states' foreign language requirements for high school diplomas. To assess this, Appendix C on state requirements of teacher certification was compared with Appendix B on states' foreign language requirement for high school diplomas. It is clearly seen that teacher certification and endorsement were provided for ASL in states that require foreign language, particularly for college-preparatory diplomas, such as New York, California, and New Jersey. None were provided in the

states that did not require foreign language study for any of their diplomas, such as Connecticut and Maine. States that did not require foreign language study for any of their diplomas had no teacher certification or endorsement in ASL. In states that did not require foreign language study for diplomas, but whose high schools offered ASL classes to aid students with earning college-preparatory credits, such as Connecticut, ASLTA certification was frequently adopted in lieu of state certification for high school teachers of ASL.

Years of Teaching Experience. The respondents were asked about the average number of years of experience in ASL and other fields teachers had by the 2004–2005 academic year. Survey results showed that nationally, the average number of years of experience was about 6 years. The average number of years of experience teaching ASL varied across states. Pennsylvania teachers had the highest number of years of experience teaching ASL with 28 years, and Illinois teachers had the lowest number with 3 years. Since there were schools in Illinois that offered ASL for foreign language credit more than 3 years ago, the results imply that there might be a higher turnover of teachers of ASL in Illinois. The average number of years of experience in other fields was close to 15 years. States varied in the average years of teaching experience among its teachers in fields other than ASL. Connecticut teachers had the highest number of years of experience with 27 years of teaching in fields other than ASL. None of the teachers in Oregon and Pennsylvania had taught in fields other than ASL. It suggests that teachers of ASL, at least in states other than Oregon and Pennsylvania, were recruited either from other teaching fields, straight from college, or from nonteaching employment to teach ASL.

Courses and Workshops. Respondents were asked to identify the courses and workshops they took as part of their preparation to teach ASL by 2004–2005. Information on courses and workshops was requested in order to assess the knowledge and skills of ASL teachers. Courses and workshops typically were taken in colleges and universities, but workshops also were offered at conferences and meetings in hotels and agencies. The teachers were given a list of ASL-related courses and workshops to identify, including second language acquisition, linguistics of ASL, Deaf community and culture, Deaf and ASL arts and literature, methods and materials in the teaching of ASL, and assessment in ASL and Deaf community and culture.

Results from the questionnaire revealed variation in the percentage of teachers who took such courses and workshops. Nationally, three quarters of the teachers took courses in Deaf community and culture, a little more than half of the teachers took courses in linguistics of ASL, a little more than a third of the teachers in second language acquisition, and less than a quarter in methods and materials. In addition, most teachers took courses more than workshops in the linguistics of ASL and Deaf community and culture, and workshops more than courses in Deaf and ASL arts and literature, second language acquisition, and methods and materials in teaching ASL. More than half took coursework in linguistics of ASL and Deaf community and culture, and more than half attended workshops in Deaf and ASL arts and literature, second language acquisition, and methods and materials.

Teachers varied across states in the proportion of courses and workshops they took. In one extreme case, all teachers in Florida have taken courses and workshops in all areas. In another extreme case, Massachusetts teachers took courses only in Deaf community and culture and no courses and workshops in other areas. Teachers in other states showed a variety of percentages of courses and workshops in each area taken, the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this study.

ASL Clubs

ASL Club Statistics and Activities. Survey results showed that half the schools had an ASL club as of 2004–2005. The respondents commented in the survey questionnaires that their ASL clubs offered a myriad of activities that provided opportunities for socializing between signing hearing and D/HH students within and outside school buildings. The activities were student visits to schools for the Deaf, participation in local and national Deaf community activities, Deaf guest speakers at the schools, and "pen-pal" programs where hearing students in ASL classes connected with their deaf counterparts from schools for the Deaf through the use of instant messaging and email on computers. The respondents remarked in the survey how ASL clubs have encouraged D/HH and hearing students to interact as they proceed in learning ASL. In other words, ASL classes and clubs in public high schools seemed to be the places where signing D/HH and

hearing students interacted on a daily basis (Rosen, 2006).

DISCUSSION

There has been growth in the number of high schools that offer ASL for foreign language credit since 2000. There were increases in the number and distribution of ASL programs, number and levels of classes, and number of teachers and students in public secondary schools in the years covered in this survey, namely 2002 to 2005. The impetus was the mainstreaming of signing D/HH students as originally mandated by IDEA. The presence of sign language interpreters and signing D/HH students created interest among hearing teachers and students in the lives, language, community, and culture of the American deaf people. The interest among hearing teachers and students generated the process for state recognition of ASL as a foreign language and for implementation of foreign language programs and classes in ASL in general education schools, although the process varied across states and localities. There was no indication in the survey as to which states were the first ones to approve ASL for high school credit. Survey results suggest that the schools drew teachers largely from deafness-related programs to teach ASL. The teachers were the original creators of the ASL-as-a-foreign-language space in public high schools (Rosen, 2006).

Future trends for ASL programs in public secondary schools nationwide were discerned based on respondents' comments. The respondents provided information about the date of establishment of their ASL programs. Of the 188 high school respondents, 9 were established in 1992, which grew to 123 in 2000. This represented a growth of more than 1200% between 1992 and 2000, and more than 50% from 2000 to 2004. In addition, there was a 6% growth in the number from 2003 to 2004. The growth had its peaks and valleys; the trend in the growth was cyclical. The growth rate for each state using year-by-year comparisons would be too cumbersome to calculate here. In some states, the numbers were stable, and in other states, they declined. Those figures suggest that the number of high schools that implement programs in ASL as a foreign language will continue to increase at the national level in the near future. Based on the national annual growth rate, the number of public high schools with ASL programs may reach more than 1,000 within a decade. This increase will co-occur with increases in student enrollment, classes, and teachers. Compared to other foreign languages, as indicated by the total number of foreign language teachers and student enrollments, the penetration of ASL in foreign language programs in secondary schools was negligible but currently is growing. The increased number of states that recognize ASL as a foreign language, coupled with the placement of ASL programs and classes largely in foreign language departments, attest to the increased acceptance of ASL for foreign language credit in secondary schools.

The future trends for ASL programs at the state level may be shaped by local processes such as consolidation, expansion by fission or fusion, and suspension of programs. For instance, public high schools with ASL foreign language programs in Maine were being consolidated and administered by one high school. In New York, some high schools have grown and split into smaller high schools, and its ASL programs followed. Population growth in Florida created the construction of more high schools, and ASL programs were expanded to newly built high schools. A very few high school ASL programs were suspended for either budgetary reasons or lack of qualified teachers. The trends also may be shaped by states' recognition of ASL for foreign language credit and policies on student diploma requirements. According to survey results, there was a relationship between states' policies on foreign language requirements and the offering of ASL classes for foreign language credit. The results suggest that states generally did not require foreign language study for their basic diplomas, but required it for advanced or college-preparatory diplomas. Not all states offered college-preparatory diplomas. However, the states that did not require foreign language for any of their diplomas often permitted schools to offer foreign language classes in order to ensure that students met college entrance requirements.

In states that required foreign language for graduation, classes in ASL typically were offered for foreign language credit. It depended on states' recognition of ASL. States that recognized ASL as a foreign language and that generally required study of a foreign language were more likely to permit ASL to be offered in schools for credit than states that had less stringent requirements. States that required foreign language for college-preparatory diplomas mostly offered ASL for foreign language credit. There is no difference between states in the prevalence and levels of ASL classes if they recognized ASL and required foreign language study for graduation.

States that did not require foreign language for any of their diplomas mostly did not offer ASL

for foreign language credit. However, if a state required foreign language study but did not recognize ASL as a foreign language, ASL was not offered for foreign language credit in its high schools.

Survey results and respondents' comments provide information for schools considering implementing ASL programs in the future. The results showed mechanisms at the local level in establishing ASL classes for foreign language credit in secondary schools. Principals and school districts held the final decision since they determined student graduation requirements in addition to their states' requirements, and they ascertained whether ASL could be offered for foreign language credit. If ASL classes can be offered in their schools, the principals, coordinators of foreign language departments, and teachers in schools can garner student interest and find available teachers who are certified to teach ASL as a second language. ASL interpreters can provide assistance particularly in mainstreamed schools. A survey can be given by the schools to assess student interest in taking ASL for foreign language credit. Once student interest is deemed by the principal as justifying a class, locating teachers would be the logical next step.

The teachers need to be knowledgeable about ASL, ASL and English linguistics, second language acquisition, curriculum, instruction and assessment, history, sociology and anthropology of Deaf community and culture, and ASL and Deaf arts and literature. The availability of teachers with qualifications to teach ASL in secondary schools depends on mechanisms provided by the states for individuals to become teachers. To assess whether there are mechanisms provided by the states for individuals to become teachers of ASL, the relationship between states' recognition of ASL as a foreign language and their requirements and provisions for teacher certification needs examination. Table 1 on state recognition of ASL for foreign language credit was compared with Appendix C on state requirements for teacher certification. This comparison shows that states that recognize ASL for foreign language credit usually provide mechanisms for teachers of ASL to obtain either a certification or an endorsement from state education departments to teach in secondary schools. However, the type of certification varies across states. If a state has a teacher certification in ASL, its teachers usually are certified in ASL. If a state has no teacher certification, it may add an endorsement in ASL to its certificates. In the states that do not offer a certification or an endorsement, they may accept a certification from ASLTA. In other words, if a state recognizes ASL and/or permits it to be taken for foreign language credit for its diplomas, the state often offers ASL classes for foreign language credit and provides either certification or endorsement, or accepts ASLTA certification, for individuals to teach ASL. The states that do not recognize ASL as a foreign language do not offer ASL classes, teacher certification, and endorsement, and do not recognize any certification from outside organizations such as ASLTA.

After teachers are identified, ASL classes may be formed with interested students. Principals and school administrators would need to ensure that there are Deaf communities around the schools so that they may be able to take students to Deaf community activities, and so that they can draw deaf individuals from the communities to speak to students in classes. In order to expand the classes into a fully fledged, three- or four-level ASL program, and to generate and maintain student interest, ASL clubs, demonstrations of signing classes in school assembly and auditorium-sited functions, and other club activities that were outlined in the section on ASL clubs, would need to be implemented.

Finally, schools need to be aware of college entrance requirements, particularly at national research universities. There are about 150 national universities as of 2005 that recognize ASL for admissions purposes. Junior and community colleges largely do not require foreign language for admission.

REMAINING ISSUES FOR FURTHER STUDY

Several remaining issues, particularly in the field of ASL teaching, necessitate further investigation. The future growth of ASL secondary school programs requires more teachers trained, qualified, and certified to teach ASL in secondary schools. The survey contained information on degrees and areas of collegiate study and certification of teachers of ASL. Survey results revealed that only less than a quarter nationally have degrees and certifications in ASL teaching. This finding suggests inconsistencies among teachers of ASL in their training and certifications. In addition, the survey contained no information of the hearing status of teachers, their proficiency in ASL, and their preparation in practicum courses in ASL teaching. The inconsistencies in teacher training and certifications raise several questions on the teachers' qualifications, proficiency in ASL, and preparation in ASL teaching, the resolution of which lies outside the scope of this

study but may be of use to the field in its future studies.

Studies show deaf people, primarily those who are native users of ASL, were at a disadvantage in accessing higher education (Moores, 2001). They may not have access to careers in teaching ASL as a foreign language. Given the disadvantage that ASL-using deaf people face in access to higher education, it is likely that many teachers of ASL, with backgrounds in special education or Deaf education, may be hearing and nonnative signers but with interest in ASL.

What is not known from the survey is how the proficiency of ASL teachers compares with the proficiency of spoken language teachers on the ACTFL scale. There are sign variants used among deaf people other than ASL as used among native signers who grew up in the Deaf community. They are Contact Sign Language and manual variants of spoken English such as Signed English. What needs to be investigated is the form of sign language the teachers learned during their scholastic studies and the form of sign language they taught and used in their ASL-as-a-foreign-language classrooms.

Survey results showed a low percentage of teachers who attended teacher preparatory programs in ASL teaching. Two of the courses that are crucial to teacher preparation are methods and practicum courses. It is possible that there was a lack of access to appropriate teaching methodology for describing syntactic and grammatical features of ASL. It appears that there is an issue with teachers with the lack of methodological expertise. This may have consequences for students learning ASL. A student who learns ASL misses an opportunity to learn language features that offer distinct contrasts to his or her first language and that enable the student to develop language learning skills that can be applied to other languages.

The inconsistencies in teacher qualifications at the national level may reflect inadequacies in the proficiency and preparation of teachers. Survey results showed a paucity of well-trained and highly qualified teachers of ASL in secondary schools. A number of high schools reported in the survey that they were forced to suspend ASL programs and classes due to the lack of qualified, certified teachers as per the No Child Left Behind (2001) provisions. Recently, there were increased calls among public secondary schools for teachers who are prepared and certified to teach ASL as a second language. In order to become qualified and certified teachers of ASL as a second language, individuals need to do coursework not only in ASL and Deaf community and culture, but also in second language theories and approaches, and they need to undergo practicum experience in ASL second language teaching. A few state education departments, such as in New York, have called for the establishment of teacher and scholar preparation programs to prepare individuals to become teachers and scholars in the field of ASL. Only a few institutions of higher education have heeded the calls.

In spite of shortcomings in teacher qualifications, that teachers continue to be hired to teach ASL in public secondary schools suggests two things: There is a rising demand by secondary school students for ASL classes for foreign language credit, and there is a continuing need for highly degreed and certified secondary school teachers of ASL.

NOTES

[1]D/HH students in mainstreamed settings exhibit diversity in communication preferences. Their languages range from speech and Cued Speech to Manually Coded English and ASL. The designation “signing D/HH students” refers to a subset of the deaf and hard of hearing student population who predominately use ASL.

[2]The survey was made possible by financial and logistical support from the Department of Health and Behavior Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University.

REFERENCES

Antia, S. D., Stinson, M. S., & Gaustad, M. G. (2002). Developing membership in the education of deaf and hard of hearing in inclusive settings. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 7,* 214–228.

Armstrong, D. F. (1988). Some notes on ASL as a “foreign” language. *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 231–239.

Baker-Schenk, C., & Cokely, D. (1980). *Green books: American Sign Language teacher’s resource text on curriculum, methods and evaluation.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Battison, R., & Carter, S. M. (1981). The academic status of sign language. In F. Caccamise, M. Garretson, & U. Bellugi (Eds.), *Teaching American Sign Language as a second/foreign language* (pp. v–xiii). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Baynton, D. (1996). *Forbidden signs: American culture and the campaign against sign language.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Belka, R. W. (2000). Is American Sign Language a “foreign” language? *NECTFL Review, 48,* 45–52.

Caccamise, F., Garretson, M., & Bellugi, U. (1981). *Teaching American Sign Language as a second/foreign language*. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

California Department of Education. (2006a). *Course enrollments by subject*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit.

California Department of Education. (2006b). *Number of teachers by subject*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (1997). *A national survey of foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools: A changing picture*: *1987–1997*. Washington, DC: Author.

Charlson, E., Strong, M., & Gold, R. (1992). How successful deaf teenagers experience and cope with isolation. *American Annals of the Deaf, 137,* 261–270.

Chopin, P. (1988). American Sign Language and the liberal education. *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 109–115.

Clary, W. M., Jr. (2004). *American Sign Language as high school language elective: Factors influencing its adoption*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California (University Microfiche International No. 3145184.).

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1993). *Inside outside: Teacher research and knowledge.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Commission on Education of the Deaf. (1988). *Toward equality: Education of the deaf*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cooper, S. B. (1997). *The academic status of sign language programs in institutions of higher education in the United States*. PhD Dissertation, Gallaudet University.

Corwin, K., & Wilcox, S. (1985). The search for the empty cup continues. *Sign Language Studies, 48,* 249–268.

Davis, L. (1998). The linguistic turf battles over American Sign Language. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 44,* 60–64.

Dounay, J. (2002). *Foreign language requirements for high school graduation*. Washington, DC: Education Commission of the States.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Pub. L. 94–142, 89 Stat. 773 (1975).

Final Regulations for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 34 C.F.R. Part 300. (1999).

Fischer, S., & Siple, P. (1990). *Theoretical issues in sign language research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foster, S. (1989). Social alienation and peer identification: A study of the social construction of deafness. *Human Organization, 48,* 226–235.

Frishberg, N. (1988). Signers of tales: The case for literary status of an unwritten language. *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 149–170.

Fromkin, V. A. (1988). Sign language: Evidence for language universals and the linguistic capacity of the human brain. *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 115–128.

Gallaudet Research Institute. (2004a). *Regional and national summary report of data from the annual survey of deaf and hard of hearing children & youth*. Washington, DC: GRI: Gallaudet University.

Gallaudet Research Institute (2004b). *States that recognize American Sign language as a foreign language*. Retrieved July 10, 2006 from http://clerccenter.gallaudet.edu/InfoToGo/index.html

Gannon, J. (1981). *The Deaf heritage: A narrative history of Deaf America*. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Gaustad, M. G., & Kluwin, T. N. (1992). Patterns of communication among deaf and hearing adolescents. In T. N. Kluwin, D. F. Moores, & M. G. Gaustad (Eds.), *Toward effective school programs for deaf students* (pp. 107–128). New York: Teachers College Press.

Humphries, T., & Padden, C. (1992). *Learning American Sign Language, levels I and II—beginning & intermediate*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Indiana Department of Education. (2006a). *Trends in foreign language enrollment in Indiana*. Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Education, Indiana Accountability System for Academic Progress. Retrieved July 10, 2006 from http://www.doe.state.in.us/opd/wrldlangs/ET_04-05.doc

Indiana Department of Education. (2006b). *Number of teachers by subject*. Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Education, Indiana Accountability System for Academic Progress. Retrieved July 10, 2006 from http://www.doe.state.in.us/opd/wrldlangs/ET_04-05.doc

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. Section 1400–1487. (Supp. III, 1997).

Jacobowitz, E. L. (1996). President's report. *ASLTA Quarterly,* Fall 1996.

Jacobowitz, E. L. (1999). *American Sign Language in higher education: Implications for administrators and teacher trainers*. Presented in American Sign Language Teachers Association Professional Development Conference, Rochester, New York, October 7–10, 1999.

Kanda, J., & Fleischer, L. (1988). Who is qualified to teach American Sign Language? *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 183–194.

Kemp, M. (1998a). Why is learning American Sign language a challenge? *American Annals of the Deaf, 143,* 255–259.

Kemp, M. (1998b). An acculturation model for learners fo ASL. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *Pinky extension and eye gaze: Language use in deaf communities* (Sociolinguistics in deaf communities series, vol. 4) (pp. 213–230). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Kiger, G. (1997). The structure of attitudes toward persons who are deaf: Emotions, values, and stereotypes. *Journal of Psychology, 131,* 554–560.

Klima, E., & Bellugi, U. (1979). *The signs of language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kreeft-Peyton, J. (1998). ASL as a foreign language. *K-12 Foreign Language Education, 6,* 1–3.

Lane, H. (1984). *When the mind hears: A history of the deaf*. New York: Random House.

Lane, H., Hoffmeister, R., & Bahan, B. (1996). *A journey into the Deaf-World*. San Diego, CA: DawnSignPress.

Lee, C., & Anita, S. (1992). A sociological approach to the social integration of hearing impaired and normally hearing students. *Volta Review, 95,* 425–434.

Liddell, S. K. (1980). *American Sign Language syntax*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton.

Loux, D. (1996). *Report of the legislative task force on American Sign Language to the members of the 69th session of the Nevada Legislature* [booklet]. Nevada. In D. L. Pfeffier (2003). The implementation and administration of American Sign Language programs for foreign language credit in public secondary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 3083807).

Moores, D. M. (2001). *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles and practices.* (5th ed.). New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

Nash, J. E. (2000). Shifting stigma from body to self: Paradoxical consequences of mainstreaming. In P. E. Spencer, C. J. Erting, & M. Marshark (Eds.), *The deaf child in the family and at school* (pp. 211–227). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Neidle, C., Kegl, J., MacLaughlin, D., Bahan, B., & Lee, R. (2000). *The syntax of American Sign Language: Functional categories and hierarchical structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Newell, W. (1994). *A job analysis of teaching American Sign Language*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms. No. LD3041.

Newell W. (1995a). A profile of professionals teaching American Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies, 86,* 19–36.

Newell W. (1995b). American Sign Language teachers: Practices and perceptions. *Sign Language Studies, 87,* 141–165.

Padden, C. (1981). Some arguments for syntactic patterning in American Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies, 32,* 239–259.

Padden, C., & Humphries, T. (1988). *Deaf in America: Voices from a culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Padden, C., & Humphries, T. (2005). *Inside Deaf culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Padden, C., Humphries, T., & O'Rourke, T. (1994). *A Basic Course in American Sign Language,* Second Edition. Silver Spring, MD: Linstok Press.

Peterson, R. W. (1999). The perceptions of deafness and language learning of incoming ASL students. *Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 9925067).

Pfeffier, D. L. (2003). The implementation and administration of American Sign Language programs for foreign language credit in public secondary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 3083807).

Reagan, T. (2000). But does it count?: Reflections on "Signing" as a foreign language. *NECTFL Review, 48,* 16–26.

Rosen, R. (2005). *National survey of secondary schools offering ASL as a foreign Language: Preliminary data*. Unpublished manuscript, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Rosen, R. (2006). An unintended consequence of IDEA: American Sign Language, the Deaf community, and Deaf culture into mainstream education. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 26*. Retrieved December 10, 2007, from http://www.dsq-sds.org.arugula.cc.columbia.edu:2048/_articles_html/2006/spring/rosen.asp

Rutherford, S. A. (1988). The culture of American Deaf people. *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 129–148.

Sandler, W., & Lillo-Martin, D. (2006). *Sign language and linguistic universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selover, P. (1988). American Sign Language in the high school system. *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 205–212.

Shroyer, E.H., & Holmes, D. W. (1982). Sign students in sign language classes. *The Reflector, 3,* 21–22.

Sign Enhancers, Inc. (1996). *Bravo ASL! Curriculum, Student Workbook, Videocourse*. Seattle, WA: Sign Enhancers.

Sinnett, D. R. (1995). An investigation of how foreign language departments at colleges and universities view American Sign Language. *Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 9610898).

Smith, C., Lentz, E. M., & Mikos, K. (1988). *Vista American Sign Language series: Signing naturally,* Levels I, II and III. Berkeley, CA: DawnSignPress.

Stinson, M. S., & Kluwin, T. N. (1996). Social orientations toward deaf and hearing peers among deaf adolescents in local public schools. In J. Nash & P. C. Higgins (Eds.), *Understanding deafness socially: Continuities in research and teaching* (pp. 113–134). Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas.

Stinson, M. S., & Liu, Y. (1999). Participation of deaf and hard of hearing students in classes with hearing students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 4,* 191–202.

Stokoe, W. C. (1960). *Sign language structure: An outline of the visual communication system of the American deaf*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet College Press.

Stokoe, W. C. (1995). Competencies important to teaching American Sign Language: Comparisons between groups. *Sign Language Studies, 89,* 303–330.

Stokoe, W. C., Casterline, D., & Croneberg, C. (1965). *A dictionary of American Sign Language on linguistic principles*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet College Press.

Terstriep, A. L. (1993). Ethnicity, social theory, and Deaf culture. In J. Cebe (Ed.), *Deaf Studies III: Bridging cultures in the 21st century* (pp. 231–244). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University College for Continuing Education.

U.S. Congress.(2001). *No Child Left Behind Act (PL 107–110).* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (1992). *Policy Guidance on Deaf Students Education Services,* 57 Federal Register 49274.

U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *Analysis of Final Regulations for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,* 64 Federal Register 12527–12656.

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *Educational Longitudinal Study 2002/2004* (ELS 2002/2004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Valli, C., & Lucas, C. (1992). *Linguistics of American Sign Language*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Van Gurp, S. (2001). Self-concept of deaf secondary school students in different educational settings. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 6,* 54–69.

Wallinger, L. (2000). American Sign Language instruction: Moving from protest to practice. *NECTFL Review, 48,* 27–36.

Welles, E. B. (2002). Foreign language enrollments in U.S. institutions of higher education, Fall 2002. *ADFL Bulletin, 35* (2–3), 7–26.

Wilbers, S. (1987). The case for recognizing American Sign Language. *College Board Review, 145,* 4–9, 30.

Wilbers, S. (1988). Why America needs Deaf culture: Cultural pluralism and the liberal arts tradition. *Sign Language Studies, 59,* 195–204.

Wilbur, R. (1979). *American Sign Language and sign systems*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Wilcox, S. (1992). *Academic acceptance of American Sign Language*. Burtonsville, MD: Linstok Press.

Wilcox, S. (2006). *Universities that accept ASL as a foreign language*. Retrieved July 10, 2006 from http://www.unm.edu/%7ewilcox/universities_that_accept_as.htm

Wilcox, S., & Wilbers, S. (1987). The case for academic acceptance of American Sign Language. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* July 1.

Wilcox, S., & Wilcox, P. (1991). *Learning to see: Teaching American Sign Language as a second language* (1st ed.). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Wilcox, S., & Wilcox, P. (1997). *Learning to see: Teaching American Sign Language as a second language* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

APPENDIX A

Survey Questionnaire

Teachers College, Columbia University
Program in the Teaching of American Sign Language as a Foreign Language
525 West 120th Street, Box 223
New York, New York 10027

Trends in Student Enrollment and Number of Teachers and Classes:
American Sign Language as a Foreign Language

QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME OF SCHOOL: ____

RESPONDENT: ____

POSITION OF RESPONDENT: ____________________________________

HISTORY

1. When was the first year that classes in ASL as a foreign language were established at your school? ________________

2. Please number below the order of events leading to the establishment of ASL as a foreign language classes at the school (which happened first, second, etc.). If the event did not apply or occur, please leave blank.

____Teachers from other fields who know ASL and want to teach ASL as a foreign language at the school.

____Students, either individually or collectively such as ASL Club, request courses in ASL as a foreign language.

____Principal took the lead in creating courses in ASL as foreign language at the school.

____School district requested the school to offer courses in ASL as a foreign language.

____Parents requested the school to offer courses in ASL as a foreign language.

____Community members requested the school to offer courses in ASL as a foreign language.

3. Please provide information below on number of teachers, classes, and students, and whether students can take ASL for foreign language credit and indicate it in their transcripts for the past three years, current year, and projections for next year at your school. Leave blank in certain cells if you cannot answer or do not have sufficient information.

	2002–2003 Academic Year	2003–2004 Academic Year	2004–2005 Academic Year
Number of ASL Teachers, in FTE			
Number of ASL Classes			
Number of Students in ASL Classes			
How Many Levels of ASL Classes Offered?			
Is ASL given foreign language credit?			

Note. 2004–2005 was the current academic year.

STAFFING

1. Please list below the names of teachers currently teaching ASL and their highest degrees, fields, certifications (such as state teacher certification, ASLTA, etc.), and prior coursework and workshops taken.

Name, Degrees, Certifications, and Experience of Current Teachers of ASL	Coursework and Workshops (Circle *c* for coursework and *w* for workshop. Leave blank if none.)
Name:	Second Language Acquisition: c w
Highest Degree:	Linguistics of ASL: c w
Field:	Deaf Community and Culture: c w
Certifications:	Deaf/ASL Literature: c w
Years Teaching ASL:	Methods and Materials in ASL Teaching: c w
Years Teaching Other Fields:	Assessment in ASL: c w

CLASSES

1. Where are the ASL classes housed in your school? Please check only one of the following.

____Foreign, Modern, Second, or World Language Department

____Special Education Department (such as Deaf Education)

____Vocational Education Department

____Extracurricular Clubs (ASL Club, etc.)

____At a school for the deaf

____Other: ____________________________

2. What are the percentages of students in ASL classes in 2004–2005 who are:

Special Education students: ___________

Regular Education students: ___________

CURRICULUM

1. Please check the following curriculum currently used by teachers in ASL as foreign language courses at the school. You can check any that applies.

____*Signing Naturally* (“Vista”) series

____*A Basic Course in ASL* (“ABC” book) series

____*American Sign Language: A Teacher's Resource Text on Curriculum* ("Green Book")

____Gallaudet University's K–12 L1 and L2 curriculum for ASL

____District-made curriculum

____Teacher-made curriculum

2. What is the approach in teaching ASL used by the teachers? Please number the following in order of importance.

____Sign vocabulary

____Nonmanual segments and classifiers

____Grammar

____Conversation

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

1. Is there additional information that you would like to add about the ASL program and classes at your school that is not covered in the above? We may include the additional information in this survey study.

2. Is there an ASL club at the school? If so, what are the activities?

3. Are there other secondary schools within your school district that offer ASL as a foreign language? With this information we will contact the schools(s) and send them the questionnaire.

Your kind assistance is greatly appreciated! We will send you the results of the study if requested. Please include email address since the report will be mailed via email attachment. Thank you.

APPENDIX B

Foreign Language Requirements for High School Diploma*

State	Details
AZ	*Basic diploma*: none *Honors endorsement*: two units of foreign language. *Source:* Arizona Education Department Web site: http://www.ade.gov/standards/aims/gradrequire (accessed on 9/23/2006)
CA	*Basic diploma*: one elective course, either foreign language or visual arts. *University preparatory diploma*: 2 years of foreign language for admission to Cal. State Univ. system; 3 years for Univ. Calif. System. *Source:* Calif. Educ. Code Section 51225.3
CT	No explicit mention of foreign language.
FL	*Standard diploma*: none. *Florida Academic Scholars Award (FAS)* and *Florida Merit Scholars Award (FMS)*: two credits in the same language. *Source:* Florida Department of Education Web site: http://www.firn.edu/doe/curriculum/intro.pdf (Dounay, 2002)
IL	*Basic diploma*: no statewide requirement. *Additional criteria*: one unit of language study, as determined by local school boards. *Source:* Ill. School Code Section 1.440(f)
IN	*Standard diploma*: no explicit mention of foreign language. *Academic honors diploma*: six credits in one language or four credits in one language and four in another. *Source:* IND. ADMIN. CODE title 511, r. 6-7-6.5 (Dounay, 2002)
ME	No explicit mention of foreign language.
MD	*Standard diploma*: no explicit mention of foreign language. *Maryland High School Certificate of Merit*: students must meet one or more of four criteria to obtain the Certificate of Merit, one of which is instruction in foreign language at Level III or beyond. *Source:* MD. REGS. CODE title 13A, § 03.02.03 (Dounay, 2002)

(Continued)

APPENDIX B
Continued

State	Details
MA	*Basic diploma*: no statewide requirement. Local school authorities require 1 to 3 years of study in a foreign language. *Source:* Mass. Department of education Web site: http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/archives/gradreq.pdf (accessed on 9/23/2006)
NJ	*Basic diploma*: no statewide requirement. Local school boards require up to 10 credits of foreign language study. *Source:* N.J. STAT. ANN. § 18A:7C-1, -2; N.J. ADMIN. CODE title 6A, § 8-5.1; http://www.state.nj.us/njded/news/0702wlg.htm (Dounay, 2002)
NY	Students entering Grade 9 in 2000–01 school year and earlier: *Standard diploma*: none. *Regents diploma*: three units in a language other than English and the Regents comprehensive examination in a language other than English. Students entering Grade 9 in the 2001–2002 school year and thereafter: *Regents diploma*: one unit and passing the state second language proficiency examination. *Regents diploma with advanced designation*: two additional units in a language other than English for a total of three units and the passing of proficiency examination. *Source:* N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. title 8, § 100.5 (Dounay, 2002)
OH	*Basic diploma*: foreign language as an elective option up to one unit or two half units. *Diploma with Honors*: three units of foreign language or two units each of two foreign languages. *Source:* Ohio Department of education Web site: http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?Page=3&TopicRelationID=1202&Content=15240 (accessed on 9/23/2006)
OR	*Basic Diploma*: none. *Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM)*: one to three units of foreign language study as determined by local school boards. *Source:* OR. ADMIN. R. 581–022-0102, -1115, -1130; OR. REV. STAT. § 329.447, § 329.465, § 329.487 (Dounay, 2002)
PA	*Basic Diploma*: no statewide requirement. Requirements are set by local boards, however, foreign languages is not an area required to be tested by state or local assessments. *Source:* 22 PA. CODE § 4.24 (Dounay, 2002)
TX	*Minimum diploma*: none. *Recommended high school program*: two units, which must be Level I and Level II in the same foreign language. *Distinguished achievement high school program*: three credits, which must be Levels I, II, and III in the same language. *Source:* 19 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 74.11, 74.43, 74.44 (Dounay, 2002)
UT	*Basic diploma*: students may take foreign language after 24 courses of basic skills (English, math, science, social studies) are taken. Local school boards require one to two units of foreign language. *Source:* Ut. Div. of Admin. Rules R277-700.
VA	Beginning with 9th grade class of 1998–99: *Standard Diploma* and *Modified Standard Diploma:* none. *Advanced Studies Diploma*: 3 years of one language or 2 years of two languages. *Source:* 8 VA. ADMIN. CODE 20–131-50 (Dounay, 2002)
WA	*Basic diploma*: no statewide requirement. Local school boards are granted 5.5 credits of electives in addition to basic state requirements, and one to two units of foreign language is included as an elective. *Source:* Wash. Dept. of Public Instruction Web site: http://www.k12.wa.us/graduationrequirements/CreditReq.aspx (accessed on 9/23/2006)

Note. As of 2004. The above includes only the states that responded to survey questionnaire.

APPENDIX C
Teacher Certification Requirements, by State

State	Minimum Degree	Transcript Review: Subject Area	Endorsement Area	Proficiency Tests	Certification Area
AZ	BA	24 credits in content area; 30 credits in pedagogy	Foreign Languages	Arizona Basic Skills Test Transcript review	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired
CA	BA	20 credits in content area; 32 credits in pedagogy	Languages Other Than English	California Basic Educational Skills Test	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing
CT	BA	15 credits in content area; 18 credits in pedagogy	Other World Languages	Praxis II ASLTA SCPI	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired; ASLTA
FL	BA	18 credits in content area; 20 credits in pedagogy	ASL	Florida Teacher Certification Examination SCPI ASLTA	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired; ASLTA
IL	BA	32 credits in content area; 16 credits in pedagogy	Foreign Languages (“Other Languages”)	Illinois Test of Basic Skills Illinois Assessment of Professional Teaching	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired
IN	BA	36 credits in content area; 24 credits in pedagogy	World Languages	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired
ME	BA	24 credits in content area; 12 credits in pedagogy	Modern and Classical Languages	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired
MD	BA	36 credits in content area; 21 credits in pedagogy	Foreign Language: Modern	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test	Foreign Language: Modern—ASL
MA	BA	no explicit information	Foreign Languages	Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure (MTEL) SCPI	Foreign Language; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; ASLTA; Special Education
NJ	BA	30 credits in content area; 33 credits in pedagogy	World Languages	SCPI	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing
NY	MA	24 credits in content area; 12 credits in pedagogy	Languages Other Than English	New York State Teacher Certification Examination	Teacher of ASL as LOTE
OH	BA	15 credits in content area; 6 credits in pedagogy	Foreign Language: ASL	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test SCPI	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired

(Continued)

APPENDIX C
Continued

State	Minimum Degree	Transcript Review: Subject Area	Endorsement Area	Proficiency Tests	Certification Area
OR	MA	15 credits in content area; 15 credits in pedagogy	ASL	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test, or California Basic Educational Skills Test	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; ASLTA
PA	MA	18 credits in content area; 18 credits in pedagogy	Foreign Languages	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing
TX	BA	24 credits in content area; 12 credits in pedagogy	ASL	Texas Examination of Educator Standards TASC-ASL	Secondary; ASL; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; ASLTA
UT	MA	30 credits in content area; 16 credits in pedagogy	World Languages	SCPI Transcript review	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired
VA	BA	24 credits in content area; 18 credits in pedagogy	Foreign Languages	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test ASLTA	Secondary; Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Hearing Impaired; Foreign Language: ASL
WA	BA	30 credits in content area; 15 credits in pedagogy	World Languages	Praxis: Pre-Professional Skills Test Washington Educator Standards Test	Primary (Secondary); Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing

Note. Information correct as of 2004 and includes only the states that responded to survey questionnaire. Certification is obtained either from an accredited baccalaureate institution or from the State Board–approved teacher preparatory programs. The above are minimum requirements for teachers of ASL in secondary schools. ASLTA = American Sign Language Teachers Association; SCPI = Sign Communication Proficiency Interview; LOTE = Languages Other than English; TASC–ASL = Texas Assessment of Sign Communications-American Sign Language.

Submissions Now Accepted Through Manuscript Central

Effective immediately, manuscript submissions are now being processed through Wiley-Blackwell's Manuscript Central Web site. Authors can submit their manuscripts and reviewers can submit their reviews directly online at: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/mlj

Please send all queries about manuscripts to the new Editor, Professor Leo van Lier, at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. The email address for the new editorial office is: mlj@miis.edu