

## **Report of the Senate-Administration Advisory Committee on Language Instruction**

October 24, 2006

### **I. Introduction and Background**

A joint Senate-Administration Advisory Committee on Language Instruction was appointed by Senior Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs Marsha Chandler in Fall 2003-04 and asked to consider a broad range of issues related to language instruction on the UCSD campus. It was asked to assess language course offerings, the coordination of instruction among teaching units and client areas, pedagogical issues, resource requirements, the administration of the language programs, and instructional facilities available for language instruction. SVC Chandler's charge to the committee is included as *Appendix I*. The committee met frequently during the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years to conduct its work.

The formation of this advisory committee to examine language instruction was motivated by several factors. Over the years there has been a sense among faculty, members of the administration, and the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) that UCSD's unique model of language instruction presents, at times, unique challenges. When, in this report, we speak of foreign language instruction, we are referring to the basic acquisition of speaking and listening skills in the language, as well as the first steps in acquiring literacy in those languages. Most, but not all, such courses are offered at UCSD at the lower division level; most, but again not all, carry course number designations in the 1-4 sequences. In addition to these courses, there are many courses that study the literature and culture of a society in a language other than English. While courses such as these can be expected to "sharpen" the language skills of the student, they are not considered, for the purpose of this report, to be foreign language courses since the student must already have mastered much of the language in order to be able to take these courses.

At UCSD, there are no academic units with the sole responsibility for the instruction of foreign languages, i.e., there are no departments such as a Department of French, or a Department of Asian Languages. Rather, at UCSD language instruction is a shared responsibility of at least four academic units – the Departments of History, Linguistics, and Literature, and the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IR/PS). These units, which report to three different divisional deans, are responsible for teaching multiple languages. The Department of History offers language instruction in Chinese, Japanese, and Hebrew through its programs in Chinese Studies, Japanese Studies, and Judaic Studies. The Department of Linguistics offers language instruction in American Sign Language, Arabic, French, German, Hindi, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish, as well as Arabic, Armenian, Cantonese, Hindi, Korean, Persian, Tagalog, and Vietnamese through its Heritage Language Programs. In addition to offering introductory instruction in Italian, Korean, Russian, and classical Greek and Latin, the Department of Literature teaches more advanced courses in these languages and in French, German, and Spanish as well. IR/PS offers undergraduate students the opportunity to learn languages of the Pacific Rim regions on a space-available basis. Languages taught through IR/PS include Vietnamese, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, and Bahasa Indonesian. In addition to all of these languages, several dozen additional languages can be studied on a "self-instructional" basis through Linguistics 19: Directed Study – Language. Thus

many languages can be studied at UCSD and it is sometimes the case that the same language can be studied through a number of different instructional units or by different instructional approaches.

This Balkanization of language instruction has proven to be somewhat problematic at a number of levels, not the least of which is the span of language coverage. This issue is currently of particular importance to Chancellor Fox and Senior Vice Chancellor Chandler, who are focused on strengthening the international dimension of UCSD's teaching and research programs. It is clear that the success of our attempts to develop a full international perspective will depend, in part, on the quality of our language instruction both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The committee spent considerable time gathering information from the campus and other institutions; reviewing relevant data; and consulting with campus and external language experts, units that offer language instruction, and campus clients of language instruction. The committee reviewed volumes of material, much of which was discovered in web searches. Some of the more relevant pieces of this material can be found in *Appendix II - XIV*.

The committee found it extremely useful to meet with campus language experts: Robert Kluender, Chair, Department of Linguistics; Todd Kontje, Chair, Department of Literature; and Grant Goodall, Director, Linguistic Language Program (LLP). The committee also held a joint discussion with representatives of the two undergraduate colleges whose General Education curricula include language requirements and a representative of the studies abroad programs: Nancy Groves, Dean of Academic Advising, Revelle College; Kay Reynolds, Dean of Academic Advising, Muir College; and Mary Dhooge, Dean/Director, UCSD International Center.

We also invited two external language experts to visit the campus: Robert Blake, Director of the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching (UCCLLT) and Professor of Spanish, Department of Spanish and Classics, UC Davis; and Susan Steele, Provost, Defense Language Institute, Monterey Language Center. In preparation for their respective visits to the campus, Professor Blake and Dr. Steele were provided with an advance set of questions and discussion topics; this list of questions is available as *Appendix XV*. Prior to meeting with our committee, the visitors participated in a series of discussions with language instructors from the campus language teaching units; a list of these language instructors is included as *Appendix XVI*.

## **II. Summary of Recommendations**

- A. Proficiency-based language instruction is endorsed as a campus-wide principle
- B. Foreign language instruction should be strengthened and expanded
- C. A UCSD Center for Language Instruction (CLI) should be created
- D. A standing Language Instruction Advisory Committee should be established
- E. Impediments to obtaining language instruction should be removed to encourage UCSD students to acquire foreign languages
- F. Heritage Language is a widely accepted term in the field of linguistics and language instruction, and the continued use of this term is appropriate.
- G. The Linguistics Language Program (LLP) should be transferred from the Division of Arts and Humanities to the Division of Social Sciences.

## **Other issues discussed**

The committee did not support any major restructuring of campus language instruction, e.g., consolidation of all language instruction under a single division. We did not discuss or support the creation of new academic departments such as French, Romance Languages or East Asian Languages and Cultures. In addition, the committee also made a decision not to recommend any direct changes to instructional approach or departmental structure.

## **III. Importance of language instruction**

Over the course of the advisory committee's discussions, the importance of language instruction emerged as a basic theme that was central to our deliberations and recommendations. The University of California has a significant role to play in educating the future workforce and the citizenry of a remarkably multilingual and multicultural state that must be prepared to compete in the global economy. The ability of Californians to function in a linguistically and culturally diverse society – both within the U.S. and in the world – is crucial to the state's future.

Enrollments in foreign language courses and the demand for new areas of language instruction are increasing nationally and at UCSD. More than 300 languages are spoken in California's K-12 schools; this is a tangible indication of the multicultural and multilingual background of students who enter UCSD. Although no single institution can offer instruction in all of these languages, it is essential that any UCSD student who desires to learn a language should be guided to the appropriate UCSD courses and programs. If the desired language is not offered by UCSD, the student should receive comprehensive advice on how to accomplish their goal (via independent study, distance learning, or other options).

We firmly believe that effective language instruction is essential to the mission of the university and should be supported as part of the core of the university's curriculum. We view language instruction as being a basic and fundamental component of the curriculum of the university and worthy of institutional support from both state resources and private donations directed specifically at the goal of offering language instruction of the highest quality possible.

- A. Language is a central part of a number of UCSD's instructional programs, including the majors in the Department of Linguistics, Department of Literature, the International Studies program, Chinese Studies, Japanese Studies, Latin American Studies, the Chicano and Latino Arts & Humanities (CLAH) Minor, the International Migration Studies Minor, General Education requirements in some of the undergraduate colleges, and as preparation for study abroad.
- B. Language is a key element in developing strong international programs as well as the profile of the university and its students. As an example, in area studies programs, instruction in relevant foreign languages is key to obtaining extramural funding through U.S. Department of Education Title VI programs.
- C. Quality instruction in foreign language does not come cheaply. The general view in the field is that language instruction must be taught in small groups, requires a great deal of

interaction between instructors and students, and increasingly employs instructional technology to enhance student learning.

#### **IV. Views on the pedagogy of language instruction.**

The committee heard from many experts on language instruction and was informed of the complexity of language instruction, with the main distinctions being between basic language instruction, more advanced literacy education, and heritage language teaching. There are a number of approaches to language teaching used among the various instructional units on campus. Some of the differences are due to different goals inherent to each language (e.g., some languages are primarily written, and some are both written and spoken), but others are due to underlying philosophical differences regarding the nature of language learning. While there may never be complete consensus on the details of methodological choices in foreign language instruction, most of the field today (at least in Europe and the United States) is in agreement that if the desired outcome is proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and/or writing, then the instruction itself should be "proficiency based". This means that if students are expected ultimately to be able to handle specific real-life situations using the target language -- in any of the four basic language skills -- then instruction should provide them with the tools they need to achieve that goal.

One major step in this direction has been the nationwide adoption of proficiency standards for spoken languages (signed language standards are currently under development). The articulation of these standards began in the 1950s at the behest of then Secretary of State Dean Acheson as the Foreign Service Institute Oral Proficiency Interview. Over time, this procedure was refined, standardized, and adopted by all government agencies with a language instruction component (including the Defense Language Institute, CIA, FBI, and NSA), under the auspices of the federal "Interagency Language Roundtable" (ILR, <http://www.govtilr.org/>). Eventually the ILR developed proficiency guidelines for the other three language skills of listening comprehension, reading, and writing as well. In the 1980s, the government proficiency guidelines were adapted for use in academic settings by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, <http://www.actfl.org>). The ACTFL version of the proficiency scale guidelines differs from the ILR version only in providing more fine-grained definitions at the lower levels of proficiency (i.e. below level 3 is "general professional proficiency" in ILR scale and "superior" in the ACTFL scale).

The ILR and ACTFL have worked closely over the past twenty years to ensure that their respective guidelines remain complementary and compatible for use in both governmental and educational environments, and in fact the federal government has contracted out training in oral proficiency testing to ACTFL. The United States is thus in the enviable position of having national standards for all four language skills that are used both by federal agencies and at most institutions of higher learning. These are the standards against which proficiency in a wide variety of languages can be measured; these standards can be used both for pedagogical as well as for research purposes (in research in second language acquisition). It makes sense for language programs at UCSD to adhere to nationally codified standards that have been in existence and in active and productive use in this country for over 50 years now. Since UCSD is an active member of the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching

(<http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/>) it is imperative that our campus join and even lead the movement toward standardized, state-of-the-art language instruction, grounded upon the concept of proficiency-based instruction.

#### **V. Current state of UCSD language instruction and issues considered by the Advisory Committee**

We include in this section a brief summary of relevant observations about the characteristics of UCSD's language instruction and the issues that dominated our deliberations as well as a series of questions that we think need to be examined on a continuing basis.

##### Observations

- A. The list of languages currently offered by the UCSD language instruction units could be described as a "Baker's dozen" array of languages taught. It is our belief that in most cases the instruction in language courses is of high quality, but in many cases, it is not possible to confirm that judgment. Some languages are taught by multiple units (e.g., Korean). On occasion there has been insufficient coordination, so that in a given academic year, a certain language course may be taught by multiple units or, more unfortunately, by no units.
- B. Innovative programs in heritage language instruction have been developed over the past few years, and these have proved popular with students. UCSD has been one of the first institutions to establish heritage instruction through the Linguistics Language Program, and it is now at the forefront of a growing national trend. More importantly, this trend reflects growing student demand in language instruction.
- C. Student demand for foreign language instruction is strong, and interest in less commonly taught languages (those other than French, Spanish, or German) is increasing. Chinese and Japanese are the second and third most popular languages at UCSD, and students have been increasingly vocal in expressing their desire for instruction in specific languages, e.g., Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Arabic, many of them heritage (see B. above).
- D. UCSD's model of language instruction, with language courses taught by a number of units (the Graduate School of International Relations & Pacific Studies (IR/PS), and the Departments of History, Linguistics, and Literature), is unusual among universities in of itself, and the particular distribution is uniquely UCSD, due to historical circumstances. There are costs associated with this model. For example, communication and coordination between the various instructional units and with clients of language instruction do not appear to be optimal.
- E. It is not apparent that the goals of the various language instructional units mesh with the campus mission with respect to language instruction, or that the campus has developed and articulated its mission.

- F. There is a need to determine whether objective assessment mechanisms for the educational effectiveness of language instruction are in place and to implement the consistent use of such mechanisms in any areas where they are currently not employed.

Questions and issues that need to be addressed in an ongoing manner

- A. How should the campus determine which languages should be taught and by whom? How can the campus respond in a rational manner to changing fluctuations in demand for various languages?
- B. How can we ensure that instruction remains responsive to changing students, languages, and pedagogical methods?
- C. To what extent are the language teaching programs on campus moving towards the goals outlined in the national proficiency standards (established by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL))?
- D. The use of instructional technology should be evaluated, as well as distance learning opportunities with sister UC campuses, particularly for the less commonly taught languages.
- E. The campus needs to determine whether TA training and instructor professional development is adequate across the various teaching units and strengthen these capabilities where needed.
- F. What funding mechanisms are appropriate for language instruction, particularly of graduate students whose primary appointments might not be in the department of instruction? How can the needs of the Colleges for instruction in foreign languages be assured?
- G. How can appropriate levels of articulation between the teaching units be achieved?

**VI. Discussion of Recommendations**

The committee was able to reach consensus on a set of recommendations which are discussed briefly below. All of our conclusions and recommendations are based upon the overriding general principle that high quality instruction in foreign languages is an important component of the university's curriculum.

- A. Proficiency-based language instruction is endorsed as a campus-wide principle

We endorse as a campus-wide principle the construct of proficiency-based language instruction, as described in Section IV. While it is our anecdotal impression that the proficiency-based approach is currently reflected in many language courses taught at UCSD, we agreed it is essential for this approach to be at the very core of the instructional goals for all language courses. We further agree that the campus should

take an affirmative approach to assuring that the proficiency-based approach is utilized, rather than just stating a passive endorsement of the principle.

Proficiency-based language instruction seems to be the most universally accepted principle in the somewhat fractious field of language pedagogy. The principles are clear and seem the most likely to ensure maximal success on the part of the language learner.

B. Foreign language instruction should be strengthened and expanded

We agreed that foreign language instruction should be strengthened and expanded. We acknowledge that the costs associated with adding new languages and expanding current offerings are considerable. Further, we believe that technological improvements in the mechanisms for delivery of foreign language instruction should be investigated and implemented where possible.

Increasing student demand for foreign language courses and new areas of language instruction at UCSD is consistent with the trend observed nationally and within UC as a whole. Our students are motivated to take language for multiple reasons. Some take language primarily to fulfill General Education requirements of the two colleges (Revelle and Roosevelt) that require language or to satisfy requirements for majors that require language (e.g., Literature, Linguistics, the International Studies Program, and Latin American Studies), while others pursue language to prepare for study abroad through the Education Abroad Program (EAP) or Opportunities Abroad Program (OAP). Other motivating factors include personal enrichment, professional development, or a strong desire to learn a language spoken in the home (witness the development of Heritage Language Programs). New UCSD interdisciplinary programs requiring language (i.e., the International Studies Program, the Chicano and Latino Arts & Humanities Minor, and the International Migration Studies Minor) have contributed to robust demand for language instruction on this campus. The International Studies major has experienced phenomenal growth since it was first offered in Fall 2002 and is currently the largest interdisciplinary major, with 679 students enrolled for Fall 2005.

Chancellor Fox has signaled her commitment to heightening UCSD's international role, recognizing the critical importance of internationalization in all of its dimensions to the success of any leading research institution. While internationalization may once have been optional for success, it is no longer an option. UCSD cannot hope to take international research, education, and service to a new level without language instructions that are anything less than first-rate.

Foreign language instruction is typically labor intensive, and hence expensive, since it is offered in small classes and requires significant interaction between instructors and student and many hours of class and practice each week. While new instructional technologies and distance learning offer promising new possibilities, the development of new teaching approaches and methodologies also requires a substantial investment of resources. As national and global political and economic realities evolve over time, demand for instruction in some languages will decline while interest in other languages will increase dramatically. This was vividly demonstrated by the nation's post 9/11 need

to engage individuals fluent in Arabic and the decline in interest in studying Russian after the decline of the Soviet Union. It is expensive to respond to these shifting enrollment patterns, but it is imperative that the campus develop the capability to be responsive to these factors.

In view of our committee's strongest support for UCSD's internationalization goals, we urge the university to think creatively about how it will adequately fund quality foreign language instruction. We see this as a fundamental component of the university's educational mission, and appropriate funding for quality foreign language programs must be part of the core funding of the campus. While the allocation of state funds will be necessary to significantly improve language instruction, we also believe that private funding should be explored as a possible route to support at least some aspects of improved instruction. Clearly there is much interest within the business community as well as among alumni and parents for internationalization and language instruction. We would hope that conversations with our Development Office would explore the possibilities of developing support for a Center for Language Instruction.

#### C. Creation of a UCSD Center for Language Instruction (CLI)

A UCSD Center for Language Instruction (CLI) should be created to strengthen campus language instruction by supporting language teaching and language instructors at UCSD.

The Center would be managed by a Director, who would be a ladder rank faculty member affiliated with one of the four academic teaching units. We envisioned that the Director's departmental FTE would be reduced, with approximately 50 percent of the individual's effort linked with the administrative responsibilities of running the Center.

We recommend that the Director of the CLI should report to the SVC-AA (although this direct responsibility would likely be delegated) since the language teaching units report to three divisional deans (Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and IR/PS). We concluded that this reporting structure is warranted in light of the involvement of multiple campus divisions in foreign language instruction. This organizational structure would eliminate the question of which divisional dean the Language Center should report to.

The Center would likely require the participation of an Associate Director whose sole focus would be on the Center. The position might be filled by a language instruction expert appointed in the Academic Coordinator series on an 11-month basis, rather than a ladder rank faculty member.

We did not reach a conclusion on whether the new Center should build on the existing Linguistics Language Lab, or should incorporate LLL activities and personnel into an essentially new entity. We did, however, reach consensus on the key functions of a Center for Language Instruction, which are described below.

#### Functions of the UCSD Center for Language Instruction (CLI):

While many details would need to be worked out, we agreed that a UCSD Center for



Language Instruction should provide the following functions:

1. Instructional support: The Center for Language Instruction (CLI) would have the following responsibilities:
  - (a) Instructional Technology: The CLI would develop and support the use of state-of-the-art instructional technology, up-to-date pedagogical methods, and innovative teaching materials, such as those offered at the UC Davis Language Learning Center.
  - (b) External funding for language instruction: The CLI would develop infrastructure support for securing grant funding for innovative language instruction. The Center would work with faculty throughout the campus on developing such proposals and would support activities leading to Title VI funding.
  - (c) Language proficiency testing and placement exams: The CLI would coordinate the administration of language proficiency testing and placement exams. Several programs, particularly those in the Colleges, have periodic needs to have the competency of students in any number of languages assessed. The Center could maintain listings of individuals capable of providing those assessments and pay small honoraria where appropriate.
  - (d) Instructional Improvement Program proposals: The Center could provide consultation to the award committee for Instructional Improvement Program (IIP) grants involving language instruction by reviewing and providing commentary on proposals (via the CLI Director).
  - (e) Proficiency-based language instruction: The CLI would work with teaching units to assure that the principles of proficiency-based language instruction are instantiated in all language courses.
2. Professional development
  - (a) TA training: The Center would work with teaching units and the Center for Teaching Development to ensure that TAs are adequately trained in all necessary dimensions of language pedagogy
  - (b) Professional development of instructional faculty: The CLI would institute training and professional development opportunities on campus and off. The Center could maintain comprehensive listings of training opportunities and could, with appropriate support, provide some funding for faculty participation in those events.

### 3. External relations

- (a) Collaborative efforts with sister UC campuses: The CLI would investigate cooperative efforts that UCSD might undertake with sister UC campuses, e.g., distance learning and multi-campus collaborations.
- (b) UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching: The Center would also support UCSD's more active participation in the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching.

The Committee's review of language instruction models at sister UC campuses and external institutions led to the conclusion that successful campuses offer a wide range of instructional support services and professional development opportunities through centralized language centers that provide centralized support for all language instructional units and instructors campuswide. Among the models we found interesting were the Language Learning Center at UC Davis and the Language Resource Center at Cornell. The UC Davis center is their central site for technology-based language pedagogy. It is a place where faculty, staff, and students can come together to study language and culture. The center features a variety of classroom, lab, and multi-purpose spaces that focus on facilitating language learning, research, and culture. Cornell's Language Resource Center serves as a resource for learning foreign languages by providing a media library with audio and video files for student use and working with teachers in producing new materials for language classes. The Center has developed a wide array of web-based language teaching tools, many of which are designed with a user interface for teachers to be able to create and change web material without using HTML codes or programming languages. The Web Audio Lab replaces the tape-based language lab systems in a technologically updated form, giving greater power and utility to both teacher and student.

UCSD's Linguistics Language Lab (LLL) is a departmental facility that primarily supports the Linguistics Language Program and heritage language courses and offers unique resources and services to the general campus and surrounding community as well. It contains a specialized reference library of language and linguistics materials in various media, and equipment for course-related and independent language study and testing.

We concluded that there is not significant awareness of LLL resources and services outside of the Linguistics Department. The LLL is theoretically available to anyone, and use of the facility by non-Linguistics instructors should be increased.

We were unanimous in our support for the creation of a UCSD Center for Language Instruction that would facilitate the teaching of language for all language instructors across the UCSD campus. Although we did not reach a conclusion on whether this new Center should be an expansion of the existing Linguistics Language Lab, or should incorporate LLL activities and personnel into an essentially new entity, we did reach consensus on the primary functions of a Center for Language Instruction, as described above.

- C. A standing Language Instruction Advisory Committee (LIAC) should be established to provide advice and intellectual coordination of the activities of the Center for Language Instruction and to serve as the administrative hub of the Center.

A recurring theme throughout our discussions, which was also at the very core of the range of issues that prompted the formation of our committee, was the critical need for better communication between the units that offer language instruction and with the various campus entities that are clients of language instruction. Even if all of the current issues relative to language instruction were resolved to everyone's complete satisfaction, new challenges and opportunities will continue to arise on an ongoing basis. The campus would be well served by the creation of a standing committee charged to provide ongoing advice on language questions and intellectual coordination of the activities of the Center for Language Instruction.

Membership of the Advisory Committee would include representation from the following groups:

1. All departments or schools offering foreign language instruction: History Department, IR/PS, Linguistics Department, and the Literature Department
2. Other academic units that require foreign language acquisition as part of their curricula, e.g., Education Abroad Program (EAP), International Studies program, Revelle and Roosevelt Colleges
3. At least one member of the Language Instruction Advisory Committee should also serve as a UCSD representative to the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching
4. The Director of the Center for Language Instruction would serve as an *ex officio* member of the Language Instruction Advisory Committee
5. The LIAC would be chaired by a ladder rank faculty member from one of the teaching units listed above.
6. Consideration should be given to including the Director of Academic Computing Services and the Director of Media Services as consultants to the Advisory Committee

Members of the Advisory Committee would be appointed by the Senior Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs and would serve two to three-year overlapping terms in order to provide for continuity.

Functions of the Language Instruction Advisory Committee -- The functions and responsibilities of the Language Instruction Advisory Committee (LIAC) would evolve over time. Initially the responsibilities linked with the LIAC should include the following:

1. Serve as an advisory body to the Center for Language Instruction and participate actively in setting goals of the Center.
  2. Advise the Language Center Director on major decisions affecting the Center and set standards for the evaluation of the Center's effectiveness on an ongoing basis.
  3. Confer with and advise the administration and the Senate's Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) on issues and policies bearing on language instruction, e.g.,
    - (a) evaluate languages taught, and the demand for those languages and other languages that are not currently taught, with the aim to meet student demand for new languages;
    - (b) provide recommendations on department proposals to offer new languages or delete existing languages;
    - (c) investigate cooperative efforts UCSD might take with sister UC campuses – distance learning, more active participation on the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching, etc.;
    - (d) coordinate language course offerings with other campus goals; e.g., development of the Middle East Studies program will require teaching at least one additional Middle Eastern language as well as more advanced Arabic courses.
  4. As part of the CEP process for undergraduate program review, periodically survey and review the adequacy of language instruction.
  5. Periodically review and advise upon the adequacy of instructional technology in language instruction and the shared utilization of IT resources by all teaching components.
  6. Advise the administration concerning budgetary needs in support of campus language instruction.
  7. Develop mechanisms for the coordination of language instruction among the several units which provide language instruction. This articulation would ensure the adequate coverage of languages, the smooth transition between courses in the same language but taught by different units, and elimination of redundancy in instruction so that limited resources can be used more effectively and efficiently.
  8. Serve as a Search Committee for the Director of the Linguistic Language Program when that position becomes open.
- E. Encourage UCSD students to acquire foreign languages by removing impediments to obtaining language instruction

1. Develop effective, more centralized advising services on language instruction options. The Language Instruction Center could play a constructive role here by providing information on pursuing any language (“one-stop shopping” is often best for students).
2. Pay greater attention to articulation between different levels of language instruction, particularly courses in the Linguistics 1 series and Literature 2 series courses. The Language Instruction Advisory Committee will be a valuable resource here, in consultation with the college Deans of Academic Advising, as well as articulation between UCSD and the community colleges.
3. Ensure that students are aware of summer language programs and options for more advanced language training through study abroad (e.g., clarify options, publicize opportunities, and make sure college advisors receive complete information). The Center for Language Instruction should also contribute substantially to this effort.
4. Encourage the development of foreign language instruction as a component of summer session instruction.

The overall goal should be that any student who wishes to learn a language should have a smooth and transparent route to language proficiency in any language that the student chooses to study.

In addition to the topics described above, the Committee was asked to address two additional issues which are related to language instruction, but deal with issues very specific to UCSD and its current arrangements. The first has to do with the terminology surrounding the area of heritage language instruction; the second relates to the administrative positioning of the Linguistics Language Program (LLP).

- F. Heritage Language: From all that the committee was able to learn, the term heritage language is a standard term used to describe the teaching approaches appropriate for students who grew up exposed to the relevant language. We find that there is no implication of any sort between the language teaching approach and anything vaguely resembling a genetic inheritance. We think the term is appropriate, commonly used as an academic category, and does not admit to any offensive interpretation.
- G. Linguistics Language Program. The LLP is an administrative unit associated with the Division of Arts and Humanities. This is a small unit that manages the funds for the Director of the LLP and several Academic Coordinators (perhaps a total of 4 FTEs) who coordinate the instruction of the major language instructional programs offered by the Department of Linguistics, which is a department within the Division of Social Sciences. The Dean of Arts and Humanities also has administrative oversight for the appointments of the LLP Director and the Academic Coordinators – at least formally. We were unable to determine the historical events by which this arrangement was established. The Director of the LLP has, in recent history, been a faculty member in Linguistics with .5 of his FTE associated with the administrative responsibilities of LLP. Hence, the position itself is largely a component of the instructional program of the Department of Linguistics. The Academic Coordinators as

well as the Director are housed in the Department of Linguistics. While we are certain that there will be some non-trivial sensitivities involved, it is the recommendation of this committee that these functions and budgets be transferred to the Division of Social Sciences.

## **VII. Other issues discussed**

One of the reasons for the creation of this committee derives from the unusual structure of language instruction at UCSD. While the committee did not directly discuss, at any length, any major restructuring of the administrative organization of language instruction (beyond the recommended efforts to improve and coordinate it), there seemed to be no enthusiasm to entertain ideas such as a consolidation of all language instruction under a single divisional dean (e.g., to move the Department of Linguistics and some components of IR/PS to the Division of Arts and Humanities). Neither did the committee actively discuss the creation of new academic departments such as a Department of Romance Languages or East Asian Studies or finer grained departments such as a Department of French. Any such changes would involve the complete reorganization of many units such as the Departments of Literature and Linguistics, and in our many hours of open and free-ranging discussions no such approaches were suggested by any member of the Committee.

## **VIII. Summary**

The Committee is strongly committed to the basic premise that instruction of foreign languages is a core function of the University of California, San Diego and requires increased support in order to provide this instruction at the level and with the quality that our students deserve. We think that forecasts of increased demand for high level instruction in an increasing number of languages are realistic. The Committee also recognizes that UCSD's unique history and culture with regard to foreign language instruction means that we will have to arrive at solutions that will not look like the arrangements seen at most other comparable universities – if for no other reason than our instructional resources for foreign language instruction are already distributed over no fewer than four departments answering to three separate divisional deans and employing several different philosophies of language instruction.

Despite these historic and pedagogical differences, we all seem to agree that a proficiency-based approach to foreign language instruction is highly desirable and should be the approach that the university strives to adopt for all our foreign language instruction. The Committee also strongly recommends the creation of a Center for Language Instruction which would report directly to the Senior Vice Chancellor. The goals of the proposed center (under the guidance and direction of a Language Instruction Advisory Committee) would be to provide instructional and technological support for language instruction, to help seek external support to improve the quality of foreign language instruction, to further the goal of campus-wide instantiation of proficiency-based language instruction, and coordination of foreign language instruction across the departments that offer foreign language instruction.

Respectfully submitted,

**Senate-Administration Advisory Committee on Language Instruction**

Mark Appelbaum (Associate Vice Chancellor-Undergraduate Education), *Chair*

Susan Kirkpatrick (Department of Literature)

Mark Machina (Department of Economics)

Barry Naughton (Graduate School of International Relations & Pacific Studies)

Maria Polinsky (Department of Linguistics)

Peter Smith (Department of Political Science)\*

Stefan Tanaka (Department of History)

---

\* Professor Smith, currently an EAP Study Center Director in Spain, wished to be listed as a dissenting member, primarily over the role of the Language Instruction Advisory Committee vis-à-vis the Center for Language Instruction. He also favored the inclusion of stronger statements in support of funding and resources required for quality language instruction.

Report of the Senate-Administration Advisory Committee on Language Instruction

**Appendices**

<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
I	Advisory Committee Charge Letter from SVC Marsha Chandler (September 2003)	18
II	“Standards for Foreign Language Learning – Preparing for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century,” (1996 Executive Summary – collaborative project of ACTFL, AATF, AATG, AATI, AATSP, ACL/APA, ACTR, CLASS/CLTA, and NCSJTJ/ATJ) (website information, May 2005)	19
III	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (website information, December 2003)	27
IV	James, Dorothy (Hunter College and the Graduate School, City University of New York), “The Impact on Higher Education of Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century, an ACTFL White Paper” (ACTFL Newsletter, Fall 1998)	29
V	The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (website information, December 2003)	33
VI	UC San Diego Linguistics Language Program and Linguistics Language Lab (website information, October 2003)	36
VII	University of California Consortium of Language Learning and Teaching (website information, October 2003)	43
VIII	University of California – Davis Language Learning Center (LLC) (website information, October 2003)	52
IX	University of California – Quick Reference for Counselors – Language Other than English Requirements (website information, January 2003)	56
X	Language Other Than English Requirements at UC San Diego (College general education requirements) (website information, October 2003)	57
XI	Welles, Elizabeth B., “Foreign Language Enrollments in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2002,” ADFL Bulletin, Volume 35, No. 2, Winter 2004	58
XII	Modern Language Association (MLA) News Release, “More College Students Studying Language Than Ever Before, Says New Study by the Modern Language Association,” (November 2003)	78



<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
XIII	Registered UCSD students whose primary or secondary undergraduate major requires taking a language course, Fall 2001 – Fall 2003 (Campus Planning: Analytical Studies and Space Planning report, February 2004)	81
XIV	U.S. Senate Resolution 28, 109 <sup>th</sup> Congress, 1 <sup>st</sup> Session, “Designating the Year 2005 as the “Year of Foreign Language Study”	87
XV	Discussion Questions for Meetings with Invited External Experts on Language Instruction (February/March 2004)	91
XVI	Lists of UCSD Language Instructors and Others who met with the External Experts on Language Instruction (February/March 2004)	93