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Subject: Advisory Committee on Language Instruction

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for agreeing to serve as members of the Advisory Committee on Language Instruction, which will be chaired by Associate Vice Chancellor Mark Appelbaum. The advisory committee is charged to review a broad range of issues related to language instruction on our campus, including: which languages should be taught and by what units; how should language instruction be coordinated between teaching departments and schools (History, IR/PS, Linguistics, and Literature), as well as with “client” departments and programs; and to which dean should the various language programs report. The committee is also asked to examine pedagogical issues (e.g., basic language skills and grammar vs. literature and writing competency), resource requirements, supervision of language instruction (ladder rank faculty vs. non-ladder rank instructors), instructional facilities and materials, and TA training.

You will soon be contacted about your availability for meetings during fall quarter, when we envision that the committee will meet roughly once a month. I hope that you will have a report of your findings and recommendations by the end of winter quarter, 2004.

I look forward to meeting with you in early fall to discuss the committee’s charge in more detail. Again, thank you for agreeing to participate in this important endeavor.

With kind regards,

Marsha A. Chandler
Senior Vice Chancellor

[Signature]

c: AVC Miller
STANDARDS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING
Preparing for the 21st Century
Language and communication are at the heart of the human experience. The United States must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which ALL students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other language, modern or classical. Children who come to school from non-English backgrounds should also have opportunities to develop further proficiencies in their first language.

Statement of Philosophy
Standards for Foreign Language Learning

In 1993, a coalition of four national language organizations (the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, the American Association of Teachers of French, the American Association of Teachers of German, and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese) received funding to develop standards for foreign language education, grades K-12.

This was the seventh and final subject area to receive federal support to develop national standards as part of the Bush Administration’s America 2000 education initiative, which continued under Goals 2000 in the Clinton Administration. An eleven-member task force, representing a variety of languages, levels of instruction, program models, and geographic regions, was appointed to undertake the task of defining content standards—what students should know and be able to do—in foreign language education. At each stage of development, the task force shared its work with the broader profession and the public at large. The resulting document represents an unprecedented consensus among educators, business leaders, government, and the community on the definition and role of foreign language instruction in American education.

The standards do not describe the current status of foreign language education in this country. While they reflect the best instructional practice, they do not describe what is being attained by the majority of foreign language students. The Standards for Foreign Language Learning will not be achieved overnight; rather, they provide a gauge against which to measure improvement in the years to come.

The standards are not a curriculum guide. While they suggest the types of curricular experiences needed to enable students to achieve the standards, and support the ideal of extended sequences of study that begin in the elementary grades and continue through high school and beyond, they do not describe specific course content, nor recommended sequence of study. They must be used in conjunction with state and local standards and curriculum frameworks to determine the best approaches and reasonable expectations for the students in individual districts and schools.
The purposes and uses of foreign languages are as diverse as the students who study them. Some students study another language in hopes of finding a rewarding career in the international marketplace or government service. Others are interested in the intellectual challenge and cognitive benefits that accrue to those who master multiple languages. Still others seek greater understanding of other people and other cultures. Many approach foreign language study, as they do other courses, simply to fulfill a graduation requirement. Regardless of the reason for study, foreign languages have something to offer everyone. It is with this philosophy in mind that the standards task force identified five goal areas that encompass all of these reasons: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities—the five C’s of foreign language education.

*Communication* is at the heart of second language study, whether the communication takes place face-to-face, in writing, or across centuries through the reading of literature.

Through the study of other languages, students gain a knowledge and understanding of the *cultures* that use that language and, in fact, cannot truly master the language until they have also mastered the cultural contexts in which the language occurs.

Learning languages provides *connections* to additional bodies of knowledge that may be unavailable to the monolingual English speaker.

Through *comparisons* and contrasts with the language being studied, students develop insight into the nature of language and the concept of culture and realize that there are multiple ways of viewing the world.

Together, these elements enable the student of languages to participate in multilingual *communities* at home and around the world in a variety of contexts and in culturally appropriate ways.

"Knowing how, when, and why to say what to whom"

All the linguistic and social knowledge required for effective human-to-human interaction is encompassed in those ten words. Formerly, most teaching in foreign language classrooms concentrated on the *how* (grammar) to say *what* (vocabulary). While these components of language are indeed crucial, the current organizing principle for foreign language study is *communication*, which also highlights the *why*, the *whom*, and the *when*. So, while grammar and vocabulary are essential tools for communication, it is the acquisition of the ability to communicate in meaningful and appropriate ways with users of other languages that is the ultimate goal of today’s foreign language classroom.
Standards for Foreign Language Learning

Communication
Communicate in Languages Other Than English

Standard 1.1: Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions.

Standard 1.2: Students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics.

Standard 1.3: Students present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.

Cultures
Gain Knowledge and Understanding of Other Cultures

Standard 2.1: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture studied.

Standard 2.2: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture studied.

Connections
Connect with Other Disciplines and Acquire Information

Standard 3.1: Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language.

Standard 3.2: Students acquire information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures.

Comparisons
Develop Insight into the Nature of Language and Culture

Standard 4.1: Students demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own.

Standard 4.2: Students demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own.

Communities
Participate in Multilingual Communities at Home & Around the World

Standard 5.1: Students use the language both within and beyond the school setting.

Standard 5.2: Students show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment.
Following is an abbreviated sample of the goals, standards, and progress indicators for grades four, eight, and twelve as they appear in “Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century.”

COMMUNICATION

1.1 Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions.
This standard focuses on interpersonal communication, that is, direct oral or written communication between individuals who are in personal contact. In most modern languages, students can quite quickly learn a number of phrases that will permit them to interact with each other. In the course of their study, they will grow in their ability to converse in a culturally appropriate manner.

Sample Progress Indicators

Grade 4: Students ask and answer questions about such things as family, school events, and celebrations in person or via letters, e-mail, or audio and video tapes.

Grade 8: Students exchange information about personal events, memorable experiences, and other school subjects with peers and/or members of the target cultures.

Grade 12: Students exchange, support, and discuss their opinions and individual perspectives with peers and/or speakers of the target language on a variety of topics dealing with contemporary and historical issues.

1.2 Students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics.
Standard 1.2 involves one-way listening and reading in which the learner works with a variety of print and non-print materials. The context in which the language is experienced and the ability to control what they hear and read may impact students’ development of comprehension. As a result, the ability to read may develop before the ability to comprehend rapid spoken language. In addition, content knowledge will often affect successful comprehension, for students understand more easily materials that reflect their interests or for which they have some background.

Sample Progress Indicators

Grade 4: Students comprehend the main idea of developmentally appropriate oral narratives such as personal anecdotes, familiar fairy tales, and other narratives based on familiar themes.

Grade 8: Students use knowledge acquired in other settings and from other subject areas to comprehend spoken and written messages in the target languages.

Grade 12: Students demonstrate an increasing understanding of the cultural nuances of meaning in written and spoken language as expressed by speakers and writers of the target language in formal and informal settings.

1.3 Students present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.
This standard focuses on the formal presentation of information, concepts, and ideas in spoken and written form and is concerned, in most cases, with one-way speaking and writing. Students with little or no previous language experience are likely to produce written and spoken language that will contain a variety of learned patterns or will look like English with words in the other language. This is a natural process and, over time, they begin to acquire authentic patterns and to use appropriate styles. By contrast, home-background students will write in ways that closely resemble the spoken language. Moreover, they will control informal oral styles. Over time these learners will develop the ability to write and speak using more formal styles.

Sample Progress Indicators

Grade 4: Students prepare illustrated stories about activities or events in their environment and share with an audience such as the class.

Grade 8: Students prepare tape or video recorded messages to share locally or with school peers and/or members of the target cultures on topics of personal interest.

Grade 12: Students prepare a research-based analysis of a current event from the perspective of both the U.S. and target cultures.
CULTURES

2.1 Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture studied.

This standard focuses on the practices that are derived from the traditional ideas and attitudes (perspectives) of a culture. Cultural practices refer to patterns of behavior accepted by a society and deal with aspects of culture such as rites of passage, the use of forms of discourse, the social "pecking order," and the use of space. In short, they represent the knowledge of "what to do when and where."

2.2 Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture studied.

This standard focuses on the products of the culture studied and on how they reflect the perspectives of the culture. Products may be tangible (e.g., a painting, a piece of literature, a pair of chopsticks) or intangible (e.g., an oral tale, a dance, a sacred ritual, a system of education). Whatever the form of the product, its presence within the culture is required or justified by the underlying beliefs and values (perspectives) of that culture, and the cultural practices involve the use of that product.

CONNECTIONS

3.1 Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language.

Learning today is no longer restricted to a specific discipline; it has become interdisciplinary. Just as reading cannot be limited to a particular segment of the school day, so too can foreign language build upon the knowledge that students acquire in other subject areas. In addition, students can relate the information studied in other subjects to their learning in the foreign language and culture. Foreign language instruction thus becomes a means to expand and deepen students' understanding of, and exposure to, other areas of knowledge. The new information and concepts presented in one class become the basis of continued learning in the foreign language classroom.

3.2 Students acquire information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures.

As a consequence of learning another language and gaining access to its unique means of communication, students are able to broaden the sources of information available to them. They have a "new window on the world." At the early levels of language learning, students can begin to examine a variety of sources intended for native speakers, and extract specific information. As they become more proficient users of the foreign language, they can seek out materials of interest to them, analyze the content, compare it to information available in their own language, and assess the linguistic and cultural differences.

COMPARISONS

4.1 Students demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own.

This standard focuses on the impact that learning the linguistic elements in the new language has on students' ability to examine English and to develop hypotheses about the structure and use of languages. From the earliest language learning experiences, students can compare and contrast the two languages as different elements are presented. Activities can be systematically integrated into instruction that will assist students in gaining understanding and in developing their abilities to think critically about how languages work.

4.2 Students recognize that cultures use different patterns of interaction and can apply this knowledge to their own culture.

As students expand their knowledge of cultures through language learning, they continually discover perspectives, practices, and products that are similar and different from their own culture, and they develop the ability to hypothesize about cultural systems in general. Some students may make these comparisons naturally, others may not. This standard helps focus this reflective process for all students by encouraging integration of this process into instruction from the earliest levels of learning.
5.1 Students use the language both within and beyond the school setting.

This standard focuses on language as a tool for communication with speakers of the language throughout one’s life: in schools, in the community, and abroad. In schools, students share their knowledge of language and culture with classmates and with younger students who may be learning the language. Applying what has been learned in the language program as defined by the other standards, students come to realize the advantages inherent in being able to communicate in more than one language and develop an understanding of the power of language.

5.2 Students show evidence of becoming lifelong learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment.

Each day millions of Americans spend leisure time reading, listening to music, viewing films and television programs, and interacting with each other. By developing a certain level of comfort with their new language, students can use these skills to access information as they continue to learn throughout their lives. Students who study a language can use their skills to further enrich their personal lives by accessing various entertainment and information sources available to speakers of the language. Some students may have the opportunity to travel to communities and countries where the language is used extensively and, through this experience, further develop their language skills and understanding of the culture.

SAMPLE LEARNING SCENARIO: NEWSCAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards Targeted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>In the Spanish II class in Williamston High School, a small, rural community in Michigan, students worked in groups to write, produce, and videotape a fifteen-to-twenty minute Spanish language news show that included news events; a live, from-the-scene report; weather; sports; and commercials. The news events included items from the Spanish-speaking world, the United States, the state, and local areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Presentational Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Practices of Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Furthering Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 School and Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Life-long Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection

1.1—Students work cooperatively in groups using the language to produce the newscast.
1.3—Students produce the newscast in the language studied.
2.1—Students present news stories that reflect a perspective from the culture studied.
3.1—Students develop news items on a variety of topics.
5.1—Students use the language in the classroom.
5.2—Students develop insights necessary for media literacy.

If the students were asked to view taped newscasts and commercials from two Spanish speaking countries and use them as models for their project, an emphasis could be placed on Standards 1.2 and 4.1 (in preparing for the project, students view newscasts and compare and contrast language styles) and Standard 4.2 (students note cultural similarities and differences in the videotapes they viewed). This type of preparation for the project would also provide the opportunity to target Standard 2.2 with students analyzing a product of the culture studied. This scenario could be applied to any language at a variety of levels.
SAMPLE LEARNING SCENARIO: CHINESE CALENDAR

Description
In Ms. Chen-Lin’s Chinese class in West Hartford, CT, eighth graders are learning about the Chinese calendar. Students listen to the folkloric tale of how the years got their names, which the teacher explains using story cards. The students then use artistic expression to recall the details of the story by making posters that announce the race of the twelve animals in the story. They are encouraged to include on their poster the date, time, location, and prize in Chinese. On the next day, the class explores the importance of a calendar in the students’ own culture and in others. The students discuss the differences found in the Chinese and American calendars. They then make a calendar using Chinese characters to be used in their homes. They include birthdays, family celebrations, school activities, and other special events.

Reflection
1.2—Students comprehend the story of the Chinese calendar told in the target language
2.2—Students read about and discuss products of the culture
4.2—Students compare and contrast products found in the two cultures.

In this activity, the students understand the calendar explanation more easily because the teacher accompanies the story with visuals. The use of artistic expression to check for their understanding allows students with various learning styles to be successful in showing what they understood from the story. The follow-up discussion helps students reflect on the importance of a calendar within a culture and the role that the calendar plays in American culture.
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The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages is the only national organization dedicated to the improvement and expansion of the teaching and learning of all languages at all levels of instruction. ACTFL is an individual membership organization of more than 7,000 foreign language educators and administrators from elementary through graduate education, as well as government and industry.

Over the past 30 years, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has become synonymous with innovation, quality, and reliability in meeting the changing needs of foreign language educators and their students. From the development of Proficiency Guidelines, to its leadership role in the creation of national standards, ACTFL focuses on issues that are critical to the growth of both the profession and the individual teacher. Through their membership, new as well as veteran teachers are making an important investment in the future.

ACTFL is governed by a 15-member Executive Council. Ten council members are elected by the members, and five are appointed by the five regional foreign language organizations. Council members serve a four year term. The president serves for three years—one year each as president-elect, president, and past president.

ACTFL Headquarters, based in Yonkers, NY, has a full- and part-time staff of fifteen that manages the day-to-day operation of the organization.

Accomplishments

1977
President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies

ACTFL spearheaded a nationwide effort to provide testimony and offer assistance to President Jimmy Carter's special commission. The findings of the commission prompted the ongoing renaissance of foreign language education in the U.S.

1981
Washington Office for Joint National Committee for Languages

JNCL, a federation of language associations of which ACTFL is a founding member, established a Washington presence with funding from ACTFL.

1986
ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines

1991
ACTFL Provisional Teacher Education Guidelines

1995
National Standards for Foreign Language Education

History

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages was founded in 1967 by the Modern Language Association of America. It remains the only national organization representing teachers of all languages at all education levels.

Mission

As part of an on-going strategic planning process begun in May of 1996, the ACTFL Executive Council developed the following vision statement for the organization:

All Americans should be proficient in at least one language and culture in addition to English. For this reason, foreign

http://www.actfl.org/public/articles/index.cfm?cat=8
language education must be part of the core curriculum and be treated as central to the education of all children. To realize the vision, foreign language educators must strive for unity of purpose and they must take steps to realize fully the potential of professional status.

The mission of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages is to promote and foster the study of languages and cultures as an integral component of American education and society. ACTFL must provide visionary yet practical leadership, create policy and programs to further our goals, and initiate and build programs that will enhance the profession and enable it to be proactive in a changing world.

Copyright 2003, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
The publication of Standards for Foreign Language Learning signals the end of business as usual in departments of national languages and literature in our colleges and universities—not so much because of the content of the document per se—but because this content has grown out of a grass-roots desire for change in the foreign language teaching profession across the country. Several state standards projects begun before the national Standards came out had a great deal in common with them (Sandrock). Seventeen states have already modeled their own standards closely on the document, six others have created related standards, and other states are moving in this direction. A 1997 national survey on the impact of the Standards on elementary and secondary school curricula showed that in many cases these already "embodied standards-like principles prior to the development of the actual standards" (Salomon, 6). A generation of enthusiasts was well into the process of trying to change the goals and outcomes of foreign language teaching before the national Standards saw the light of day. While large numbers of university professors of language and literature were paying little if any attention to what was going on, a relative consensus was emerging among the leaders in the pre-college sphere. The grassroots of enthusiasm for change at those earlier levels of the system was not allowed to dissipate, flow off in numerous different directions and weaken itself. It was effectively channeled into a document that sustains the force of the groundswell by allowing a good deal of regional and local latitude for curriculum development and assessment while clearly setting out popular, overall directions for foreign language learning as a whole. When the groundswell fully hits the postsecondary level, it will rock the boat.

University foreign language and literature departments are often shaken into awareness by questions surrounding placement examinations. Administrators are increasingly dubious about the need for numerous sections of beginning college courses in languages commonly taught in high school. They call for tests that will bring down these numbers and place students in higher level courses. Why, they wonder, is enrollment in upper level courses so small and enrollment in lower level courses so big? Foreign language chairs have to face up to such questions. They experiment with various placement tests that are easily accessible, often grammar-based, discrete-point, multiple-choice tests, perhaps computerized, efficient and cost-effective. The result? More students than ever place in F.L.101. "What is going on in the high schools?" the chairs ask angrily. At that point, as their own boat rocks, they come to the belated conclusion that they had better find out what is going on in the high schools. Perhaps they take a look at the Standards. In the worst case scenario, they say, "There you have it. No grammar. No wonder we have to place them in 101." In the best case, they sit down and seriously compare curricula with high school teachers and come up with a test that will place students higher. But, to and behold, this action goes beyond placement: The college curriculum itself has to change. There is indication in the colleges at the thought that pre-college standards might drive the college curriculum. Consider the reluctance of many colleagues to think in terms of a "K-16" curriculum. The college years, they feel deeply, are not just a continuation of high school. They are something else. This sense of separateness has helped to perpetuate for far too long the foolish phenomenon of American students repeating the same two beginning years of a language at various levels of the educational system instead of building on what they have learned and moving on. It has been all too easy for universities to fill large beginning classes with students who already began once before, and to blame the high schools for not teaching them properly the first time. This will not be so easy now, as colleagues at the elementary and secondary levels strengthen their own voice and sense of professionalism through having a real plan of action. There are already models for genuine cooperation on high school/university articulation plans—but most of us have a long road to travel before we reach the goal of a multi-year seamless language-learning continuum that includes the college level. To set out on this road, we need first to recognize that what Paul Sandrock has stated about K-12 applies equally to K-16: "Curriculum really bubbles up: it does not get directed from the highest level down" (5). This is not a statement of an ideal; it is a practical description of the way things work when curriculum is based, as Sandrock says, on the reality of what students actually achieve. At the recent conference on articulation sponsored by the Modern Language Association, when Claire Kramsch argued that we needed to establish some continuity and coherence to gain the trust of our students who want to see the payoff
for their efforts, she was giving voice to a national sentiment; she proceeded, however, to argue that "the only way to do this is to build the curriculum not piece by piece from the bottom up, but from the top down. Keep your eye on the prize, get the faculty to agree on the final goal, and shape each stage according to this final goal." She was here giving voice to a sentiment that is widespread at the university level but flies flat in the face of national reality. It is too late to try to build a new curriculum in foreign languages from the top down: the top is too split and unsure of what it wants, and the bottom increasingly knows what it is doing and why. Dale Lange has argued that if postsecondary language departments and programs do not take the Standards seriously, "a tragic step will take place in the evolution of second language programs at all levels" (40). He is not exaggerating. Either we look seriously at the curriculum "bubbling up" from the lower levels in the system, and consider how to work with it, or we continue blithely and on the whole blindly to set roadblocks in its way and in the way of the students who bubble up with it.

Better by far to consider why the Standards have struck such a responsive chord among our colleagues at other levels of the system, and to work with these colleagues at interweaving the curricula of all the levels into a variety of courses of study that will make sense in various ways for the hugely varied mass of American students. There are many individuals and many groups at our colleges and universities whose goals in foreign language teaching can well be subsumed under the flexible and broad definitions of the Standards: They include professors who have worked on various languages-across-the-curriculum projects; those working in cultural studies; area studies; interdisciplinary studies; those who have worked at the colleges since the early eighties on proficiency-oriented language-teaching; on communicative or student-centered language-teaching.

Aspects of the Standards can appeal in fact to teachers of literature as well as to teachers of language. It might be argued indeed that there is something for everyone in the document, and that it does not give a very precise definition to anything, neither to the content of curriculum nor to the mastery of skills. Certainly it lacks any insistence that one content area, one particular kind of subject matter, should have precedence over another and this disturbs in particular the literary scholars, long used to seeing their particular field as pre-eminent in foreign language programs. It also lacks a workable system of readily assessable proficiency levels in the separate skill areas of speaking, reading, writing and listening, and this disturbs those practitioners who have become accustomed to the generally serviceable yardstick provided by the ACTFL Guidelines.

The gap in mutual understanding that marks language and literature departments at the college level is reflected in the way critics of the Standards in the literary segment of the profession tend simplistically to view the document as a product of the "proficiency people." Such critics have no notion of the problems that the document might present to the "proficiency people" themselves. All this shows that, while individual professors may buy in to the Standards in various ways, the universities have a long way to go before they can hope to contribute coherent components to the K-16 curriculum.

Yet try we must to move towards this if we are to avoid taking the "tragic step" of thwarting the aspirations of students coming to us from the secondary schools, of failing to build on the efforts of our finest colleagues at the pre-college levels, and of cutting off the best and biggest source of students for our own programs. Some state-wide and local collaboratives are already hard at work on articulation projects in which participants from the various levels of the system are working as "equal partners with an equal voice and an equal stake" (Birckbichler 45). A great many individual colleges and universities, however, are not involved in any collaboratives at all. Over the next decade, students will be coming from schools in which they have been taught a foreign language along at least some of the lines that the Standards advocate into departments and programs that have never heard of the 5 Cs. Are these 5 Cs just a gimmick, as some people are inclined to think? It is easy to mock the Madison Avenue alliterative-approaching approach, and ask what would have happened to the 5 Cs if communication or culture had begun with another letter of the alphabet. The alliterative approach is, of course, a gimmick. The multi-purpose Standards document is not only a serious attempt at educational reform—it is also an advertisement for the foreign language enterprise and it has to reach an audience wider than that of professors of language and literature, an audience too bored and disillusioned by its own experiences of school and college foreign language learning to want to read a Standards document that reminds them of these experiences.

The readers of this document do not see tired students reciting paradigms and learning vocabulary lists. They see happy campers communicating about butterflies, chocolate, dinosaurs, hockey and any number of amusing things. They see competent and responsible young people engaging in community projects, making speeches, acting in plays, making videos, communicating with the world on the Internet. The document conveys a direct message: Foreign languages are fun, they are useful, they are exciting, you can speak them, write them, read them, understand them; you want to learn them, you want your children to learn them; you don't want to be shut out from the new global society, and you don't want your children to be shut out. And this is only the document! It turns out that your children actually enjoy Ms. Bauer's first year Latin class on the Roman family; they enjoy corresponding by E-mail with "keypals" in Dakar in Monsieur Joseph's seventh grade French class; they enjoy planning a Chinese New Year's celebration in their second year Chinese class; they enjoy the clean-up of the old Spanish cemetery near their school, along with their Spanish teacher, their art teacher, and their history teacher; they enjoy the interviews of local community members that go with it. And they do not at all enjoy getting to college and finding themselves sitting in one-
dimensional foreign language classes, working through half a textbook in 101, and the other half in 102, or sitting in advanced courses talking about literature in English, or struggling hopelessly with literary criticism in a foreign language.

Disappointment with college courses is increasingly being reported back to high school teachers by students who have had their high hopes dashed. The five Cs may sound like a gimmick, but if students really communicate, really compare, really make practical connections with other cultures and other disciplines, really participate in multilingual communities, then the gimmick turns out to be not just an advertisement, but a motivation of teachers and students that can in no way be equaled by the "cover the textbook" approach, so easy to coordinate in basic college foreign language courses, and so difficult to turn into a successful life-long learning process.

The emerging hard truth is that unless we change our way of going about things at the colleges, the main impact the Standards will have on higher education is that fewer and fewer students who have learned languages in elementary and secondary schools will want to take courses in our departments when they come to college. Beyond the ones required, they will find other ways of keeping up their languages. Or else our college administrators will find ways of offering them language instruction other than our own. Instead of worrying patronizingly about whether Standards-educated students will be adequately prepared to take our college-level courses, we would be better advised for own sake to worry about how to prepare ourselves to teach Standards-educated students. How will we recognize, assess and build on the skills and knowledge that they have acquired? How will we ourselves offer such skills and knowledge in our own programs of languages that are not offered at the pre-college level. Our first step must be to take these skills and this knowledge seriously, and not assume arrogantly, as many of us do, that creating courses and programs for Standards-educated students is a code-expression for lowering college standards.

Since the Standards are identified with "proficiency," and since many of our colleagues mistakenly identify the word "proficiency" with an emphasis on speaking at the expense of reading and writing, they assume that they will be teaching students who cannot read and write and who don't know grammar. If we are to avoid Lange's "tragic step," we at the colleges have to give up knee-jerk responses to words we have never bothered to understand. And at all levels of the system, we have to clarify much more precisely the rigor of a genuinely proficiency-based foreign language program. Such a program can be great fun for students, but the fun is not an end in itself. Its justification lies in its usefulness to their real lives, lives of work as well as lives of leisure and self-enrichment. Such a program certainly does not eliminate grammar from its teaching nor de-emphasize reading and writing. It does, however, test mastery of grammar and performance of skills in a way that is different from standardized testing, and this is why the placement test often acts as a useful catalyst in belated postsecondary attempts to cooperate with the secondary level. The whole question of grammar is a touchy subject that people try to avoid, but I fear that we have to bite the bullet on it and on its role in the Standards if we are to bring opponents and adherents of the document closer together.

The people who say disparagingly, "There's no grammar in it," are not right; but one sees why they say it. There are a number of references in the document to "the need to know how the language system operates" but the only place where the word "grammar" is itself center stage is in the "frequently asked questions" section at the end. There, the question that bothers many people is directly put: "What is the role of grammar?" In their answer to this question, the authors stress their efforts to change the emphasis from memorization of words and grammar rules to the exploration, development and use of "communicative strategies, learning strategies and critical thinking skills as well as the appropriate elements of the language system and culture" (97). The document is intended as a corrective to past practices, where teachers were tied hand and foot to the grammar book. The authors seek to set them and their students free.

Thus while they state quite explicitly in their introduction to the Communication Goal that "knowledge of the linguistic system, its grammar, emerging vocabulary, phonology, pragmatic and discourse features, undergirds the accuracy of communication" (38), nowhere in the Sample Progress Indicators for the three communication standards at the three selected grade levels is there any mention of grammar, though there are plenty of reading and writing Indicators. The authors situate knowledge of grammar under Goal 4, the goal of making comparisons between the native and the foreign language—here the students' attention is focussed on the nature of linguistic systems. The five goals, however, are not intended to be approached separately in the classroom (this is clear from the Learning Scenarios), but are to be seen as parts of an interconnected whole; the success of the Standards will largely rest on the interconnections which are worked out in the process of curriculum development. The colleges need to understand that the Standards quite expressly do not prescribe curriculum. The framers of curriculum and of assessment tools are the ones who will have to deal, among other things, with the indisputable fact that while indeed it is fascinating, useful, and even fun, to compare grammatical systems, it is also absolutely unavoidable in the act of communication itself to use grammar, whether good, bad, or indifferent grammar. It is pleasant to be able to use it easily and without anxiety, and, as we who have worked with the OPI for years know only too well the more complex the act of communication is, the more crucial it becomes to use grammar correctly. Various language groups are creating language-specific Standards based on the generic ones, and, as one might expect, the classicists do bite the grammar bullet. They place knowledge of the linguistic structure of Latin or Greek under the analytic Goal 4, but equally firmly place demonstra-
tion of that knowledge under the communicative Goal I, where under Standard 1.1, sample progress indicators at each of the three grade levels include: "Students demonstrate knowledge of vocabulary, basic inflectional systems, and syntax appropriate to their reading level" (7 f.). A line of this kind could well be inserted under the communication goals for other languages. It behooves those college professors who feel strongly on the matter to involve themselves in the ongoing discussions of curriculum frameworks, and not to complain later that they were not consulted.

I have dwelt on the question of grammar here because I know that it is a major preoccupation at the college level. It is a great pity, given the wide-ranging disciplinary competence available at the colleges, that the Cs of the Standards standing for cultures, connections and communities, are not a greater preoccupation in college-level language programs. Language Across the Curriculum programs that have been developed in the colleges in recent years have brought new students into the foreign language classroom, students who would not have enrolled in a traditional language class but who want to pursue the use of a language—sometimes a language learned at high school, sometimes a heritage language—in connection with other fields of study and work. Such programs often find themselves working against rather than with the mainstream of foreign language instruction in the colleges. The Standards aim to break down barriers between languages and other disciplines from the very beginning, but the authors of the document admit that an integrated curriculum with learning opportunities for students around a common theme is more easily accomplished in the elementary school setting than at the middle and high school levels (69). And as Lange points out, the curricular work being done around the Standards in ongoing articulation projects is not showing much evidence of being interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary, nor does he see "evidence of work-related curriculum development or articulation with employment issues " (38). Here is an area of endeavor ripe for collaboration between high school and college faculty in relatively uncharted territory. I began this piece with the suggestion that it was the placement test that would wake up the colleges to the need to look outside their own bailiwicks at what was going around them, and I will return to this now in my conclusion because I believe that Lange's "tragic step" is already being signaled precisely at the placement point in some states. In Wisconsin an alarm bell is already sounding. A new competency-based admission process has been worked out to "provide high schools with an option to select the process that is better suited to their curricular structure." Students demonstrate appropriate levels of performance on a set of defined academic competencies; there are five levels (roughly equivalent to the familiar three levels of the FSI scale) and each is further categorized under Breadth, Depth and Accuracy. Clearly this system will arouse the curiosity of all of us who have worked on proficiency-oriented programs, whether at the pre-college or the college level. Based on pilot studies, this system of competency rating has been approved by the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents. But—and here comes the alarm bell—in the words of Paul Sandrock: The competency ratings tentatively show high correlation with traditional admissions practices, but have yet to be linked to university language course placement. University departments need to adopt the competencies as their goals for early levels of instruction. Then the system would truly be seamless, with compatible assessment helping students make the transition. Articulation would clearly be in place. As the Competency-Based Admission process moves from piloting to wide-scale usage, this potential remains an unfulfilled promise. 3

Sandrock summarized the problem in one sentence at the recent MLA conference on articulation: "The University curriculum has not changed," And there we have it. We can develop new curricula and new ways of teaching at the pre-college level, we can even develop ways of testing that are suitable for the new curricular structures and that satisfy university entrance standards, but if these ways of testing cannot be used for placement in the college curriculum, then the potential for a seamless system of articulation across levels will remain unfulfilled. The national Standards provide a vision of long coordinated sequences of language study, of interactive, interdisciplinary language programs, of programs to take heritage learners as well as learners of second languages to a high level of literacy. Such a vision, if realized, will finally raise foreign language teaching to the colleges to a genuine "college-level." The Standards, as has often been said, provide a destination rather than a road-map. As yet there are practically no twelve-year language sequences, but road-maps are being created all over the country for pieces of such sequences. The necessary multiple entry and exit points in the envisioned curriculum are being devised. We at the colleges need, with some humility, to inform ourselves about what is going on, and become a part of it. We need to learn from our placement problems alone that there is a "complex web of connections among curriculum, instruction and assessment" (Liskin-Gasparro, 170) which we can no longer slough off as something that concerns someone else. It concerns us.

NOTES
1 Unpublished Comments on Articulation at "High School to College in Foreign Language Programs," a conference sponsored by the Modern Language Association, 6-8 February 1998.
2 Quotations and information are taken from a handout distributed at the MLA Conference "From High School to College in Foreign Language Programs, 6-8 February, 1998. The source given was University of Wisconsin System Office of Academic Affairs, January 1998.
3 Unpublished Comments on Articulation, as above. Contribution by Paul Sandrock.
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The Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center

Mission
The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) and Presidio of Monterey (POM), is the primary foreign language training institution within the Department of Defense (DoD), conducts full-time foreign language resident training, exercising technical control of nonresident foreign language training in the Defense Foreign Language Program. The DLIFLC provides foreign language services to DoD, government agencies, and foreign governments.

Vision Statement
The DLIFLC and POM will remain the DoD leader in providing quality foreign language education and foreign language services to the Armed Forces and government agencies in support of national security interests and global operational needs. The POM will set the standard for base operations support, maximizing innovative partnering initiatives.

Goals
1. Lead the development, planning, and execution of DoD foreign language education programs to meet Service foreign language requirements.
2. Train 100% of Service requirements.
3. Sustain and improve the proficiency of DoD linguists throughout their careers.
4. Evaluate and assess DoD language programs and personnel proficiencies to ensure the required operational language capability.
5. Serve the language needs of the DoD operational community.
7. Transfer all excess real property, real estate, personal property, and infrastructure of the former Fort Ord.
Faculty and Staff

There are approximately 900 civilian teachers employed at the DLIFLC, most of them native speakers of the language they teach. More than two-thirds hold advanced degrees (Master’s or higher), and nearly one-quarter hold doctorates. Represented disciplines include Foreign Language, Second Language Acquisition, Education, Area Studies, and English.

The DLIFLC faculty represents a wide variety of accomplishments and experience. There are a number of musicians, authors, artists, and educators; some were formerly government or military officials in their native lands.

Supplementing the civilian instructors are almost 100 Military Language Instructors (MLIs), who are noncommissioned/petty officers of the four branches of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The DLIFLC employs 1600 civilians. Of these, nearly 1200 hold teaching and other academic and staff positions, and 400 work in base operations. In addition to the civilian workforce, 400 military personnel participate in or provide support for the DLIFLC’s academic activities. The military permanent party personnel assigned to the DLIFLC represent the four branches of the U.S. Armed Services.

The skills and expertise of the faculty and staff are accessible beyond the confines of the DLIFLC’s academic programs. Limited translation and interpretation support is provided to affiliates of the DoD and national-level agencies on a space-available basis. Requests are prioritized on a case-by-case basis according to urgency of need and the DLIFLC’s ability to honor the request. The DLIFLC’s Public Affairs Office also maintains a speaker’s bureau as a function of its community relations program. This service assists local organizations in drawing on the wealth of specialized experience that exists in the DLIFLC community.
Facilities

The years since the establishment of the school in 1941 have been a time of growth and modernization. When the first Japanese course was taught, a few battered orange crates were used as desks and chairs and the instructors were hard put to find pencils and paper. To meet expanding space requirements and to replace old buildings, the DoD undertook a building program designed to support future needs of the Institute. This extensive program had the goal of providing adequate facilities to instruct, house, and support students in foreign language educational programs. The plan has resulted in new classrooms, dormitories, and support facilities, such as childcare, physical fitness, and logistic support centers.

Today the DLIFLC is one of the best-equipped facilities for language instruction in the U.S. Most classrooms have computers, closed-circuit television, and videotape equipment. Students make use of extensive audio and computer language laboratory facilities and the latest state-of-the-art audiovisual learning aids.

Twenty-two languages are presently taught by the DLIFLC, located at the Presidio of Monterey. In addition, approximately 85 languages can be taught by contracting with other government and private organizations in the Washington, D.C. area, such as the State Department’s Foreign Service Institute School of Language Studies (FSISLS).

Resident education at the Presidio of Monterey is conducted in eight language schools: Asia I (SAA), Asia II (SAB), Asia III (SAC), European I (SEA), European II (SEB), Middle East I (SMA), Middle East II (SMB), European and Latin American (ELA); as well as the School of Continuing Education (SCE) and the Operation Enduring Freedom Task Force (OEF TF).

Facilities to support resident students at the Presidio of Monterey include over 500 classrooms, more than 1,200 language lab positions, 17 permanent dormitories, and two dining facilities.
Linguistics Language Program

I. The context: UCSD’s proficiency-oriented language requirement

"...students would be required to attain **sufficient spoken and reading proficiency** in a foreign language to enable them to participate in meetings with foreign scholars (that was a notion dear to the heart of Harold Urey, who felt ashamed of his own lack of a foreign language at international conferences), and to read with some sensitivity literary and historical documents in a foreign language."


"...students are required to demonstrate **basic conversational and reading proficiency** in a modern foreign language...or completion of the fourth quarter of foreign language instruction...”

Revelle College general-education requirements, 2003-2004

"...students are required to demonstrate **basic conversational and reading proficiency** in a modern foreign language...by completing the fourth quarter of language instruction...”

Eleanor Roosevelt College general-education requirements, 2003-2004

II. What is needed to attain basic proficiency

Intermediate level of proficiency: “may satisfy simple personal needs and social demands to survive in the target language culture.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training required (in hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German, Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian, Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foreign Service Institute data

4 quarters at UCSD (classes 5 days per week) = 207 hours of instruction
### III. What to include in 207 hours of instruction

1. immersion in language and culture (input and interaction)

2. awareness of specific grammatical features
   awareness of specific cultural features

3. intellectual context:
   - structure of language
   - nature of language learning
   - culture, history, geography, etc.

### IV. How to implement these components within a 5-day schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWF</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Conversation”</strong></td>
<td><strong>“Analysis”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class size = 12 - 14</td>
<td>class size = 30 - 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Immersion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Immersion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wide variety of interactive, communicative activities to promote acquisition of <strong>new words</strong> and <strong>new structures</strong> in an authentic cultural context.</td>
<td>Same, but with activities appropriate to a larger group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Awareness of grammar and culture</strong></th>
<th><strong>Intellectual context</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities to promote <strong>noticing</strong> and <strong>analysis</strong>.</td>
<td>Learning about the structure of the language, the nature of language learning, and the larger cultural, historical, and geographical context of the language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities that promote acquisition

Activities that promote intellectual growth
V. What languages to teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Quarters of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi* (approved)</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic*</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese*</td>
<td>A/AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed study (60+ languages)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French for reading</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German for reading</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning (w/UCLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi*</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Currently MWF only. 5-day/week schedule approved for next year.

* Approved, but not yet taught.

| Heritage Language: Courses may be taken 3 times for credit. |
VI. Relationship between LLP and Dept. of Linguistics

Linguistics → LLP
- Creating environment for acquisition
- Instructed second language acquisition research
- Grammatical analysis
- Intellectual context: nature of language and language learning

 LLP → Linguistics
- Research on second language acquisition
Below are the languages offered in the program. Click on a link for the syllabus needed for the language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>AmericanSign</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Armenian (Eastern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>Cambodian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Chewa</td>
<td>Chinese (Cantonese)</td>
<td>Chinese (Mandarin)</td>
<td>Chinyanja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Esperanto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Fula</td>
<td>Fulfulde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Greek (Modern)</td>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew (Modern)</td>
<td>Hindi-Urdu</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>Igbo</td>
<td>Ibo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>Khmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kituba</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>New Guinea Pidgin</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanja</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Twi</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>Yoruba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary
LINGUISTICS LANGUAGE LAB
McGill Hall 2126
By Linda Murphy, Language Lab Librarian

The UCSD Linguistics Language Lab is a departmental facility which 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.

PRINT COLLECTION
Over 200 languages are represented within the library, principally in the print collection. Included are eight thousand published volumes ranging from textbooks to historical grammars, dictionaries to discourse studies; over 400 linguistics dissertations; and 3000 articles, journals, and conference proceedings documenting five decades of evolution in linguistics and related fields. Many of these titles are not available in the Geisel Library or other campus libraries, but are available to all Language Lab users for in-house use and for limited circulation to Linguistic Department affiliates.

MEDIA COLLECTION
The media collection contains more than 450 audio and video titles for language study and teaching and for cultural enrichment, mostly associated with Linguistics Language Program (LLP) and heritage language (HL) courses. As the only multimedia playback facility on campus, however, the Language Lab also keeps recordings and software on reserve for other language-teaching departments at UCSD including the Literature Department, University Extension, IR/PS, and the History Department’s interdisciplinary programs in Chinese, Japanese, & Judaic Studies.

ACTIVITIES
The Language Lab contains 26 audio- and video-playback stations which students use individually or in small groups to prepare weekly LLP class assignments, for grammar review, and for cultural background in HL courses. Books, recordings and software are available for those courses and for the Linguistics Directed Study (LIDS) credit course in 65 additional languages. Computerized quizzes and secure midterm tests in the Language Lab have become a regular feature of LLP French, German, Italian and Spanish courses. An audio/video recording station in the Language Lab is used to tape American Sign Language presentations, recitations in ESL, and oral proficiency tests. Group activities and guided internet access are permitted under the supervision of a language instructor in a designated area of the Lab.

TEACHER RESOURCES AND SERVICES
Teacher support is an important part of the Language Lab’s services, including distribution of desk copies to LLP, HL and linguistics TA’s and faculty, all of which are tracked by a customized database. A special area called the Instructor’s Corner houses a large array of teaching materials for classroom use—realia, picture files, maps, and games in several languages. Also available to teachers for class use are: overhead and carousel projectors, screens, boomboxes, CD players, video carts and (on a limited basis) Powerpoint and videotaping equipment.
TECHNICAL SUPPORT
A Linguistics Department electronics technician repairs our audio and video playback, recording, and duplicating equipment. Playback equipment for audio and video (including DVD) is available for all of our classes. This is provided by the Language Lab for nearby classrooms and by Media Center Audio-Visual Services for classrooms outside McGill Hall. LLP movies, once shown here, are now outsourced to the Geisel Library’s Film & Video Reserve to provide more convenience to students and less crowding in our facility. For similar reasons, specialized web interfaces were developed by our staff to provide course information and exercises for LLP students working online at home or in other campus computer labs. Despite these changes, our need for computers, particularly for testing, has risen beyond a level which department funds could support, so Academic Computing Services now provides our 35 student-used computers and technical support for same.

SPECIAL ARCHIVE
As one of UCSD’s founding academic departments, the Linguistics Department has gathered an archive of audio tapes over the years, some recorded in the field, which includes endangered languages and languages with unusual phonological or structural features. Many of these recordings are currently being digitized by Language Lab staff for analysis and, in some cases, to preserve samples of the languages themselves. Of special interest are a number of local Native American languages documented by Linguistics Professor Emeritus Margaret Langdon which have all but disappeared and may never again be recorded or heard.

USAGE
The Language Lab is open six days a week during academic sessions, for a total of 58 hours per week including evenings and Sunday afternoons. Attendance statistics are collected hourly to record the number of users present and equipment in use. These figures show more than 15,000 user-visits to our facility over the course of an academic year, the heaviest being in Fall Quarter when the total enrollments in the full-scale LLP & HL courses exceed 1200. Another 400-500 students each quarter come to the Language Lab from other departments: e.g., University Extension offers six languages with a Language Lab component, Literature and IR/PS currently offer two such courses each, while Chinese Studies and Japanese Studies courses have lab tapes for all their first- and second-year students. The average language students has one Lab assignment per week which typically takes 30-50 minutes to complete (LIDS students, however, must spend 6-12 hours!). While enrolled students are our primary users, we also welcome UCSD faculty, staff, alumni, Friends of the Geisel Library and others from the San Diego community, as space permits.

CLERICAL STAFF
The Language Lab is staffed by a librarian and 10-12 student assistants trained to answer questions about language and linguistics courses, schedule lab-use appointments when necessary, demonstrate and operate equipment, assist with library tasks. Course syllabi, reserve books and tapes, EAP information and related materials are readily available for reference at the service desk. In addition the librarian can assist in locating language resources at other schools, from commercial vendors, and on the internet.
Under the direction of Professor Robert Blake (UC Davis), the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching is a system-wide initiative designed to make the most effective use of UC's vast linguistic resources and expertise at a time when foreign language enrollments are increasing dramatically. The consortium fosters collaboration among and across the language programs at the UC campuses with an eye to increasing student access to language study through a combination of the best classroom practices, technological enhancements and EAP programs.

http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/

http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/consortium.htm
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PREAMBLE

On October 15, 1999, the Chronicle of Higher Education announced a new study by the Modern Language Association that reported the highest number of enrollments in foreign language courses in U.S. institutions of higher education on record. Enrollments nationwide have risen 4.8% since 1995, reversing a 3.8% decline between 1990 and 1995. Within the UC system, this growth has been even more dramatic, with enrollments in foreign language courses up by 10.8% between 1994 and 1998. Spanish enrollments accounted for almost half of the 26,729 increases, but increases were reflected across the board, and particularly in Asian languages.

How do we explain these shifts, and how do they affect us? Changing demographics in the population of California no doubt have contributed to the increase in students studying Spanish and East Asian languages. Spanish has become the de facto second language of California; increasingly it is the only foreign language taught in California high schools. This contributes to the popularity of Spanish with undergraduates who want to make use of the only investment in foreign language they have been able to make before entering UC. It also means that the many students who want to study other languages must begin in college. Furthermore, a great many students, especially those of Asian and Latino ancestry, arrive on campus with prior exposure to a language other than English in the home and want to continue with it as their foreign language. They constitute a new clientele of “heritage learners” whose needs are not addressed by traditional modes of language pedagogy or standard curricular offerings.

In other words, enrollments in foreign language courses and the demand for new areas of instruction are increasing both nationally and at the University of California and, in the coming years, the teaching of foreign languages may
take place in different demographic and academic contexts than it did twenty-five years ago. Undergraduates study languages for many different reasons (for personal enrichment, academic preparation, professional development, general education) in addition to the reasons why students major in traditional national literature departments. Shifting enrollment patterns and new curricular pathways will change the academic landscape in some areas, challenging us to formulate coherent policies about the academic, cultural and intellectual contexts in which research universities should offer foreign language instruction.

Furthermore, following the national trend in the humanities, many of our national literature departments are accepting fewer graduate students. Increasing undergraduate enrollments in these departments (composed of both majors and non-majors) may necessitate new approaches to the staffing of language courses, which traditionally have been taught by graduate students on most UC campuses. Whether professional language teachers are hired (as opposed to faculty or graduate students who teach language but conduct research in literature or linguistics) or whether research faculty themselves participate in the teaching of language, we will have to maintain coherent and stable language programs as we address complex questions about academic priorities, educational policy and intellectual mission, staffing, intercampus cooperation, and resource allocation.

Foreign language instruction traditionally has been labor intensive, and expenses tend to grow exponentially as a decision to offer new courses leads to a commitment to intermediate and advanced as well as elementary instruction. Campuses by necessity have duplicated each other’s efforts, even in the preparation of course materials. New technologies and new strategies for distance learning, however, provide new opportunities in these areas. Although language instruction always will require human interaction and many hours of classes and practice per week, it is clear that instructional technology will offer significant possibilities for changing the way foreign languages are taught and learned.

As CD-ROMS and website-based instruction move into the space of the traditional language lab, the time is ripe for UC faculty to take the lead in developing innovative and collaborative means of delivering instruction in foreign languages. The technological tools to accomplish this goal already exist, but the training and planning essential to its successful realization have never been attempted systematically across multiple campuses. With leading authorities in foreign language pedagogy and research, the University of California has the potential to engage in systemwide planning and to pool resources and share in the development of pilot courses in these areas. Moreover, the mandate to address the Tidal Wave II of students anticipated by the UC system should inspire more creative uses of summer sessions and the development of intensive summer programs for foreign language instruction. These might also allow campuses to coordinate efforts and offer instruction in certain languages at only one or two campuses. There is also enormous room for growth with UC’s Education Abroad Program, and we should seek new ways to connect EAP to the curriculum and summer language study.

Finally, even if enrollment patterns and student interest did not compel University of California to confront these issues, it would be our responsibility as a state university and national leader in higher education to address the significance of the study of foreign languages at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Americans may increasingly believe that U.S. economic and geo-political dominance will make English a universal language, but the combination of globalization and the multicultural environment of California makes foreign language study imperative for our students. The University of California can and will need to show leadership in this area and to spearhead coordination and collaboration with K-12 educators on issues of foreign language education where this is practical and appropriate.

The more than 300 languages spoken in California’s K-12 schools provide a concrete indication of the multicultural and multilingual background with which our students enter college. The state’s future economic prosperity also depends upon our students’ ability to function in an international context. A recent report by the California Department of Education cites this recommendation of the California Economic Development Corporation: “Internationalize all curricula to provide greater understanding of our place in the global economy, through international studies and stronger requirements for foreign languages and cultures.” The Stanford University
Graduate School of Business, for example, recently has placed a greater emphasis on foreign language courses. It is not our mission to play Berlitz to business schools and international studies programs any more than it is our job to provide mere language instruction to our heritage language students. However, our faculty have a necessary role to play in integrating language study into these areas in a pedagogically and academically serious way. It is the responsibility and the strength of our humanities divisions and liberal arts curricula to offer rigorous language instruction in a humanistic, cultural, and comparative context. In this way we can prepare our students (and the future workforce of the state) for the global economy and the multicultural environment in which they live.

The challenges and responsibilities presented by these demographic and academic trends make it crucial that we pool our resources (both financial and intellectual) and develop strategies and programs for the future. We believe that a University of California Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching would be able to address some of the theoretical, pedagogical, and professional problems that we all will face. The worst case scenario is that the changing landscape of foreign language instruction will be allowed to overwhelm divisions of humanities, skew academic priorities, and shift resources from traditionally strong research areas to instructional programs removed from academic contexts. In addition to depriving the academy of rich linguistic and intellectual resources, it would also create a large group of lecturers whose professional needs are increasingly neglected by the system. It could necessitate costly duplication of course development at a moment when UC faculty are taking the lead in new technologies of language pedagogy and other universities are developing "brand name" products in distance learning curricula. It could leave our graduates unprepared for the workforce.

Alternatively, we could share our collective resources and talents in order to draw upon our world class research and pedagogical expertise in foreign language learning and teaching. Together we could explore policy issues and institutional strategies, and address issues of state and national significance. We believe that a relatively modest investment now would be cost-effective in the long run and would address compelling instructional and administrative problems of our campuses while there is still time to think ahead. We know that all of our campuses will share most of the problems brought about by the enrollment trends in foreign language study and instruction. It would be best to address them thoughtfully, informed by the best expertise and experience our faculty have to offer. A UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching would help us to share and, indeed, together discover some of the solutions to these problems.

**CHARGE**

The Consortium has the overall mission of fostering communication and collaboration across the UC campuses, across and among language groups (e.g., between teachers of German and teachers of Spanish, and among teachers of German at various campuses), and across the various disciplines that inform the learning and teaching of foreign, classical, second, and heritage languages within the UC system. It has four areas of responsibility:

- Curricular planning and institutional programming;
- Research and development in language learning and teaching;
- Professional development of language teachers; and
- Outreach on the regional, national, and international levels.

**1. CURRICULAR PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMMING**

In the last five years, several initiatives have improved foreign language instruction remarkably across the UC system. The Inter-campus Academic Program Incentive Fund, before it was discontinued, promoted the development of course materials in African languages and in Russian; it made possible course sharing using distance technologies in Italian, Russian, Japanese, and Spanish, and promoted the use of interactive video in Russian and video teleconferencing in Greek and Hebrew. In addition, several campuses have established Centers or Institutes for the enhancement of second-language acquisition and teaching: the Second Language Acquisition Institute at UC Davis, the Berkeley Language Center, the Language Resource Program at UCLA and the Linguistic Minority
Research Center at UCSB. These developments, however, have not been coordinated and, except on a local level, the resources have not been shared equitably across the campuses. The Consortium can help articulate and disseminate the various models of foreign language delivery, curricular innovation, and institutional programming across the various campuses.

The considerable variability from campus to campus in the distribution of foreign language instruction is another curricular and institutional planning issue to which the Consortium should direct its attention. UCB and UCLA, for example, offer courses in 55 and 63 world languages, respectively, and maintain the study of less commonly taught languages (LCTLS) so vital to our national and international well-being and security. With the exception of UCSB, which offers instruction in fewer languages than UCB and UCLA but still offers a relatively broad range, the other campuses typically, and quite reasonably, support instruction only for the principal European and Asian languages. At present, no bureaucratic or programmatic infrastructure exists that could be used to extend the sphere of language instruction in LCTLS from UCB and UCLA to the other campuses. The Consortium should take the lead in exploring how to harness recent advances in technology to nurture language study at a distance and thereby open access to a population wider than just one campus. Expanding language delivery and student access will not necessarily decrease UCB’s and UCLA’s cost of maintaining a large number of LCTLS. However, it should provide the means to enable them to spread benefits out over the entire system, thereby ensuring a prudent and economic use of scarce resources.

Any discussion of distance learning of course raises legitimate concerns that the technology, once in place, might supplant the face-to-face instruction that is essential for effective language learning. The Consortium should work quickly towards establishing guidelines that reflect the current understanding of the importance of a mix of live and mediated delivery, guidelines that can be used to establish criteria for approval of distance learning initiatives based on need and feasibility. At the same time, the Consortium should undertake an evaluation of current research on the pedagogical issues related to the various combinations of delivery systems.

The Consortium’s charge is therefore to facilitate the review and planning of language teaching both on individual campuses and across the system and to encourage greater intercampus cooperation. In addition to the tasks mentioned above, the Consortium should provide advice on such curricular matters as:

- Data collection and appropriate institutional response to shifting enrollments, new curricular pressures, job placements, etc.;
- Articulation of EAP and language instruction on the various campuses; and
- The "virtual university" model and its potential across the UC system.

The Consortium should facilitate cooperation in such areas as:

- Academic and alternate disciplinary contexts for language instruction (e.g., foreign languages across the curriculum, distance learning).
- Articulation of credit for non-UC language courses.
- Development of a clearinghouse of foreign language curricular initiatives both intra and intercampus.
- Articulation of International and Area Studies with language study on campus.
- Links between academic language or language-related centers within the UC system, e.g., Humanities Research Institute, Berkeley Language Center, SLA Institute at UC Davis, Language Resource Program at UCLA, UC Nexus, the Linguistics Minority Research Institute.
- Links to the various research communities within the UC system in the fields of Education, Linguistics, Anthropology, Applied Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, Literature and Cultural Studies, Media and Communication Studies and International and Area Studies. The Consortium can help bring the research done in these fields to bear on the learning and teaching of any of the 78 different languages taught at the University of California. The Consortium should also establish links with research groups outside the U.S. that investigate the learning and teaching of English as a Second or International Language, as well as
national languages taught as second languages within their respective national communities (e.g., Deutsch als Fremdsprache in Germany, Francais Langue Etrangere in France).

2. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
Collaboration and cooperation can best be accomplished in the context of the University’s research mission. The state of California, and UC in particular, have the largest concentration of scholars and researchers in the fields of second-language acquisition, applied linguistics and related research areas, and psychology in the country. The linguistic and cultural diversity of the State, and the unique concentration of foreign, second, and heritage languages (including Native American languages) taught within the UC system, make the Consortium a natural research environment to investigate the learning and teaching of languages in instructional settings.

The Consortium’s charge is therefore to encourage, stimulate and fund on a competitive basis various research initiatives which are aimed particularly, although not exclusively, at testing the value of various experiments in pedagogy and delivery (referred to in the first charge). These initiatives may be of a single-campus or a multicampus nature and may have an intra or intercampus focus. These initiatives may include:

- Pedagogical projects, e.g., instructional or curricular innovations, materials design and development, development of new testing techniques, new uses of technology;
- Language teaching research, e.g., evaluation of materials, methods, instructional activities, or the use of technology; conceptualization of various approaches to language instruction; theoretical or empirical studies of various aspects of second language acquisition in tutored environments.
- Conferences, workshops and colloquia on any aspect of language learning and teaching. These events can be addressed either to all language teachers or more specifically to those who teach the same language or the same level of instruction across the UC system. Topics could be: The teaching of heritage languages; Multimedia technology and the development of L2 literacy; The role of literature in language teaching: The "focus-on-form" approach in language instruction; Language learning and cultural identity.
- Cross-disciplinary conferences that bring together linguists, applied linguists, anthropological and educational linguists, psychologists, cognitive scientists, literary scholars, media specialists, to shed light on various aspects of language study.

3. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
A significant portion of the language instruction throughout the UC system is delivered by Lecturers (Unit 18 or SOE), who in some cases are also responsible for training the graduate student instructors. In many cases, these faculty members have specialized training/expertise in a field directly related to the teaching of languages (e.g., second language acquisition, applied linguistics), but their positions allow them very limited access to travel and research funds and provide virtually no incentive for professional or intellectual growth. Ladder-rank faculty, particularly from fields less obviously related to language teaching, do not necessarily fare better in terms of resources to support them in learning about current research, theory, and practice in the teaching of languages. By increasing access to professional development resources and by creating local opportunities for professional development of language faculty, the Consortium can raise the morale of instructors, strengthen the quality of language programs, and enhance the status of language teaching across the system.

The Consortium’s charge is therefore to provide an intellectual and professional forum for the pre- and in-service training of language teachers across the UC system. It supplements, rather than supplants, the development opportunities offered by individual departments on individual campuses. It should sponsor teacher training events that are run by language program coordinators or applied linguists taken from various campuses. Possible Consortium initiatives are:

- Regularly scheduled workshops for teachers of language-specific or generic groups on topics of common interest (e.g., Intermediate German, Spanish for Native Speakers, Teaching Writing at the Intermediate Level, Articulation of Instruction between Secondary and Post-secondary Sectors):
• Summer workshops, summer institutes for language instructors;
• Clearinghouse for library and software materials developed or available at the various campuses through Consortium Website, Listservs, Newsletter, etc.;
• Clearinghouse for information regarding the governance of foreign language instruction across campuses including enrollment data, language requirements, placement procedures, teaching and testing practices, curricula, etc.;
• Travel grant program to enable language instructors to attend professional meetings; and
• Grants program for research projects.

In order to support these initiatives outlined above, the Consortium will develop a plan for extramural funding from private and public sources.

4. OUTREACH
The University of California has a tradition of outreach to schools and community colleges across the State. The California Foreign Language Project has strengthened the ties between UC and the teaching of foreign languages in California’s elementary and secondary schools. In addition, UC has nurtured links with various linguistic communities. For example, the Native American Master-Apprentice Project has helped revitalized Native American languages in Northern California. These initiatives would benefit, however, from being associated with a larger outreach effort on the national and the international scene.

The Consortium’s charge is therefore to actively seek links with the various linguistic, academic, professional, research, and business communities that have an interest in furthering the learning and teaching of foreign, second, and heritage languages on the regional, national, and international levels.

• Links with linguistic communities, especially of speakers of less commonly taught languages like Vietnamese, Tagalog, Finnish.
• Links with K-12 outreach programs that seek to improve students’ ability to meet the E (language) requirement for entrance; work with the California Foreign Language Project in the professional development of K-12 language teachers, particularly in the area of incorporating instructional technology into language instruction.
• Links to professional organizations across the U.S.: the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC), the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), the various National Language Resource Centers (e.g., Minnesota, Hawaii, San Diego), and, outside the U.S.: the European Council, the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA), and the Federation Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes (FIPLV).
• Links to the business communities in California that seek job applicants with foreign language competencies.

ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF CONSORTIUM

A Director, a Steering Committee, and a Board of Governors will work together to set the direction for the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching.

The Consortium Director
The Consortium Director, a Senate faculty member, will work with the Steering Committee to develop the Consortium’s programs and address its various charges. The founding Director will be appointed for five years. Subsequent directors will serve 3-5 year appointments. The Director, in consultation with the Steering Committee, will set priorities for a given year and will be responsible for carrying out the tasks associated with those priorities. In particular, the Director will be responsible for developing a fund raising plan to assure sufficient resources to support the Consortium’s programming. The Director will be assisted by a full-time administrator who will implement the fund raising plan, among other things, and a part-time technical support person.
The Steering Committee
The Steering Committee shall consist of the Director, two representatives from each campus, and a representative from the Education Abroad Program. The Director serves as the Chair of the Steering Committee. Each campus that has foreign language instruction will appoint its two representatives: one administrator (dean, department chair, etc.) and one faculty member directly involved in language teaching. The Steering Committee will advise on policy issues and conduct the major business of the Consortium. The Steering Committee will meet two times a year; its members will serve for three-year terms and will have staggered terms to ensure continuity.

The Board of Governors
The Board of Governors shall have representation from within UC, from the academy outside the University, and from other institutions, Foundations, and entities such as the national language centers. The broad representation of the Board will give it the necessary stature for enhancing the University's national visibility as a leader in the foreign language field. The Board advises the Consortium on national trends, related programs and policy issues. Its members will be selected by the Consortium Director in consultation with the steering committee and will be appointed by the President of the University of California to serve for three-year terms. The Board will meet annually.

CONCLUSION

Now is the time to apply the collective resources and talents across the UC to plan for language teaching and learning in the UC system. Now is the time to develop innovative and efficient means of delivering language instruction. New technologies and pedagogies provide excellent opportunities for systemwide planning that will help eliminate duplication, while simultaneously enabling support of cutting-edge research in language pedagogy. Burgeoning enrollments require creative solutions to increased language demand, and the demography of our students and the requirements of a global economy heighten the urgency of our attention. The proposed UC Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning offers a structure to accomplish these goals. And the collaborative manner in which representatives of different language interests across the system worked to develop this proposal exemplifies the Consortium's potential to be visionary, cooperative and pragmatic in planning for language teaching and learning in the UC system.
Under the direction of Professor Robert Blake (UC Davis), the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching is a system-wide initiative designed to make the most effective use of UC's vast linguistic resources and expertise at a time when foreign language enrollments are increasing dramatically. The consortium fosters collaboration among all across the language programs at the UC campuses with an eye to increasing student access to language study through a combination of best classroom practices, technological enhancements and EAP programs.

What's New

Robert Blake  
Director  
Phone: (530) 754-7153  
Fax: (530) 754-7152  
Email: rjblake@ucdavis.edu

Kathleen Dillon  
Associate Director  
Phone: (530) 754-9727  
Fax: (530) 754-7152  
Email: kedillon@ucdavis.edu

Karen Callahan  
Office Manager  
Phone: (530) 752-2719  
Fax: (530) 754-7152  
Email: kplilis@ucdavis.edu

UC Language Consortium | University of California, Davis  
220 Voorhies | One Shields Ave | Davis, CA 95616  
Ph: (530) 752-2719 | Fax: (530) 754-7152  
If you have comments or suggestions, please e-mail: uccllt@ucdavis.edu.

Updated: 4/5/2003
Links of Interest

- National Foreign Language Resources Center
- Second Language Acquisition Institute (SLAI), UC Davis
- The Berkeley Language Center, UC Berkeley
- Language Resource Center, UCLA
- Language Materials Project, UCLA
- The Center for Middle Eastern Studies at UCSB, UC Barbara
- CSU Strategic Language Initiative
- SLAI Self-Instruction Database
- Survey from the American Council on Education about International and Language Studies
- The UC Teaching, Learning and technology Center
- Heritage Language Journal
- National Council of Organizations of Less Common Languages
- UNICODE information
LLC Mission

Mission Statement

The Language Learning Center (LLC) is the central site on the UC Davis campus for technology-based language pedagogy. Conveniently located next to the library in the center of the UCDavis campus, the Language Learning Center is a site where faculty, staff, and students can come together in order to study language and culture. It consists of a variety of classroom, lab, and multi-purpose spaces—all with a focus on facilitating language learning, research, and culture. In addition to managing state-of-the-art spaces for language activity, the LLC differs from traditional language laboratories by offering workshops on a variety of topics including technology, conducting computerized adaptive placement examinations, serving as a reserve center for specialized check-out materials, hosting various conferences and cultural activities, assisting with the creation of courseware, and serving as a support mechanism for student and faculty language and technology endeavors.

Please contact the LLC for more info at:

Language Learning Center
University of California, Davis
1 Shields Avenue, Olson Hall Room 53
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 752-1508
Fax: (530) 754-8764