



CIC

Report

Strategies for Sharing Less Commonly Taught Languages Across the CIC

Osiyo Hello
Salaam
Nyob zoo
KONNICHI WA
Buongiorno
HABARI Ni hao ma



***A report to Deans
of Arts and
Sciences
of the CIC
Universities
September 12, 2003***

**Committee on Institutional Cooperation
1819 S. Neil Street, Suite D.
Champaign, IL 61820-7271
www.cic.uiuc.edu**

Working Draft

September 12, 2003

Strategies for Sharing Less Commonly Taught Languages Across the CIC:
A Report to Deans of Arts & Sciences
of the CIC Universities

Big Ten Conference Center
May 20-21, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Meeting Narrative	3
Strategies Matrix	8
Appendix 1: Draft list of LCTL course offerings in the CIC	11
Appendix 2: Draft list of LCTL course offerings in CIC delivered via technology	14
Appendix 3: Languages with broad interest across CIC but with traditionally low enrollment as presented by one meeting participant	15
Appendix 4: Completed pre-meeting questionnaires on three successful models of video conferencing and online language courses	16
Appendix 5: Meeting participant list	23

Executive Summary

On May 20-21, 2003, the CIC convened a strategic planning meeting to discuss opportunities for sharing, and thus increasing, student access to less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) across the CIC. Together the CIC universities offer over one hundred languages collectively. However, most member schools teach between 13-39 languages individually, resulting in widely differing student access to languages within the CIC.

Eleven representatives from the Colleges of Arts & Sciences, including associate deans, language faculty, department heads, and language center directors, reviewed current CIC programs aimed at sharing LCTLs and identified opportunities for enhancing these efforts and implementing new strategies. Through both small and large group work, the meeting participants developed a set of four strategies with a number of recommended actions. The four strategies divided neatly into two categories; consortial and campus-based. These strategies are aimed at increasing interest in and demand for LCTLs at the campus level; streamlining and enhancing such important and effective existing CIC programs as the Foreign Language Enhancement Program to better meet current needs; and moving to coordinate and share LCTL offerings wherever practical and appropriate, thereby expanding access to the approximately 106 language offerings currently delivered across the member universities. A report of this meeting was drafted and reviewed for accuracy by the meeting participants. The draft report was then circulated for four weeks to a broader audience including foreign language departments, international studies, graduate schools, and central learning technology units. The final (working) draft reflects comments from the meeting participants as well as the field.

It should be noted up front that there is no commonly understood agreement on effective pedagogy in the electronic classroom for language instruction, and the intent of this meeting was not to debate and establish a consensus on this. In fact, effective language pedagogy in an online environment will be determined by faculty after much experimentation and research. We hope the recommendations found in this report will result in more opportunities for such experimentation and research.

CONSORTIAL STRATEGIES

1. Pool and expand existing LCTL courses and resources, as appropriate, throughout the CIC, making them available to all CIC students—undergraduate as well as graduate students.
2. Create a mechanism through which CIC universities may plan for coordinated and expanded collaborative language offerings. This will provide the necessary long-term course development, access and articulation, and incentive structures.

CAMPUS STRATEGIES

1. Increase student interest in LCTLs.
2. Expand focus of LCTL courses to include language survival and business courses, and language immersion programs, while encouraging intra-campus program coordination (e.g., between LAS and Study Abroad Offices) in order to accomplish objectives.

Of these strategies, the participants recommend that the Deans focus on those related to consortial activities, and particularly the strategy and related actions with the greatest immediate impact and ability to leverage existing resources—including the sharing of some subset of the 10 languages already available via technology; canvassing our institutions for other online language courses in development, either planned or underway, and in which other universities might want to participate; and identifying a list of targeted languages that have potential for wider sharing.

Participants in this meeting respectfully submit these recommendations to the CIC Deans of Arts and Sciences for consideration and action.

According to the National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages, 91 percent of Americans who are studying a foreign language are learning French, Spanish, German, or Italian. The vast majority of American foreign language learners, then, are studying a minority of the world's languages. If one of the important goals of language learning is to enhance cultural awareness and understanding as well as teach our students about the world, it only makes sense that students have access to a more representative sample of the world's languages.¹

INTRODUCTION

While definitions vary, less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) in the United States typically encompass low-enrollment and/or infrequently taught languages (essentially all of the world's thousands of languages except English, French, German, and Spanish).

The CIC member universities have long worked to expand access to language opportunities for faculty and students. Some 106 different less commonly taught languages—from Akkadian to Zulu—are delivered by CIC universities, though most universities offer between 13 and 30 locally. Recognizing the consortial opportunity to increase students' access to language learning, the CIC Deans of Arts and Sciences have funded since 1987 the Foreign Language Enhancement Program, which has provided scholarships to 355 students to support specialized language acquisition through short-term, on-campus experiences to study languages not offered at the student's home campus.

During the mid-1990s, with the advent of networked technology, many throughout the CIC believed that such technologies could support and accelerate the availability of high-quality language courses throughout the CIC. In 1995, experts from across the CIC gathered at Ohio State University and identified access to less commonly taught languages as a key strategic opportunity for CIC universities (CIC Symposium on Learning Technologies and Foreign Language Instruction Report, March 1996). While well-intentioned, the outcomes of the conference were less sweeping than had been hoped, owing, it would seem, to both unsatisfactory technology solutions that had been used and lack of coordination across the consortium. These early conversations, however, fueled interest. In 2001, the CIC embarked on a strategic planning process. In small groups and large, in discussions that took place on every member university campus, "access to less commonly taught languages" was identified as a key opportunity for the CIC. The CIC Deans of Arts and Sciences agreed, and charged a small group of senior A&S administrators, faculty, department heads, and language center directors to identify the most promising areas of collaboration.

The planning group convened over two days, and the meeting consisted of four elements: 1) identification of challenges and opportunities; 2) examination of current CIC initiatives aimed at supporting access to LCTLs; 3) examination of successful LCTL collaborations based on technology; and 4) identification and discussion of strategic opportunities for the CIC. Here follows a brief summary of the conversations around three of these elements, while the fourth, the strategic opportunities, are described in a matrix.

IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Challenges were readily identified and included, as examples, the following:

- Agreeing on required contact hours per credit hour in an online or video conferencing course
- Agreeing on guidelines for determining language proficiency
- Achieving articulation and equivalency in language sequences
- Meeting the administrative challenges that accompany the differences between quarter and semester systems
- Resolving concern about loss of university identity
- Locating the necessary funding for course development (particularly using technology)
- Avoiding overlap and competition among universities

¹ Glew, Margo (Fall 2001). Why offer instruction in the less commonly taught languages? *CLEAR News*, 5(2) [On-line]. Available: <http://clear.msu.edu/newsletter/fall01/main.html>.

- Avoiding the need to cut on-campus courses when equivalent inter-institutional distance courses are available .
- Reconciling different ideas of effective, high quality instruction—online or face-to-face or hybrid
- Scheduling across time zones
- Assessing the effectiveness of online offerings
- Justifying course costs associated with the online course development for small enrollment course
- Funding the use of videoconferencing facilities on each campus for a single course, particularly when only one or two students enroll in a course per participating campus.

Likewise, opportunities were plentiful and included, as examples, the following:

- Increase access to and coordination of LCTL courses—especially leading to expanded language programming by organizing “virtual departments” across CIC
- Sharing LCTL resources
- Increasing the opportunities for heritage learners
- Increasing the opportunities for pedagogical innovation
- Expanding the frequency of offering certain LCTLs, especially upper-level courses, by increasing the number of students per course
- Pooling instructional expertise across the CIC, including team-teaching where appropriate
- Allowing cost-sharing course development by dividing up responsibilities for developing LCTL online courses among interested universities
- Linking LCTL study to CIC study abroad opportunities for language immersion
- Expanding the range of specialized language courses (for survival, agriculture, business, etc.)
- Helping to resolve the larger higher education issue of online security through authentication which currently limits the sharing of online resources between institutions, by providing an on-going inter-institutional initiative on which new authentication approaches and protocols could be experimented.

Draft lists of LCTL course offerings in the CIC (see Appendix 1) and those delivered via technology (see Appendix 2) were gathered as background information for the meeting participants. Despite the fact that these course lists were not comprehensive or completely accurate, many meeting participants (and later, reviewers of this report) agreed at the value of developing a comprehensive consortial list of language offerings and recommended that a process be identified by which this information can be regularly gathered and made available.

The information gathered indicated that there are approximately 106 different LCTLs taught throughout the CIC, with one school teaching 58 LCTLs but other schools ranging from 13-39. In addition, 10 of these LCTLs are currently taught at a distance via technology, providing an immediate opportunity for sharing inter-institutionally. Another immediate opportunity for sharing could be identifying languages offered by several CIC universities, indicating a fairly broad consortial interest or need, but that on any given campus the registration for these courses is typically low, thus threatening the possibility that they will actually be taught. Inter-institutional sharing could help campuses continue to provide access to these languages. The Iowa representative to the meeting, Fred Antczak, identified eleven languages as a starting place for further discussions about targeting languages for sharing (see Appendix 3). However, it is recommended that the Deans canvass their universities to identify languages where there is interest or plans to develop courses taught via technology as well as languages courses they’d likely have students interested in taking from another school.

CURRENT CIC INITIATIVES AIMED AT ENHANCING ACCESS TO LCTLs
Foreign Language Enhancement Program (FLEP)

The CIC Foreign Language Enhancement Program provides scholarships to help graduate students take advantage of language offerings not available at their home university, but available at another CIC member university. Scholarships are intended to cover living expenses incurred while attending another CIC host institution during the summer session.

- Approximately twenty-four \$2000 awards given annually to students for summer study of LCTLs since 1987.

- Total of 355 CIC students have used FLEP awards to study 51 LCTLs.

Suggestions for program enhancement include:

- Expand to include areas not used for language study (survival language vs. language study)
- Expand to include undergraduates with a focus on honors and other advanced level courses
- Improve communications and advertising of FLEP on the campuses, including surveys to better understand why students use FLEP
- Increase number of FLEP applicants by Deans appealing to departments/advisors, targeting new or non-traditional students, and linking FLEP to other academic programs (e.g., engineering).

Traveling Scholar Program (TSP)

The CIC Traveling Scholar Program enables doctoral-level students at any CIC university to take advantage of educational opportunities—specialized courses, unique library collections, unusual laboratories—at any other CIC university without change in registration or increase in tuition.

- This was the first collaborative CIC program, established in 1963. It has since allowed over 5,000 graduate students to study at another CIC institution while remaining enrolled in their home institution.
- Many graduate students have used TSP to enhance their graduate study with the study of LCTLs.

Suggestions for program enhancement related to language acquisition include:

- TSP may be more useful in access to advanced level, rarely taught language courses and summer intensive study
- Expand to include masters students as well as doctoral
- Improve communications and advertising of TSP on the campuses, including surveys to better understand why students use FLEP
- Consider “featuring” campuses for a language area or identifying “magnet language scholars” on some regularly scheduled basis.

Alliances for Expanded Study in Overseas Programs (AESOP)

AESOP is a cooperative program designed to match unused study abroad capacities with the unmet study abroad needs of other CIC institutions, thus allowing students at CIC member institutions to participate in study abroad programs sponsored by other CIC institutions. Institutions list their programs in AESOP when they anticipate having excess capacity. Currently, the pool of study abroad offerings includes programs at more than 70 locations worldwide.

- Of the 70 programs within the AESOP pool, at least 25 offer a LCTL.
- 169 students from 13 CIC universities participated in this program in 2001-02.

Suggestions for program enhancement related to language acquisition include:

- Provide more specific information regarding language offerings on the AESOP program listings and highlight language programs separately
- Think boldly about sharing ALL of study abroad offerings and link more closely to or add language offerings

CourseShare

CourseShare is a pilot administrative framework that was created by the CIC Registrars to allow for the cross-registration, grading, and credit transfer related to inter-institutional courses. Using this mechanism, participating Deans and Faculty agree to conditions of shared course development and implementation, including any provisions for tuition sharing. CIC headquarters staff supports the sharing of information and tracks and reports course activity annually to the Deans.

- CourseShare was first piloted in Spring 2003 with a graduate Nursing Informatics seminar shared between four CIC universities.
- Two LCTLs (Portuguese and Uzbek) will be piloted using the CourseShare mechanism in Fall 2003.

Suggestions for program enhancement related to language acquisition include:

- Explore the interest of the universities that currently deliver 10 LCTLs via technology to share within the CIC
- Canvass CIC universities for other online language course possibilities in development, either planned or underway, in which other universities might want to participate.

SUCCESSFUL MODELS OF INTER-INSTITUTIONAL VIDEO CONFERENCING AND ONLINE LANGUAGE PROJECTS

Three CIC guest presenters, listed below, who are responsible for delivering inter-institutional language courses/programs via technology, were invited to present briefly to the group (two via conference calling) and then were available for questions. Each prepared handouts for the meeting participants (see Appendix 4) that summarized these key issues:

- Why did they select the particular language and level?
- Why did they select the particular technology for primary delivery?
- What is the cost of their course—development and implementation; direct and indirect?

Lauren Rosen (UW-Mad): UW System Collaborative Language Program

The University of Wisconsin System Collaborative Language Program was established in January of 1998 as a grant-funded program. Its inception was based on three primary initiatives:

1. Creating collaborative programs was of great interest to all UW campuses.
2. Distance technology is now pedagogically sound and functionally feasible to support collaborative language instruction. Video conferencing is the primary technology used.
3. A foundation would be built based on a needs and course availability survey. This would focus on a number of critical but less commonly taught languages, primarily Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese and Russian.

Russell Valentino (Iowa): Russian East European, and Eurasian Studies (REEES) Distance Learning Consortium

The Iowa REEES Distance Learning Consortium is a collaborative effort supported by Iowa's three regents' universities—The University of Northern Iowa (UNI), The University of Iowa (UI) and Iowa State University (ISU)—along with generous support from the US Department of Education Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages (Title VI) program. They began teaching elementary Polish and Czech primarily via video conferencing in Fall 2002.

- In 2003-04, the consortium will begin offering intermediate Polish and Czech along with elementary Serbo-Croatian via video conferencing.

Patricia Paulsell (MSU): CIC Portuguese Project

The CIC Portuguese Project is an experiment in the online inter-institutional sharing of less commonly taught languages led by the Liberal Arts and Sciences Deans. Michigan State University is the lead university, developing and teaching the course. This 2nd year Portuguese course is described as a “hybrid” course in that it includes a pedagogically innovative online component supplemented by twice weekly face-to-face meetings with a native speaker.

- Participating institutions in the Fall 2003 pilot project include the University of Illinois at Chicago, Michigan State University, Penn State University, and University of Wisconsin-Madison.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite the reality of the many challenges of inter-institutional collaboration, the meeting participants unanimously agreed that the potential gains through course sharing were worth implementing strategies to overcome the challenges. They encouraged all to “think boldly” and to be willing to try some pilot programs in the short term with a few interested universities rather than waiting for commitment from a large number of universities, which would be more likely over the long-term. Over the two-day meeting, small group and large group facilitated discussion led to the identification of a set of strategies and action items for the CIC LAS Deans' consideration, some of which would require campus-based decisions and implementation and some that would involve consortial activity.

Four strategies for increasing the sharing of less commonly taught languages within the CIC were identified, each including several short-term (6 months to 2 years) and long-term (3 to 7 years) strategic actions. These strategies and actions are expressed in the Strategies Matrix that follows. This matrix also addresses the institutional considerations, resource implications, key actors, and measures for success for each identified strategy.

Of these strategies, the participants recommend that the Deans focus on those related to consortial activities, and particularly the strategy and related actions with the greatest immediate impact and ability to leverage existing resources—including the sharing of some subset of the 10 languages already available via technology; canvassing our institutions for other online language courses in development, either planned or underway, in which other universities might want to participate; and identifying a list of targeted languages that have potential for wider sharing.

These strategies are respectfully presented to the CIC LAS Deans for their consideration and action.

**CIC LCTL Strategy Meeting
CONSORTIAL STRATEGIES MATRIX**

Consortial Strategies	Strategic Actions	Institutional Considerations	Resource Implications	Key Actors	Measures of Success
<p>1. Pool and expand existing LCTL courses and resources, as appropriate, throughout the CIC making them available to all students—undergraduate as well as graduate students.</p>	<p><u>Short-Term</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Share resources and approaches used for promoting LCTLs to students. b. Identify and implement a process of gathering and updating the LCTLs taught within the CIC. c. Determine interest in sharing the 10 LCTLs already developed and delivered via technology at CIC universities. d. Canvass CIC universities for other online language course possibilities in development, either planned or underway, in which other universities might want to participate. e. Identify which languages on CIC campuses may no longer be taught due to lack of funds, enrollment, and/or have the potential for broader interest across the CIC, and then develop a plan for sharing these languages inter-institutionally. f. Once strategic opportunities are identified, create an administrative mechanism to support course sharing. <p><u>Long-Term</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Collaborate on the training of language teaching assistants. b. Create a CIC pool of LCTL instructors available for hire for either online or face-to-face courses by any CIC school. c. Influence the DOE to re-conceptualize Title VI support so that it allows for inter-institutional collaboration without forfeiting funding. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the determination of languages with potential for broader consortial interest be made and by whom? 2. How might collaboration on instructor training be approached? Are there existing models available? 3. How might the creation of the “CIC instructor pool” be approached? How might a “shared appointment” be structured? 4. What strategies would likely be most effective to influence the DOE? Which actors would be most appropriate to include in this effort? 5. What can be done to avoid inter-institutional competition while preserving university identity with these LCTLs? 6. What can be done to assure maintenance of existing offerings so that the outcome is not an actual diminution in what is available? (A total expansion is the goal, not cancellation of existing offerings.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More language offerings available immediately with minimal additional investment at campus level. • Potential for preserving endangered offerings. • Potential for sharing language instructors. • There may be challenges in coordinating these efforts across Title VI centers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAS Deans • Associate Deans • Language Faculty • Language Center Directors • Learning Technology Specialists • Video Technology Specialists • Registrars • CIC Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of the existing 10 technology-delivered LCTLs that schools are interested and willing to share in CIC. • A list of LCTLs to be developed into courses taught via technology is developed. • A priority list of LCTLs to be shared is developed. • A collaborative program to hire and train instructors is developed. • DOE continues Title VI support to CIC schools who share LCTLs.

Consortial Strategies	Strategic Actions	Institutional Considerations	Resource Implications	Key Actors	Measures of Success
<p>2. Create a mechanism through which CIC universities may plan for coordinated and expanded, collaborative language offerings. This will provide the necessary long-term course development, access and articulation structures.</p>	<p><u>Long-Term</u></p> <p>a. Develop shared program centers for summer intensive instruction of graduates and undergraduate students.</p> <p>b. Establish “virtual departments” across the CIC that consort to provide a pathway for beginning through advanced study of LCTLs.</p> <p>c. Establish a CIC advanced language proficiency certificate and related incentives.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How might consensus be developed on what constitutes “proficiency”? 2. How will decisions be made as to which universities will teach which languages and levels? 3. How will articulation and equivalency be ensured? 4. What will be the source(s) of funds for course development? 5. How might scheduling across time zones be approached? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Cost for course development · Cost for course implementation · Coordination and management of inter-institutionally shared courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · LAS Deans · Associate Deans · Language Faculty · CIC Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Summer intensive language programs coordinated within CIC. · Opportunities for language proficiency through “virtual departments” when all language levels not available at home institution. · CIC advanced language proficiency certificate program is established.

**CIC LCTL Strategy Meeting
CAMPUS STRATEGIES MATRIX**

Campus Strategies	Strategic Actions	Institutional Considerations	Resource Implications	Key Actors	Measures of Success
<p>1. Increase student interest in LCTLs.</p>	<p><u>Short-Term</u></p> <p>a. Improve promotion of LCTLs availability to students (e.g., feature information in the freshman orientation packet).</p> <p>b. Share promotional materials and strategies between CIC universities.</p> <p><u>Long-Term</u></p> <p>a. Eliminate first-semester Spanish or change it to become Accelerated Spanish. Students might flow into other languages including LCTLs.</p> <p>b. Establish (or maintain) incentives for students to take LCTLs and pursue proficiency.</p>	<p>1. To what degree of investment does the institution value increasing student interest in LCTLs? Would it be willing to invest in promotion and incentives? Would it be willing to alter traditional language offerings in order to encourage the study of LCTLs?</p> <p>2. What campus infrastructure exists for overseeing LCTL promotion and incentives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Promotional expenses · Financial incentives for students · Cost of administrative staff · Potential for increased revenue with increased enrollment, but potential for increased costs if LCTLs are offered with modest enrollments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · LAS Deans · Associate Deans · Academic Advisors · Language Faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increased undergraduate and graduate registration in LCTLs · Improved language proficiency among students
<p>2. Expand focus of LCTL courses to include language survival, business courses, and language immersion programs.</p>	<p><u>Short-Term</u></p> <p>a. Investigate language needs of students in colleges, schools and departments outside of the Foreign Languages Department.</p> <p><u>Long-Term</u></p> <p>a. Develop “one-credit” courses and specialized models for heritage learners, possibly following a “language-on-demand” model.</p> <p>b. Create partnerships on campus between, for example, College of Arts & Sciences, College of Engineering and Study Abroad Office for development of innovative programs.</p>	<p>1. How will the language needs of the broader campus be assessed and by whom?</p> <p>2. What process will be used to determine which campus language needs get priority?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Cost of staff time for needs assessment · Cost of collaborative planning and course development · Cost of course delivery—promotion, technology, help desk, instructor, etc. · Potential for increased revenue with increased enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · LAS Deans · Associate Deans · Senior International Officers · Language Faculty · Language Technology Specialists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Development of innovative language programs that promote language proficiency.

Appendix 1
Draft list of LCTL course offerings in the CIC²

LCTL	Courses offered by CIC Institutions	CIC Levels	Institutions Using Technology
African Languages	MSU	I-II	
Akkadian	UC, OSU, PSU	I	
Albanian	UC	I	
ASL	UC, IU, Iowa, UMN, OSU, PSU, PU	I-IV	
Arabic	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-VI	
Aramaic	UC, Mich, UW-Mad	I	
Armenian	UC, Mich	I-V	
Aymara	UC	I	
Azerbaijani	IU	I	
Bamana	UIUC	I-II	
Bambara	IU	I	
Bengla(Bengali)	UC	I-II	UC: OL
Bosnian/Serbo/Croatian	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, OSU, PSU, UW-Mad	I-III	Iowa: VC
Bulgarian	UC, UIUC, IU, OSU, UW-Mad	I-II	
Burmese	UIUC, UW-Mad	I-III	
Catalan	UIUC, IU	I	
Chechen	IU	I	
Chinese	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-IV	
Coptic (Old/Late Egyptian)	UC,UIUC	I	
Czech	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, NU, OSU, UW-Mad	I-III	Iowa:VC; UC: OL
Danish	UMN, UW-Mad	I-III	
Dakota/Lakota	UMN	I	
Dutch	IU, Mich, UMN, OSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
EALL	OSU	I	
Estonian	IU	I-II	
Finnish	IU,UMN	I-III	
Georgian	UC,IU	I-II	
Greek, Ancient	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-II	UC: OL
Greek, Modern	UC, IU, Mich, UMN, OSU	I-II	
Haitian Creole	IU, MSU, PU	I	

² When preparing to convene a CIC LCTL Strategy Meeting to discuss and explore scaling the sharing of less commonly taught languages, it was considered a ‘pre-meeting’ necessity to know which LCTLs were being taught within the CIC. A starting point for collecting this information was the 2002/2003 Modern Language Association (MLA) Survey. This survey is conducted every five years by the MLA and Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL) and they seek enrollment data for language course registrations. The survey asks for a campus’ Fall 2002 language course registration data and lists as a reference point that institution’s 1998 language entries (the year of the previous MLA survey), though a university may add or delete languages as appropriate. More than half of the CIC institutions had completed the survey by spring 2003, thus a copy was requested from each campus university registrar. For those campuses that had not yet completed the survey, language course information and information about courses delivered via technology was obtained from some campus representatives but mostly from university webpages. Therefore, Appendices I and II were used as general information on which to base decisions about consorcial strategies, but were not and should not be considered comprehensive or unerring.

LCTL	Courses offered by CIC Institutions	CIC Levels	Institutions using Technology
Hausa	IU, MSU, UW-Mad	I-II	
Hebrew, Biblical	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, NU, PU, UW-Mad	I-II	
Hebrew, Modern	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-IV	
Heiroglyphs (Middle Egyptian)	UC, Mich, PSU	I-II	
Hindi	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Hindi-Urdu	UC, UIC, UIUC, Mich, UW-Mad	I-III	
Hittite	UC, Mich	I	
Hmong	UMN, UW-Mad	I-III	
Hungarian	IU, OSU	I-II	
Icelandic	UMN, UW-Mad	I	
Italian	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Indonesian	Mich, UW-Mad	I-III	
Japanese	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-IV	
Javanese	UW-Mad	I-III	
Kazazh	UC, IU, UW-Mad	I	
Khmer	UW-Mad	I-III	
Korean	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Kyrgyz	IU	I	
Lak	UC	I	
Lakota	IU	I	
Lao	UW-Mad	I-III	
Latin	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-III	UIC and UIUC: OL
Latvian	IU	I	
Lingala	UIUC	I-II	
Lithuanian	UC, UIC, IU	I-II	
Luwian	UC	I	
Macedonian	UC, IU	I	
Marathi	UC	I-II	
Mongolian	IU	I-II	
Nahuatl	UC	I	
Nepali	MSU	I	
Norwegian	UC, UMN, UW-Mad	I-III	UMN:OL
Ojibwa	Mich, MSU, UMN	I-II	
Old Church Slavonic	UC, UIUC, IU, OSU, UW-Mad	I	
Old English	Iowa	I	
Old Norse	UMN, UW-Mad	I	
Pali	UC, UW-Mad	I-II	
Persian	UC, IU, Iowa, Mich, OSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Pilipino/Tagalog	Mich, MSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Polish	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, UW-Mad	I-IV	Iowa:VC
Portuguese	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-III	MSU:OL, UW-Mad:VC
Portuguese for Speakers of Spanish	UC, OSU, PU	I-II	
Punjabi	Mich	I-II	
Quechua	UIUC, IU, Mich, W-Mad	I	
Romani	UC	I	
Romanian	IU, OSU	I-II	

LCTL	Courses offered by CIC Institutions	CIC Levels	Institutions using Technology
Russian	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-VI	
Sanskrit	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, OSU, PSU, UW-Mad	I-II	
Scandinavian	UIUC	I	
Shona	IU, OSU	I-II	
Slovak	UC, IU	I	
Slovene	IU	I	
Sumerian	UC, Mich, UMN, OSU	I	
Swahili	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Swedish	UIUC, Mich, UMN, OSU, UW-Mad	I-IV	
Syriac	UC	I-II	
Tamil	UC, Mich, UW-Mad	I-III	
Telugu	UC, UW-Mad	I-II	
Thai	UIUC, Mich, UW-Mad	I-III	
Tibetan	UC, IU, Mich, UW-Mad	I-III	
Turkic	UW-Mad	I	
Turkish	UC, UIUC, IU, Mich, OSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Turkmen	IU	I	
Twi	IU, OSU	I-II	
Ugaritic	UC, Mich, UW-Mad	I	
Ukrainian	UC, UIC, UIUC, Mich, PSU	I-II	PSU:VC
Urdu	UC, UMN, OSU, UW-Mad	I-II	
Uzbek	UC, IU, Mich, OSU	I-II	IU:VC
Vietnamese	Mich, MSU, UW-Mad	I-III	
Wolof	UIUC	I-II	
Xhosa	UW-Mad	I	
Yiddish	UC, IU, Mich, OSU	I-IV	
Yoruba	Iowa, UW-Mad	I-II	
Yucatec Maya	UC	I	
Zapotec Maya	UC	I	
Zulu	UIUC, IU, Iowa, OSU	I-II	

Key:

UC	University of Chicago
UIC	University of Illinois – Chicago
UIUC	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
IU	Indiana University
Iowa	University of Iowa
Mich	University of Michigan
MSU	Michigan State University
UMN	University of Minnesota
NU	Northwestern University
OSU	Ohio State University
PSU	Pennsylvania State University
PU	Purdue University
UW-Mad	University of Wisconsin-Madison
OL	Online delivery
VC	Via video conferencing

Appendix 2
Draft list of LCTL course offerings in the CIC delivered via technology

LCTL	Courses known to be offered by CIC Institutions	Course levels	Offering institutions and technology
Bengla (Bengali)	UC	I-II	UC: OL
Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, OSU, PSU, UW-Mad	I-III	Iowa: VC
Czech	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, NU, OSU, UW-Mad	I-III	UC: OL, Iowa: VC
Greek, Ancient	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-II	UC: OL
Latin	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-III	UIC and UIUC: OL
Norwegian	UC, UMN, UW-Mad	I-III	UMN:OL
Polish	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, UW-Mad	I-IV	Iowa:VC
Portuguese	UC, UIC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, Mich, MSU, UMN, NU, OSU, PSU, PU, UW-Mad	I-III	UW-Mad: VC,MSU:OL
Ukrainian	UC, UIC, UIUC, Mich, PSU	I-II	PSU: VC
Uzbek	UC, IU, Mich, OSU	I-II	IU:VC

Key:

UC	University of Chicago
UIC	University of Illinois – Chicago
UIUC	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
IU	Indiana University
Iowa	University of Iowa
Mich	University of Michigan
MSU	Michigan State University
UMN	University of Minnesota
NU	Northwestern University
OSU	Ohio State University
PSU	Pennsylvania State University
PU	Purdue University
UW-Mad	University of Wisconsin-Madison
OL	Online delivery
VC	Via video conferencing

Appendix 3

Languages with broad interest across CIC but with traditionally low enrollment as presented by one meeting participant

An immediate opportunity for sharing could be identifying languages offered by several CIC universities, indicating a fairly broad consortial interest or need, but that on any given campus the registration for these courses is typically low, thus threatening the possibility that they will actually be taught. Inter-institutional sharing could help campuses continue to provide access to these languages. The Iowa representative to the meeting, Fred Antczak, identified the following eleven languages as a starting place for further discussions about targeting languages for sharing

- **Czech**
- **Dutch**
- **Hebrew, Biblical**
- **Hebrew, Modern**
- **Hindi**
- **Korean**
- **Persian**
- **Polish**
- **Sanskrit**
- **Serbo/Croatian**
- **Swahili**

Appendix 4

Completed pre-meeting questionnaires on three successful models of video conferencing and online language courses

Model 1: Background Information about UW System Collaborative Language Program Submitted by Lauren Rosen, Director, Collaborative Language Program, UW System

LCTL/level (e.g., 2nd year Portuguese):

1st-5th Semesters Japanese, 1st-4th Semesters Chinese & Russian, 1st year Portuguese & Arabic

Delivery format (synchronous/asynchronous/both):

Both, but primarily synchronous

Primary technologies used (videoconferencing, online, chat, etc.):

Videoconferencing for synchronous, web-Blackboard for asynchronous

Timeline for course development (how long did it take? e.g., 2 semesters, 1 year):

One semester for course approval prior to the first course. Subsequent courses developed while the first semester was in session. Most all of our courses were being taught locally. They mainly needed to be adapted to fit the technology in their new setting, e.g. portrait page-oriented materials for an overhead were replaced with landscape, games, flashcards, and other realia were adjusted to be used with the document camera, room cameras or delivered electronically, etc.

Key people/titles involved in course development and delivery:

Pedagogically, the course instructors are the key people for both development and delivery. They begin with a course proposal that is submitted to the curriculum committee. The curriculum committee is made up of language faculty, often the chair, from our thirteen 4-year campuses plus two representatives of the thirteen 2-year colleges. Once a proposal is approved by the committee, the sending and receiving campuses have to get local approval which leads to a course number and title specific to that campus.

With respect to course delivery, there are also technical support staff on each campus whose duties vary with regard to how much involvement they have. On some campuses there is a technical person in the room that might even push the buttons, or perhaps just observe in case of problems. On other campuses they may be a phone call away or in a room down the hall.

For scheduling, each course is submitted through me, the program director and I work with the scheduling folks statewide to get it on the network and scheduled in an appropriate classroom on the participating campuses.

1. Why did you select the language and level you did? What criteria did you use to make this decision?

These languages are considered critical for economic development and national security. Of the less commonly taught languages available for UW students, these seemed to be the ones of greatest interest to students and with the largest connection to other degree programs. Because of choosing these languages we were more likely to attract a larger cohort of students and receive needed funds to support the cost of the program. These are also languages where we felt we had a sufficient number of instructors spread out through the UW System to accommodate a reasonable number of courses in hopes of taking each language through five semesters.

2. Why did you select the technology you did for primary delivery of the course? What were the criteria for this selection?

Videoconferencing technology most closely matches the face-to-face interaction of a traditional classroom. Studies have proven the effectiveness of face-to-face interaction for language learning and we believe simulating it as closely as possible is the only way in the beginning levels of language learning for students to become as orally proficient as their peers who are taught in traditional classrooms.

In choosing the technology, the following criteria were considered:

- 1) Students must have ample opportunity to orally interact with their peers
- 2) Students must be able to easily work in pairs and small groups
- 3) Instructors must be able to use a variety of methods to reach all learning styles, similar to what they are able to do in a traditional class
- 4) Student to student, student to instructor, and student to facilitator interaction must have a real time component allowing for immediate feedback

Several of our instructors have commented on the fact that they prefer to teach through videoconferencing as it has added an element of reality to their language teaching. For example, when teaching the difference between near/far/very far, they can actually compare far and near end sites to get students talking. They have also worked hard to build community among students between sites. In doing so, students get to know more about a city they aren't living in yet feel as though they are one class rather than two separate entities. They has not worked for all of our courses as it is to a great extent a reflection of how the instructors design in-class and outside of class sessions. They longer they have been teaching in this environment the better they get at building this sense of community between sites.

Over time several of our instructors have adapted Blackboard as a course tool for outside discussion of cultural topics and as a way to add students from overseas sister schools into the discussions. They have found this to be a very useful way to give time to cultural topics that they no longer can cover during class time due to time constraints. It also offers students an opportunity to help each other, get to know each other, and work more closely with students at the distance site. Information from these discussions is also brought to light during class sessions. Instructors however have found this type of discussion to be useful only if specific guided questions are asked and if students are in some way required to participate. As a result part of their class participation grade is dependent on their contributions to the website. It is noteworthy that as the students have taken more language they begin to write as much as they can in the target language during the discussions. This was not a requirement as it wasn't until rather recently that it was easy to input Asian and Cyrillic fonts.

3. What is the cost of your course—development, implementation; direct, indirect?

This is variable by course but I can give you a general list:

We are using three different technologies at this time:

Compressed Video:	point-point approx. \$4000/semester/course
Bridged (3 sites)	approx. \$12,500
DS3:	No charge
IP:	Currently No charge. This may change if demand for bandwidth increases significantly.

We do not cover tech support fees as they vary from free to \$40/hour depending on the campus. The quality of the three technologies also varies. DS3 is the best in that it has the least amount of lag time. This technology however will be unsupported soon so we are phasing it out. For the

campuses that have IP that is the next best option. IP is fairly reliable and if you can connect at a high enough bandwidth and not lose video packets along the way it seems to be a good alternative to the DS3 system. Compressed video is the most expensive for us and has the most noticeable lag.

Other costs:

	Cost per hour	Cost per extra load credit	Cost per instance
Course development			\$500
Instructor replacement		\$1,250	
Far End Facilitator (TL speaker)	\$10		
Instructor travel			\$150
Supplies (as needed, not to exceed)			\$200

Instructor replacement is offered to the campus where the instructor is housed. The idea is that the instructors teaching with distance technology have to spend more time in preparation and communication with the other campus. The money is given to offset the cost of hiring someone else to perform the duties the instructor no longer has time for. In reality, many of the campuses give this money directly to the instructor in recognition of her extra efforts, or use it to pay the campus tech support fees. The way it is calculated is a 4 credit course is considered to be worth 5 credits, one extra load credit. A 5 credit course would be 1.25 extra load credits.

Our facilitators are all native speakers who most often are students at the receive site campus. They are hired to help facilitate pair and group work during class, assist with instructions, and to hold office hours. They are not certified nor qualified to teach. They are however the key to our success and we will not run a course without this person being hired.

We believe it is important that the instructor visit the far end at least once if not more during a semester. During their visit they originate their course from the far end. This helps them to get to know their students at that end and gives the students who are typically at the near end a better appreciation for the difficulties the far end students face.

Instructors already were in place on the originating campus so we are not currently paying salary or benefits for instructors.

Model 2: Background Information about Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies (REEES) Distance Learning Consortium
Submitted by Russell Valentino, REEES Center Director, University of Iowa

LCTL/level (e.g., 2nd year Portuguese):

1st- and 2nd-year Polish, Czech, and Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian

Delivery format (synchronous/asynchronous/both):

both

Primary technologies used (videoconferencing, online, chat, etc.):

videoconferencing, email, MP₃

Timeline for course development (how long did it take? e.g., 2 semesters, 1 year):

one summer per year-long course

Key people/titles involved in course development and delivery:

Russell Valentino, Director, REEES Center, University of Iowa

Jitka Sonkova, Czech, University of Iowa

Alicja Boruta-Sadkowski, Polish, University of Northern Iowa

John Thomas, Director, Language Learning Resource Center, Iowa State University

1. Why did you select the language and level you did? What criteria did you use to make this decision?

Selection was based on (1) faculty expertise; (2) student demand; and (3) relevance to the related programs on the three partner campuses (Russian Studies at ISU; Russian and East European Studies at UNI; Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies at the UI).

2. Why did you select the technology you did for primary delivery of the course? What were the criteria for this selection?

The primary criteria were (1) delivery quality and cost; (2) ease of use; (3) effectiveness in combination with other technologies; (4) portability.

3. What is the cost of your course—development, implementation; direct, in-direct?

There was a one-time equipment fee for each site. We spent approximately \$13,500 on this. But some equipment was in place already, and all three sites had relatively good infrastructure to begin with. If one had to start from scratch, my estimate would be that for optimal performance the following items would be needed (prices are estimates):

Internet connection: (assumed in place)

Videoconferencing unit: we use 1 Polycom Viewstation FX (\$6,500) and two less expensive units of \$3,000 each. For two-way connections the less expensive unit is enough; for linking three or four sites, at least one has to have the FX; for linking more sites, an additional piece of hardware, called an “MCU” is necessary; last I checked MCUs start at about \$20,000. The configuration we use is for small groups of up to about 15 students per site.

Document camera: \$1,700 (only at the site where instruction originates)

Computer workstation: \$1,500 (only at the site where instruction originates)

LCD projector and screen: \$3,000 (you can also use a video monitor)

Miscellaneous software: \$300

Our server space is provided in-kind by Iowa State University, as is the time of a staff person/faculty member to maintain the website that contains course syllabi and password protected course materials, including MP₃ sound files for listening comprehension.

Equipment total (for teaching one course at three sites): \$25,000

Once the equipment is installed, in effect courses can be run continuously for the cost of the internet connection, the salary of the instructors, and everyday phone calls, faxing, etc.

We paid the Polish and Czech language course instructors a one-time summer salary stipend of \$6,000 plus fringe benefits to develop each year-long language course. The

Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian instructor will come to the UI as part of a program administered by the Croatian Ministry of Science and Technology, with funds provided by (1) the U.S. Dept. of Education (approx. \$5,000); (2) International Programs at the UI (approx. \$5,000); and (3) the Croatian Ministry of Science and Technology (local stipend, airfare, health insurance, costs of books and other teaching materials).

Model 3: Background Information about CIC Online Portuguese Project
Submitted by Patricia R. Paulsell, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Letters, MSU

LCTL/level:

2nd Year Portuguese

Delivery format (synchronous/asynchronous/both):

Both

Primary technologies used (videoconferencing, online, chat, etc.):

Online activities, bulletin board discussions, live internet chat, face-to-face interaction with conversation partner, self-study

Timeline for course development (how long did it take? e.g., 2 semesters, 1 year):

One year per course (201, 202), with some false starts

Key people/titles involved in course development and delivery:

Dean Wendy Wilkins

Associate Dean Patricia R. Paulsell

LCTL Coordinator (project coordinator): Margo Glew

Director of MSU language lab (course programmer): Dennie Hoopingarner

Content developer/course instructor: Aline Antunes

Translator: Varies

1. Why did you select the language and level you did? What criteria did you use to make this decision?

The CIC Deans, who were involved in discussions that led to the decision to adopt Portuguese as the language for which the course was ultimately developed, were looking for a LCTL that was (1) regularly offered at all CIC institutions, but tended to be under-enrolled, and (2) sufficiently enrolled so as to have enough students to provide useful feedback on the course. Thus, it was important to find a language and level that had enrollments that were low enough so that a distance-based course would benefit all institutions, but sufficient to provide a useable database. The LCTL that best met all of these criteria was 2nd year Portuguese.

2. Why did you select the technology you did for primary delivery of the course? What were the criteria for this selection?

We decided against video conferencing because the purpose of the course was to provide instruction to a large number of sites (potentially, all CIC institutions) and we felt that video conferencing would be too expensive and technologically problematic for such a large number of remote sites.

Furthermore, given the large number of potential participating institutions, we decided against video conferencing because of concerns over possibly insurmountable challenges with coordinating schedules of students, conversation partners, and the instructor. Given the large number of people and institutions involved in the project, a totally synchronous model was not practical.

In order to accommodate multiple sites, we decided to go with a web-based system. In order to maximize interaction in the language, we decided to make the course a hybrid, combining both online and tutorial-based learning. Furthermore, in order to maximize interaction, we also designed the course to be fairly lock-step in nature. That is, all students work on the same assignments at roughly the same pace.

3. What is the cost of your course—development, implementation; direct, in-direct?

Direct:

CIC Investment:	\$29,500
MSU College of Arts and Letters investment:	\$8,385
MSU Provost's investment:	\$41,034

Indirect:

1. Cost of buying out LCTL coordinator's time in order to focus nearly full-time on project (a second LCTL coordinator was hired to take up tasks formerly handled by Margo Glew).
2. Time/lost attention to other projects from:
 - Programmer (Dennie Hoopingarner, plus other programmers hired throughout project)
 - Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Letters
3. Administrative staff and supplies and services from Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic, Asian, and African languages
4. Administrative staff and supplies and services from College of Arts and Letters
5. Office space, phone line for content developers

General Q & A:

1. What are 1 or 2 lessons learned...things you might do differently if you were to develop/teach this course again...advice you would offer others...?

a. We probably would have interacted with faculty from other institutions differently when it was time to "sell" the project to other institutions. It is important to involve deans in this process early on and not to allow it to evolve into turf wars.

b. We would be more careful about who we involved in the project. It is probably best to develop such courses on one campus, rather than trying to work on development across campuses. The logistics and differences in goals/objectives mitigate against faster progress in course development.

c. In the initial phases of design, we made some trade-offs that we are now living with. Given the chance to redesign the course, we would make it more modular in order to better accommodate schedules and make delivery easier. For instance, the weekly "live partner chat" is presenting us with some difficulties because we're not sure how to deal with it during Spring Break. In addition, if partners skip a chat session, it will create difficulties for the students in meeting expectations for on-line sessions that follow up on those chats. But both of these choices were made in the name of interactivity (with partner chat we are able to have some very effective information gap activities; with the lock-step format of the course, we can integrate the tutorial hour, bulletin boards, and chats with the content).

With a language class, maximizing interactivity is crucial; it is more central to the design of the course than it is for other distance course subjects. But right now, we are facing challenges and difficulties in order to preserve that interactivity . . . no solutions here.

2. What are the leverage points that made it possible for you to develop/deliver this shared LCTL course using technology?

Commitment of key people:

MSU Provost

Dean of Arts and Letters (knowledgeable, as a linguist, as well as supportive)

Associate Dean of Arts and Letters (Co-Director of CLEAR, MSU's Title VI Language Resource Center; also knowledgeable and supportive of initiative)

Key resources on campus to support development of project

LCTL coordinator position allowed for someone to focus nearly full time on project

Dennie Hoopingarner – (Director of MSU's Language Learning Center, Assistant Director of CLEAR for Technology Implementation; person with expertise in language materials development as well as key programming skills)

MSU's outstanding Technology Infrastructure

3. Can you share any data on the effectiveness of your course or how it has impacted the learning of your students?

Not yet – we are excited and optimistic about this unique and new learning model.

Appendix 5

LCTL Strategy Meeting Participants

Barbara Allen

Director
Committee on Institutional Cooperation

Fred Antczak

Associate Dean for Academic Programs
University of Iowa

Paul Dixon

Department Head
Foreign Language & Literature
Purdue University

Caroline (Carey) Eckhardt

Department Head
Comparative Literature
Director, School of
Languages and Literature
Pennsylvania State University

Bob Gundlach

Professor and Director of
WCAS Writing Program
Northwestern University

Esther Ham

Lecturer, Dutch
Indiana University

Stephanie Latkovski

Associate Dean for Int'l & Second Lang Education
University of Chicago

Donald Lopez

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
University of Michigan

Jim Parente, Jr.

Associate Dean for Faculty & Research
University of Minnesota

Karen Partlow

Assistant Director for Technology Collaboration
Committee on Institutional Cooperation

Patricia Paulsell

Associate Dean for Arts & Letters
Michigan State University

Catherine (Katie) Player

Program Coordinator for Academic and Technology
Collaboration
Committee on Institutional Cooperation

Dean Pribbenow

Meeting Facilitator
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Jane C. Tylus

Associate LAS Dean
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Galal Walker

Professor & Director of
National East Asian Language Resource Center
Ohio State University

