

**AD HOC COMMITTEE ON
TITLE VI-FUNDED INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGES**

FINAL REPORT

AD HOC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

KATHERINE BOWIE, DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES
BRUNO BROWNING, DIRECTOR OF L&S LEARNING SUPPORT SERVICES
JUNKO MORI, DIRECTOR OF THE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
LALITA DU PERRON, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR SOUTH ASIA
ELLEN SAPEGA, DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES (CHAIR)
STEVE SMITH, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF GLOBAL STUDIES
**JENNIFER TISHLER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR RUSSIA, EAST EUROPE
AND CENTRAL ASIA**

19 APRIL 2013

FINAL REPORT

Ad Hoc Committee on Title VI-funded International Languages

The Ad Hoc Committee on Title VI-funded International Languages (TALC) was created in January 2013 by Deans Gary Sandefur (Letters & Science) and Guido Podestá (Division of International Studies) and charged with producing a report about the current role of language instruction in the context of area and international studies and making recommendations about future plans for delivering Title-VI funded languages, should that revenue source disappear. The committee's charge is attached in Appendix A and its recommendations are presented at the end of this report. Since receiving its charge, the committee has met weekly and has consulted with a number of colleagues and units across campus that were identified as key to helping us understand the importance of these languages across the disciplines. Over the course of these conversations, a clear picture has emerged of the opportunities and challenges facing programs and departments committed to the teaching of several less-commonly taught languages (LCTLs). The committee met with representatives from: International Academic Programs (IAP), the Wisconsin Summer Language Institutes (WISLI), and the pedagogy coordinator for the Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia (LCA). The TALC chair also spoke twice with the chairs of the language departments at their monthly meeting; additionally, a set of questions was sent to the language departments that offer Title VI-funded languages. The associate directors of the nine area and international studies centers were consulted, as were colleagues in the Schools of Law, Business, Engineering, Agricultural and Life Sciences, and Medicine and Public Health.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison has long been invested in creating and maintaining international excellence. Its faculty and academic staff have won national and international recognition for their wide and deep knowledge about international issues, as evidenced by the fact that the UW-Madison is currently home to eight federally

funded National Resource Centers (NRCs). The NRCs and their faculty and staff, as well as the Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellows, form the core of campus expertise in international education. These centers are dedicated to supporting the comprehensive study of the world's societies through their history, culture, economy, politics, international relations, and languages. Concomitant with its reputation as a leader in the field of international research in the humanities and social sciences, our campus has long been considered a leader in the field of foreign language education. Recently, "TheBestColleges.org" placed UW-Madison second (and first among public institutions) on its list of "The 10 Most Innovative Colleges for Foreign Language Study."

Over the years, the US Department of Education's Title VI program, designed to fund research and teaching across the world's areas, has brought millions of dollars to the University (especially to the College of Letters & Science). These grants have been particularly instrumental in assuring that our university follows sound pedagogical practices as it offers an impressive array of international languages. At present, it is fairly certain that Title VI funding will continue at its current level during the coming academic year. It is also most likely that a new competition for Title VI support will open sometime next year, although the priority languages and other guidelines for that competition have not yet been identified. The current issues regarding language instruction that are outlined below were developed with the goal of ensuring that we remain well-positioned to enter future competitions for Title VI, should they be opened, while also recognizing that it is imperative to seek additional external funding sources that will allow us to pursue new, innovative approaches to the teaching of less-commonly taught languages. The models discussed in this report, and the recommendations that follow, are designed to provide more efficient administrative support structures for the Title VI-funded language programs. As we expect that Title VI funding will still be available in AY 2013-14, the implementation of several of our recommendations could begin almost immediately, so as to aid the foreign language departments and area studies programs in identifying new funding opportunities as they arise.

According to data collected by the Language Institute, the UW-Madison offers 59 modern languages, although not every language is offered each year, and several are

currently available only during the summer. During AY 2012-2013, 43 languages were offered at the UW-Madison (not counting English as a Second Language). Of these, TALC identified 27 languages taught on the UW-Madison campus that have received full or partial funding from Title VI during the current grant cycle. Approximately half of these languages (15) are fully funded by Title VI resources; the rest are funded by both 101 funds and Title VI monies. There are nine departments on campus that receive Title VI funding for language instruction, but the departments that are primarily dependent on this funding are African Languages and Literature (ALL) and Languages and Cultures of Asia (LCA). Most of the partially funded languages receive Title VI support only for advanced-level courses.

All the language courses funded by the various Title VI grants are taught by TAs, lecturers, or academic staff. The appointment for these instructors is normally .33 FTE per course; however, in LCA, with the exception of Hmong, it is .25 FTE per course. **We recommend that all LCA instructors' compensation be brought into line with the other language departments.** Job security in general is an issue in regard to these positions. The lack of job security sometimes endangers our ability to retain experienced instructors at the level of lecturer, given that other institutions often offer higher wages and more stable appointments. With the recommendations contained in this report, we expect to be able to begin to address this problem.

The Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships program from the US Department of Education provides allocations of academic year and summer fellowships to institutions of higher education to support meritorious undergraduate students and graduate students who are pursuing training in modern foreign languages and related area or international studies. FLAS fellowships are essential for the UW-Madison to maintain its leadership in international education. The eight NRCs at UW-Madison award over 60 academic-year and over 75 summer FLAS fellowships each year, totaling over \$2 million annually. The graduate students (and, since 2010, undergraduates) who receive FLAS fellowships go on to use their advanced language and area studies skills in higher education, and also in fields such as federal government, private industry, NGOs, and the military. Beyond the financial benefit to individual students, FLAS fellowships have positive campus-wide impact. FLAS fellowships help

our graduate programs to maintain their competitiveness by recruiting the strongest students into their programs and maintaining and supporting enrollment in specialized courses, such as courses in critical languages and upper-level graduate seminars.

There are five summer language institutes hosted at UW-Madison: Arabic, Persian and Turkish Language Immersion Institute (APTLII), South Asian Summer Language Institute (SASLI), Southeast Asian Studies Summer Institute (SEASSI), Central Eurasia Studies Summer Institute (CESSI), and Brazilian Portuguese. APTLII is an immersion program in which students and instructors live together for 8 weeks, speaking only the target language apart from one evening a week. SEASSI, SASLI, and CESSI are intensive programs supported by consortia of NRCs. Except Brazilian Portuguese, all summer institutes set fees based on a cost-recovery model. No institute differentiates between resident and non-resident students. All nine UW-Madison area and international studies centers contribute generously to the summer language institutes.

The five UW summer language institutes are nationally renowned for providing high-level language instruction by highly qualified, experienced university-level professional instructors. The summer language students, who come to Madison from around the nation, constitute a vibrant and highly motivated learning community, characterized by a keen desire for language learning and a strong interest in academic exchange. Each summer, over 250 students enroll in summer language institutes at UW-Madison. In addition to classroom instruction, the summer institutes offer extracurricular programs of lectures and films, as well as non-academic avenues for meeting students with similar academic interests such as sporting events and picnics.

All the summer language institutes have been severely affected by the recent cuts in NRC funding. SEASSI and APTLII have lost significant support from other institutions that are unable to make an annual contribution due to the pressure on their individual budgets. SASLI and CESSI still attract funding, but additional budget cuts would no doubt result in lower contributions. The loss of external contributions further threatens the viability of the lower-enrollment languages. As recommended elsewhere in this report, a possible solution for increasing the enrollments in these languages may be found in shifting emphasis from AY to summer instruction for some languages and presenting a clear pathway for further study by pairing summer instruction with AY study

abroad experiences. Enrollments for certain languages (Arabic, Hindi, Turkish, Urdu, Russian) have also increased through funding from Project GO (Global Officers), which is an initiative to help cadets and midshipmen in Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) learn critical languages and study abroad.

The main challenges reported by the summer institutes are loss of funding, loss of FLAS, which impacts student numbers, ability to retain administrative staff, and ability to retain experienced instructors. Languages need to be offered consistently each summer in order to retain high-quality, experienced instructors. Combining administrative staffing across the summer language institutes would optimize efficiency and should be explored as a cost-saving possibility. The summer institutes are encouraged to include assessment of their funding and overall structure as part of their external evaluations along with the usual assessment of administration and pedagogy.

I. Proposed Models for the Continued Delivery of Title VI-funded Languages

It is our strong belief, based on conversations with various constituencies on and off campus and also on the analysis of enrollments, projected demand (of campus, partner schools, and the community), and staffing structures in our language departments, that a coherent tapestry of language offerings using different approaches and taking advantage of varying models and resources will strengthen language and international and area studies on this campus overall. Investment in the creation of a variety of models will contribute to a sustainable framework that will ensure the continued strength of UW-Madison as a preeminent player in national language education.

These models will allow for us to continue offering a wide range of world languages at multiple levels and will place us in a strategic position for seeking external funding. **We recommend that departments and programs begin transitioning to these models during AY 2013-14, while Title VI funding is still assured at its present level.** Differing fee structures across institutions must be taken into account in order to implement points 2, 3, 4, and 5.

- 1 Platform model. This model systematically integrates the broad range of opportunities and resources for learning a given language (AY and summer instruction, FIGs, study abroad, language floors at the International Learning Community, etc.) that already exist at the UW-Madison. When appropriate, new

ways of pursuing language study will be developed. The model is designed for students to accelerate the language learning process and attain proficiency by graduation. These platforms would be promoted to incoming students who will be informed of diverse funding opportunities (IAP International Scholars Program, FLAS undergraduate fellowships, WISc Scholars Program, etc.) and of the various international initiatives across campus. We envision that students enrolled in the various platforms would combine language study with another major, including STEM areas and the professional schools. The committee strongly believes that this model could serve as a national example of innovative language instruction.

Model 1 can be accomplished by making use of existing resources and through the reallocation of 101 funds to strengthen programs, if needed.

- 2 Course-share hosting model. Certain language courses can be shared with CIC, UW System, ACM, and other partner institutions (sending language to partner institution). Using distance learning technology, languages currently taught at UW-Madison would be made available to students at remote sites.
- 3 Course-share receiving model. Certain language courses can be shared with CIC, UW System, ACM, and other partner institutions (receiving language from partner). UW-Madison students would use distance learning technology to receive instruction delivered by partner institutions at remote sites.

Models 2 and 3 can be accomplished, to a large extent, through the use of existing course-share systems. However, the fee structures for these systems should be reviewed or renegotiated, in order to ensure that UW-Madison break even financially, or even gain some funding that could be used to further support these programs.

- 4 Revenue capture model. This model offers language instruction to students simultaneously at UW-Madison and to remote students at other institutions. Building on Educational Innovation and blended learning efforts already under way on campus, this model takes advantage of increased demand for online offerings to further build the UW-Madison “brand” in excellent language pedagogy. This model requires continual and significant involvement from both language pedagogy specialists and technology specialists. Two main modalities of

this model show promise: (a) a distant classroom or individual students linked to a UW-Madison classroom via interactive two-way videoconferencing and (b) several distant students participating exclusively online. Technology already exists to implement either modality, including state-of-the-art videoconferencing rooms and mobile units. However, there are additional technological needs over the current classroom-based language models, as well as different costs associated with student recruitment and administration. Nevertheless, by allowing flexibility in setting of tuition and fees as well as in capture of resources, other campuses have demonstrated that this model offers a significant possibility of longer-term cost savings overall.

- 5 Tutorial model. On-demand offerings for independent or small group language study will be made available according to student need. Careful consideration should be given to this model prior to its implementation. We foresee a model in which students would work on acquiring the target language individually or in a small group according to fixed academic format. The student(s) would work in collaboration with an instructor (TA or lecturer) whose training would be coordinated by the Language Institute and supervised by the pedagogy coordinator of the appropriate department. There are models and resources available nationally to help us organize this model here on campus, and the committee believes that UW-Madison should participate in and contribute to ongoing discussions about this method of language instruction.

Models 4 and 5 have not yet been tested on this campus and are still very much in the exploratory stage.

The committee recognizes that language instruction prior to study abroad is beneficial to many students. Delivery of instruction by any of the five models would be sufficient to prepare students for study abroad in the countries where the target language is spoken. Study abroad, however, should not be used as a primary vehicle for beginning language instruction. The development of models 3, 4, and 5 could well provide greater opportunities for language study prior to study abroad than are readily available today.

II. Enhancement of Pedagogical Support for LCTL Instructors

The implementation of the models discussed above requires the enhancement of ongoing training and professional development opportunities for all instructors, whether they are faculty, academic staff, graduate teaching assistants, or tutors hired for the newly proposed on-demand, individualized learning models. The committee strongly believes UW-Madison has established its current reputation as a leader of language education not merely because of the number of languages taught, but because of the quality of language instruction, informed by current theories and methods. Sound pedagogy becomes all the more imperative to make distance learning or tutorials work. In addition to the basic principles of language learning and teaching, instructors should understand how parameters presented by different delivery formats impact students' learning experiences and design lessons and curricula accordingly.

The pedagogical support that is currently provided for TAs and instructors varies among programs to a degree, but key activities commonly adopted by the majority of programs are as follows.

- Pre-service: An interdepartmental orientation workshop for new foreign language TAs and instructors is offered annually in late August. Faculty, academic staff, and TAs across the departments contribute to this workshop, coordinated by the Language Institute.
- Methods courses: Faculty-taught methods courses tailored for African languages, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Slavic languages, and Spanish and Portuguese have been offered either annually or biannually, primarily targeting graduate students. For TAs and instructors in other languages, a two-credit online/hybrid course called *Fundamentals of Language Teaching Methods*, developed by the Language Institute with the support of a Title VI International Research and Studies grant was offered in 2008, 2009, and 2011 (taught as an overload in 2011, after the completion of the grant). TAs in the departments of African Languages and Literature (Arabic, Swahili), East Asian Languages and Literature (Korean), Languages and Cultures of Asia (Indonesian, Hindi, Pashto, Persian, Turkish),

Slavic Languages and Literature (Russian), and Scandinavian Studies (Norwegian) were served by the course.

- Ongoing supervision: Each language program has faculty or academic staff responsible for ongoing support to instructors, including reviewing lesson plans, observing classroom teaching, and providing feedback. In most language programs, these coordinators are responsible only for the language in which they specialize, but in the case of LCA, one person is responsible for overseeing all the languages offered by the department. ALL is also planning to shift to this model, expecting a new hire (specializing in Swahili) to supervise instructors in multiple languages.
- Workshops: Various types of workshops on language learning and teaching are offered by departments, centers, the Language Institute, and L&S Learning Support Services (LSS).

As we move forward, the activities described above should be reviewed and strengthened in the following ways.

- The format and content of the pre-service interdepartmental orientation workshop should be reviewed and redesigned to meet the needs of different programs.
- The structure and content of the methods courses and workshops currently offered by various units on campus should be reviewed to improve interdepartmental collaboration and to address the common needs of language instructors. In addition to shared fundamentals, the unique needs of LCTL instructors must be taken into consideration as we review and redesign these activities. In particular, additional training is necessary to adopt non-traditional delivery formats such as distance learning and tutorial models. Participation from LSS, DoIT Academic Technology, and the Division of Continuing Studies (DCS) will be essential in developing this training.
- Pedagogical training opportunities should also be coordinated more systematically among the institutions and consortia (CIC, UW System, etc.) with which we expect to enhance collaboration.
 - Ongoing opportunities to share ideas and concerns among language instructors should be sustained. The high attendance at the Language Institute's spring 2013 brownbag series on innovation in language teaching and learning demonstrated the

desire of instructors at all levels to learn more from other programs on campus and beyond.

The committee recommends that funding sources be identified to develop, redesign, and sustain these critical pedagogical support activities. There are obvious and compelling connections between this kind of support and UW's Educational Innovation initiative, which should be considered as a possible funding source for enhanced pedagogical support for the incubation of new ideas and experimentation with new formats in language instruction.

III. Technological Support

The models discussed above include increased use of distance-education technologies, whether to provide UW instruction to non-UW students, or to allow UW students to receive instruction provided elsewhere. The support required falls into two broad categories: instructional technology and infrastructure.

Instructional-technology support. Experience has shown that when developing a course of instruction for distance-education, it is advantageous to use a collaboration between instructors who know the course content and the traditional classroom pedagogies associated with it and instructional-technology specialists who know the technologies to be used and are current on distance-education pedagogical strategies. Instructional technologists are needed to:

- assist with the identification and introduction of new technologies
- assist with the development of new pedagogical approaches to using new technologies
- encourage and support experimental technologies where such support is not available as a campus service
- assist with transfer of distance-education experience from other disciplines.

This kind of support is available on campus from various sources including notably LSS, but the demand for such services is growing rapidly campus wide and the available services are generally not intended to support program revenue-based instruction. Some resources are also available through UW System and the CIC, though more could be done to coordinate those resources with campus ones. As the technical-support unit, which is historically, physically, and operationally most closely aligned with the language

programs, it makes sense for LSS to serve as a nexus for efforts at enhanced collaboration.

There are obvious and compelling connections between this kind of support and UW's Educational Innovation initiative, which should be considered as a possible funding source for enhanced technical support for the incubation of new ideas and experimentation with new formats in language instruction. **The committee recommends that funding sources be identified to develop, redesign, and sustain these critical instructional-technology support activities.**

Technical Infrastructure. Increased use of distance-education technologies will also place demands on the campus technological infrastructure, both in the classroom and otherwise.

For many of the languages discussed here, the distance-education model will inevitably involve aggregating students from multiple locations. Language instruction, especially at the lower levels, benefits from synchronous technologies, usually video. The facilities necessary are sometimes technology-equipped classrooms but, in other cases, other facilities may be more appropriate. An example would be a single UW-Madison student receiving language instruction from another institution, where a video-equipped carrel would be more appropriate than an entire classroom. The campus does have some facilities to provide such technologies for instruction, but any significant expansion would require increased investment in the needed physical infrastructure. It is also likely that mobile devices will figure prominently as new pedagogical strategies are developed, and it will be necessary to provide such devices to students and instructors.

IV. Recommendations for the Implementation of the Five-model Approach

As described in this report, UW-Madison has long been a leader in instruction of less and least commonly taught languages. However, over time, various demands and priorities have led to a hodge-podge of instructional approaches and business models, which taken as a whole do not cohere into a logical campus language strategy. Some languages that are widely agreed as vital to campus continue on precarious funding; other languages are taught simply because they have always been taught, with no consideration for how they fit with other offerings; innovation into different pedagogical and business models is haphazard. This committee's overarching recommendation is that **the**

University commit to maintaining its premier position in both the quality and breadth of its language instruction. In order to fulfill this commitment, maintain UW-Madison's nationally recognized position, and build on its historic strength, **we recommend a five-model approach that takes into consideration all languages as well as the broader area and international studies situation on campus.** It is no longer sustainable to offer all languages solely through the traditional classroom-based instruction model. Below, we make specific recommendations for changes that will advance the overall strength of language instruction at UW-Madison through a combination of enhancement of existing classroom instruction, adoption of new and mixed pedagogical approaches, and the models identified above in section I. These recommendations are based on our research into enrollments, funding and staffing, campus and funder priorities, as well as the interests of both language departments and area studies programs. However, we strongly believe that the overall structure of mixing the five models to build on strengths and address needs is more important than the specific changes for any given language.

Africa – UW-Madison boasts a thriving Arabic program, housed in the Department of African Languages and Literature (ALL), in both the Academic Year and Summer. AY offerings in Arabic should continue on 101 funds and Title VI and other external funding should be directed solely to summer instruction. Building on already existing significant strengths (including a language floor, a summer immersion program, etc.), Arabic should be expanded into a platform program and the UW-Madison should develop outgoing course-share Arabic. UW-Madison offerings of Swahili are similarly strong and thus ALL should explore outgoing course-share Swahili. As long as funding permits and demand allows, Yoruba should remain as it currently is.

Given that the African continent is home to several hundred languages, it would be impossible to cover the less and least commonly taught languages through the traditional classroom approach. ALL should be encouraged to develop the new language coordinator position to afford maximum flexibility to offer all languages that are required for graduate and faculty research, according to the individualized study model described above. We recommend that Twi, Zulu, and all other African languages be offered through

a tutorial model and/or through received course-share options for these languages from partner institutions in the CIC.

Americas – Portuguese is robust on this campus, making it a perfect candidate for a platform approach. In addition to creating a Portuguese platform, UW-Madison should develop outgoing course-share options for some levels, including specialized offerings (Portuguese for business, engineering, etc.) at the intermediate level. The Summer Intensive Brazilian Portuguese Institute should be restructured to a revenue-capture model along the lines of the other summer institutes. Once this new structure is in place, additional levels of summer instruction can be offered, further enhancing Portuguese on this campus. For the instruction of Quechua and Yucatec Maya, if Title VI funding continues, outgoing distance learning and course-sharing options should be pursued, transitioning these offerings to sending models. In the absence of such outside funding, receiving and/or tutorial models for these languages should be pursued.

East Asia – Chinese and Japanese have not recently received Title VI support other than FLAS awards. The main beneficiaries of Title VI funding have been upper-level courses in Korean (offered by EALL) and all levels of Tibetan (offered by LCA). In order to maintain UW's status as one of the preeminent centers for the study of East Asia, **it is critical to secure all levels of Korean by moving upper-level courses onto 101 funding**. In addition, given that Korean is listed as one of the languages for which ACM institutions would like to explore collaboration with the CIC, the course-share sending model should be considered. For Tibetan, on the other hand, the course-share receiving model, and/or the independent study tutorial model should be explored. In addition, considering a growing interest in Chinese seen across the campus and region, the committee also considers it important that our Chinese program remain competitive, and recommends that Chinese be developed into a platform model.

Eurasia – Russian is one of the most robust languages at UW and its current funding structure should remain. The Russian Flagship program can serve as an example for and resource to the platform languages recommended herein. Advanced Polish has been the main recipient of Title VI funding for this region, with first- and second- year funded on 101. Polish is on a two-year sequence, with first-semester classes offered only every other fall semester, but the Slavic Department does offer a Polish Major and has a sizable

endowment for scholarships in Polish. **As long as Title VI funding continues, it should be used to transition Polish over completely to UW funding sources and to further develop outbound course sharing.** Czech and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS) are also offered on a rotating schedule and only for two years. Collaborations should be developed with CIC and others to enable a combination of sending and receiving course-share offerings to enable all partner universities to sustain frequent and regular offerings of Czech and BCS at all levels. Currently, Czech and BCS are 101 funded and not tied to a major or certificate, whereas Polish, which is linked to a major, relies heavily on soft funds. In addition to our recommendations above, we encourage the Slavic Department to continue developing a major in Central and East European Languages & Cultures, as well as a series of literature and culture courses, so as to more closely align offerings and funding with academic programs.

In LCA, Kazak has been supported entirely on soft funds and Turkish has received Title VI funding at advanced levels. We recommend expanded use of distance-learning technology to support Kazak language instruction at all three levels. As with Czech and BCS, Kazak instruction would benefit from a more regularized sharing agreement for both sending and receiving. (See section on Middle East for Turkish.) Europe – Most of the European languages that receive Title VI funding do so at the advanced levels and Title VI funds are not used for first- or second-year language classes. This is the case for Dutch, Finnish, Norwegian, Portuguese, and Swedish, which only sporadically receive Title VI support and can easily be maintained on 101 funds in the future. For the European languages that are wholly dependent on Title VI support— Icelandic, Modern Irish, Modern Greek— the course-share receiving model, and/or the tutorial model should be explored.

Middle East – Hebrew has never been a Title VI language at UW-Madison (and thus is not mentioned elsewhere in this report), but it is strong on this campus and vital to Middle East studies more broadly and should be continued. Given campus strengths in Arabic (secure funding, language floor, summer offerings, study abroad), it is an excellent candidate for a platform approach, as recommended in the section on Africa. Persian (along with Turkish) is a good example of how externalities such as faculty retirements and funding changes over the years have resulted in a chaotic set of offerings.

We recommend that academic year Persian be discontinued as a traditional 101-funded classroom offering, transitioning to a greater emphasis on the summer institute and exploring receiving course-share options for the academic year. A vibrant and complete Turkish offering at UW-Madison would serve Middle East Studies and international studies more broadly much better than a partial program in two languages. **We recommend that all levels of Turkish be placed on 101 funding.**

South Asia– The committee feels strongly that securing funding for the teaching of Hindi is integral to the continued strength of South Asian studies on this campus and to the maintenance of excellence in international studies more broadly. **All levels of Hindi should be returned to 101 funding.** This would help to bring the India Initiative in line with the other regional initiatives, all of whose primary languages (Portuguese, Chinese, and Russian) are securely on 101 funds. Some levels of Urdu could be combined with Hindi. Hindi is an ideal candidate to be promoted as a platform language, as it currently includes options for both academic year and summer instruction and is connected with a FIG. Moreover, one of the longest-running study abroad programs at UW-Madison, the program in Varanasi, has a strong Hindi component (with the option of adding Urdu as well). Although Hindi is not currently part of the International Learning Community, this is certainly something that could be developed, in part through collaboration with the FIG office. Pashto should be moved to the course-share receiving model, and/or the tutorial model should be explored.

Southeast Asia – We recommend that Thai and Hmong continue fully 101 funded and that outbound course sharing be developed, immediately in the case of Hmong and for Thai as soon as instructor salaries in LCA are brought into line with campus standards for language. In addition, we propose that **the university should endorse and support the Center for Southeast Asia’s (CSEAS) efforts to develop the capacity to offer revenue-capture, blended distance-traditional instruction, initially with Vietnamese, Filipino/Tagalog, and Indonesian** as an experimental program. CSEAS must be allowed to capture at least a portion of course revenues and be offered flexibility in setting tuition for non-campus students in order to provide appropriate technical support and compensation for instructors and administrative staff participating in this educational innovation. If this experiment can successfully develop financial self-sufficiency after

three years, the format could be expanded to other less-commonly taught languages offered on this campus. Existing Title VI, Mellon, and other funding should be allocated for this initiative. Once in place, revenue generated from this model could be used to buy incoming Cambodian/Khmer, Burmese, and other languages currently only offered at UW during the summer. In addition, CSEAS should explore models whereby some levels of low-enrollment languages are offered during the summer only.

V. Conclusion

Each of the five models described in this report represents a specific approach to pursuing innovative methods for language instruction and optimizing administrative support structures for less commonly taught languages. The adoption of these models will represent an important step in maintaining our university's strength in language education and, by extension, the UW-Madison brand, thereby enhancing our ability to publicize the diversity of our language offerings to the campus community and nationally. It will also strengthen our ability to secure a variety of funding sources for these languages, as we will be able to match specific approaches with appropriate revenue streams. If Title VI funding continues, all centers should be encouraged to support the development of pedagogical training, especially in regard to developing sound distance education and revenue capture offerings, the summer language institutes, and on-campus flexible offerings. Additionally, funding from the current Mellon grant for area and international studies should be targeted for this purpose. A taskforce, including technology experts as well as members with expertise in pedagogy and administration, should be formed to conduct further research on the feasibility of these models and their administrative structures. The committee strongly recommends the creation of such a taskforce to oversee the implementation of the five-model approach to language instruction described in this document.

Recommendations:

This committee's overarching recommendation is that the University commit to maintaining its premier position both in the quality and breadth of its language instruction.

To achieve this, we propose that the five-model approach for teaching of LCTLs on this campus be adopted during AY 2013-14, while Title VI funding is still assured at its present level. The 5-model approach is described in section I of this report and implementation recommendations can be found in section V.

The committee recommends that critical pedagogical support activities such as pre-service and in-service TA/instructor workshops, methods courses, course development support, and so on, be enhanced through systematic collaboration among language departments, the Language Institute, LSS, and others. Area and international studies centers, the Division of International Studies, the College of Letters & Science, and others must support these activities through identification of funding sources. (See section II.)

For the successful implementation of the five-model approach, the committee recommends that instructional-technology support resources such as use of synchronous video, audio-enabled course-management systems, appropriately trained staff, and so on, be enhanced and securely funded. (See section III.)

Appendix A. Charge to the committee

We encourage you to engage in this work with an eye toward long-term, broad thinking around language instruction in the context of area and international studies. International language instruction, field-work and research are central to the current educational innovation efforts of our campus. It is also rooted in a long UW-Madison tradition and guided by our institution's mission and the Wisconsin Idea. Larger-scale formulations are both possible and necessary as an outcome of this report. You have before you the opportunity to:

- review and update the area studies programs' role in relation to international language instruction, articulating the professional benefits of language instruction and clarifying its academic contributions
- design a process by which campus-wide priorities could be strategically established, identify the less-commonly taught languages (LCTLs) that area studies programs consider an absolute priority, and assess and identify the demand in priority languages across our campus with particular attention paid to the needs of students in professional schools
- discuss and recommend efficient administrative support structures for the Title VI-funded language programs, in collaboration with departments and the *Language Institute*, and evaluate the financial and academic role area studies programs have played and should play in the future of language instruction across our campus
- outline how the FLAS program (or an equivalent funding program for study of critical languages) could be sustained and strengthened with or without federal funding
- review the financial model behind *summer language institutes* currently in existence (SASLI, SEASSI, APTLII, CESSI and Portuguese), and explore how the area studies programs could sustain the procurement and/or generation of external resources
- identify current campus programs that are receiving external grants (e.g. Russian Flagship, Project GO, StartTalk), consider whether and if these funding opportunities could be expanded to other languages
- identify language instruction programs that could be developed in collaboration with the Division of Continuing Studies, Madison colleges (MC, Edgewood College), Foreign Language Resource Centers, consortia like CIC, and across the UW System in order to use existing resources more efficiently without sacrificing instruction in LCTLs and critical languages and also to be competitive and successful in the application for federal and private funds
- explore how language instruction could be approached drawing resources and expertise from campus units such as LSS and DoIT-Academic Technology, creating an environment that facilitates the incubation of new ideas and the experimentation of new formats (e.g. distance learning, blended) that take advantage of campus, UW-System, and CIC resources in an integrated fashion

- consider the resources currently available--IAP, the FIG program, service-learning, international learning community--in the development of an integrated *platform*, and in the creation of undergraduate and graduate opportunities
- examine the costs and benefits of campus language instruction vis-à-vis study abroad opportunities
- consider advancement opportunities in relation to alumni who over the years have benefitted from their experiences as recipients of FLAS funds, as participants in international programs such as Peace Corps and IAP, or campus programs like ILC.

A few principles should guide the process:

- it is critically important to secure faculty and staff involvement in the formulation of recommendations
- committee members should feel free in conducting their deliberations to undertake as necessary broad consultation with current and potential stakeholders including the convening of public forums
- in the fulfillment of its mission, it is imperative to prioritize the allocation of current and new resources
- area studies programs are in a unique and advantageous position to be guided by the realization of the Wisconsin Idea.
- careful consideration should be given to the promotion of institutional collaborations across our campus and beyond, and
- the procurement of new funding resources will need to be clearly aligned with our campus efforts in Educational Innovation.

We hope, in the course of your strategic planning discussions, you will give consideration to the ideas developed in 2009 by the reaccreditation Theme 4 sub-committee report on language and the 2004-2012 Language Institute Self-Study Report.

Appendix B. Academic Year Language Courses Funded Entirely by Title VI

Language	Department Offering	Center Contributing
Filipino	LCA	Center for Southeast Asian Studies
Hindi	LCA	Center for South Asia
Icelandic	SCAN	Center for European Studies
Kazak	LCA	Center for Russia, East Europe & Central Asia
Modern Greek	COMP LIT	Center for European Studies
Modern Irish	FOLKLORE	Center for European Studies
Pashto	LCA	Center for South Asia
Quechua	ANTHRO	Latin American, Caribbean & Iberian Studies
Tibetan	LCA	Center for East Asian Studies
Twi	ALL	African Studies Program
Urdu	LCA	Center for South Asia
Uzbek	LCA	Center for Russia, East Europe & Central Asia
Vietnamese	LCA	Center for Southeast Asian Studies
Yucatec Maya	ANTHRO	Latin American, Caribbean & Iberian Studies
Zulu	ALL	African Studies Program

Appendix C. Academic Year Language Courses Funded Partially by Title VI

Language	Department Offering	Center Contributing
Arabic	ALL	African Studies Program; Global Studies
Dutch	GERMAN	Center for European Studies
Finnish	SCAN	Center for European Studies
Indonesian	LCA	Center for Southeast Asian Studies
Korean	EALL	Center for East Asian Studies
Norwegian	SCAN	Center for European Studies
Polish	SLAVIC	Center for Russia, East Europe & Central Asia
Portuguese	SPANPORT	Latin American, Caribbean & Iberian Studies
Swahili	ALL	African Studies Program
Swedish	SCAN	Center for European Studies
Turkish	LCA	Center for Russia, East Europe & Central Asia
Yoruba	ALL	African Studies Program