

WORLD LANGUAGES AT RUTGERS – NEW BRUNSWICK:

A PROPOSAL

Submitted to Richard L. Edwards, Chancellor

Language Requirement Task Force

April 17, 2017

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 4 |
| ANALYSIS..... | 4 |
| PROPOSAL..... | 5 |
| PREFACE | 9 |
| BACKGROUND ANALYSIS | 13 |
| I. CONTEXT..... | 13 |
| Languages and K-12 education..... | 13 |
| Languages and higher education..... | 14 |
| Enrollments..... | 15 |
| Enrollments vs. requirements..... | 17 |
| Requirements..... | 19 |
| The RU–NB anomaly..... | 20 |
| II. ARGUMENTS..... | 24 |
| Strategy..... | 24 |
| Culture..... | 24 |
| Technology..... | 25 |
| Jobs and markets..... | 26 |
| Knowledge and research..... | 27 |
| Cognition and education..... | 27 |
| PROPOSAL | 29 |
| I. RATIONALE..... | 29 |
| II. LANGUAGE EXPOSURE REQUIREMENT (LER, 1 CREDIT)..... | 34 |
| Objective..... | 34 |
| Form and content..... | 34 |
| Place in the Curriculum..... | 36 |
| Implementation..... | 36 |
| Development..... | 37 |
| III. MULTILINGUAL COMPETENCIES REQUIREMENT (MCR, 6 TO 8 CREDITS)..... | 38 |
| Objective..... | 38 |
| Outline..... | 38 |
| Relation to the Core Curriculum..... | 40 |
| Relation to programs..... | 42 |
| Minors and the MCR..... | 43 |
| Adding language components to existing minors..... | 43 |
| New interdisciplinary minors or majors with language requirements..... | 44 |
| Transfer students..... | 45 |
| Placement testing..... | 46 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| IV. EXAMPLES AND FURTHER PROPOSITIONS..... | 47 |
| 1. Language-based interaction and cultural exchanges among students..... | 47 |
| 2. Curricular innovations and incentives for heritage speakers..... | 49 |
| Identification process..... | 50 |
| Courses..... | 50 |
| Certificates..... | 50 |
| Other innovations..... | 51 |
| Heritage Language Forum..... | 51 |
| 3. Modules at work..... | 52 |
| Rutgers Business School..... | 52 |
| School of Communication and Information..... | 53 |
| School of Environmental and Biological Sciences..... | 55 |
| School of Arts and Sciences..... | 56 |
| Department of Earth & Planetary Sciences..... | 56 |
| 4. Study Abroad..... | 57 |
| 5. Study Away..... | 59 |
| 6. 1-credit courses: two examples..... | 61 |
| Learning About Language Learning..... | 61 |
| How to Learn a Chinese Dialect..... | 61 |
| BEYOND THIS PROPOSAL..... | 63 |
| Publicity, fundraising, development..... | 63 |
| Resource-sharing..... | 63 |
| Additional curricular program..... | 64 |
| Co- and extracurricular programs..... | 64 |
| Outreach to New Jersey schools, students, and educators..... | 64 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... | 66 |
| ENDNOTES..... | 67 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report proposes a set of **interconnected initiatives** concerning the study of languages other than English (LOTE). The proposal includes **two different language requirements**, both of them innovative in their nature, structure, and function; as well as several other recommendations, which are designed to work in tandem with the requirements, often as their “content,” but can also work independently from them.

The goal of these multiple initiatives, many of which will be coordinated by the new **Council on Linguistic Diversity** called for by the Rutgers–New Brunswick Strategic Plan, is not just to **strengthen LOTE studies** at RU–New Brunswick as a specific academic area, although we do show that this area needs and deserves strengthening. It is also, and more broadly, to **bring out and help develop our students’ language competencies**, which are extraordinarily varied – and, at the moment, mostly invisible, both in academic terms and in terms of collective life on campus; and to have Rutgers–New Brunswick embrace, as a premier public institution of higher learning, **the value of multilingual literacy in a “globalized” world**; thus becoming the “language university” that its unique diversity promises it can be.

The **proposal** proper is grounded in a detailed **analysis** of the relevant context, namely the situation of second-language learning and studies in the United States: first in K-12 education; and second (our most direct concern) in higher education, most notably among comparable public universities – within the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) and the Association of American Universities (AAU). After the analysis, and before the proposal, comes a recapitulation of the main **arguments** in favor of postsecondary LOTE studies, which this summary will not recapitulate in turn.

ANALYSIS

Our study focuses on the evolution of LOTE higher-education enrollments and its relation (if any) to language graduation requirements. We conclude the following:

- LOTE studies form a highly scattered and diverse field, making it difficult to assess them as a whole; but in the main, enrollments in this field have been **declining alongside the rest of Humanities**, in terms of share of the student population and degrees granted.
- The LOTE field, however, is **more vulnerable** than many other Humanities disciplines, because of the small numbers of students enrolled in each language in the first place, with the relative exception of Spanish.
- On the whole, “traditional” **European languages** (French, German, Italian) are declining in enrollment, as is the case with **Classical languages** and **Hebrew**; **Arabic and East Asian languages**, in contrast, are on the rise; **Spanish** has been declining in more recent years as well, albeit from enrollment numbers higher than all the other languages combined.
- While the decline of LOTE enrollments in higher education is a general phenomenon, **it is not universal**. The BTAA, in particular, contains a number of schools whose LOTE programs

are thriving, or at least resisting the trend, either across the board or with respect to many of the languages they offer.

- The lack of a language graduation requirement (except for the SAS / RBS Honors Program) at RU–NB is a **true anomaly**: virtually all BTAA or AAU public institutions have one.
- The presence of a language graduation requirement **does not guarantee** the strength of LOTE programs at an institution. On the other hand, there is no such thing as a public research university with strong LOTE programs (in terms of enrollments at least) and no language requirement. It would appear that requirements are **necessary but not sufficient** to ensure the health of these programs.
- Virtually all the requirements in question are **“proficiency”** ones, mandating 2nd-semester-level (typically for BS) to 4th-semester-level (for BAs) proficiency, with a number of outright exemptions (for professional schools or credit-intensive science programs) and a “placing-out” safety valve: **the requirement is waived** for students who demonstrate (upon admission, in a variety of ways) proficiency at the required level.
- The **proportion of students who place out** is difficult to establish. A fifty percent place-out rate seems a reasonable estimate, with far higher rates likely in many cases. The effect of graduation requirements at some institutions seems to be that students **anticipate them in high school**, and disproportionately pursue high school coursework allowing them to place out: as a consequence, and over time, the “plus” for LOTE enrollments diminishes.
- The schools where LOTE studies fare best are ones where **several elements seem to converge**, of which **a graduation requirement is only one** (although it helps provide a **“floor”** for enrollments, which RU–NB lacks, but may also result in inflated low-level registrations leading to no further language study). The opposite of the placing-out spiral described above would be a growing number of students interested in languages flocking to a University that seems to favor them (via a requirement *and* other means).

Aware of the adverse effect of the “placing-out” factor on actual language learning, a recent report of the AAAS’s Commission on Language Learning urges institutions that can afford it to **abolish waivers**, so that all their students be required to study another language.

PROPOSAL

We propose **two linked but distinct language requirements** in light of the following key considerations:

- 1)** the importance of the hard-to-control **“placing-out” effect**, which can deplete or even annul a requirement’s long-term potential benefits for language programs and study;
- 2)** the difficulty of **creating a proficiency requirement of adequate strength *ex nihilo*** at RU–NB, considering its likely sudden effect (even assuming a 50% placing-out rate) on **a)** language instruction resources in several (though not all) language and literature programs, **b)** student schedules and time to graduation, and **c)** other curricular interests, in the Humanities notably;

- 3) the amplification of problems **b** and **c** by **the existence of the Core Curriculum**, which makes the insertion of a mandatory 2- to 4-semester sequence in the “Arts and Humanities” distribution area all but impossible, and which would demand that such a sequence replace, instead of fitting alongside, most or all of another section of the Core;
- 4) the fact that, should a proficiency requirement somehow be created, the only way to make it manageable would indeed be to have all students who have achieved Intermediate-level proficiency place out, thus **excluding all advanced learners and most heritage speakers** from the benefits of LOTE;
- 5) our strong conviction that a language requirement tailored for RU–NB’s specific needs and personality **should encourage advanced learners to advance further, and in particular heritage learners to improve or complete their skills**; and therefore **should not be waived** for students who place beyond the Intermediate level;
- 6) and the sheer impossibility, on the other hand, of **creating a campus-wide, no-waiver requirement** of the type recommended by the Commission on Language Learning, which would allow us to serve advanced learners and heritage speakers, but only exacerbate all the above problems and create unsustainable costs.

The two proposed requirements were developed to square this succession of circles, as **light and flexible tools** designed to leverage RU–NB’s cultural and programmatic resources through **a great variety of means**, with the aim of creating conditions in which LOTE study and student skills could actually grow over time, organically, while also serving the needs of other fields alongside those of language, culture and literature programs.

The requirements we propose share two basic traits: they **do not insist on a particular proficiency target**, and they **cannot be waived** for students who place beyond such a target, e.g. the Intermediate level. They do not separate language learners into artificial categories, but instead seek to provide benefits to every level of learning. On the other hand, they both require **extensive and accurate placement testing**, which should be developed accordingly by language programs in coordination with placement testing services.

The two requirements are also very different, in one key respect. The first (**1 credit**) is meant to be **adopted campus-wide**, by each and every School preferably, for all students (including international and transfer students) to fulfill within their first or second year of study at RU–NB. The second, larger requirement, consisting of **6 to 8 credits**, will **only be demanded of those** Schools, or Divisions, or Departments, or majors or minors, or even individual students **who endorse it**. We hope that it will earn wide support from the start; but it could develop its own “base” progressively.

LANGUAGE EXPOSURE REQUIREMENT (LER, 1 credit)

The **1-credit requirement** has obviously no ambition to develop proficiency by itself. It will serve as a spark or trigger, but also provide students with real, meaningful opportunities to **reflect on their own language skills** (irrespective of level) as well as to **share them with others**.

The LER will be fulfilled in several ways, some classroom-based, some not, among which it will create synergies: Byrne-like **mini-courses** serving as introduction to LOTE studies (**about**

language learning in general, or about learning a particular language, or allowing the study of one aspect of a language); **FIGS courses** taught by students fluent in a language; **language modules** added to courses in other fields, and relevant to their content; 1-credit activities with **Study Abroad** or “**Study Away**” (linguistic immersion within the U.S., e.g., in New Jersey); 1-credit **Tutoring or Conversation activities**, designed and supervised under the umbrella of the Council on Linguistic Diversity; including **mutual tutoring** between international students or heritage speakers on the one hand, and English speakers on the other hand. The LER can also be fulfilled by **taking a regular 4-, 3-, or 1.5-credit language course**.

The LER will be **added to the Core Curriculum**, as a stand-alone 1-credit goal within section III, “Cognitive Skills and Processes.” We think that its small size makes this addition possible. An **Advisory Committee** to the CRC will be instituted to vet and recommend 1-credit courses and other items for certification, as well as assessment guidelines and procedures.

The LER should be initiated once a sufficient number of fulfilling items are in place, including new courses designed for this purpose, and the necessary tools to ensure accurate placement into them. Once in place, the hope is that the LER will lead to the **further development of LOTE components to the curricula of certain programs** within Schools such as RBS or SC&I (for example), and eventually to further, **field-specific** language requirements or to the adoption of the second, more comprehensive requirement we are proposing.

MULTILINGUAL COMPETENCIES REQUIREMENT (MCR, 6 to 8 credits)

The second, **6- to 8-credit requirement** is not imposed across the board, but **only on those units that accept it**: for example, divisions within the School of Arts and Sciences (e.g. the Humanities), or clusters of departments within divisions (e.g., the Social Sciences), or individual departments. It could also work as an **option for individual students** in departments that have not adopted it. Either way, students who fulfill it would earn a **Seal of Multilingual Competence** added to their transcripts or diplomas. Special conditions will apply to transfer students.

The MCR, like the LER, **is not proficiency-based**; no placing-out is allowed. Students **fulfill it at the level into which they place**, be they beginners or very advanced. Even though it will be mostly met through coursework, the MCR is **credit-based rather than course-based**, and can be met, with a grade of C or higher, via diverse **combinations of 1-, 3-, or 4-credit elements**, including some of the elements used to fulfill the LER.

The MCR “**floats**” **around the Core Curriculum**, thanks to **goals** added to or modified within different sections; thus avoiding too much pressure on just one area. But **it is not a Core Curriculum requirement**, even though it *can* be fulfilled entirely within the Core, where it consists only of a **set of optional goals** among others.

The MCR can also be **fulfilled outside the Core**, e.g. by taking advanced language program courses, or advanced courses based in other departments with added language components – such as specialized **1-credit modules**. The MCR could also be linked with **existing or new interdisciplinary minors**, which it would help equip with a language component.

In sum, the MCR is designed not only to develop LOTE studies per se, but to do so in a manner that favors **intellectual and curricular exchanges** between language programs and other units, in the Humanities, Social Sciences, or any other field. It should accomplish this goal without creating undue burdens, either on language programs in terms of instruction resources, or on other programs in terms of their own curricular needs and priorities.

RELATED PROPOSITIONS

The two requirements we propose **are not ends in themselves**: they are devices meant to **concentrate and leverage** linguistic, cultural, programmatic, and pedagogical resources (most of which already exist in one form or another) so as to help realize a triple goal:

- 1) **develop LOTE studies at all levels** (including the highest ones), gradually and organically, in ways that are meaningful and rewarding from an academic and intellectual standpoint;
- 2) **develop substantial relations and favor curricular co-creations between language programs and other disciplines**, so as to make our students' language learning, at the most advanced levels especially, **an interdisciplinary experience**, whereby languages other than English add useful dimensions to the mastery of other subjects;
- 3) **bring to the fore and develop the existing language cultures of our students**, including international students, immigrants, and heritage speaker students, and create opportunities for exchange and collaborative progress among diverse communities at Rutgers.

Accordingly, the "content" associated with the requirements (such as the LER's "menu" of 1-credit items) also **exceeds their scope**; it could just as well be understood as a set of initiatives *within which* the requirements find their place, rather than the other way around.

That is why the "**examples and propositions**" that follow the requirement descriptions provide more detailed, free-standing accounts of some "moving parts," all of which could be developed in relation with the requirements **or on their own**:

- linguistic interaction and cultural exchanges among students;
- curricular initiatives for heritage speakers; Heritage Language Forum
- language modules added to courses in other disciplines;
- Study Abroad and Study Away initiatives;
- further curricular ideas (a Global Language Scholar certificate);
- initiatives regarding admissions, fundraising, resource-sharing;
- initiatives regarding outreach to and collaboration with New Jersey K-12 education.

We look forward to discussing all these elements, which, as we hope this report will make clear, are not meant as "take it or leave it" options, but rather as a means of launching a collaborative process – which in turn can only enrich and transform what we are proposing.

PREFACE

Should we, as a university, do more to support and develop the study of languages other than English^a? Should we, in particular, create a graduation requirement in world languages, beyond the limited one we currently have?

Questions of this sort are being discussed all over the United States and its education system, as the country tries, once again, to tackle the “language deficit”^b it is said owe to many factors: its size, its relative geographic isolation, its history of linguistic assimilation, and the current status of English as global lingua franca. Federal and state agencies, educational institutions, professional associations, and commentators of all stripes are debating what to do about the stubborn fact that this nation of immigrants – where many tongues are used by large numbers of native and heritage speakers^c and Spanish alone is spoken by close to 40 million people, does not seem particularly interested in *learning* languages other than English.

On February 28th this year, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences’ recently formed Commission on Language Learning (CLL) released the latest milestone in this perennial discussion, its much-awaited recommendations about “America’s languages.” On higher education, the CLL has this to say:

Two- and four-year colleges and universities must ensure that future teachers – indeed any student who requires or wishes to pursue intermediate or advanced proficiency in a language – can find the courses they need. Language programs were particularly vulnerable during the Great Recession: many administrators, faced with difficult budgetary decisions, sacrificed language courses and requirements in order to preserve other disciplines. These cuts did not always serve the best interests of students, who can reap professional rewards for achieving even moderate proficiency in a second language. Nor do they serve the interests of a nation that requires an ever-larger cadre of bilingual citizens to maintain its place in the international community. Rather than eliminate programs or requirements, two- and four-year colleges and universities should find new ways to provide opportunities for advanced study in languages, through a recommitment to language instruction on campus, blended learning programs, and the development of new regional consortia that allow colleges and universities to pool language resources.^d

Accordingly, the Commission “urges two- and four-year colleges and universities to continue to offer beginning and advanced language instruction to all students, and to reverse recent programmatic cuts wherever possible” (*America’s Languages*, viii). It also “applauds recent efforts to create new undergraduate language requirements” or even to institute “mandatory language study” by having the most advanced admits take higher-level courses rather than exempt them (*ibid.*, 18). Indeed some schools, responding to the current surge in public

^a We will use this phrase and its acronym (LOTE) or speak of “world languages” rather than “foreign languages”: Spanish is no longer “foreign” in the U.S.; neither are, from their own perspective, the tongues used by millions of immigrants and heritage speakers. This is not to deny that the languages in question are indeed foreign to many or most of those who learn them, in a school context especially; nor to suggest that the study of what is foreign to us is less important or legitimate than the study of what is not. Yet it is a fundamental fact that “other” languages, in our world, can be foreign *or not* to an unprecedented degree: we should not reduce the matter to just one of its configurations.

^b See <http://www.forbes.com/sites/collegeprose/2012/08/27/americas-foreign-language-deficit/> and the AAAS report cited below.

^c The Census Bureau’s 2013 American Community Survey shows that 7 languages beside Spanish have more than a million native speakers (immigrants or not) in the U.S. (Arabic, French, German, Korean, Mandarin, Filipino, Vietnamese), while another 12 have more than 300,000 (Cantonese, Greek, Gujarati, Haitian Creole, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Urdu).

^d *America’s Languages. Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century*, Commission on Language Learning, AAAS, 2017 (https://www.amacad.org/multimedia/pdfs/publications/researchpapersmonographs/language/Commission-on-Language-Learning_Americas-Languages.pdf), p. 17-18.

concern, are taking steps to remove requirement exemptions; most prominent among them is our neighbor, Princeton^e. The CLL notes helpfully that “not every college or university has the resources to institute such a policy” right away: in most of the universities that have language degree requirements, exemptions of various sorts are used to manage costs, enrollments, and competing curricular demands. The Commission is aware of this, but insists nonetheless that an across-the-board mandate to study languages in college is “a laudable goal [...] worthy of serious consideration,” one that should not be reserved to the likes of Duke or Yale^f.

Should Rutgers–New Brunswick, seizing the moment in turn, heed the AAAS’s request and work at expanding its existing requirement, which only applies (incidentally without exemptions) to Honors students in the School of Arts and Sciences and the Rutgers Business School^g? Our University did not need the spur of the CLL’s report to raise this issue:

There is abundant evidence concerning the value of acquiring proficiency in a language other than one’s own — from broadening career opportunities to improving brain health and cognitive skills to enriching one’s understanding of how other cultures conceptualize reality. Rutgers, alone among the members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, does not ask undergraduates to study a foreign language as a graduation requirement. This anomaly may place our students at a competitive disadvantage with those at our peer institutions. It may also hamper our ongoing efforts to increase Rutgers–New Brunswick’s international profile and expand programs such as study abroad and international service learning. Given the University Strategic Plan’s emphasis on preparing students for citizenship in a dynamic world and on exploring cultures both local and global, it is time for a rigorous discussion of the benefits, challenges, and anticipated costs of implementing a requirement for students across Rutgers–New Brunswick to show or develop proficiency in a language other than English. We will, therefore, convene a New Brunswick-wide task force to consider a foreign language requirement and to make recommendations to the administration and the New Brunswick faculty.^h

As the Task Force that was instituted in the wake of these words from the Rutgers University–New Brunswick 2015-2020 Strategic Plan, we did consider the requirement question, but in light of a larger one, dictated by what the Strategic Plan calls a “revolutionary future”: should we embark on a collective effort to make world languages a more central and visible component of our institutional identity? Likewise, the recent report of the Task Force on the Humanities, submitted to President Barchi in September 2016, proposed to “require that all undergraduates do coursework either in a language other than English or in new courses on the histories and cultures of non-English speaking nations offered in English by language departments,” in an effort to “more meaningfully connect Rutgers and the world through support and promotion of language education across campuses.”ⁱ This report, in turn, will argue in favor of such a “connection” and offer a proposal to that effect, of which a language requirement (in two forms) is a key part, but only a part.

^e See Princeton’s *Report of the Task Force on General Education* (<http://www.princeton.edu/strategicplan/files/Task-Force-Report-on-General-Education.pdf>), on which see also <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/11/02/princeton-proposal-would-require-all-students-even-those-already-proficient-study>.

^f See <http://trinity.duke.edu/sites/trinity.duke.edu/files/page-attachments/foreign-language-requirement-information-sheet.original.pdf>, and <http://catalog.yale.edu/ycps/academic-regulations/requirements-for-ba-bs-degree/index.html#distributionalrequirements>.

^g See <https://honorscollege.rutgers.edu/foreign-language-requirement> or <http://www.sashonors.rutgers.edu/requirements/foreign-language-proficiency>. Outside Honors and language and literature departments, some interdisciplinary programs have a language requirement of their own (e.g. African Studies, Latin American Studies, Comparative Literature, Medieval Studies, Middle Eastern Studies, South Asian Studies, East Asian Languages and Area Studies). So does, at Mason Gross School of the Arts, the Vocal Performance program.

^h <http://nbstratplan.rutgers.edu/sites/nbstratplan/files/RU-NB%20Strat%20PlanFINAL.pdf>, p. 42.

ⁱ *Report of the Task Force on the Humanities*, p. 5.

“Jersey Roots, Global Reach”: the motto that defines our vision also presents us with a critical choice. Should our “reaching” be done in English – or in other tongues as well? Should it address or bypass the difficult question of languages – of what it takes to learn them, of why one should try to do so? Should it consider or ignore the presence of multilingual literacies in our “globalized” reality? To ask the question is to answer it: we might as well admit that we have no choice. A 21st-century “global” university could not possibly settle for the notion that “English is enough,” suffices to work and play, learn and understand, create and communicate, in most (if not all) situations; it could not possibly seek to implant that conquering notion in its students’ minds. Our motto commits us, as an institution of higher learning, to *meeting* the world – the immense variety of our interlocutors – at least half-way: away, that is, from our own familiar sentences, from our linguistic comfort zone.

What is true of the “reach” part is no less true of the “roots.” “Global” is not just found or enacted on the other side of the ledger, somewhere afar; it is here as well. In the mosaic that is the state of New Jersey^j, and at Rutgers specifically, the “roots” – of students, staff, and faculty – are indeed “global.” They are the world, and the world to be “reached” is also in our streets and on campus. So the same choice obtains, and again resolves itself – as demonstrated, for example, by the Strategic Plan cited above, when it proposes that a coordinating **Council on Linguistic Diversity** be instituted to “facilitate contacts among students speaking the same language and between linguistic communities sharing similar experiences,” so as to “encourage international, immigrant, and second-generation students to maintain or develop skills in their own languages, enhancing their preparation for a globalized job market.”^k We cannot simply assume that our legitimate demand that all parties to our education contract use English competently places enough of a responsibility (and it is unquestionably one) on our shoulders. We must also acknowledge, as the Plan does, that we have another responsibility, as the “student-centered University” we want to be, toward the languages that our international, immigrant, or heritage students already know and use to varying degrees; or, for that matter, toward the languages that our Anglophone students learned (or not) in previous years and need to study further in order to function in a “global” society, wherever it may take them^l.

Assuming that we do welcome this enlarged, dual responsibility, the two-way street of an education that no longer posits that “English is enough,” much work remains to be done. The languages of the world are both everywhere on our campus^m *and* nearly invisible from an

^j 2013 Census data show that about 30% of the New Jersey population speak a language other than English at home – which is Spanish for above half of them, or 1.2 million speakers. Portuguese, Chinese, Filipino, Italian, Korean, Gujarati, Hindi, Polish, Arabic, Russian and Haitian Creole have between 85,000 and 45,000 speakers each.

^k Rutgers–NB Strategic Plan, p. 36. We are aware that a separate proposal, elaborated by our colleague Paola Gambarota (Department of Italian) in conjunction with the Language Center (<http://wli.rutgers.edu/>), calls for the creation of a **Center for Language and Cultural Literacy**, whose role would match, in many ways, that of the Strategic Plan’s “Council” as we envision it here. The two concepts seem to dovetail in their general spirit. The key is that a **body** be created to both **incarnate** (in the eyes of all RU–NB stakeholders, **including students**) the vital connection between language learning and language cultures, and **coordinate** the initiatives built on that premise.

^l Our survey of RU–NB students strongly suggests as much. See **Appendix A** to this report, which contains a detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of the survey. While our ≈ 2,800 respondents evidently “self-selected” with a strong bias in favor of language study, the emphasis they placed on their own “language cultures” and their need to strengthen them is nevertheless striking.

^m See *Immigrant Students’ Journeys to Higher Education. An Initial Report of a Study at Rutgers University* (P. Guarnaccia, M. Giliberti, C. Hausmann-Stabile, I. Martinez), 2013, p. 18-22 (http://www.ihcpar.rutgers.edu/downloads/acc_study_report.pdf).

academic standpoint, except within the programs that teach some of them, and in some student organizations. The non-English linguistic abilities of our students do not have the intellectual currency they should have; all too often, they merely represent an obstacle (overcome by ESL instruction) – or, when English native or near-native fluency is there as well, an implicit heritage that we have no business engaging on its own terms. Patel is one of the most (if not the most) common surname at Rutgers; South Asian languages are being taught, in our AMESALL departmentⁿ, to about 80 students per year. This number speaks to a human and social disconnect, as well as to an opportunity we could do more to seize. Disconnects of this sort are many, and they carry a risk: that of making a vast, intricate reality ever smaller and simpler in our minds, by ignoring most of the words that shape it in the first place.

This report will argue that the time has come for Rutgers to accept its own “global” culture more fully; and that we should, in particular, take an explicit, official, long-term *language turn*, in a sensible commitment to embracing what (and who) we are. The pages that follow only propose some first steps, but will try to indicate a direction. World languages are but one academic subject among many equally worthy ones; yet they also define our current reality in a unique way, and offer us an extraordinary but mostly untapped educational, cultural, intellectual *resource*. While this is not something that we have adequately measured, Rutgers may well be one of the most culturally *and* linguistically diverse universities in America. That is one of our core strengths; it is indeed time we “reached” out to it.

ⁿ See <http://www.amesall.rutgers.edu/>. At the moment the department teaches Hindi and Urdu as well as Sanskrit, though not Gujarati.

BACKGROUND ANALYSIS

I. CONTEXT

The purpose of this section is to summarize^o a few relevant facts on the state and status of world languages in U.S. K-12 education, higher education, among Rutgers’s peers, and at Rutgers itself. The reasons to foster second-language literacy, the scholarly pursuits (and finite resources) of a large, public research university, and the myriad technical challenges of requirements and curricula do not align spontaneously: there is a lot of space for slippage and conflict, not to mention circular and dead-end arguments. Hence the need to describe the context in some detail and define, however briefly, the “frame” through which the questions we are considering – notably that of a language requirement – come to us.

Languages and K-12 education

Quoting data from the Census Bureau¹, the CLL’s report and its predecessor (published a few months ago as a statistical preface)² remind us that more than 65 million U.S. residents (almost 3 times as many as in 1980, with 43% of them born here) speak a language other than English at home – although only half do so proficiently, and less than 10% of speakers of immigrant descent, according to some studies, remain proficient by the third generation³. On the other hand, of the more than 230 million Americans who only speak English at home (80% of the population over the age of 5), “very few develop proficiency in another language in our schools”⁴. As critics have pointed out⁵, Census data focus on languages acquired and spoken at home, not on those learned elsewhere. Yet other results seem to match the CLL’s assessment: in 2006, according to a General Social Survey, only 25% of Americans reported speaking a language other than English, with less than half of those (43%) stating that they did so “very well,” and only 7% of *those* citing school as the source of their competence, vs. 89% citing their childhood home⁶. By way of comparison, a 2012 European Commission report⁷ on foreign language learning found 68% of E.U. citizens stating that they acquired second language skills at school, and 54% of the same deeming themselves able to hold a conversation in at least one language⁸ other than their own (though only 44% said they could read a newspaper)⁹.

Analysts point out that second-language study is required across E.U. education systems¹⁰ and expanding in elementary schools¹¹, while it is only optional in most American states¹², and not only low, but declining at the elementary and middle levels. According to the Center for Applied Linguistics, the proportion of U.S. public and private elementary schools offering world languages decreased from 31% to 25% between 1997 and 2008; for public schools alone, the proportion went from 24% to a paltry 15%. For middle schools, public and private, it went from 75% to 58%. For high schools of both kinds, it remained both high and stable (\approx 91%); but the percentage of high school *students* taking languages also declined, from 52% to 41%¹³. For its part, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), focusing on K-12 public enrollments in world languages over a narrower period, found that they barely grew, from 18% to 18.5% of all students, between 2004-05 and 2007-08¹⁴.

^o A lot of information was relegated to the endnotes (1, 2, 3...). Footnotes (a, b, c...) are reserved for references of more immediate import.

We should note, however, that New Jersey's results are better than the American norm. Since 1996, the state has had a K-8 world language requirement as well as a high school graduation one, which mandates 5 credits (one year) or "Novice High"¹⁵ tested proficiency¹⁶. In 2005, an official report estimated that as many as 64% of New Jersey's high school students took languages¹⁷. The CLL just found 51.2% of the state's K-12 students enrolled in world language classes (in 2014-2015), a national record¹⁸. The ACTFL's 2008 estimate for public schools was much lower (27.58%, behind Wisconsin and New York, and slightly below the 2005 percentage), but still placed New Jersey above most of its peers, and well above the 18.5% national average¹⁹. Yet implementation is hampered by curricular and budget constraints, and remains very uneven: some districts (the poorer ones in particular) provide only a bare minimum, in terms of actual teaching and hours dedicated to language learning. Further, the state-mandated bar is very low: "Novice High" means that students can repeat stock phrases, combine a few words on their own and "sometimes respond in intelligible sentences, but will not be able to sustain sentence-level discourse"²⁰.

The standard for World Language teachers in New Jersey is not high either: "Advanced Low," a level at which productions remain of limited length, and patterns borrowed from one's first language still prevail. In addition, while dual-language education flourishes on the other side of the Hudson (in NYC at least²¹), it is underdeveloped in our state, which does not certify dual-language teachers. On the other hand, New Jersey became (in January 2016) the 15th state to create a "Seal of Biliteracy"^p, awarded to graduating students who reach the "Intermediate Mid" level (and also meet graduation requirements in English). Again that is not a very challenging bar, just two notches above "Novice High." Still, the Seal is a sign that the state is willing to support and reward WL learning (though only 115 districts out of 600 are now on board with program). The larger context has also become less unfavorable to disciplines other than English and Math, with the federal and local pendulum of education policy swinging back, in recent years, toward a modicum of "well-roundedness" (though "Failing" and "Priority" schools are still required to focus twice as hard on the two core subjects). In sum, New Jersey's accomplishments should not be overrated: progress remains incremental at best. Yet there is some; it is not unreasonable to hope, if not expect, that more could follow.

Languages and higher education

Two questions we face, in the light of such realities, are whether there is something that higher education can do for languages after K-12 education has (in the main) failed to do its part; and whether there is something that Rutgers should do in the somewhat more conducive context of New Jersey. Weak second-language learning is a problem, but is it ours? The CLL's report posits that this is the case when it calls for a national effort, shouldered at every level, and then suggests that requirements (creating them, strengthening them) are the tool of choice for universities willing to get involved. The arguments in favor of postsecondary language learning will be presented below (p. 24-28). For now, let us take a look at the situation of language enrollments and requirements in higher education, while also asking to what extent this situation can be said to reflect (and contribute to) the country's linguistic "deficit."

^p See <http://www.nj.gov/education/aps/cccs/wl/biliteracy/over.htm>.

• Enrollments

According to a 2015 Modern Language Association report^q, the total higher education enrollment in languages other than English (LOTE) more than doubled between 1960 and 2013, through a series of spikes and dips, including a 6.7% decrease between 2009 and 2013. This most recent downturn, which may or may not be confirmed by the next survey, affected 11 of the top 15 languages taught (the exceptions were Korean, ASL, Portuguese, and – to a lesser extent – Chinese); including Spanish for the first time in history. The 50-year rise that preceded it showed strong disparities among languages: apart from the unique case of Spanish (which, recent dip aside, has grown almost five-fold since 1960 and remains more widely studied than all the other languages combined²²), some (Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean) flourished from a modest starting point²³, while others (German, French) declined from their once dominant position²⁴. During the same period, however, the *proportion* of language course enrollments to postsecondary student population²⁵ went down, very sharply: “the 2013 ratio is half of what it was in 1960,” going from 16.2 to 8.1 for (Modern) language courses. Setting aside the 2009-2013 dip, the fall of languages in colleges and universities is not so much a decline as a “falling behind” effect; it is a failure to grow *enough*, to catch up²⁶.

It must be recognized as well that the fate of LOTE studies in higher education parallels that of the rest of the Humanities, which have also gone through a long period of dissonance (overall growth in absolute terms, overall drop in proportional terms), followed lately by a fall on both counts. In terms of majors, a recent report, which found the core Humanities disciplines together, as a percentage of all Bachelor’s degrees, at “their lowest recorded level, 6.1%, in 2014”²⁷, also showed that the total numbers of BA degrees completed between 1987 and 2014 in English, in History, and (at a much lower level to begin with) in the combined LOTE grew overall, and are now declining, in rough unison²⁸; if anything English and History fell more sharply in the past few years. So world languages are not worse off, proportionally. But in real life they are, because they do not constitute one discipline: for the “smaller,” less commonly taught languages (LCTL) among them, and even for not-so-small ones (either as stand-alone departments or as programs within departments), a “decline” of this sort can easily mean death, by attrition or administrative fiat^r. Languages in the plural, *because* there are many of them (each with peculiar traits and interests), are disproportionately vulnerable to negative trends that may not target them as such^s.

Therein lies a conundrum: the higher education avatar of the “language deficit” reflects demographic, curricular, and budgetary shifts driven by other aims at least as much as it does social forces or habits that stand in the way of second-language learning per se. The two problems intersect, but they are not one. In the K-12 world as well, in fact, the demands of larger and new fields, compounded by the need to focus on English skills, put LOTE at a disadvantage that is practical (and financial) as much as it is moral or ideological²⁹. This

^q D. Goldberg, D. Looney, and N. Lusin. *Enrollments in Languages Other Than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2013*. MLA Web publication, February 2015 (https://apps.mla.org/pdf/2013_enrollment_survey.pdf).

^r See the examples – like SUNY’s University at Albany, which got rid of its majors in French, Italian, Russian, and Classics – marshalled by former MLA president Russell A. Berman (<https://www.aaup.org/article/real-language-crisis#.WLDNIhBdpJk>).

^s Conversely, support for languages (in the plural) normally implies support for large *and* (a number of) small ones: institutions like Indiana-Bloomington, where LOTE are particularly strong (which, as we will see, does not mean that some of them are not declining), offer a wide variety of languages “for their own sake,” as it were – including many with low or very low enrollments.

challenge can only be heightened in postsecondary contexts that tend to move away from the generic liberal arts model toward more specific studies requiring a heavy share of credits: most languages are bound to serve as canaries in that particular coal mine. By the same token, it is not self-evident that they should respond (as we believe they should) by affirming their faith in the liberal arts and their solidarity with the Humanities: they could, conceivably, decide to break ranks instead, in an effort to prove their unique usefulness to the fields whose growth has been pushing them aside[†]. In other words, school-based solutions to the decline of languages may or may not be aligned with solutions to the concurrent problem faced by the liberal arts model, and by the Humanities within it. The debate on the LOTE field is riddled with such contradictions; the question is whether we can rise above them, or make them productive instead of destructive.

Now to some specifics. A look at undergraduate enrollment numbers, courtesy of the MLA database[‡], among comparable institutions yields varied results for the last years recorded (1998, 2002, 2006, 2009, 2013). Within the Big Ten Academic Alliance (excluding Northwestern, the consortium's sole private member³⁰), the rise of Korean, Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic was clear (although the last three dipped after 2009 in some schools); so was the decline of French and German, with strong exceptions for either or both (Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota–Twin Cities, Ohio State); Italian showed an even greater mix of growth and loss. Spanish did experience decline after 2009 in 6 schools – not counting Penn State and Indiana–Bloomington, which had exceptional (in fact artificial) peaks in 2009 and 2006 respectively³¹; although lower, their 2013 numbers for Spanish (4,070 and 4,492) remained very high. In addition to those two, four universities (Iowa, Michigan State, Minnesota, Wisconsin–Madison) showed a higher Spanish enrollment in 2013; at OSU it was stable. AAU public institutions outside the BTAA³² also had mixed results, but with a stronger negative trend: Spanish decreased after 2009 (from high and less high numbers alike) at Arizona, Washington, Florida, Kansas, Colorado–Boulder, Iowa State, Virginia, Texas–Austin, Texas A & M, UNC–Chapel Hill, Georgia Tech, Pittsburgh, UC San Diego, UC Santa Barbara, and UC Irvine; remained stable at UCLA and Missouri–Columbia; and grew at UC Berkeley, UC Davis, SUNY–Buffalo, Oregon, and (by a whopping 46%, from a low baseline) SUNY–Stony Brook. All in all, world languages appeared significantly healthier in the Big Ten than among other AAU public institutions, thanks perhaps to a cohort of Midwestern schools that traditionally favor them.

To summarize:

- 1)** “Traditional” languages (Spanish included) were (by 2013) softening or eroding in many of those universities, as they did on average nationally; schools like Florida or Texas-Austin³³ showed a serious downward trend.
- 2)** Again as they did nationally, a number of non-European and less commonly taught languages, led by Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Arabic, were growing consistently; although this rise from a low starting point, and that of Portuguese and American Sign Language³⁴ in

[†] The SUNY at Albany case is telling: the departments mentioned above still exist as providers of language learning (there is a weak, one-course graduation requirement); but their hearts (their majors) have been cut out – a cautionary tale about the kind of survival language programs can expect as a strictly or mostly utilitarian resource.

[‡] Accessible here: https://apps.mla.org/flsurvey_search.

some places, did not compensate the losses in other languages (Spanish aside) combined, let alone the losses in Spanish, which are in the high hundreds if not low thousands by definition.

3) Exceptions to the decline (in every language that suffers it, whether large or small, Spanish or Hebrew, Italian or Ancient Greek) were significant enough to suggest that world languages are *also* susceptible to local trends and influences, whether these be understood in terms of cultural environment (e.g. German in the Midwest, Spanish in the Southwest); in terms of social environment and political circumstances (e.g., 2009-2013 undergraduate enrollments in Spanish went down, from 1,491 to 1,246, at UC San Diego, but up, from 2,358 to 2,843, at San Diego SU³⁵); or in terms of school policy, institutional support, and individual program practices. Iowa, Michigan, MSU, Minnesota, OSU, but also Oregon, Colorado, Missouri resisted or even reversed the erosion, and at times managed to do so across the language board; Stony Brook, where numbers were quite low, seems to have engineered a strong upward swing. While national and regional forces are real, also real seems to be the fact that the condition of languages is, at least in part, what universities, their schools and colleges, and their departments decide it should be.

- **Enrollments vs. requirements**

What such decisions should consist of is another matter. Can a fourth observation be added to the three summarized above? All the institutions alluded to in the last two paragraphs, except Rutgers–New Brunswick and Georgia Tech, have a language graduation requirement: the device seems to preside over a variety of outcomes. It may have helped universities to buttress the growth of Asian languages and LCTLs, to resist the decline of the traditional “big four” (Spanish, French, German, Italian) and others, or to limit this decline when it did occur. *Or* it may have failed not only to prevent, but to limit the decline: figuring this out accurately would require investigations that are beyond the reach of this report. It appears, at the very least, that the presence of a requirement does not guarantee, per se, the health of languages at a particular institution; to the extent that it plays an active role in that health, which can certainly be surmised in some cases, other factors have to be involved as well.

Can we discern a correlation between Rutgers-NB’s near-unique status and its enrollment outcomes? A look at undergraduate numbers from the last three MLA surveys (2006, 2009, 2013) across BTAA public institutions shows that five schools (Iowa, Michigan, MSU, Minnesota, OSU) experienced growth or stability in most (or even all) of their “largest” languages (Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish); one (Nebraska) showed mostly stability; four (Indiana, Maryland^v, Penn State, Wisconsin) went through a mix of growth (often in Asian languages) and loss (often in French, German, or Italian); and three (Illinois–Urbana-Champaign, Purdue, and Rutgers) had mostly losses. At Illinois, only Korean and Portuguese were up, while Russian was stable; the best that Purdue achieved was stability in Chinese, Japanese, and Russian; at Rutgers, only Arabic was up, while French (which had declined in previous years) was stable and Russian dipped slightly. All the other languages listed above (smaller ones as well) incurred significant enrollment losses; Spanish was down 37% at Illinois, 39% at Purdue, and 29% at Rutgers – from

^v The results of our fellow BTAA newcomer were very mixed, with losses prevailing, though only moderate in Spanish (but extensive in French and German, less so in Italian). Chinese and Arabic, on the other hand, were way up, while Portuguese and Russian were stable.

3,082 to 1,927, 3,609 to 2,180, and 1,448 to 1,020 respectively^w. The irony, as we will see, is that Purdue has a fairly strong language requirement (4- to 2-semester proficiency for Arts and Sciences Baccalaureates), and Illinois has *the* strongest requirement in the field (4- to 3-semester for all Baccalaureate degrees, university-wide). So the correlation is not obvious.

It appears that requirements per se do not preclude (nor do they necessarily moderate) enrollment downturns. Do they give more space to breathe, more room to fall, by ensuring higher numbers to begin with? Illinois's and Purdue's numbers in Spanish, Indiana's in French and German show serious decline over time, but the 2013 results hardly look alarming (although they would soon become so if the trend continued at the same rate). About Indiana at least, we can speculate that its strong requirement *and* deep language culture^x, which work in tandem to boost (at a great variety of numerical levels) languages as diverse as Spanish and Turkish, Korean and Swahili, also provide a buffer to the fall of the French and German houses.

By the same token, it seems probable that the absence of a requirement (perhaps compounded by the presence of *other* requirements, as organized by the Core Curriculum) is at least a factor in our **abnormally low** Spanish numbers for an institution of our size, compared with Illinois and Purdue^y (even though losses there were even greater proportionally); to say nothing of Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, OSU, Penn State, and Wisconsin (or Arizona, Oregon, and UNC), where Spanish enrollments, whether trending up or down, are in the 3,000 to 5,000 range^z. Most ominously, our Spanish program's latest total (Fall 2016) fell under 1,000. Yet Spanish is hardly alone in its plight: while our F16 numbers^{aa} cannot be easily compared yet (absent a new MLA update), they also show a new or continuing (and accelerating) downward pull for Arabic, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Persian, Portuguese, Russian, Turkish, Twi, and Yoruba. At the same time, the recovery of Asian languages^{bb} and the resistance of Classics^{cc} confirm that the lack of requirement does not spell doom by itself, even in fragile cases: LOTE keep singing to different tunes. Yet it is not unreasonable to conclude that RU–NB, on balance, makes **decline more dangerous** for its languages: although we can bet that the latest adverse

^w At RU-Camden (which has a 2-semester language requirement) and RU-Newark (which does not), undergraduate numbers for 2006 and 2013 in Spanish were 479 and 430, 244 and 231 respectively; In other words, significantly more stable within their much lower range.

^x See <https://college.indiana.edu/academics/languages.html>. Here, for a wider perspective, are undergraduate numbers for French, German, Italian, and Spanish between 1990 and 2013 at **Indiana** (currently 39,000 overall, 10,000 in A&S), **Purdue**, and **Rutgers–NB**.

IU–B: French 2,687 – 1,188 (-55.7) German 1,212 – 578 (-52.3) Italian 599 – 502 (-16.1) Spanish 3,558 – 4,492 (+26.25)

PU: French 1,614 – 521 (-67.1) German 921 – 438 (-52.4) Italian 173 – 215 (+19) Spanish 3,199 – 2,180 (-31.8)

RU–NB: French 1,016 – 708 (-30.3) German 505 – 200 (-60.3) Italian 561 – 454 (-19) Spanish 1,514 – 1,020 (-32.6)

^y Especially when considered against the following totals (rounded F16 figures): UIUC: 33,500 undergraduates / 11,500 A&S; PU: 30,000 / 9,000 A&S; RU: 36,000 / 20,500 A&S.

^z The other languages do not necessarily suffer from this outsized company, and may benefit from it. Michigan, MSU, OSU or Minnesota show that the 4 “traditional” languages can rise (or rise back) together, along with Asian languages; Purdue, Florida or Texas-Austin show that they can fall together, while Asian languages soar. But the LOTE world is one of variations and exceptions: observed over a couple of decades, for example, it is clear that French at Wisconsin or Indiana, though still healthy-looking in raw numbers, is in steep decline, while Spanish and Chinese are growing; but at Wisconsin German resists quite well; at Indiana, Italian does.

^{aa} Here are the undergraduate totals (not including – except for Sanskrit – single-digit, often intermittent ones, e.g. in Armenian, Bengali, Czech, or Hungarian) for 2013 (as reported by the MLA) and 2016 (as reported by the programs themselves): **Arabic:** 179, 155; **Chinese:** 404, 400; **French:** 708, 535; **German:** 200, 150; **Ancient Greek:** 18, 29; **Modern Greek:** 13, 26; **Hebrew:** 40, 18; **Hindi:** 42, 60; **Italian:** 454, 193; **Japanese:** 294, 421; **Korean:** 182, 232; **Latin:** 63, 72; **Persian:** 17, 9; **Polish:** 0 (39 in 2009), 19; **Portuguese:** 100, 39; **Russian:** 128, 91; **Sanskrit:** 4, 8; **Spanish:** 1,020, 910; **Swahili:** 5, 10; **Turkish:** 29, 17; **Twi:** 53, 36; **Yoruba:** 20, 0. **Yiddish** disappeared before 2013; **Urdu** (22), **Filipino** (35), and **Vietnamese** (10) appeared after 2013.

^{bb} Chinese has corrected its previous dip; Japanese and Korean are growing again; Filipino is off to an encouraging start.

^{cc} See the totals for Latin and Ancient Greek above. The same is true of Sanskrit, and of Classical Arabic (0, 5), even though minuscule numbers are inherently fragile. In other good news, Hindi seems solid; Modern Greek, Polish, and Swahili show some progress as well.

movement is not unique among similar institutions (nor among Humanities disciplines), chances are that their unrequired status enhances our programs' exposure, thus helping to put them in a uniquely vulnerable (and, for quite a few, potentially fatal) position.

- **Requirements**

Let us now focus on the requirements themselves. Once upon a time, “foreign languages” (like the classical languages before them) were supposed to contribute as such to the well-roundedness of higher education. Securing their place in the curriculum, however, meant that their specific learning curve had to be accommodated, so as to bring students to a level where they could begin to do the sort of things they did in English for other classes. Hence a need to underline the importance of the subject *and* to provide for the sequence that its study demands: in LOTE requirements, an academic justification meets a concrete matter of pedagogical logistics. Both rationales work against them today, as curricula have grown more specialized and attuned to the no less (or even more) constraining sequences demanded by other subjects, in the sciences and in professional fields. Accordingly, another MLA survey^{dd} shows that language requirements have been losing ground in American colleges and universities, although the trends affecting **admission** and **graduation** ones have diverged lately. With respect to the former, the MLA found that the percentage of 4-year institutions that require previous LOTE study (typically 2 years of high school) for acceptance into Baccalaureate programs, which went from approximately 89% in 1913 and 70% in 1922 to 33.6% in 1965-66 to a “historic low” of 14.1% in 1982-83, subsequently showed a “steady” though limited recovery, to 20.7% in 1994-95, then 24.7% in 2009-10 (the last year covered by the survey), while the proportion of institutions that do not require but recommend LOTE for entrance jumped from 6.3% in 94-95 to 38% in 09-10. It seems that a growing number of institutions are again paying attention to previous language study as a desirable (though not mandatory) trait in applicants.

Twice as many institutions (50.7%), in 2009-10, had a LOTE degree requirement for BA and BS than had an entrance one³⁶. For nearly half of them, the graduation bar was set at 2-semester proficiency; only 23.7% demanded 4 (for BA programs alone, however, the percentages were 30% for 2 and 40% for 4). Just like their entrance counterparts, degree requirements went down to their lowest proportion ever in 1982-83 (47.4%, vs. 88.9% in 1965-66), then recovered, to 58.1% in 1987-88 and 67.5% in 1994-95. But then they fell again, to a bare half³⁷. Much of this new decline seems due to the shift discussed above: a move toward distribution models in which LOTE are only an option³⁸, driven by “developments of new fields of study within colleges of arts and sciences” as well as by “the growth of baccalaureate degree programs outside [those] colleges [...], where languages have been strongest historically”³⁹. If languages are indeed the canary in the mine, then language degree requirements are the canary's canary; which explains why the CLL is so focused on them. A key point, however, is that serious disparities persist behind the average. Not between public and private institutions (51.9% and 50% respectively), but between small and large ones (52.5% for those with less than 3000 students, 69.2% for those with more than 10,000) and between institutional types (65.6% for doctorate-granting institutions, 43.5% for master's, 50% for baccalaureate). Using a

^{dd} Natalia Lusin, *The MLA Survey of Postsecondary Entrance and Degree Requirements for Languages Other than English, 2009-10*, Web publication, 2012 (https://www.mla.org/content/download/3316/81618/requirements_survey_200910.pdf).

different sample, a 2012 report by the American Council on Education⁴⁰ also noted a decline (between 2001 and 2011), with associate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctorate institutions all falling – but from 27% to 20%, 71% to 65%, 72% to 61%, and 82% to 73% respectively.

Returning to class counts: despite what the Illinois case may suggest, the declines in enrollments and requirements are probably correlated to some extent, with a mounting proportion of students not subject to the latter, or subject only to less demanding forms of them. Professional schools are often exempt (nearly always in such fields as Engineering), even in those universities that maintain a strong requirement for their Arts and Sciences divisions. Within the latter, credit-intensive science programs (BS degrees typically) may be exempt as well, or allowed to set the bar at 2 semesters (i.e. pretty much where the admission threshold is set when there is one, a college semester being deemed the equivalent of a high school year). In which case admitted students will place out as a matter of course: the difference is not big, for a BS program, between a 2-semester bar and outright exemption, as long as placing out is allowed. More generally, a robust entrance criterion will produce many students who also sail above the graduation one when it is not significantly higher (thus never take another language course). Of such cases it can be said that K-12, for those students at least, *has* done its job: not every non-registration in postsecondary LOTE studies speaks, per se, to a “deficit” in earlier language education. Yet a similar effect would have a different meaning in an institution which, having no entrance requirement and a low graduation one, admits a lot of students who already took care of the latter in high school⁴¹.

Be all this as it may, the surveys demonstrate what we already saw: that strong (albeit eroding) majorities of large PhD-granting institutions *do* in fact maintain degree requirements in world languages. A review of our fellow BTAA and AAU members (see the charts in Appendix B) confirms that such requirements are indeed the norm in our world, not the exception, at least as far as Arts and Sciences are concerned. Which suggests, incidentally, a disconnect rather than a continuity between their world and the national problem that the CLL seeks to address. Irrespective of K-12 deficiencies, AAU schools, even public ones, seem capable of finding enough applicants to meet their requirements. Elite universities, by nature, tend to fly above issues that affect the larger population – postsecondary population very much included: there must be a reason why only 20% of AA-granting institutions have a language degree requirement (see e.g. below, p. 45), and that reason is not the rise of cutting-edge professional schools in their midst. We need to keep that reality in mind while assessing the case of our own university against this particular benchmark.

The RU–NB anomaly

12 BTAA public schools out of 13, Rutgers–NB included, require at least two years of language study for admission; at Rutgers, however, the requirement is not universal⁴², and MSU does not have one at all^{ee}. Rutgers, on the other hand, is the only Big Ten school without a language graduation requirement beyond its Honors program. All BTAA universities

^{ee} “MSU suggests two years of a language and looks for the ‘best curriculum’ possible. Estimates suggest that about 85% of our students come in with some language, and often two years of language in high school will equate with a year in college based on our internal testing.” (MSU’s response to our survey, Fall 2016).

(Northwestern included) *except us* demand 4-semester proficiency for graduation in the Humanities – with a slight inflexion (2 semesters in some programs) for Maryland, which, on the other hand, exempts all the sciences. 10 institutions set the bar at the same level for Social / Behavioral Science BAs, and 9 demand 4- or 3-semester proficiency for Baccalaureates of Science in those fields also (Minnesota does not). MSU only applies the 4-semester requirement to its Social Science global/cultural studies majors and minors, and Penn State has a number of exemptions, such as Psychology, Sociology, and Women’s Studies. The same pattern prevails for Mathematical, Physical, and Life Sciences: 4-semester proficiency for BAs in 10 schools, 3- or 2-semester for BS in 9 (sans Minnesota); whereas MSU and Penn State only impose the requirement on a handful of departments (e.g. Math). In sum, 10 universities (counting Minnesota) out of 14, or 9 out the 13 public ones, subject all disciplines within their Arts & Sciences divisions (or separate A & S colleges) to a language mandate.

The situation is more checkered for professional schools: while Communication and Journalism are often in and Engineering almost always out, other areas, like Business or the Arts, are split. In the main, not only are the traditional A & S maintaining requirements, but their professional counterparts do not eschew them as much as the national pattern might suggest they do, although the case of Illinois, the only BT institution with a true campus-wide requirement, remains exceptional (at Indiana, which comes closest, languages are only one of 3 campus-wide General Education options). Such nuances aside, it can be said that 10 institutions (appropriately enough) within the Big Ten, including 9 public ones, share a common profile. MSU, Maryland, Penn State march to a different tune (the latter is also in a class by itself, in that it conceives its requirements à la carte, with exemptions in most sciences yet strong mandates in Business, Communication, the Arts, and even one Engineering department, Computer Science). As for Rutgers, it seems to belong in another league altogether; in practice, however, the Maryland and MSU raw numbers of students required to study languages cannot be far above ours: MSU’s Humanities division has about as many students as our Honors program, and Maryland’s about twice as many (both schools have fairly small enrollment counts, but MSU shows steady growth while Maryland’s record is mixed).

Expanding this review to other AUU public institutions^{ff} leads to an even firmer conclusion. Except at Georgia Tech (which has a *separate* School of Languages, involved in interdisciplinary majors), degree requirements prevail, covering BAs and not unfrequently BS as well (in A & S at least). UNC and Virginia expect the same 4 semesters of both sorts, while Arizona and Texas settle for 2 semesters for BS; Missouri, Kansas, Oregon, Colorado, UCLA exempt the latter; Florida and Washington split the difference by demanding 3 semesters across the A & S board. Apart from GIT, there are no real outliers beside those we have already encountered; only different flavors. For example, while Pittsburgh demands and Stony Brook recommends three years for admission, both only insist on 2-semester proficiency for graduation – but expect it of both BA and BS (so does Texas A & M), with individual BA

^{ff} We did not go in any detail over AAU private schools, most of which have strong language requirements (there are exceptions, like Brown and its “open curriculum”), because their means and student bodies are so different from ours. One could also look, for another perspective, at our immediate neighbors, whether public or private: in New Jersey, Drew (3-semester), Fairleigh Dickinson (2), Montclair (2), Princeton of course (3 or 4, expansion on the way), Rider (2), Seton Hall (4), TCNJ (3 or 2), William Paterson (2), Ramapo (3 for H / SS majors), Stockton (4 for some majors), Monmouth (2, as an option fulfilling two Gen Ed requirements), and Caldwell (1) all have a language standard that applies more or less widely (in most cases to their A&S BAs). On Rutgers–Camden, and on County Colleges, see below (p. 22 and 45).

programs adding further demands. Business schools often accept the requirement, Engineering schools almost never do: against this wider landscape, Illinois's one-size-fits-all 4-semester mark still stands out, in principle at least.

Yet for all this, as we saw, the impact of language degree requirements is hard to determine with precision, because of the maze of factors (linguistic and cultural environments, institutional cultures, the divergent trajectories of individual languages, and above all, perhaps, the proportion of admits for whom the degree requirement is waived or met quickly) that account for incessant variations in this highly scattered field. Such interferences might explain why, for all the might of its requirement, Illinois's enrollments pale before those achieved by Penn State, whose language mandate is much weaker on paper. Then again, Illinois seems an outlier when compared with its Midwestern neighbors (Purdue excepted).

Another complicating element, beyond the aggregate numbers, is their distribution between lower-level (elementary / intermediate) and upper-level courses. Michigan (currently 29,000 undergraduates, 17,000 in A&S) had 1,260 of them enrolled in French in the Fall of 2013, an impressive total (vs. 708 at Rutgers) – but only 184 of them in upper levels, a strikingly low proportion (vs. 137 at Rutgers); whereas at Virginia, which is smaller (16,000 total, 11,000 in A&S), those numbers were 998 and 406 respectively, a truly remarkable result. Both schools have the A & S gold standard, 4-semester requirements applied to all B degrees. Assuming that those strong mandates helped produce such high numbers in the first place, what became of this army of recruits beyond the intermediate level could not be more different: in one case the benefit (to the hosting department) seems to evaporate almost entirely as soon as the requirement is met; in the other, it looks like a great investment toward upper-level courses.

A prudent conclusion is that language degree requirements do not necessarily make strong language programs, but that **there is no such thing, among our peers, as strong language programs without language requirements**, which may help shore them up or give them a higher “floor” to build upon. Nothing is automatic, however, to what they achieve beyond that, depending on student populations and programmatic goals. It appears that requirements work, in any case, as one factor among several, in synergy with other elements whose relative weight remains difficult to sort out. They are not a panacea: the right question to ask about them is not what they accomplish, but what it is that universities seek to accomplish with them. That is the question that will drive our propositions.

Let us conclude this section with a short stroll down memory lane. How did we get to be so different? Circumstances; or, rather, the peculiar Rutgers dialectic of fragmentation and concentration: first diverging parts, then a willful whole. One final irony must be noted here: while we do not have a language requirement beyond our Honors program, Rutgers–Camden does have one, which was recently strengthened; it mandates 2-semester proficiency⁸⁸. In most state university systems, the flagship institution has the strongest requirement: not so on the banks of the Raritan. Why? At the time the School of Arts and Sciences was created (2007), two New Brunswick colleges had a language degree requirement, mandating 4-semester (Douglass) or 2-semester proficiency (University). Rutgers College merely had a language option in its 2-

⁸⁸ See <https://foreignlanguages.camden.rutgers.edu/general-information/language-requirement/>.

course Humanities requirement, plus a “Recommendation on Foreign Language Proficiency,” which encouraged students to reach the 4th-term level. For Livingston and Cook, languages were one option among several in one segment or the other of their distribution requirements. The Douglass and University mandates disappeared upon the advent of SAS. What appeared in their stead was the SAS/RBS Honors program requirement, which was adopted in 2008 alongside the Core Curriculum for SAS and affiliated schools. No larger language degree requirement was proposed by the Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee; a common view was that attempting to include one in the Core would put the entire project in jeopardy.

The Honors requirement, however, is strong by current standards. Its most common version mandates completion of the intermediate level; also offered are reading, speaking (limited to Basic Spoken Chinese), and ASL options. Most importantly, as already mentioned, there is no waiver. Those who place above the 2nd intermediate-level semester (or received AP credit for a course above that level) are still required to take one course, either in that language or related to it: that is close to the Duke standard – but only applied to a fraction of our student body, one not defined by its choice of field, but by its excellence.

As for the Core Curriculum, LOTE courses can serve to fulfill goals pertaining to the Arts and Humanities and Writing and Communication sections, but only on an optional basis; one AH goal, “Understand the nature of human languages and their speakers” (goal “q”) was subsequently tailored around the subject. In other words, with the exception of the Honors program, our evolution follows the national trend noted above, a shift from (partial) mandate to mere option within a distribution model – even though distribution, in our case, formed only a part of the new Core: this hybrid structure may have made the inclusion of a language requirement more difficult at the time; we will argue that the same need not be true today.

II. ARGUMENTS

This report is not the place to detail the arguments most commonly used in favor of learning another language. Before getting to a proposal that assumes their validity, however, it is appropriate to summarize some of them, **from a postsecondary perspective**: to what extent do they justify such learning in a university context, as opposed to (say) elementary school? Beyond the context that frames our collective thinking on the subject, here are some of the reasons why we – higher education stakeholders – might want to think about it some more.

Strategy

One peculiar trait of the American debate on the value of learning LOTE is that it tends to be driven by international crises, with a focus on (and resources thrown at) the “critical-need language” du jour, requiring attention for reasons of national security⁴³. Because we are again living such a moment, it is worth keeping in mind that this argument can be as fickle as it is pressing, and that it runs the risk of casting other languages (a few of them anyway) in a paranoid light – unless it is tied to a larger concept of “cultural diplomacy,” postulating that it is good “to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries”⁴⁴, and that learning the languages spoken by the latter is a key to such understanding. So “strategic” reasons to study languages, important as they may be, should not be separated from deeper cultural ones (and are also mixed with other pragmatic motivations). Yet there is no denying that this approach is the one that insists the most on achieving advanced, “professional-level” proficiency⁴⁵ in a few years of postsecondary study, and on procuring the means to achieve it.

This model assumes rapid, intensive language learning, but of a kind that also counts on the acquisition, as the federal “Flagship program”^{hh} puts it, of “advanced cultural skills and experience living and working abroad” (the program concludes with a capstone year spent abroad), and of “intercultural insights for careers in federal government, global business, nongovernmental organizations, and other fields.” While Flagship sponsors K-12 initiatives as well, its main objective is to foster synergies between the quest for fluency and a relation to the world based on adult competences and interests. Such programs are not for everyone; but they demonstrate in their own extreme way how language learning, in a university context, works hand in hand with “advanced cultural skills” and “intercultural insights.”

Culture

A broader cultural argument posits, more modestly, that stepping out of English is a good way to approach a non-Anglophone culture and begin to understand it on its own terms rather than ours. The preface to this report argued that a “globalized” world makes this form of experience more, not less, necessary from a moral standpoint, and more likely from a practical one: not only are other languages and other cultures (some of them anyway) more accessible

^{hh} Federally funded program for “critical-need languages” (<https://www.thelanguageflagship.org/>). 14 languages in all are currently recognized under this label. Indiana, unsurprisingly, counts among the universities most invested in (and funded by) the program.

than ever before via travel or technology (on which more below), but they are already sharing the space in which we live and work. We can count on them to step out of their native languages and understand us on our own terms; we can also reciprocate and begin to build two-way streets. University campuses (at least when they are as cosmopolitan as ours) are among the places where it makes the most sense to experiment with this kind of reciprocity, not just as a fact of life, but as a cultural decision. “Global roots” are everywhere in cities and suburbs; but on campus their interconnection can, more easily than perhaps anywhere else, become part and parcel of our learning processes.

Success is not self-evident: linguistic fluency is hard to achieve; nor does it imply, by itself, cultural understanding. On the other hand, a form of cultural contact and exchange *may* start happening as soon as we try to “get” what others are saying – through the very sense of what we are missing, somewhere between our own terms and theirs. We do not learn a language as a neutral tool, and then proceed to use it to make cultural discoveries: the latter are occurring, dialoguing and colliding with our own references in the words we learn, in learning those words and how they organize, refer or signify differently from ours. That is also why, even though most of what we learn about other cultures cannot possibly spring from our mastery of their languages, even limited familiarity with one other tongue is a unique cultural benefit, which makes us more conscious of what we miss in all other cases. Studies show that it also increases tolerance generally, in terms of both substance and process, by enhancing “cultural competence” (understanding of other norms) and “tolerance of ambiguity” (when communication feels awkward and has to make do with whatever means are at hand)ⁱⁱ. While college students are not, as adults, in the best cognitive position to learn another language quickly, they *are* in the best position, and in the best place, to learn language through culture (and shuttling between cultures), *including* by way of their own linguistic limitations and the culture-based compensating mechanisms they induce.

New teaching methods based on this premise seek to unify the curriculum and erase the “language-content divide.” The idea is to stop presenting language as a set of technical skills meant to be used later, once acquired; and call instead on the students’ own cultural framework (and ability to step out of it) by offering “advanced” material, such as literature or film, at every stage of the process⁴⁶. This is also what could make college-level language learning an interdisciplinary affair, allowing the content of many other fields to be glimpsed, now and then, through the non-English words that helped produce and define it.

Technology

This perception of language-with-culture is at risk, in the lives we now live, when communication feels immediate to us because it does away with many (not all) mediations; thus losing the rewards of awkwardness and creative ambiguity. A few clicks connect us with a few (not all) of the other sides of the world: voilà, and English will do, or a machine will translate⁴⁷. The benefits are instant; what they filter out is the effort to adjust to something different when we can, and a chance to find out that (and why) we can’t. What is at stake is the layered reality of contact. Today’s technology can both serve language learning and replace it:

ⁱⁱ See A. Thompson, <https://theconversation.com/how-learning-a-new-language-improves-tolerance-68472>.

from the perspective of pragmatic outcomes (e.g. produce an increasingly perfect utterance or text in the target language with little or no human intervention), there is no reason not to prefer replacement – unless something important (to the *kind* of communication envisioned) turns out to be missing. There may be domains where a digital takeover makes sense; but surely there are others where it would be inefficient, insufficient – or dangerous. The argument here is to avoid assuming that everything lends itself to shortcuts.

On this subject as on many others, an interconnected world is bound to bump into the limits of interconnection, which it can ignore or acknowledge. More simply, English speakers can be shown (or not) that the internet knows more than one “global” language, starting with Chinese, Spanish, or Portuguese. Again, to the extent that they teach complexity and a multiplicity of contents whose relations are meant to be challenged, transformed, or combined in original ways, universities are well positioned to demonstrate that “global” contacts do not just happen, courtesy of the devices we use: they have to be conceived, shaped and earned in a slower, more complex fashion – for example by learning the languages that permit them.

Jobs and markets

It is not by chance that the “professional” reasons to learn another language have begun to make this very point, starting with jobs that send people abroad or deal with non-English speakers at home. It has long seemed to American social and economic actors that the opposite was the case: that English would do, with ad hoc assistance from interpreters and translators (and now machines). A one-language “world,” however illusory, carries obvious advantages for business, and powerful forces are still working toward its advent (or assuming we live in it). Yet the pendulum may have begun to swing⁴⁸, with employers increasingly recognizing the value of multilingualism⁴⁹. Instead of assuming that everyone would learn English, they are coming to believe, for example, that managers should know the languages used by their interlocutors, be they clients, associates, or their own co-workers⁵⁰: internal and external communication may be more efficient that way, with (for example) a reduced risk of misunderstanding or alienation. In this light, the cultural benefits mentioned above become professional assets: taking the time and trouble to step out and meet someone half-way, to converse between languages instead of assuming that one will conveniently vanish, turns out to be good for the bottom line.

This incipient movement might accelerate on its own^{jj}. Yet the present moment is ambiguous, and it is again, at least in part, up to us to decide what to make of it. This ambiguity is reflected by the current divide of Business schools between those that mandate language study and those that do not. Beyond mandating, the challenge is to meaningfully integrate LOTE learning into a demanding professional curriculum; and some version of this challenge seems increasingly likely to present itself to fields other than Business. Universities that harbor professional schools could do worse than think proactively about ways to facilitate their choice. As we noted before, successful treatment of this question also has to entail some kind of creative compromise between the “Humanistic” ideal of language learning and the pragmatic needs of specific professions; we do not have to think of these two sides as incompatible.

^{jj} Students who responded to our survey (see Appendix A) certainly felt that LOTE skills would be useful to them from a professional point of view: 78.05% chose “career advancement / competitiveness” among the “potential benefits” of being required to study another language.

Research and knowledge

One variant of the professional argument concerns the transmission of knowledge as such, e.g. in scientific research. Leaving aside the question of how long this imperium will last, there is no denying the dominance of English as the lingua franca of today's science in most fields. Yet concerns are now being raised about linguistic interference with scientific exchanges. In the words of the AAAS's report: "Language barriers impede the progress of science just as they impede business interactions. In one of the more startling recent examples, U.S. and other English-speaking scientists were late in recognizing the severity of the 2004 avian flu epidemic because the initial research on the disease was published in Chinese-language journals. In 2007, when Congress passed the America Competes Act to promote innovation in U.S. science and technology, it prioritized the need to increase 'the opportunities to study critical foreign languages and the context in which the critical foreign languages are spoken; and [...] the number of American students who achieve the highest level of proficiency in critical foreign languages.' This commitment was, in part, a recognition that the nation's competitiveness in scientific and technological innovation would be improved if researchers were able to communicate and translate their findings internationally and to account for the work of scientists who reported their findings in non-English journals."⁵¹

To the extent that this argument (which, as we can see, tends to merge with the "strategic" one) is valid, universities might come to see the value of fostering this kind of competence in the science majors they train; which again implies a reflection, in this case as in that of their professional schools, on the large and legitimate obstacles (curricular ones first and foremost) that stand in the way.

Cognition and education

The case for language learning invariably circles back to arguments of the "cognitive" sort, seen as the foundation to all others. In the strict sense of the term, research is now tracing the effects of multilingualism on a number of brain functions⁵², and has begun to sort out possible consequences of those findings for the processes of second language acquisition and, most importantly, bilingual education⁵³. In a looser sense (pertaining to our conscious use of language rather than to its substructures), "cognitive benefits" are also invoked to argue that with learning another tongue comes awareness that languages are not transparent to reality nor to one another, and that language as such plays a role in determining what and how we think (which is also a key factor in the experience of cultural contact mentioned above). The practice of an alternative modifies the effect of our native language's "filter" on what we know, but also makes us more aware of its presence; familiarity with two languages, no matter how asymmetrical, enables us to think with the help of what differentiates them.

Such benefits increase with proficiency, however, and seem most evident in children exposed to them from the start. Yet research seems to show that a form of them is also found in later learners, who experience what specialists call "bidirectional influences" between their native language and the new one, even "at the earliest moments of new learning"⁵⁴. Be this as it may, we should not twist the strongest, most critical arguments for early-childhood language

education (which urgently needs support) to ask them to build, implausibly, an equally strong case for its higher education counterpart: the postsecondary milieu has to accept (with exceptions) the reality of more laborious learning. Yet the achievement of fluency in two or three magical years is not the only model of language acquisition. There is nothing wrong with the notion of a few years of university study contributing to what is, of necessity, a longer process, and could become a life-long one⁵⁵.

Flagship programs aside, the legitimate drive for superior proficiency can backfire on the short time frame of postsecondary experience, which rarely delivers it to beginners or near-beginners (who form the largest cohort of LOTE students and are least likely to reach the 400 level^{kk}). As far as languages are concerned, universities should expand both their time vision and their sense of solidarity. The early-childhood argument *is* relevant, not because college students are like two-year-olds, but because they *were* two years old not so long ago. If K-12 fails to deliver (and all the more if it begins to improve, as New Jersey shows timid signs of doing), resentment or indifference will not do. Nor is our responsibility to replace K-12, let alone pre-K: it is, rather, to work with institutions and the general public to help improve learning *continuity* – and thus increase the odds that we will inherit a larger number of more competent students.

We (public institutions especially) have a stake in what is being done before we come into play; and we may yet influence it, to a degree. We also have a stake in what will follow us, after we perform our own limited part. College students who only achieve, say, “Intermediate” proficiency did not ipso facto waste their time, even though our objective should be to see more of them go much further. Yet how they end up feeling about this middling result is likely to depend on what they were exposed to, in the classroom and elsewhere: on the tangible, memorable “cognitive” and cultural benefits they received. The more varied and integrated their experience, the more it might help, well beyond the few years we control, with future linguistic progress. College language learning, by virtue of **its own specific strengths**, should embrace this partial, transitory role rather than feel constrained (or left off the hook) by it.

^{kk} Although it *is* important to recognize a phenomenon that is familiar to all language programs: that of beginners or near-beginners who do flourish, advance quickly, and become majors (typically double majors) of extraordinary quality, often with the decisive help of **significant Study Abroad experience**. Such cases will never amount to a majority, but deserve our attention all the same.

PROPOSAL

I. RATIONALE

We saw that the disappearance of a language degree requirement at Rutgers–New Brunswick may reflect a national trend in higher education, but remains, in the world of large public research universities, the true “anomaly” of which the Strategic Plan spoke. We pointed out that this anomaly may be hindering the development of our language programs; at the very least, it makes them more vulnerable (than is the case with most of our peers and competitors, including ones where languages are suffering) to adverse circumstances such as those currently experienced by LOTE studies, along with the rest of the Humanities, across the postsecondary landscape. In short, there is no doubt that Rutgers, in the words of the Task Force on the Humanities, should “more strongly support and promote language education across campuses” than it currently does, “as a way of increasing our international presence and [our] advantage as a [BTAA] institution in a highly linguistically, racially, and ethnically diverse state.”¹¹

We also noticed, however, that language requirements, even robust ones, *do not suffice*, on their own, to ensure the strength of language studies at a particular institution; and we suggested that this discrepancy speaks to the importance of “placing out”: while requirement waivers for those who earn them have a justification in proficiency, they also function as a *regulating tool* that allows institutions to balance support for languages (whether lukewarm or enthusiastic) with other priorities. Absent any other factor, a research university equipped with an admission requirement and attracting high-performing students bound to meet it will find many of them also meeting the degree requirement, upon admission or soon afterwards. In this way, a strong, even “universal” proficiency requirement can become a bit of an illusion: instead of fostering the study of LOTE on campus, it incites applicants to anticipate and clear it in advance. In some cases, a growing proportion of admits could end up behaving in this fashion; as a result, languages would continue to be a good “quality marker” for applicants, yet languish, compared with other fields, within the university itself⁵⁶.

It has not escaped the Commission on Language Learning’s attention that most requirements of this sort work negatively, by allowing people *not* to study languages, as much as (or even more than) positively, by requiring people to do so. Hence the CLL’s embrace of Princeton’s recent efforts to get rid of exemptions and waivers, so as to impose language study on every student. This position has the merit of coherence and candor: there is something disingenuous to the paeans to language learning found on every university website – invariably followed by the business of exemptions and exonerations, whose actual scope is left unmentioned. If languages are so important that one has to mandate them, how come 50, 70 or 80% of an institution’s students can get away with having gone through the Intermediate level in high school and not having to dedicate one more minute, in four years, to the subject?

¹¹ *Report of the Task Force on the Humanities*, p. 17. Further, “because of the significance of language to the humanities fields, where engagement with the writings and cultures of other places and times is at the very heart of our work,” the report urges “the strengthening of support for language instruction,” noting as well that “In an ever more connected world, it is more important than ever that our students have access to the language skills in demand in business, government, and the non-profit sector.” (p. 23)

The current reality, however, as the CLL also acknowledges, is that only wealthy private schools with relatively small numbers of (high-achieving) students can afford to demand language study of all of them regardless of the proficiency level they would start from. The problem is compounded, in our case, by the fact that any requirement beyond Honors has to be created from scratch. Established requirements, as a rule, have been around for a long time; they tend to exist because they exist. Even when they reform or expand, as happened in recent years at Illinois, they do so from a strong baseline (which would also be the case at Princeton should it decide to proceed with its plan). So far as we know, there is no recent precedent for massive requirement expansion at a very large public school, let alone a budget-challenged one trying to remain accessible financially, and where the only existing mandate concerns about 1,600 students out of 20,000+ (SAS) or 36,000 (NB). It is doubtful that such an institution, were it somehow to accept a no-waiver mandate, would withstand the massive enrollment shifts (starting with a few hundred new sections in Spanish alone) and severe curricular pressures that would come with it. So should we begin, instead, by trying to catch up with our peers, i.e. build a more ordinary 2- to 4-semester proficiency requirement equipped with the usual waivers (for anyone placing higher) and exemptions (for credit-intensive programs)?

It sounds more reasonable, if anything because this model is so ubiquitous among comparable universities. Yet delivering it could *still*, given our size and if done too fast, put a lot of pressure on many of our students (who come to Rutgers, despite its admission language requirement, with very uneven degrees of preparedness in this domain, depending on their social background and previous educational circumstances) as well as on their curricular choices (with respect to double majors, minors, and electives especially); on our teaching resources⁵⁷, in Spanish notably; and on existing curricular requirements, starting with SAS's Core Curriculum (which students, in particular, are loath to see expand any further^{mm}, and which presents any extra requirement with a serious structural problem). Assuming that we created such a system without traumatizing the Core, the best way to limit stress for students, teaching resources, and other curricular interests would be to push legions of enrollees out of it. Which begs the question: does it make sense to build such an ambitious structure only to end up exempting half or two thirds of our students *and* risk filling, with the remaining ones (many of them ill-prepared and less than enthusiastic), dozens of low-intermediate language sections with little ulterior benefit? Big numbers in the lower levels and tiny ones above would be a risk, all the more so if the mandate were imposed abruptly: such downsides are likely to be made worse by large-scale ex nihilo creation.

^{mm} See the report from the Core Evaluation Committee (p. 15): "Student responses to this question were consistently or strongly negative. [...] they generally felt that adding a language requirement of two to four courses would create even more scheduling problems than students now face." Hence the CEC's recommendation (III-2, p. 21): "If a language requirement is added to the Core, it should not add additional courses to the Core. [...] we do feel that this option would create further scheduling issues for students, and that any foreign language requirement should substitute for part of the existing Core." Responses to **our own survey** (see **Appendix A**) are more sanguine (though clearly biased in favor of language study). Asked about a language requirement that would be included in the Core Curriculum (or equivalent) *without adding to its total number of credits*, **48.30%** of 2,085 respondents said that it would make completion of the Curriculum "somewhat more difficult" and **16.16%** "much more difficult," but **46.02%** said (in response to a separate question) that it would make it "somewhat more interesting," and **25.36%** "much more interesting." Asked about the *number of additional credits* they would be prepared to tolerate in the Core for the purpose of language study, **18.41%** chose "1 or 2," **44.15%** "3 or 4," and **19.27%** "6 to 8." Where the two surveys dovetail is with respect to the "worst potential problems" caused by a requirement added to the Core: **77.53%** of our respondents selected "The creation of scheduling complications," and **68.14%** "An increase in your time to graduation."

All of this helps explain why the responses to our survey of RU–NB undergraduate programs were marked, overall, by a distinct lack of enthusiasm. Out of 49 receivedⁿⁿ, and despite general sympathy for languages (deemed a good thing for our students and for citizens to have), only 19 answers, including 9 from language and literature programs and 4 from programs already equipped with a requirement of their own (African Studies, Comparative Literature, Latin American Studies, and Medieval Studies), expressed support for the notion of creating one. Among the 19, several, including 4 language programs, had significant reservations about the standard model. Spanish & Portuguese argued strongly against waivers beyond the Intermediate level, so as to allow heritage speakers to fulfill the requirement by taking targeted upper-level courses; Jewish Studies also objected to waivers, out of concern that an imbalance in favor of entry-level Hebrew courses could hurt their upper-level counterparts; Asian Languages and Cultures likewise expressed concern that a requirement would produce more students with low motivation and, combined with other mandates, hinder access to advanced courses; French worried that too many dead-end “Fundamental” sections (between Elementary and Intermediate) would have to be created, to the frustration of students and instructors alike. The strongest support for a regular proficiency requirement (again not without tweaks or reservations) came from those programs (AMESALL, Classics, German, Italian, Russian and Eastern European Languages) whose current capacity would allow them to absorb enrollment increases that are not likely to be huge, while the mandate would help secure some vulnerable offerings and allow a few new ones. The evidence observed elsewhere does suggest that a standard requirement could shore up our language programs in terms of raw numbers at least, notably at both ends of the spectrum: Spanish, which at the moment is not, enrollment-wise, where it should be; and Hebrew (18 enrollees in F16) or AMESALL’s most fragile (though “critical”) languages (Persian, Urdu, Bengali, Turkish, Swahili), which face extinction from one semester to the next for want of enough resources to grow.

The Core Evaluation Committee’s polling of individual faculty^{oo} showed stronger support not only for the cause of languages in general, but for the notion of establishing a requirement: the CEC noted that “nearly 3/5 of [a total of only 202] respondents support a language requirement as part of the Core.” But added: “that view is especially held by Humanities faculty, and it is opposed by a significant number in the other divisions.” This imbalance is certainly echoed (and then some) by our survey of UG programs. At SAS, among the Mathematical, Physical, and Life Sciences (13 of which responded), only Math supported the idea; among the Social and Behavioral Sciences, only Geography spoke in favor (with reservations), while Economics was not opposed (though concerned); among the Humanities (18 of which responded), aside from the programs listed above, only Art History and History expressed active support rather than skepticism or worry. Among the other Schools, opposition

ⁿⁿ We heard from 31 departments or programs at SAS (out of 48): 18 in Humanities, 5 in Social & Behavioral Sc., 4 in Mathematical & Physical Sc., and 4 in Life Sc. We also heard from 4 departments at RBS (out of 7); 4 at SEBS (out of 12); 3 at SCI (out of 4); 2 at SMLR (out of 2); 1 at SoE (out of 9); and from the SSW UG program. EJB and MGSA produced a collective response to the survey on behalf of their UG programs; SoE did so via e-mail correspondence, without formally completing the survey (although one SoE department did). As this report shows in several ways, we also had fruitful exchanges with the Graduate School of Education.

^{oo} See the CEC’s report (Appendices, second survey). The relevant question (27) concerned the sentence “I think it is important that some kind of foreign language requirement be part of the Core Curriculum.” Of the 202 of us who answered, 22.78% disagreed somewhat or strongly, 60.89% agreed somewhat or strongly, and 16.34% neither agreed nor disagreed.

ranged from mild to absolute. The main exceptions were SC&I's Journalism and Information Science – although EJB, for its Planning and Public Policy major, as well as Marketing and Supply Chain Management, over at RBS, indicated some interest along with serious concerns. Aside from the overwhelming objections of credit-intensive programs (which are typically met by exemptions) and those pertaining to the Core Curriculum, the key issues raised by respondents were the poor performance of most adult beginners (compared to children) with respect to second language acquisition and (especially) school-based learning; the adverse effects of yet another requirement on course choices, even in non-credit-intensive programs (for double majors, multiple minors, and curricular creativity), as well as on degree completion; the burden that a requirement could represent for transfer students, with a mere two years, in most cases, to complete their studies; and the hardship that it would represent for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, graduates from high schools with little or mediocre LOTE training – of which we know that there are many in New Jersey. It was argued that the instauration of a language proficiency requirement at Rutgers–New Brunswick would signal (and contribute to) an ongoing shift away from the cause and interests of such students toward high-performing ones hailing from more privileged circumstances, whether in-state or out-of-state.

Our proposals will have to answer these concerns, along with the following questions: assuming that we do want to develop LOTE studies (our students' proficiency in world languages via the latter's presence in their curricula) and support our language programs, is a requirement the best way to achieve this result? If so, of what kind, and in connection with what other factors? How can we create one anyway, in a context of tight budgets, tight resources, and large curricular constraints? A requirement, per se, is not enough to nurture language studies and programs, thus may not be worth our collective effort (even if it provides a higher "floor" to some enrollment numbers) – *unless* it is grounded in a specific environment that makes it meaningful and intellectually productive for all. Indeed, we should think less in terms of how a requirement can change an environment (overnight, by... requiring it to change) and more in terms of how an environment can bring about a requirement: over time, by justifying it, helping to build its foundation, and accommodating, rather than breaking down, a host of formidable obstacles, most of which have strong justifications of their own.

Which brings us to this: **a requirement attuned to Rutgers's actual language culture, to the values and the needs it carries, and to its current practical situation should not follow the standard model; it should not insist on a particular proficiency target, and it should not be waived for students who place beyond the Intermediate level.**

Many of the peer institutions we surveyed about their own requirements, when asked about heritage speakers in particular, responded that such applicants tended to place out and were not on the system's radar screen. We feel strongly that Rutgers should do the opposite; that one of our key objectives should be to encourage heritage and other advanced learners to further improve or complete the literacy they have, be it by taking courses at a much higher level than envisioned by usual mandates. By the same token, we should want to offer exciting language-learning opportunities to beginners or near-beginners, especially when they come to us from an educational environment that featured nothing of the sort, without forcing them to reach a level which, in the context of their other requirements, challenges, interests, and

academic goals would prove all but unreachable. Rutgers, with its highly diverse student population, more than 80% of which comes from New Jersey, **should not separate learners into artificial categories**. If we are going to impose language learning on anyone, let it be on the premise that the progress that is within their reach in a certain time frame (all other factors taken into account) would fulfill it, **irrespective of what that level is**. A traditional requirement sets a given proficiency level as a “cut-off” line beyond which no more learning is needed, yet below which learning is mandatory until the line is crossed. This may make sense when the bar is high (which the standard Intermediate one is not), or perhaps when such a system has been “lived in” for a long time, when it has the merit of existing; but the device’s arbitrariness becomes obvious as soon as one thinks of creating it – on a large scale at least – from thin air.

A no-waiver mandate (i.e. what the CLL hopes will become a new standard, the way of the future) *would* in that sense be more appropriate to our circumstances than a place-out-driven requirement: the latter might, to a degree, boost our language programs’ numbers, but – all other drawbacks aside – would do so at the expense of two (at least) of our constituencies: it would inflict an unfair burden on those students least prepared, through no fault of their own, to shoulder it; and it would sacrifice the interests of advanced and heritage speakers to the logic of enrollment and curriculum management.

The problem, of course, is that the rapid imposition of a no-waiver requirement may be conceivable at Princeton, but is impossible at Rutgers: what we should do is what we cannot do – as long as we think of it as an earth-shattering “game changer.” We submit that such an “absolute” requirement would be best put in place, outside the Ivy League, in an incremental and voluntary fashion; as a project to which people adhere, not as a formula that is imposed on them. That is why **we propose to bypass the standard model that RU–NB dropped 10 years ago**, and work instead – using that accident as an opportunity – at building something that takes the full arc of language learning into account rather than a truncated one. The proposal includes two requirement-type measures along with additional recommendations. But what we would like to see is **a multi-year process**, based on a collective commitment to strengthening not just language studies, but the language culture that is, in many ways, already ours; all of which should be accomplished over time and from inside; organically, and with a strong interdisciplinary outlook.

We recommend that Rutgers-New Brunswick (SAS, but other schools also and ideally the entire campus) set as its goal that, by 2025, at least 50% of our students will engage in world language study at some point during their campus career, in the form of two courses (or credit equivalent) at least, at whatever level happens to be theirs. A goal is not a requirement; and the requirements described below, far from being their own end, are but steps toward this goal, meant to incite or allow progress toward it. Should they be adopted, they are sure to evolve and be revisited later, to better express a modified reality. Ultimately, it could be that Rutgers *will* one day adopt an official school-wide or campus-wide “language requirement” to match what it will have achieved at that point; or not. Either way, the hope is that we will have already built a significant part, perhaps the greater part, of what such a requirement would entail, not because its letter was mandated, but because its spirit grew from some of the initiatives that this report is proposing, and (or) from many others that we did not imagine.

II. LANGUAGE EXPOSURE REQUIREMENT (LER, 1 CREDIT)

Objective

To mark in a tangible way and to initiate what we called a “language turn” in our campus culture, we propose that all Rutgers–New Brunswick Schools adopt a **one-credit language requirement** for undergraduates, to be fulfilled – **without waivers or exemptions**^{pp} – during the first (preferably) or second year of study (or the Junior year for transfer students). This very small requirement should be campus-wide, truly universal: we fervently hope that all our Schools will choose to adopt it, and we propose that it be simply **added** to their curricular requirements, notably to the Core Curriculum followed by SAS and others, where its modest size should not create much disturbance.

The point of such a small requirement is *not*, obviously, to achieve **any form or level of proficiency** on its own steam. Nor is it, however, to provide a mere token – a content-free “language badge.” While there is something symbolic to it, as an expression of our multilingual collective identity and of our new commitment to embracing and upholding it, the requirement’s purpose is both **practical** and **catalyzing**.

Through an array of options and the multi-layered content they will convey, this “Language Exposure Requirement” will create a **culture of exchange** among languages and about language learning. Straddling the divide between classroom and non-classroom activities, it will bring our students’ **multiple linguistic competencies** into sharper academic focus and to the forefront of campus life. It will also encourage those so inclined to develop these competencies further in the direction they desire. The emphasis is on **first or enhanced exposure to language learning**, triggering multilingual awareness and reflection across campus, and providing a platform for further progress.

Form and content

The LER is designed to be as varied as the Rutgers community itself. It will, for example, be met by students who

1) mobilize their own language culture and skills as tutors^{qq}, **conversation partners**^{rr}, **FIGS teachers**^{ss} – thus in a variety of ways, some course-based credits and some not; involving themselves, **as agents rather than recipients** (this, in our view, should very much apply to **international students** as well), in innovative curricular endeavors, most of which already exist at Rutgers – but doing so **for credit**; this could take the form of mutual tutoring, as a “language exchange” between English and another tongue (including one not taught here), or between two LOTE; or

^{pp} Students with documented disabilities would be accommodated: the essence of the 1-credit requirement is that it allows a vast number of options. In all cases it should be possible to replace one that proves problematic with one that suits a student’s particular need.

^{qq} Within (or in the manner of) Learning Centers (<https://rlc.rutgers.edu/student-info/group-and-individual-academic-support/peer-tutoring>).

^{rr} Following the Conversation Tree model (<https://conversationtree.rutgers.edu/>) or, again, within that structure itself.

^{ss} See <https://figs.rutgers.edu/>.

- 2) combine a one-credit, level-appropriate **language “module”** (on the model of those created, several years ago, by the innovative, now defunct Transliterations Project) with a regular course taken in **another field**, so as to add a linguistic dimension (which could be expanded later, should they or their program be so inclined) to the particular content they are learning; or
- 3) learn, not a language (yet), but **about language learning** (a process often hindered or blocked by fears and misconceptions in need of dispelling); and/or explore **their own language literacy and culture**, as multilingual learners with varied levels of competence, of which they could develop a deeper awareness; via **1-credit mini-courses** on those subjects, the content of which would be elaborated by second-language acquisition and bilingualism specialists; or
- 4) meet a **new language** – or become acquainted with **one aspect of it** (for example, learn a non-Latin script) by way of a 1-credit **introductory course**, serving as a preface or appetizer to a fuller language curriculum; or
- 5) participate in a short **Study Abroad** or **Study Away** program (see below, p. 57-60), providing exposure to and interaction with a non-Anglophone culture and community; or
- 6) take a **regular 4-, 3-, or 1.5-credit course**, at a level **matching their placement** (a key issue, to which we will return; see below, p. 46). While the vast majority of such courses would be those taught in a LOTE by our language programs (or online via the BTAA consortium for those languages not taught at Rutgers), a few appropriate courses in English could be accepted as well: e.g. from AMESALL^{tt}, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese’s Translation and Interpreting Program^{uu}, the Department of Linguistics, the Graduate School of Education^{vv}, or the School of Communication and Information^{ww}.

In some cases, the instructors of the mini-courses (3 and 4 above) could be students, courtesy of the FIGS program^{xx}. Some courses would resemble Byrne seminars, with limited registration; or *be* Byrne seminars, including E.O.F./RU-1st ones^{yy}. Others, such as “Learning About Language Learning,” could be delivered online to large groups. Most could be graded Pass/Fail, as the Byrne courses are. Two examples are described below (p. 61-62).

Together, these options will form a “menu” from which students will choose, with the help of advisors, according to their needs, interests, and constraints. Each item (the ones involving teaching especially) will have to be defined rigorously, in order to avoid confusion or devolve into amateurism. Specific Tutoring and Conversation protocols will be set up as well – within reason, so as to preserve those activities’ freer format (a possible model is that of the Learning Assistant program^{zz}). But with credit-bearing come specific obligations, and so a supervising structure should be created under the umbrella of the Council on Linguistic Diversity (or an equivalent body), in collaboration with the units involved.

^{tt} See <http://www.amesall.rutgers.edu/courses/272-285-language-and-globalization>.

^{uu} See <http://span-port.rutgers.edu/academics/translationinterpreting/course-description>.

^{vv} E.g. “Teaching Emerging Bilinguals in PK-12 Classrooms,” I and II (http://catalogs.rutgers.edu/generated/gse_current/pg219.html).

^{ww} E.g. courses on American Sign Language (http://catalogs.rutgers.edu/generated/sci_current/pg155.html).

^{xx} See e.g. <https://figs.rutgers.edu/first-year-students/course-offerings/foreign-language-linguistics>.

^{yy} See <https://byrne.rutgers.edu/seminars/eof-byrne-seminars>; and <https://byrne.rutgers.edu/seminars/ru-1st>. Subjects could invite students to investigate the layering of their own language experience, between two languages or between two forms of one.

^{zz} See <https://rlc.rutgers.edu/la-program-application-information>.

Place in the Curriculum

We recommend that the LER be **added** to the Core Curriculum (or to equivalent requirements for other Schools), *pace* the Core Evaluation Committee's request that we do not expand the Core. We are asking for this one exception, on account of the requirement's small size. Given its nature, and as a true, stand-alone requirement (as opposed to a mere option), the logical place for this addition is section III of the Core, "Cognitive Skills and Processes," where the 1-credit requirement would be introduced as a fourth category, with the mentions "One credit" and "Students must meet this one goal." In the current listing (subject to change), it would become goal "ab," alone in its own category within section III. While it is not our prerogative to write goals, we would recommend simply "**Learn about language learning**," taking our cue from the mini-course that would constitute the heart of the program: every activity involved, even at advanced levels or from a teaching or tutoring position, would have this reflexive quality and benefit. The goal could be dubbed "**World Languages**" (WL).

The WL goal could be fulfilled in the variety of manners outlined above; the simplest would be a specific 1-credit item (whether a course or not) certified for this purpose. 1-credit modules added onto existing topical courses (see 2 above) would be certified for WL on their own, separately from the courses to which they are added (whose own Core goals, if any, would have nothing to do with languages). As for the existing 1.5-, 3-, or 4-credit courses which could also be used to meet the requirement, many of them are likely to be already certified for other language-themed goals: AHq, WCt (when not in English), or any other Core goal newly earmarked for LOTE study (see below, p. 41). Those courses should be proposed for the new WL goal as well (certification should not be automatic, so as to avoid confusion between various optional 3-credit goals and the one required 1-credit goal). Language courses that are not currently Core-certified, such as Elementary ones, should also be proposed for the WL goal. Because any course taught *in* the language (irrespective of subject) could serve for this purpose, we suggest that all such courses be certified **as a class** for the WL goal, from lists established by language programs and submitted to the CRC; whereas courses taught in English would be certified individually, by demonstrating how they would introduce students to the experience of learning another language and/or lead them to reflect on this experience.

An **Advisory Committee**, heir to the CRC's original Foreign Language Advisory Committee, featuring language acquisition specialists among its members, and working in concert with language programs and the Language Center^{aaa}, should be instituted to vet and recommend 1-credit and other items for certification by the CRC (or its equivalent in non-Core-bound Schools), as well as assessment guidelines and procedures.

Implementation

Instruction for the LER should be funded, for the most part, by the tuition generated, with various distribution models depending on the item involved. Who will pay the instructors of 1-credit modules and whether their revenue should go to the School where the courses are based (when not SAS) or to SAS (which will provide the instructors) will have to be determined.

^{aaa} On the role and activities of the Language Center, see <http://wli.rutgers.edu/> and <http://languageinstitute.rutgers.edu/wlmain/aboutwli>.

We would recommend, however, that participating Schools set aside funds dedicated to the requirement's launching and management, which would serve to supplement instructional budgets as needed (in the beginning at least) and provide for the necessary supervising structures (it is critical that the latter be properly staffed). It is difficult to predict the effect so many students taking one-credit items might have on other enrollments (and their tuition revenue), within the total credits taken by each student every semester: will simple addition prevail (for the majority of full-timers who are not up against the credit-per-semester limit, e.g. 20.5 at SAS), or will the credit tend to be subtracted from somewhere? Students should be systematically encouraged to simply **add** this lone credit to their first year's course work.

Over the course of one or more preparation years, new LER creations and LER-related changes to existing options would be experimented with. New 1-credit courses (1, 3, and 4 above) could be offered on their own, in the manner of Byrne seminars, in this interim period. Modules (2 above) will require cooperation between host departments and language programs. Only when a critical mass of offerings is ready to go (or, for a good part, already in use) and backed by appropriate placement testing should the requirement be launched. The following few years would show which items work best, which should be improved or dropped, and what proportion of students choose to "overshoot" the requirement (a desirable outcome) by fulfilling it with a course worth more than one credit. Finally, as important as the coexistence of course-taking and more open-ended activities (which should help mitigate class-creation pressure) is to the concept of this requirement, we recognize that it could create imbalances to the detriment of the former. This will have to be monitored; but we hope that both the inherent appeal of the courses themselves and the high standards set in place for the purpose of Tutoring or Conversation (1 above) will protect the requirement from this kind of distortion.

Development

The LER's second most important feature after its polyvalent character is its **ability to grow** or, rather, **foster growth**: to serve as seed and incentive for further LOTE instructional development pursued **within the units themselves**. In the professional Schools notably, the LER could spark the growth of **program-specific language requirements**. Interested Schools, or departments or programs within them (e.g. Marketing or Leadership and Management at RBS; Journalism and Media Studies at SC&I; SEBS' international programs; see p. 52-56 for details) could start by adding language modules (2 above) to one, then several courses. The next step could be content-specific language instruction in the form of 3-credit courses (e.g. Chinese for Business). As such offerings (in various language iterations) find a home inside a specific curriculum, they could be on their way to providing a suite of options for **a more rigorous language requirement** (3-credit, 6-credit), or result in the adoption, by these units, of the Multilingual Competences Requirement described below, which we recommend be adopted by a wider range of programs, within the School of Arts and Sciences in particular. Such requirements would be self-designed by the units and modular in nature. Over time, students in those fields would not think of doing what they do without factoring in another language. The idea is that units would do this for their own reasons – yet in cooperation with language programs, which would provide instructors and help design both methods and content.

III. MULTILINGUAL COMPETENCIES REQUIREMENT (6 TO 8 CREDITS)

Objective

The second requirement, while designed to complement the first, is very different in that it supposes – to a point – an incremental approach. To a point, because this larger mandate will ideally demand, from the start, a “critical mass” of active support (which can then expand over time), on the part of programs that will not just consent to its existence, but **participate in it**. The assumption behind this requirement is not merely that languages other than English constitute a staple of general education and a good thing to have, as a “well-rounded” person and as a “global” citizen. It is, rather, that higher education comes with **its own reasons to study languages** and creates an array of **new incentives to learn them, in connection with other fields** and their own objectives. To the extent that competence in another language is **desirable in a given discipline**, then that discipline should not just count on the previous or separate acquisition of that competence as something general and generic, but also **require it**.

We propose to turn the accidental absence of a traditional proficiency requirement at RU–NB into an opportunity to build an innovative, more meaningful one **from the ground up**, as an **interdisciplinary project** affirming a common “**language culture**,” partly shaped by and nurtured from the intellectual needs, goals, and resources of our academic community.

Thus we propose a **6- to 8-credit “Multilingual Competencies Requirement,”** to be built over a few years. The implementation principle is the same as for the 1-credit LER: a good portion of the MCR’s tools and content should be put in place first. The overall objective, albeit taken further, would also be similar: the requirement does not focus on achievement of a fixed proficiency; it seeks, rather, to enhance cross-language experience by developing second- (or third-) language skills **at a variety of levels**. We hope that this requirement *will* increase the presence and scope of LOTE studies at RU–NB, but think that its design will allow this increase to be gradual, rational, and evenly distributed. It would be presumptuous of us to make cost estimates or predictions about enrollment shifts; but we think that implementation will neither unduly tax the instructional resources of language programs, nor steal from the curriculum and tuition interests of other departments. Our goal is to avoid reducing the progress we want to see to a zero-sum game, making it instead as collective an endeavor as possible.

Outline

The main features of the Multilingual Competencies Requirement are as follows:

- **It is not imposed across the board**, but only on **those units that will accept it**. Departments or (preferably) divisions choose to take it on. To be fully viable, we expect that it will have to be adopted by both the Humanities division and the Social and Behavioral Sciences division within SAS, with some possible departmental exceptions. We also hope that other SAS divisions and other Schools and their departments will consider the MCR. We envision a process whereby **a division would adopt the requirement**, meaning that all students majoring or minoring (or planning to do so) in that division (with a few exceptions) will have to fulfill it; so it would be in

this case, for all practical purposes, a “Humanities requirement,” or a “Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement,” which would give it clarity and visibility. On this basis it could function as a prerequisite, fulfilled mostly within the Core Curriculum, even though it is not a “Core requirement” (see below). The MCR could conceivably work mostly that way, i.e. as a division requirement independent from majors and minors, and fulfilled within the Core.

- But it is designed to work on a more individualized and advanced basis as well, **at the level of departments**, and in connection with ulterior curricular choices (involving **majors and minors**). Thus the MCR **should also be endorsed by individual departments** within the divisions that adopt it. In cases where an entire division would not endorse the requirement, a cluster of departments could do so and be identified as such, so as to achieve the necessary visibility across its area of implementation. Finally, the MCR is *also* designed (see this outline’s last point) to work as an **option for individual students** in departments and programs where it has not yet been or will not be implemented.

- In all cases, students who complete the MCR will be awarded a **Seal of Multilingual Competence**; the Seal, which is independent from the level of proficiency achieved, will be added to a student’s transcript and/or diploma, or issued as a separate document.

- The MCR **is not proficiency-based: it does not set a target level, and no placing-out is allowed**. Beginners could fulfill it with two Elementary courses (8 credits), and **near-beginners** with two courses designated as appropriate for them. The latter point is crucial to ensure that students who were **poorly prepared in high school** (but cannot be considered beginners because they did get some preparation) be treated fairly under the requirement, which would create an opportunity for progress instead of imposing a punishing proficiency goal. Advanced learners will have to fulfill the MCR too, for example by taking two upper-level courses (6 credits). We would like to include non-Anglophone international students as well, who would meet the requirement via ESL courses, English writing courses, the most advanced courses in their native languages, selected activities like teaching and tutoring – or, if they so desire, two courses in a third language at an appropriate level.

- **It is credit-based rather than course-based**. It can be met, with an average grade of **C or higher**, by way of two 3-credit (hence 6) or 4-credit (hence 8) courses, but with the help of 1-credit items as well (including the one used to fulfill the LER). Not all combinations are permitted, however: a total of 6 credits is allowed *only* via the addition of two 3-credit courses at the advanced level; a total of 7 credits is allowed via the addition of one 4-credit and one 3-credit course, or of one 3-credit course and four 1-credit elements; a total of 8 credits is allowed via the addition of two 4-credit courses, and *required* when one 4-credit course is combined with 1-credit elements: there must be four of the latter.

- Among relevant 1-credit items are **language modules** added to courses in other fields; among relevant 3-credit courses are **content-based** language ones developed jointly by language, culture and literature programs and other departments. The requirement could thus be met in part, in the case of advanced students especially, via continued language learning associated with the disciplines that recognize it.

- The MCR “floats” around the Core Curriculum, so as to expand choice and reduce pressure on student schedules and on the “Arts and Humanities” portion of the Core. We propose added, modified, or implied “language goals” for “Writing and Communication,” “Information Technology and Research,” and “21st-Century Challenges,” so as to allow students to earn credits toward the MCR in more ways than are currently available: while other goals can be met via work done in another language, only AHq and WCt (the latter insofar as it envisions “writing appropriate to a discipline”) were specifically formulated with LOTE in mind.

- **It is not a Core Curriculum requirement**, even though it *can* (and often will) be fulfilled entirely within the Core, via the fulfillment of Core goals. As far as the Core is concerned, the MCR consists of a set of optional goals among many others (contrary to its 1-credit counterpart, which must be met specifically). Students in degree programs that follow the MCR can fulfill it through courses in the Core or, if appropriate, **outside the Core**, with LOTE courses that are not Core-certified; further, some degree programs may decide to require specific language courses as a means of fulfilling the MCR. From this perspective, the requirement is department-based (more precisely: **major- or minor-based**, in several ways, on which more below); **it is not Core-based**, even though the Core will likely remain, to a large extent, the place where (through which) it is met.

- Given its flexible relationship to the Core Curriculum as well as its functional independence from it, the MCR **is also available as an elective option for individual students** in departments or divisions that decline to take it on as a requirement^{bbb}, as those students select courses within or outside of the Core. An incentive will be provided for students who elect this option in the form of the **Seal of Multilingual Competence** mentioned above. To earn the Seal, the students who choose this option will simply need to complete the 6- to 8-credits of the MCR within the parameters outlined for it and at the level into which they place. (As described above, the Seal will also be awarded to any student who completes the MCR as a department- or division-based requirement.) This “personal” option could also be used in the early stages of adoption of the MCR, before it is more broadly implemented by departments and divisions.

Relation to the Core Curriculum

The addition of 6 to 8 “language credits” to the Core could be a serious problem. Leaving aside its consequences for student schedules, various collisions might ensue, threatening to destroy the balance among the Core’s three sections, among section II’s “Areas of Inquiry,” and, most specifically, among tenants of the “Arts and Humanities” Area, thus triggering conflict between disciplines that should support one another in their common time of need. An alternative would be that the MCR simply replaced an equivalent part of the Core, as a caveat from the CEC’s report made clear: “any foreign language requirement should *substitute* for part of the existing Core” (emphasis ours). In practice, with changes in Area distribution within section II (presumably⁵⁸) out of bounds, this would mean taking over a significant part of section III (“Cognitive Skills and Processes”) or gutting section I (“21st-Century

^{bbb} “Individual” does not have to mean “isolated.” For example, the School of Engineering’s curricular constraints are such that the School is unlikely to adopt the MCR. At the same time, it appears that over 100 SoE students take LOTE program courses as electives every semester. It would be entirely appropriate for the Seal of Multilingual Competence to recognize such students.

Challenges”) – arguably the most innovative part of the Core – an approach that diverges sharply from the CEC’s own prudent recommendations. There might be a case for such surgery if those two domains were empty *and* if a language requirement were the obvious, consensus candidate to justify their eviction – which our survey of Undergraduate programs did not exactly establish. Even if those two conditions were met, another bout of curriculum engineering on such a scale might not be advisable: the moral and practical burden on all parties may well exceed the benefits.

What we propose is very different. To make the requirement “float” around the Core (so as to not burden it, nor be burdened by it), we suggest that new goals be created and that the functioning of existing ones be modified. One preliminary question, in this respect, concerns the degree of specificity of the redefined language goals. In a sense, their role is to be interchangeable, so as to give maximum flexibility to fulfillment choices: they would all be essentially the same, only located in different sections of the Core. While the Language Advisory Committee will be the proper body to make such decisions, we do not believe that it would be necessary to go that far: each goal should still reflect the specific theme or orientation of the section in which it is set. Certification *should* be flexible, however: as long as its content justifies it, a language course could be certified for several or even all language goals (but only used, by a student, **to fulfill one of them**, or two when specifically allowed).

Here are suggestions about the “language goals” (in addition to WL, discussed above about the LER, the fulfillment of which earns one credit that can also be used toward the MCR):

1) Goal AHq, which was set at the Intermediate level of language learning, must be opened to the Elementary (e.g. 101) and “Fundamental” (e.g. 121) levels as well, so as to allow the requirement to be met **by beginners or near-beginners**. **Accurate placement** will be crucial, so as to avoid a “placing down” effect, on the part of students seeking to fulfill the requirement below their actual level. It does not seem that goal “q” would need to be rewritten. Its current formulation (“Understand the nature of human languages and their speakers”) is a good match for the approach we are suggesting, based on experience and reflection as much as proficiency in the strict sense. As for the other AH goals for which courses taught in LOTE may be certified (for higher-level courses generally), we see no reason to alter them.

2) Goal WCt, “Communicate effectively in modes appropriate to a discipline or area of inquiry,” is already used for courses taught in LOTE and involving writing, but is currently underserved. It seems that there is much room to grow, and we recommend **a systematic expansion of world language offerings under that goal**. For the sake of clarity, a “**t2**” formula could perhaps be added, which would state more directly: “Communicate effectively in a language other than English,” with some courses certified for writing and others for conversation (for example in languages whose script is much harder to master). In any event, the goal would be set, just as “t” is currently for LOTE courses, at the advanced level (200 or higher, depending on programs). As for the other WC goals (u, v) for which courses taught in LOTE are also certified, there is no reason to alter them.

3) A new goal would be added to **ITR**, “Information Technology and Research.” Or one of the three ITR goals could be rewritten or duplicated so as to allow a “language angle.” We understand that this could be disputed (and was in the past): the connection seems artificial.

Yet technology is both at the forefront of language learning (and retrieval of information in other languages) and at the forefront of language *cheating*, with (for example) students using Google Translate, or harvesting bits of LOTE texts from websites: beyond standard plagiarism, this is one of the avatars of the notion that technology could not just assist, but **replace language learning**. In other words, there is a genuine specificity (riddled with specific challenges) to LOTE “Cognitive skills and processes” within the ITR domain, which could be recognized as such. It would not be a stretch to add a “**y2**” formula along the lines of “Employ current technologies to access information, conduct research, and communicate findings *in a language other than English*”: the addition would not be incidental. Again, advanced LOTE courses could be certified for such a goal, and might in turn be incited to include a specific “use of technology” component.

4) No new goal should be added to the first section, **21C**, “21st-Century Challenges,” because its first two goals, “Analyze the degree to which forms of human difference shape a person's experiences of and perspectives on the world” and “Analyze a contemporary global issue from a multidisciplinary perspective,” are excellent fits – for the form of human difference that is language and for the contemporary global issue that language is also. We do not suggest that just any language course be certified for this section of the Core, which must retain its distinct ambition. But *some* LOTE courses beyond the few that already are could, with adjustments, become good candidates. We suggest a half-way meeting of minds, to the effect that language, culture and literature programs would enhance some existing advanced-level courses with 21C in mind (or create new ones), and 21C, in turn, would officially accept as a premise that **other languages and their acquisition are one of the defining challenges of our century**.

Relation to programs

As mentioned above, not all requirement-fulfilling courses need to be Core-certified, although a majority are likely to be. Contrary to the 1-credit requirement, the MCR does not need to be considered an “early” requirement, i.e. one whose fulfillment would necessarily precede the choice of a major or minor. From the perspective of the latter, the MCR *can* work as a prerequisite, but it does not have to. For that matter, it is already the case that many students still have Core goals to meet in their junior and senior years *and* often use minor and major courses to also fulfill Core goals: thus there would be nothing strange to the notion that some students would wait to complete the MCR along with their major, and then do so either with Core courses or not. Students who choose their major late could wait until they have chosen it to decide, with the help of advisors, how to fulfill the MCR for their new purpose; students who know early on what major they will choose (and would therefore know whether it includes the MCR) could arrange to fulfill the requirement in their first or second year, and then work with their major programs to build more language learning on that base.

To be clear, the MCR is light enough that it stands a good chance to be fulfilled early rather than late, and within the Core rather than outside of it, which *would* allow it to function as a language prerequisite in the case of less advanced students. But **advanced students** who would complete their MCR with **300- or 400-level courses** might want to wait and choose those language program courses that best match their majors, or even courses *within* their majors that have developed language components: specialized 1-credit modules, for example, which in

this case would not be appetizers designed for beginners, but on the contrary would facilitate the acquisition of **specialized knowledge in the target language** (this could take many forms, e.g. include supplemental reading, research, or writing).

A particular application would be to create introductory discussion sections of several popular courses (Introduction to Sociology; Introduction to Politics; SAS Signature courses) in which some of the readings (not all) and the discussions would take place in another language. Students would be required to have studied the language through the advanced intermediate level. Heritage and international students would mix with non-heritage students in these discussions sections. It is important to note that a “language component” of this sort might have no relevance to the Core, remain “invisible” to it, even if it accompanied, say, a SHA-, HA- or SA-certified course. We saw (in the LER section above) that add-ons used to meet the 1-credit LER requirement will need to be Core-certified (for the WL learning goal) separately from the courses to which they are added (and those, for their part, might or might not be certified). By contrast, 1-credit add-ons used to fulfill the MCR in one combination or another do not have to be Core-certified. Specifically, **“late” modules serving to fulfill the MCR beyond the Core** could be added to courses that are certified even though they themselves are not.

These are the combinations that help make the MCR relevant **both to an advanced speaker and learner** (who will use her “language requirement” to enrich what she is doing toward her major) **and to the major program itself**, which would have an opportunity to develop such additions and adjacent tracks without adversely affecting its own enrollments. Conversely, to the extent that some major programs would become committed to this kind of collaboration, their language counterparts would be incentivized to **develop advanced content of their own** to meet them half-way: new courses could emerge from this interaction. In short, both programs would benefit and perhaps even, once the synergy is strong enough, develop **joint majors** on the model of the (currently dormant) French-History one.

No less important for taking advantage of the MCR and giving it the substance it needs are **minors**. Departments seeking to incorporate LOTE features to their content could first experiment with them. A department’s “endorsement” of the MCR could perhaps begin, in this way, on a limited (albeit creative) basis.

Minors and the MCR

Minors provide our students with an opportunity to acquire skills and explore content and methodologies complementary to, or wholly different from, their chosen major(s). Two important pathways to promote the integration of language learning into Rutgers undergraduates’ chosen course of study, while maintaining the inherently exploratory nature of any minor, include: (1) the incorporation of language components into existing minors, and (2) the creation of new, interdisciplinary minors with built-in language requirements or options.

- **Adding language components to existing minors**

Numerous already existing minors in departments in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and professional Schools have a world regional component or global focus, or are otherwise oriented toward preparing students to engage non-English speaking communities. Very few of

these minors, however, have a language requirement or prerequisite or allow language study to count toward the minor. Adding **language prerequisites**, or allowing language courses (**including at the elementary level**) to count toward the minor while also fulfilling the MCR, would greatly enrich student exposure to the world region they study, the mode of global engagement they pursue, or the multilingual world they are likely to encounter as professionals. Given the pedagogic benefits of language study for enhancing global awareness and cross-cultural competency, departments choosing to add language components to existing minors would directly contribute to the RU–NB Strategic Plan’s Integrating Themes of “Cultures, Diversity, Inequality,” “Educating Involved Citizens and Effective Leaders for a Dynamic World,” and “Creative Expression and the Human Experience.”

- **Creating new interdisciplinary minors or majors with language requirements**

Interdisciplinary minors require students to take courses within a single “field of study” (e.g., international and global studies, environmental studies) but across multiple disciplines. In doing so they stimulate creative problem solving and diverse modes of inquiry, using an “exposure” model of learning to open new pathways of discovery and leverage deeper interest in specialization. Incorporating language learning directly into this model of interdisciplinarity can further enhance the internationalization of student learning, deepen knowledge and awareness of linguistic diversity, and build familiarity with different worldviews and modes of inquiry. Two recently added or proposed minors in SAS provide models for the more widespread incorporation of language study, under the MCR or under a **higher, program-specific requirement with a proficiency target**, into interdisciplinary curricula at Rutgers. These might be called the MIGS and MICIS models.

The **Minor in International and Global Studies (MIGS)**, administered through the Department of Geography, aims to “promote an interdisciplinary understanding of global processes and relationships between places, while fostering specialization in a particular world region and its language(s).” MIGS has grown rapidly in its three years of existence (>120 minors as of January 2017) and has found special appeal among students in traditional disciplines seeking to add a global perspective or international credential to their studies. In addition to the requirement that students complete 6 credits of core requirements in international studies and 6 credits in one of three thematic tracks drawn from courses across SAS, MIGS students must complete 6 credits in a Regional Specialization in one of six recognized world regions. A **prerequisite** for completing the Regional Specialization is intermediate college-level proficiency in a language spoken in the student’s chosen area of Regional Specialization (determined by the teaching unit responsible for instruction of that language on campus). The MIGS model is built upon the expectation that “international studies” demands an investment in language study without imposing too onerous a language requirement or requiring students to have “discovered” their region of interest early in their Rutgers career.

The **Minor in Critical Intelligence Studies (MICIS)**, hosted by the Department of Political Science, follows a more flexible model than MIGs with respect to language learning. It encourages, but does not require, language competency, and language courses can be taken for credit toward the minor. MICIS resembles MIGS in that it is an interdisciplinary minor requiring a distribution of credits between core and breadth courses. Unlike MIGS, however, it allows

students to use a second-semester, intermediate-level language course toward the language and cultural competency requirement.

An **expansion of interdisciplinary minors** (in, e.g., Global Health, International Business, Digital Humanities) following the MIGS or MICIS models – each of which require language or cultural competency and incentivize language learning through a proficiency requirement or by counting language credits toward the minor – would help create a platform of interdisciplinary curricula heavily invested in language learning.

Transfer students

We mentioned above that the LER (1-credit requirement) would apply to transfer students as to everyone else. The logic of our proposal, which rejects proficiency cut-offs and proposes instead a requirement that is on the “light” side but admits no waiver, would suggest that transfers be treated like everyone else for the MCR as well: upon joining a program that features the requirement, transfer students would not be exempted on account of proficiency, whether acquired in high school or in the college they are transferring from.

Yet requirements present **unique challenges** – with respect to time to graduation first and foremost – to transfer students, who represent as many as 1/3 of all undergraduates in some RU–NB Schools, and whose specific situations vary widely. Those who come to us with an AA degree (and for whom the Core Curriculum is waived) have already fulfilled requirements of their own; AA degrees in the Liberal Arts and Sciences may well, in fact, feature language requirements (e.g. 2-semester sequences at Raritan Valley Community College or Union County College), or offer world languages as important electives (e.g. at Middlesex County College, Essex County College, Ocean County College, or Mercer County Community College). AA degrees aside, individual cases vary depending on the number of credits transferred (from a minimum of 12 to as many as 90, with the majority of cases falling between 30 and 45). Finally, the MCR is likely to be experienced differently depending on a transfer student’s level of proficiency: one thing would be to take advanced courses dovetailing with other subjects during junior or senior year; another would be to take elementary or intermediate language courses, which might less readily merge with an advanced curriculum.

Taking all this into account, we propose that transfer students joining MCR-endorsing programs (or deciding to “endorse” the MCR individually) be allowed – when transferring a minimum amount of credits to be determined – to meet the requirement by **taking or transferring one 3- or 4-credit language course in addition to** the mandatory 1-credit LER-fulfilling item: so a total of **4 to 5 credits** instead of 6 to 8. The MCR, in other words, would be cut in half for those students; but the LER would not be included in the MCR count. However, we would like to see the **Seal of Multilingual Competence** reserved for those transfer students who **complete the required 6 to 8 credits**, either by performing all the necessary coursework at Rutgers, or by transferring just one 3- or 4-credit course and completing the other one here.

As is the case with other disciplines, courses accepted for transfer for this purpose would have to meet certain conditions, and in particular be comparable, in terms of duration and contact hours, to equivalent RU courses (highly compressed sequences, such as those often

proposed by Winter sessions, would not count). More generally, we should reach out to County Colleges and work with them to ensure optimal complementarity and synergy between their LOTE offerings and ours in the new context created by the MCR^{ccc}.

Placement testing

As already mentioned, **accurate placement** will be vital to the proper functioning of the LER and (especially) the MCR. Placement testing takes place throughout the entire academic year, but it is principally done in the Spring semester, when the new incoming class is scheduled to take exams in Math, English, and “Foreign Languages” (LOTE)^{ddd}. The implementation of the requirements will involve the addition of one or more placement tests that a great number of students will have to take. Without the **necessary personnel** and appropriate backing from **the Office of Information Technology**, the Testing and Placement Program may not be able to cope with the resulting increase of its workload, which includes coordination of exams, the preparation of online and on-site testing facilities, and support to students and departments.

Online placement exams are administered by the Testing and Placement program, using the Sakai NB Learning Management System as the main form of delivery. Most of RU-NB departments use in-house placement tests, but some use commercial versions. One of the main arguments in favor of in-house placement exams is that they allow departments to control quality and content, and can also offer specific questions related to NB-courses, which leads to an accurate placement system tailored to the institution. However, some of this work is done manually; and this would have to be changed. A seamless process **connecting testing platforms with the RU-NB mainframe** will have to be created, to avoid manual work, reduce the waiting time for students, and **strengthen the registration process** by making it impossible to register in courses that are classified as either higher or lower than placement.

Another important area of concern is academic integrity for online placement. The tools that are set in place to avoid it, including an **honor’s pledge**, may not be enough. While not sufficient to entirely address this issue, a special effort will be needed to convince students that we want to place them into courses where they can succeed. Also of concern are online placement exams delivered off-site, especially when students do not have the appropriate basic software or hardware. A reliable physical location, like a language lab, could give the necessary support on site for those students who may need to repeat a test.

In sum, we want to emphasize again that the effective implementation of both the LER and the MCR will very much depend on **a solid, well-supported and staffed Testing and Placement Program**, working with all the language programs to deliver a fair and accurate placement system and procedure. This matter will require our collective attention from the start. A “summit” of interested parties – Testing and Placement, OIT, language departments, the Language Center, and appropriate School authorities – would be very helpful early in the process, to determine what the needs are and design the best strategy to address them.

^{ccc} As the Task Force on the Humanities puts it: “Rutgers has excellent relationships with many community colleges in New Jersey, and some have Rutgers staff on-site. Faculty should work with their community college counterparts [...] to facilitate transfer by advising students on the courses to take before applying for admission to Rutgers.” (*Report*, p. 2-3). We could not agree more.

^{ddd} See <https://oirap.rutgers.edu/testplace.html>; <https://oirap.rutgers.edu/TestingandPlacement/Language%20Testing%20for%20Students.pdf>.

IV. EXAMPLES AND FURTHER PROPOSITIONS

Below are series of propositions pertaining, for some of them, to the 1-credit requirement (LER), though adaptable to the MCR as well; in several cases they have already been mentioned or alluded to. Yet they also **stand on their own**, as initiatives that could and should be implemented separately, in part or in full, even if the requirements are not adopted. They are, in terms of substance, arguably more important than the requirements per se, even though we strongly believe that the requirements would give them much more weight, coherence, and visibility, as well as ensure their durability.

1. Language-based interaction and cultural exchanges among students

Rutgers has a wide range of language knowledge and experience among its undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and staff. Many of our undergraduates are heritage speakers of a diverse set of languages. In a study that Peter Guarnaccia^{eee} did of immigrant students at Rutgers, the relatively small sample of 176 students spoke more than 35 languages in addition to English. These languages spanned the globe. Most students had oral facility in the language; many could read and write as well. We also have a large and growing number of international students, especially from China but again spanning the globe. In addition to the language skills of our language faculty, many faculty members at Rutgers speak another language as heritage speakers or through language study and use for their research and other academic work. Many professional and non-professional staff also speak languages in addition to English; for non-professional staff, improving their English is a high priority.

All of this language ability provides a wide range of opportunities to enhance **language learning beyond the classroom**, under the supervision of the **Council on Linguistic Diversity** proposed by the RU–NB Strategic Plan. In this section we propose opportunities for language-based interaction and cultural exchanges among students, with three goals:

1. Complement and enhance formal language learning beyond the language departments
2. Make learning another language the norm at Rutgers, in line with our “Jersey Roots, Global Reach” motto; and create a multilingual, multicultural environment throughout the University
3. Enhance appreciation and respect for the languages spoken by heritage speakers to reduce prejudice and enhance pride in multilingualism, and to encourage heritage speakers to maintain and develop their language fluency

The following ideas are meant to stimulate new thinking and creativity about language learning at Rutgers:

1. Develop a series of Byrne seminars or equivalent that would focus on introducing students to a new language and culture in a way that would get them excited about

^{eee} See Guarnaccia et al., *Immigrant Students’ Journeys* (http://www.ihcpar.rutgers.edu/downloads/acc_study_report.pdf); and above, note m.

language learning and serve as a gateway to full language courses at the university. These could be taught by faculty in language departments or faculty in other departments who have the requisite language knowledge and teaching skills.

2. Building on the FIGS model, develop a series of parallel seminars that would allow students who are heritage speakers to share their passion about their languages and cultures, much as current FIGS leaders share their passions about different careers. Parallel to FIGS, there would need to be a training program and curriculum development effort to allow undergraduates to be successful language educators.
3. Create and encourage language tables in dining halls and residence halls. These could be patterned after the models used in the Douglass Global Village and Language Living-Learning communities. Heritage speakers and/or international students working in small groups could host meals in their languages as an opportunity for students to be exposed to new languages, to practice languages they are studying through formal course work, and/or to prepare for travel abroad prior to study abroad or service programs (such as GlobeMed, Engineers without Borders, etc.).
4. Expand the “Conversation Tree” model developed by the Rutgers Collaborative to a wider range of settings and languages using Rutgers undergraduates, international students, faculty and staff to facilitate the conversation tables. These “Conversation Trees” could be opportunities to learn and practice international languages and/or in an interchange format provide a chance for participants to learn and practice English. These “Conversation Trees” could serve multiple functions:
 - a. Opportunity for students to practice conversational language and develop their oral abilities as a supplement to language courses, or while not currently enrolled in such courses
 - b. Opportunity to explore languages students are interested in before enrolling in formal courses
 - c. Opportunity to explore and learn languages that are not taught at Rutgers
 - d. Opportunity for heritage speakers to keep their language alive and develop appreciation for language diversity among the Rutgers community (these “Conversation Trees” could be co-organized with Rutgers cultural organizations)
 - e. Opportunity to prepare for Study Abroad by practicing conversational language
 - f. Supplements to co-curricular programs (for example, anthropology field schools, service learning programs, research exchanges) where students could develop some ability in local languages
5. Develop 1-credit language modules attached to content courses (see below), with instructors working in conjunction with heritage speakers and international students.

2. Curricular innovations and incentives for heritage speakers

One of our guiding principles throughout this proposal and one of the major reasons we insist on a no-waiver requirement is the need to affirm and develop RU–NB’s commitment to the many heritage speakers among its students (the survey that we conducted only strengthened our views on the subject). Below, along with a few explanations and statements underlining the importance of this question, are recommendations to that effect, which could dovetail with the requirements proposed above or be implemented independently.

Who are heritage language learners?

“We view HLLs [Heritage Language Learners] as individuals with familial or ancestral ties to a language other than English who exert their agency in determining if they are HLLs of that language. We take into consideration their wider group’s social, economic and political positioning in the United States. We also distinguish between HL [Heritage Language] speaker and HL learners, framing our discussion in terms of HLLs who may or may not be HL speakers. Furthermore, we do not differentiate HLLs in terms of bilingual, foreign, heritage, or indigenous language programs. Instead, our attention is focused on the identity and biliteracy development of HLLs in the ecological system they inhabit.”

“Who Are Our Heritage Language Learners? Identity and Biliteracy,” in Heritage Language Education in United States. N. Hornberger and S. Wang (2008), p. 6

Who are heritage speakers?

“As used in United States, *heritage speaker* refers to individuals from language minority groups who grew up exposed to a minority language in the home and the majority societal language. In essence, this is a bilingual situation, and heritage speakers are bilingual individuals. [...] Two notions related to bilingual competence are language dominance—the idea that one language of the bilingual will be used more often (in specific contexts) and will likely be processed more easily than the other— and proficiency, actual grammar ability, and fluency in the language. ... Some bilinguals may exhibit similar patterns of language dominance but may differ on the levels of proficiency in each language when compared to each other...”

Silvina Montrul, The Acquisition of Heritage Languages, p. 16

The importance of heritage languages

“Heritage language initiatives at schools and colleges are important, in part, because they recognize forms of self and cultural expressions that have been devalued by our educational policies and practices, sometimes [as in the case of Native Americans] to devastating effect.”

America’s Languages: Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century, p. 24

Sources and examples related to the propositions below can be found [here](#)⁵⁹.

Identification process

- Require all languages taught at Rutgers to develop and/or use a placement test; **provide students with a standard definition of HLL** on the placement test, and offer questions that will reveal a respondent’s linguistic profile
- **Distribute a questionnaire during the first week of classes** (in all courses, regardless the level) to gather information about linguistic background, placement results, other language learning experiences and goals for the course they are taking

- **Identify students that are HLL** and send them to Undergraduate Directors for orientation and possible paths available (minoring, majoring, earning a certification), as well as to the **Heritage Language Forum** (see below) if they are not aware of it

Courses

- Create a **special and exclusive track for HLL** that includes a significant and authentic cultural component (1-3 courses)
- Reinforce sociolinguistic appropriateness
- Develop technological competence, a domain in which, in some cases, heritage speakers are disadvantaged in comparison with second-language learners
- Offer courses in different formats (traditional, hybrid, and online course) for additional flexibility
- Design courses that reinforce collaborations (an extremely valuable skill for the 21st century)
- Develop a community-based curriculum that integrates Service Learning and Community Service projects
- In courses that heritage speakers and second language learners take together, create activities, projects and/or requirements that will respond to each population needs by using the same content
- Develop content-based instruction to develop literacy; create courses for specific needs: business, medical, law enforcement, social work, international relations, hospitality, etc.
- Create courses around departmental activities such as Brown Bags, conferences, presentations, invitees, films or cultural topics.

Certificates for the professionalization of heritage languages

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese has created a Certificate for heritage speakers. Here are some details:

- 12 credits are required to earn the Certificate
- The Certificate must be referenced in college transcripts, in a similar way to the notation of the Seal of Biliteracy in high school transcripts
- The structure is flexible; students take a variety of courses from the 100 to the 300 level
- Courses offered for the Certificate must be part of the Major and Minor catalogue
- A 3.5 or better grade-point average for the entire sequence is required
- Balance must be maintained between language courses and more advanced courses

Other innovations to the Curriculum (campus- and department-based)

- Create special Study Abroad and/or Stay Away Programs for heritage speakers
- Create scholarships earmarked for heritage speakers to participate in such programs
- Provide training for TAs, PTLs and instructors on how to develop joint or distinct activities for second language learners and heritage speakers
- Collaborate with the communities and NJ schools to sponsor programs, training and curricular innovations for high school teachers, in collaboration with the Graduate School of Education

- Develop internship-like courses for heritage speakers studying majoring in business, science, art, etc.
- Develop language modules designed for heritage speakers in content courses
- Collaborate with other BTAA institutions that have similar initiatives, and also develop programs that are unique to Rutgers' diverse population.
- Create language conversation exchanges between international students and heritage speakers (see above)
- Provide students with opportunities to interact with their language communities in a formal context, by participating in research projects using the target language and in outreach programs
- Language departments should shift their attention to heritage speakers more and build a robust catalogue of courses that are engaging, develop critical thinking, and help them specifically to develop the necessary skills to be a successful professional
- Seek funding to create open-source materials for heritage speakers. This is an emerging field which, given our diverse population, could potentially make RU the leader in the field of Heritage Language Learning.

Heritage Language Forum

Finally, the creation of a **Heritage Language Forum** on campus, as a specific entity hosted by the new **Council on Linguistic Diversity** (or equivalent), would represent a significant step in addressing the needs of heritage language learners. A small team of perhaps three people with expertise and training regarding heritage languages could act as **liaisons** between students, language departments, the Language Center, and other units, organize events and meetings involving heritage speakers, sponsor workshops on teaching HLLs, provide classroom materials, and develop strategic partnerships within Rutgers (e.g. with such programs as RU-1st and the Rutgers Early College Humanities Program^{fff}) and in the community.

^{fff} About which see <http://reach.rutgers.edu/> and below (p. 64).

3. Modules at work

As explained above, 1-credit language modules are a crucial tool to encourage the study of LOTE from the content-based, interdisciplinary outlook we are advocating. The concept of such modules was first proposed and developed, within the School of Arts and Sciences, by the **Transliterations Project**, which was terminated a few years ago. Modules in Arabic, Chinese, Russian, and French were created for four different Political Science courses; a module in Ancient Greek was likewise added to a culture course in the Department of Classics. Here is how Transliterations described the concept:

Special foreign language modules serv[e] undergraduate students majoring in non-language disciplines. The intent is to allow students to be exposed to foreign languages in the context of their (non-language) classes, on the assumption that even a short encounter with a foreign language benefits a student, particularly if the nature of this encounter is directly related to that student's major. To achieve this objective, the foreign language modules are conceived only in relation to classes actually given in the non-language disciplines, with the teachers of the relevant classes having the final word regarding the content.

A module consists of a small number of sessions of a given class dedicated to the study of some aspects of one or more relevant foreign language(s). Example: three to five out of the usual 28 sessions of a Political Science class on "Islam and Democracy" allocated to the study of relevant terminology in Arabic, with a focus on the history, etymology and possible ambiguity of selected words. The decision on the format, timing and content of the modules is always made by the teacher of the (non-language) course – in this example, the Political Science faculty teaching the class on Islam and Democracy. SAS simply provides and funds the language teacher.

Most module teachers are experienced graduate students from language programs. However, with adequate preparation, graduate students from non-language programs, but with native or near-native proficiency in the relevant language, can be selected as well. As a general rule, priority is given to graduate students from the department where the module is actually taught, thus allowing for a bit of extra student support, both financially and in terms of teaching experience.

A wide range of courses in the Humanities or Social / Behavioral Sciences could lend themselves to this model: an Art History course on French or Indian art could feature one such module; an international relations course might have several, to look at language and politics in relevant countries. There are also opportunities in the Natural Sciences: an Astronomy course might link a Spanish module with study of the major research telescopes in Chile; another example is described below. The possibilities are endless, as independent creations or as parts of a larger curricular endeavor, at SAS or within other RU–NB Schools. We begin with the latter.

Rutgers Business School

In an opinion piece for the *U. S. News and World Report's* Economic Intelligence section, Lisa Chau states: "The benefits of effective communication across multiple languages have long been known by the international business community as an indispensable tool for relationship building." While this is not a new nor surprising idea, providing our Business School students with the opportunity to acquire this skill has its challenges. There are, of course, some students

who are already fluent in a language other than English, via study, living in another country, and/or as a native language. Our target population would be the remaining students.

While we suspect business students would agree that knowing a language other than English is beneficial, we should embark on a path that first introduces them to the current methods in teaching language and provides them with (or requires them to take) a language module associated with one of their classes. This introductory path could encourage students to pursue additional language studies, to earn a certificate, a minor, or perhaps a second major.

The very first step would be to introduce the current approach to teaching LOTE to the incoming student population. This can be accomplished by conducting two or three lessons in a course called Business Forum. This course is actually a professional development forum required by all students who complete a Rutgers Business School major. Most students take this course within two semesters of entering the New Brunswick RBS program. The Business Forum covers skills not generally presented in the regular curriculum such as interviewing skills, resume writing, ethics, presentation skills, writing for business, and talks from industry executives. Learning about language skills, how they are currently taught, and the advantage of knowing a language other than English will fit nicely in this class.

The next step would be to offer 1-credit “business” modules in specific languages. These would be modules focused on essential business language and cultural knowledge in particular countries. The structure and nature of these modules would have to be determined.

If the modules gain traction, the next step would be to tie these modules to the Business Forum class, thus *requiring* the approximately 1400 students entering the Rutgers Business School each year to participate.

A second approach would be to strongly encourage some Business School majors to embark on a minor or second major in language. While effective communication is important in all aspects of business, some may find it more practical. The majors of Accounting, Business Analytics, Finance, and, to some degree, Supply Chain Management are somewhat technical. They may not find the study of language as important as it might be. The two majors of Leadership and Management and Marketing might be good prospects to view the study of language as important in their potential careers. For these latter two majors, a strong effort should be used to encourage these students to either minor or second major in a language.

School of Communication and Information

The School of Communication and Information offers 3 majors (Communication; Information Technology and Informatics; and Journalism and Media Studies), and 2 interdisciplinary minors (Digital Communication, Information and Media; and Gender and Media). Our students are predominantly from SAS, but also include a handful of SEBS students. Clearly foreign language competence and intercultural awareness and sensitivity are crucial in all the fields that our majors and minors go into upon graduation. Like so many Rutgers students, many of our majors and minors speak languages other than English.

The Communication Department offers American Sign Language in summer and winter sessions as a service to the Rutgers community. Annual enrollments average approximately 70 students. While this offering could in theory be expanded to the regular semester as a service to the University, this has not been done so far, since the courses do not count towards the Communication major. Our Information Technology and Informatics majors also learn computer programming languages. In addition to a dedicated course called Intercultural Communication, many courses in our Communication major address explicitly issues of intercultural communication.

4 recently developed courses in the **Journalism and Media Studies department** would benefit directly from the addition of language modules, which could be optional or mandatory.

- **Global Media Abroad:** Students study the media systems and practices of the U.S., the UK and France, in a comparative manner. The course meets weekly for the first half of the semester. Then over spring break, the students, instructor and a Ph.D. student program assistant travel to London and Paris, where they visit media organizations (the BBC, *The Guardian*, France24 television, *The New York Times'* Paris office) and individual media makers (a BBC freelance radio documentary-maker, an editor at *The Telegraph*, a Rutgers grad doing publications and other work for a London gallery, CNN's Paris correspondent, an Afro-Caribbean Anglophone lifestyle blogger in Paris). Students also research and write a piece of journalism while they were abroad.
- **Media and Struggles for Democracy in Central America:** This course looks at the role media, both professional and amateur, have played in democratic movements in Central America. The course meets weekly after spring break and then travels to Guatemala for 10 days after graduation. (Students receive T grades that are replaced after they turn in final projects at the end of May.)
- **Writing the Mediterranean:** The course meets until Spring break. Over Spring break, the professor and 10 students travel to Rome and Florence, where students practice the journalistic craft of travel writing.
- **Global Journalism:** This will be taught as a four-week summer course, designed to help students learn to work as foreign correspondents. They will live and work in Bologna, Italy, along with students from other universities attending this course, which is co-sponsored by ieiMedia, a study-abroad organization. Our students will live in dorms with and be accompanied during their reporting efforts by Italian students learning to be Italian/English translators.

Clearly some form of language instruction (in Spanish, French and Italian) attached as modules to these courses would greatly enhance them⁸⁸⁸.

⁸⁸⁸ See this *Daily Targum* article about SC&I's study abroad activities: <http://www.dailytargum.com/article/2016/04/rutgers-launches-embedded-study-abroad-programs>.

School of Environmental and Biological Sciences

“A major focus for me as we move into a new academic year is to begin in earnest an effort to encourage internationalization of the educational experience for undergraduate students of the School of Environmental and Biological Sciences. What do I mean by that? I mean a curriculum that increasingly takes a global focus—one that aims to connect local understanding and solutions to international issues. I also mean a curriculum that doesn’t stop at the classroom, but that offers our students opportunities to study and work abroad. Our goal should be to graduate students who are global citizens, who have a level of sophistication and knowledge of international issues that will make them competitive with their peers throughout the world. To create an environment that fosters and encourages this kind of learning experience, we should aim not only to increase study and work abroad opportunities for our students, but we should also strive to recruit international students who will add to the diversity of ideas and student experiences on our campus.”

(Executive Dean Robert M. Goodman, SEBS, June 2007)

"Internationalizing the curriculum and providing more global learning opportunities for our students have been top priorities for me."

(Dean Goodman, June 2008)

“The School of Environmental and Biological Sciences strives to provide its students with an international curriculum and opportunities for educational experiences abroad. We have made it a priority to ensure that our students have the background and experience to work in a world made smaller by the internet, and for organizations and companies that have become increasingly multinational.”

(Description of International Programs at SEBS, SEBS Website, 2017)

Since his arrival at the School of Environmental and Biological Sciences (SEBS), Dean Goodman has made internationalizing the curriculum an important goal for the School, as the above quotes illustrate. Providing incentives and expanded opportunities for language study complement these broad goals well. Since SEBS is a professional School, many of its majors are credit intensive and do not provide much room for additional requirements, such as a language requirement. This was made quite clear by the Chairs and Undergraduate program directors consulted in our survey. Expanding language abilities at SEBS, therefore, will require a creative combination of incentives and new programs.

Here are some possible recommendations:

1. SEBS has already made a significant investment in Global Education programs, particularly in the Summer, and has made available scholarship funds for these programs. Every program should have a **language component** equivalent to at least one credit of coursework to complement other aspects.
2. SEBS has a large number of international students, especially from China and Brazil. It should institute a series of **“Intercambio” programs**, where small groups of international students and U.S. students get together to share in the learning of Chinese, Portuguese, and other languages, as well as enhancing the English language abilities of international students. The model typically involves scheduling regular meetings where half the meeting is in English and the other half in the international language. The “Conversation Tree” of the Rutgers Collaborative could serve as a model.

3. SEBS has exchange research programs with Brazil and China where **undergraduates travel to present work at scientific symposia**. A 1-credit option could be added to these to allow students to study the local language as part of the program.
4. Majors such as **Environmental Policy, Institutions and Behavior** and **Environmental and Business Economics** have strong international dimensions. These majors could develop 1-credit modules that would involve language learning as part of their curricula. Several of the faculty in these programs are multilingual and could facilitate these efforts.

School of Arts and Sciences

As mentioned above, modules were actually tried within SAS, in the department of Political Science notably. Similar formulas – e.g., a **translation workshop** added to a course taught in English on the theater of France – are currently in use. Here is yet another possibility.

Department of Earth & Planetary Sciences: Natural Hazards Mitigation and Societal Resilience

A fundamental challenge facing experts in natural hazards related to earthquakes, volcanoes, floods, droughts, landslides, etc., lies in translating their knowledge and their ideas on how to keep people safe into messages that will be not only understood, but also accepted by the intended audience.

This challenge is compounded by language and cultural barriers, and further magnified by the fact that in a large fraction of the world affected by natural hazards the primary language is not English. Examples of earthquake-stricken cities of Haiti and Katmandu, frequently flooded plains of Bangladesh, and tsunami-prone shores of Indonesia speak for themselves.

Building strategies for fostering societal resilience in a world where a growing fraction of the population is affected by natural hazards requires cross-disciplinary efforts of natural scientists (geologists, geographers, climatologists, oceanographers) with the expertise in specific hazards and means of their mitigation, political and social scientists with expertise in development of public policy, and experts in the culture of targeted societies or groups.

At present numerous unrelated courses across Rutgers schools provide elements of knowledge that need to be combined for the purpose of developing strategies for specific hazards in particular regions. Among these are courses in relevant languages and regional cultures.

The proposed cross-disciplinary instruction would pull together necessary components for the goal of developing case-specific strategies for societal resilience. It can take the form of an interdisciplinary seminar, examples of which already exist in the Honors College and the Honors Program, and would target a region, or a specific hazard affecting multiple regions.

A key goal for the proposed instruction activity would be the development of recommendations, policies, and strategies that would be based on regional cultural awareness, and formulation of **public safety messages that would work in languages used in the region**.

4. Study Abroad

as a Component of Language Enrichment Environment at Rutgers

As a first approach to understanding the role of study abroad in American higher education, it is helpful to begin by considering the statistics, both on the national level and here at Rutgers. Due to a number of targeted efforts in legislation, such as the Paul Simon Study Abroad Program Act and the recommendations of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, and long-term initiatives, such as the Fulbright Program, 100,000 Strong initiatives, and the Generation Study Abroad Pledge, to name a few, research is clearly indicating both a rise in participation rates and a discernable shift in type of program participation.

According to the Institute for International Education's most recent "Open Doors" report (2016), which reports on data from the previous year (2014/15), the number of U.S. students studying abroad has shown a continual increase over the last 30 years. IIE totals participation at 313,415 American students receiving academic credit last year for study abroad, which is an increase of 2.9% from the previous year. Study abroad by American students has more than tripled in the past two decades; however, the rate of growth has actually begun to slow in recent years. The increase was about 52% in the past 10 years, from about 205,983 students in 2004/05, and only 16% over the past five years, from 270,604 in 2009/10⁶⁰.

With these numbers in mind, and although the total number is at an all-time high, it is still the case that **only about 10% of all U.S. undergraduate students**, including student enrolled in community colleges, will study abroad during their academic career. For Rutgers, this number is even lower: **under 2% of our undergraduates study abroad**. Compared with our BTAA peers⁶¹, Rutgers has a relatively low participation rate considering our overall student population and university size. However, a number of factors (e.g. geography, diversity, demography, an historical under-emphasis on the strategic importance of study abroad) challenge Rutgers in way not equal to our peers.

In light of this data, it has been part of the Center for Global Education's mission and charge to increase participation and access to study abroad. Research and assessment practices are beginning to prove what study abroad professional already knew about study abroad, that engaging in an international experience supports a variety of beneficial outcomes, such as personal growth, academic gains, professional and interpersonal skills, greater international awareness, and cross-cultural understanding. The Task Force's survey (see its Qualitative Review in Appendix A) shows both a clear understanding of the benefits of study abroad among our students and a strong demand for expanded access.

Among other opportunities, **study abroad can be leveraged to support the goal of incorporating a meaningful language requirement into the curriculum and a student's course of study**. Language learning and language immersion have long been considered one of the cornerstones to study abroad program development and certainly the building blocks to its proliferation across the landscape of higher education in the United States. Given this foundation, many traditional study abroad opportunities capitalize on this history. As this

requirement is contextualized, it is important to note that study abroad offers a platform for those studying a language and for true language learners, an opportunity for broader engagement in local communicative practices, for mindfulness of their situation as peripheral participants, and a for more nuanced awareness of language itself. A student's language laboratory becomes the city, the café, and conversation on the street.

As study abroad becomes a wider (optional, integral, or even mandatory) part of our curriculum offerings, it is important to acknowledge the potential of such an evolution for its beneficiaries, but also the barriers or even misconceptions about Study Abroad that may stand in the way. As a result of Rutgers' 50-year tradition with organizing and operationalizing Study Abroad programs, our portfolio includes over 150 different programs and supports students going abroad in many different capacities. CGE offers over 60 active exchange (direct-enroll) partnerships for semester- or year-long study abroad. The university has supported over 60 different faculty-led programs that span a wide range of disciplines and Schools.

Crucially, Study Abroad has become agile to the Rutgers course schedule, offering short, four-week programs that run over the Summer, as well as a number of embedded classes that fit in with the Spring term and travel over Spring break or Summer to complement the semester coursework. Rutgers also capitalizes on the Winter session and offers one- to two-week courses that occur in late December or early January. Internship, service-learning, experiential-learning, and research can be found as a part of our program offerings; in 2015-16 over 30 programs were offered which supported language study. In this spirit, short trips and stays are an excellent fit for **the menu of 1-credit items** described above, either as stand-alone elements or as **modules** added to relevant courses in the form of travel complementing their content.

The most common barriers to further development concern academic progress and financing. We join the Center for Global Education to stress in the strongest possible terms that **Rutgers must find ways to address and support the following:**

- 1. University-sponsored scholarships, possibly awarded competitively to students who engage in serious language study, and proceed to study abroad in a country of their language learning.**
- 2. Formal recognition of Study Abroad experiences that are shorter than 1 semester** (e.g. focused courses taken at institutions in other countries, and at least partially in another language)
- 3. Expansion of collaborative links with universities and colleges in countries with relatively low cost of living**
- 4. Development of programs that qualify students for aid and scholarship opportunities** (e.g. 6-credit options for financial aid, program of 28 days for minimum Gilman scholarship eligibility, "Critical Language" programs and scholarship).

5. Study Away

A different approach to the immersion experience

“A national strategy to broaden access to language education for every student in the United States, as preparation for life and work in a global twenty-first century, must also promote opportunities for students to travel, experience other cultures, and immerse themselves in languages as they are used in everyday interactions and across all segments of society.”

America’s Languages, p. 27

Study Away is an alternative to Study Abroad for students who have financial constraints but wish to experience another culture. Such programs already exist, at Michigan State University notably^{hhh}, and foster language learning in several ways. They offer the opportunity for students to **be immersed and use a “world” language inside the U.S.**, by interacting with speakers around the nation. For many students, a Study Away program is the perfect option to help them encounter another language and culture, putting them on a personal path towards internationalization without requiring them to leave the United States.

Students travel to different locations within the U.S. and its territories to expand their language skills while they take content and/or language courses and obtain a rich experience beyond the classroom. Beside New Jersey, possible locations include Florida, Illinois, New York, Texas, Arizona, New York, California, Washington DC, and Native American Nations. In some cases, students can benefit from an experience that is essentially similar to immersion programs abroad (e.g. Native American Nations, Puerto Ricoⁱⁱⁱ, some areas of California, etc.).

A flexible structure is needed in this kind of program, which must incorporate **community engagement, service learning, and engaging approaches for language learners** regardless of their linguistic profile. In most cases, for language learning purposes, students with different language profiles (heritage speakers, students holding a Seal of Biliteracy, native speakers of the language and students placed in intermediate language courses) can expand their linguistic knowledge and communicative competence inside and outside the classroom.

Students who may wish to learn a new language in Study Away programs can be exposed to language learning, depending on the language, location, and course. While Study Away programs designed around language learning are of limited appeal to language learners at beginner’s level (first-year instruction), they offer very interesting options and combinations for student at the intermediate and advanced levels (second-year and beyond).

With programs running during Winter session, Spring Break, end of May and beginning of June, students will have multiple options to have engaging experiences and benefits beyond the classroom context. Students can earn 1 to 6 credits depending on the duration and location of the program. We would recommend that programs be limited to 1 to 3 weeks, so as to offer a low-cost but extremely meaningful experience. In addition to helping fulfill the LER or the

^{hhh} See <http://www.socialscience.msu.edu/students/experiential-learning/study-away/>. This was discussed in a meeting of the Big Ten Alliance Language Coordinators (Chicago, October 28, 2016), from which we are taking some of the ideas found here.

ⁱⁱⁱ See <http://www.cal.msu.edu/currentstudents/studyabroad/study-away-programs/puerto-rico>.

MCR, Study Away programs should count toward CC credits, minors, majors, and certificates. They should be run by the Center for Global Education in collaboration with language programs, with the support of SAS and other Schools. We should also collaborate with other BTAA institutions, such as MSU, which offer programs of this type.

Setting up a Study Away program would include:

- Creating a flexible structure of course components to allow maximum participation for students with financial constraints or advanced transfer students who wish to have an immersion experiences
- Identifying locations in the U.S. that are conducive to LOTE learning and allow students to demonstrate language skills inside and outside the classroom
- Developing curricula providing at least 3 hours per day of language learning / exposure during the duration of the program
- Working with diverse populations and cities in New Jersey, and in particular with RU-Newark and Camden and their surrounding populations, to build Study Away opportunities and content related to the life of these communities
- Creating discipline-specific course content to which a Study Away component could be added as language module
- Developing outreach programs and course components that foster 21st-century skills such as Service Learning and Community Service; with internships, independent courses, and collaborative projects to that effect
- Creating cultural components, similar to excursions in Study Abroad programs, using the target language and relevant assessment tools
- Developing financial incentives such as awards, scholarships from sponsors and involved parties; also keeping in mind that programs that are worth 6 credits or more are eligible for financial aid.

Here is summary of possible Study Away program components:

- A language-learning course, esp. for intermediate/advanced students (2-3 hours)
- A content course (preferably with an interdisciplinary approach) related to the language community of the selected location (2 hours)
- Cultural events in the target language and discussions (2-3 hours)
- Community Service / Service Learning / Internship component (2-3 hours)
- Language Pledge to use target language while interacting with the community
- For NJ communities specifically: immersion-like experiences to engage with the communities and connect them with RU (from conducting empirical research in the target language under a faculty mentor, to serving as a Rutgers Language Ambassador, providing Rutgers information in the target language and helping prospective students and parents during orientation, etc.)

Study Away provides students with unique, low-cost, meaningful opportunities to acquire and demonstrate linguistic *and* cultural competency in and outside of the classroom, by taking language courses and using the same language to work with and learn about particular communities. Our student survey reveals strong potential interest in such a program.

6. 1-credit courses: two examples

The 1-credit “mini-courses” which may be taken to fulfill the LER are *not* concentrated or accelerated versions of regular 4- or 3-credit languages courses. Following the model of Byrne Seminars or equivalent (i.e. not restricted to first-year students), or developed online for larger audiences, they are built around concepts appropriate to their size, and they set highly specific goals for the students who take them, whether beginners or not. They may assume a workshop format, as is done, for instance, in a French course based on theater improvisation.

Whatever the formula, the objective is simple yet crucial: it is to **reveal** something – about languages, and about the process of their acquisition – to students who did not necessarily realize it was “out there” or, more often than not, already present in their own minds. Two examples are sketched out below: first, the rationale and goals for a “Learning about language learning” course, which could be taught (in English) online; second, a sample syllabus for a “Byrne-like” introduction to Chinese dialects.

Learning About Language Learning

Proposal by Liliana Sánchez (Department of Spanish & Portuguese)

Depending on their high school experience, students can develop notions about language learning that are based in traditional methodologies and result in both unreasonably high *and* low expectations about the way in which their minds acquire languages. For example, they think that they can develop oral proficiency by reading and writing only (an unreasonably high expectation), and that it is impossible for them to acquire automatization through conversation with native or heritage speakers, because the latter speak too fast (an unreasonably low expectation about their own abilities).

This course introduces students to the processes involved in language learning in instructional contexts. It addresses the cognitive and social skills that underlie the acquisition of new vocabulary, syntactic structures, and ability to engage in language interaction. It teaches students how to understand phenomena such as activation and inhibition of languages, differences between comprehension and production skills, automatization for processing purposes, and how these factors affect the development of language proficiency. The course also addresses key concepts in social interaction, such as cooperation and the use of shared knowledge, which are at the basis of language acquisition. Finally, it introduces strategies based on current knowledge of cognitive and social studies of language acquisition aimed at helping students maximize their potential as language learners.

How to Learn a Chinese Dialect Introduction to Cantonese / Taiwanese / Shanghainese

Proposal by Richard VanNess Simmons (Department of Asian Languages & Cultures)

This 10-week course has no prerequisites. Knowledge of Standard Chinese (aka Mandarin) is helpful but not essential. Native and heritage speakers of the dialects are welcome

to take the course and to serve as linguistic informants or tutors; and doing so they would also fulfill the LER. The course will introduce the fundamentals of a single Chinese dialect over the course of 10 weeks, meeting one 80-minute period per week. Dialects to be taught will vary by semester and will include Cantonese, Taiwanese, Shanghainese, and possibly others. By the end of the course students will be able to carry out simple conversational tasks in the language, write the dialect in Romanization, and be equipped with the skills to continue to learn the dialect on their own. Successful completion requires regular attendance and participation, as well as composing and presenting a short conversational skit at the end of the course.

Textbook(s) and resources

(not required to purchase; sample, illustrative selection for Cantonese)

Dana Scott Bourgerie, Keith S T Tong, and Gregory James. *Colloquial Cantonese: The Complete Course for Beginners*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Learn Cantonese at <http://cantonese.ca>

Wikibook course on Cantonese at <https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Cantonese>

Course Schedule

Week 1: What is a dialect? Standard and non-standard dialects

Sources for learning dialects: textbooks, the internet,
and, of course, the people who speak it

Developing conversation skills: Introductions and talking about people in the dialect

Week 2: Speaking and writing the dialect

Romanization, tones, and an introduction to the sounds of the dialect

Developing conversation skills: Counting and money

Week 3: How to learn a dialect from its speakers—writing down what you hear

The Chinese writing system and the dialect

Developing conversation skills: asking questions

Week 4: How to listen and learn—makeshift and bridging strategies

Developing conversation skills: Transportation and asking directions

Week 5: The calendar, time, and weather

Developing conversation skills: Discussing one's schedule

Week 6: Food and drink

Developing conversation skills: Ordering in a restaurant

Week 7: Shopping

Developing conversation skills: Asking prices and bargaining

Week 8: Sports and entertainment

Developing conversation skills: Talking about the game or the show

Week 9: Education and employment

Developing conversation skills: Talking about school and career

Week 10: Final presentations of student-designed conversations

BEYOND THIS PROPOSAL

In order for Rutgers to take a leadership role in the study and teaching of world languages, and in order to dramatically increase the percentage of our students who speak and study them, we propose to complement the requirements and related ideas presented above with a suite of programs, initiatives, and incentives guided by the same spirit. The goal is to stimulate a vibrant “global culture of languages” at Rutgers that spills out beyond the classroom to enrich students’ lives and values.

Publicity, fundraising, development

Rutgers should endeavor to increase the visibility of language learning and acquisition as one of the key goals of liberal education as it conceives it, standing at the heart of the mission of the university. To that effect, we should:

- Seek a **marketing budget** to publicize Rutgers’ distinctive goals and achievements in creating a “culture of languages.” Posters, flyers, brochures, multi-media and video, news releases, etc., should accompany the development of our initiatives.
- Work with **Undergraduate Admissions** to make a concerted effort to recruit a larger percentage of students who would like to major or minor in languages other than English, by making potential applicants aware of the breadth and originality of our “language culture” and, for example, organize campus visits to that effect.
- Work with **the Rutgers Foundation and the Center for Global Education** to find donors who would help us develop multiple new scholarships (akin to merit-based ones such as the Presidential Scholarship and the Carr Scholarship) to attract students interested in world languages, and to expand the reach of Study Abroad.
- Work with **Departments** in which the relevant “critical need” languages are taught to determine whether applying for support from the **Language Flagship program** would be advisable.
- Work with **Career Services** to systematically inform our students about career choices and employment opportunities involving world languages, and more generally about the growing relevance of languages other than English to the professional world.

Resource-sharing

We should work **more systematically with our BTAA peers**, and in particular with those most committed to world languages (such as Indiana–Bloomington), not only to share information or teaching resources on an ad hoc basis, but to develop **mutual awareness and a common academic culture** on the subject, along with specific synergies and complementarities with respect to LCTL offerings and online courses.

Additional curricular program

We should create a **“Global Language Scholars” certificate** (to be defined: it might require, for example, four language courses; a 3-credit Study Abroad or Study Away experience; and a 3-credit campus-based language service internship as a language tutor, ESL tutor, etc.), to acknowledge and reward the students who study languages and would like to go beyond the proposed requirements and the MCR’s Seal of Multilingual Competence without seeking a minor or major.

Co- and extracurricular programs

As already suggested above, we should launch a vast campaign to develop and support **experiences outside the classroom** that allow students to build on their classroom-based language learning. The for-credit, outside-the-classroom elements we described with respect to the LER must be part of larger landscape, weaving the use and exploration of languages into the social life of our students through clubs and residence halls, under the umbrella of the Council on Linguistic Diversity. To that effect, we should:

- Increase university financial support for **Language Living and Learning communities**, and explore the creation of new communities of this kind; create new **“Language Houses”** with apartment-style learning near the College Avenue Campus.
- Increase university financial support to expand the number and visibility of **language clubs** on campus.
- Create daily **“language tables” in each dining hall** for **multiple different languages**. Through the creation of a new **“Global Diner”** program, encourage faculty, graduate students, and members of the community to join these language tables on a regular basis. Seek ways to make practicing a language other than English outside of class **the norm rather than the exception**.
- Seek increased financial aid and scholarships, as already mentioned, to support Study Abroad and Study Away experiences.

Outreach to New Jersey schools, students, and educators

Last but most certainly not least, we should work with the **New Jersey Department of Education** and its **World Languages division**, with our own relevant units (the **Graduate School of Education**, the **World Languages Institute**), with **K-12 institutions and educators** across New Jersey, and with **high schools** in particular (as we already do in a variety of ways), to encourage K-12 students to learn languages other than English as early and thoroughly as possible, and to encourage districts and the state to provide them with the resources to do so.

A special effort should be made, in concert with Rutgers’ own **REaCH** program^{jjj} and the World Languages division, to reach out to schools in **less advantaged districts**, where language learning is least developed and suffers from a severe lack of resources. The requirements proposed above are designed, among other things, to **avoid penalizing students** who come

^{jjj} Cited above; see specifically <http://reach.rutgers.edu/responses-to-reach>.

from such districts. But more should be done (and Rutgers should do its part) to spread the benefits of language learning across all areas, and help disadvantaged districts to close the gap.

As Rutgers develops its own “language culture” as an integral part of both student learning and student life, it should provide inspiring models, to high school students notably, of the kind of academic and social experience they will be able to take part in during their college years (whether or not they envision majoring or minoring in the subject); all the more so if they devote themselves to learning or perfecting a language other than English beforehand. We should make it clear that we are not developing this in isolation, but on the contrary in the hope of creating a genuine **synergy** with New Jersey’s own educational goals, commitments, and progress, as embodied by such initiatives as the Seal of Biliteracy.

To that effect, a **World Language Education Outreach Committee** should be created, as an expression of all relevant RU–NB entities. This Committee would report to the Chancellor and to the Deans of our Schools, and be tasked with fostering and coordinating collaboration with the NJ Department of Education and our K-12 partners across New Jersey; so that all parties may work to build, together, the “language culture” of the future.

The Language Requirement Task Force is very much indebted to Chancellor **Richard Edwards**, who gave us our mission and a generous chance to fulfill it; to **Peter March**, Executive Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, who sent us on our way with as much support as we could possibly need; and to **Jimmy Swenson**, Dean of Humanities at SAS, who put our committee together and did all he could to sustain its progress.

We would also like to thank the following individuals, who supported our work in myriad ways and contributed countless insights in meetings or conversations: **Carolyn Burger** (Manager, The Language Center); **Mary Curran** (Associate Dean for Local-Global Partnerships, Graduate School of Education); **Robin Diamond** (Assistant Dean and Director, Office of Academic Services, SAS); **Uri Eisenzweig** (founder and Director, the Transliterations Project); **Deborah Epting** (Associate Vice President, Enrollment Management); **Eric Garfunkel** (Vice President for International and Global Affairs); **Kenneth Iuso** (Executive University Registrar); **Paul Johnson** (Associate Vice President, Enrollment Management); **Barbara Lee** (Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs); **Rick Lee** (Director, Center for Global Programs and Relations); **Courtney McAnuff** (Vice President for Enrollment Management); **Phyllis Micketti** (Director, Undergraduate Admissions); **Eugene Murphy** (Assistant Vice President for International and Global Affairs); **Lenore Neigeborn** (Associate Dean, Office of Academic Services, SAS); **Christelle Palpacuer Lee** (Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Education); **Linda Schulze** (Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs); **Ben Sifuentes-Jáuregui** (Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Academic Affairs); **Kelley Sokolowski** (Undergraduate Registrar, Office of the Registrar); **Barry Sopher** (Chair, Core Evaluation Committee); **Thomas Stephens** (Chair, New Brunswick Faculty Council; Faculty Director, The Language Center); and **Julie Traxler** (Assistant Dean and Director, Office of Academic Services, SAS).

Our warmest thanks go as well to the **Undergraduate Directors** who responded to our survey with great generosity, frankness, and precision; to the **School Deans** who did the same; to the **Department Chairs, Administrators, Committee members, members of the faculty**, and over **2,800 students** who took the time to meet with us or respond to our queries and surveys with precious information and advice. This is true par excellence of our colleagues from Language Departments and programs – **Undergraduate and Language Instruction Directors** particularly –, whose powerful ideas and candid opinions were a constant inspiration to us.

We are especially beholden to **Lauren Franson** (Associate Director, Study Abroad), **Susan Lawrence** (Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education, SAS), **Carolyn Moehling** (Acting Chair, Core Requirements Committee), and **Vidhi Waran** (Senior Program Coordinator, Testing and Placement), who were beyond generous with their time and expertise; without their advice and insights, this report would have missed many a crucial mark.

David Greer (Director, World Languages, New Jersey Department of Education) was kind enough to travel to New Brunswick to give us an education on the state of language studies in New Jersey's primary and secondary schools; and for that we are most grateful.

Victoria Porterfield (Research Analyst, Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning) not only made our student survey possible, but improved it immeasurably, and ran it flawlessly. She also created the graphs and data files that gave us the best possible chance to make sense of its oceanic results. We cannot thank her enough for her invaluable contribution.

Our deepest gratitude goes to the Research Assistant who helped with many tasks, gave us the benefit of his expertise as a bilingualism and SLA specialist, produced some great ideas of his own, and composed a remarkable report on our student survey: **Benjamin Kinsella**, Doctoral candidate in the Department of Spanish & Portuguese.

François Cornilliat, Chair; Distinguished Professor of French, SAS – Asher Ghertner, Associate Professor of Geography, SAS; Director, South Asian Studies Program – Peter Guarnaccia, Professor of Human Ecology, SEBS; Investigator, Institute for Health, Health Care Policy and Aging Research – Jennifer Jones, Associate Professor of History, SAS; Dean, the SAS Honors Program – Vadim Levin, Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences, SAS – Jenny Mandelbaum, Professor of Communication, SC&I – Martin Markowitz, Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, RBS – Richard VanNess Simmons, Professor of Chinese and Chair, Department of Asian Languages & Cultures, SAS – Andrew Vershon, Professor of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, SAS; Principal Investigator, Waksman Institute of Microbiology – Celinés Villalba Rosado, Assistant Teaching Professor and Language Program Coordinator, Department of Spanish & Portuguese, SAS.

ENDNOTES

¹ See <http://www.census.gov/data/tables/2013/demo/2009-2013-lang-tables.html> for the most recent numbers.

² *The State of Languages in the U.S.: A Statistical Portrait* (henceforth *SL*), Commission on Language Learning, AAAS, 2016 (<http://www.amacad.org/multimedia/pdfs/publications/researchpapersmonographs/State-of-Languages-in-US.pdf>).

³ *SL*, p. 6; *AL*, p. 22.

⁴ *SL*, p. 3. Cf. *AL*, p. 1-3.

⁵ See e.g. Michael Erard, “Are We Really Monolingual?”, *The New York Times*, January 14 2012.

⁶ As reported in <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/07/13/learning-a-foreign-language-a-must-in-europe-not-so-in-america/>. GSS survey: <http://sda.berkeley.edu/sdasearch/?study=gss10&query=language>. A 2001 Gallup poll found a similar proportion (<http://www.gallup.com/poll/1825/about-one-four-americans-can-hold-conversation-second-language.aspx>); so did a 2013 YouGov poll (<https://today.yougov.com/news/2013/07/31/75-americans-have-no-second-language/>).

⁷ See *Europeans and Their Languages*, 2012 (http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf).

⁸ English for 38% of E.U. citizens. 25% of the same say they can converse in two languages other than their own; 10% in three.

⁹ The U.S. / E.U. contrast is real enough: there is no need to overstate it and describe Americans as second-language illiterates left in the dust by Europe’s accomplished polyglots. For one thing, English is the most studied language in Europe (and mandatory in 14 E.U. countries): the strongest driving factor behind multilingualism over there is the biggest obstacle to its development here, irrespective of policies on either side. English is seen as the language “by far the most useful” (*Europeans*, p. 69; see also *Key Data on Teaching Languages in Europe*, http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/key-data-2012_en.pdf, p. 11, 12, and 103). Second, that barely more than half of E.U. citizens can converse in another language is no towering achievement, given the small size and high degree of interconnection of the countries involved. Less than half can do so in 9 countries, including Spain (46%), Italy (38%), and the UK (39%). The Netherlands is at 94%, but Germany at 66%, France at 51%, and Hungary at 35%. The E.U. average went down 2 points since 2006; many countries show either no change or a decline. While the U.S. undoubtedly lags, the truth is that both sides of the Atlantic should do better, which suggests that school requirements (early ones especially) are likely to help, but may not suffice to achieve wide-scale multilingual fluency – although there are countries where “nearly everyone has learnt” second-language skills at school: Slovenia, Sweden (92%), Malta, the Netherlands (91%), Denmark (90%) (see *Europeans and Their Languages*, p. 102). It helps to be small. That language policy is hard is also confirmed, in a very different context, by China’s aggressive efforts to mandate the study of English; see e.g. <https://chinachange.org/2011/08/30/is-teaching-english-in-china-a-waste-of-time/>. Conversely, how “a lack of language requirements [...] impact[s] language acquisition” deserves more study (*SL*, p. 20), and a new survey is under way (see <https://www.americancouncils.org/foreignlanguagesurvey/>). Still, that there is an impact (for primary and secondary education at least) seems quite probable.

¹⁰ Except in Ireland and Scotland, where the main focus is on native bilingualism. About other regions of the world, we should at least mention that Canada, Brazil, Russia, Israel, India, China, Thailand, Japan all require second language learning in primary and/or secondary education (Australia and New Zealand do not), with an average starting age ranging from 8 to 11 (vs. 14 in the U.S.); see University of Maryland’s National Foreign Language Center’s *Resource Guide to Developing Linguistic and Cultural Competency in the U.S.* (http://www.nflc.umd.edu/publications/the_teachers_we_need_Resource_Guide.pdf), p. 9.

¹¹ From 2004 to 2010, the percentage of elementary students *not* learning a foreign language went from 32.5 to 21.8 (*Key Data*, p. 10). In the U.S., that percentage was 85% in 2008 (*Foreign Language Teaching in U.S. Schools*, Center for Applied Linguistics survey, 2010, p. 27).

¹² See <http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbquest3NE?rep=HS11> for details on high school graduation requirements by state (2007), as well as the NFCL's *Resource Guide*, s. 3, p. 3). In 2010, only 8 states and the District of Columbia required foreign language study in high school. A few more may have joined them since.

¹³ *Foreign Language Teaching in U.S. Schools*, p. xv, 22-23; cf. *SL*, p. 9; *AL*, p. 8-9.

¹⁴ See the ACTFL's charts on <https://www.ced.org/pdf/actfl-k12-foreign-language-for-global-society.pdf>.

¹⁵ See https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf, p. 9, and <http://www.state.nj.us/education/cccs/2014/wl/WL-1-NH.pdf> for New Jersey's interpretation.

¹⁶ See <http://www.nj.gov/education/aps/cccs/wl/>; <http://www.nj.gov/education/cccs/2014/wl/WL.pdf> for details.

¹⁷ See <http://brrsd.org/Forms and Documents//Curriculum/World Language/A Report on State of World Languages Implementation in New Jersey.pdf> (p. 16).

¹⁸ See *The State of Languages*, p. 10 (from the new American Councils K-16 survey). 8 states and DC are at 30% or higher; 20 are at less than 17%, and 8 at less than 13%. See also <http://www.humanitiesindicators.org/content/indicatordoc.aspx?i=159>.

¹⁹ <https://www.ced.org/pdf/actfl-k12-foreign-language-for-global-society.pdf>, p. 3. The CLL (p. 10) puts it at 21.5% for all K-12 in 2014-2015.

²⁰ *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*, p. 9.

²¹ <http://schools.nyc.gov/Offices/mediarelations/NewsandSpeeches/2015-2016/Chancellor+Farina+Announces+38+New+Bilingual+Programs.htm>

²² Total 2013 enrollments in Spanish: 790,756; in all other languages combined: 771,423. In the last 4 years covered by the survey, however, Spanish enrollments declined (by 8.2%) for the first time ever.

²³ Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and especially Korean exhibited vigorous growth, in terms of enrollments and institutions offering them, though Arabic, Japanese, and to a lesser extent Chinese were touched by the dip also experienced by Spanish after 2009. A special case is that of the American Sign Language, whose numbers went from negligible in 1990 to over 100,000 in 2013, which made ASL the 3rd most studied language after Spanish and French.

²⁴ French and German fell in the 1980s and 90s, then stabilized. They are now eroding again, albeit slowly. Italian grew overall until 2009, but is now weakening too, as are Russian and Modern Hebrew. Latin and Ancient Greek are also in decline.

²⁵ It is noted that "Students taking language courses [...] may enroll in more than one language class per semester and therefore be counted more than once in our survey. [...] Nonetheless, the ratio of language course enrollments to total students registered [...] is a figure that over time can serve as an important indicator [...]" (*Enrollments in Languages*, p. 3). The report further calculates that the 1960-2013 "growth index" for higher education enrollments in Modern (excluding Classical) languages was 248.5, vs. 495.7 for total enrollments.

²⁶ While comparison is difficult (for want of equivalent figures, and because the systems are so different), it is worth noting that European universities (which often favor specialization over general education) are undergoing a sea change courtesy of the continent-wide "Bologna process" (<http://www.ehea.info/pid34247/how-does-the-bologna-process-work.html>): degree alignment, student mobility (see <http://www.erasmusprogramme.com/>), and multilingual instruction. English is the greatest beneficiary of this metamorphosis: hence conflicts (see <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/should-non-english-speaking-countries-teach-in-english>; <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/european-universities-hobbled-by-language-laws/2020050.article>), and a number of official efforts to avoid an "English only" model (see the 2004-06 "action plan" (http://www.saaic.sk/eu-label/doc/2004-06_en.pdf), the CELAN project (<http://www.celan-platform.eu/>), and the ENLU project (<http://web.fu-berlin.de/enlu/>)). Where this experiment is going is not certain; but the U.S. seems to be moving in the opposite direction, away from the "well-rounded" ideal its higher education system has long embodied.

²⁷ See <http://humanitiesindicators.org/content/indicatordoc.aspx?i=34>; the number is 9.9% when "area and gender studies, non-vocational religious studies, and some art studies" are included. All sciences combined are at 34.6% (with natural sciences growing strongly), business and management (which are falling as well) at 18.5%.

²⁸ English and History experienced much steeper growth in the late 80s and early 90s, then depression in the mid-90s, then renewed growth until the present dip. Taken together, LOTE show a very muted version of this dramatic curve; individual languages are another matter.

²⁹ While K-12 and higher ed concerns are not aligned and STEM-minded universities may balk at having to do, for languages, the job that K-12 is not doing, it is also possible that languages are hurt in K-12 by the growing focus on STEM in the first place (see *AL*, p. 9). Yet the most relevant factor there remains the joint prioritization of ELA (English Language Arts) and Math.

³⁰ Now that the University of Chicago has left the consortium.

³¹ Spanish undergraduate enrollments at Penn State show an all-time high (8,464) in the 2006 survey, due, we were told, to a perfect storm of three reasons (Spanish, alone among languages, had moved to a hybrid format that year; 20% more students were admitted that same year; and a new rule had them complete the language requirement during their first year). Numbers went back down progressively to a more normal level. At Indiana, the 2009 survey showed likewise an off-the-chart number in Spanish (7,601) and many other languages, but the reason there, according to officials, was a mere computation error: other schools in the IU system and various non-course items were counted by mistake under the Bloomington entry. Setting aside this faulty number, IU–B Spanish enrollments, which had dipped in 2006, showed a strong recovery in 2013.

³² All BTAA members also belong to the AAU, except Nebraska–Lincoln.

³³ The decline of world languages at UT–Austin may have something to do with the decision (dictated by concerns over 4-year graduation rates) to reduce the time allowed to fulfill the requirement, from two years to one year.

³⁴ ASL is not offered everywhere (or it is offered only in limited settings, such as our SC&I’s Winter and Summer sessions, with about 65 students enrolled per year); but 2013 numbers hit at least 100 in eight BTAA public universities. They were strongest, however (in the mid- to high triple digits), at Indiana, OSU, and Minnesota, where languages are strong across the board.

³⁵ The relatively low enrollments in Spanish at UC institutions compared with CSU ones (and with their peers at the highest echelon of other state systems) may be an effect of reduced diversity in the former (see <http://reappropriate.co/2014/03/the-effect-of-prop-209-on-uc-admissions-and-campus-diversity-edu4all-noliesnohate-sca5/>).

³⁶ This gap may be more apparent than real, in the sense that admission requirements, when they exist, are often school-wide, while graduation ones tend to be narrower. Further, institutions that have only the latter use them to recommend (though not require) languages for admission.

³⁷ Which suggests that some institutions add an entrance requirement without adding (or even while dropping) a graduation one. They might consider LOTE literacy a good predictor of student quality yet not care to further improve it, not because their attitude suddenly shifts from respect to contempt for languages, but because of the growing demands of other fields.

³⁸ “In 1994-95, [LOTE] were an option in the distribution requirement at 16.9% of institutions,” vs. 32% in 2009-10. Meanwhile, “the percentage of institutions without either a language requirement or [such an option] rose only slightly [...], from 15.6% to 17.3%” (*MLA Survey*, p. 1).

³⁹ *MLA Survey*, p. 3.

⁴⁰ See *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2012 Edition* (ACE), p. 12 (<http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Mapping-Internationalizationon-US-Campuses-2012-full.pdf>).

⁴¹ E.g., Virginia Tech does not have an entrance requirement in LOTE (only a recommendation), but warns that a number of its College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences majors include a graduation one, met by “three years of high school”: the degree requirement is announced and envisioned from an applicant’s perspective, even though it will strike 4 years hence and concern only a fraction of those admitted.

⁴² At Northwestern (BTAA’s one private school), the College of A & S and the Schools of Journalism, Education, Communication, and Music require 2 years of language for admission, but the School of Engineering does not. At Rutgers–NB, the Schools of A & S, Business, and Pharmacy require 2 years for admission; Engineering, Nursing, and SEBS do not; Mason Gross recommends but

does not require. At all other BTAA institutions except MSU, the admission requirement is universal (with 1 or 2 additional years often recommended, university-wide or for certain units). Wisconsin requires 2 years but strongly recommends 3 to 4 years (which most of its admits have).

⁴³ See Gail H. McGinn, “Foreign language, Cultural Diplomacy, and Global Security” (CLL briefing paper) about such efforts.

⁴⁴ Mission statement of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (<https://eca.state.gov/>); quoted by McGinn, p. 2.

⁴⁵ See the ACE’s report on Internationalization: “Certainly courses that address global issues are important, and their increasing prevalence in general education requirements is a positive development. However, foreign language instruction and other courses that primarily feature non-U.S. perspectives provide important background and cultural knowledge to contextualize the broader content covered in global issues courses. If current downward trends continue and fewer institutions require these types of courses, the depth and nuance of students’ understanding of current global issues and challenges may be compromised.”

⁴⁶ See e. g. *Advanced Foreign Language Learning: A Challenge to College Programs*. Ed. H. Byrnes and H. H. Maxim. Issues in Language Program Direction (AAUSC, 2003); J. Swaffar and K. Arens, *Remapping the Foreign Language Curriculum: An Approach Through Multiple Literacies* (New York: MLA, 2005); H. W. Allen and K. Paesani, “Exploring the Feasibility of a Pedagogy of Multiliteracies in Introductory Foreign Language Courses.” *L2 Journal* (online, 2010); and “Beyond the Language-Content Divide: Research on Advanced Foreign Language Instruction at the Postsecondary Level.” *Foreign Language Annals*, 45 – S1, Summer 2012, 54-75.

⁴⁷ See e.g. L. R. Summers, “What You (Really) Need to Know,” *New York Times*, January 20, 2012; and six responses gathered in the *Times*’ subsequent “Room for Debate” (between January 2012 and May 2014).

⁴⁸ See e.g. <http://www.renewoureconomy.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/NJ-Biliteracy-Brief.pdf> (similar briefs were produced for Georgia and Massachusetts); and <http://newsroom.niu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Current-and-Future-Need-for-Bilingual-Employees-9-10-2015.pdf>. See also *America’s Languages*, passim.

⁴⁹ See e.g. C. M. Rodríguez, “Language Diversity in the Workplace.” Yale Law School Legal Scholarship Repository (1/1/2006) (http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5334&context=fs_papers); and *The Bilingual Advantage. Language, Literacy and the US Labor Market*. Ed. R. M. Callahan and P. C. Gándara (Multilingual Matters, 2014).

⁵⁰ See D. A. Porras, J. Ee, P. Gándara, “Employer Preferences: Do Bilingual Applicants and Employees Experience an Advantage?” *The Bilingual Advantage*, 234-257.

⁵¹ *America’s Languages*, p. 2

⁵² From the better “executive control” and “enhanced information processing” of bilingual children to the substantial delays in the onset of Alzheimer’s disease observed in bilingual older adults: see J. F. Kroll and P. E. Dussias, “Language and Productivity for All Americans” (CLL briefing paper).

⁵³ One key is that “all the languages that an individual knows and uses are processed in an integrated language system in which there is extensive interaction.” (Kroll and Dussias).

⁵⁴ K. Bice and J. F. Kroll, “Native language change during early stages of second language learning.” *NeuroReport*, 26 (2015), 966-971.

⁵⁵ On all this, see the ACTFL’s compilation here: <https://www.actfl.org/advocacy/what-the-research-shows>.

⁵⁶ Encouraging a process of this sort could be a perfectly rational choice, especially to anyone not buying the CLL’s case or the arguments of the previous section. Such a position would not rule out a demanding language graduation requirement, as long as the latter is conceived as a generic recruit-and-triage device rather than as the keystone of a distinct academic construction.

⁵⁷ Part of the problem is that it would be hard to estimate the exemption and place-out rates before launching the experiment. Assuming, for argument’s sake, a 50% rate for an entering SAS class, and assuming that not everyone will start fulfilling the

requirement in the first semester, our very rough estimate is that we would be looking at about 150 to 200 additional language sections in the first year (and soon twice as many assuming a 2-year sequence).

⁵⁸ In fact, the most coherent choice would be to dispose of the distribution section, thus abolishing our collective stab at “well-roundedness” while retaining what belongs clearly to the domain of “skills and processes” (to which 9 or 12 credits worth of LOTE proficiency – assuming appropriate means – could then be added straightforwardly) and what belongs, somewhat less clearly, to the domain of transdisciplinary adventures. The tried and true basics, and the trial balloons. Coherence is tempting, but (aside from the sheer task of handling such an about-face in an institution of our size) who could rationally predict the effects of this culling exercise on enrollments among the fields thus thrown out of our “Core”?

⁵⁹ Heritage Languages in America:

http://www.cal.org/heritage/about/language_reps.html

Heritage Language Program in NJ and collaborative efforts at the college level (Hindi):

https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/TLEsamples/TLE_Apr10_Article.pdf

Heritage Speakers Study Abroad Programs (sample):

<http://www.acrussiaabroad.org/?action=program&prog=HSP>

<http://potowski.org/oaxaca-uic>

https://studyabroad.wvu.edu/index.cfm?FuseAction=Programs.ViewProgram&Program_ID=12022

<https://www.summer.harvard.edu/courses/study-abroad-beijing-china-pre-advanced-modern-chinese-heritage-speakers/33270>

Study Abroad Programs for Heritage Speakers:

https://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/heritage_seekers_speakers.pdf?n=3742

Language Certificates:

<http://span-port.rutgers.edu/spanish-program/718-certificate-of-academic-spanish-for-heritage-speakers>

<https://web.sas.upenn.edu/korean/>

⁶⁰ IIE (Institute for International Education) (2016) Open Doors Annual Data, URL: <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data>.

⁶¹ See, for example, this annual report from Indiana University: <http://overseas.iu.edu/docs/AnnualReport201516.pdf>.