INTRODUCTION

Learning a foreign language involves specific skills, academic discipline, and cultural awareness that together are relevant to every aspect of a student’s education. The Language Program seeks to offer a rich and diverse acquisition of a foreign language as it is embedded in cultural contexts — through courses designed not only for students who choose to pursue graduate studies in literature, but also for those who elect to follow careers in engineering, medicine, law, government, business, education, and other areas.

The Language Program works closely with other departments in preparing students for the requirements of their particular major: among others, the Language Studies major, Global Economics, Health Sciences (PhSci Division), Music, East Asian Studies, German Studies, Italian Studies, Latino and Latin American Studies, World Literatures, Art History, and Philosophy. Over the last decade, several members of the Language faculty have co-taught with faculty in other departments offering the first courses in Language Across the Curriculum. This project forged a number of close cooperative relationships between Language lecturers and other predominantly humanities faculty.

A previous survey of a sampling of 550 UCSC students pursuing language study (1996), demonstrated that the Language Program serves all academic divisions: of students enrolled in languages 33% approximately were majors in the humanities and arts, 31% in the social sciences, 18% in the natural sciences, and 18% were undeclared.

A much more accurate tabulating was done in November 2005, based on hard data patiently collected by Sylvia Zito. It shows the distribution of students according to majors in the thirteen languages offered by the Language Program. This table reveals an even broader distribution:
### FALL 2005 ENROLLMENTS, BY DIVISION, FOR ALL LANGUAGES TAUGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Enr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Enr</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portug.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>27.21</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>29.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | Enroll. | 1676 | 481 | 450 | 269 | 144 | 34 | 298 | 17.78 |

Students of language are often engaged in required or recommended language coursework vital to their particular fields. Additionally, a significant number take courses in language due to their interest in their heritage or to a commitment to obtaining multilingual skills for their future success in a global community. The above breakdown of a cross-section of language students at the only UC campus that does not have a language requirement suggests not only a cross-divisional interest in languages but also underscores the importance of second and third language learning in the 21st century.
Although the call to consider the appropriate roles and goals of language instruction might be read to imply that different objectives (such as “preparing students for academic careers” or “to promote travel and cultural exchange”) are mutually exclusive, we do not regard them to be so. This conclusion is supported by consideration of participants in the languages that the Program currently offers. The student enrollment in every one of these languages reflects a mix of students who are taking the language to further academic goals as well as those who take it for cultural or communicative purposes. By casting a broad net, it could be argued that the Language Program in fact helps to recruit students to other, related areas of advanced study offered by campus Departments. Similarly, many students who enroll in a language as preparation for more advanced academic study end up taking an active interest in the contemporary culture of that language and want to be able to communicate with current speakers of it. This goal entails both linguistic proficiency and cultural understanding.

The Language Program faculty are exceptionally well-equipped to fulfill the Program’s complex role. The disciplinary knowledge base of the faculty is diverse: many faculty members hold the Ph.D in national literatures, area studies or linguistics; many others have masters degrees in national languages. Because all faculty teach primarily language (and have an average of 15 years of experience), they have achieved a high degree of specialization in diverse teaching and produce well-trained students of language. The Program is distinguished in the UC System by its reliance on a sizable core of professional language teachers who mentor a small number of teaching assistants, rather than the predominantly teaching assistant based model used at all other UC campuses, besides UCSD.

UCSC language faculty have participated in numerous regional, national, and international conferences and continue to provide statewide and national leadership in the fields of foreign language pedagogy: Several members have been actively developing materials and new technology to enhance the teaching of foreign languages and culture. This year (2001) saw the completion of the three-year internal grant that provided approximately half of the faculty with the opportunity to undertake technological projects. Other faculty have worked in the pedagogy of language across the curriculum (NEH), receiving national recognition for cross-divisional courses offered in the original language. Ongoing experimentation with applied language pedagogy culminated this spring (2001) in a five language theater presentation for the public. In addition, several faculty members are experimenting with large attractor courses in English focusing on cultural practices and film.

In the next decade we look forward to continuing our tradition of excellence in language teaching and leadership in language pedagogy. We hope to strengthen and broaden our language base, thus continuing to respond to an increasingly diverse regional population and to an ever more intimate world environment. We hope to strengthen the technological possibilities that a state- of-the-art language lab will provide for students and faculty alike (remove the previous sentence?); ongoing faculty support for the sensible integration of technology into the classroom will expand on the significant uses currently being made of websites, internet, interactive exercises and multi-media materials in general.
IMPLEMENTATION OF A DIVISIONAL LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT

The original Ten-Year Plan was very favorable to a Divisional language requirement that had the potential to increase enrollments and give a more predictable base that would facilitate rational long-term planning.

At the time, the Humanities Division proposed a language requirement for all Humanities majors that would have the following basic characteristics.

1) It will be administered by the UCSC Language Program faculty and staff;
2) it will be competency based;
3) it will require students to take diagnostic tests at least one quarter before they plan to take the proficiency test;
4) it will allow students to choose the quarter in which they take the tests;
5) it will accept proficiency in any language recognized as satisfying the University of California language requirement for admission.

This proposal would have required that a number of preconditions be met in order to make it operational:

1) a new staff appointment would be needed to do the scheduling and record-keeping;
2) office space for the additional staff person;
3) additional computer hardware and software for testing;
4) training in testing skills for all Language faculty, compensation for that training, and temporary course reductions for some.
5) A plan to accommodate students seeking to satisfy their requirement in a language not offered at UCSC;
6) A definition of the performance level that would be expected to satisfy the language requirement;
7) A plan to accommodate heritage speakers;

The divisional proposal has not been discussed since 2001. A Fall 2005 Ad Hoc Committee on Languages, chaired by Professor J. Isbister, is discussing the possibility of reviving a Language General Education requirement track available as an option to UCSC students. It is too early to tell if the discussions will lead to a positive recommendation, and what steps will be recommended regarding the implementation of such a requirement. The Language faculty enthusiastically support such an option.

SUMMER QUARTER

Several languages are being offered in the Summer, in both Summer sessions. They are usually in Spanish, French, and Arabic. We hope to be able to continue to develop these offerings in cooperation with University Extension.

GRADUATE STUDENTS AS LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS

The Language Program is willing to integrate more graduate students into its curriculum. At present only a handful of graduate students teach for the Language Program, about 2 per year in French and/or Spanish. As a consequence we deal with those Teaching Fellows and/or Associates in an ad hoc manner. However things develop over the next
few years, it is difficult to imagine an immediate and significant surge in the numbers of Teaching Fellows and/or Associates. Therefore, we propose to manage them on an ad hoc basis, although with some important caveats.

We propose the following.

1) The initiative for placing graduate students as Teaching Fellows and/or Associates in the Language Program should rest with the graduate students’ Departments. Departmental Graduate Advisors should contact the Language Program Chair with the names of proposed Teaching Fellows and/or Associates. The Language Chair will then designate a committee of Language Lecturers who will be responsible to interview prospective Teaching Fellows and/or Associates and determine if they are qualified.

2) The Language Program will decide on how many Teaching Fellows and/or Associates it can accommodate for the year based on the Program’s curricular needs, its contractual obligations to Lecturers, and the qualifications of prospective Teaching Fellows and/or Associates. At this point, the Language Program and the graduate student’s home department will reach a formal agreement whereby the Language Program will reserve positions for qualified Teaching Fellows and/or Associates; the students’ home Departments will agree to make the graduate students available to teach the courses reserved for them and to pay the Language Program replacement salaries for any courses that their graduate students may subsequently turn down after they have accepted their course assignments.

3) Lecturers from the Language Program will be assigned to mentor those graduate students who do qualify.

4) Mentoring will consist, as it does now, of having the graduate student audit a section of the course s/he plans to teach and working with the Mentor to develop his/her own curriculum. Once the Teaching Associate begins teaching his/her course, the Language Mentor will continue supervision as the Mentor and Teaching Associate deem appropriate between them.

Three important caveats.

1) It is essential both for the Language Program’s curricular planning process and for proper training of Teaching Fellows and/or Associates that prospective Teaching Fellows and/or Associates be introduced to the Language Program as early as possible. We propose that this take place during the period when curriculum plans are normally drawn up each Fall. Thus, agreement on Teaching Fellows and/or Associates for the 2006-07 academic year would be made in the fall of the 2005-06 academic year when other curricular plans for 2006-07 are being made.

2) Our ability to accommodate Teaching Fellows and/or Associates will necessarily be constrained by our contractual obligations to Lecturers. For example, if assigning all Lecturers in a given Language caucus the full number of courses to which their contract entitles them leaves no open courses, then we will not be able to accommodate Teaching Fellows and/or Associates in that caucus. This is more likely to be a problem in the smaller caucuses than in the larger ones.
3) We will need to find some way to compensate Mentors for their work with Teaching Fellows and/or Associates. Mentoring could be combined with other service for an equivalency. There would always be a need for someone in French and Spanish. In other areas, we might have to find other combinations of service that would allow us to compensate Mentors with a full course equivalency. Less than full equivalency is often unattractive to Lecturers, specially full-time Lecturers, for whom it means a loss of pay, even though it also means a reduced teaching load. It may be that on occasion we will need to augment the number of equivalencies funded for the Program in order to accommodate Mentors. On the whole, though, we do not think that this will be a big problem.

WHAT LANGUAGES SHOULD THE DIVISION SUPPORT?
We are committed to keeping the same level of staffing in languages currently offered. They all serve academic programs and all have significant student constituencies. While we discuss specific languages below, our guiding principles are the following:

1) We should only add languages that have the potential to attract enrollments sufficient to pay for the language; we should add languages to support Departmental programs only if those languages have a reasonable likelihood of attracting student support. For example, if Finnish were represented among the research interests of our Linguistics Department, it would still be unlikely to attract a satisfactory student enrollment and therefore would not be an appropriate addition to our curriculum.

2) While the potential to attract enrollments is a sine qua non, a second condition should be that the language support some area of a more advanced study represented in our campus curriculum. We do not envision adding languages to our curriculum that would be academic dead ends on our campus, regardless of their potential appeal for other reasons.

All thirteen languages presently offered in the program can be considered essential for a number of programs. For the majors displayed in the following table, the language requirement can be fulfilled by studying any one or more of these thirteen languages. The numbers are given for majors, predeclared, and minors as of November 14, 2005 (asterisks [*] indicate a Division other than the Humanities):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Lang. Requirement</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Predeclared</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Studies</td>
<td>level 6 for the 1st language, level 3 for the 2d; level 6 + 3 UD for Asian lgs. Level 6 of any lg for minor.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Level 6 or equiv.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Global Economics</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following majors have a language requirement that is fulfilled by one or more languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Lang. requirement</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Predeclared</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French/Francophone studies</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Studies</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Health Sciences</td>
<td>up to Spanish 5M</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Latin and/or Greek, and modern</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Studies</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Studies</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*LALS</td>
<td>Spanish / Portuguese</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Politics and LALS</td>
<td>Spanish / Portuguese</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sociology and LALS</td>
<td>Spanish / Portuguese</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature/ Intensive Major</td>
<td>Proficiency + two UD in original</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature/Nation. Concentr.</td>
<td>6 upper division courses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Music</td>
<td>French 1, Italian 1, German 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South or SE Asian Studies</td>
<td>Hindi / Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate programs requiring a language:
*Anthropology
*Education
  CLAD = Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (second language requirement)
  BCLAD = Bilingual CLAD (2 years of Spanish)
History
Linguistics (reading and translation)
Literature (two languages)
*Math
*Music (through level 3 for MA)
*Politics

**CURRICULAR GROWTH, THE NEXT 5 YEARS.**

We foresee three kinds of growth:
1) expansion of existing language areas to accommodate new enrollments that will come with campus growth;
2) addition of new language areas;
3) creation of a limited number of new courses both in specialized professional areas and courses in specialized skills (such as reading and translation) that will fill in gaps in the broader Humanities curriculum.
1) Expansion of existing language areas:

Spanish is the only language presently in a position to cap enrollments at 24. The most notable thing in the table given in the previous paged is that the Health Sciences Major offered by the Physical and Biological Sciences Division, with 399 declared and pre-declared majors in its third year of existence (as of November 2005), who must all take Spanish 5M, is already having a considerable impact on enrollments in Spanish 1 to 4. According to preliminary calculations this Fall, it appears that for a population of 400 majors regularly enrolled in the Health Sciences, 5 sections of Spanish 5M would be needed every year, not to mention more sections of Spanish 1-4. It may well be that this new major will see higher numbers in the near future. We are presently offering 3 sections of 5M. We think that 2 more sections could be offered through Summer Session. We are watching the numbers closely, in cooperation with the PBSci Division. The situation is being discussed in the Fall 2005 Ad Hoc Committee on Languages. One thing to be avoided is to see the resources needed for Spanish language instruction leading to a curtailment of instruction in the other languages.

2) Expansion to new language areas:

The original Ten-Year Plan proposed the regularization of Portuguese, Russian, Hindi, and an expansion in Hebrew, in Korean, and Arabic. We are not in a position to offer more than two years of instruction in Portuguese, Russian, and Hindi (with the help of outside donors for Hindi 5-6, starting Winter 2006) in the coming years. We offer one year of Arabic and cannot offer more in the foreseeable future. We offer Hebrew 1-5, but cannot offer Hebrew 6 without outside donors. Korean and other languages cannot be envisioned for the coming five years.

3) The current curriculum focuses on Language 1-6, that is, fundamental speaking and writing skills. It also includes a small number of upper-division courses in various aspects of the national cultures of the languages offered. We need to expand the number and variety of these upper-division courses in all language areas, as repeatedly emphasized by the 2003 “External Review Report” (their top recommendation). Our second year sequences bring students to an intermediate level of proficiency. There is need for courses to bring them to an advanced level in speaking and writing. This means at least third year offerings in most of our languages, and eventually fourth year offerings in Japanese and Chinese. There is a significant student demand among students for third-year courses and a special need among returning EAP students. The Program has been scrupulous in avoiding competition for course enrollments with other campus programs and will continue to be so.

We also think that it is very important to begin considering certain kinds of general interest courses in translation (these might be at either the upper- or lower-division levels). These will complement the cultural aspect of our language instruction program. Communication between speakers of different languages requires cultural
understanding as well as linguistic proficiency. Courses in contemporary culture will enhance communication skills, just as language courses will enhance cultural understanding. Such courses will help us to achieve a satisfactory over-all student/faculty ratio while continuing to keep enrollments in language courses to a pedagogically viable level. We currently do something of the sort with film courses. They also have the potential to attract students into language study as well as into more advanced courses in Literature and History, and would give our faculty a valuable opportunity for variety in their teaching. Please note, first that the “Contemporary Life . . . “ idea is meant only to indicate a kind of direction we could move in. Also, whatever we undertake by way of courses in English would be cleared with other Humanities Departments to avoid competition for enrollments with them. Finally, we anticipate a modest number of such courses. We should not require new resources in order to offer them.

Separations and Hires projected for the next 5 years

Note 1: This proposal includes the transfer of Hebrew, Portuguese, Russian, and Hindi to the regular TAS funding in addition to the four new positions to be made available to the program in the next five years.

Note 2: The entries for New Lect.-Retire/Separate for the years 2005-06 and 2008-09 represent replacements at the Lecturer level for retirements in the respective previous years of SOE Lecturers. It is our understanding that SOEs will be replaced not with new SOEs but with Lecturers, although it is important to note that several faculty feel strongly that the health of the Program requires the acquisition of additional SOE Lecturers.

Note 3: We assume on-going need in all of the language areas currently represented in our curriculum, i.e., that anyone who retires or separates from a language area will be replaced by a new hire in that same area.

SCHEDULE OF HIRES (YEARS ARE THOSE IN WHICH THE ACTION WILL BE EFFECTIVE, HAVING BEEN INITIATED THE PREVIOUS YEAR)

2001-02
0

2002-03
0

2003-04
0
2 NSF retirements (in French)
1 replacement (in French)

2004-05
Spanish (temporary)
Two retirements (SOEs in French and Japanese)

2005-06
1 Russian (post-6 regularization)
1 Spanish (post-6 regularization)

2006-07
One NSF retirement (in French)
One NSF replacement (in French)

2007-08
Two replacements (SOEs)
One NSF retirement (in Spanish)
One NSF replacement (in Spanish)

2008-09
0

2009-10
0

2010-2011
0

STAFFING
Projected growth implies the need for additional staff. Some of this growth can be achieved by increasing the current Assistant’s position from one-half to three-quarter time.

SPACE
Faculty Office Space: It is important to keep in mind that Language Lecturers spend more time in their offices for student advising and consultation than do most ladder rank faculty. Therefore it is especially important that they not share office space since this would compromise their teaching effectiveness. Currently the program is able to provide each Lecturer with his or her own office. In addition, we have had two rooms to use in which undergraduate tutors can meet with students, but one of those rooms was in effect traded for space for the mini-lab set up by Victoria González-Pagani. The Language lecturers who presently have their offices in the Merrill and Crown Colleges will move to offices in the new Humanities Building in Fall 2006. The lecturers presently in Cowell and Stevenson will retain their offices in those colleges.

Staff Office Space: The addition of a third staff person will would mean that the Language Office must have additional space. The obvious place for expansion is Cowell 230, the office across the hall from the current Language Program office. This office is currently used for the Chair.

It is conceivable that no new space for a Chair will be needed in the short term, if the next Chair is someone whose office happens to be near the Language Program office.
Language Lab: This is a matter of space as well as equipment. The current lab is quite inadequate even to our current needs. There are not enough stations for the number of our students. The equipment consists mostly of listening stations, includes few computer stations that would allow students and teachers to take advantage of current developments in language software. Language instruction has been evolving rapidly to utilize new technology, not to displace the instructors’ central role but to complement it. UCSC has been a leader in this process. We need a lab that will allow us to make good use of the technology that we have developed and to continue growing in this area. The lab itself although centrally located in a topographical sense is remote from the areas where most language instruction takes place. The Program badly needs a whole new lab and one that is better equipped and located to serve student needs.

DIVERSITY
The Language Program is committed to the principles of diversity in its hiring. By its nature its faculty represents a broad range of nationalities and ethnicities. The addition of new languages as proposed above will undoubtedly increase the diversity of our faculty still further.