

**Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning Task Force Report: Rethinking the Ivy+
Language Consortium in the Context of Institutional Internationalization**

Authors: Catherine C. Baumann, University of Chicago
Margaret Edsall, Columbia University
Dick Feldman, Cornell University
Ann Matter, University of Pennsylvania
Andrew Ross, Brown University
Nelleke van Deusen-Scholl, Yale University

Rationale:

In May 2008, the Board of the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning decided upon a plan to produce a major position paper on foreign languages and internationalization initiatives at our colleges and universities. A task force of several Board members was selected, chaired by Professor Ann Matter, Associate Dean of Arts and Letters at the University of Pennsylvania, and charged with gathering comprehensive information on foreign language programs at Consortium schools. The task force was to travel to several member campuses to meet with top administrators involved in internationalization efforts, with other administrators, and with language faculty. The present report, which is the product of the task force's work, summarizes efforts undertaken throughout the Consortium institutions to internationalize the curriculum, and highlights initiatives involving foreign language and culture education. In addition the task force has produced a set of recommendations for integrating foreign language study with internationalization efforts, with emphasis on how the Consortium can encourage collaborative projects involving several of our institutions, especially as regards those languages which are less frequently taught.

The task force will share its report with Consortium deans, and our hope is that the final product will prove highly useful for institutional planning and curriculum development and will thereby convince our administrations of the usefulness of the organization in an era of rapid change and development.

The Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning is uniquely well suited to the task of integrating and advancing the role of language study in the internationalization of the curriculum for several reasons. This organization incorporates the energies and insights of teachers of over 80 languages; collaboration among them constitutes a powerful and well integrated resource able to develop and model best practice programs. The collaboration is powerful because it arises from institutions that have an unmatched reach of international research and relationships and a dedication to a very broad range of language programs. It is well integrated because the teachers and students share standards and expectations.

Summary Outline of Task Force Proposals

Support Language and Internationalization Initiatives at Member Campuses

- Develop and maintain experts' groups across consortial partner campuses (assessment, pedagogy, curriculum design, technology).
- Create and provide shared professional development opportunities for FL instructors.
- Develop and promote models for integrating language study and the disciplines at the advanced level.
- Develop and actively share broad-based assessment data and profiles on L2 students with L2 faculty.

Increase FL instructional capacity at member institutions.

- Develop shared curricula for less-commonly-taught languages.
- Support the design and implementation of hybrid courses to maximize availability, efficiency of instruction.
- Create shared repositories of instructional materials linked to SA programs, international partnerships.
- Promote curricular and pedagogical standards in LCTLs through coordination of programs and collaboration with pedagogical leaders

Help develop and implement improved preparation programs for study abroad experiences; promote and support innovative SA programs.

- Help develop and disseminate best practices for SA preparatory programs.
- Offer shared preparatory programs.
- Help develop best practices for the integration of SA experience into the student's broader curriculum.

Create and promote opportunities for non-traditional language study and reflection.

- Develop and maintain a shared FL student e-portfolio infrastructure.
- Develop and share models for the furthering of language study which are not academic courses (language partners, tandem learning, maintenance tutorials, language for special purpose tutorials).
- Model and disseminate discipline-specific language study opportunities for graduate and professional students.

Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning Task Force Report - 2009

- Develop and disseminate alternative language study opportunities for faculty, researchers /students.

I. Response to the Modern Languages Association Report “Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World.”

In its 2007 report, the MLA indicts the two-tiered language-literature structure of many foreign language departments as the principal barrier to producing “educated speakers (of other languages) who have deep translingual and transcultural competence,” (3) that is, the ability to operate between cultures. The report goes on to challenge departments to make both paradigmatic shifts and dramatic structural changes. In this proposal, we seek funding to create a consortium whose mission will involve taking concrete action in response to the challenges described by the MLA.

These challenges are directed at almost every contingent of foreign language departments: language instructors and their curricula, literature faculty and their major and minor programs, study abroad and interdepartmental governance. And while the report both raises and summarizes issues that have been apparent to the profession for years, albeit in various degrees of awareness, it does not suggest specific plans of action beyond lists of presumably hypothetical examples that seem to be the result of the committee’s discussions in camera.

Beyond the MLA report, it is increasingly clear that post-secondary institutions, even those privileged entities that have historically made up the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning, must rethink their approaches to teaching world languages and cultures, and expand not only the types of educational experiences they offer but integrate the study of other languages and cultures into their curricula, as universities and colleges across the nation seek to internationalize. Although the process of internationalization is variably defined at our institutions, we take internationalization to mean developing an environment in which learners are able to apply experiences with foreign cultures and languages, whether attained at home or abroad, to inform and enhance all of the learning they undertake, so that they have a better understanding of the way others live, as well as a deeper understanding and broader range of options for their own lives.

II. The Role of Language in the Internationalization of Curricula

Preparation for international experiences

The MLA report notes that “classroom study and study abroad should be promoted as interdependent necessities: the classroom is an ideal place for structured learning that first sets the state and later reinforces and builds on learning absorbed in study abroad.” (8)

Part of the goal of a language class is to simulate immersion, to bring the target culture into the classroom. But the abroad environment itself also requires awareness and preparation on the part of the student to make that experience a productive part of a language-study career. This starts with some meta-awareness about the student herself as a learner, cultural ethnography as a tool, and language study strategies and expectations. Many students do not anticipate the relationship between their own actions and reaching their learning goals. Some study abroad administrators do not feel empowered with programmatic tools to effect this learning, or the ability to induce participation. If the goals of intercultural competence and substantial language proficiency gains are taken seriously, preparation is required.

Many schools require a statement of purpose for study abroad, but this is not enough to focus and motivate successful language study. As the recent *Modern Language Journal* monograph¹ shows, there are many pitfalls, even for apparently well-motivated learners: extended language and culture study is not for everyone. Pilot projects could offer inducements for self-identified students to make greater commitment to strategy development and advanced preparation, coupled with realistic goals once they understand the complexity of the task.

Some Consortium schools have study abroad preparation programs, but these are mostly short-term and optional for students. The Consortium will collect the best of these – sessions given at Princeton and Cornell, insights from the Lauder School at Penn, the preparation for the summer immersion study at Chicago – then develop and pilot a true orientation to language and culture study abroad, for committed students. The Penn Gap Year, for example, calls for such advance

¹ Kinginger, Celeste and Barbara A. Lafford, eds. “Language Learning in Study Abroad: Case Studies of Americans in France” *Modern Language Journal*, Supplement to v. 92, 2008.

opportunities. Byram et al. (2001) suggest this should start with an ethnographic project before departure, to introduce skills in a known environment. Analysis and assessment of these courses along with pilot testing and assessment of outcomes will develop into best practice models that other schools can adopt.

Internationalization at Consortium schools is pervasive and diffuse, so there are many opportunities for sharpening of focus and synergies surrounding language study. The Brown Global Independent Study Initiative², as an example, promotes coordination with faculty in an organic way; culture and language study strategies could be added to their preparation.

From a task-based perspective, the study abroad environment represents a target context for language study at appropriate levels. Home language courses could have close contact with students abroad. Some study abroad participants might act as assistants, to carry out tasks and collect information for the home classes, all communicated via technological conduits. This would imbue the home course with some of the pragmatic complexity of immersion, while giving these assistants a stronger focus on their own information gathering (ethnography).

In-country language assistants could also funnel information to Foreign Language Across the Curriculum (FLAC) sections. The underlying arrangement might be a category of summer travel

² Brown's Global Independent Study Initiative is intended to "to integrate and facilitate off-campus and on-campus internationalization efforts in order to have maximum internationalization impact at Brown, and to effectively engage the undergraduate study abroad experience with the Brown curriculum, creating opportunities for student/faculty interaction that will reflect collaborative learning at its best."

In the initiative, "students seek out on-campus Brown faculty with teaching or research experience in their proposed overseas study destinations, and design proposals for Global Independent Study Projects identifying project goals, including syllabi, bibliography and structured timeline for consistent communication with Brown faculty mentors. Once the outlines of the project are agreed upon, students and faculty identify ways to enhance projects by tapping into local resources unavailable in Providence, e.g., archives, museums, on-site experts in given disciplines, participation in cultural events, interaction with NGOs, business and industry leaders. Assessment instruments and expectations are clearly defined prior to departure."

Expected outcomes are that "students will receive academic credit equivalent to one Brown course for their Global ISP"; that the students' experience will "serve as a catalyst for continued research, senior capstones, honors theses, enhanced faculty international collaboration and exchange, etc." The project will "create a repository of international research projects and expertise, and particularly noteworthy projects will be recognized and showcased (both students and faculty)"

The initiative's priorities include "maximizing quality experiences and bringing education abroad 'full circle'"

<http://www.brown.edu/Administration/OIP/programs/gis/overview.php>

grant, where students who took a FLAC section or did some topical reading in the target language on their own, would then gather documents and data abroad and record interviews for the next year's FLAC section in that course. Those assistants could then have some face-to-face teaching responsibility after returning – leading discussions and interpreting the materials s/he has produced – for example, providing the context for a video-recorded interview. Like Chicago's FLAGs (Foreign Language Acquisition Grants)³, focused offerings to students could intensify the language link between home courses – both language-focused and discipline-focused -- and immersion assistants abroad.

Involvement of anthropology and other social sciences faculty may be fruitful in developing language-study strategies. Practicing ethnography at home could lead to an ethnographic approach to the target culture. Anthropologists could collaborate with language teachers, providing students and faculty with the intellectual and practical tools required to approach their abroad experience with a different sort of academic rigor, and an eye to data collection and analysis. This taste of basic anthropology could interest students in that discipline, some newly interested majors constituting the payback to anthropology faculty.

Since the Consortium is not a degree-granting organization, it is not in a position to sponsor study abroad programs. Nevertheless, it could be instrumental in helping universities to set up programs that share students, and even possibly share resources and faculty. In the current financial atmosphere, study abroad programs have to be profitable to survive, and the fact that so many schools have competing programs is starting to be problematic. Again, the Consortium is the natural vehicle for helping language faculties and administrators think through the potential for sharing some of the study abroad burden, and the possible intellectual advantages of different models of study abroad. No one university could bring together as many options for study abroad, nor muster the variety of expert knowledge about the pros and cons of various models. It would not be impossible to someday see a Consortium summer program, sponsored officially by two or more universities, in places where it would not be feasible to establish more than one program.

³ Each year the University of Chicago offers up to 100 competitive grants in the amount of \$3000 to students to undertake 8 weeks of intensive language study in a country where the language is spoken.

Continuing opportunities for culture and language study

We propose to help develop and model continuing articulated opportunities for culture and language study upon students' return. Students returning from study abroad often experience a mismatch between the reality of the culture and language they have encountered and course offerings on campus. We will seek funding to develop and share models for innovative courses across languages, disciplines and campuses that meet the needs of these students. Sharing these courses via hybrid models or technology is also an option. In addition, we will seek to develop and share a variety of models for the furthering of language study which are not academic courses, such as language partners, tandem programs, individualized language tutoring and language for special purpose tutorials.

Some administrators interviewed in site visits by the task force commented on a perception among non-language faculty that language learning is " ... about what you can't do, not what you can." Language teachers often remark that administrators (and sometimes literature faculty) base their views of language teaching and learning on their own, often dusty, experience in the audiolingual or grammar-translation classrooms. A forum, either electronic or face-to-face, where successful language learners talked about their own strategies could be enlightening to those faculty as well as to students.

Developing and actively sharing broad-based assessment data and profiles on L2 students with L2 faculty.

As we endeavor, on and across our campuses, within and across disciplines, to reach the goal of translingual and transcultural competence put forth by the MLA report, we will need innovative assessment models that serve both learners and teachers. We propose the development of an interactive electronic portfolio, conceived as a place for students to collect and reflect upon a variety of language and culture study experiences and link them to their ongoing academic endeavors to encourage awareness of the practice of seeking links across various learning experiences and to process them internally to discover the connections that allow for new and deeper understandings of all they are learning and of themselves. Thus students will become cognitively aware of the kinds of translingual and transcultural study we hope to engender and

furthermore, instructors at all stages of their study will have an instrument enabling them to assess the impact of the broad range of activities proposed in this report. A portfolio is ideally suited to meet our stated goals because it makes possible two types of cognitive processing that can enhance students' ability to reach the goal of internationalization: metacognitive processing and reflective learning.

Metacognition is the ability to be aware of one's own cognitive processes and to use this self-awareness to regulate one's own cognition. Applications of metacognition, distilled into learning strategies, are already well integrated into second language pedagogy. We aim to take these processes even further, beyond the tasks of studying a new language and its culture, to that of linking this knowledge and experience in order to inform other areas of academic and personal development.

III. Integrating language study and the disciplines at the advanced level

Established models of language study in higher education in the United States have rarely led to high levels of proficiency or competence despite increasingly pressing societal and individual needs. Robinson et al. (49) note “the relative inability of America’s schools to prepare Anglophones in foreign languages” and cite Frank’s (2001) study which found that only 9% of 4th year college students in six languages reached level 2 of the ILR scale. The need for better articulation between K-12 institutions and postsecondary institutions, rethinking curricular models and departmental structures (cf. MLA Report), a research focus on “advancedness” in second language acquisition (Byrnes et al. 2006), and pedagogical reform (e.g. Kramersch 2008) are among the issues that need to be addressed.

As institutions are emphasizing their internationalization efforts, the curricula also increasingly reflect an emphasis on global interdependence. While study abroad and other international experiences offer opportunities for students to develop a global perspective, undergraduate majors as well as graduate and professional programs have shifted toward addressing global and regional issues. For example, the faculty and students in the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies are working in 70 countries around the world; many institutions are developing new majors in, for example, South Asian Studies or Modern Middle East Studies. Within these initiatives, however, relatively little emphasis has been given as yet to the role of language in developing crosscultural understanding. In order to be adequately prepared for research and scholarship in cultures and regions around the world, students and faculty must not only attain an advanced level of language proficiency, but also have an understanding of their academic disciplines within the context of their specific target language. This requires a different type of language study, which emphasizes the integration of language and academic content. The 2007 MLA Report challenges existing curricular models as well as the two-tiered hierarchy within university foreign language departments, and calls for a transformative approach that situates the study of language within a broad interdisciplinary context. It stresses the concept of “mapping of content” to create “unified, four-year curricula that situate language study in cultural, historical, geographic and cross-cultural frames.”(5)

The Consortium can play a role in sharing best practices and curricular innovations that could be replicated across its member institutions or adapted to fit institutional needs. While there are as yet no models among our institutions that demonstrate the type of comprehensive integration of language and content that the MLA Report calls for, some examples of innovative courses and programs are worthy of further examination. For instance, at the University of Pennsylvania, a separate curriculum allows undergraduate students in the School of Nursing to fulfill their language requirement through a course sequence in Medical Spanish; Penn also has extensive offerings in business language curricula in a wide variety of languages, such as Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Korean, Chinese, and Japanese. At many institutions, departments have begun to diversify the curriculum at the advanced level beyond a focus on literature and are offering courses with a discipline-specific focus, such as Spanish and the Law, Portuguese for Environmental Studies, French and the European Union, etc. Often, these courses are labeled as “bridge courses,” with the tacit assumption that they provide a bridge to upper level literature courses. We strongly encourage departments to rethink this model in favor of one in which students can follow multiple paths to advanced proficiency in the context of a diversity of academic interests.

Outreach to faculty with language interests and needs to develop curricula

The Consortium should provide educational opportunities and resources to help our member schools encourage language teaching and study in classes outside of the language curriculum. Many universities are now recommending, or even requiring, some type of transcultural knowledge on the part of undergraduate students, and are interested in creative ways to make transcultural and international studies an integral part of the curriculum. Since the Consortium reflects as many curricular models as there are members, it provides an excellent vehicle for encouraging language teaching and study in a variety of classroom settings. For example, Penn’s Center for Italian Studies advisory Board is made up of faculty from many departments besides Romance Languages, including Classical Studies, English, History, History of Art, Political Science, Religious Studies, and Sociology. All of these departments teach courses focusing on some aspect of the history and culture of Italy, mostly without a language component. But on several occasions faculty from Italian and other departments (History and Religious Studies) have taught a course jointly with a colleague from Italian, in which the language is a very present option. The

Consortium could provide the sort of incentives that motivate faculty (such as workshops and small grants) to find other ways of partnering between language teaching and other disciplines. This approach would take the FLAC approach (something many feel is a good idea that never lived up to its potential) to a new level.

Another way the Consortium can promote the sophisticated use of foreign languages in different types of classes is to provide data on how many students are studying which languages, and how well they are learning them, at our member universities. This seems simple, but it can be an effective tool for helping departments and administration make decisions about which languages need to be taught, and which should be expanded. Another part of this document speaks about the promising future in joint language teaching between universities; the Consortium's function as a center for communication and sharing of information could be a great help in this effort.

IV. Collaboration and Shared Resources in Less Commonly Taught Languages

Shared Needs

As the task force looked at language instruction across the institutions of the Consortium, it became apparent that while we collectively teach 92 modern languages (see Appendix A), there are significant opportunities for the sharing of instructional resources, curricular modules and capacity in both instructional personnel and student base. The Consortial schools, briefly, are an excellent example of the “long tail” model of the markets (Anderson, 2006). Of the 92 languages taught, only six are taught at all ten schools of the current Consortium. 38 languages are taught only at one institution among the ten. For these languages and their near numeric cousins, those languages taught at two or three Consortial institutions, it is quite clear that the instructors on those campuses are prone to administrative isolation, variable but low enrollments which tend to place them low on lists of institutional priorities, and concomitant limits of instructional capacity. These languages, many of which are linguistically complex, are taught at the first- and second-year levels, perhaps at the third-year level on a few campuses, and likely not at fourth-year or advanced levels. Materials are few, dated and scattered. Instructors in some cases are native speakers of the language with quite varied professional backgrounds; relatively few of them have regular opportunities for professional development in the areas of language pedagogy and methodology, materials development and the application of technology to language teaching and study.

We propose to create a network of regular communication between these instructors, offering opportunities for creating materials and resources, developing best practices with the help of expert language pedagogues at member institutions and elsewhere, and disseminating these to less-commonly-taught language (LCTL) instructors at institutions nationwide. In developing this network, we intend to concentrate on pilot programs in eight languages: Nahuatl, Zulu, Yoruba, Bengali, Indonesian, Modern Greek, Turkish, and Vietnamese. These languages in varying degree possess specific elements that are common to LCTL instruction: primarily oral culture, complex written representation, intricate grammar, and variably available resources. Creating shared resources and curricula in these languages will require developing and assessing common curricular objectives, gearing instruction toward extra-literary fields of academic

endeavor, and meshing language study with research and study abroad programs in the areas where these languages are spoken. We anticipate that aside from improved instruction, professionalization and communication between LCTL instructors on our campuses, we will, in at least the pilot cases, develop shared curricula at the advanced proficiency level, allowing for greater capacity across our institutions and elsewhere.

Workshops and Professional Development

The Consortium will plan and deliver summer workshops on pedagogy, language methodology, and technologies for language instruction, open to LCTL instructors at member campuses, and selected graduate students who are either currently serving as teachers of their languages on our campuses, or assist in that endeavor. As part of the development of this cohort, the Consortium will offer certification programs in second language acquisition (SLA), language methodology and pedagogy, and language technology.

The above plans are predicated on the use of technology to support communication, collaboration, materials production and dissemination, and instruction. Fortunately, language technology staff at member institutions have a longstanding and fairly productive relationship with one another, and possess the requisite expertise and resources to undergird the projects outlined in this report. We point to individual campus projects such as the Columbia LRC's Indonesian materials repository, MIT's Cultura project, Brown's Czech Anthology, Yale's Language Learning Templates, Cornell's Web Audio Lab and Dartmouth's DL Recorder as evidence of the collective knowledge that can be harnessed in support of instruction. Little of the technical infrastructure necessary to support this effort is costly; much of it is either open source or preexistent at member campuses. What is required is a mandate for collaboration and allocation of staff time to make it happen.

We anticipate that not all of the Consortium institutions' instructional needs with respect to LCTLs can be met in traditional fashion – in courses that meet face-to-face for x hours per week in a classroom. While it is clear from our discussions with administrators at member campuses that the typical “distance education” model for matriculated students is a non-starter, given our missions and populations, we recommend exploration and eventual adoption of hybrid

curricular adaptations of current “brick-and-mortar” courses as appropriate. Given the current economic climate and the indisputable need for more and more varied language study opportunities, it behooves us to seek and ratify commonalities between our instructional programs, rather than dismiss new models of delivery and shared curricula as somehow watering down the institutional brand.

V. Alternative models for language study

While the MLA Report critically examines the curricula as they currently exist within departments of foreign languages and literatures and sharply criticizes the two-tiered system that has created a divide between language and literature, it may not go far enough in looking beyond the departmental model to address some of the barriers that students encounter in trying to continue their language study beyond the language requirement: students who return from study abroad programs often experience difficulties in re-integrating into a departmental curriculum; many students are not interested in literature as their primary option at the more advanced levels; and, finally, increasing numbers of students would like to combine their discipline specific course work with language study but either cannot find the appropriate courses or lack the flexibility in their schedules to pursue language study. We must, therefore, consider alternative models of language study that encourage rather than prevent students from reaching their potential, a potential that need not be limited to intermediate levels of proficiency, which has—sadly—become the implicit standard for language study at the postsecondary level.

Research and assessment of language needs across Consortial schools

In view of our shared emphasis on internationalization (see pp. 1, 6 above), the Consortial institutions should create standard mechanisms to collect and share information on enrollments, languages taught, special programs, and student and faculty interests and needs. The wide variety of languages taught at our member institutions (see Appendix A) provides us with a unique perspective on trends in language study that allows for a more nuanced analysis than the data presented in the periodic nationwide MLA Survey of Foreign Language Enrollment data. Particularly the increasingly critical role that the less commonly taught languages play in student and faculty research needs to be examined more closely.

Discipline-specific language study opportunities for graduate and professional students

A number of language study opportunities are emerging that offer an alternative to the more standard curricula offered within the language and literature departments. It has become clear that in many cases, an individualized approach may be the most effective way for students to combine their disciplinary interests with language study, as there are infinite combinations of languages, disciplines, and language levels to be taken into consideration. The Directed Independent Language Study (DILS) program at Yale, for instance, allows undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to apply for individualized language support in languages that are not taught in the regular departments. A distance-learning pilot was conducted this past year, linking School of Forestry students with a Nahuatl instructor in Mexico; the intent is to expand on the program and include graduate history and art history students. Another model is to target programs at specific professional needs; some examples are the Spanish for Dairy Science program at Cornell; Spanish for Healthcare Professionals (Yale and Penn); Chinese for School of Management Professionals. The Lauder Institute at Penn has also experimented with short-term language and cultural immersion courses for Wharton students and faculty who are preparing to go abroad.

As our graduate and professional programs have created global research agendas, we must better prepare our students, faculty, and staff to function in the many regions across the world where our institutions have interests. Thus, we need to consider, for example, the language needs of healthcare professionals working in many African countries, of environmental specialists working in South America, political scientists working in the Middle East, etc.

Alternative language study opportunities for faculty, researchers, students

The ability of the Consortium to communicate and propound best practices in language learning makes it the logical nexus for truly innovative approaches to teaching languages at the post-secondary level. The Consortium should encourage and guide the application of different models of language instruction. For example, the Lauder Institute at Penn combines a Wharton MBA with a Master's in International Studies that often requires customized language study. Working with the language departments of the School of Arts and Sciences, Lauder offers short-

term immersion courses in the late summer before the program starts, and follows through with language courses tailored specifically to the business world. The Consortium is optimally positioned to provide informational support, educational opportunities and potentially curricular modules in these types of alternative language instruction.

Works Cited

Anderson, Chris. *The Long Tail: Why the Future of Business Is Selling Less of More*. New York: Hyperion, 2006.

Byram, Michael, Adam Nichols, and David Stevens, eds. *Developing Intercultural Competence in Practice*. Cleveland, England: Multilingual Matters, 2001.

Byrnes, H., H. Weger-Guntharp and K. Sprang. *Educating for advanced foreign language capacities. Constructs, curriculum, instruction, assessment*. Georgetown University Press, 2006.

Frank, V. *Language learning at advanced and above: Individual and programmatic characteristics*. Paper presented at 2001 ACTFL. 2001

Modern Language Association. *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*. 2007.

Robinson, J., W. Rivers, and R. Brecht. "Speaking foreign languages in the United States: Correlates, trends, and possible consequences." *The Modern Language Journal*, 90: iv, 2006: 457-472.

Appendix A: Languages Regularly Taught at current CLTL institutions and distribution:

Language	Brown	Chicago	Columbia	Cornell	Dartmouth	Harvard	MIT	Penn	Princeton	Yale
Chinese	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
French	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Italian	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Japanese	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Spanish	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
German	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Languages Taught at Eight Institutions										
Arabic	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Hebrew (Modern)	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Portuguese	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Russian	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Swahili	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Languages Taught at Seven Institutions										
Farsi	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Hindi/Urdu	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Korean	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Turkish (Modern)	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Languages Taught at Six Institutions										
Czech	x	x	x			x		x		x
E S L	x		x	x			x	x		x
Greek (Modern)	x	x	x	x				x		x
Polish		x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Languages Taught at Five Institutions										
Catalan	x	x	x			x		x		
Dutch			x			x		x		x
Swedish	x		x			x		x		
Tamil		x	x	x				x		x
Ukrainian		x	x	x		x		x		
Zulu			x	x		x		x		x
Languages Taught at Four Institutions										
Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian		x	x	x		x			x	
Hausa	x		x			x		x		
Vietnamese			x	x		x		x		x
Yiddish		x	x			x		x		

Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning Task Force Report - 2009

Language	Brown	Chicago	Columbia	Cornell	Dartmouth	Harvard	MIT	Penn	Princeton	Yale
Languages Taught at Three Institutions										
American Sign Language	x	x						x		
Arabic, Levantine						x		x		x
Armenian		x	x			x				
Bengali		x	x	x				x		
Indonesian			x	x						x
Thai				x		x		x		
Wolof			x			x		x		
Yoruba				x		x		x		x
Languages Taught at Two Institutions										
Amharic						x		x		
Arabic, Egyptian		x						x		
Bulgarian		x								x
Cantonese				x				x		
Georgian		x	x							
Hungarian			x					x		
Igbo						x		x		
Malayalam		x						x		
Marathi		x						x		
Nahuatl		x								x
Nepali				x		x				
Pulaar			x			x				
Punjabi			x					x		
Setswana						x		x		
Slovak		x		x						
Tagalog			x	x						
Telugu			x					x		
Twi						x		x		
Languages Taught at One Institution Only										
Albanian		x								
Balochi		x								
Bamana						x				
Breton, Modern						x				
Cape Verdean Creole						x				
Chichewa						x				
Dinka						x				
Gikuyu						x				
Gujarati								x		
Haitian Creole	x									
Irish Gaelic								x		
Kannada			x							
Kazak		x								
Khmer				x						
Kikongo						x				

Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning Task Force Report - 2009

Krio						x				
Luganda						x				
Macedonian		x								
Malagasy						x				
Manchu						x				
Maya (K'iche')		x								
Maya (Yucatec)		x								
Mongolian						x				
Norwegian		x								
Oromo						x				
Pashto								x		
Quechua										
Shona						x				
Sinhalese				x						
Slovene				x						
Taiwanese								x		
Tigrinya								x		
Uzbek		x								
Welsh				x						
Xhosa						x				
Scottish Gaelic						x				
Tibetan						x				
Uyghur						x				
Language	Brown	Chicago	Columbia	Cornell	Dartmouth	Harvard	MIT	Penn	Princeton	Yale
Totals by Institution	22	40	40	35	11	56	7	50	17	28