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INTRODUCTION

2002 NFLRC Summer Institute

The Heritage Language Institute was intended to provide practical information, theoretical considerations, and program/curriculum models for language education that utilize existing heritage language resources. The initiative for the symposium was based on the recognition that service organizations, government agencies, and businesses in the US are increasingly calling for personnel with specialized bilingual abilities. Yet language educators are often at a loss as to how to develop programs that provide individuals with the language and literacy skills needed for use across a broad range of occupations.

The Heritage Language symposium took a language as resource approach (Ruiz 1988)† to addressing language needs in which educators capitalize on the linguistic assets of language minority students through developing their heritage language skills. This approach is intended to help meet foreign language demands while providing educational and professional opportunities for language minorities that might not otherwise experience school success. In addition, the language as resource approach can enhance foreign language development among monolingual speakers of English through programs in which heritage language speakers serve as conversation partners and tutors.

Although many foreign language scholars can see the value in utilizing heritage language resources, they are often unfamiliar with information and models that can guide program/curriculum development for multiple languages and diverse spoken and literacy needs. This summer institute offered a range of language, culture, literacy, and technology workshops by experts who have extensive knowledge and experience in developing innovative K–16 heritage language programs.

Organization of the summer institute

Summer institute staff consisted of:

Kathryn Davis (summer institute director)
   Center for Second Language Research/Second Language Studies
John Mayer (entertainment coordinator)
   Hawaiian & Indo-Pacific Languages & Literatures
Richard Schmidt (NFLRC director)
   National Foreign Language Resource Center
Jim Yoshioka (program coordinator)
   National Foreign Language Resource Center

---

Heidi Agunias (student assistant)
Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center
Deborah Masterson (publications specialist)
National Foreign Language Resource Center
John Standal (information technology specialist)
Language Learning Center

The institute was held at the East-West Center Imin Conference Center at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

The summer institute was organized into three to six hour workshops over two days (see appendix A). Presenters were chosen by the summer institute director based on their nationally recognized expertise in the foreign language, bilingual education, and ESL fields. While the NFLRC supported the honorarium and airfare of the key note speaker, the Center for Second Language Research provided funding for stipends and airfares for other workshop presenters. The NFLRC also provided funding for the East-West Center Imin Conference Center and associated costs.

DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHOPS AND PRESENTERS

Descriptions of the key note address and 14 workshops as well as the biographies of presenters are provided below.

Key Note Address

Pluralism as Resource:
Ecological Approaches to Bilingual, Foreign, and Heritage Language Education

Nancy Hornberger, University of Pennsylvania

The one language-one nation ideology of language policy and national identity is no longer the only available one worldwide (if it ever was). Multilingual language policies which recognize ethnic and linguistic pluralism as resources for nation-building are increasingly in evidence. These policies, many of which envision implementation through bilingual intercultural education, open up new worlds of possibility for oppressed indigenous and immigrant languages and their speakers, transforming former homogenizing and assimilationist policy discourses into discourses about diversity and emancipation.

This presentation used the metaphor of ecology of language to explore the ideologies underlying multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy framework as ecological heuristic for situating the challenges faced in implementing them. Specifically, the presentation considered community and classroom challenges inherent in implementing these new ideologies, as they are evident in three nations which introduced formative policies in the early 1990s: post-apartheid South Africa's new Constitution of 1993; Bolivia's National Education Reform of 1994; and Paraguay's constitutional and educational recognition of Guarani alongside Spanish. It
concluded with implications for multilingual language policies and specifically bilingual, foreign, and heritage language education in the United States.

NANCY H. HORNBERGER is Professor of Education and Director of Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education, where she also convenes the annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum. She specializes in sociolinguistics, language planning, bilingualism, biliteracy, and educational policy and practice for indigenous and immigrant language minorities in the United States, Latin America, and internationally. She teaches, lectures, and consults on these topics throughout the world. Her published books include Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up (Mouton, 1996), Sociolinguistics and language teaching (Cambridge, 1996, co-edited with S. McKay) and Bilingual education and language maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua case (Mouton, 1988). She serves on numerous journal and book series editorial boards and co-edits an international book series on Bilingualism and bilingual education with Colin Baker for Multilingual Matters.
Email: nancyh@gse.upenn.edu

Workshops (listed in alphabetical order by presenter)

Creating a Heritage Language Curriculum for Sociocultural Development in Academic Settings
Theresa Austin, University of Massachusetts

This hands-on workshop helped participants create transformative curricular directions (sections, courses, and/or programs) for heritage language students by using principles from critical literacy & language development; interdisciplinary learning; and multicultural education. Examples were provided of heritage language curriculum implemented in after-school elementary programs, middle/high school courses, and at the university level in areas other than heritage language (e.g., health care, law, social work). Workshop participants learned how to:

- Conceptualize curriculum design as a cycle of inquiry, performance, critical reflection, enactment, and deliberation
- Create instructional spaces for critical language & literacy in interdisciplinary learning
- Profit from a critical multicultural perspective
- Construct informative assessment and evaluation through stakeholder involvement

Participants shared their school district, state, or department curricular frameworks for the heritage language, levels of language instruction, and subject areas that reflect their curriculum development interests, e.g., Ilokano and health care for university studies; Samoan, science, and music for high school; Spanish, art, and history for middle school; Japanese, math, and computer science for elementary school.

THERESA AUSTIN, associate professor in the Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies at the University of Massachusetts, specializes in second language and
literacy, planning and policy. Her research uses a sociocultural framework to examine the development of cross-cultural pragmatics and the impact of technology-aided instruction on language learning. Through several collaborative action research projects, she has conducted ethnographic research to examine how teachers’ practices can improve students’ learning opportunities. Having researched, designed, and implemented curricula for teaching Japanese, Spanish, Chinese, and ESL, she serves as a consultant for instruction and assessment in bilingual education and foreign language programs nationally and internationally. She has been awarded several prestigious grants from the Social Science Research Council, Fulbright Commission, and Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities. Currently, she is working with graduate students on several community service summer language camps in Chinese, Russian and Spanish. In addition to her research on language development, Dr. Austin is currently working with ETS and the National Boards for Professionals in Teaching to develop national certification exams for teachers of languages other than English.

Email: taustin@educ.umass.edu

Critical Pedagogy in S/FL Teaching

Graham Crookes, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
René Antrop-González, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Critical pedagogy is now a well-established, if necessarily non-mainstream, perspective on curriculum theory and pedagogical practice. Associated for the last 40 years particularly with the name of Paulo Freire, it now encompasses a large body of work, both theoretical and practical, in many domains of education. For ESL, it is particularly associated with the work of Elsa Auerbach. For FL education in the US, the early work of Linda Crawford-Lange was an important influence that brought Freire’s ideas to the attention of North American teachers. In this short workshop, the facilitators (René Antrop-González & Graham Crookes) first introduced basic concepts of critical pedagogy (drawing on the perspectives and background of participants in a dialogical fashion). The group then separated into two break-out groups according to shared interests and orientation, in which they reviewed key classroom practices and looked at relevant materials, as appropriate, and concluded by developing action plans for individuals to take back with them to their practice sites beyond the summer institute.

GRAHAM CROOKES is an associate professor in the Department of Second Language Studies and Director, English Language Institute, UH Mānoa. Over the years he has published in many of the major journals of SL Studies (TESOL Quarterly, Applied Linguistics, Modern Language Journal, Language Learning). Among his professional interests are teacher research and critical pedagogy; a particular concern is the continuing poor working conditions of most SL teachers.

Email: crookes@hawaii.edu

RENÉ ANTROP-GONZÁLEZ is Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction/Bilingual Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Dr. Antrop-González received his doctoral degree from Pennsylvania State University in 2001. Currently, his research interests
are critical pedagogy and its application in bilingual/ESL education and the academic achievement of high school Puerto Rican students in urban settings within the United States. Dr. Antrop-González has published several articles on topics including language policy in Puerto Rico, alternative Puerto Rican-centric schooling/critical literacy, and media images of Puerto Ricans in United States cinema.
Email: antrop@uwm.edu

**Language Awareness, Culture, and Education**

Jacinta Galea’i & Laurie Luczak, *University of Hawai’i at Mānoa*

This session featured student work from a university-school partnership which was currently underway at two middle schools in the Kalihi area of Honolulu, which aims to help students of Hawaiian, Samoan, and Filipino ancestry to achieve high academic standards and to enter and succeed in college. Built on language and culture as resource and language awareness language models that draw on the strengths of culturally and linguistically diverse students as ways to help them learn academic discourse, while maintaining their own heritage languages, the presentations included pedagogical practices that foster positive self-esteem, critical thinking, awareness of multiple-identities, literacy skills for academic success, and greater appreciation and interest for community cultures and languages. Participants received hands-on experience that fostered implementation of similar pedagogy approaches into their curriculum as ways to create and transform current educational practices and as ways to address the needs of students of diverse backgrounds.

JACINTA GALEA’I is completing her Ph.D. in English at the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa. She has taught English at Samoana High School, the American Samoa Community College, and this past year at Dole Middle School.
Email: jgaleai@yahoo.com

LAURIE LUCZAK was born and raised in Hawai‘i and is a graduate of St. Andrew’s Priory and UH Mānoa. She worked in the insurance industry for approximately 15 years before returning to graduate school. She is currently in the Master of Education in Teaching (MET) program at the College of Education at UHM. She has been working with the GEAR-UP Program since December of 2000 and is interested in developing “culturally appropriate and congruent pedagogy and curriculum.” She is a recipient of the Carl and Alice Daeufer Scholarship and the COE Student Teaching Grant.
Email: lluczak@hawaii.edu

**Re-Thinking Identity and Education**

Roderick Labrador, *University of California, Los Angeles*

When we think or talk about “identity,” what do we mean? Typically, “identity” indexes one’s race, ethnicity, culture, language, religion, class, gender, and/or sexuality. The first part of the presentation examined the various ways that we think about “identity,” as theoretical construct and lived social experience. The second part explored how our understandings of “identity”
impact our work with students from immigrant communities. Lastly, the presentation challenged participants to re-think “identity” as multiple, processual, and strategic and investigated how this re-thinking impacts the learning environments and educational experiences of students.

RODERICK N. LABRADOR is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, Los Angeles. His research focuses on issues relating to the construction of identities among communities in diaspora, particularly the constitution of racial, ethnic, and cultural identities among Filipinos in Hawai'i. He also serves as the project manager of UH Mānoa GEAR-UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs).
Email: labrador@hawaii.edu

Clarifying Heritage Resources for Curriculum Planning and Assessment
Genevieve Lau, Skyline College, San Bruno, CA

Heritage resources include not only language but also culture. Students bring into the classroom their native language abilities and cultural understanding of the learning process. Their lack of understanding of the new classroom’s functioning is harder to discern and sometimes more detrimental to their learning than their lack of proficiency in the new language. In a classroom with students from a language background other than English or with students from many language backgrounds, it is of utmost importance for teachers to make explicit their own “heritage resources” — their perceived ways of learning and expected student outcomes to themselves and to their students. They also need to facilitate their students’ awareness of the latter’s heritage resources.

The curriculum planning and assessment framework presented was informed by research in participatory evaluation, alternative assessment, outcome-based assessment, teacher research, metacognitive monitoring, and cooperative group work. The framework linked desired student outcomes to collaborative learning activities and assessment strategies which can be used for lesson planning or program evaluation. The presenter stressed that collaborative activities (when conducted appropriately) allow students to reflect on and share their heritage resources, practice language use, and gain respect and understanding from each other. She also suggested that linking assessment to activities and expected outcomes and making the criteria of successful performance explicit to students allow equal access to assessment criteria and help students focus. It was suggested that the process also helps teachers detect gaps in student learning and seek ways to assist.

The presenter demonstrated planning a lesson using the proposed framework and shared actual student response to the lesson. The assessment of student outcomes included the use of alternative ways in examining their learning which may be used for program planning and evaluation. Participants were asked to generate lesson topics, skill areas, or program types of interest to them in small groups. They worked on applying the framework to their chosen topic, skill area, or program. This collaborative endeavor allowed participants to experience firsthand the issues confronted by people from different backgrounds working together.
GENEVIEVE LAU is Professor of Language Arts at Skyline College, San Bruno, California. Her training in evaluation, ethnography, and sociolinguistics involves her in teaching English as a second language and studies concerning language teaching and learning, cross-cultural communications, curriculum development, and program evaluation. Dr. Lau received her Ph.D. in Education and specialist certificate in Evaluation from Stanford University. She has recently led accreditation self-studies at the school (K–12) and community college levels. She has also conducted training workshops on evaluation, cross-cultural communications, and diverse learning styles. Her presentations and published papers include studies on alternative ways of assessment.

Email: genlau@hotmail.com

Using Oral History for Heritage Culture Learning
Warren Nishimoto & Michi Kodama-Nishimoto
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Collecting oral history involves much more than running a tape recorder and asking someone to “talk story.” Presenters examined the basic elements of a successful project: planning and research; conducting a preliminary interview; developing a questionnaire; conducting the recorded interview; selecting and using audio recording equipment; transcribing the tape; and preserving and disseminating the completed interview. The value of students using oral history as a way to better their knowledge and understanding of heritage culture learning was discussed.

WARREN NISHIMOTO is director of the Center for Oral History, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. He has served as principal investigator of a number of oral history projects documenting Hawai'i's history, cultures, and people, teaches credit and non-credit courses and workshops on oral history at the university and throughout the community, and serves as consultant to many community-based oral history and local history projects. He is co-editor of Hanahana: An oral history anthology of Hawai'i's working people and recently published an article on the early history of Palama Settlement in the Hawaiian Journal of History.

Email: wnishimo@hawaii.edu

MICHIKO KODAMA-NISHIMOTO, a research associate at the Center for Oral History, UH-Mānoa, is a graduate of the University of Hawai'i. She is the compiler/editor of Uchinanchu: A history of Okinawans in Hawai'i and co-editor of Hanahana: An oral history anthology of Hawai'i's working people.

Email: kodamani@hawaii.edu

Integrating Technology with Curriculum: Creating Digital Video
Rachel Rivers, Ariana Eichelberger, & Leslie Arakaki
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

This hands-on workshop took participants through each step of creating digital videos. Participants used miniDV cameras to shoot video, import their video into a computer, and
digitally edit using iMovie2. Finally, participants exported their video into formats ready for the web, other software applications, or VHS tape. Additional topics covered included tips on shooting video for optimal viewing on the web and different video formats that work best with common software applications.

The Educational Technology department at UHM received two U.S. Department of Education Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) grants. Through these grants and other funds, the department’s grant personnel try to model, facilitate, and demonstrate creative ways to integrate technology into classroom learning at all education levels and in all content areas.

RACHEL RIVERS, MA in English as a Second Language at UHM, is a new faculty member in the Department of Educational Technology and is currently the project manager for the Learning through Innovation (LEI Aloha) grant initiative. Her current research agenda focuses on systemic program evaluation and technology integration in seamless education initiatives involving multiple institutions and subject areas.

Email: rivers@hawaii.edu

ARIANA EICHELBERGER, M.Ed in Educational Technology at UHM, coordinates faculty professional development throughout the State of Hawai‘i as an outreach manager. Her research interests focus on electronic portfolio development and technology mentoring.

Email: ariana@hawaii.edu

LESLIE ARAKAKI, M.Ed in Educational Technology at UHM, primarily facilitates student and faculty support for new teacher cohorts at the College of Education as an outreach manager.

Email: larakaki@hawaii.edu

Showcasing Student Work through PowerPoint

Rachel Rivers, Ariana Eichelberger, & Leslie Arakaki

University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

This hands-on workshop introduced participants to the basics of creating presentations and pointers on how PowerPoint can help anyone be an effective presenter. “Tricks of the trade” such as visual design tips and effective use of graphic elements were covered. Participants designed and produced their own presentations, which included special effects such as sound and pictures.

Biliteracy Development in Indigenous Communities

Richard Ruiz, University of Arizona

This workshop consisted of three parts: (1) A brief description of an on-going literacy/biliteracy development project in Guatemala designed specifically for rural Maya-speaking communities; (2) a discussion of the major theoretical and conceptual influences on the project, including language planning orientations (language-as-resource), sociocultural approaches to learning (funds of knowledge for teaching), curriculum development (community participation in
materials development), and the politics of education (problem-posing and circles of culture); and (3) a demonstration of the activities of the project, with members of the workshop participating in the actual development of materials. In Project TACAL, community members who are developing literacy learn to read and write through workshops in which they themselves produce the curriculum materials to be used, in both Spanish and their local language. The products of these workshops are various, including books of local and traditional stories, poems, songs, community histories, maps, reflections on themes of local interest (such as health, small business development, environment, water quality, gender roles, etc.), as well as materials in other media (videos and audio recordings). Conceptually, this project elaborates a paradigm in which community languages are regarded as resources to be preserved and developed, local knowledge is the basis of literacy development, and members of the local communities are the principal agents of their education.

RICHARD RUIZ received degrees in French literature at Harvard College and in anthropology and philosophy of education at Stanford University. He is currently a professor in the Department of Language, Reading and Culture in the College of Education of the University of Arizona, with faculty affiliations in the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching and in the Program on Comparative Cultural and Literary Studies. He is recognized internationally for his research and scholarship in language planning and policy development. He has been a consultant to the governments of Mexico, Australia, Guatemala, Bolivia, the Northern Marianas, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Netherlands Antilles (Aruba and Curacao), and native communities in the United States and Canada. He was editor of the *Bilingual Research Journal* for three years and serves on the editorial boards of *Urban Education, Teaching Education, Journal of Teacher Education,* and the *Review of Educational Research.* He has been chair of the Standing Committee on the Role and Status of Minorities in Educational Research and Development and chair of the Social Justice Action Committee of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). He was recognized for his expertise in educational policy studies by being named to the Clinton-Gore Education Transition Team. In June 2001 he was appointed director of Social Justice of the American Educational Research Association. Email: ruiz@email.arizona.edu

**Grass-Roots Heritage Language Planning**

**SHALL Project**

*University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa/Farrington High School team:*

HYE-SUN CHO (curriculum developer/electronic portfolio assessment coordinator)
VAI LEATIOTA (Samoan instructor/curriculum developer)
JULIUS SORIA (Ilokano instructor/curriculum developer)
SARAH TOOHEY (instructor/curriculum developer)
AARON YOSHINO (technology consultant)
BENJIE A. CASTILLO (FH student)
MOLLY PAPALAGI (FH student)
This workshop presented a grass-roots language planning model focusing on heritage language projects currently being carried out in Hawai’i. Since the early 1900s native Hawaiians, immigrants, and local speakers of Hawai’i Creole English have been denied the right to maintain their heritage languages and, in many cases, receive the academic preparation needed for educational success. The language planning projects described in the workshop utilize a critical participatory action research approach in which teachers, students, parents, community members, and university personnel collectively assume responsibility for transforming educational practices and linguistic attitudes within language minority communities and schools. The primary overarching goal of the projects is to initiate State-wide change in educational practices and attitudes from the prevailing “language as problem” discourse in which lack of English languages skills is viewed as problematic to one of “language as resource” in which heritage language learners/communities offer rich resources for use in developing high levels of dual language skills among both native English and heritage language speakers.

In developing and interpreting innovative programs, workshop presenters drew on Gee’s notions of discourse, Wenger’s communities of practice and education as identity formation, Bourdieu’s cultural capital, McComiskey’s textual, rhetorical, and discursive levels of analysis, and Bakhtin’s notions of genre, among others. Presenters linked these theories to practice by describing student as researcher activities and final classroom products. The actual teachers and students of one model high school project presented their classroom projects through a PowerPoint demonstration and readings from the class anthology. Finally, workshop participants were provided with the opportunity to ask questions and discuss possible language plans in their home states or countries.

Through presenting the Hawai’i model, presenters expressed the hope to provide a platform for examining the potential of alternative programs that can lead to the transformation of language policies and practices, in the US and beyond, from those that harm or ignore to those that actively aid immigrants and other disenfranchised groups.

The SHALL TEAM (Studies of Heritage and Academic Languages and Literacies) consists of graduate students and teachers with expertise in SLA, ESL, bilingual education, English, evaluation, and technology. Sarah Toohey, a MA student in the University of Hawai’i (UH) Department of Second Language Studies (SLS), is the curriculum development coordinator. Hye-sun Cho holds the position of electronic portfolio assessment coordinator. Ms. Cho is a graduate of the UH Department of SLS MA program and recently has been accepted into the department’s certificate program. Aaron Yoshino, an undergraduate student at UH, is assisting Ms. Cho in portfolio assessment as well as teaching computer technology courses at Farrington High School. Julius Soria, the Ilokano language instructor, is a graduate of the
The Samoan instructor position is held by Vai Leatiota who has a BA degree in English. Four ninth grade Farrington High School students who have participated in the SHALL project — Benjie A. Castillo, Molly Papalagi, Ruth Pei, and Jaedee-Kae B. Vergara — have developed expertise in developing PowerPoint presentations through Saturday classes taught by Aaron Yoshino.

Email: Kathryn Davis <kathrynd@hawaii.edu>
Hye-Sun Cho <hyesunc@hotmail.com>

Unstandardized Varieties as a Classroom Resource

Jeff Siegel, Kent Sakoda, & Terri Menacker
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

For many people in the world, their heritage language is an unstandardized variety, such as Chicano Spanish, Louisiana French, or Hawai‘i Creole English. Such varieties are usually seen as obstacles to educational advancement and thus banned from the classroom. But the theme of this workshop was that such stigmatized varieties can be an important educational resource. Participants learned about various contentious issues surrounding the use of unstandardized varieties in the classroom and then got involved in some innovative classroom activities which do focus on these varieties. These include sociolinguistic awareness, basic linguistic analysis, and contrastive studies. Presenters described how such activities aim at valuing and validating the students' home language while at the same time helping them to acquire the “standard.”

JEFF SIEGEL has an MA in ESL from the University of Hawai‘i and a Ph.D. in Linguistics from the Australian National University. He has taught at the Papua New Guinea University of Technology, the University of the South Pacific, and the University of New England (Australia), where he is currently an associate professor. In January this year, he also began work as director of the new Charlene Sato Center for Pidgin, Creole and Dialect Studies at the University of Hawai‘i. Jeff has done research on Fiji Hindi, Pidgin Fijian, Melanesian Pidgin, and Hawai‘i Creole English. His recent work has focussed on the origins of pidgins, creoles, and other language contact varieties and on the use of these varieties and minority dialects in education. Jeff’s major publications include: Language contact in a plantation environment (CUP, 1987), Vernacular education in the South Pacific (AusAid, 1996), and Processes of language contact (Fides, 2000). He also produces the yearly Pidgins and Creoles in Education (PACE) Newsletter.

Email: jsiegel@hawaii.edu

KENT SAKODA teaches the UHM Department of Second Language Studies course in Pidgins and Creoles in Hawai‘i and is an instructor of Linguistics at TransPacific Hawai‘i College. He is a Hawai‘i Creole English native speaker, expert, and advocate.

TERRI MENACKER is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Her research and current work involves training and working with teachers to implement community-based “language as resource” approaches in Hawai‘i public schools.

Email: menacker@hawaii.edu
Expanding Success Across Cultural Contexts

Olga Vasquez, University of California, San Diego

La Clase Mágica, is an after school educational activity that has focused primarily on Spanish-English bilinguals from Mexican origin homes for the past 13 years. It is a community-based initiative that partners with the University of California to funnel educational resources to local children and their families. It utilizes a computer-mediated curriculum that is culturally and developmentally appropriate for four different age groups: pre-schoolers, elementary school-aged children, adolescents, and adults. This workshop examined the extension of the after-school program to two new, culturally different contexts: one at a school near the US-Mexico border and the other at an educational center at an American Indian Reservation in San Diego, California. It introduced curriculum materials developed around computer activities and also laid out the adaptation processes that must take place in order to make the program relevant to a different local ecology that changes in context and culture.

OLGA A. VASQUEZ (Ph.D., Stanford University) is an associate professor in the Department of Communication at the University of California, San Diego. Her research is best characterized as ethnography of education that examines multiple ways in which underserved populations can gain access to educational resources and institutional support. Professor Vásquez is the lead author of Pushing boundaries: language and culture in a Mexicano community (Cambridge University Press, 1994) and sole author of an upcoming manuscript, La clase mágica: Imagining optimal possibilities in a bilingual community of learners. She has contributed chapters to numerous edited volumes in the fields of education, bilingual education, literacy, and community studies. Her recent work focuses on the issues of educationally preparing minority populations to enter into the global processes increasingly characterizing society.

Email: ovasquez@weber.ucsd.edu

No Zones of Purity: Valuing Hybridity Strategically

Jerri Willett
University of Massachusetts

For the purposes of developing strategies and practices for heritage language projects, this presentation first summarized the ongoing dialogue concerned with the concept of hybridity within the discourse communities of postcolonial, feminist postmodern, and critical literacies scholars. The paper then drew on insights from
this dialogue to examine the tensions with which we must struggle in order to simultaneously preserve heritage identities, languages, and cultures and transform them for new times. Finally, the audience was asked to explore ways to value hybridity strategically.

JERRI WILLETT is a professor at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst in the Language, Literacy and Culture Doctoral Concentration and the Bilingual/ESL Multicultural Practitioner Concentration. Her scholarship focuses on understanding the construction of practices and identities in multicultural classrooms and communities. She teaches courses in second language learning and teaching, ethnographic research, and curriculum development for culturally responsive classrooms.

Email: willett@educ.umass.edu

Developing Curriculum and Materials in a Threatened Language: Lessons Learned from Papahana Kaiapuni, the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program

Lois Yamauchi, University of Hawai’i at Mānoa
Puanani Wilhelm & Keoni Inciong, Hawai’i State Department of Education

Most of the world’s 6,000 languages are spoken by relatively small communities. Very generally, the fewer the number of speakers of a language, and the older they are, the more the language is considered threatened by extinction. Some estimate that half of all languages in existence today will be extinct within the next century. An educational program that teaches a threatened heritage language is one way to revitalize or maintain that language. However, one of the challenges of such a program is the development of curriculum and materials because there is often few appropriate materials written in the language, especially for young children. In this session, presenters discussed issues related to producing curriculum and materials in a threatened heritage language, including strategies for translation and developing materials that are originally written in the heritage language. Presenters also discussed how to develop curriculum that is consistent with the culture of the heritage language community. They presented lessons learned from Papahana Kaiapuni, the Hawaiian language immersion program, as a case study of how the Hawaiian language community has developed curriculum and materials for a K–12 total immersion program. Session participants were encouraged to bring examples of curriculum and materials they have developed and particularly “works in progress” for discussion and development during the session.

LOIS A. YAMAUCHI is an associate professor at the University of Hawai’i and a researcher with the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE). Her research focuses on cultural influences on learning and the educational experiences of indigenous teachers and students. Dr. Yamauchi recently conducted a five year study of the development and implementation of Papahana Kaiapuni, the Hawaiian language immersion program. She is co-author of the book Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony (Westview Press, 2000).

Email: yamauchi@hawaii.edu

KEONI INCIONG is an educational specialist for the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program (HLIP) for the Department of Education, Instructional Services Branch. He has taught on
the island of Kaua'i for 18 years teaching Hawaiian history, culture, language, and music at the high school and community college levels. He was a reading/social studies teacher for the Kamehameha Schools Intermediate Reading program at Kapa'a and has developed curriculum for culturally-based programs. He was a teacher for HLIP secondary program in Kapa'a, Kaua'i until accepting his current position. Keoni received a master’s degree in Administration, Curriculum and Instruction from Gonzaga University in 1997, and he continues to support education through the native language.

Email: Keoni_Inciong@notes.k12.hi.us

EVALUATION OF SUMMER INSTITUTE

The evaluation is based on a questionnaire (see Appendix B) distributed to institute participants. Approximately 25–30 participants answered the questionnaire, out of a total of 80 participants. The evaluation below represents numerical analysis of likert scale questions and written comments by participants. It should be noted in evaluating results of the questionnaire that less than half of the participants completed the questionnaire so that he number of attendees indicated for workshops does not represent actual participation. Also, the total number of participants was below our expectations. This issue of under-attendance will be discussed below.

Evaluation: Part I

Part I of the evaluation provides demographic information. As indicated in chart 1, the vast majority of participants listed college or university as their institutional affiliation. Most attendees were professors or instructors (chart 2). The languages taught or of primary area of interest, as shown in chart 3, involved a heritage language majority, including Ilokano/Tagalog, Japanese, Chinese/Mandarin, English/ESL, and Spanish. Other participants listed a range of interests such as Bilingual Education, TESL/TEFL, and Language Policy and Planning. Years of experience (chart 4) indicated that most participants had 1–10 or 26+ years of experience.
Chart 2: Position Title

- Student
- Professor
- Instructor
- Librarian
- No response

Chart 3: Language Areas

- Ilokano
- Japanese
- Spanish
- Mandarin
- Hawaiian
- Heritage
- Teacher
- Bilingual
- Lg.
- Foreign

Chart 4: Years of Experience

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26 +
Evaluation: Part II

Part II of the evaluation questionnaire focused on administration, venue, and overall organization of the institute. As represented in charts 5–13, most participants found out about the institute by email/WorldWideWeb or from colleagues. The vast majority strongly agreed or agreed that the information on the summer institute website was adequate for their needs.

![Chart 5: Advertising](chart5.png)

Most participants found the symposium well organized and run. The majority of participants indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed the staff was helpful; facilities and technical support were adequate; and the length of the symposium (2 days) was appropriate. Again, participants strongly agreed or agreed that the overall format of the symposium and variety of perspectives offered were well done. Most also indicated that their overall expectations of the symposium were met.

![Chart 6: Website Adequate](chart6.png)
Replies in Part II generally indicate that the summer institute was considered a valuable and enjoyable experience. As director of the summer institute, I would add that the NFLRC staff, particularly Jim Yoshioka, ensured that the institute proceedings went smoothly. However, the issue of attendance being lower than expected suggests a number of problems. First, both university personnel and K–12 teachers often have summer plans and so may find it difficult to attend a two day workshop mid-summer. Also, there were two other heritage language workshops being conducted on the mainland within two or three months of our institute. Given the additional distance and expense of coming to Hawai‘i, those interested in heritage language
education may have opted for an institute closer in proximity to where they lived. However, a conference held over a weekend mid-Fall semester could draw both mainland participants as well as Pacific Islanders and local residents who would be funded by their educational institutions and/or could receive credit for attending in-service training. We should also examine our advertising strategies, e.g., by drawing on the PREL Institute which has strong links with the Pacific Islands and other similar organizations for assistance in disseminating information about future heritage language symposiums and workshops.

Evaluation: Part III

Part III of questionnaire indicates the number of attendees, ratings, and comments for individual presentations. The opening keynote address by Professor Nancy Hornberger received mostly excellent and good ratings. Comments included: “very interesting”; “wonderful presentation chock full of ideas!”; and “the presentation was very clear and organized.” The one written criticism was: “the overhead projector should be more clear without too many words in one transparency.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 14 Keynote Address: Pluralism as Resource--Nancy Hornberger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Chart Image] Following are the ratings for the keynote address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Bar Chart Image] Excellent: 10, Good: 8, Average: 6, Below Average: 4, Poor: 2, No response: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were three workshops for the first day morning session following the keynote speaker. All workshops were rated either excellent or good. Genevieve Lau’s workshop on Clarifying Heritage Resources for Curriculum Planning and Assessment was attended by the largest number of participants. Participants indicated that this workshop was “…insightful and (it was) helpful to understand the importance of students’ bringing in their own heritage resources into the classroom”; “well-prepared. Clear”; “informative, solid, and good pace throughout”; “Excellent presentation”; “Genevieve is a great speaker/presenter”; “Learned new ideas and answered some questions.”

Richard Ruiz had nearly as many participants in his workshop on Biliteracy Development in Indigenous Communities. Participants observed: “Again, what a joy listening to such a scholar!”; “thought-provoking & substantive; incorporation of Guatemalan case highly valuable.”

The workshop on Unstandardized Varieties as a Classroom Resource presented by Siegel et. al. was not as well attended as other sessions. The one comment made on questionnaires was: “little discussion—wish we’d broken off into groups.”
There were four afternoon workshops on Day 1. The workshop conducted by Graham Crookes and René Antrop-González on *Critical Pedagogy in S/FL Teaching* was best attended. Most reviewers rated this workshop either excellent or good. Participants observed: “I loved the dialogue and audience voices!”; “excellent dialogue, good modeling of its subject, engaging and informative, useful hands-on ‘take-away’ materials”; “somewhat new to me”; “for a newcomer to the topic, it was not clear at the beginning. Needed more concrete examples early in the presentation. Needed more time!”; “very interesting workshop. A little bit closer to an understanding of critical pedagogy.”

Warren Nishimoto and Michi Kodama-Nishimoto had the second most participants and received all excellent or good ratings for their workshop on *Using Oral History for Heritage Culture Learning*. Participants indicated: “It was informative, particularly regarding instrumental and ethical issues concerning oral history data collection”; “comprehensive and well organized.”

Jacinta Galea’i and Laurie Luczak’s workshop on *Language Awareness, Culture, and Education (LACE)*, which had nearly as many participants as the Nishimoto presentation, was rated either excellent or good. Comments included: “I enjoyed the LACE presentation because I was specifically looking for concrete ways to apply theory into actual practice”; “first (presentation) a little too informal—I think there’s a better way to combine fun/language that’s more appropriate for (the) audience. Excellent handouts/resources”;

The Rivers, Eichelberger, & Arakaki workshop was least well attended, but was rated excellent by all participants. One participant observed: “I’m thoroughly thrilled with the movie production but I suggest the Center will allow participant to own the tape or be asked to bring one’s own zip disk to save the production instead of delete it at the end.”
The workshops presented by Theresa Austin on *Creating a Heritage Language Curriculum for Sociocultural Development in Academic Settings, Part I* and by the Studies of Heritage Language and Literacies (SHALL) staff on *Grass-Roots Heritage Language Planning* were best attended during the morning of the second day of the institute.

The Austin presentation received excellent and good ratings. In addition to questionnaire comments, Dr. Austin asked participants to write a one-page evaluation of the two session (6 hour) workshop. Comments from both sources are as follows: “Theresa is a great presenter and provided lots of info to digest”; “step by step progression of themes was so helpful”; “It was a great session — comprehensive and well documented”; “clarified critical pedagogy for me”; “Loved it! Reinforced many of the (institute) presentations!”; “It was very insightful and organized. The discussion in small groups was particularly helpful”; “I have learned how to develop a heritage language curriculum in integrating context—goals, actions, and assessment”; “Today’s presentation let me know that a language program should not only focus on classroom teaching. Students should get involved into the community”; “This is a dynamic and flexible approach to curriculum development and teaching which would add variety and excitement in the class”; “Although ‘heritage’ learning and ‘foreign’ language studies seem to be different concepts, it seems the basic idea may be applied to foreign languages study to stimulate student involvement and development in their second language learning.”

The SHALL workshop also received excellent and good ratings. Comments included: “great student products and participation!”; “well-organized, informative, highly applicable”; I loved hearing from the students and seeing the fruits of their labor. How inspiring!”

Olga Vasquez unfortunately arrived late to the institute and her workshop on *Expanding Success Across Cultural Contexts* was not well attended. The presentation on *Showcasing Student Work Through PowerPoint* by Rachel Rivers, Ariana Eichelberger, & Leslie Arakaki was not well attended but received good ratings.
For the second day afternoon workshops, Theresa Austin’s Part II of her workshop on *Creating a Heritage Language Curriculum for Sociocultural Development in Academic Settings* (see above for comments) and Jerri Willett’s workshop on *No Zones of Purity: Valuing Hybridity Strategically* were equally well attended. They both received excellent ratings with one and two indicating a rating of good, respectively.

Comments on Jerri Willett’s presentation were: “Best one I saw. Too much information, but will be good to read at home”; “Thanks for pushing the boundaries of my structured thinking!”; “new, refreshing ideas”; “remarkable attitude, speech, and discussions.”

Rod Labrador’s presentation on *Rethinking Identity and Education*, although not as well attended as other sessions, received excellent and good ratings. One participant remarked: “I enjoyed his presentation style; he is knowledgeable and personable.”

The workshop on *Developing Curriculum and Materials in a Threatened Language* by Lois Yamauchi, Puanani Wilhelm, and Keoni Inciong was not very well attended but received good ratings.

**Evaluation: Part IV**

Part IV of the questionnaire asked respondents to comment on the professional development aspects of the institute. The following section is organized by questions and responses to each question.
What effect do you expect the symposium will have on your teaching/professional development?

As the following comments indicate, although two respondents felt that their theoretical and pedagogical approaches to heritage language education had been reaffirmed, the vast majority found the workshops of great value—both theoretically and practically—in their future educational and research endeavors.

Validation of (my) teaching method, philosophy & mission enhancement.
Mostly, the symposium reaffirms my current practices and ways of thinking.
A very positive effect. I’ve learned a lot of new material about heritage language and its effect in educational curriculum. I’ve enjoyed listening to other people in the field and the various projects they’re involved in. It was a very productive and educational experience listening to everyone’s feedback and insights.
The information received will allow me to improve my teaching as I question and analyze the “things” or “approaches” I use to teach a foreign language.
It gave me some good ideas on which I can base my future work.
It has both theoretical and practical value (in terms of) my project.
It helped me improve/expand my knowledge. Great ideas.
A change in approach.
Many useful ideas (and some inspiration) to take back to teaching and colleagues.
Transformation of perspective on learning/teaching heritage language.
Will help me in developing curriculum.
I’ve come away with some new ideas for teaching, lots of unanswered questions (I'll be mulling over) and wonderful motivation and support to keep going.
Awareness and application of a framework that incorporates heritage language in my classes. Interest in research related to heritage language.
My ideas/concepts about heritage learners will be more concrete.
Much effect! I have new ideas/challenges to take back to my community.
The symposium made me more aware of the fact that there are a number of different issues concerning heritage learners/learning.

Do you plan to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at your home institution? In what way?

The following comments by institute participants indicate that they will use a variety of ways to disseminate what they’ve learned, including collaborative curriculum planning; informal/formal presentations and discussions with colleagues; sharing handouts; and incorporation of theories/practices in university courses.

Yes, in the way of working on heritage language projects of Japanese by JSL-L.
Yes, we will do curriculum together.
I plan to send out an email to our listserv to offer to share (informally) what I’ve learned with anyone who is interested.

Yes—by pushing their thinking!

A general presentation.

Through a seminar within my dept.

At meetings.

Share handouts.

Share handouts and explain, discuss the methodologies and theories.

Through my teacher development related courses.

By incorporating in my plan of assessment strategies what I have learned through this conference.

I will use some ideas I learned in future workshops I give as well as my methods course and in developing curriculum for heritage language courses.

Through informal discussions that come up…water fountain talk.

By sharing information on the handouts and explaining what we covered in the workshops.

I will apply what I learned from the symposium in my job as project coordinator. I have a better understanding on how to work with students in high school who are still struggling with issues of identity.

What was done well at the symposium and what could we have done better?

The vast majority of the questionnaire respondents were extremely positive about what they took away from presentations and the overall experience of the institute. The few suggestions we received suggested the need for reaching a broader audience by advertising extensively before the conference and repeating workshops during the institute so that individuals could experience more of what was offered. One respondent found that the use of the term “heritage language” by presenters was sometimes unclear. There were a few suggestions for better handouts, coffee throughout the day, better or less expensive lunches, and more breaks. The following comments are divided according to positive aspects of the symposium and suggestions for improvement.

Positive aspects of symposium

A positive aspect of the symposium was the array of competent presenters and topics; very diverse and informative.

The conference was very good!

The idea of having a few workshops instead of a long series of short presentations was excellent.

Good speakers. Afternoon registration and reception allowed participants extra time as tourists. Well organized and friendly staff—great hospitality!
Well-organized. Hopefully bigger in the future—perhaps natural growth will occur as more communities become involved in HL, good for cross-pollination.
Great facility, atmosphere, hospitality.
You did a great job!
Done well. Encouraging dialogue, providing comfortable spaces.
Overall organization, facilitators, videotaping assistants and staff members are all professionally working together. Topics and speakers are well chosen.
Everything was just dandy!
I enjoyed the opening ceremony and all of the workshops. I also enjoyed staying on campus at Lincoln Hall.
Good schedule/topics/info. Professional. Great food/entertainment.
The symposium was informative and helped me develop my interest in the field of heritage language even more. However, it seems that people have different interpretations as to what “heritage learners” means and as a result, some of the presentations do not seem clear as to how their presentation is related to “heritage learners.”

Suggestions for improvement

Advertise more widely.
How about repeat workshops so we can attend others that are scheduled at the same time?
More information (needed) about writing curriculum.
A few times during the workshops, I felt that we could have used a short break. Also, a few of the presenters had handouts that were hard to read or incomplete (missing citations & details).
Coffee, coffee, coffee all day long, not just in the a.m.
Something that could have been improved was the lunch—the price was too high for the lunch that was given. The breakfast and snacks were great though.

SUMMARY

The overall evaluation of the 2002 NFLRC/CSLR summer institute is highly positive. Participants generally felt that the institute was well organized, presenters/topics were thoughtfully chosen, and the infrastructure of the institute was professionally planned. The impact of the institute will go far beyond the two days of workshops through participant dissemination of ideas among colleagues and through coursework.
Informal discussions with participants indicated a general feeling of satisfaction. Some participants even commented that the intimacy of the conference (smaller numbers) was extremely positive in terms of more direct involvement with presenters and other participants.
Nonetheless, the questionnaire and comments gave us some useful insights into how we might better plan and advertise for future two-day long conferences so as to increase numbers. As previously mentioned, both university personnel and K–12 teachers often have summer plans and so may find it difficult to attend a two day workshop mid-July. Thus, a conference that is held over a weekend mid-Fall semester might draw mainland participants as well as Pacific Islanders and local residents who would be funded by their educational institutions and/or could receive credit for attending in-service training sessions. We should also examine our advertising strategies, drawing on organizations such as the PREL Institute which has strong links with the Pacific Islands; State Departments of Education; professional organizations (perhaps advertise in professional journals); and other institutions for assistance in disseminating information about upcoming institutes. The questionnaire also provided us with valuable information about the kinds of topics and presenters that are most needed and appreciated. This information can not only be used to plan future conferences, but also serve to provide ongoing resources and contacts for NFLRC and CSLR projects.

In sum, the 2002 NFLRC/CSLR-sponsored summer institute was a success. The professionalism of the NFLRC staff was evident, and we were fortunate to have widely known experts serve as our key note speaker and workshop presenters. As director of the 2002 NFLRC Summer Institute and CSLR, I look forward to continuing collaborative work with the NFLRC.
APPENDIX A: SCHEDULE OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19</th>
<th>Imin Center lanai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30–5:30 Registration</td>
<td>Imin Center lanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30–8:30 Opening Ceremony</td>
<td>Imin Center lanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(food, beverages, island entertainment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THURSDAY, JUNE 20</th>
<th>Wailana Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30–8:30</td>
<td>Complimentary morning refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration (continues throughout day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30–9:30</td>
<td>Opening Keynote Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Dr. Nancy Hornberger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40–12:40</td>
<td>Concurrent 3-hour workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complimentary snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40–1:40</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45–4:45</td>
<td>Concurrent 3-hour workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRIDAY, JUNE 21</th>
<th>Wailana Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30–8:30</td>
<td>Complimentary morning refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration (continues throughout day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30–11:30</td>
<td>Concurrent 3-hour workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30–3:30</td>
<td>Concurrent 3-hour workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45–4:45</td>
<td>Wrap-up session / Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keoni Auditorium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION

Your assistance with this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. Please take a few minutes to assess the effectiveness of the symposium. Completing it carefully will aid us in preparing for future Summer Institutes. Thank you very much!

PART I

1. Which best describes your institutional affiliation?
   □ Elementary   □ High School   □ Adult/Community College
   □ Intermediate □ College/University □ Other ______________________

2. What is your position title? ____________________________________________

3. Please indicate the language(s) and/or subject(s) that you teach or that represent your primary areas of interest: ___________________________________________

4. Years of experience in education ________________________________
PART II

Please check the phrase or statement that best applies to your experience. Feel free to add any comments to clarify or enhance your response.

1. How did you find out about the 2002 NFLRC/CSLR Summer Institute?
   - Journal/Newsletter
   - Flyer
   - Email/WWW
   - Conference
   - Colleague
   Other? Comment

2. The information on the Summer Institute website was adequate for my needs.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   Comment

3. The symposium was well organized and well run.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   Comment

4. The staff was helpful.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   Comment

5. The symposium facilities and technical support were adequate.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   Comment
6. The length of the symposium (3 days) was appropriate.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

Comment ........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................

7. I enjoyed the overall format of the symposium (opening reception, keynote address, 3-hour workshops, wrap-up session)

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

Comment ........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................

8. I found the variety of perspectives represented by symposium presenters and participants valuable.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

Comment ........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................

9. Overall, my expectations of the symposium were met.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

Comment ........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................
Part III

Please evaluate the keynote presentation and the workshops you attended (circle your rating). Specific comments are greatly appreciated.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS:

Pluralism as Resource: Ecological Approaches to Bilingual, Foreign, and Heritage Language Education (Nancy Hornberger)

Excellent    Good    Average    Below Average    Poor

Comment

THURSDAY MORNING WORKSHOP (please check the workshop you attended):

☐ Clarifying Heritage Resources for Curriculum Planning and Assessment (Genevieve Lau)
☐ Unstandardized Varieties as a Classroom Resource (Jeff Siegel, Kent Sakoda, and Terri Menacker)
☐ Biliteracy Development in Indigenous Communities (Richard Ruiz)

Excellent    Good    Average    Below Average    Poor

Comment

THURSDAY AFTERNOON WORKSHOP (please check the workshop you attended):

☐ Critical Pedagogy in S/FL Teaching (Graham Crookes & René Antrop-González)
☐ Language Awareness, and Culture and Education (Jacinta Galea’i & Laurie Luczak)
☐ Using Oral History for Heritage Culture Learning (Warren Nishimoto & Michi Kodama-Nishimoto)
☐ Integrating Technology with Curriculum: Creating Digital Videos (Rachel Rivers, Ariana Eichelberger, & Leslie Arakaki)

Excellent    Good    Average    Below Average    Poor

Comment
FRIDAY MORNING WORKSHOP (please check the workshop you attended):

☐ Creating a Heritage Language Curriculum for Sociocultural Development in Academic Settings, part 1 (Theresa Austin)
☐ Grass-Roots Heritage Language Planning (SHALL Project Team)
☐ Expanding Success Across Cultural Contexts (Olga Vasquez)
☐ Showcasing Student Work Through PowerPoint (Rachel Rivers, Ariana Eichelberger, & Leslie Arakaki)

Excellent  Good  Average  Below Average  Poor

Comment ___________________________________________
__________________________________________________
__________________________________________________

FRIDAY AFTERNOON WORKSHOP (please check the workshop you attended):

☐ Creating a Heritage Language Curriculum for Sociocultural Development in Academic Settings, part 2 (Theresa Austin)
☐ Re-Thinking Identity and Education (Roderick Labrador)
☐ No Zones of Purity: Valuing Hybridity Strategically (Jerri Willett)
☐ Developing Curriculum and Materials in a Threatened Language: Lessons Learned from Papahana Kāiapuni, the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program (Lois Yamauchi, Puanani Wilhelm, & Keoni Inciong)

Excellent  Good  Average  Below Average  Poor

Comment ___________________________________________
__________________________________________________
__________________________________________________

Part IV

Please respond to the following questions.

1. What effect do you expect the symposium will have on your teaching/professional development?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
2. Do you plan to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at your home institution? In what way?

3. What was done well at the symposium and what could we have done better?

MAHALO FOR YOUR TIME!