

AAUSC 2016 Volume—Issues in Language Program Direction

The Interconnected Language Curriculum: Critical Transitions and Interfaces in Articulated K-16 Contexts

Per Urlaub, University of Texas at Austin

Johanna Watzinger-Tharp, University of Utah

Editors

Stacey Katz Bourns, Northeastern University

Series Editor





**AAUSC 2016 Volume - Issues
in Language Program
Direction: The Interconnected
Language Curriculum: Critical
Transitions and Interfaces in
Articulated K-16 Contexts**
Per Urlaub, Johanna Watzinger-
Tharp and Stacey Katz Bourns

Product Director: Beth Kramer
Product Assistant: Cara Gaynor
Marketing Manager: Sean
Ketchem
Manufacturing Planner: Betsy
Donaghey
Art and Design Direction,
Production Management,
and Composition: Lumina
Datamatics, Inc.

© 2018 Cengage Learning

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright herein may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

For product information and
technology assistance, contact us at **Cengage Learning
Customer & Sales Support, 1-800-354-9706**

For permission to use material from this text or product,
submit all requests online at **www.cengage.com/permissions**.
Further permissions questions can be e-mailed to
permissionrequest@cengage.com.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016953602

ISBN: 978-1-337-27645-0

Cengage Learning

20 Channel Center Street
Boston, MA 02210
USA

Cengage Learning is a leading provider of customized learning solutions with employees residing in nearly 40 different countries and sales in more than 125 countries around the world. Find your local representative at **www.cengage.com**.

Cengage Learning products are represented in Canada by Nelson Education, Ltd.

To learn more about Cengage Learning Solutions, visit
www.cengage.com.

Purchase any of our products at your local college store or at our preferred online store **www.cengagebrain.com**.

Chapter 7

The Roadmap to Mainstreaming Dual Language Immersion in Rhode Island

Erin L. Papa, University of Rhode Island

Sigrid Berka, University of Rhode Island

Introduction

“Monolingualism is the illiteracy of the 21st century”—this quote from Utah State Board of Education dual language immersion expert Gregg Roberts (personal communication, November, 2014) serves as the motto for our attempt, in this article, to illustrate how the State Language Roadmap process can be a vehicle for mainstreaming language immersion education from K-12 and articulating that programming with higher-education Cultures & Languages Across the Curriculum (CLAC) programs or initiatives. In particular, we describe strategies and insights gained during the Rhode Island Roadmap to Language Excellence process that can be used to implement language education reform at the university level.

In the absence of regulatory frameworks to foster compatibility among the U.S. states and with “little legislative initiative from the federal government to influence curriculum and instruction at universities” (Urlaub, 2014, p. 3), the leaders of the Rhode Island Roadmap process opted to independently develop a model for curricular changes at the state level. The changes implemented in this model begin in kindergarten and extend all the way to postsecondary. By moving the “Stakes of Curricular Transformation in Collegiate Foreign Language Education” (Urlaub, 2014, p. 1) to the K-12 level, the Roadmap framework leverages successful models of professional language integration (in engineering, business, and other disciplines) at the postsecondary level and applies these models to content-based dual language immersion reform in the K-12 sphere. It is the vision of the authors that articulation be created across all levels of language learning and instruction. Successful coordination of policy implementation, both horizontally and vertically, and articulation between all levels of the K-16 classroom can inspire a further scaling up of already considerable enrollments exemplified by promising early results of the Utah K-12 dual language immersion initiative (Swenson, Watzinger-Tharp, & Mayne, 2014), the Language Flagship programs (Davidson, 2010, 2015), and the University of Rhode Island (URI) International

Engineering Program (IEP) (Berka, von Reinhart, & Papa, 2013; Grandin, 2011, 2013). It is hoped that this approach will ultimately lead to higher numbers of proficient world language (WL) users among our high school and college graduates and thus to an overall mainstreaming of multilingualism. With these goals in mind, this article offers a possible route toward transforming WL education.

(Co)Creating Language Policy to Meet the Demands of Business and Government: The Case of the Rhode Island Roadmap

There is a long-standing consensus in both the public and private sectors that the lack of advanced language and culture skills in the United States is a threat to our national security and economic competitiveness (Committee on Economic Development, 2006; Klein & Rice, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, 1983). In an effort to meet this challenge and encourage bilingualism in the absence of a national foreign language (FL) policy, a number of initiatives have been put forth by the federal government, including the Language Flagship programs (Department of Defense), the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI) and NSLI-Y for Youth (Department of State), and the Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP, Department of Education). At the Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA's) Foreign Language Summit in 2010, U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan pointed to the Department of Education's responsibility to support language study from the earliest grades through high school; he articulated a national goal of preparing students to master other languages "to support America's economic and strategic interests as diplomats, foreign policy analysts, and leaders in the military" (Duncan, 2010).

Ironically, within a year of Duncan's speech, FLAP, the only federally funded program exclusively supporting FL education at the K-12 level, was discontinued. With the discontinuation of FLAP—and the increased focus on accountability since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2001), particularly in the areas of mathematics and English language arts—programs promoting bilingualism both for native English speakers and for English learners (ELs) have been shrinking. This instability in language education policy at the federal level may be due to a lack of local support and buy-in for language education, as well as an absence of coordination between the various stakeholders from top to bottom and across sectors.

FL education at the postsecondary level largely mirrors the K-12 situation, although forward-looking FL department chairs and educators have tried to address the problematic trend in various ways. In a 1994 *ADFL Bulletin*, Russell Berman called for a post hermeneutic pedagogy that aims for "foreign cultural literacy: the ability of the student to operate effectively in a different cultural

setting” (p. 10). Four years later, the shift to language and culture study across academic and professional disciplines resonated with the German Studies Association’s (GSA) guidelines for curricular organization, which challenged the community to “foster new interdisciplinary models that encourage students to pursue in-depth knowledge while acquiring useful skills in several related fields and developing flexibility for their future careers” (GSA, 1998). The GSA strongly encouraged extended stays and study abroad to develop intercultural competency, deeper international understanding, and proficiency in an FL.

A more recent attempt to revisit the status quo of U.S. FL education in the face of the present language crisis (Glenn, 2011; Jaschik, 2008, 2010; McWhorter, 2010) was the 2007 report by the MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, which found that only 6.1% of students declaring an FL as their first major actually continue their studies toward a doctoral degree with the goal of becoming an academic, while 94% of students are studying languages for another reason. Based on the report’s findings, the authors advocated for curricular reforms to increase the pragmatic relevance and appeal of language courses for students whose primary interests may not include a foreign literature. Adopting such a broad approach to language study, supported by alliances with other departments (through interdisciplinary course offerings, for instance), offers an opportunity for reinvigorating language departments as valuable academic units central to—and not on the margins of—the humanities and the university as a whole. It is an approach that chairs of FL departments may wish to consider to strengthen overall enrollment.

The cause of moving FL departments from the margins to the center of postsecondary education is supported by MLA and American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) survey statistics. Despite grim media reports on the subject, these statistics show that the number of K-12 language learners increased by roughly 3% between 2005 and 2008 (ACTFL, 2010; Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2010). Despite these gains, however, the Fall 2011 German Quarterly point to an apparent disconnect between the large number of language learners in K-12 schools and the much smaller number, especially beyond the first year, in college courses, where the ratio of enrollees between beginner and advanced courses is 4:1 (Costabile-Heming, 2011). Furman et al. (2010) conclude that language faculty need to do more on the postsecondary side of the equation to tap into the pool of eager K-12 learners by using marketing tactics to fill the pipeline of language courses, offering attractive topics that are more relevant to the students’ worlds, and presenting them with a purpose for their learning (p. 27). Even more recently, the agenda of integrating disciplinary content knowledge into collegiate language programs has been advanced on multiple levels in an attempt to work outside the FL box (See discussion of transformational models in Urlaub, 2014).

And yet, since the United States has no official FL education policy, for better or for worse, there is no *de jure* policymaking body in charge of language education at the federal level. This leaves language education policy in the hands of

the states (when a state supervisor for language education is in place) and in the hands of the local education agency, school administrators, practitioners, parents, students, and the local community otherwise. Ricento and Hornberger (1996) describe this variability in language policy and planning as a multilayered “onion” of agents, levels, and processes that interact with each other and are interpreted and modified at the various layers in the process of implementing language programs. The outer layers of the onion represent national- or macro-level legislation and policy objectives, whereas the center of the onion represents the classroom practitioner.

While much research in the realm of language education policy has focused on the macro-level—and, more recently, on the role of educators in (re)creating policies in their classrooms (Menken & García, 2010)—the literature does not address the question of how to coordinate these policies with classroom practice. The present manuscript seeks to fill that gap, and thus help language program directors find a concrete way of influencing policy, by introducing the State Language Roadmap as a possible policy solution in which stakeholders from the various layers of the metaphorical onion (co)create policies to increase the bilingualism of the U.S. labor force. Specifically, we discuss the development of the Roadmap as a policy tool by examining our own experience (co)creating the Rhode Island Roadmap to Language Excellence with stakeholders in the business, government, and education sectors in the state from the bottom up.

The Instability of Top-Down Policies

Top-down language education policies can be problematic; leadership positions change frequently and the various levels often fail to coordinate. Research in a variety of contexts around the world has shown that top-level policies tend not to be implemented as originally intended: they are negotiated, interpreted, and then (re)created by administrators, local communities, and practitioners in the classroom (Menken & García, 2010). Johnson and Freeman (2010) examine the various interpretations of federal, state, and local education policies by three different administrators in the School District of Philadelphia and report that the administrators interpret the policies differently based on their beliefs about the needs of language learners, making idiosyncratic choices about which language to use when and how and whether to expand or restrict space for bilingual education. In a case study of two student teachers in France, Hélot (2010) found that these early-career professionals could be agents for multilingualism even in a “centralized, hierarchical, and monolingually biased education system” (p. 65).

Although research has identified some cases of successful implementation of multilingual policies and practices, success stories are more often the exception than the rule. In the Providence Public School District (PPSD) for example, leadership instability and lack of clarity on how best to educate English language

learners leave many students without fully developed literacy in any language (Casserly, 2011). In many cases in PPSD, students are learning English at the expense of their home languages, even though data from Thomas and Collier (2012) strongly suggest that this loss of the home language is in fact detrimental to the learning of English. Wong Fillmore (2000) explains language loss as “the result of both internal and external forces operating on children. The internal factors have to do with desire for social inclusion, conformity, and the need to communicate with others. The external forces are the sociopolitical ones operating in the society against outsiders, against differences, against diversity” (p. 208). To counteract these forces, it is essential for language educators and language users, as Hornberger (2005) suggests:

To fill up implementational spaces with multilingual educational practices, whether with intent to occupy ideological spaces opened up by policies or to prod actively toward more favorable ideological spaces in the face of restrictive policies. Ideological spaces created by language and education policies can be seen as carving out implementational spaces at classroom and community levels, but implementational spaces can also serve as wedges to pry open ideological ones (p. 606).

We agree with Hornberger (2005) that language educators and language users must “fill up” and “prod open” implementational and ideological spaces, but we also advocate for a coordination of grassroots efforts with individuals and groups who have a stake in multilingualism. Such coordination can be achieved, for example, when scholars and educators share research on bilingual education and evidence of successful bilingual education programs with policymakers at both the state and district level. State Language Roadmaps can help bring stakeholders together to (co)create new policies for language education, informed by decades of research on bilingualism and biliteracy, to meet the needs of business and government in the 21st-century global economy. We believe that these roadmaps have the potential to empower language educators in schools and universities to take charge of FL policymaking in their states.

Possible Policy Solution: State Language Roadmaps

State Language Roadmaps offer a possible policy solution to the problem of fractured bilingual education. By bringing stakeholders together from the various macro- and micro-levels of policy creation, State Language Roadmaps help to open up implementational and ideological spaces, per Hornberger (2005), geared to each state’s particular context, with the ultimate goal of (co)creating educational policy to meet the demand for a multilingual workforce. The Language Flagship, which conceptualized the State Language Roadmap, is a community of

programs designed to create global professionals in a variety of fields who possess superior proficiency in one of the many languages critical to national security and economic competitiveness. The Flagship model “addresses the needs of students around the nation who are motivated to gain professional proficiency in language during their undergraduate studies” and also supports efforts “to push the model down to elementary, middle, and high schools.” Flagship considers the integration of language skills into K-12 education as “vital to our capacity to educate a citizenry prepared to address the nation’s well-being in the 21st century” (The Language Flagship, 2016). With funding from the U.S. Congress and co-sponsorship from the Departments of Commerce and Labor, the Flagship Centers at the University of Oregon, The Ohio State University, and The University of Texas at Austin led the effort to revitalize language education policy in 2007. Utah, using the model developed by The Language Flagship, created the Utah Language Roadmap in 2009. Rhode Island completed the process in 2012, with Hawaii following in 2013.

Each project began with a preliminary analysis of the language needs of business and government in the respective state. This process was followed by a full-day State Language Summit in which 50 to 60 leaders from business, government, and education in the state participated to further delineate language needs. Following each summit, a subset of participants met in working groups over a four-month period to develop a Roadmap to Language Excellence for the state, which was then launched publically.

The Roadmap process dovetails with Hornberger’s (2010) findings in her research on multilingualism-in-practice around the world. Hornberger demonstrates that top-down policy is insufficient and doomed to fail without bottom-up support for multilingual education. This insight is manifested by best practices at the postsecondary level at the URI: It was the entrepreneurial, bottom-up initiative of one educator that, in 1987, jump-started the innovative International Engineering Program (IEP), a dual degree program leading to a Bachelor of Science in an engineering discipline and a Bachelor of Arts in German, French, Spanish, Italian, or Chinese (with a Japanese track now on the horizon). In the fourth year of the five-year program, students spend a year abroad completing a semester of study at a partner institution, followed by a six-month professional internship with an engineering company. Students enrolled in the IEP have their eye on the excitement of being immersed in an FL and culture, as well as the career path that language knowledge affords them (Grandin, 2011).

Such a model is achievable on any campus where department chairs and program directors take the lead in strategically crossing disciplinary boundaries to initiate collaborations with other colleges and work toward a more purposeful approach to language education on their campuses. In the case of the IEP, support from the administration was gained later, after initial success was achieved through funding from external sources (Grandin, 2013). Similarly,

the Roadmap process creates an opportunity to bring together top- and grass-roots-level stakeholders to (co)create policies that work for each state's particular context. For example, Utah began the process at the urging of its bilingual governor Jon Huntsman. With strong coordination between leaders and practitioners in business, government, and education, the state held two Language Summits, developed a Roadmap, and—with the leadership of State Senator Howard Stephenson—passed the International Initiatives Senate Bill 41 in 2008, which funded the implementation of dual language immersion (DLI) programs statewide.

The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) has become a national model for seamless coordination of macro- and micro-level stakeholders. Senate Bill 41 provides ongoing funding to schools and districts that choose to take part in DLI, principals and administrators from all districts share their expertise and participate in an advisory council, teachers participate in the Annual Utah Dual Immersion Institute (AUDII) each summer and ongoing professional development throughout the school year, and seven Utah colleges and universities partner with the USOE to recruit and train DLI teachers (Leite, 2013). This convergence of top-down and bottom-up support has played a critical role in the growth of Utah's DLI programs; just seven years after the approval of Senate Bill 41, 28,000 students were enrolled in five different languages (Chinese, French, German, Portuguese, and Spanish) at 138 schools for the 2015–2016 school year. Indeed, Utah may be well on its way to making DLI the norm for FL education in the state and beyond (G. Roberts, personal communication, August 31, 2015). Utah's programs use a 50/50, two-teacher model beginning in first grade, with daily instruction divided equally between the immersion language and English. Keeping the model and best practices learned from Utah in mind, in the next section, we will examine Rhode Island's experience in developing a State Language Roadmap in greater detail.

The Rhode Island Context

Rhode Island (RI), the smallest state in the United States, is home to a little over one million residents and can be crossed by car in under an hour. The state's 36 public school districts and 300 schools served 142,008 public school students in the 2013–2014 school year, of whom 6% received English as a second language (ESL) or bilingual education services. The most common home languages of RI ELs are Spanish (7,868), Portuguese-based creoles and pidgins (450), Portuguese (291), Khmer (171), Chinese (159), Arabic (101), and French (78) (Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE), 2014). Although districts typically offer—or would like to offer—many of these same languages through their WL departments, coordination between foreign and English language education in the state is next to nonexistent. There has also been no concerted effort to create an articulated

language program between K-12 and any of the three public institutions of higher Education, URI, Rhode Island College, and the Community College of Rhode Island. In the following sections, we describe current policies affecting language education in the State of Rhode Island.

Rhode Island FL Education Policy

In Rhode Island, decisions regarding which languages are offered, to whom, and for how long are made at the district or school level. There is no office within the RIDE responsible for FL education and no state supervisor for language education. The Rhode Island Board of Regents Basic Education Program Regulations require that the “determination of the [world language] offerings shall be based on the needs and interests of students, the community, and the global economy” and that each local education agency shall provide “Coursework in a minimum of two languages other than English at the secondary level and offerings of at least three consecutive years of the two selected languages” (Rhode Island Board of Regents, 2009). Local education agencies are encouraged but not required to offer at least one language other than English at the elementary level (Rhode Island Board of Regents, 2010).

We can see in this legislation a clear implementation space available for K-12 language education; in practice, however, FLs are almost exclusively taught at the high school level, and enrollment numbers are discouraging. According to the ACTFL’s (2010) report on FL enrollments in K-12 public schools, enrollment in FL courses in Rhode Island decreased an estimated 40% from 2004–2005 to 2007–2008, with only 16% of Rhode Island students in grades 6–12 enrolled in an FL course in 2007–2008.

In Rhode Island, both public and private colleges and universities require two years of FL study for admission and include FL and culture courses as a part of the general education requirements for an undergraduate degree. In most cases, fulfillment of these requirements is based on “seat time,” or number of hours in the classroom, rather than on proficiency. Two high school years or two college semesters typically take students to the Novice High to Intermediate Low level of proficiency.

Rhode Island’s FL education situation is not unique. In her analysis of the state of FL education in the United States, Met (2003) notes that little has changed since the early 1990s. She observes that official policymakers at the national, state, and local levels have made successful careers as monolingual English speakers, causing them to “remain unconvinced of either the importance of language learning or our ability to produce students with the levels of proficiency needed” (Met, 2003, p. 590). Met further describes how, in the absence of a federal language education policy, an array of decision-makers—some officially charged with policy-making and others not—make critical decisions about language education (p. 590).

Rhode Island EL Education Policy

Until the recent implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2016, EL education policy in Rhode Island was based on the Rhode Island Board of Education's interpretation of Title III of NCLB: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students. While the main focus of the NCLB's publication (and the Rhode Island Board of Education's interpretation thereof) is on the development of students' academic skills across school subjects in the English language, Rhode Island Board of Education Regulation L-4-1.5 (2010) requires that districts "facilitate the preservation and development of the existing native language skills of English Language Learners." This clause could provide the ideological and implementational space for bilingual/DLI education in Rhode Island public schools. At present, however, the majority of programs focus solely on the development of ELs' academic and social English language skills. Prior to the launch of the Roadmap in 2012, there were only three bilingual education programs in Rhode Island public schools, all at the elementary level: a Spanish-English DLI program in PPSD, two-way immersion programs in Spanish-English and Portuguese-English at The International Charter School, and a developmental bilingual program for native Spanish speakers in the Central Falls School District. One private school, the French-American School of Rhode Island, offers a PK-8 French-English DLI program.

The Rhode Island Roadmap to Language Excellence

In this section, we discuss the Roadmap development process from Papa's perspective as the lead coordinator of the initiative in Rhode Island. We first describe the National Security Education Program (NSEP) rationale for selecting Rhode Island and then describe our process leading to the Roadmap recommendations. We conclude this section by discussing particular challenges to implementing the recommendations and noting encouraging signs of success.

Why a Roadmap for Rhode Island?

In the spring of 2011, the director of NSEP approached the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at URI to promote the development of a State Language Roadmap for Rhode Island through our Chinese Flagship Program office. URI was selected due to its track record in engaging businesses through the URI IEP and its burgeoning Flagship program. URI first championed the innovative IEP in 1987 as a solution to several connected problems: dwindling student numbers in the higher-level FL classrooms, concerns over the value of a university education, and industry complaints about the lack of coordination between higher education and the needs of the workplace (Grandin, 2013). In their piece on "Reforming American Higher Education: The University of Rhode Island International Engineering Program," Grandin and Berka (2014) describe how Grandin pioneered a partnership between the URI Humanities Faculty and

the Sciences and Technology Faculty. That partnership can be seen as a template for much-needed reform that bridges a broad range of disciplines toward the common goal of offering students an education that is simultaneously rooted deeply in the liberal arts and the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) disciplines.

IEP alumni work for a variety of global and local engineering firms and government agencies, and many go on to top graduate programs in engineering, law, or medicine (Grandin, 2011). Using data from alumni surveys and company interviews, Berka, von Reinhart, and Papa (2013) have documented the effectiveness of the IEP model in preparing engineers for the Rhode Island workforce. The IEP has also proven to be an agent of change on the URI campus by moving the languages from the margins to the center. It helped turn around a national trend of discontinuing certain language majors (e.g., German) and instead—thanks to the high percentage of engineering majors in the German classroom—grew German major enrollment in Rhode Island to one of the highest levels in the country. According to Woodis (2010), German major enrollment at URI in 2010 was 124, the second largest after the University of Michigan with 184; now, in 2016, URI is at the top, along with Michigan, in number of German majors (Court, 2015).

The Language Flagship program is a broader version of the IEP that is offered at universities across the country. Like the IEP, the Flagship program requires a year of study and internship abroad, but it expands the IEP's interdisciplinary model to all possible majors that can be combined with a critical language. The Flagship program also raises the bar in terms of target language proficiency to Superior. Before Flagship students can embark on their Capstone Year abroad, they must achieve a minimum of Advanced Low proficiency in at least two language modalities (speaking plus listening or reading). The rigor of the Flagship requirements has inspired curricular reform in WL departments where the Flagship program has been introduced and has in some cases started a discussion about adopting a more content- and proficiency-based approach to noncritical-language pedagogy. The IEP, too, has moved toward the implementation of unofficial OPI (Oral Proficiency Interview) assessment before and after the year abroad, although systematic official assessments have yet to be implemented. Davidson (2015) examines the language gains made by students participating in The Language Flagship, among other federally funded programs, and confirms that U.S. undergraduates are capable of achieving Superior level proficiency through the structured Capstone Year programs overseas.

While K-12 WL curricula can extract important lessons about interdisciplinary integration and content-based instruction from the IEP and the Flagship Programs, those programs, in turn, would benefit greatly from stronger language education programs at the K-12 level. The decentralized nature of present

language education means that students enter both programs at varying levels of proficiency—a characteristic that cannot be confidently predicted based on “seat-time” in a language classroom alone. Department chairs and FL educators nationwide would similarly benefit from gathering intelligence on the spectrum of languages taught in the districts from which their universities draw students and by working with those schools to build articulation with DLI programs and implement proficiency-based language instruction on their campuses.

The Process

Based on the rationale outlined earlier, we secured a Roadmap grant from NSEP in August 2011, which provided the funds to hire a graduate student to help with the preliminary research, to run the day-long Rhode Island Language Summit at a hotel in downtown Providence in December 2011, to print and distribute the Roadmap in June 2012, and to hire consultants to advise us on Roadmap development and implementation. In the fall of 2011, we conducted our preliminary research on the demand for and supply of language skills in the State of Rhode Island. We gathered demand-side data through semi-structured telephone interviews with CEOs, human resources directors, and directors of Rhode Island government service agencies (see Appendix A for interview questions). In order to identify potential demand-side interviewees, we acquired the Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation’s (RIEDC) list of the top 100 employers in Rhode Island (in terms of number of employees) and chose from that list globally and domestically operating businesses of varying sizes from all of Rhode Island’s major industry sectors, which include manufacturing, biotechnology, health care, and social services. We also included employers in Massachusetts and Connecticut that draw on the Rhode Island workforce and made a list of Rhode Island government service agencies in the emergency services, health care, human services, and public transportation sectors. Since Rhode Island is a small state, we were able to identify potential interviewees within our personal and professional networks at many of the selected organizations. When we did not have direct connections, we would “cold call” the organization, introduce ourselves and the project, and request an interview. Using a shared Google document, the dean, IEP director, graduate assistant, Roadmap consultant, and main principal investigator (PI) of the grant made initial phone calls, sent follow-up e-mails to schedule the interviews, and took detailed notes during the interviews. When possible, we conducted the interviews in teams of two, with one person asking questions and the other taking notes. We worked closely with our graduate assistant and Roadmap consultant to analyze the interview data and to produce our preliminary research report.

We invited all interviewees, as well as all Rhode Island federal and state legislators and state education leaders, to the Rhode Island Language Summit on December 7, 2011, in Providence. Dr. Susan Duggan, then Senior Strategist for

The Language Flagship, facilitated the day-long working meeting aimed at further delineating the language needs of the state. Fifty-six leaders from Rhode Island's business, government, and education sectors participated. Participants were divided into working groups by sector and by global or domestic focus (i.e., businesses with global operations, businesses with domestic operations, government agencies with a domestic focus, and government agencies with a global focus). An equal number of supply-side (education sector) participants joined each group as facilitators and recorders. Groups were asked questions similar to those asked during the interview process in order to further delineate the language needs of the state.

Language Supply versus Demand in Rhode Island

Through the interviews and the discussions at the Summit, we found that both domestically and globally operating businesses and government agencies in Rhode Island have urgent needs for employees with Advanced- to Superior-level language skills. Business needs for multilingual skills vary based on the size of the company, the geographic focus of business, and the industry sector. Rhode Island companies indicated that Spanish is equally important for domestic and global operations. After Spanish, the most prominent language needs for domestic operations are Khmer (Cambodian), Portuguese, and Haitian Creole, while Chinese, German, and French are the most noted needs for current global operations. Businesses agreed that Chinese, Brazilian Portuguese, and Arabic would be the most prominent language needs in five years. Small- and medium-sized businesses reported a need for employees with language proficiency at a level sufficient to conduct contract negotiations to help to avoid additional business costs; at a technical level, to communicate with suppliers and customers; at a cultural level, to build trust; and at a medical level, to communicate with Rhode Island's immigrant populations, often in emergency situations. Multilingual capabilities in multinational corporations are critical at the upper management level, and all employees must have the ability to work in global teams. All business leaders emphasized the need for cultural competency of employees at all levels. Most companies would prefer to hire local employees with bilingual or multilingual capabilities, but often face challenges in locating hires with such language skills. This lack in supply prompts most companies to rely on outsourcing to meet their language needs, although some provide in-house language training for their employees when resources are available.

Rhode Island government service agencies interviewed included those in the health, human services, emergency services, and transportation sectors. All reported Spanish to be their most prevalent language need, with increasing demand for Portuguese (primarily Cape Verdean Portuguese Creole), French and Haitian Creole, and Hmong, as well as a variety of other languages reflective of the current Rhode Island immigrant population.

The language supply and demand information that emerged from the Summit clearly demonstrated that language education in Rhode Island's public schools is not sufficient to meet the needs of business and government. The corporate world could benefit if the existing talents and home languages of ELs were leveraged in school. Although districts offer a variety of WLs, including Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Chinese, and Japanese, most schools do not offer WLs until high school. This late start means that our public institutions of higher education are forced to focus most of their energies on Novice- and Intermediate-level language skills. In 2010–2011, the Rhode Island higher education system produced only 91 language majors; only 105 URI students were enrolled in language courses at the 400-level, which would be expected to produce speakers with limited professional proficiency.

Roadmap Recommendations

Following the Rhode Island Language Summit, a subset of participants met from January through May in working groups to develop the Rhode Island Roadmap to Language Excellence. Based on the findings from the Summit and our knowledge of the workings of the state, we developed the following strategic vision: *The State of Rhode Island strives to create a multilingual, culturally savvy, globally competent Rhode Island community and workforce by creating well-articulated language learning programs emphasizing proficiency and biliteracy. By 2030, the majority of Rhode Island graduates will be proficient in English and at least one other language.*

Our key recommendations for implementing this vision and addressing Rhode Island's workforce needs are to:

1. develop and implement a public awareness campaign promoting the benefits of WL education.
2. establish the position of State Supervisor for WL Education.
3. establish the Rhode Island Center for Language Teaching, Learning, and Culture.
4. create articulated PK-16 WL sequences.
5. develop incentive programs to train, license, and employ language education teachers.
6. develop proficiency incentives for students rewarding them for WL study.

We launched the Rhode Island Roadmap publically on June 8, 2012, at the Rhode Island Statehouse, with remarks from business, government, and education leaders in the state. Following the launch, we held a series of Roadmap implementation meetings and formed subcommittees around the key recommendations, appointing a leader for each. We also formed the Roadmap

Leadership Council to oversee the implementation of the strategic vision of the Roadmap.

Since the initial launch of the program, the Roadmap Leadership Council and subcommittees have found it challenging to remain in close collaboration. Thus, while we have been successful in opening up implementational and ideological spaces, the practical implementation of the recommendations of the RI Roadmap has been slow. Three years later, two districts, one urban and one suburban, have stepped up to the plate and partnered with the International Charter School to launch DLI programs in Spanish in Fall 2015, with programs in Portuguese and Chinese planned in coming years. The Council continues to advocate for more support at the state level for this initiative and has supported the development of these programs by connecting the districts with experts in dual language education in Rhode Island and nationally. The Council has also spearheaded the development of a new Master's program at URI to certify teachers in DLI. The Rhode Island Senate passed a Resolution in 2015 to form the Ocean State World Language Learning Commission, which represents a first legislative step in locating funding for these initiatives.

Since the members of the Roadmap Leadership Council and Subcommittees are volunteers who all have full-time jobs, time and commitment have been our greatest challenges. We all need to incorporate the goals of the Roadmap with the larger goals of our respective organizations in order to see this project through to fruition. In Papa's particular context, for example, as the former Assistant Director of the URI Chinese Language Flagship Program, she was in charge of program administration, recruitment, and retention. Dovetailing the Flagship goals with those of the Roadmap could lead to the development of strong Chinese language programs at the K-12 level that could be articulated with the Flagship program. In Berka's case, dovetailing the Roadmap goals with the mission of the IEP (to produce bilingual, culturally savvy engineers for the global economy) means implementing strong DLI programs in K-12 classrooms to produce a pipeline for the IEP, with the goal that students enter the IEP already at an Advanced language level.

Bringing Together Policymaking: First Steps

Encouraging signs for the Roadmap can be observed on the state level. While, up to the year 2014, the State of Rhode Island had two educational boards—the Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education and the Board of Governors for Higher Education—in 2014, the General Assembly consolidated these two boards to form a joint Rhode Island Board of Education. The mission of this joint board is better integration and articulation between the two levels. Already in its first two years of operation, the integrated board has produced several promising initiatives; an example is the “Advanced Coursework Network,”

which gives public secondary schools the opportunity to collaborate with institutions of higher education to create opportunities for high school students to get college credit. A joint strategic plan has also been created, with input from the public, to address the entire spectrum of education. This plan prioritizes, among other values, personalized learning and global competency.

Thus, the atmosphere seems right to finally implement our Roadmap recommendations. The policies we developed have created ideological spaces, which, in turn, have begun to open implementational spaces along the lines suggested by Hornberger (2005) and discussed in this chapter. Ultimately, if the recommendations come to fruition, they will help produce graduates from a range of disciplines with Advanced-to-Superior proficiency in a variety of languages. These graduates, in turn, will lead the growth and development of Rhode Island's economy and society in the long term.

Lessons Learned

The creation of a State Language Roadmap can be achieved in any state, but this kind of highly involved project requires funding, leadership, determination, perseverance, and coordination among all stakeholders. It is particularly crucial that WL department chairs and language program directors come in and take the lead on their campus and in their communities. Reflecting on the most important lessons we learned from the Roadmap process in Rhode Island, we have created the following list of action items, which we hope will provide guidance to fellow educators launching Roadmaps in their states:

- Gather intelligence first: Read all preliminary research reports and State Language Roadmaps at www.thelanguageflagship.org; communicate with the successful drivers of Roadmaps in other states and ask them all the questions you have to begin the process. We convened lots of Skype talks, brought in role models who spoke to our stakeholders and organized workshops at conferences to bring together constituencies from other states and share progress so far.
- Seek funding to hire help in setting about this task: NSEP has funded Roadmaps in Oregon, Ohio, and Texas, as well as our project; Utah received funding from their Office of Economic Development and World Trade Center to create an educational video; in Rhode Island, local advocates and philanthropists helped out by hosting lunches and dinners; corporations hosted incubator meetings at their facilities; and so forth.
- Use your networks: We asked members of our IEP and Chinese Flagship Advisory Board to reach out to legislators to advocate for a state language coordinator to be added to the commissioner's and governor's budgets and also to use their political weight to influence decision making involving language education.

- Educate yourselves on the political process in your state: How are decisions made that impact education? Who are the key players in the process? Who should you meet with and when, keeping in mind the legislative calendar?
- Educate others: Prepare for the need to continuously educate new political and educational leaders.
- Form a consulting team to provide technical and moral support to school districts that want to start or enhance language immersion programs.

We are fortunate in Rhode Island to have a regulatory framework established for DLI, which includes certification requirements specifically developed for DLI teachers and two programs at the higher education level to certify dual language teachers. However, one hurdle we are still confronting is the “chicken and egg” dilemma: With only five current DLI programs, there are not enough teacher candidates to fill the anticipated, statewide, large-scale program growth. Other states have solved this dilemma by establishing memoranda of understanding with foreign nations to bring in international visiting teachers while their state universities work to prepare homegrown dual language educators. We are, in the meantime, encouraged by small successes and the energy level the movement has created in selected schools, which is beginning to effect change in other districts.

It has been rewarding to be involved in the Roadmap process, but we have learned to be patient: these immersion programs are being created one grade level at a time, and it will take years before we feel the effects in our university’s language programs. And yet, the success stories on the higher education level, such as the International Engineering and Language Flagship Programs, as well as the momentum that has been created in several Roadmap states toward an articulated K-16 vision of FL education, are strongly encouraging. The programs we are designing seek the integration of language with content and prepare students for the global workplace. Getting involved in this Roadmap process will help educators throughout the country to move university language departments from the margins to the center of innovative curricular reform in language education, on the one hand, and to impact innovative workforce creation, on the other.

References

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2010). *Foreign language enrollments in K-12 public schools: Are students prepared for a global society?* Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Berman, R. (1994). Global thinking, local teaching: Departments, curricula, and culture. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26(1), 7–11.
- Berka, S., von Reinhart, W., & Papa, E. (2013). Invited paper—Does the International Engineering Program produce graduates for the Rhode Island workforce? Assessing skill sets and company needs. *ASEE International Forum*, 10. Retrieved from <http://www.asee.org/public/conferences/27/papers/8382/view>

- Casserly, M. (Council of the Great City Schools, Gallardo, V. M., Garcia, M., Garza, N., Infante, A. M., Uro, G., & Walters, T.). (2011). *Raising the achievement of English language learners in the providence schools: Report of the strategic support team of the Council of the Great City Schools*. Washington, DC: Council of the Great City Schools.
- Committee on Economic Development. (2006). *Education for global leadership: The importance of international studies and foreign language education for U.S. economic and national security*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Costabile-Heming, C. A. (2011). Responding to the MLA report: Re-contextualizing the study of German for the 21st century. *The German Quarterly*, 84(4). Cherry Hill, NJ: American Association of Teachers of German.
- Court, J. (2015). Personalia 2015. *Monatshefte*, 107(4), 622–668. University of Wisconsin Press. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/605340>
- Davidson, D. E. (2010). Study abroad: When, how long, and with what results? New data from the Russian front. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 6–26.
- Davidson, D. E. (2015). The development of L2 proficiency and literacy within the context of the federally supported overseas language training programs for Americans. In T. Brown & J. Bown (Eds.), *To advanced proficiency and beyond: Theory and methods for developing superior second language ability* (pp. 117–150). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Duncan, A. (2010). *Education and the language gap*. Remarks from the CIA Foreign Language Summit retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/education-and-language-gap-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-foreign-language-summit>
- Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2010, December). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2009. In *Modern Language Association*. New York, NY: Modern Language Association.
- German Studies Association. (1998). Guidelines for curricula in German studies at universities and colleges in North America. Retrieved from <https://www.thegsa.org/resources/curriculum.html>
- Glenn, D. (2011). Traditional language programs have declined steadily over decades. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Traditional-Language-Programs/126368/>
- Grandin, J. M. (2011). *Going the extra mile: University of Rhode Island engineers in the global workplace*. Wakefield, RI: Rockland Press.
- Grandin, J. M. (2013). *Merging languages and engineering; partnering across the disciplines*. San Rafael, CA: Morgan & Claypool.
- Grandin, J. M., & Berka, S. (2014). Reforming American higher education: The University of Rhode Island International Engineering Program. *ADFL Bulletin*, 43(1), 23–44.
- Hélot, C. (2010). Tu sais bien parler maîtresse!: Negotiating languages other than French in the primary classroom in France. In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 52–71). New York: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 605–609.
- Hornberger, N. (2010). Multilingual education policy and practice: Lessons from indigenous experience. *CAL Research Digest*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Jaschik, S. (2008, April 11). Das Ende for German at USC. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/04/11/german>
- Jaschik, S. (2010, April 19). Left out of gen ed. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/04/19/gwu>

- Johnson, D. C., & Freeman, R. (2010). Appropriating language policy on the local level: Working the spaces for bilingual education. In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 13–31). New York: Routledge.
- Klein, J. I., & Rice, C. (2012). *U.S. education reform and national security: Independent task force report no. 68*. New York, NY: Council on Foreign Relations Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-education-reform-national-security/p27618?co=C007301>
- Leite, J. (2013). Mainstreaming dual language immersion: The Utah model for replicable and sustainable language education (Master's thesis). Utah Valley University, Orem, UT. Retrieved from <http://161.28.20.133/cdm/ref/collection/UVUTheses/id/619>
- McWhorter, J. (2010, December 13). Which languages should liberal arts be about in 2010? *The New Republic*. Retrieved from <http://www.newrepublic.com/blog/john-mcwhorter/79843/which-languages-should-liberal-arts-be-about-in-2010>
- Menken, K., & García, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York: Routledge.
- Met, M. (2003). Developing language education policies for our schools. *Modern Language Journal*, 87(4), 589–592.
- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages in higher education: New structures for a changed world. New York, NY: Modern Language Association. Retrieved from <http://www.mla.org/lreport>
- Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education. (2009). *Basic education program regulations*. Retrieved from <http://sos.ri.gov/documents/archives/regdocs/released/pdf/DESE/5751.pdf>
- Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education. (2010). Regulations governing the education of English language learners, Reg. G-13-1.3.17b. Retrieved from <http://sos.ri.gov/documents/archives/regdocs/released/pdf/DESE/6260.pdf>
- Rhode Island Department of Education. (2014). English Language Learners 2013–2014.
- Ricento, K. T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401–427.
- Swenson, K., Watzinger-Tharp, J., & Mayne, Z. (2014). Assessing the academic learning of Utah students in Dual Language Immersion (DLI) programs. [PowerPoint slides]. *Fifth international conference on language immersion education: Mainstreaming access to multilingual communities*. Salt Lake City, UT.
- The Language Flagship. (2016). The flagship history. Retrieved from <https://www.thelanguageflagship.org/content/flagship-history>
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Dual Language Education of New Mexico Fuente Press.
- Swaffar, J. K., & Urlaub, P. (Eds.). (2014). *Transforming the foreign language curriculum in higher education: Critical perspectives from the United States*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/49151492/A-Nation-at-Risk>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *No child left behind act*.
- Weissmann, J. (2012, April 23). 53% of recent college grads are jobless or underemployed—how? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/04/53-of-recent-college-grads-are-jobless-or-underemployed-how/256237/>
- Wong Fillmore, L. (2000). Loss of family language: Should language educators be concerned? *From Theory to Practice*, 39(4), 203–210.
- Woodis, A. (2010). Personalia 2010. *Monatshefte*, 102(4), 550–599. University of Wisconsin Press. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/issue/21790>

Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. What languages are currently important for your organization?
2. What languages will be important five years from now?
3. What are the missed opportunity costs of not having linguistic and cultural skills readily available in your organization? Can you give an example of a missed opportunity due to missing language or cultural skills?
4. What are the top usages of language in your organization? (e.g., working in global teams, providing service to clients and/or contracting agencies)
 - a. How does your organization utilize employees with second language skills?
 - b. Do you provide linguistic and/or cross-cultural training to employees?
 - c. With regard to spoken communication, what kind of information exchange is required?
 - d. How essential is knowledge of regional sociocultural demographics for your organization?
5. For these languages, what proficiency level is required? Is it only spoken communication or are reading/writing also important? (e.g., working on contracts, government documents, technical reports)
6. What hiring policies or strategies do you have to increase organizational, cultural, and linguistic competencies?
7. What solutions does your organization use to respond to these language needs? (e.g., translation services, heritage speakers, foreign workers, Americans with language training). Have you had any trouble finding/accessing people/services that serve your need for second language-skilled workers?
8. If resources were not a factor, how would you meet your organization's language proficiency needs?