



COTSEAL

Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages



NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTER
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

**2004 NFLRC/COTSEAL Workshop:
New Visions for Southeast Asian Language Teaching**

**Imin International Conference Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa
January 9-10, 2004**

**©2004 William Savage, Workshop Facilitator
Bangkok, Thailand**

The contents of this NetWork were developed under a grant from the Department of Education (CFDA 84.229, P229A990004). However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and one should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Contents

Acronyms	ii
Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	iii
The Workshop	1
Pre-Workshop Task	2
Setting the Context	2
Needs	4
Issues	8
Long-term Objectives	12
Follow-up Actions	17
Evaluation	18
Appendices	
1. Participants	20
2. Agenda	21
3. NFLRC Projects	22
4. Authorizing Language	24
5. Pre-Workshop Task	25
6. Needs	26
7. Issues	28
8. Evaluation	29

Acronyms

AAS	Association for Asian Studies
ACTFL	American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages
ANU	Australian National University
CARLA	Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota
COTIM	Consortium for the Teaching of Indonesian and Malay
COTSEAL	Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages
DLI	Defense Language Institute
FAQ	Frequently Asked Question
FLAS	Foreign Language and Area Studies fellowships
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
GUAVA	Group of Universities for the Advancement of Vietnamese Abroad
LCTL	Less Commonly Taught Languages
LLL	College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
NDEA	National Defense Education Act
NFLRC	National Foreign Language Resource Center
NIU	Northern Illinois University
NNS	Non-Native Speaker
NRC	National Resource Center
OPI	Oral Proficiency Interview
SEAL	Southeast Asian languages
SEASITE	Southeast Asian languages website maintained by Southern Illinois University (http://www.seasite.niu.edu/)
SEASSI	Southeast Asian Summer Session Institute
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SLS	Second Language Studies
SOPI	Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview
UC	University of California
UCLA	University of California at Los Angeles
UH	University of Hawai'i
USINDO	United States Indonesia Society
VASI	Vietnamese Advanced Summer Institute

Acknowledgements

NFLRC and COTSEAL would like to thank:

- Jim Yoshioka, Deborah Masterson and Pam DaGrossa, for their support in the organization of the workshop
- Ben Arcangel and Eun-Kim Sook, for the enjoyment of being able to see them dance during the workshop reception

Executive Summary

The “NFLRC/COTSEAL Workshop - New Visions for Southeast Asian Language Teaching” was held from 9-10 January 2004 at the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa. The 27 workshop participants (Appendix 1) represented a range of national stakeholders in the teaching and learning of Southeast Asian languages in the United States.

The purpose of the workshop (see agenda in Appendix 2) was to formulate long-term objectives for improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia, and define the role that the UHNFLRC can play in facilitating their achievement. The objectives were to:

- Exchange institutional and individual experiences of the teaching and learning of Southeast Asian languages
- Assess and prioritize capacity-building needs in teaching and learning Southeast Asian languages
- Formulate long-term objectives, collaborative strategies and timelines for addressing the prioritized needs
- Consider issues of whether and how the UHNFLRC can satisfy needs expressed by Southeast Asian area studies and language specialists, and can establish a clearer relationship with COTSEAL as a conduit to Southeast Asian language colleagues
- Plan follow-up actions for progress toward meeting the needs

Participants were provided in advance of the workshop with background information on NFLRC’s projects (Appendix 3) and its authorizing language (Appendix 4). Through a pre-workshop task (Appendix 5), participants provided inputs into the drafting of the workshop objectives and agenda.

Also from the pre-workshop task, participants’ statements of perceived needs (Appendix 6) formed the basis for the workshop’s first discussions, when colleagues worked in language-based groups (Filipino/Tagalog and Ilocano; Indonesian; Khmer, Lao and Thai; and Vietnamese) and an ‘others’ group, to prioritize the needs based on each group’s perspectives. The needs categories were:

- Assessment of Southeast Asian language programs
- Center for Southeast Asian languages
- Curriculum
- Funding
- Materials development and distribution
- Proficiency testing
- Research
- Standards
- Student recruitment
- Study-abroad programs
- Summer institutes
- Teacher education and training, and professional development
- University governance

Nine needs areas were seen as priorities [for details, see the section on Needs]:

- Advocacy
- Articulation
- Communications
- Demand
- Professional Development
- Publications
- Research
- Standards and Guidelines
- Technologies

Again through the pre-workshop task, participants had raised six issues (Appendix 7) in need of consideration:

1. Continuation of Southeast Asian languages as a priority area of UHNFLRC
2. Role of UHNFLRC in the training and credentialing of teachers in various states for Southeast Asian language teaching
3. Teacher education role of graduate programs at UH (e.g., Department of Second Language Studies, Southeast Asian languages, Asian Studies) in Southeast Asian languages, and UHNFLRC facilitation role
4. UHNFLRC relationships with teachers, institutions, Southeast Asian centers and COTSEAL (in US): identifying needs and coordinating cooperation
5. Cooperation between UHNFLRC and partner institutions in Southeast Asia
6. Role of UHNFLRC, perhaps in partnership with COTSEAL, in addressing the issue of articulation among individual programs, domestic summer programs and study-abroad

Colleagues were encouraged to consider the issues in light of both the needs previously outlined and the upcoming discussion on long-term objectives, and to express their perspectives [for details, see the section on Issues].

Ideas were drafted for objectives, strategies, timelines and roles for each of the nine needs areas and in consideration of the previous discussion on the six issues. This framework of long-term objectives for improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia needs to be further developed as various efforts are made to build partnerships, work in a more collaborative manner, and communicate with the range of stakeholders in SEAL teaching and learning.

Several actions were agreed to follow up the workshop, including:

- Beginning discussions on COTSEAL-NFLRC cooperation on the website, publications and administration
- Sharing (draft) outcomes of the workshop with the NRC directors meeting in Santa Fe (February)
- Making a presentation of the workshop and its outcomes at meetings at the AAS meeting in San Diego (March)
- Posting the workshop report on the NFLRC website
- Informing overseas institutions of the workshop report on the NFLRC website (as they involve activities with them)
- Disseminating workshop outcomes to others (e.g., AAS)

In the participants' evaluation of the workshop, it was noted that there was not a specific commitment from the UHNFLRC on what role it can play in facilitating in-service training. More generally, the workshop only went part of the way toward building long-term objectives and collaborative strategies, and did not result in a workplan, but at least a start has been made and a need recognized to continue this kind of dialogue.

No conclusion was reached on the sort of 'Southeast Asian language center' that can be integrated into the UHNFLRC, but an important step was taken toward meeting that goal.

Participants learned about frustrations in the SEA community vis-à-vis the NFLRC and generally and about the complexities of the relationships between NFLRC and its stakeholders, and how the NFLRC operates. Colleagues also learned that there is great resolve to move the field of SE Asian language teaching forward and a genuine commitment by the established center [NFLRC] to the promotion of SE Asian languages in the US.

Workshop participants also observed that things can be done better by working with each other in unity, that even when viewpoints are disparate, good results can be obtained. A spirit of cooperation exists among SE Asian language studies people and the need to "communicate, communicate, communicate" among groups should not be underestimated.

It was suggested that UHNFLRC and COTSEAL continue their cooperation, with several specific suggestions made for how each of the two organizations can follow up the workshop together and separately.

The Workshop

The “NFLRC/COTSEAL Workshop - New Visions for Southeast Asian Language Teaching” was held from 9-10 January 2004 at the Imin International Conference Center on the campus of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. The 27 workshop participants¹ (Appendix 1) represented a range of national stakeholders in the teaching and learning of Southeast Asian languages in the United States, including COTSEAL, NFLRC, other Language Resource Centers, National Resource Centers, specific Southeast Asian language associations, SEASSI, and universities in Hawai‘i and the mainland US. The workshop was facilitated by William Savage of Bangkok, Thailand.

The purpose of the NFLRC/COTSEAL Workshop was agreed in advance by the organizers - Richard Schmidt, Director of the NFLRC, and Prawet Jantharat, President of COTSEAL: Formulate long-term objectives for improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia, and define the role that the UH NFLRC can play in facilitating their achievement.

As part of a pre-workshop task (see next section), participants were asked to suggest specific *objectives* to be achieved during the NFLRC/COTSEAL Workshop:

- Exchange institutional and individual experiences of the teaching and learning of Southeast Asian languages
- Assess and prioritize capacity-building needs in teaching and learning Southeast Asian languages
- Formulate long-term objectives, collaborative strategies and timelines for addressing the prioritized needs
- Consider issues of whether and how the UHNFLRC can satisfy needs expressed by Southeast Asian area studies and language specialists, and can establish a clearer relationship with COTSEAL as a conduit to Southeast Asian language colleagues
- Plan follow-up actions for progress toward meeting the needs

Participants’ responses to the pre-workshop task informed the design of the workshop agenda (Appendix 2) and indicated appropriate *outputs* for the workshop. These included:

- Documentation of prioritized needs, objectives, strategies, timelines and follow-up actions, and
- Statement regarding federal funding policy and issues²

Before the workshop, participants were also provided with background information on UHNFLRC, including:

- Recent, Current and Planned Projects Supporting the Languages of Southeast Asia (Appendix 3 NFLRC Projects), and
- Authorizing Language (Appendix 4)

1 Of the 31 people originally invited to participate, four were unable to make it: Elvira Swender, ACTFL; Kimloan Hill, UC San Diego; Nguyen Ngoc Hung, Hanoi University of Foreign Studies; and Hanh Nguyen, UH Manoa.

2 In the event, the nature of the workshop discussions did not lend itself to the development of such a written statement. This may be a task which NFLRC and COTSEAL decide to take up as part of their collaboration.

Pre-Workshop Task

The pre-workshop task (Appendix 5) was sent by e-mail to the 31 participants on the original list. Seventeen responses were received. In addition to clear statements of workshop *objectives* and *issues* in need of addressing, respondents overwhelmingly wrote about perceived *needs* (see following section) in the field of Southeast Asian language teaching and learning.

Setting the Context

In the first session - following a Hawai'i aloha welcome with leis for the participants, a round of introductions, and a facilitator's overview of the workshop purpose, objectives, outputs and agenda - the context of the workshop was set by several of the participants, beginning with Richard Schmidt of NFLRC (text below). Following his remarks, other participants expressed their views of the context of the workshop, including Prawet Jantharat, Tom Gething, Roger Bresnahan and Teresita Ramos.

Dick Schmidt briefly reviewed the history of Title VI and US government support for less commonly taught languages (LCTL), with particular emphasis on three dates: 1957, 1990 and 2001. In October 1957, the US was shocked when the Soviet Union successfully launched a satellite (Sputnik) into outer space. This led to a great deal of soul-searching in the US and a feeling that it had fallen behind in critical areas - math, science and foreign languages - and needed to catch up fast. One of the main results was the establishment of the first NDEA (National Defense Education Act) fellowships, which financed the graduate study of many of the participants in this workshop. This was a period in which federal financing for foreign languages was strong. For example, the number of FLAS (Foreign Language and Areas Studies) fellowships in 2004 (1,561) is 1/3 lower than the number of NDEA fellowships in 1967 (2,344).

The Sputnik era had one lasting result: Title VI of the Higher Education Act (then entitled "Language Development", now entitled "International Education"), which led to the founding of what were, originally, language centers, but which evolved over time to become centers for language and "related subjects", and finally evolved into language and area studies centers. In fact, by the 1980s, these centers (NRCs or National Language and Area Studies Resource Centers) had become predominantly area studies centers, with language playing second violin at most centers, in the sense that, although the NRCs have always supported the teaching of LCTLs, the directors of such centers are overwhelmingly members of what Richard Lambert has called "the area studies tribe" (historians, political scientists and scholars in other social sciences) rather than "the language tribe" (applied linguists and language teaching professionals). In recognition of this fact, in 1990 Congress created a new type of center within Title VI - Language Resource Centers (the LRCs) - organized around a mandate to improve the nation's capacity for the learning and teaching of foreign languages, with a particular focus on the needs of the less commonly taught languages, which in the US these days means all languages except Spanish and French. In the first round, three such centers were established: one at the University of Hawai'i, one at San Diego State, and a Washington DC consortium consisting of the Center for Applied Linguistics and Georgetown and George Washington Universities. In each subsequent funding cycle, new centers were added, and there are now fourteen of them.

None of the first seven LRCs focused their efforts on the languages of particular world regions. This is probably because, while from a geo-political perspective it may make sense to group languages that way, such groupings often do not make much linguistic or pedagogical sense. Languages can be grouped linguistically in terms of their historical relationships (which sometimes match geopolitical divisions but often do not), while from a teaching perspective what often matters more is groupings such as the commonly taught, uncommonly taught, rarely taught, and almost never taught, as well as such functional groupings as foreign, second, minority and heritage languages. As the number of LRCs expanded beyond the initial few, each one staked out some territory based on linguistic or educational considerations. For example, the Iowa State LRC proclaimed itself the national LRC for K-12 language education.

However, in the mid-90s there was a political attempt organized by the NRCs to rewrite the authorizing language for the LRCs to force them to re-organize so that each LRC would serve the needs of a specific world region (using the world regions recognized for the NRCs). This political move was unsuccessful in terms of forcing a rewriting of the legislation, but since that time a number of LRCs have been established that do concentrate on the languages of specific world regions. The LRC at Duke/University of North Carolina is for Slavic and East European languages; the one at Wisconsin is the National African LRC; and the Ohio State LRC, previously a "general" center, renamed itself an LRC for East Asia.

Of course, everyone knows the significance of September 11, 2001. Once again the US was shocked by the realization that we do not know the languages of the world and that languages are critical for national security. One result has been an influx of funding for language and related areas, but for specific security-related languages, while funding for more traditional sources of support has suffered. For 2004, funding for Title VI is about 4% less than last year, and many other programs have been cut deeply. However, as a direct result of 9-11, three new LRCs were created by congressional mandate: one each for the Middle East, South Asia and Central Asia.

The University of Hawai'i LRC is considered a "general" language resource center. Among the LRCs as a group, it is generally regarded as outstanding in several areas. One is research on language learning and teaching (the first mandated activity of the LRCs). The UH LRC is the only one of the fourteen that has a full-time publications manager and produces a scholarly monograph series in addition to two on-line scholarly refereed journals and materials in many different formats (e.g., standard texts, videos, CD-ROMS), all emphasizing the use of authentic materials as teaching tools. A second focus has been the development of models for distance education in LCTLs: on-line courses are now operational for the three East Asian languages and are being developed for SE Asian languages. A third has been the development of innovative types of foreign language testing and assessment, such as a project on elicited imitation as a testing method now under development. In addition, the Hawai'i LRC has been a de-facto Asia-Pacific center, since the languages of these areas have been where all materials development, research and professional development activities have been focused. To take just one example, the current project to develop elicited imitation (sentence repetition tests) - as a reliable, valid and relatively inexpensive method of assessing overall linguistic proficiency (far more economical than OPIs and SOPIs, for example) - is focused not on English as a model that can be extended to other languages but on Vietnamese and Indonesian as models that can be extended to all other languages.

Dick Schmidt closed his remarks by saying that in the next proposal (2006-10), the Hawai'i LRC intends to significantly expand its focus on Southeast Asian languages and to address the needs

of language educators who have usefully combined their expertise and voices in COTSEAL in every way possible, but does not intend to rename itself the “national Southeast Asian LRC”. To take that narrow focus, in his view, would be counter-productive, perpetuating the ghettoizing of language educators (who are often referred to as “instructors,” by folks who consider themselves “scholars”) by geographical area and the subjugation of language to politics. The real problem is not that there are not enough courses to train graduate students who need to do fieldwork in specific world regions, and the real solution is not to provide funding and recruit untrained native speakers of those languages and put them into classrooms. The real problem is that the US no longer has much capacity for learning and teaching those languages. The solution is to carry out research and provide professional development to those with the capacity to become scholars in the language field itself. Otherwise, those untrained teachers who are recruited to meet short-term demands will find themselves teaching classes for which there is not a single decent textbook and no one anywhere with the expertise to produce one, no tests and no one who has the slightest idea how to create one, and so on. Indeed, that is the situation for many languages already.

Needs

The statements of perceived needs (Appendix 6) in Southeast Asian language teaching and learning were drawn from participants’ responses to the pre-workshop task questions on objectives and issues. The needs were categorized, distributed to participants in advance of the workshop, and then formed the basis for the workshop’s second session when participants worked in language-based groups and an ‘others’ group, to prioritize the needs based on each group’s perspectives.

The needs categories were:

- Assessment of Southeast Asian language programs
- Center for Southeast Asian languages
- Curriculum
- Funding
- Materials development and distribution
- Proficiency testing
- Research
- Standards
- Student recruitment
- Study-abroad programs
- Summer institutes
- Teacher education and training, and professional development
- University governance

The discussion groups were:

<p>Filipino/Tagalog and Ilocano Roger Bresnahan Rhodalyne Crail Ruth Mabanglo Juanita Nacu Leo Paz Teresita Ramos Julius Soria Flora Switzer Adelwisa Weller</p>	<p>Indonesian Barbara Andaya Erlin Barnard Dustin Cowell Uli Kozok Flo Lamoureux</p>	<p>Khmer, Lao and Thai Yuphaphann Hoonchamlong Thomas Hudak Prawet Jantharat Chhany Sak-Humphry Seree Weroha</p>
<p>Vietnamese Tran Hoai Bac Margaret Bodemer Steve O'Harrow</p>		<p>Others Robert Bley-Vroman Stephen Fleming Tom Gething David Hiple Richard Schmidt</p>

During the reportback session, these nine need areas (in alphabetical order) were seen as priorities by the various groups:

- Advocacy
- Articulation
- Communications
- Demand
- Professional Development
- Publications
- Research
- Standards and Guidelines
- Technologies

Following are significant comments from the different groups' perspectives on each of the need areas, and then some comments specific to the Khmer, Lao and Thai, Vietnamese and Indonesian groups.

Advocacy

There is a desire for some sort of 'center' for Southeast Asian languages, one which will be committed to advocating for the needs and interests of all SEA language teachers and their professional development.

As individuals, we need to advocate for ourselves and it is difficult to do that alone. We need training - and need to be connected to COTSEAL - to advocate within the different universities. We can start by helping individuals to advocate, but COTSEAL can help to advocate for the different language groups.

Advocacy audiences include our own institutions, national organizations, and the “SEAL center”. We need to learn how to promote the languages we are teaching. We need to link teachers with student groups, parents and educators, all joined together to advocate with administrators. Such community organization can also involve the adult community advocating for students. Finally, we need to advocate for the organization of SEA language educators, and with national-level decision-making agencies.

Articulation

From K-12 and into higher education, there is little or no maintenance of languages taken for foreign language credit, nor many high-level students who have continued. We should be able to recruit more students interested in the languages, and look at combinations of study-abroad, and study opportunities before and after SEASSI. Students should be able to get certification for the range of language studies, and databases of all students of given languages could be facilitated by a “SEAL center”.

Post-workshop Participant Feedback Comment

We have students from K-12 who have studied LCTLs at high school with varying levels of competence. Our centers and universities should be open to developing and revising curricula which meet the needs of these high school graduates entering college. We should talk about standards and competencies at the university level, but we should not take these as inflexible. We need to adjust to, and even “come down” to, the level of incoming students and offer courses that are appropriate for them. We also need this kind of flexibility for potential heritage language students.

Communications

SEAL teachers and learners are perceived as being unaware of what resources are available. There is thus a need for an information clearinghouse, i.e., a communications system to identify what is out there. Discussions are needed between COTSEAL and UHNFLRC on a website facility for this purpose.

Demand

How do we address demand at university level? What is the role of technology without a community base? Especially at upper levels, now is a good time to be talking about high-proficiency students and their needs.

Professional Development

A main concern about professional development is that it is not just short-term, but also includes long-term education (e.g., masters and doctoral programs), and working to get better conditions for teachers.

What is it that creates sustainability at tenure track level at universities? There is a tendency in the SEAL profession for there to be one person of rank who maintains a roster of teachers, and they do not have SLA-type training. What would be the factors that would change this situation, in the context of cuts, consolidations and the overall ‘political’ environment? Training in SLA or another relevant masters degree might do it, though this remains an open question. Hawai’i may be an exception because there is a College of LLL, and because of the political motivation to have the resource of SEA languages and the tenure tracks.

Publications

Publication is crucial in helping teachers. Without this, there is little chance of professional development. There is a need for publications channels for research but also for instructional materials.

Research

Research needs to be not only by and for researchers, but also by teachers, classroom-room based and with classroom implications, and used for curriculum and materials development.

Standards and Guidelines

There is a need for standards and guidelines for each level, to know what is meant by first year, second year and so on. Until we have this in place, we cannot ask for money and programs for training. Once we have the standards and guidelines, then we can move into materials and curriculum, assessment (proficiency testing), instructional methods for teachers, and research.

Standards and guidelines have been developed by small groups of teachers of specific languages. This now needs to be done for the wider field, with concrete actions.

Consideration needs to be given to materials specific to certain groups of students. In situations where there are mixed classes of heritage and non-heritage learners, different teachers have different approaches to teaching mixed classes. This is a situation where guidelines would be valuable. There is also a need to compare different curricula and methods being used, and to develop standards for textbooks so that programs are comparable. There is also a desire to see the Framework for SEA Languages through to application.

Technologies

It is time to look at delivery of teaching programs through multiple technologies.

Khmer, Lao and Thai Group

How can we get all Khmer, Lao, Thai and Hmong people to sit together and agree? There is no professional organization for teachers of our languages.

Vietnamese Group

GUAVA is the Group of Universities for the Advancement of Vietnamese Abroad. On the need for standards and guidelines, with Fulbright funding, GUAVA established a proficiency guidelines project and evolved a set of guidelines. GUAVA has gone forward with that development and also the role of GUAVA in advocacy.

Indonesian Group

We already have the professional organization of COTIM which is mainly concerned with study-abroad, and needs expansion to be concerned with conferences, publication, workshops, grants-making (not only in one institution but nation-wide), being a forum for the exchange of ideas, cooperating more closely with programs for NNSs within Indonesia and with institutions in Australia, where Indonesian is one of the main second languages.

We need to promote Indonesian because there has been a drop in enrollments. There are heritage communities in California, especially in Los Angeles, which may be attracted by programs at Chino State or UCLA.

Indonesia does not really have a study-abroad program other than language. There is no program for people without the language who want to go and study the culture. This could be a program that was run nationally and attracts students throughout the nation. Courses taught in Indonesian could be taken and residence credit awarded; this could also be a good link with institutions in Australia. What is the connection with SEASSI, since these comments have been made before? USINDO has a language program, but it is limited to six weeks.

Issues

The fourth workshop session involved participants (in four self-selected groups) discussing the six issues which had emerged from the pre-workshop task (Appendix 7), and which were reviewed earlier at the conclusion of the first session. The six issues were:

1. Continuation of Southeast Asian languages as a priority area of UHNFLRC
2. Role of UHNFLRC in the training and credentialing of teachers in various states for Southeast Asian language teaching
3. Teacher education role of graduate programs at UH (e.g., Department of Second Language Studies, Southeast Asian languages, Asian Studies) in Southeast Asian languages, and UHNFLRC facilitation role
4. UHNFLRC relationships with teachers, institutions, Southeast Asian centers and COTSEAL (in US): identifying needs and coordinating cooperation
5. Cooperation between UHNFLRC and partner institutions in Southeast Asia
6. Role of UHNFLRC, perhaps in partnership with COTSEAL, in addressing the issue of articulation among individual programs, domestic summer programs and study-abroad

While two groups discussed the first and sixth issues, issues 2 and 3, and 4 and 5, were coupled and handled together by two other groups, to optimize the group numbers. Colleagues were encouraged to consider the issues in light of both the needs previously outlined and the upcoming discussion on long-term objectives. Their perspectives on the issues follow, as reported back in the fifth session on the morning of the second day.

Issue 1 - Continuation of Southeast Asian languages as a priority area of UHNFLRC

There should be some sort of 'center', if only to legitimize the profession of SEAL teaching, so that there will be a single unit that people can look to. We came up with a number of schemes to look at, but do not need to come to any decision here. By 2005, we can come to an agreement so that we can optimize the access to funding resources. The four schemes are:

1. The current UHNFLRC with a separate unit there for SEAL (would this be a project?)
2. A separate LRC for SEAL elsewhere, since there cannot be two LRCs at the same university
3. A separate LRC elsewhere working with the unit within the UHNFLRC
4. One LRC elsewhere as an administrative unit and then different projects sent out to other universities, e.g., UH could do professional development, others could do SEASSI, and others could do COTSEAL.

On scheme 1, the little circle (a unit) in the big circle (the UHNFLRC) could be bigger; it could be drawn so that SEAL is the biggest part. It could be area-based and not project-based, e.g., there could be a permanent summer pedagogy institute. Scheme 4 would be difficult to make work, though it could if there was a dynamic coordinator, but there is also potential for disaster.

Some languages are covered by more than one center, so one way of looking at how SEALs are treated is the more attention we get, the better. On scheme 4, it does look like collaboration may be the best as a model.

In each of these 'new' arrangements, how would the language projects be determined, particularly the production of products? When you look at the LRCs, the research function is systematic and these are largely SLA people who are working out the end pieces of the field, filling in the field, whereas the product is erratic at best. Michigan State has a whole curriculum on Thai, but no one uses it. This is true of all the LRCs: the person who is willing to do the work is the one to whom you give the money.

We should look to LRCs that focus on Southeast Asia, but more deliberately, to do a more systematic development of materials on SEAL. How would that be determined? What role would the LRCs play, COTSEAL, COTIM?

On the current organization of the UHNFLRC, is it possible to change the composition of the broad-based advisory committee so that SEAL teachers have some input into the committee and the UHNFLRC, that there be SEAL teacher representation on the committee?

If we were to go one step beyond that, it would also be accountability, that the line of reporting is not solely to the UH administration. The Department of Education is more interested in the NRCs and LRCs cooperating. If we were to do any of the suggested schemes 1-4, then we would want to have the NRCs on board, at least mentioning the developing partnerships in their grant proposals. In November 2005, NRC and LRC applications are due. We could ask the NRCs to put money into this pot that would be managed by the LRC and this would create another line of accountability.

We cannot discount what Hawai'i has done and what it will do - all the resources are here. To ignore this would be courting disaster - is there a problem with the current organization?

There is no contradicting the fact that UHNFLRC has done much good with language teaching and research. The concern is that SEAL teachers have had the least training, resources and materials. Now there will be some focus, visibility and communications about our needs.

Issue 2 - Role of UHNFLRC in the training and credentialing of teachers in various states for Southeast Asian language teaching

Teacher credentialing is controlled by the states so it would be difficult for the UHNFLRC to influence their measures, though the UHNFLRC could get involved in the documentation of teacher training.

Post-workshop Participant Feedback Comment

Although UHNFLRC cannot influence state teacher credentialing offices, courses offered at NFLRC could still be officially described and given some unit equivalents - e.g., participation in a particular workshop is equivalent to a two-unit graduate level course on language teaching pedagogy - so that when SEA language teachers apply for credentials or equivalency, training at NFLRC may be cited. NFLRC and COTSEAL should also make themselves more recognized so that state teacher credentialing offices give them more credence.

Issue 3 - Teacher education role of graduate programs at UH (e.g., Department of Second Language Studies, Southeast Asian languages, Asian Studies) in Southeast Asian languages, and UHNFLRC facilitation role

The profession seems to be moving toward expecting MAs in such fields as SLA or Applied Linguistics, though additional courses may be needed to teach SEALs. There is a need for continuous development for beginning teachers and also those conducting research, and these should be the ones attending the courses.

Would a masters in SEAL teaching be desirable? A masters plus post-MA training, an MA plus language certification? A masters in SEAL teaching could be limiting, but a degree in SLA, ESL or EFL plus a language (and culture) credential would be beneficial in terms of teaching, curriculum, research and publication.

Post-workshop Participant Feedback Comment

If UH and UHNFLRC pioneer an MA in SLA or ESL with SEA language certification, from the inception of their strategy, they should inform other schools of the effort.

Issue 4 - UHNFLRC relationships with teachers, institutions, Southeast Asian centers and COTSEAL (in US): identifying needs and coordinating cooperation

UHNFLRC can best foster relationships by serving as a nexus of communication. There are two good ways for this to happen:

- Designing and hosting an **information clearinghouse website**, and
- Fostering collaboration among teachers to create **distance learning courses**.

Information Clearinghouse Website

This has high priority. People are simply not aware of what is available, thus a need exists for a communications system to identify what is out there.

Could the UHNFLRC create and host a dedicated information clearinghouse website to serve the SEA language teaching and learning community (in collaboration with COTSEAL³, and in an effort to expand COTSEAL's capacity)?

Some possible features of such an information clearinghouse website could include:

- Survey results provided periodically and regularly by individual associations (e.g., GUAVA) and tabulated on the site, for example, enrollments (databases of all students of given languages) and demographics⁴, and textbooks and curricula
- Framework, guidelines and standards documents⁵
- Links to NRC and SEA studies sites
- Links to language-specific pages
- Conference announcements
- Calls for Proposals (UHNFLRC could also support COTSEAL and its members by training them in grant-making expertise for grants in various competitions.)
- Fellowship and scholarship opportunities
- Professional development opportunities
- Documentation of teacher training
- Topic boards for issues in teaching and learning, e.g., with heritage students
- FAQs on teaching and learning
- Job board

Issues to consider would include the need for a permanent webmaster, and consideration of cooperative relationships and overlap with other websites such as SEASITE⁶ at NIU, CARLA, ANU's major SEA directory site, University of Michigan and UHNFLRC's existing website.

UHNFLRC has the structures in place. With COTSEAL and the various language organizations, and SEASSI, all of the components could be under the UHNFLRC umbrella.

Distance Learning Courses

UHNFLRC could serve as a broker for collaborative on-line SEAL course creation, bringing together developers across multiple institutions, to create courses that might be offered at several institutions by different teachers through multiple technologies. Further, UH could assist by hosting the courses and providing technical support. There would be issues to consider such as inter-institutional enrollment and credits.

3 COTSEAL is in the process of revamping its website and wants to link with other websites. Could the COTSEAL site be moved to a UHNFLRC-hosted site?

4 Post-workshop Participant Feedback Comment: So that plans to open and offer SEA language courses are focused in areas where we can meet a need, and not at LRC sites or universities where we may have faculty in place.

5 Documents could be clearly labeled as working or draft documents, and could be shared with limited distribution. They could be shared regardless of their stages of development, with some deadline given so that people could comment.

6 This is for language learners, but there are a few pages for teachers. Can UHNFLRC link with NIU to coordinate the content?

Issue 5 - Cooperation between UHNFLRC and partner institutions in Southeast Asia

It does not seem that UHNFLRC should or could foster relationships with SEA partners on behalf of COTSEAL. Such relationships tend to be between a university and a partner abroad. Also, NFLRC federal funding does not extend to such institutions.

Issue 6 - Role of UHNFLRC, perhaps in partnership with COTSEAL, in addressing the issue of articulation among individual programs, domestic summer programs and study-abroad

What should we do with the wealth of existing documents which have been called frameworks, standards and guidelines? They could be used to set a threshold baseline requirement for admission to programs (such as Chiang Mai) so that we would have some expectation of students' abilities before they go to the program.

As an example, the advanced Vietnamese class in the VASI program was actually being under-taught: the students had higher expectations than were being made of them. They were amazed that the teachers had not been properly briefed about the level of the students. Students reported that changes were made.

Professional development would be required for teachers to use such criteria to advantage. There needs to be some training in the field so that foreign nationals would be prepared to teach the students we have sent them. UHNFLRC has done some of this and will continue to provide that training in the summer of 2004. It has been haphazard until now because the federal funding restraint has been difficult. If this is a service that UHNFLRC can provide, and there is a need, then there needs to be some endorsement from COTSEAL, which might help to regularize the use of funds for this purpose.

On the matter of the standards, and using them as requirements for admission overseas, SEASSI would also benefit from these kinds of criteria.

The critical nature of our advanced overseas programs to our programs in-country, and the link between them, is the language teacher groups. They are not parallel in their organization and ways of working, but they do share the funding mechanism. There may be a role for these organizations and a SEAL unit. Perhaps these groups could be advisory to the UHNFLRC. If they are represented in the UHNFLRC, it would help visibility, they could also be advocacy groups, and it would be a way of involving teachers in the UHNFLRC. This is an issue of 'power' and its exercise - if teachers' 'advice' does not lead to action, then it is lip-service being paid to a 'minority' as members of a committee. If there is a SEAL unit, then there needs to be a SEAL advisory committee.

Long-term Objectives

The aim of the sixth session was to formulate long-term objectives for improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia. Again working in four self-selected groups, colleagues drafted ideas for objectives, strategies, timelines and roles for each of the nine identified areas of need and in consideration of the previous discussion on the six issues.

It should be noted that these “new visions for Southeast Asian language teaching” are initial steps, and that they will need to be further developed as various efforts are made to build partnerships, work in a more collaborative manner, and communicate with the range of stakeholders in SEAL teaching and learning.

Advocacy

<i>Objective - what?</i>	<i>Strategies - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Engage in advocacy to speak for and to act on behalf of SEAL teachers and learners, and the languages and cultures of SEA, and to promote SEAL programs, recruitment, retention and maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Gatherings, meetings and cultural performances – A website – Research (scientific-based and surveys to provide information and recommendations) and conference papers – Continuing education and advocacy training – Awareness-raising with employers – Lobbying and networking with existing organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ongoing – Advocacy training to be included in UHNFLRC symposia and workshops in 04, 05, 06 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Individuals, educators, students (especially at college level), parents, local and national – government institutions like LRCs (especially UH), educational institutions – Advocacy is primarily a responsibility of educators because we know what is happening – UHNFLRC has the structure to support, be a venue, and provide publications and professional development

Articulation, Standards and Guidelines

<i>Objective - what?</i>	<i>Strategies - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Continue to develop a generic Framework for SEA languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In the short-term, consult with representatives of all languages to get the backing of COTSEAL leadership – Come up with guidelines for criteria for defining proficiency – Prepare first draft by COTSEAL conference in Madison 2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Out by 25 February, to be discussed at AAS in March and SEASSI in July 	

Communications

<i>Objective - what?</i>	<i>Strategies - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Expand COTSEAL's communications capacity in collaboration with UHNFLRC	Set up an information clearinghouse website [see the description in Issue 4]	ASAP	UHNFLRC to coordinate and network with COTSEAL and language organizations

Demand

<i>Objective(s) - what?</i>	<i>Strategy(ies) - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Explore ways of increasing demand for SEAL courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Draw heritage communities into language courses _ Conduct distance learning to increase learner pool _ Publicize more in universities _ Advocate local school boards and other organizations to have feeders into university programs 		

Professional Development

<i>Objective(s) - what?</i>	<i>Strategy(ies) - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Increase long-term training and certification at masters level	Broaden ESL masters programs to allow for training teachers of other languages using the same methodologies (rename the degree SLS)		University departments
Increase in-service training opportunities	Summer training for in-service teachers on a modular basis (certified by a body like COTSEAL), with subjects like technology, pedagogy, materials survey, adaptation, development of appropriate materials; issues of heritage learners, and mixed classroom situations; dissemination of current guidelines; evaluation; testing and placement; advocacy (there must be follow-up support for the in-service training)	from 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ The "SEAL center" which will emerge from the workshop discussions _ There is an on-line credit course on generic teaching methodology offered by the UH under Title II, ready to be offered within a year to any teacher of any language.

Publications

<i>Objective(s) - what?</i>	<i>Strategy(ies) - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Expand publications channels for research and instructional materials	Advocate with universities to re-adjust their standards of what is valued for electronic publications and what kind of peer review can be put into on-line publications	Ongoing	

Research

<i>Objective(s) - what?</i>	<i>Strategy(ies) - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Strengthen theoretical and practical (applied) research in SEAL teaching and learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ For theoretical, (e.g., language change and use) identify outlets for publication of theoretical research with practical applications _ Identify what has been done and what can be applied, and ways to disseminate what has been done _ Compile a substantial annotated précis on research that has been done _ For practical, develop on-line reference grammars, and on-line assessment guidelines for rational funding of materials to be produced _ Whether theoretical or practical, adapt 'instruments' from one language to another 	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Until this year, we could go to ERIC, so there is now a need for someone to provide access to ERIC, likely too big a job for any one LRC to do. _ The combination of doing the ERIC function of surveying, annotating, and coordinating or carrying out teacher research is bigger than the UHNFLRC has the capacity to do.

Technologies

<i>Objective(s) - what?</i>	<i>Strategy(ies) - how?</i>	<i>Timeline - when?</i>	<i>Roles - who?</i>
Develop distance education courses in SEAL		Ongoing	

Follow-up Actions

In the eighth and final session, several actions were agreed to follow up the workshop.

Action	Person	Time
Begin discussions on COTSEAL-NFLRC cooperation on website, publications and administration	Dick and Prawet	24 January
Draft and disseminate workshop document	Bill	31 January (delayed to 9 February)
Share (draft) outcomes of workshop with NRC directors meeting in Santa Fe	Barbara and Roger	mid-February
Read and provide feedback to Bill on draft	All participants	29 February
Make a presentation of the workshop and its outcomes at meetings at AAS meeting in San Diego	Tom Gething (SEASSI advisory committee and board) Prawet (COTSEAL and SEAC)	3-7 March
Finalize, submit and disseminate workshop document	Bill	12 March
Post on NFLRC website	Dick + colleagues	After 12 March
Inform overseas institutions of document on NFLRC website (as they involve activities with them)	Uli	After 12 March
Disseminate workshop outcomes to others (e.g., AAS)	Barbara and Prawet	After 12 March

Evaluation

Participants were asked to evaluate the workshop by responding to the questions below. Their complete responses appear in Appendix 8, and are summarized following the questions.

1. To what extent have we met the workshop objectives and addressed the issues?
2. What do you think about the workshop sessions and methods?
3. How do you feel about your own participation and contributions?
4. What did you learn over the two days?
5. Do you have any suggestions for NFLRC or COTSEAL?
6. Anything else?

Participants' expectations were met or exceeded, with a perceived good fit among workshop objectives, issues, achievements and follow-up actions. Different views were freely expressed in a collegial manner in what was seen as a "venue for dialogue", where participants could speak about their concerns in various formats.

There was not a specific commitment from the UHNFLRC on what role it can play in facilitating in-service training. More generally, the workshop only went part of the way toward building long-term objectives and collaborative strategies, and did not result in a workplan, but at least a start has been made and a need recognized to continue this kind of dialogue.

No conclusion was reached on the sort of "Southeast Asian language center" that can be integrated into the UHNFLRC, but an important step was taken toward meeting that goal.

The workshop atmosphere was open, flexible, relaxed and non-intimidating. For the most part, the sessions and methods were conducted in a timely manner and provided opportunities to talk, vent, exchange information and work hard together, especially in the interactive and informative small group discussions which allowed participants to choose where to make their contributions. There could have been more briefing before the small group discussions, since some discussions seemed a bit unfocused.

Having a facilitator who is 'outside' the institutional interests but who understands the issues and can summarize discussions in an effective way, produced far better results than would have resulted if we were on our own. The pre-workshop task formed a good basis for preparation and participation in the workshop discussions. The documentation and use of the computer projector were also helpful.

Participants freely and actively participated, listened and learned; they voiced ideas, concerns and opinions (in some cases sensing that they "talked too much") and got responses; they shared experiences and real-life situations as advocates, educators and parents; and they hope to contribute more in follow-up to the workshop.

Participants learned:

- _ about frustrations in the SEA community vis-à-vis the NFLRC and generally
- _ about the complexities of the relationships between NFLRC and its stakeholders
- _ through insights about how the NFLRC operates
- _ that there is great resolve to move the field of SE Asian language teaching forward
- _ of a genuine commitment by the established center [NFLRC] to the promotion of SE Asian languages in the US

- _ that things can be done better by working with each other in unity
- _ that even when viewpoints are disparate, good results can be obtained
- _ that a spirit of cooperation exists among SE Asian language studies people
- _ of the need to “communicate, communicate, communicate” among groups

- _ about the state of SEA language teaching as a profession
- _ about issues of funding
- _ about concerns of untenured faculty
- _ about personality and character profiles and the political environment of language policy-making

- _ how discussion can be channeled effectively through a ‘gentle’ way of dialogue and discussion

It was suggested that UHNFLRC and COTSEAL continue their cooperation, since the assistance of UHNFLRC to COTSEAL will be valuable. The two organizations should:

- _ facilitate all agreements as soon as possible
- _ engage in more networking with other SEAL teachers groups
- _ contact the SE Asia NRC directors and assistant directors and ask those who did not participate to interact with their faculties
- _ begin working on the inclusive and informative website clearinghouse that could be linked to NRCs
- _ develop concrete projects to implement the many great ideas from the workshop
- _ keep the workshop participants informed - communication is the key issue
- _ arrange this kind of brainstorming workshop regularly
- _ follow through

NFLRC should:

- _ continue to dialogue and work with the consortium
- _ be more proactive in publishing and announcing their plans and projects for SEA languages

COTSEAL should:

- _ find ways to be more inclusive in its decision-making
- _ have some formal advisory role with NFLRC
- _ produce the agreed-upon products such as standards and/or guidelines for different languages

Appendix 1 Participants

1. Barbara Andaya, UH Manoa <bandaya@hawaii.edu>
2. Tran Hoai Bac, UC Berkeley <bact@uclink4.berkeley.edu>
3. Erlin Barnard, University of Wisconsin <esbarnard@wisc.edu>
4. Robert Bley-Vroman, UH Manoa <vroman@hawaii.edu>
5. Margaret Bodemer, UH Manoa <bodemer@hawaii.edu>
6. Roger Bresnahan, Michigan State University <bresnaha@msu.edu>
7. Dustin Cowell, University of Wisconsin <dccowell@facstaff.wisc.edu>
8. Rhodalyne Crail, Northern Illinois University <TL0RQC1@wpo.cso.niu.edu>
9. Stephen Fleming, UH Manoa <sfleming@hawaii.edu>
10. Tom Gething, University of Washington <getting@u.washington.edu>
11. David Hiple, UH Manoa <dhiple@hawaii.edu>
12. Yuphaphann Hoonchamlong, UH Manoa <yuphapha@hawaii.edu>
13. Thomas Hudak, Arizona State University <thomas.hudak@asu.edu>
14. Prawet Jantharat, COTSEAL President <JantharatP2@state.gov>
15. Uli Kozok, UH Manoa <kozok@hawaii.edu>
16. Flo Lamoureux, UH Manoa <cseas@hawaii.edu>
17. Ruth Mabanglo, UH Manoa <mabanglo@hawaii.edu>
18. Juanita Nacu, UC San Diego <drjsnacu@aol.com>
19. Steve O'Harrow, UH Manoa <soh@hawaii.edu>
20. Leo Paz, City College of San Francisco <lpaz@ccsf.edu>
21. Teresita Ramos, UH Manoa <teresita@hawaii.edu>
22. Chhany Sak-Humphry, UH Manoa <sak@hawaii.edu>
23. Richard Schmidt, UH Manoa <schmidt@hawaii.edu>
24. Julius Soria, UH Manoa <soria@hawaii.edu>
25. Flora Switzer, UH Manoa <fswitzer@hawaii.edu>
26. Adelwisa Weller, University of Michigan <alagawel@umich.edu>
27. Seree Weroha, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction <Seree.Weroha@dpi.state.wi.us>

Appendix 2 Agenda

Thursday, January 8		
7:00-9:00 pm	welcome reception	Dick Schmidt's house in Hawai'i Kai
Friday, January 9		
8:30-9:00	<i>morning refreshments</i>	
9:00-10:30	SESSION 1 _ welcome and introductions _ objectives and overview of the workshop _ setting the context _ review of issues	by workshop facilitator, with Dick Schmidt, Prawet Jantharat and others "setting the context"
10:30-10:45	<i>break</i>	
10:45-12:00	SESSION 2 _ needs	by language and other groups, with reference to 'needs' document
12:00-1:30	<i>lunch</i>	
1:30-3:00	SESSION 3 _ needs reportback	in the whole group, to begin formulating objectives and strategies
3:00-3:15	<i>break</i>	
3:15-4:30	SESSION 4 _ issues	begin with whole group discussion, with reference to 'issues' document, then in self-selected groups to begin addressing issues
5:30-7:30	reception	with entertainment
Saturday, January 10		
8:30-9:00	<i>morning refreshments</i>	
9:00-10:30	SESSION 5 _ issues reportback	in the whole group, to begin building consensus on the issues
10:30-10:45	<i>break</i>	
10:45-12:00	SESSION 6 _ formulating long-term objectives for improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia	in self-selected groups, to elaborate the objectives and strategies (with timelines), and to define the UHNFLRC's roles
12:00-1:30	<i>lunch</i>	
1:30-3:00	SESSION 7 _ long-term objectives reportback	in the whole group, to agree on the objectives, strategies and roles
3:00-3:15	<i>break</i>	
3:15-4:30	SESSION 8 _ evaluation - revisiting the workshop objectives and issues _ follow-up action planning	to check whether the workshop objectives were met and issues covered, and to identify actions to immediately follow the workshop
4:30	closing ceremony	

Appendix 3 NFLRC Projects

RECENT, CURRENT AND PLANNED PROJECTS SUPPORTING THE LANGUAGES OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- 1999** *Self-Directed Learning: Materials & Strategies Summer Institute*: workshop and symposium with Filipino, Khmer, Thai, & Vietnamese-related presentations
- 2000** *Computer-based Tests for Less Commonly Taught Languages Summer Institute*: workshop with teams representing the Filipino and Vietnamese language teaching community
- 2001** *Pre-institute Methodology Training for SEASSI Faculty*: as a follow-up by a visit to SEASSI by David Hiple in 1999 to conduct a comprehensive external review and evaluation of the program
- 2002** *Heritage Learners & National Language Needs Summer Institute*: workshop & symposium dealing with Ilokano & Filipino
- ACTFL Levels, Text Levels, and Lesson Design*: presentation at the annual meeting of GUAVA at the University of Washington
- Vietnamese Authentic Video Lesson Development Workshop*: a workshop to orient Vietnamese language educators toward a common philosophy of materials development for authentic video segments and provide them with tools for lesson design
- 2003** *CLAN for Conversation Analysis*: workshop for participants representing Ilokano, Khmer, Thai, & Vietnamese and doing research in those languages
- Southeast Asian Pedagogy Summer Institute*: site visits and faculty development workshops for study abroad faculty in Indonesia (COTIM, Manado), Cambodia (ASK, Phnom Penh) & Vietnam (VASI, Hanoi)
- 2004** *New Visions for Southeast Asian Language Teaching: NFLRC/COTSEAL Workshop* (January), to bring together language educators and others with a stake in improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia. The purpose of the workshop will be to formulate long-term objectives for the field and define the role that the UHNFLRC can play in facilitating the achievement of these objectives.
- Distance Education Summer Institute* (Summer): a workshop to launch the development of advanced on-line courses in selected SEA languages, followed by a symposium
- Heritage Language Symposium* (Fall): focusing on SEA and Pacific Islands languages
- 2005** *Issues in Placement, NFLRC Summer Workshop* (Summer): a workshop bringing together language educators working in SE Asian languages and other LCTLs to address issues in placement & articulation
- 2006** *Asia Pacific Pedagogy Summer Institute* (Summer)

RESEARCH & ASSESSMENT PROJECTS

1999-2002 *Teaching the Pragmatics of Indonesian as a Foreign Language*: research project. Team: Gabriele Kasper & Margaret DuFon

2002-2006 *Elicited Imitation*: research project. Team: Craig Chaudron, Uli Kozok, Hanh Nguyen

Research has shown not only that elicited imitation (EI), sometimes referred to as “sentence repetition,” attains high reliability and validity measured against alternative assessments, but that some data can be used for diagnostic procedures, and, like cloze testing, it lends itself to relatively easy-to-construct items and batteries. In this project, EI tests are being developed for Indonesian and Vietnamese as models that can be emulated by teachers of all languages. The final products of the project will be completed tests for Indonesian and Vietnamese, together with a handbook on elicited imitation containing guidelines for the development of comparable measures in any language.

MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT & DISSEMINATION

Filipino (Tagalog) *Authentic Tagalog video* (text & tape), Ruth Mabanglo & David Hiple

Indonesian *Authentic Indonesian video* (text + tapes), Erlin Barnard, Julie Winter & David Hiple

Nah, Baca! Authentic Indonesian readings (vol. 1, student workbook plus reading packet), Ellen Rafferty, Jim Collins, Erlin Barnard & David Hiple

Nah, Baca! Authentic Indonesian readings (vol. 1, teacher’s edition), Ellen Rafferty, Jim Collins, Erlin Barnard & David Hiple

Nah, Baca! Authentic Indonesian readings (vol. 2, student workbook plus reading packet), Ellen Rafferty, Jim Collins, Erlin Barnard & David Hiple

Nah, Baca! Authentic Indonesian readings (vol. 2, teacher’s edition), Ellen Rafferty, Jim Collins, Erlin Barnard & David Hiple

Mari belajar sopan santun Bahasa Indonesia (text + video), Margaret A. DuFon

Khmer *Communicating in Khmer 1*: An interactive intermediate level Khmer course (text + CD-ROM), Chhany Sak-Humphry

Communicating in Khmer 2 (text + CD-ROM), Chhany Sak-Humphry

Vietnamese *Computerized intermediate Vietnamese 2 .1 Hang* (CD-ROM), Le Minh & O’Harrow, Steven

Appendix 4 Authorizing Language

retrieved from http://clear.msu.edu/nflrc/authorizing_language.html on 11/29/03

HEA-TITLE VI, INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
SEC. 603. 020 U.S.C. 1123

LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTERS

- (a) LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTERS AUTHORIZED - The Secretary is authorized to make grants to and enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the purpose of establishing, strengthening, and operating a small number of national language resource and training centers, which shall serve as resources to improve the capacity to teach and learn foreign languages effectively.
- (b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES - The activities carried out by the centers described in subsection (a) -
 - (1) shall include effective dissemination efforts, wherever appropriate; and
 - (2) may include -
 - (A) the conduct and dissemination of research on new and improved teaching methods, including the use of advanced educational technology;
 - (B) the development and dissemination of new teaching materials reflecting the use of such research in effective teaching strategies;
 - (C) the development, application, and dissemination of performance testing appropriate to an educational setting for use as a standard and comparable measurement of skill levels in all languages;
 - (D) the training of teachers in the administration and interpretation of performance tests, the use of effective teaching strategies, and the use of new technologies;
 - (E) a significant focus on the teaching and learning needs of the less commonly taught languages, including as assessment of the strategies needs of the United States, the determination of ways to meet those needs nationally, and the publication and dissemination of instructional materials in the less commonly taught languages;
 - (F) the development and dissemination of materials designed to serve as a resource for foreign language teachers at the elementary and secondary school levels; and
 - (G) the operation of intensive summer language institutes to train advanced foreign language students, to provide professional development, and to improve language instruction through preservice and inservice language training for teachers.
- (c) CONDITIONS FOR GRANTS - Grants under this section shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Appendix 5 Pre-Workshop Task

The *purpose* of the workshop is to “formulate long-term objectives for improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia, and define the role that the UHNFLRC can play in facilitating their achievement.”

Participants are requested to complete a two-part pre-workshop task to set the *objectives* of the workshop and to raise any *issues* they see as necessary for consideration in the workshop discussions. Interaction around the pre-workshop task will be moderated in confidence by the facilitator, and the outcomes presented anonymously on the first morning of the workshop.

Please reply by 15 December 2003 to Bill Savage <savage@loxinfo.co.th> with responses to these two pre-workshop task questions:

1. Given the above purpose of the NFLRC/COTSEAL Workshop, what *objectives* (for the workshop itself) would you like to see achieved over the two days?
2. From your organizational and individual perspectives, what *issues* do you think need to be addressed in “defining the role that the UHNFLRC can play in facilitating long-term objectives for improving the US capacity to teach and learn the languages of Southeast Asia?”

Appendix 6 Needs

[drawn from pre-workshop task, in alphabetical order by category]

Assessment of Southeast Asian language programs

- including identification of geographical areas, institutions, and educational levels targeted for promoting Southeast Asian languages over short and long term, i.e. particular states, schools, training institutions (even groups like FSI, Defense Language Institutes), K-5, Middle School, or Grades 9-12, 13-14 (at community colleges), higher education levels

Center for Southeast Asian languages

- center that solely promotes Southeast Asian language issues and interests [UHNFLRC applying for a grant to set up a center for SEAL in Hawai'i], including collaborative work; sharing and dissemination of information, opportunities and training to all members; and learning LCTL

Curriculum

- assessment, development and effective dissemination efforts of improved teaching methods for all levels and languages
- assistance with on-line course development and maintenance
- language syllabus guidelines
- articulation among individual programs, domestic summer programs and study-abroad

Funding

- no-cost vs money required
- federal government vs other funding sources
- grants

Materials development and distribution

- assessment, development and effective dissemination efforts of new research-based teaching materials, and as resources for foreign language teachers at elementary and secondary levels and other community based-programs
- handbooks for interactive classroom communicative tasks for all levels of [language]
- UHNFLRC provides a technician or computer programmer whose responsibility is to assist with development and preparation using various authorware, software and hardware
- publications workshops and funding

Proficiency testing

- development, application and dissemination of performance testing (comparable with ACTFL guidelines) appropriate to an educational setting for use as a standard and comparable measurement of skill levels in all languages

Research

- assessment, development and effective dissemination efforts of new research relevant to Southeast Asian language teaching and learning, of improved teaching methods for beginning to advanced language levels and of new research-based teaching materials
- collaboration opportunities

Standards

- e.g., for admission to SEASSI or study-abroad programs
- graded functions
- for a language proficiency level (speaking/listening, reading/writing) that is expected of students completing each "academic" year (2 semesters/32 weeks/~100-120 hours) of language classes, that will be commonly adopted by all university level language programs

of a given language (e.g., Thai, Indonesian) in US institutions. This guideline can be stated in commonly accepted scales such as FSI/ACTFL. This will eliminate the “vagueness” of the terms “beginning, intermediate, advanced” commonly used in various institutions, which might not refer to the same language proficiency level and coverage. If this is achieved, maybe we will have a common syllabus or program of topics and functions of the language that should be covered in each “academic year” of teaching that particular language.

Student recruitment

- study to high proficiency levels
- dealing with heterogeneity of learners

Study-abroad programs

- train local teachers with new methodology and technology

Summer institutes

- affordable intensive summer language institutes to train advanced foreign language students, to provide professional development, and to improve language instruction through pre-service and in-service language training for teachers

Teacher education and training, and professional development

- professionalization of Southeast Asian teachers
- identification of objectives for teacher training and certification for various levels (e.g., credential programs for K-12, MAs or higher for college and university levels), and identification of articulation links between all these levels to ensure continuity of training over a well-planned number of years and semesters to ensure seamless continuity in language education
- regular training programs
- coordination with SEASSI (Southeast Asian Summer Session Institute)
- teaching strategies
- pedagogical and technological updates
- on-line courses
- distance education
- administration and interpretation of performance tests
- travel scholarships

University governance

- in relation to workplace and career improvement
- ‘colonial’ power structure in many Southeast Asian language programs
- ‘exploitation’ of Southeast Asian language teachers in academia
- role of language professionals in Title VI NRCs (National Resource Centers)

Appendix 7 Issues

[drawn from pre-workshop task]

- Continuation of Southeast Asian languages as a priority area of UHNFLRC
- Role of UHNFLRC in the training and credentialing of teachers in various states for Southeast Asian language teaching
- Teacher education role of graduate programs at UH (e.g., Department of Second Language Studies, Southeast Asian languages, Asian Studies) in Southeast Asian languages, and UHNFLRC facilitation role
- UHNFLRC relationships with teachers, institutions, Southeast Asian centers and COTSEAL (in US): identifying needs and coordinating cooperation
- Cooperation between UHNFLRC and partner institutions in Southeast Asia
- Role of UHNFLRC, perhaps in partnership with COTSEAL, in addressing the issue of articulation among individual programs, domestic summer programs and study-abroad

Appendix 8 Evaluation

Note: Responses with the same number are from the same person.

To what extent have we met the workshop objectives and addressed the issues?

1. Exceeded expectations
2. Good fit between objectives/issues and achievements of the workshop
3. Extensively
4. We have mostly covered if not all topics.
5. There has been a presentiment among the participants in the establishment of a language center for SEALs. This workshop addressed the different views toward that goal and provided a venue for dialogue.
6. Somewhat, we really did not have some commitment from the UHNFLRC on what role it can play in facilitating in-service training in the near future.
7. Well
8. 80%
9. We've pretty much covered most of the important aspects
10. Fairly well; we need to continue this kind of dialogue.
11. There has been no final conclusion on what form a 'center' can be integrated into the UHNFLRC, but we have achieved an important step toward meeting that goal.
12. We did successfully accomplish most of the objectives and discussed all of the issues that were outlined.
13. Great extent
14. I think we have met and discussed all the workshop objectives and issues.
15. They were met substantially.
16. We touched on all the stated objectives and issues. I would say "very good", on a scale of 1-5, a 4.
17. All issues were addressed squarely and candidly in a collegial manner. The idea of giving everyone a lei, helped create the collegial mood of cooperation.
18. I thought we would come away with a working plan.
19. The facilitator kept the topics on track and as a resulting, we were able to meet the objectives we stated.
20. The workshop met the last four objectives nicely, but did not really touch much on #1.
21. Very much so - we have new visions now!
22. Well - objectives and issues were specifically formulated and thus enabled participants to address each of them systematically.
23. Only part way in building long-term objectives, but at least a start has been made; issue of a SE Asian LRC not resolved

What do you think about the workshop sessions and methods?

1. Sometimes sessions seemed to drag a bit, but methods were good and people needed a venue to talk, vent, exchange information.
2. Time and task meshed well. Facilitation produced far better results than would have resulted if we were on our own.
3. Well done; brainstorming of small group sessions were excellent. Participants were allowed to choose sessions relevant to their needs and issues.
4. Excellent
5. Interactive small group discussions; excellent facilitation
6. Well run
7. A well-run workshop, with an especially skillful facilitator
8. Well-chaired
9. Things went smoothly
10. Well-facilitated! Topics and discussions covered in a timely manner.

11. Well done!
12. Professional; all participants have chances to talk and actively work hard together.
13. Alright; good facilitation
14. Well-planned, well-guided
15. The workshop session and methods were of a high level. The agenda and schedule were clear and specific. The facilitator and the process he used was excellent. He summarized and controlled the process well. The documentation and use of the computer projector were helpful.
16. Interactive, open to discussions, flexible, relaxed, non-intimidating
17. Having an experienced facilitator who is 'outside' the institutional interests but who understands the issues and can summarize discussions in an effective way, was a plus.
18. Well planned; good combination of large and small group sessions; working group tasks were well laid out.
19. Good organization for input from all
20. Excellent way to give opportunity to participants to speak out their concerns in various formats.
21. Informative, interactive participation
22. It's logically organized and appropriately moved along, well-managed.
23. I like the facilitator. I'm wondering if workshop sessions could have been given a little more briefing. I got the feeling some discussions were a bit unfocused.

How do you feel about your own participation and contributions?

1. I listened mostly (or tried to).
2. Appropriate
3. It's a great venue to voice out ideas and share experiences from our background.
4. I felt that I have voiced out what my concerns are, have worked and participated in most of the tasks.
5. My participation encouraged me to begin thinking of ways on how Northern Illinois University may contribute our own institutional and NRC expertise (e.g., SEASITE) toward the creation of a SEA language center
6. I was happy to be able to say what I want to say, and people seemed to listen to me.
7. Peripherally useful, although mostly in a listening and learning mode
8. Talked too much - what's new?
9. I've said most of what I had to say.
10. As a junior faculty in the field, this was a learning experience for me.
11. Okay
12. I feel good about my own participation and hope to contribute more after this workshop.
13. Actively participated, quietly most of the time, but contributed ideas in general and group sessions
14. I have a chance to voice my concerns and opinions and get responses.
15. The pre-workshop tasks formed a good basis for preparation and my participation in the workshop discussions. The openness and professionalism of the colleagues allowed all to share their thoughts and concerns and to collaborate on plans. I believe my contribution was in discussing practices, plans and strategies from my state and my institution. I believe I also made the group more aware of the need to be aware of the K-12 area.
16. Good - provided some insights based on experiences and real-life situations as an advocate, educator and parent.
17. Through the group discussions I felt I was able to make a contribution. The atmosphere was conducive to free discussion.
18. Maybe I said too much, but I did feel people were focused on these issues.
19. Good
20. I accomplished the general goal.
21. Productive, effective participation
22. I'm OK
23. OK

What did you learn over the two days?

1. A better understanding of frustrations in the SEA community vis-à-vis NFLRC and generally
2. Even when viewpoints are disparate, good results can be obtained. There is great resolve to move the field of SE Asian language teaching forward.
3. That there is a great need to communicate, communicate, communicate among groups.
4. Many things - problems, issues, concerns of SEAL teachers; programs are available; funding sources; where resources come from
5. Funding is crucial in the creation of a SEALs center; institutional integrity on the part of the center is highly important; genuine commitment by the established center to the promotion of SE Asian languages in the US
6. You can do things better by working with each other.
7. Much more about the state of SEA language teaching as a profession
8. A lot about the concerns of untenured faculty and the complexities of the relationships between NFLRC and its stakeholders
9. We could get things done when we put our heads together.
10. Functions of NFLRCs, varied perspectives of professionals in the field at different levels.
11. Provided me with insights on how the center operates; informative
12. Clear objectives and issues of what SEA languages need to do
13. Lots of ideas; personality and character profiles and the political environment of language policy-making - quite interesting!
14. Actually, in this workshop, it is what we 'achieved' rather than learned. I see some actions coming out of this workshop, which is good and I am happy with it.
15. I learned much about the history, organization and process of funding a language association vis-à-vis LRCs and NRCs.
16. Purpose and objectives of NFLRC; resources, happenings with different groups; new perspectives and insights; 'gentle' way of dialogue and discussion
17. I learned about specific activities and projects being conducted at the various centers. I saw how discussion can be channeled effectively by an experienced facilitator.
18. That a spirit of cooperation exists within SE Asian language studies people that can be called upon
19. There was a good overview of the concerns of various language groups, although some, such as Burmese, were missing.
20. A lot needs to be done.
21. Different views and opinions of my colleagues on different issues and needs
22. That communication and unity should speak volumes in advancing our cause, i.e., SEA language teaching
23. Although I can see there is considerable commitment, I was disappointed in the turn-out from the East Coast - this taught me that building a national esprit is still a problematic task.

Do you have any suggestions for NFLRC or COTSEAL?

1. Plenty of suggestions have been made. Let's see what shakes out.
2. Continue cooperation. The UHNFLRC assistance to COTSEAL will be valuable.
3. Grouping by language group be given more time.
4. Facilitate all agreements as soon as possible; more networking with other SEAL teachers groups; begin working on the website clearinghouse
5. NFLRC: continue to dialogue and work with the consortium in this effort; COTSEAL: find ways to be more inclusive in the decision-making
6. They should work closely on getting some of the needs solved.
7. -
8. COTSEAL should have some formal advisory role with NFLRC
9. Concrete projects to implement the many great ideas we have been able to come up with.
10. -
11. Keep us informed; communication is the key issue.
12. Continue working together

13. To be more up-front with their objectives and agendas on this issue. I learned more from private conversations about the direction of this project than from the public discussions. I also learned about how to make a decision without really defining what that decision is and to commit to something without being accountable for it.
14. We should have this kind of brainstorming workshop regularly (once a year?) on issues on SEA instruction and learning (which results in action). It's good to get together and discuss issues face to face with SEA colleagues.
15. We have made an auspicious start, the first significant step in a long journey. Good luck and god speed - let us follow through.
16. Follow up with action and results of this workshop; keep the participants informed and in the loop.
17. Keep up the good work and try to implement the suggestions to the extent possible with the resources available.
18. Continue this initiative by contacting the SE Asia NRC directors and assistant directors and asking those who did not participate to interact with their faculties.
19. NFLRC should be more proactive in publishing and announcing their plans and projects for SEA languages.
20. On-going communication with COTSEAL is responsible for communicating ideas to members.
21. Produce the agreed-upon products such as standards and/or guidelines for different languages.
22. Mentioned in the workshop already
23. Urgent need for a really inclusive and informative website that could be linked to NRCs

Anything else?

1. Good job, thanks
2. The proof of the pudding will be found in the follow-up actions.
3. Hope, faith and trust that all the expressed voices will be captured in print as is.
4. -
5. Good food and great entertainment
6. It was an excellent opportunity for us SEA teachers to be heard (and I hope taken seriously).
7. -
8. Great food!
9. Great facilitation!
10. -
11. Great facilitation, good food and strong coffee!
12. Extremely well done
13. Great workshop!
14. No
15. Believe or hoped that we had more time to develop collaborative strategies.
16. Great job!
17. Thanks to the UHNFLRC and COTSEAL for putting together such a great meeting!
18. -
19. Approximately two-thirds of the participants were from UH. Was this simply a case of other invitees declining the invitation (i.e., Cornell)?
20. -
21. Develop K-12 standards or guidelines for SE Asian languages and create task forces for specific languages.
22. Anticipating the actualization of greater support and focus on the advancement of SEA language teaching
- 23.