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

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.**

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 2

The Shared Course Initiative: Curricular Collaboration Across Institutions

Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl, Yale University

Stéphane Charitos, Columbia University

Introduction

In the last decade, globalization has become one of the key issues in higher education.[1] Global engagement is considered increasingly vital to the future success of the university, and global issues are seen as playing a significant role in helping shape an academic institution's overall identity in tomorrow's educational environment (Berman, 2007; de Wit, 2002, 2011). In order to reflect a more complex and networked world, an increasing number of institutions of higher education are transforming themselves into "global universities" (Wildasky, 2010) by modifying their missions, their operations, their governance structures, their organizational arrangements, and their institutional cultures.

Institutions offer various justifications for the significant reallocation of human and financial resources needed to meet these new global missions. They include preparing students to live and work in a globalized world, improving overall academic quality, strengthening research, attracting new students, generating new streams of revenue, and enhancing prestige and international reputation.[2] Moreover, as there is no common agreement on what global engagement means, different institutions can also expand their global identity in significantly different ways. For some, globalization means welcoming an increased number of international students and scholars onto their campuses as well as sending

---

[1] The literature on globalization and higher education is extensive (Block & Cameron, 2002; Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Blight, Davis, Olsen, & Scott, 2000; Frank & Gabler, 2006; Gacel-Ávila, 2005; King & Bjarnason, 2003; Marginson & van der Wende, 2007, 2009; Scott, 2000; Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004; de Wit, 2002, 2009).

[2] As part of a larger research project based at the University of California, Berkeley, Richard Edelstein and John Aubrey Douglass have been trying to generate a taxonomy of actions and logics used to initiate international activities, engagements, and academic programs (Douglass & Edelstein, 2013; Edelstein & Douglass, 2012).

faculty overseas through exchange arrangements that showcase their commitment to global education. For others, it means raising their global profiles by setting up institutional partnerships with international partners. For yet others, a "global makeover" means integrating global issues into a revised curriculum. And for a small subset of universities, globalization means establishing an actual brick-and-mortar presence internationally by developing branch campuses and global outposts in overseas locations (Edelstein & Douglass, 2012; Holquist, 2006; Wellmon, 2008).[3]

While some institutions have a long and rich history of international academic engagement and collaborations with scholars and institutions across the globe, many more colleges and universities in the United States now want to participate in the global knowledge economy, capitalize on emerging transnational opportunities, and address global issues in new, interdisciplinary ways. To do so, however, is not without challenges: both exogenous challenges, including fundamental changes in the global economy, tax-funded public support, new communication technologies, and shifting markets for students, faculty, and graduates, and endogenous challenges related to the strategic choices institutions make in aligning their programs and curricula with the global policies, programs, and relationships they have chosen to pursue (cf. Block & Cameron, 2002).

A key challenge for institutions with global ambitions is defining the role foreign language (FL) education should play in institutional globalization (Warner, 2011; Watzinger-Tharp, 2014) in an era where English appears to be the default language of choice for the vast majority of initiatives promoted by many administrations. In order to meet this challenge, this chapter will first offer a critical reflection on how globalization is affecting language pedagogy (Kramsch, 2014), and then discuss a cross-institutional model that demonstrates how globalizing institutions can sustain their offerings of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs)—languages often perceived as irrelevant in a globalized world dominated by the English language.

---

[3] Even this commitment can take multiple forms. One choice is the creation of new institutions in partnership with a local university to create a hybrid liberal arts and research university (e.g., Yale-NUS College, created in 2011 as a collaboration between Yale University and the National University of Singapore, or the Duke Kunshan University (DKU), a partnership between Duke University and Wuhan University). Another strategy consists in the establishment of a branch campus in a foreign location, such as the New York University Abu Dhabi and New York University Shanghai campuses, opened as part of NYU's Global Network University strategy. A third option, explored by both Columbia University and the University of Chicago, is the establishment of "global centers," a network of smaller and more flexible hubs that support a wide range of activities and resources.

The Changing Landscape of Higher Education

In times of economic uncertainty, one hears increased calls for a more practical college education focusing on skills that translate more directly to employment. In recent years, a one-dimensional public debate has emerged that seeks to directly measure the value of different undergraduate majors by gauging their future earning potential (cf. Levine, 2014). In response, students are increasingly shifting their interests away from the humanities and FL education and choosing to major in fields of study that are thought to offer better employment opportunities after college. The most recent Modern Language Association (MLA) Report on language enrollments notes nationwide declines, with just a little over 8% of college students in the United States currently enrolled in a language course, compared with double that number several decades ago (Goldberg, Looney, & Lusin, 2015). While many factors have played a role in this ongoing decline, one issue of significant concern is the persistence of the two-tiered departmental structure in language departments that has alienated many potential FL majors (cf. Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007; Swaffar & Urlaub, 2014).

For FL departments, shrinking enrollments and declining numbers of majors have had serious repercussions. In times of financial constraints and budgetary cutbacks, some universities have been forced to downsize language programs significantly or even close underperforming FL departments entirely (Hu, 2009; Wasley, 2008). Other consequences—while less drastic—are just as consequential for the future of FL instruction: institutions dilute or eliminate foreign-language requirements, while off-loading those requirements that remain to community and junior colleges; online language programs supersede standard classroom language offerings; and nonpermanent adjunct instructors are hired to fill positions that had before been held by tenured and/or permanent faculty.

Furthermore, language departments are forced to compete for scarce institutional funding, not only against other departments, but also among themselves. As a result, established language programs are pitted against newer, emerging languages such as Arabic, Chinese, and Korean. For the foreseeable future, this creates an unhealthy situation in which FL programs are closely scrutinized at an institutional level with "an eye toward optimizing expenditures versus student demand" (Foderaro, 2010). Whether language departments might see these developments as a wake-up call to become more relevant to the broader student interests and as an incentive to create a more integrated curriculum remains to be seen.

Regardless of the underlying causes of declining enrollment, the institutional status of language and literature departments has clearly changed. In part, department-level changes reflect broader changes occurring within parent

institutions. In today's globalized world, culture, education, and the university itself have become commodities, required to conform to the logic of account-ability (Alonso, 2010). Not only has this shift resulted in a sustained attempt to impose business-style management practices and decision-making criteria on academic institutions (Krücken, Blümel, & Kloke, 2013), but the rhetoric of neoliberalism has also seeped deeply into the academy so that corporate talk and thinking have become commonplace. The corporate mentality that has emerged through these practices equates students to customers and education to a ser-vice industry, and has led to the widespread adoption of guiding principles such as accountability, competitiveness, and efficiency that use metrics to quantify the value of teachers, students, and programs. In short, the discourse of the nascent "global university" reflects the values of the instrumental, the commer-cial, and the practical at least as much as those of critical dialogue, analysis, and interpretation (Giroux, 2008).

If our language programs are to survive in this new environment, they will have to adapt (cf. Block & Cameron, 2002). The challenge will be to repo-sition language education within the global/corporate framework and to seek opportunities for a more globally engaged language pedagogy without sim-ply giving in to instrumentalist goals (cf. Kramsch, 2014). The more language departments view this challenge as insurmountable and reject any curricular changes as an attack on their intellectual rigor, the more this rigid stance will contribute to their ongoing marginalization within the structures of the global university.

A final issue to consider is the lack of an overall national language strategy in the United States (cf. Jackson & Malone, 2009). FL education is not presently coordinated at the federal level. While the U.S. Department of Education (2012) has published an international strategy document laying out a framework for U.S. students to become more globally competent, its main focus is on using English to increase "global competencies" rather than on promoting FL education. This decision followed—not coincidentally—the cuts to the Title VI International and Area Studies programs and has reinforced "the hegemonic and expanding role of English" as a global language (Levine, 2014; see also Byrnes, 2009; Santirocco, 1999). In this regard, Kramsch (2014, p. 299) points out that "globalization has exacerbated the competition among the FLs taught at educational institutions around the world, [. . .] has skewed the playing field in favor of English, and it has fueled linguistic rivalries between nation–states as to which language will counterbalance the over-whelming power of global English." In the United States, the public debate on this issue has been further fanned by, for example, Summers's (2012) essay in *The New York Times*, dismissing FL competency as irrelevant for future gener-ations and—most recently—by Sarah Palin's exhortation to "speak American" (McWhorter, 2015).

These larger issues play a significant role in the growing perception of language education as irrelevant for the global university and its ongoing dislocation from the discourses of the academy (cf. Levine, 2014; Watzinger-Tharp, 2014; Warner, 2011). FL departments are being challenged to articulate new narratives about how to prepare the students of tomorrow's global university for the realities of the future global society—yet the responses of many language professionals in the face of this challenge (which, in many cases, directly questions their institutional relevance) have been largely ineffective. Few have accepted that globalization has fundamentally changed the way we think, and fewer still have championed the structural, disciplinary, and pedagogical changes needed to prepare tomorrow's multilingual, multinational speaker who knows how to operate between languages and navigate between cultures, as the MLA Report proposed (Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007). As we will argue in more detail in the next section, the ongoing language/content divide at many institutions remains a major barrier to repositioning language departments within the global university. Overcoming this obstacle will require collaborative and cross-disciplinary approaches that both maintain the intellectual rigor of language study and prepare students with the global perspectives necessary in today's world.

Alternatives to Traditional Curricular Models

Given the current marginalization of FL education in the United States (Levine, 2014) and the lack of participation of language departments in the institutional discourses of globalization (Brustein, 2007; Gehlhar, 2009; Warner, 2011), FL departments are facing an unprecedented crisis of legitimization (Swaffar, 2003). The conventional arguments and strategies language departments used in the past to justify their existence have long since collapsed. Indeed, Watzinger-Tharp (2014) notes, perceptively, that "foreign language programs' discourse and practices conspire to marginalize language departments in internationalization, an arena in which they should play a central role" (p. 124), and that these departments must "accept the responsibility to initiate meaningful conversations about the goals of global education" (p. 137). Despite the clear crisis, however, few seem willing to take the lead in fostering cross-disciplinary approaches and global perspectives in institutional debates on globalization.

A major obstacle to forward progress in language departments is the long-standing, much-lamented problem of bifurcated curricular structure (Kern, 2002; Paesani & Allen, 2012; Swaffar & Urlaub, 2014). The 2007 report of the MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages called for both "a restructuring of FL departments to move beyond the two-tiered language-literature configuration that still prevails in many postsecondary institutions" and a refocusing of the

goals of FL education on "translingual and transcultural competence" (Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007)—although Kramsch (2014, p. 304) already finds these recommendations in need of recontextualization in the face of globalization. While the document stimulated a much-needed national discussion on curricular transformation, the process of departmental reform has not been without challenges and much work still remains to be done (cf. Byrnes, 2008; Maxim, 2009; Walther, 2009). Despite the fact that a number of language departments at institutions across the country have successfully implemented curricular reforms,[4] the overall impact of the MLA Report has fallen short of expectations (cf. Byrnes, 2008; Maxim, 2014). Maxim (2009, p. 125) describes this situation as "the discipline's general inability to substantively address its bifurcated nature."

If curricular transformation in language departments is to be sustainable and successful, it will require "working outside of the FL box" (Urlaub, 2014). To that effect, Watzinger-Tharp (2014, p. 137) points to the "urgent need for dialog and collaboration between internationally focused area and global-studies degrees, and language departments" and calls for a greater focus on interdisciplinarity and for more collaboration across departmental boundaries. Kramsch (2014, p. 302) echoes this sentiment, pointing out that globalization, which requires a "more reflective, interpretive, historically grounded, and politically engaged pedagogy," may well provide the opportunity for language study to broaden its curricular focus and regain its institutional relevance.

At some institutions, innovative, flexible, and sustainable models of language education are already being created that cross both departmental and institutional boundaries. One example is the Directed Independent Language Study (DILS) program, which has been implemented at various institutions (Yale University, the University of Miami, Emory University, among others) and which is driven by student needs and interests. The program allows students to request any language not regularly taught at their institution (usually the least commonly taught languages) and study with a language partner to prepare for international fieldwork and research in their academic field of interest.[5] Another example is the Fields program, also at Yale University, which encourages undergraduate, graduate, and

---

[4] For example, Byrnes (1998, 2001, 2002) has carefully documented the restructuring of the curriculum in the German Department at Georgetown University; Maxim, Höyng, Lancaster, Schaumann, and Aue (2013) and Maxim (2015) describe the collaborative process of revising the undergraduate curriculum in the German Studies Department at Emory University; and Yu (2008) discusses the goals of the Chinese program at Carnegie Mellon University.

[5] At Yale University, nearly 1300 students in the DILS program have studied approximately 90 languages over the past 15 years in preparation for international experiences across the world. Among the least frequently studied languages are, for instance, Dzongka, Mapundungun, Kinyarwanda, Choctaw, Chinese Oracle Bone Inscriptions, Tshiluba, Newari, and many others.

professional school students with advanced language skills (advanced to superior on the ACTFL scale) to design a customized program of study within the context of their academic disciplines.[6]

If we accept the premise that the language of the global university should not be limited to English only, then it is essential that we continue to support the teaching of a wide array of languages necessary to engage with the world, whether through research, fieldwork, or study abroad opportunities. Unfortunately, for many language departments, language study has now become a matter of survival-of-the-fittest, with only the major languages continuing to receive institutional support. LCTLs that were previously central to language departments and area studies programs have become a luxury at most institutions, especially as enrollment pressures have become part of the culture of accountability.[7]

The model introduced and analyzed in this chapter is the Shared Course Initiative (SCI). This collaborative framework for sharing LCTLs has been implemented among Columbia University, Yale University, and Cornell University in response to sharp cutbacks in funding for language education at the federal, state, and institutional levels. By sharing instructional resources and leveraging enrollments across institutional boundaries, the SCI model offers a viable solution for maintaining low-enrollment courses (not just in the LCTLs but also advanced-level courses in the commonly taught languages).[8] We discuss the SCI model in more detail in the next section and outline its pedagogical affordances and challenges as well as implications for teacher training.

The Shared Course Initiative

The SCI Model

The SCI is a joint collaborative project among Columbia University, Cornell University, and Yale University to share instruction in the LCTLs. The project was established in 2012 with the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.[9]

---

[6] Thus far, students have studied more than 15 languages. Focuses have included such diverse selections as Vietnamese and child psychology; Polish and theater; Punjabi and philosophy; German and law.

[7] According to the latest MLA enrollment survey, 248 LCTLs were taught in the United States in 2013, and 104 of these were taught at only one institution each. Only four had enrollments of over 1000 students and four more had over 100 students enrolled. Total enrollment for all LCTLs was 40,059.

[8] Another model has been developed by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, which offers a Course Share program in the critical languages among its member institutions through its Collaborative Language Program (Rosen, 2015).

[9] After funding an initial two-year start-up (Phase I), the Mellon Foundation agreed in 2012 to continue to fund the project for an additional three-year period (Phase II).

All three schools have adopted many of the globalization strategies outlined earlier, including the development of global programs (such as global health or environmental studies) and the establishment of global centers. However, despite strong faculty and student interest in language programming, limited funding has been made available for language study. The SCI model has allowed the three institutions to leverage existing local resources and expand the breadth and depth of language instruction across all three institutions. In essence, the SCI is a bottom-up faculty-driven effort to guide the expansion of LCTL programs; the program was instigated in reaction to top-down administrative globalization policies that had largely defaulted toward English as a global language.

The SCI allows the three schools to supplement their local face-to-face language offerings with language instruction delivered via high-definition videoconferencing and other distance learning technologies to synchronously connect up to three classrooms: one on the campus of each of the partner institutions. Each of these learning spaces has been designed to facilitate a small, highly interactive, learner-centered, multimodal environment intended to emulate a traditional language classroom.

Offering a shared course is remarkably similar to offering a traditional language course. A language instructor based at one of the campuses (the sending institution) teaches a regular language class in a specially outfitted classroom; that learning space is then virtually extended to include participating students located in similarly fitted classrooms at one or both of the other campuses (the receiving institution(s)). Students at the remote locations are expected to attend class regularly according to the schedule that is posted on their respective class directory. Class size is limited to a total of 12 students per course across all participating locations.

An interinstitutional Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishes the general administrative framework needed to institutionalize the initiative between the three partner schools. It stipulates that students enrolled in an SCI course will receive local credit for that course; that students of one institution will pay no tuition to another institution; that each institution agrees to make a reasonable effort to continue to offer instruction in a particular language once an exchange is initiated so that students are able to fulfill their respective institution's language requirements; that grading will conform to each institution's rules and procedures; that issues of academic integrity will be adjudicated by a student's home institution; and that the sending institution's calendar (both daily and hourly) will dictate the timing of instruction for any language shared through the SCI.

Since its inception, the SCI has annually increased the number of languages it offers as well as the levels of instruction and the total number of courses.

Likewise, enrollments—while still modest—have increased each year, from a total of 71 students enrolled in academic year 2012–13 to 116 students in 2014–15 (refer Appendix section).

The languages offered through the SCI are chosen on the basis of a number of criteria:

- The overall strength of an existing curriculum at the sending institution.
- An identified need for a specific language at one or both of the receiving institution(s).
- The availability of a qualified instructor at one of the participating institutions.

The goal of the project is to address a number of issues that have persistently plagued the instruction of LCTLs (cf. also Blake, 2008; Blyth, 2013):

- Chronically low enrollments at the elementary and intermediate levels for many LCTLs, which led to many of these languages having to be cross-subsidized by other languages with higher enrollments.
- Limited ability to develop and offer instruction beyond the intermediate level or offer expanded LCTL offerings in specific curricular areas due to an inadequate local pool of students with the required proficiency level.
- The lack of qualified instructors in many LCTLs.
- The institutional isolation from other language faculty members (as well as from the larger faculty in general) of many instructors of LCTLs, given the nature of their appointments.
- A dearth of professional development opportunities for instructors of LCTLs.
- A lack of forums for sharing best practices with colleagues at other institutions.
- The institutional isolation of students in small-enrollment courses, where they may often be the only ones studying the language and lack access to a broader community of practice.
- The shortage of local opportunities for heritage learners of LCTLs to study the languages of their cultural and ethnic background.

The SCI also addresses some of the institutional constraints and pressures that have forced other institutions to reduce their number of FL offerings, not only in the LCTLs but in some case even in the more "traditional" modern languages, such as French, German, and Italian. By pooling students across three campuses, we have been able to increase enrollments in languages that have traditionally suffered from extremely low enrollments. In a number of languages (e.g., Tamil, Yoruba), the shared nature of the courses has produced higher than expected enrollments, and has allowed us to jointly offer advanced

instruction in languages that were previously offered only at a lower level of instruction due to a lack of students. The SCI also provides opportunities for instructors to collaborate. Examples of such projects include the creation of joint syllabi and course materials, the co-teaching of advanced courses, and the development of specialized courses targeting professional school students. For example, instructors are currently developing Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) courses for Public Health and Medical students in Zulu, Yoruba, Wolof, and Kiswahili.

Pedagogical Affordances

The SCI model encourages instructors to take advantage of the possibilities afforded by technology and new modes of delivery. Thus, the SCI model engages learners in innovative ways. Working within this framework, instructors design multimodal activities that integrate visual, textual, and aural inputs to encourage the students not only to participate actively in the language learning process but also to help them rethink the boundaries separating the language classroom from the world.

The dynamic interplay between remote and local spaces provides students in an SCI course with ample opportunities to interact with a broader spectrum of community- or campus-based resources than peers receiving face-to-face instruction on the local campus. These resources might include native speakers and communities, experts in other disciplines, and special events hosted at one of the remote sites. For instance, Yale University students enrolled in a Dutch class originating from Cornell University had the opportunity to experience a "virtual" tour of an exhibit of Dutch art hosted in Ithaca on the Cornell University campus. The on-site students at Cornell University used an iPad to take their off-site peers on a guided tour of the exhibit, allowing these students to both see the artifacts on exhibit and interact with the student who led the tour.

Likewise, students enrolled on one campus can enrich their experience of a particular culture by accessing campus-based specialized collections located on another campus. The off-site students enrolled in the Classical Tibetan classes taught at Columbia University, for instance, were able to access Columbia's extensive collections of early Tibetan books and manuscripts that are only available locally. Likewise, in the future, should we decide to share Akkadian or Early Babylonian, all students enrolled in these courses would be able to work with the unique collections of tablets housed in Yale University's Sterling Memorial Library.

Finally, being able to tap into more than one location provides students with enhanced opportunities to engage with the target language and culture. For example, New York City's rich linguistic and cultural diversity offers students

located in New Haven or Ithaca possibilities to interact virtually both with target language groups as well as with place-based resources for language learning, even though these resources are geographically remote from their own location. The opportunities for collaborations across the world, and the ability to have students exchange cultural perspectives with their peers from the target languages' cultures, are added benefits of the model that will be more fully explored and implemented in future academic years.

Some Implications for Teacher Development

While this collaborative model of teaching LCTLs depends on innovative approaches to teaching and learning, such as community-based and collaborative learning, preparing instructors to teach in this environment remains a major challenge. A thoughtful and comprehensive approach to teacher training is certainly required (cf. Rosen, 2015).

A shared classroom such as the SCI represents a hybrid model of instruction that combines the face-to-face interaction of a regular classroom with the technology-mediated environment of a distance course. This environment requires not simply an adaptation of existing pedagogies, but a new approach to teaching. While, ideally, teacher training builds on a shared foundation of existing accepted practices in language pedagogy, in LCTL instruction, the quality of teaching can be uneven, the pedagogies and materials may be inadequate, and technology skills are often limited. This poses a challenge for teacher development but also provides an opportunity for many instructors to rethink their practices and to transform their pedagogies.

SCI instructors are trained in a variety of ways. They receive informal, on-campus, one-on-one technical and pedagogical support and many participate in both webinars shared across the participating institutions and in the annual intensive workshops hosted by each institution in turn. Attendance at national conferences and workshops is also encouraged and supported. Additionally, instructors receive support to travel to the receiving institutions and meet with their students and engage in the broader intellectual community in which their languages are situated. An essential component of instructor training is familiarization with multiple technologies, such as high-definition videoconferencing equipment, interactive whiteboards, a shared web-based course management system (Canvas), and a variety of mobile technologies to promote interactive group activities. However, in our experience, more important than technology training is the opportunity for sharing best pedagogical practices and discussing challenges and opportunities that arise from teaching in this new environment. In this respect, it has been critical to bring together instructors across languages and gradually build a community of practice across institutional boundaries for LCTL instructors, many of whom were previously isolated at their institutions.

A final important take-away from this project has been the realization that experience in teaching in online and distance environments is rapidly becoming an essential skill in higher education. We are therefore developing a program specifically designed for graduate students to gain the practical experience to teach distance or hybrid courses and to help them develop a deeper theoretical understanding of technology-mediated instruction in complex learning environments. The objective of this program is not only to improve the quality of instruction in our program, but also to enhance the professional development of our graduate students by providing them with training that will enhance their profile in an increasingly competitive academic job market.

Challenges

We end this overview by pointing to some of the challenges we have encountered in implementing a shared-course model. Among the most difficult aspects of the project have been the administrative complexities, including managing various institutional practices, such as differences in the language requirements, multiple academic calendars, and hourly class schedules. Addressing these challenges has required a great deal of hands-on involvement on the part of the full-time Program Manager hired to coordinate the initiative, as well as the assured participation of high-level administrators. It has also required an interinstitutional legal agreement in the form of an MOU that lays out the major principles for collaboration (described earlier in the chapter). Working through these issues has demanded flexibility and willingness to compromise on the part of all involved.

While the practical issues of implementing a shared course are complicated, an intangible challenge that we were less prepared to deal with was the very real contrast in institutional cultures—even between three universities that have very similar administrative structures and curricular priorities. Successful collaboration among these different institutional cultures has required ongoing conversations, both in-person and through videoconferencing, among the project directors as well as the technology and pedagogy support teams to create a shared understanding of how to approach teaching language in the SCI context. This challenge underscores the importance of selecting partners that not only have the desire and resources to collaborate but also share enough institutional similarities that any differences can be bridged through ongoing dialogue.

The demands made on learners and teachers in the hybrid SCI pedagogical environment can be different from those that arise in a traditional classroom setting and require some renegotiation of roles and identities on the part of all participants. Successful learners must adjust their learning strategies to take full advantage of a more complex, dynamic, and emergent distance-learning

environment. Teachers, for their part, need to develop new strategies to integrate new technologies, as well as appropriate methodologies to exploit those technologies in a meaningful way.

Finally, if the SCI is to prosper in the long term, it is essential that our administrations provide appropriate opportunities for faculty development and growth, in addition to allocating the necessary resources for administrative, technological, and pedagogical support. Currently, the SCI is largely supported through an external grant, but in the long term, new funding sources will need to be identified. As we argued at the beginning of this chapter, in order to mobilize adequate institutional support, it is critical to align a project like the one described here with the globalization strategies of our institutions. Thus far, the feedback from the faculty and administrators in area studies (e.g., South Asian Studies; European Studies) as well as from various other departments (not only FL departments but also, for instance, Religious Studies) has been positive and has led to an increase in the implementation of globally focused projects that include multiple languages.

Collaborative Models of Instruction: Implications for Cross-Institutional and Cross-Disciplinary Collaborations

In order to compete for scarce resources in an atmosphere of budgetary constraints, the SCI must be seen to add value to institutions that are adapting to a new global context. We believe that the type of collaborative, technology-mediated instruction promoted by the SCI successfully makes this case for added value. At present, we are examining the implications of the project both in terms of language learning outcomes (cf. Van Deusen-Scholl, 2015) and the broader context beyond language education.

Two major issues we are investigating are the *replicability* of the model (how can it be adapted to different types of institutions?) and its *scalability* (how can it be applied to other disciplines and used for different academic purposes?) With respect to the first issue, we have shared our experiences with many different types of institutions—large and small state universities, public university systems, liberal arts colleges, and European institutions—and we have found that the model is gaining momentum in a wide range of institutional contexts.

The second issue raises the broader question of whether this model has the potential for curricular and institutional transformation beyond language education and whether the SCI model could help institutions begin envisioning the creation of collaborative curricula for any discipline where, for

example, local resources might be limited, where access to sources of knowledge could be made available long-distance, or where lack of enrollments might jeopardize a program. A collaborative curricular model can facilitate the creation of communal spaces in which students develop the global skills required to effectively engage in critical dialogue with both teachers and peers across the world.

Courses delivered in the SCI framework are in a sense "anti-MOOCs." They constitute small, highly specialized and interactive seminars in which students and faculty co-create knowledge and engage in critical reflection and discussion. Thinking beyond LCTL instruction (and indeed, beyond language instruction), the model offers innovative approaches to cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional collaboration. Adopting these innovative approaches requires a radical change in how we think about institutional and departmental autonomy and has profound implications for established practices, from curriculum design to faculty hiring and promotion procedures. Language teaching has long been at the forefront of pedagogical innovation (cf. Rosen, 2015); through programs like the SCI, our field can be well-positioned to contribute to a paradigm shift in which departmental and programmatic boundaries become less rigid, learning experiences become simultaneously individualized and collaborative, and curricula become cross-disciplinary or even cross-institutional.

Some examples of collaborative projects already underway or currently being explored, inspired by the SCI model, include the following:

- Specialized courses in African languages and cultures for students and professionals in global health programs.
- A history course co-taught by faculty from Columbia University and Sciences-Po in Paris to students from both institutions.
- A cross-cultural meeting-of-minds in which students in political science courses at Yale University are linked with their peers in Rwanda and South Africa to compare perspectives on such issues as development aid and human rights.
- A large lecture course in Computer Science (SC 50) shared by Yale University and Harvard University, live-streamed from Harvard University, with Yale University lectures also sent back to Harvard University.
- Language courses taught by Yale University graduate students to students at Yale-NUS, its partner liberal arts college in Singapore.

While not all of these collaborations have a global focus, a number of these projects nonetheless connect students and faculty across the world. The challenge will be to create a broad institutional commitment at the programmatic, departmental, and administrative levels in order to make sure that language education and pedagogies associated with the SCI model have a central role in fulfilling the goals of institutional globalization.

Conclusion

The SCI was conceived in response to the emerging global discourses on all our campuses. It focuses on identifying and cultivating new perspectives on the dynamic interplay of global and local knowledge and seeks to reframe the issue of support for language education from a global perspective that resonates with the current institutional global mindset. Faced with ongoing challenges associated with providing language instruction for LCTLs at each of the member institutions' home campuses, the SCI offers a collaborative solution that can be implemented locally to the mutual benefit of all partners. Better still, it does so while putting renewed emphasis on effective teamwork, greater cultural and disciplinary variety in student and teacher profiles, and the development of transdisciplinary pedagogical approaches to expand the range of offerings and provide students and faculty with greater opportunities for collaboration and exchange of knowledge.

In tomorrow's university, all new programs and initiatives, if they are to succeed (and, indeed, flourish), will have to strive to adapt to and abide by the new institutional priorities and strategies articulated in the prevailing administrative discourses. As we argued earlier, globalization has become one of the defining issues shaping discussions of what a university should be and do in the future. In today's university, characterized by a climate of accountability, various players in higher education are conceptualizing globalization in terms of seeking efficiencies and optimizing resource allocation—but this way of thinking about globalization is limited by market considerations. Institutions need to broaden their understanding of the meaning of globalization so that it is recognized not as primarily a budgetary stricture, but a challenge to transcend institutional and academic boundaries in order to establish constructive relationships and shared value across partner institutions. Globalization promotes a culture of cooperation and collaboration among strategic partners and a desire to consider global and local perspectives simultaneously: to formulate global solutions to local challenges. The SCI model promotes this way of thinking by practicing a culture that advocates the sharing of academic resources across institutional boundaries in order to provide locally based students and faculty with global opportunities for collaboration and exchange of knowledge.

Acknowledgments

to our colleagues for their insights and their valuable contributions to the project: Stephen Welsh of Columbia University; Richard Feldman of Cornell University; and David Malinowski, Minjin Hashbat, and Mary Jo Lubrano of Yale University.

References

Alonso, C. J. (2010, December 12). Paradise lost: The academy becomes a commodity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*(1), 3–25.

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3–4), 290–305.

Berman, R. (2007). The humanities, globalization, and the transformation of the university. *Profession*, 210–217.

Blake, R. (2008). *Brave new digital classroom. Technology and foreign language learning*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Blight, D., Davis, D., Olsen, A., & Scott, P. (2000). The globalization of higher education. *Higher Education Re-formed*, 95–113.

Block, D., & Cameron, D. (2002). *Globalization and language teaching*. London: Routledge.

Blyth, C. (2013). Special issue commentary: LCTLs and technology: The promise of open education. *Language Learning and Technology, 17*(1), 1–6.

Brustein, W. (2007). The global campus: Challenges and opportunities for higher education in North America. *Journal of Studies in Higher Education,* 11(3–4), 382–391.

Byrnes, H. (1998). Constructing curricula in collegiate foreign language departments. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in research and scholarship* (pp. 262–295). New York: Modern Language Association.

Byrnes, H. (2001). Reconsidering graduate students' education as teachers: It takes a department! *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 512–530.

Byrnes, H. (2002). Language and culture: Shall the twain ever meet in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin, 33*(2), 25–32.

Byrnes, H. (2008). Perspectives. Transforming college and university language departments. *Modern Language Journal, 92*(ii), 284–287.

Byrnes, H. (2009). Perspectives. The role of foreign language departments in internationalizing the curriculum. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(iv), 607–627.

Douglass, J., & Edelstein, R. (2013, September 7). Why are research universities going global? *University World News*.

Edelstein, R. J., & Douglass, J. A. (2012). Comprehending the international initiatives of universities: A taxonomy of modes of engagement and institutional logics. Center for Studies in Higher Education: Research and Occasional Paper Series, 19.12. University of California, Berkeley. Retrieved from http://www.cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/comprehending-international-initiatives-universities-taxonomy-modes-engagement-and

Foderaro, L. (2010). Budget-cutting colleges bid some languages adieu. *New York Times, 5*.

Frank, D. J., & Gabler, J. (2006). *Reconstructing the university: Worldwide shifts in academia in the 20th century*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*(2), 121–136.

Gehlhar, J. N. (2009). Of course they want us at the curriculum internationalization table. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*(iv), 616–618.

Giroux, H. A. (2008). Academic unfreedom in America: Rethinking the university as a democratic public sphere. *Works and Days, 51, 54*, 26–27.

Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2015). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2013*. Modern Language Association web publication. Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Enrollments-in-Languages-Other-Than-English-in-United-States-Institutions-of-Higher-Education

Holquist, M. (2006). Language and literature in the globalized college/university. *ADFL Bulletin, 37*(2–3), 5–9.

Hu, W. (2009, September 13). Foreign languages fall as schools look for cuts. *The New York Times*, MB1.

Jackson, F., & Malone, M. (2009). *Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a comprehensive strategy for a national language framework*. Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resource-center/publications/building-foreign-language-capacity

Kern, R. (2002). Reconciling the language-literature split through literacy. *ADFL Bulletin, 33*(3), 20–24.

King, R., & Bjarnason, S. (2003). *The university in the global age*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 98*(1), 296–311.

Krücken, G., Blümel, A., & Kloke, K. (2013). The managerial turn in higher education? On the interplay of organizational and occupational change in German academia. *Minerva, 51*(4), 417–442.

Levine, G. (2014). The discourse of foreignness in U.S. foreign language education. In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary language teaching in the United States* (pp. 55–76). Dordrecht: Springer.

Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). Globalisation and Higher Education. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 8. *OECD Publishing (NJ1)*.

Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2009). The new global landscape of nations and institutions. In *Higher education to 2030: Volume 2 – Globalisation* (Vol. 2, pp. 17–62). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Maxim, H. (2009). An essay on the role of language in collegiate foreign language programmatic reform. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 42*(2), 123–129.

Maxim, H. (2014). Curricular integration and faculty development: Teaching language-based content across the foreign language curriculum. In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary language teaching in the United States* (pp. 79–102). Dordrecht: Springer.

Maxim, H., Höyng, P., Lancaster, M., Schaumann, C., & Aue, M. (2013). Overcoming curricular bifurcation: A departmental approach to curriculum reform. *Die Unterrichtspraxis, 46*(1), 1–26.

McWhorter, J. (2015, September 6). What Sarah Palin's 'speak American' is all about. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2015/09/06/opinions/mcwhorter-palin-speak-american/

Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world*. Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World

Paesani, K., & Allen, H. W. (2012). Beyond the language-content divide: Research on advanced foreign language instruction at the postsecondary level. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(S1), S54–S75.

Rosen, L. (2015). Essential elements of a successful language consortium. *FLTMAG*. Retrieved from http://fltmag.com/essential-elements-of-a-successful-language-consortium/

Santirocco, M. (1999). Languages and the global university. *ADFL Bulletin, 30*(3), 13–16.

Scott, P. (2000). Globalisation and higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 4*(1), 3–10.

Suárez-Orozco, M. M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Summers, L. (2012, January 20). What you (really) need to know. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/22/education/edlife/the-21st-century-education.html?pagewanted=all&_r=1

Swaffar, J. (2003). Foreign languages: A discipline in crisis. *ADFL Bulletin, 35*(1), 20–24.

Swaffar, J., & Urlaub, P. (Eds.). (2014). *Transforming postsecondary language teaching in the United States*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Urlaub, P. (2014). On language and content: The stakes of curricular transformation in collegiate foreign language education. In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary language teaching in the United States* (pp. 7–15). Dordrecht: Springer.

U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *Succeeding globally through international education and engagement. U.S. Department of Education International Strategy 2012–2016.* Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/internationaled/international-strategy-2012-16.html

Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2015). Assessing outcomes in online foreign language education: What are key measures of success? *The Modern Language Journal, 99*(2), 398–400

Walther, I. (2009). Curricular planning along the fault line between instrumental and academic agendas: A response to the report of the Modern Language Association on Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New structures for a changed world. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 42*(2), 115–122.

Warner, C. (2011). Rethinking the role of language study in internationalizing higher education. *L2 Journal, 3*(1), 1–21.

Wasley, P. (2008). Is German necessary? Nein, says one university. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *54*(33).

Watzinger-Tharp, J. (2014). Are global, international, and foreign language studies connected? In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary language teaching in the United States* (pp. 123–139). Dordrecht: Springer.

Wellmon, C. (2008). Languages, cultural studies, and the futures of foreign language education. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*(2), 292–295.

White, W. L. (2007). *Faculty perceptions of the role of foreign language education at West Virginia University*. ProQuest.

Wildasky, B. (2010). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wilkerson, C. (2006). College faculty perceptions about foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*(2), 310–319.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

de Wit, H. (2009). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe*. IAP.

de Wit, H. (2011). Globalization and Internationalization of Higher Education. Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento (RUSC). *Universities and Knowledge Society Journal, 8*(2), 77–164.

Yu, Y. (2008). Restructuring foreign language curricula to meet the new challenge. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(ii), 301–303.

Appendix

SCI Phase 1		SCI Phase II
Shared courses offered in Year 1	Shared courses offered in Year 2	Shared courses offered in Year 3
Elementary Bengali I & II (Cornell)	Intermediate Bengali I & II (Cornell)	Advanced Bengali II (Cornell)
Introductory Dutch I & II (Yale)	Advanced Dutch I & II (Columbia)	Beginner Bengali I & II (Cornell)
Introductory Modem Greek I & II (Yale)	Elementary Khmer I & II (Cornell)	Elementary Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian I (Columbia)
Elementary Romanian I & II (Columbia)	Elementary Romanian I & II (Columbia)	Advanced Dutch I & II (Columbia)
Intermediate Tamil I & II (Columbia)	Intermediate Romanian I (Columbia)	Intermediate Dutch I (Columbia)
Elementary Yoruba I & II (Cornell)	Elementary Tamil I & II (Columbia)	Elementary Hungarian I & II (Columbia)
Advanced isiZulu I & II (Yale)	Intermediate Tamil I & II (Columbia)	Advanced Indonesian II (Cornell)
	Elementary Classical Tibetan I & II (Columbia)	Beginner Khmer II (Cornell)
	Elementary Yoruba I & II (Cornell)	Elementary Punjabi I (Columbia)
	Intermediate Yoruba I & II (Cornell)	Advanced Romanian I & II (Columbia
	Advanced isiZulu I (Yale)	Beginner Sinhala II (Cornell)
		Intermediate Sinhala I & II (Cornell)
		Elementary Tamil I & II (Columbia)
		Intermediate Tamil I & II (Columbia)
		Elementary Classical Tibetan I & II (Columbia) Intermediate Classical Tibetan I & II (Columbia)
		Elementary Colloquial Tibetan I & II (Columbia)
		Elementary Ukrainian I & II (Columbia) Intermediate Ukrainian I & II (Columbia) Elementary Yoruba I & II (Cornell) Intermediate Yoruba I & II (Cornell)
		Elementary isiZulu II (Yale)
Total Year 1 Courses: 14	Total Year 2 Courses: 20	Total Year 3 Courses: 36