

Program Articulation and Management

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

Introduction

Broadly speaking, this chapter provides an overview of language program design with respect to the teaching of Spanish as a second language (L2) or foreign language (FL). Although at first glance the topic may seem a simple one, it is in fact a complex theme with multiple avenues. We focus here on the development of language program design over time as a way to frame our current situation, which we discuss in terms of curriculum and student outcomes. Each of these subtopics merits a more detailed discussion than we can give it here, but we reference them in order to show the interconnectedness of program design. The interested reader is referred to the section on further reading as well as to the other chapters in this volume that discuss these topics in greater detail.

The chapter begins with a historical perspective on the main issues related to program management, including the most traditional structures employed in language programs and departments. This background is then used to set the scene for a discussion of the changing landscape of language programs. The field of L2 education is reconsidering, if not yet reformatting, the role and activities of language departments, and this section examines the impetus behind these changes, as well as their curricular and administrative implications. Also relevant is the issue of academic study abroad (SA) programs, which add depth and breadth to the language curriculum but require prudent articulation and management to ensure alignment of the learning goals in the SA context with the mission of the stateside program. In the final sections of the chapter we summarize the path of change we are witnessing and provide some areas that will require the attention of applied linguists and their colleagues.

Although a considerable amount of research exists relating to the general issues of L2 program articulation, remarkably little work has been carried out with specific respect to Spanish language programs. Work in this vein tends to focus on programs for heritage Spanish speakers residing within the United States (US; also known as *Spanish for bilinguals* or *Spanish for native speakers*; e.g., Potowski 2002, 2005; Potowski and Carreira 2004) rather than on the instruction of Spanish as a L2 to English speakers. To be sure, the population of heritage speakers merits a unique approach to language instruction, given their different background and exposure to language. Chapter 9 in this volume addresses the specific issues relevant to this population, so they are not discussed in detail here. It is also necessary to note that research regarding the structure of language programs beyond the US is scarce, with most published work related to

articulation and program management being generated from within. What limited studies can be found (e.g., Cortés Moreno 2013; Sant'anna and Daher 1995) point to similar issues as those that are discussed here, namely how to meet the needs of new generations of students whose interests lie not so much in theoretical approaches to linguistics or literature but rather in practical and pragmatic uses of language in a variety of careers. With these caveats in mind, this chapter focuses largely on those general issues that affect any language program, although we relate them to the extent possible to the situations that affect Spanish programs.

Historical Perspectives

Program Articulation

Articulation in and across programs has long been a challenge, particularly for L2 educators and program coordinators (Barrette and Paesani 2005; Byrnes 2002; Lally 2001). Beginning in the latter half of the 20th century, scholars and teachers began raising concerns related to continuity in student learning and common objectives in L2 courses (e.g., Anton 1970; Brooks 1964), and it is an issue that remains largely unresolved even today (Lange 1997) and continues to be widely debated. The articulation of components within a program is an essential element when considering program structure and design at both the macro and micro levels.

Emphasis on these issues has resurfaced recently, with increased descriptive accounts of what programs are doing to improve articulation. Lally's (2001) edited volume delved into the ever-present and often-problematic issues related to students' transition between levels of language study and used a combination of theory, research, and practical applications to provide an overview of the situation and propose solutions. Shortly afterward, Barrette and Paesani (2005) also published an edited volume dealing with similar complexities and with an emphasis on the theoretical underpinnings of articulation and why programs should be structured in particular ways. Works such as these show us that articulation is relevant to virtually every aspect of a language program. Paesani and Barrette (2005: 4) proposed four guidelines for program managers as they relate to articulation within a program and, by extension, how they contribute to the mission of the program. These can be seen as both horizontal (i.e., within a particular level of instruction) and vertical (i.e., across levels of instruction) articulation goals (see Lange 1982) that encompass the following:

1. Consider the program as a whole as well as the experiences and perspectives of the individuals in the program.
2. Develop a cohesive relationship among instruction, content, assessment, and goals.
3. View language as a process as well as a product, emphasizing that proficiency is one desired outcome of completing the program, but to achieve proficiency a program also needs to incorporate input, recycling, and expansion.
4. Facilitate the development of content knowledge and proficiency skills through curricular, instructional, and experiential techniques.

Numerous factors influence program design and articulation, ranging from the relatively obvious (e.g., issues related to curriculum, such as course offerings, materials, and goals) to many that are addressed elsewhere in this volume (e.g., research findings related to second language acquisition [SLA]). Others are undoubtedly more difficult to pinpoint, although with no less

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

far-reaching implications. For example, what characteristics of the institution and its culture could affect students, instructors, and classroom (research classification of the university, commuter vs. residential campus, demands on faculty, constraints of the educational system, general education requirements, etc.)? Do most students stop after completing a language requirement (and is there a language requirement?), or do they go on? In other words, what motivates their language study? How are the students characterized in terms of their goals, needs, socioeconomic status, prior language experience, and so on? Paesani and Barrette pointed out that all these considerations can be subsumed under the three axes of articulation often found in the literature relating to program management: 'a well-planned curriculum, coordinated instruction, and an awareness of the learner's experience and development' (2005: 4).

Further, the issue is made more complex in language programs given their often multi-sectional nature. The uniformity of the curriculum across these sections is vital, what Lange (1982, as cited in Barrette and Paesani 2005) termed *horizontal articulation*. Vertical articulation, though, is equally important: the continuity of the program across levels. We can also consider the courses beyond the language program in addressing how our language program leads up to and prepares students for other coursework in the department. Lange also recommended consideration of interdisciplinary articulation, or the capability of the language program to interact with other disciplines.

Program Design and Organizational Structures

In recent years, the position of language program director (LPD) has gained prominence as one that does far more than writing syllabi. As Sadow (1989) pointed out, the LPD is regularly responsible for intellectual contributions in a field that is continually changing (SLA and teaching), and must be aware of developments in related fields as well, such as speech communication, computer-assisted language learning, and cognitive science. As part of a larger department, the language program should find a way to 'have direct, practical, and verifiable applications' (Sadow 1989: 28) that are convincing to a broad range of people. Although there are differences in programs according to language, institutional size and nature, and other variables, a certain degree of consistency can be found across programs, particularly in terms of the organizational structure of the program. This section summarizes these, particularly as they pertain to Spanish language programs.

The ways in which a program structure differs from institution to institution or language to language depends in large part on factors external to the program itself, such as institutional policies or preferences. However, the program structure in turn has far-reaching implications for all aspects of the program, ranging from instructors to professional development to content delivery and assessment. Davidson and Tesh (1997) examined different organizational structures and defined two primary trends: mechanistic and organic. The *mechanistic* model is a bureaucratic organizational structure that is recognized for its machinelike efficiency in accomplishing objectives. It is also characterized by a strict chain of command and by a relatively impersonal nature. The *organic* model, on the other hand, is anchored on work by Likert (1967) and is based on the idea that an organization must be flexible and adaptable to be productive. The organic model encourages communication and trust among its members and works to achieve goals by maximizing human motivation. Davidson and Tesh concluded that 'most optimally designed language programs . . . have features of both the organic and the mechanistic models' (1997: 182) but that the optimal mixture will depend on the specifics of the administrative setting.

Most introductory language programs at U.S. institutions today (see Lord 2013) follow a relatively uniform structure, which is mostly mechanical with some organic elements. Lower

division language courses are supervised by an LPD who is charged with supervising instructors (be they graduate assistants, lecturers, or ranked faculty) and coordinating the curriculum of what is known as ‘basic language’ courses. Some programs have coordinators for every course, whereas others have coordinators by level (e.g., 1st year, which consists of more than one course), and depending on the institution and program size, there may be other levels of liaison positions between the individual instructors and the LPDs. A great deal of the variation seen across institutions also has to do with the size of the program. In the US, Spanish remains the most commonly taught L2, both in secondary and tertiary education. Although numbers are always changing, reports over the past decade or so (e.g., Furman *et al.* 2007; Welles 2004) have indicated that this trend continues. As such, it is understandable that the systems and structures in place for Spanish program are, by necessity, larger and more complex than other languages that see smaller enrollments. Additionally, the growing presence of communities of Spanish-speakers in the US allows for Spanish language classes to capitalize on this native presence and encourages students to work beyond the confines of the traditional classroom in far greater numbers than may be possible in other languages in the US. This aspect of learning, experiential learning, is discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, along with the role of SA in language program development and management.

Beyond the introductory language courses just discussed, programmatic structures vary widely according to department size and mission, program emphasis, and faculty. More often than not advanced skills courses (such as conversation, composition, etc.) are taught in a more loosely coordinated structure that has fewer hierarchy levels and a less strict chain of command. This is often the case if the instructors are not graduate students and thus require less hands-on supervision. Beyond that level, the so-called ‘content’ courses—courses in culture, literature, linguistics, and so on—are often on their own with little or no supervision. The lack of supervision or oversight also implies that the relationship of these courses to the others in the department is sporadic, at best. This bifurcated system of language courses on one hand and content courses on the other is not ideal, nor is it new. Anderson noted that most language departments have, ‘whether we wish to call it that or not—a two-tiered curriculum, with language instruction at one level and literature at another, and we have largely two-tiered staffing patterns to match’ (1997: 20–21). This kind of division has had implications for the entire departmental structure, ranging from job descriptions to hierarchical structures, from hiring and training to curricular design. The time has come, however, for language departments to reconsider this structure.

Study Abroad

In this section we provide a brief historical view of how SA developed from being a 17th-century England privilege ‘where aristocratic young men were sent to European capitals to complete their classical studies’ (Lewin 2009: xiv), to what it is today. Lewin (2009) set forth a historical ideology of the purpose of SA, focusing on a shift in principle that has occurred over the years for sojourns abroad. He followed with an analysis of the consumerist and colonialist notions of the modern SA experience by U.S. undergraduate students. He illustrated how the SA experience can be formulated to enhance both critical reasoning and international civic experiences to enable cultural acquisition and global citizenship and, furthermore, to offer visionary models on how to develop global citizens.

The National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad was established in 1989 with the goal of internationalizing the undergraduate experience. The task force included representatives from the National Association for Foreign Student Advisors, the Council on International Educational Exchange, and the Institute of International Education (IIE), who

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

recommended, among other things, that ‘the study abroad experience . . . be integrated into regular degree programs in many different fields’ (Isabelli 2004: 124).

The task force highlighted an important facet of the undergraduate education that has been corroborated by the fact that SA is alive and well. According to IIE (2012), U.S. student participation in SA has more than tripled over the past 2 decades. Of the IIE total, 59,260 students studied abroad in a Spanish-speaking country, representing 21.6% of the U.S. student population. At the authors’ universities, much like the national pattern, SA is also increasing. Currently about 4.5% of our universities’ population studies abroad on programs ranging from 7 days to full academic years. About 25% of those students go to Spanish-speaking countries. Although not all of the programs in these Spanish-speaking countries have the specific focus of becoming proficient, our data indicate that between half and three quarters of these students are indeed taking language classes during their time abroad. In other words, about 20% of the students who study any language abroad are studying in a Spanish-speaking country, reflecting the national trend mentioned earlier.

Thus, our own numbers confirm the conventional wisdom: that studying abroad continues to be an optimal way to learn a language, in addition to providing other benefits such as cultural awareness and professional and personal development. Where SA fits into the emerging view of language study and program articulation is discussed in the subsequent section.

Core Issues and Topics

The Changing Landscape of Language Programs

Changing dynamics in the world around us have influenced current thinking on language program and design, to the point that it is becoming more widely accepted that the so-called two-tiered system has outlived its usefulness. The general thrust behind these curricular changes comes from the idea that we need to eliminate the distinction between language classes and literature and culture classes and embrace a more uniformly articulated sequence of language courses. To be clear, these are not new incentives: work by Byrnes (1990, 1998) has been advocating these ideas for some time. And the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages’ (ADFL’s) Statement of Good Practice (ADFL 2001: para. 4) maintains that ‘good teaching begins with imaginative, conscientious course design and ongoing efforts to maintain and develop subject-area and methodological expertise’. But the primary impetus for reenvisioning our language programs comes with the 2007 call from the Modern Language Association (MLA) for curricular redesign, which brings with it specific implications for how language programs are articulated and managed.

Curricular Changes

As has been discussed elsewhere in this volume, the MLA established an ad hoc committee in 2003 to examine the state of language education in the US in the wake of 9/11 and to consider the future of language education moving forward. The final report (MLA Ad Hoc Committee 2007) recognized clearly that language departments need to reconsider the relative importance given to language studies and upper level (usually literature-focused) courses and that the goal of language education needs to be much more broadly defined than previously. The report noted, in relation to the same two-tiered structure alluded to earlier, that

the standard configuration of university foreign language curricula, in which a two- or three-year language sequence feeds into a set of core courses primarily focused on

canonical literature . . . represents a narrow model. This configuration defines both the curriculum and the governance structure of language departments and creates a division between the language curriculum and the literature curriculum and between tenure-track literature professors and language instructors in non-tenure-track positions.

(2007: 2)

The MLA committee urged educators to view this time as one of opportunity, a chance to ‘make advanced study of languages and cultures appealing to students and vital to society’ (2007: 3). The MLA report argues that if language departments are going to survive, and if they are to be meaningful contributors to higher education as we move forward, we need to contemplate a new curriculum and a new structure. Rather than constructing our curricula based around individual courses, our ‘language major[s] should be structured to produce a specific outcome: educated speakers who have deep translingual and transcultural competence’ (2007: 3). How to achieve this, of course, is the challenge we all face today. The sections following address ways in which program administrators and managers may be able to contribute.

Integrating Language and Culture

As alluded to earlier, work by Byrnes (1990, 1998, 2002, 2006) advocated this stance long before the MLA report. Byrnes argued that foreign language departments need a new, modified, goal: that of literacy or multiliteracies.

We come to understand the real nature of the task that collegiate FL programs face: attempting to help their students acquire, in a foreign language, both the primary discourses of personal life in families and among friends and acquaintances and the public discourses of the L2 societies in education, research, and scholarship; in the workplace and the professions; in the arts; and in civil society with its range of forums—all in a very short period of time.

(2002: 29)

Some have begun to undertake such changes (e.g., Byrnes 2002; Pries 2009). As an example, Byrnes provided anecdotal evidence from the German department at Georgetown University, which has instituted an integrated content-oriented and task-based curriculum over the 4-year sequence in order to seamlessly combine language and content. The result, according to Byrnes, is that this curriculum ‘overcomes the split between language courses that have no discernible content and content courses that have no discernible interest in language acquisition’ (2002: 30).

Another example is the one detailed by Nance (this volume) where she proposes expanding literature and culture courses to be offered across the curriculum in creative ways. She provides examples from earlier integration of these content areas in the Spanish language program to making use of the digital humanities and even leaning on the American Association of College and Universities (AAC&U) recommendations for high-impact practices such as including service learning (Rabin, this volume), diversity/global learning (refer to the section here on SA as well as Fairclough, this volume), and connecting with nonhumanities departments to promote Spanish as a desired part of the curriculum (in this volume: Klee, Jiménez-Crespo, Cerezo, Sánchez and Almela, Martí and Taulé, Rojo, Peris, Berk-Seligson, Martínez, and Lavine and Goode).

Program coordinators or directors are in an ideal position to steer these changes, because those who principally determine the curriculum for the foundational courses at the beginning

AuQ4

levels of instruction. The goals we establish can help lead the way toward spiraling language and content material throughout all levels of a language program curriculum as a means of achieving language competence. 'Spiraling allows learners to progress to advanced-level foreign language competencies, encourages the use of target language narratives in instruction, and contributes to the development of integrated curricula' (Barrette *et al.* 2010: 218). Most established textbooks already do this for the foundational language classes and should be kept in mind for courses required for the major or minor. However, 'research and theory concerning curriculum and syllabus design for combining language and content at the university level are sparse' (Brantmeier 2008: 307). A recommendation for future study was suggested by Brantmeier: 'In order to make principled and informed decisions, this lacuna in the database needs to be addressed by specialists in the field before language departments can successfully tackle' (2008: 307) problems that the department identifies. These specialists are largely LPDs.

Pfeiffer and Byrnes recommended that program articulation aim to 'integrate the acquisition of literary-cultural knowledge and language learning throughout the entire undergraduate sequence' while at the same time acknowledging students' 'interests and ambitions' that are 'increasingly becoming more diverse and more pronounced in a globalized environment where they see themselves as actors, even leaders, on the international stage' (2009: 197). The MLA report (2007) reaffirms our students' similar characteristics and encourages program supervisors to 'integrate and articulate curricula carefully, and to face the dual challenge of both affirming the old liberal arts tradition of foreign language education and recognizing the valid, though often competing demands and opportunities of globalization' (Pfeiffer and Byrnes 2009: 197).

More recent work by Rossomondo (2012, 2014) compared traditional approaches to language instruction versus what she called 'transformational' approaches, citing the many benefits of the latter for all involved. According to Rossomondo, a program coordinator herself, rather than focus on skills development, as we usually structure our language classes, we should emphasize the ability to operate between languages and cultures, as the MLA report indicates. Likewise, instead of viewing reading and writing as separate skills, independent of any audience, we should focus on these skills as opportunities to use language within a transcultural context. Content in traditional language classes is typically self-referential and usually driven by practical concerns or transactional tasks, but Rossomondo argued that we should focus outward instead, emphasizing the identification of multiple perspectives. Finally, we should embrace culture as an ever-changing and context-bound construct that is mediated through language use and intentionally and consistently integrated into teaching materials.

Although Rossomondo's recommendations are specifically for foundational language classes, the implications for such innovation are potentially programwide. Language students can begin to explore the target culture earlier in their studies, which will make language study more engaging to them and encourage them to go further in those studies. What's more, incorporating content-based pedagogy at even the lower levels will help students not just in developing their language skills but in becoming better learners in general. They will be able to reflect on first and second language use and critically examine different perspectives, and these abilities will help them develop adaptability and critical thinking skills, something that educators in all disciplines, as well as future employers, are clamoring for (Fischer 2013; Lazere 2011). In the case of transforming Spanish classes, these modifications stand to benefit the students greatly because Spanish is so widely spoken in the US and proficiency in Spanish is in great demand in many professions, ranging from legal and medical to business and engineering. All students, at all levels, would benefit from Spanish instruction that embraces cultural proficiency, linguistic competence, and literary skills.

In sum, transforming our foundational language courses has the potential to make our departmental curriculum more attractive to possible Spanish majors and minors and to encourage interdisciplinarity with our colleagues in other departments and schools. Such an innovative Spanish language curriculum stands to make a greater university-wide impact and encourages interdisciplinary collaboration. Students emerging from this curriculum are arguably better prepared to become compassionate global citizens and to represent their university and their culture in the wider world.

Translingual and Transcultural Competence and the Role of Global Citizenship

The term *global citizenship*, a broadly defined concept, has been readily adopted and is now seen 'as a key strategic principle in higher education' (Schattle 2009: 3). The implementation of global citizenship as a learning objective of any language program 'implies transformation of perceptions and view of reality' (Brigham 2011: 21). In fact, strengthening global citizenship education has become a strategic learning objective in which mission statements of higher education institutions 'clearly reflect an alignment with globalization and internationalization, but in addition seek to produce graduates who possess a global mindset' (Brigham 2011: 17).

It turns out that this has been a concept taken on by colleges and universities for more than a decade. In a 2001 initiative of the AAC&U titled Liberal Education and Global Citizenship, one of their four objectives is 'to teach students to be adept at respectfully traversing cultural borders and to promote awareness of the interdependence of cultures' (AAC&U 2001: para. 4). Language departments have embraced this commitment to foster global citizenship, ideologizing the meaning and providing designs to achieve this goal. These designs usually come in the form of program or department student learning goals that encompass some sort of specific linguistic and (trans)cultural competence level as well as an experiential component.

Supervisors and coordinators who are involved in program articulation and management deal with a multitude of issues when implementing and assessing these learning goals. One of the more difficult goals to reach, in regards to language competence, is 'enabling adult collegiate learners to attain levels of ability in a second or third language that would readily be considered "advanced"' (Byrnes and Maxim 2004: viii). For it is the advanced competency levels that are typically assumed to be required in order to be a functioning, professional member of an L2 global workplace. This goal of most language programs 'often means reaching "native-like" ultimate attainment' (Brantmeier 2008: 307), although Brantmeier also noted that 'the issue of "advancedness" has yet to be fully addressed in applied linguistics literature' (2008: 307). Until there is a uniform definition that spans programs and universities, not to mention languages, it will be challenging for program directors to be able to make well-informed decisions about the content of our programs.

In addition to the goal of developing 'advancedness' in language learners, and regardless of the ambiguity of that definition, the MLA report (2007) called for new type of competence, translingual and transcultural competence:

The language major should be structured to produce a specific outcome: educated speakers who have deep translingual and transcultural competence. . . . [that is,] the ability to operate between languages. Students are educated to function as informed and capable interlocutors with educated native speakers in the target language. They are also trained to reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture.

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

They learn to comprehend speakers of the target language as members of foreign societies and . . . as members of a society that is foreign to others.

(2007: 3–4)

These newly defined competences, although ‘conceived as a radical departure from the traditional goals of FL education’ (Kramsch 2010: 17), address one means of developing a global citizen that would produce North American students able to work with people from/in other countries. Developing the language learner’s competence to operate between languages, both at the linguistic and at the cultural level, should be within the purview of those who carry out program articulation and management, not only for undergraduates but for graduate programs as well.

Byrnes and Maxim have argued that this allows for the ‘possibility for imagining new foreign language educational opportunities’ (2004: viii), and Spanish programs are perfectly poised to lead the charge in imagining the possibilities. Given the ever-increasing Hispanic population within our own U.S. borders, students of Spanish have the ability to seek out experiential and immersion programs both at home and abroad, and can begin the process of becoming culturally aware and accepting in their own backyards. Educational opportunities such as these may be framed within theories in applied linguistics that Kramsch has coined as ‘ecological’ (2010: 20), taking into consideration the fact that ‘the ability to operate between languages is not an exercise in playful polyglottism or inconsequential code switching. It is the much more risky circulation of values across historical and ideological time scales, the negotiation of nonnegotiable identities and beliefs’ (2000: 18).

Extending these educational opportunities from theory to practice is the next logical step in developing global citizens in our Spanish programs. Although learning a language, its culture and literatures, and becoming an ‘advanced,’ professional, global citizen starts in the traditional classroom, our program articulation should also include the high-impact practice of implementing experiential learning found in immersion contexts, among others. Although language learning in immersion contexts comes in various forms (SA and state-side), lengths (summer, weeks, semester, year), and foci (academic, residence, work related), the following section focuses on the role that SA during an academic semester for academic credit has on strong program articulation and management and is particularly relevant to Spanish programs.

The Role of Study Abroad in Program Articulation and Management

SA has become an integral part of Spanish language programs, both at foundational levels and beyond. As we mentioned earlier, at least 25% of students who study abroad in college are doing so in a Spanish-speaking country. SA seems to be one answer to achieving the competence goals previously discussed: preparing students for global citizenship while spiraling language and transcultural learning with content material. Increasingly, programs are now designed not just for traditional language learners but also for heritage language speakers as well. Wilkinson summarized the potential of SA programs:

Study abroad serves in many ways as an intensifier, accelerating gains in areas such as fluency, pragmatic appropriateness, grammar acquisition, vocabulary learning, and reading skills; it also magnifies issues of attitude, identity and motivation that may have been less salient at home.

(2006a: 157)

Over the years, empirical studies have generally shown that SA plays an important role in the development of second and third language competence (e.g., Kinginger 2009, 2011).

Nonetheless, gaps exist between the curriculum of SA program learning goals and those stateside. An example of this issue is shown in a journal entry reflection written by a U.S. SA participant in Wilkinson's (2006a) study: 'I didn't know how to ask for a new light bulb in French. [But] I knew the use of light and dark in *Phèdre* reflect her character, the principles of Camus's existentialism, the use of irony and satire in *Candide*' (as cited in Knapman 2005: 19). This example rings familiar to those who have studied abroad and points to an area of improvement needed in language programs to calibrate traditional classroom goals with the language skills needed to negotiate life abroad. Another example was described by Ramsay (2009) in which language program faculty observed that students participating with third-party-affiliated SA programs returned stateside with weaker oral proficiency than those returning from programs owned and managed by the university. One could argue that program articulation within the same institution benefited the student participants: Although not specified in Ramsay's study, the at-home program institution probably had had similar, if not equal, learning goals as their SA programs.

Language program articulation needs to address the fact that such gaps exist and focus on closing them. In doing so, effective program articulation will consider incorporating learning opportunities that develop translingual and transcultural competences not only in traditional, liberal arts-content courses but also within the realm of expected everyday, host-country discourse. This can be fulfilled with a requirement of sending the students abroad for an extended time in the target language country, but 'educators should [also] carefully consider those aspects of language development that are best fostered in a sheltered classroom environment, and those that require students' active engagement in a broad array of extra-pedagogical interactive settings' (Kinginger 2009: 221). Including these values into program articulation counteracts 'professional folklore . . . that there is little that language teachers can or should do to influence students' experience abroad' (2009: 220).

Overall, SA programs that are carefully aligned to stateside learning goals benefit language programs in a number of ways: they foster global citizenship, provide high-impact practices of experiential learning, and help to meet the MLA's (2007) call for transcultural and translingual competence. With the aid of established national and international guidelines to develop effective program development and assessment in international education (e.g., American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages 2012; Common European Framework 2011; Institute for the International Education of Students 2011; Walvoord 2010), curricular articulation in and across programs has advanced to improve meeting learning goals across the board. With these resources and others, program articulation becomes essential in fomenting and maintaining this alignment.

Looking Into the Future

Language programs have consistently held a position of relative importance in the broader educational mission, and Spanish programs are no exception. How these programs are specifically designed, though, and how program managers and department chairs view their role in articulating the goals of language programs, has not been as predictable or reliable. We maintain that although administrators must continue to grapple with traditional articulation and management issues, the time has come for us also to implement innovations in our language programs that will make them—and us—relevant and necessary in our continually changing world. The following subsections detail the roles of Spanish language program managers that are necessary for our newly articulated programs.

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

The Program Director as Manager

From a managerial perspective, the chair or director is responsible for the day-to-day running of the department or program. This management entails a number of duties, ranging from hiring instructors to designing and assessing curriculum, not to mention liaising with higher administration and stakeholders. First and foremost is envisioning the goals and mission of the language program because a well-articulated mission can help attract students and motivate continued language study. Doing so requires that the manager ‘understand not only the personnel in the program but also the institutional discourses that surround the program, as well as the ability to communicate skillfully across hierarchies and even cultures’ (Carkin 1997: 51). In addition, ‘we must keep in mind where our language programs are—and where we would like them to be—within the bigger picture of the college, university, or educational system’ (Lord 2013: 24). On top of that, program managers should be informed of the latest developments in applied linguistics and SLA research to be able to make well-informed and timely decisions for the language program (e.g., Schultz 2005).

Program managers are often responsible for hiring and training instructors. More likely than not, program managers have seen an increased need for staffing, and of late, that additional staffing tends to be made up of adjuncts (part-time instructors and/or full-time non-tenure-track instructors). Although the increase we have seen of adjuncts in Spanish programs could threaten the integrity of the profession and instructional programs and is primarily seen as motivated by administrations wanting to reduce the cost of instruction (ADFL 2001), adjuncts are integral to a successful Spanish-language curriculum. Guidelines provided by the MLA Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession (2011) should be followed in order to assure that adjunct faculty be treated as professionals, including appropriate compensation and professional advancement, professional development and recognition, and integration into the life of the department and the institution.

After the hiring process is complete, the process of instructor education is a complex one that cannot be addressed fully here (see Lord 2013 for a more complete discussion). However, the program manager should keep several factors in mind when hiring instructors and when preparing those instructors for the program. One of the main issues we deal with in language instruction is the skill level or proficiency of our own instructors. We must hold them to a predetermined standard of course, but we also must keep in mind that our goal, as we have said, is translingual competence—not perfection. In the case of Spanish specifically, we also must recognize that there are many dialects of Spanish, including the dialects of Spanish spoken in the US as well as those spoken in other Spanish-speaking countries. To a certain extent, Spanish is often not even considered a ‘foreign’ language anymore, given its presence in the US (e.g., Jaschik 2011; Planas 2013), and we must be sure our students are exposed to all varieties.

Educating instructors is an equally important aspect of program design. How this happens varies from program to program, but the manager needs to ensure that instructors are aware of the program goals and mission and are well versed in the pedagogical principles underlying their implementation. Most language programs offer in-service training to their graduate student instructors as well as a teaching-methods class of one or two semesters (Lord 2013), but we often neglect to work with other professors, lecturers, and adjuncts. In order for the curricular changes discussed in this chapter to take hold effectively, they must be implemented across the whole program, not just at the foundational levels often taught by graduate students.

Annual funding to attend national and regional teacher organizations is essential. However, for those faculty who do not specialize in the field of language teaching, professional

development funding is typically spent attending their specialized conferences. Adjuncts do not usually have access to this type of funding but appropriate alternatives come in the form of webinars offered for a minimal cost on relevant topics. Several organizations offer this sort of online professional development including ACTFL, the New York State Association of Foreign Language Teachers, Faculty Focus, and the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, to name a few. Language departments also benefit from other ongoing educational opportunities, such as roundtable meetings or workshop series.

Likewise, the selection and creation of materials used in our language classes—from foundational to advanced levels—also needs to be informed by the same principles as the overall program. The textbooks in use in language classes are the most obvious source of materials, at least at foundational levels, so these must be chosen carefully. We should strive to select texts whose purpose and content are in line with our own, and managers should ensure that instructors throughout the program are following the same design principles to work with the overall mission of the program. Some managers do so by creating and selecting all materials for the program, whereas others choose to review and approve those materials created by other instructors. The most effective means of ensuring this harmony will depend on the size and structure of the language program, but it is a factor that cannot be overlooked.

The Program Director as Innovator

Innovation is an essential element of any thriving educational program (Baldrige and Deal 1983), and one of a manager's most important tasks is 'to serve as catalysts for change' (Stoller 1997: 33). Stoller maintains that the LPD can accomplish this role through 'strong leadership and involvement in programmatic change and innovation', and in so doing, we can reap the benefits of 'greater job satisfaction among faculty and staff, better learning conditions for students, improved reputations for our programs, and more effective management of program resources' (1997: 33, as cited in Lord 2013). For a program to truly foster and welcome innovation, the members of the program must feel that they are respected and committed to that program, and collaboration must be valued (Barsi and Kaebnick 1989). The program manager is largely responsible for setting that tone. Innovation can come in many forms, but we highlight three of the most contemporary and relevant changes that are facing the field of language education, and in particular Spanish language education.

Experiential Learning and Global Citizenship

As argued previously in this chapter, and elsewhere in this volume, experiential formats are essential in language programs.

Experiential learning, whether at home or abroad, keeps this "need to know" focused on real communicative and social goals, such as the need to express and understand ideas and the desire to behave in socioculturally acceptable ways, while de-emphasizing the traditional classroom focus on grades.

(Wilkinson 2006b: 158)

Program managers should strive to incorporate experiential opportunities, at home and abroad, at all levels of the curriculum.

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

Awareness is key to the success of the experiential learning construct. Wilkinson observed that

not only do students benefit from opportunities to notice and analyze linguistic features of the language, but they also need to become aware of other aspects of language use, such as communication strategies . . . cultural attitudes and reactions . . . and issues of personal identity and self-construction.

(2006b: 158)

Additionally, Wilkinson noted that program coordinators must not lose sight of the individual language learner. 'We must remember that the students who will participate in [immersion programs] are all unique learners' (2006b: 160), and that not all students will be able to participate. Language programs need to be aware of the learner's experience and development within a curriculum. By acknowledging the language and transcultural learning experience as an individualized one, gaps may be bridged when integrating aspects '(2 the overseas experience into their home-campus approach' (Wilkinson 2006b: 160).

Thus, language programs can help learners develop translingual and transcultural competence, and the ability to easily operate between languages and cultures. Language programs that focus on these newly defined competences are in a position to enhance the learner's ability to be global citizens. In a sense, these language learners will be in a position to successfully use their advanced language skills to manage diverse perceptions and views of reality to be effective in our global market and society.

The Role of Technology

These days, we often find that the most prevalent sources of innovation are those related somehow to new technologies. This is perhaps fitting because the students in our programs are, more often than not, digital natives (Prensky 2001), and in order 'to reach and teach these individuals, traditional pedagogical techniques need to be revisited and new techniques developed and/or perfected using media that they understand' (Oxford and Oxford 2009: 1). New tools emerge on a daily basis that have the potential to change the ways instructors present material, students approach material, and teachers and students interact with each other.

Considerable research on SLA and computer assisted language learning (CALL) confirms that technology can play an important role in the language learning process. Entire books, journals, and conferences are devoted to CALL (refer to Elola and Oskoz and Sykes of the current volume), and it would be impossible to do this field justice with the few paragraphs we dedicate here to the topic. However, in light of the innovations proposed previously, the issue of technology incorporation—the why and the how—is an important consideration for the language program coordinator.

The collaborative tools that form part of the Web 2.0 rubric allow us to '[embrace] the power of the web to harness collective intelligence' (O'Reilly 2005) and as such have obvious advantages for language education (e.g., Sayers 1993). Exploring with new technologies allows for experiential learning, letting students become creators of knowledge rather than mere receivers. Motivation, which has long been recognized as a crucial element of successful language acquisition (e.g., Dörnyei 2012), has been shown to increase with technology-enhanced activities. Technology can also help students learn better strategies, take responsibility for their own learning, and increase self-confidence, in addition to providing a wider array of authentic target language materials. The multiplicity of materials available not only encourages students

to develop their digital literacy but relieves learners and educators from being bound by a single source of information (e.g., a textbook) and thus fosters interdisciplinary and multicultural learning. Finally, computer-mediated communication (e.g., e-mail, text, chat, blogs) puts students in greater contact with each other and their instructor or even with native speakers of the target language. Although in the past computers were viewed as tutors, and learners interacted with the computer solely to drill certain forms (e.g., Bax 2003), today we see computers and media as a way to supplement teaching and connect learners to each other and to other target language users. Thus, technology can offer opportunities for increased target-language negotiation outside of class and works hand in hand with our goal of preparing students for functioning in all aspects of the global community.

This potential for increased interaction through CALL amplifies the possibilities for successful inclusion of technological tools to both foundational and upper level courses. We do not advocate, though, that class time be sacrificed in favor of technology-based interaction. On the contrary, these collaborative communication tools should be incorporated as a supplement to enhance the opportunities available to students beyond the classroom. Indeed, research has shown that the increased and improved interactional possibilities available through technology do have potential benefits to all skills (e.g., Arnold *et al.* 2009; Beauvois 1992; Ducate and Lomicka 2008; Lee 2001, 2002, 2010a, 2010b; van Compernelle and Williams 2009).

To be sure, Web 2.0 technologies are only one small part of a 'larger, cohesive, multifaceted approach to world-language teaching and learning' (van Compernelle and Williams 2009: 15), as we have advocated throughout this chapter. Technology in and of itself should not be afforded a position of special importance in our programs without careful consideration of how it can enhance our language teaching and learning experiences. We do, however, consider the incorporation of appropriate, effective technology tools a key aspect of preparing our students for global citizenship and a primary task for program directors as they consider the effectiveness of their programs in transmitting multiple literacies in the tools they will need in their world.

Scholarship

Finally, a crucial element for the program manager to keep in mind is the issue of scholarship and the broader academy. The traditional merit scale in language departments tends to value scholarly work in linguistics, literature and literary theory over scholarship on teaching and teaching methods. That needs to change if we are to take our language departments to the next level and to meet the challenge posed by the 2007 MLA report. The ADFL statement of good practice recognized this as well, stating that 'scholarship on teaching ? its methods, assessment procedures, and ways to improve it ? should be valued on a par with traditional forms of scholarship' (2001: para. 10). This means expanding our understanding of what 'counts' as contributions to the profession and to tenure and promotion, and the program manager is in an excellent position to spearhead these changes from within.

Conclusion

As we consider what the future holds for our departments, our institutions, and the profession, the issues described in this chapter will come to play an increasingly important role. The ADFL (2001) and the MLA (2007), along with a growing body of research, recognize that the continuing dichotomies between teaching and research, as well as between language and content, need to be addressed so that departments recognize both as equally valuable contributions to the profession. Language program coordinators must be encouraged to re-examine their

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

curricula and their departmental structures, and there should be incentives in place to encourage them to institute the appropriate programmatic and administrative structures. Simultaneously, those of us involved in the teaching and researching of Spanish as a L2 also have a responsibility to continue to investigate program design and articulation. Only through ongoing research and innovation into what makes curricula successful, and into attempting to assess the outcomes of our programs, both at home and abroad, can we stay informed and able to offer the greatest advances in our programs. Research is needed to assess the best practices and benefits of the integration of language, culture and literature, both from a theoretical acquisition perspective and from a classroom-based action perspective. Likewise, the more we know about students' successes—linguistics and otherwise—in our residential and overseas programs, the more effectively we will be able to manage these programs. As we do this, and embrace the new possibilities that are opened up to us, we take a step towards program management that truly prepares language students for meaningful interaction with other peoples and cultures.

Related Topics

assessment
 foundational language courses
 basic language sequence
 language competences
 learning contexts
 program outcomes

Further Reading

- Byrnes, H. (2006). *Educating for Advanced Foreign Language Capacities: Constructs, Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. (Discusses the increasingly important role of language learning in the larger multilingual/global society.)
- Byrnes, H. and Maxim, H. (eds.). (2004). *Advanced Foreign Language Learning: A Challenge to College Programs*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle. (Examines ways to expand advanced language learning among college programs, looking toward both foundational language and beyond the college education.)
- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*. Retrieved from www.mla.org/flreport (An overview of the state of world language education post-9/11 with suggestions for revising course curricula and governance structures.)
- Modern Language Association Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession. (2011). *Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members: Recommendations and Evaluative Questions*. Retrieved from www.mla.org/pdf/clip_stmt_final_may11.pdf (Provides recommendations for improving the professional standing of faculty members who hold non-tenure-track appointments.)
- Rossomondo, A. (2014). 'Integrating foundational language and content study through new approaches to hybrid learning and teaching'. In F. Rubio and J. Thoms (eds.), *Hybrid Language Teaching and Learning: Exploring Theoretical, Pedagogical and Curricular Issues* (pp. 219–238). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle. (Explores the potential of technology and hybrid-based language teaching to integrate language and content throughout the language curriculum.)

References

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). *Proficiency Guidelines*. Retrieved from www.actflproficiencyguidelines2012.org
- Allen, H. W. and Paesani, K. (2010). 'Exploring the feasibility of a pedagogy of multiliteracies in introductory foreign language courses'. *L2 Journal* 2: 119–142.

- Anderson, R. (1997). 'Educating the dean: Who are we and what do we do?'. *ADFL Bulletin* 29 (1): 20–23.
- Anton, R. C. (1970). 'Articulation: The problem and some solutions'. *ADFL Bulletin* 1 (4): 17–20.
- Arnold, N., Ducate, L., Lomicka, L. and Lord, G. (2009). 'Assessing online collaboration among language teachers: A cross-institutional wiki case study'. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education* 8: 121–139.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2008). 'High-Impact Educational Practices'. Retrieved from www.aacu.org/leap/hip.cfm
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2001). 'New initiative takes on the challenge of preparing college students for global citizenship and educating them in the arts of democracy' [Press release]. Retrieved from www.aacu.org/press_room/press_releases/2001/FIPSE.cfm
- Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL) (2001). *Statement of Good Practice: Teaching, Evaluation, and Scholarship*. Retrieved from www.adfl.org/resources/resources_practice.htm
- Baldrige J. V. and Deal, T. E. (eds.). (1983). *The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Barrette, C. and Paesani, K. (eds.). (2005). *Language Program Articulation: Developing a Theoretical Foundation*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Barrette, C., Paesani, K. and Vinall, K. (2010). 'Toward an integrated curriculum: Maximizing the use of target language literature'. *Foreign Language Annals* 43 (2): 216–230.
- Barsi L. M. and Kaebnick, G. W. (1989). 'Innovative universities'. *AAHE Bulletin* 41 (6): 10–13.
- Bax, S. (2003). 'CALL—Past, present and future'. *System* 31 (1): 13–28.
- Beauvois, M. H. (1992). 'Computer-assisted classroom discussion in the foreign language classroom: Conversation in slow motion'. *Foreign Language Annals* 25 (5): 455–464.
- Brantmeier, C. (2008). 'Meeting the demands: The circularity of remodeling collegiate foreign language programs'. *Modern Language Journal* 92 (2): 306–309.
- Brigham, M. (2011). 'Creating a global citizen and assessing outcomes'. *Journal of Global Citizenship and Equity Education* 1 (1): 15–43.
- Brooks, N. (1964). *Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt.
- Byrnes, H. (1990). *Foreign Language Program Articulation from High School to the University*. Retrieved from www.cal.org/resources/archive/digest/1990articulation.html
- Byrnes, H. (1998). 'How do you get there from here? Articulating the foreign language major program'. *ADFL Bulletin* 20 (1): 35–38.
- Byrnes, H. (2002). 'Language and culture: Shall the twain ever meet in foreign language departments?'. *ADFL Bulletin* 33 (2): 25–32.
- Byrnes, H. and Maxim, H. (2004). 'Introduction: Creating sites for collegiate advanced foreign language learning'. In H. Byrnes and H. Maxim (eds.), *Advanced Foreign Language Learning: A Challenge to College Programs* (pp. vii–xv). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Carkin, S. (1997). 'Language program leadership as intercultural management'. In M. Christison and F. Stoller (eds.), *A Handbook for Language Program Administrators* (pp. 49–60). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center.
- Common European Framework (CEFR). (2011). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Retrieved from www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1_en.asp
- Cortés Moreno, M. (2013). 'Un currículo consensuado entre profesores y alumnos de ELE'. *MarcoELE: Revista Didáctica Español como Lengua Extranjera* 16. Retrieved from www.marcoele.com/curriculo-consensuado/
- Davidson, J. and Tesh, J. (1997). 'Theory and practice in language program organization and design'. In M. Christison and F. Stoller (eds.), *A Handbook for Language Program Administrators* (pp. 177–198). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center.
- Dörnyei, Z. (ed.). (2012). *Motivation in Language Learning*. Shanghai, China: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Ducate, L. and Lomicka, L. (2008). 'Adventures in the blogosphere: From blog readers to blog writers'. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 21 (1): 9–28.
- Fischer, K. (2013, March 4). 'A college degree sorts job applicants, but employers wish it meant more'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/The-Employment-Mismatch/137625

Gillian Lord and Christina Isabelli

- Furman, N., Goldberg, D. and Lusin, N. (2007). *Enrollments in Languages Other than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2006*. New York: Modern Language Association. Retrieved from www.mla.org/pdf/06enrollmentsurvey_final.pdf
- Institute of International Education (IIE). (2012). *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from www.iie.org/opendoors
- Institute for the International Education of Students. (2011). *MAP for Language and Interlanguage Communication*. Retrieved from www.iesabroad.org/study-abroad/advisors-faculty/ies-abroad-map/map-for-language
- Isabelli, C. A. (2004). 'Study abroad for advanced foreign language majors: Optimal duration for developing complex structures'. In H. Byrnes and H. Maxim (eds.), *Advanced Foreign Language Learning: A Challenge to College Programs* (pp. 114–130). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Jaschik, S. (2011, October 5). 'Not so foreign languages'. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/10/05/colleges_are_replacing_foreign_language_departments_with_world_language_departments
- Kinginger, C. (2011). 'Enhancing language learning in study abroad'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31: 58–73.
- Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language Learning and Study Abroad: A Critical Reading of Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knapman, C. (2005). 'Crossing borders and expanding boundaries'. *Edit Magazine* 4: 10–21.
- Kramsch, C. (2010). 'Theorizing translanguaging/transcultural competence'. In G. Levine and A. Phipps (eds.), *Critical and Intercultural Theory and Language Pedagogy* (pp. 15–31). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Lally, C. G. (ed.). (2001) *Foreign Language Program Articulation: Current Practice and Future Prospects*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Lange, D. L. (1982). 'The problem of articulation'. In T. V. Higgs (ed.), *Curriculum, Competence, and the Foreign Language Teacher* (pp. 113–137). Skokie, IL: National Textbook.
- Lange, D. L. (1997). 'Models of articulation: Struggles and successes'. *ADFL Bulletin* 28: 31–42.
- Lazere, D. (2011, July 7). 'Critical thinking in the curriculum'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/brainstorm/critical-thinking-in-the-curriculum-donald-lazere/37094>
- Leaver, B. L. and Shekhtman, B. (eds.). (2002). *Developing Professional-Level Language Proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, L. (2001). 'Online interaction: Negotiation of meaning and strategies used among learners of Spanish'. *ReCALL* 13 (1): 232–244.
- Lee, L. (2002). 'Enhancing learners' communication skills through synchronous electronic interaction and task-based instruction'. *Foreign Language Annals* 35 (1): 16–23.
- Lee, L. (2010a). 'Exploring wiki-mediated collaborative writing: A case study in an elementary Spanish course'. *CALICO Journal* 27 (2): 260–276.
- Lee, L. (2010b). 'Fostering reflective writing and interactive exchange through blogging in an advanced language course'. *ReCALL* 22 (2): 212–227.
- Lewin, R. (2009). 'The quest for global citizenship through study abroad'. In R. Lewin (ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship* (pp. xiii–xxii). New York: Routledge.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Lord, G. (2013). *Language Program Direction: Theory and Practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*. Retrieved from www.mla.org/flreport
- O'Reilly, T. (2005, September 30). 'What is Web 2.0?'. *O'Reilly Network*. Retrieved from www.oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html
- Oxford, R. and Oxford, J. (2009). 'Introduction'. In R. Oxford and J. Oxford (eds.), *Second Language Teaching and Learning in the Net Generation* (pp. 1–9). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Paesani, K. and Barrette, C. M. (2005). 'The role of the language program director within a three-dimensional model of articulation'. In C. M. Barrette and K. Paesani (eds.), *Language Program Articulation: Developing a Theoretical Foundation* (pp. 2–20). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

- Pfeiffer, P. C. and Byrnes, H. (2009). 'Curriculum, learning, and the identity of majors: A case study of program outcomes evaluation'. In J. M. Norris, J. M. Davis, C. Sinicrope and Y. Watanabe (eds.), *Toward Useful Program Evaluation in College Foreign Language Education* (pp. 183–208). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Planas, R. (12 June 2013). 'Eight reasons Spanish isn't a foreign language'. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/12/spanish-foreign-language_n_3430860.html
- Potowski, K. (2002). 'Experiences of Spanish heritage speakers in university foreign language courses and implications for teacher training'. *ADFL Bulletin* 33 (3): 35–42.
- Potowski, K. (2005). *Fundamentos de la enseñanza del español a los hablantes nativos en los Estados Unidos*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Potowski, K. and Carreira, M. (2004). 'Towards teacher development and national standards for Spanish as a heritage language'. *Foreign Language Annals* 37 (3): 421–431.
- Prensky, M. (2001). 'Digital natives, digital immigrants'. *On the Horizon* 9 (5). Retrieved from www.mnsto.org/download/technology/Digital%20Natives%20-%20Digital%20Immigrants.pdf
- Pries, D. (2009). 'Translingual/Transcultural competence: An operational approach to the MLA report'. Retrieved from http://blc.berkeley.edu/index.php/blc/post/translingual_transcultural_competence_an_operational_approach_to_the_mla_re/
- Ramsay, V. (2009). 'Study abroad and evaluation: Critical changes to enhance linguistic and cultural growth'. In J. M. Norris, J. M. Davis, C. Sinicrope and Y. Watanabe (eds.), *Toward Useful Program Evaluation in College Foreign Language Education* (pp. 163–182). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Rossondo, A. (2012). 'The *Acceso* project and foreign language graduate student professional development'. In H. W. Allen and H. Maxim (eds.), *Educating the Future Foreign Language Professoriate for the 21st Century* (pp. 128–148). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Sadow, S. A. (1989). 'Methodologists: A brief guide for their colleagues'. *ADFL Bulletin* 21 (1): 27–28.
- Sant'anna, V. and Daher, M. (1995). 'Tipología de textos y enseñanza de lengua extranjera: Articulación posible'. In F. J. Grande Alija, J. Le Men Loyer, M. Rueda Rueda and M. E. Prado Ibán (eds.), *Actuales tendencias en la enseñanza del español como lengua extranjera II: Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de ASELE* (pp. 359–366). León: Universidad de León.
- Sayers, D. (1993). 'Distance team teaching and computer learning networks'. *TESOL Journal* 3 (1): 19–23.
- Schattle, H. (2009). 'Global citizenship in theory and practice'. In R. Lewin (ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship* (pp. 3–20). New York: Routledge.
- Schultz, J. M. (2005) 'The role of special focus sections in the articulation of language and literature courses'. In C. M. Barrette and K. Paesani (eds.), *Language Program Articulation: Developing a Theoretical Foundation* (pp. 560–577). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Stoller, F. L. (1997). 'The catalyst for change and innovation'. In M. Christison and F. Stoller (eds.), *A Handbook for Language Program Administrators* (pp. 33–48). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center.
- van Compernelle R. and Williams, L. (2009). '(Re)situating the role(s) of new technologies in world-language teaching and learning'. In R. Oxford and J. Oxford (eds.), *Second Language Teaching and Learning in the Net Generation* (pp. 9–22). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Walvoord, B. E. (2010). *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Welles, E. (2004). 'Foreign language enrollments in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2002'. *Profession* 26: 128–153.
- Wilkinson, S. (2006a). 'Introduction: The view from abroad'. In S. Wilkinson (ed.) *Insights from Study Abroad for Language Programs* (pp. xv–xviii). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Wilkinson, S. (2006b). 'Conclusion'. In S. Wilkinson (ed.) *Insights from Study Abroad for Language Programs* (pp. 157–163). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.