# Individuals using assistive technology may not be able to fully access the information contained in this file.

**For assistance, please send an e-mail to** **ifle@ed.gov** **and include “508 Accommodation” and the title of the document in the subject line of your e-mail.**

1. **Plan of Operation**

## Overview

The National Heritage Language Resource Center has expanded its scope and service to the heritage language (HL) community in every funding cycle since its creation. Our research projects have uncovered the unique dimensions of HL learning and established guidelines for pedagogy; our learning and teaching projects have elevated teachers' skills and provided classroom-ready curricula; and our community building projects have enlarged and strengthened connections among and between scholars and practitioners.

UCLA’s leadership in HL scholarship began 40 years ago under Professor **Russ Campbell**. We organized the nation’s first Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference (2000); wrote the University of California’s system-wide guidelines for HL teaching (2002); convened the first NEH focus group on HL curriculum design (2003); and founded the *Heritage Language Journal* (2003). We became an LRC in 2006 under the leadership of Professor **Olga Kagan**. Since then, we have convened four quadrennial International Conferences on Heritage/Community Languages and hosted nearly 40 research institutes and teacher training workshops. In the last funding cycle alone, we published more than 60 articles in our Heritage Language Journal and authored the Routledge book *Multilingual La La Land: Language Use in Sixteen Greater Los Angeles Communities (Hitchins Chik, 2022)*. Our work is supported by other Department of Education (DoE) programs, the U.S. Department of Defense and National Security Agency, and initiatives funded directly by UCLA.

**Since our founding, the Heritage Center’s overarching goals have been to: (1) bridge research and practice; (2) disseminate our work widely; and (3) expand and strengthen the HL community.** Our operational goals change as national needs evolve and new members join.

Following Olga Kagan’s passing and **Maria Carreira**’s retirement, we have recruited several young and talented scholars and practitioners, several of whom are alumni of our academic and professional programs.

Anticipating this transition, we recently undertook several strategic planning projects to identify paths we should take to continue leadership. **These paths converge on the need to increase *access* and *equity*.** Many of our ongoing projects already address these issues; others will have those elements augmented. In addition, we propose three new initiatives:

1. We will develop **Open Educational Resources (OER) for HL Instruction.** A rapidly growing movement to produce OER materials has not yet reached into HL instruction— certainly not for less-commonly taught languages (LCTLs), but not even for millions of Spanish HL learners. OER not only expands access to unique pedagogical materials, it also serves the goal of equity by making these materials available to low-income students in community colleges. This initiative will be integrated with our digital repositories and professional development projects to increase the focus on LCTLs.
2. We will focus on **underserved HL learners in community colleges and community schools**:
	* Most research on post-secondary HL learners has focused on students in four-year degree programs. Community college students are far more diverse with respect to age, language background, motivation, and needs—moreover, this diversity itself varies by language. Working with a group of community college instructors representing more than a dozen LCTLs, we will identify needs and begin developing best practices for these learners.
	* Early research on HL pedagogy in the lower grades focused on ESL students; more recently, dual language immersion has occupied our attention. Using the network of

community school leaders which we began building last cycle, we will address this in our research symposia and materials development workshops.

1. Besides these access and equity initiatives, **we will provide focused support to the dual language community.** Nationwide, parents have responded to research showing the remarkable benefits of dual language programs by demanding their expansion. Ironically, many HL communities have resisted this because of fear that their children will fall behind in English language instruction. While continuing to support this movement by our research, materials development, and teacher training activities, we will *expand* our dissemination and community building programs to inform the public and strengthen advocacy.

## Heritage Center Design

We propose a coordinated suite of 14 projects, organized in three broad categories: Research; Learning and Teaching; and Community Building. They address the full range of activities delineated in the authorizing legislation. Details on each project are found in Section VI.C; Section VIII lists the specific work products for each project.

**Table 1: Heritage Center Projects by Name**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Research Projects** | **Learning & Teaching Projects** | **Community Building Projects** |
| R1: Research InstitutesR2: Digital Repositories | LT1: Summer Teachers Workshops | CB1: ConferencesCB2: Heritage Language JournalCB3: Community-Based HL SchoolsCB4: Bridging Research and Practice |
| R3: Heritage Language Survey | LT2: Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges |
| R4: Community College Focus Groups | LT3: Open Educational Resources Initiative |
| R5: Project-based Language Learning | LT4: SE Asian Language Pedagogy Symposia |
|  | LT5: Dual Language Immersion |

**Table 2: Heritage Center Projects by Statutory Goal**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities Funded by Title VI** | **Research** | **Learning / Teaching** | **Community Building** |
| (a) research language teaching methods including technology use | R1, 5 | LT6 | CB3 |
| (b) develop language teaching materials reflecting research on effective strategies | R3, 5 | LT1, 3, 4 | CB2 |
| (c) train teachers to administer/interpret performance tests, use effective teaching strategies and technologies |  | LT1, 2, 4 | CB1 |
| (d) assess needs and develop/disseminate instructional materials for LCTLs | R2, 3 | LT All | CB All |
| (e) develop resource materials for language practitioners | R3 | LT1, 3, 4 |  |
| (f) hold intensive summer institutes and provide professional development for language teachers | R1 | LT1, 2, 4 | CB1,3 |

## Management Plan

The Heritage Center has four managing organs: (1) an Executive Committee charged with oversight and management; (2) a team of Project Leaders, responsible for the design and delivery of research, learning/teaching, and community building activities; (3) Heritage Center Affiliates, who represent partner organizations that participate in dissemination and broader institutionalization; and (4) a Board of Advisors, consisting of HL experts who guide both the Executive Committee and Project Leaders.

### Executive Committee

The Executive Committee consists of the PI and two co-directors. All members have extensive experience. ***Center Director Peter Cowe*** is responsible for all Heritage Center activities. He heads the Executive Committee, certifies financial and program reports, chairs the quarterly meeting, and consults with the co-directors on an ongoing basis. He will work together with the outside

evaluator to prepare annual reports and develop the capstone report. ***Research Director Maria Polinsky*** and ***Education Director Melissa Bowles*** advise Project Leaders on matters of substance, monitor project deliverables, and support evaluation. Each director may also serve as a project leader, co-leader, or advisor for one or more projects.

The Executive Committee meets quarterly to review progress, evaluate outcomes and deliverables, and attend to personnel and financial matters. Between meetings, the members consult on *ad hoc* matters.

### Project Leaders

Because of their subject matter expertise, Project Leaders have substantial autonomy to direct the individual research, learning/teaching, and community building activities. To ensure that project outcomes align with Heritage Center goals and statutory intent, their work plans are approved in advance by the Executive Committee, and a member of the Board of Advisors serves as an internal evaluator (see Sections IV and VII, below). Project Leaders include faculty from other institutions, Heritage Center directors and staff, leaders of scholarly societies, and representatives or officers of community and professional organizations. Each Project Leader works with a member of the advisory board; Research project leaders report to Dr. Polinsky; Learning and Teaching Project Leaders to Dr. Bowles; and Community Building leaders to Dr. Cowe.

### Heritage Center Affiliates

Affiliates support Heritage Center activities and represent us at national and international conferences, state, and local events. We have 22 Affiliates and will recruit new ones based on their expertise in HL education, ability to mobilize partners, and geographic, linguistic, and institutional diversity. They constitute a national network that extends our projects to university

campuses, other NRCs and LRCs, school districts, community groups, and non-governmental organizations.

### Board of Advisors

The Heritage Center’s Board of Advisors is comprised of HL experts who provide perspective, expertise, advice, and advocacy. Besides *ad hoc* consultation with the Executive Committee, each member has formal responsibility as an expert evaluator on one or more projects (see sections IV and VI). Members are: **Fatih Bayram**, Arctic University of Norway; **Abbas Benmamoun**, Duke University; **Joseph Bianco**, University of Melbourne; **Richard Brecht**, American Councils Research Center; **Irina Dubinina**, Brandeis University; **Particia Duff**, University of British Columbia; **Cristina Flores**, Universidade do Minho; **Agnes He**, SUNY Stony Brook; **Shoichi Iwasaki**, UCLA; **Shushan Karapetian**, University of Southern California; **Hi-Sun Kim**, Harvard University; **Jürgen Meisel**, Universität Hamburg; **Silvina Montrul**, University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign; **Ricardo Otheguy**, City University of New York; **Kim Potowski**, University of Illinois Chicago; **Alegría Ribadeneira**, Colorado State University; **Irina Sekerina**, College of Staten Island; **Harold Torrence**, UCLA; **Julio Torres**, UC Irvine; **Li Wei**, University College London; and **Marit Westergaard**, Arctic University of Norway.

## Commitment to Diversity and Access

UCLA and its vendors and contractors comply with all federal and state non-discrimination laws and regulations. California expands some federal protections and extends others to additional classes. (The ones most relevant to this proposal are state protections by ancestry and for use of languages other than English.) These policies are communicated and reinforced with supervisors

and managers at periodic meetings. All UCLA employees attend formal Ethics Briefings and biennial training in sexual harassment prevention mandatory for faculty and supervisory staff.

All Heritage Center events and work products provide equal access to members of every protected class. This includes making all web-based material ADA-compliant in both audio and visual formats and providing sign-language interpreters at conferences and workshops as needed. We are guided by UCLA’s Office for Accessible Education and the Chancellor's ADA & 504 Compliance Office.

We also actively recruit members of all communities to our advisory board, as project leaders and alliance members, and as participants in our programs. In so doing, the Heritage Center is proud to have achieved a balanced representation of women and minorities in all facets of our operations.

Our commitment goes far beyond mere compliance. UCLA actively promotes strategies for upholding dignity for all through its Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. The EDI Office provides resources for confronting and eliminating racism and bias which the Heritage Center will distribute to all program leaders with instructions about how they can be used proactively.

# Quality of Personnel

## Executive Committee

The executive committee comprises the roles of the Principal Investigator (PI) and co-Directors, each of whom will provide 10% effort towards the completion of all the proposed projects. This includes their time in center-level and project-level activities.

**PI, Professor Peter Cowe (**PhD, Hebrew University of Jerusalem), the Center’s PI, provides fiscal

oversight and administrative management. He has worked with the previous PI, Dr. Christopher

Erickson, and Heritage Center staff since 2019, and he has also collaborated with the Heritage Center’s founding director, Dr. Olga Kagan. He has strong ties to the HL Armenian communities locally and nationally. He has also worked with the local Glendale Unified School District to address the Armenian HL community’s concern over dual language immersion education.

**Research Director Maria Polinsky** (PhD, Russian Academy of Sciences) is a professor of

Linguistics and associate director of the University of Maryland’s Language Science Center. She conducts research on multiple heritage languages and has taught at Linguistic Society of America’s Summer Institutes and served on the editorial boards of seventeen journals, including the *Heritage Language Journal*, the National Science Foundation’s Expert Panel on Linguistics, and advisory boards of international center, including the Centre for Literacy and Multilingualism (U. of Reading), the Child Bilingualism Center (Chinese University of Hong Kong), and the Center for Multilingual and Intercultural Communication (University of Stony Brook). She has published over a hundred scholarly articles and several books, including *Heritage Languages and Their Speakers* (2018).

**Education Director Melissa A. Bowles** (PhD, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign),

NHLRC’s new pedagogy director, is Professor of Spanish, Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education (SLATE), and Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She has a long history with the Heritage Center, primarily working with our *Heritage Language Journal*. Her research focuses on language testing/assessment, research methods, and instruction’s varying effects on second and HL learners. Her most recent book is an edited volume, *Outcomes of University Spanish Heritage Language Instruction in the United States* (Georgetown U. Press, 2022). In addition, she is a co-PI of a public engagement project, *The Bilingual Advantage Starts at Home* (co-PI: Kim Potowski, University of Illinois-

Chicago), to raise awareness of bilingualism’s lifelong benefits. The project targets licensed and future K-12 teachers and families who speak other languages at home. She has worked directly with Center co-director Maria Polinsky, and our staff.

## Project Leaders

(Percent effort for project leaders varies – see Budget Narrative).

**Claire Hitchins Chik** (PhD, UCLA) is the Center’s associate director. Her dissertation examined

heritage language maintenance at a Chinese community school. She presents at conferences and workshops and has published on HL education. She has edited and co-edited several volumes, most recently *Multilingual La Land: Language Use in Sixteen Greater Los Angeles Communities* (2021, Routledge).

**Susan Bauckus** (ABD, UCLA) is a project coordinator at UCLA’s Center for World Languages

(CWL), and she teaches Russian at Santa Monica College. She has also taught Russian at California State University Long Beach and Pasadena City College. She was the Managing Editor of the *Heritage Language Journal* since its inception in 2002, and the editor of the *UC Undergraduate Journal of Slavic and East/Central European Studies* since 2009. For over 20 years, she administered the UCLA Slavic Department’s High School Russian Proficiency test program, testing high school student heritage speakers in their knowledge of reading and writing. She is a coauthor of a chapter in *Multilingual La Land: Language Use in Sixteen Greater Los Angeles Communities* (Routledge, 2021) on the Greater Los Angeles Russian-speaking community, and has co-edited three volumes of scholarly articles, most recently *Connecting across Languages and Cultures: A Heritage Language Festschrift in Honor of Olga Kagan (Routledge, 2018)*.

**Irina Dubinina** (PhD, Brandeis University) is the Director of the Russian Language Program and

chair of the World Languages and Cultures Committee at Brandeis University. She has over 20 years of experience teaching Russian as a second and a heritage language. Her research focuses on the production and comprehension of requests by speakers of heritage Russian and on HL pedagogy. Most recently, Dr. Dubinina co-authored an introductory textbook for adult heritage learners of Russian (Rodnaya Rech', 2019) and co-edited a collection of articles on Russian language pedagogy (The Art of Teaching Russian, GUP, 2020). She is currently a co-PI on an NSF-funded project to build a corpus of naturalistic child and child-directed speech in monolingual and bilingual Russian contexts.

**Andrew Lynch** (PhD, University of Minnesota), a professor of Spanish at the University of

Miami, is the *Heritage Language Journal*’s editor in chief. His research focuses on language in society, language policy, language-based discrimination, bilingual education and bilingualism, and Spanish/Hispanic immigration in the U.S.

**Olesya Kisselev** (University of Texas at San Antonio) is an assistant professor in the Department

of Bicultural-Bilingual Studies, College of Education and Human Development at The University of Texas at San Antonio. Her research is in the areas of second and HL acquisition, second language (L2) and HL pedagogy, and learner corpus research. She has published and presented widely on these topics at national and international venues. Dr. Kisselev has been involved in the field of heritage language for many years, both as a researcher and as a language practitioner. She has served as faculty at the HL Research Institutes since 2008 and co-edited a special issue of the *Heritage Language Journal*. Dr. Kisselev has also taught Russian language courses and developed curricula and instructional materials for the innovative Russian Flagship program at Portland State

University. She is also a published author and has conducted professional development training of teachers of Russian as a foreign/heritage language.

**Joy Kreeft Peyton** (PhD, Georgetown University) is a senior fellow at the Center for Applied

Linguistics and the founding member and current director of the Coalition of Community-based Heritage Language Schools. She is co-editor of *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource* and *Handbook of Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages in the United States: Research, Educational Practice, and Policy*. She has over 35 years of experience in the field of languages, linguistics, and culture in education. She has worked with teachers and teacher trainers in K-12 and adult education programs across the U.S. and in other countries to improve their instructional practice. She serves on a number of project and editorial advisory boards focused on improving education and outcomes for students learning a second language.

**Alegría Ribadeneira** (PhD, University of Florida) is Distinguished Professor at Colorado State

University – Pueblo. She specializes in HL teaching and teacher training. She has worked with the Heritage Center for ten years on several projects. In addition to HL teaching, she is an expert in educational technology and collaborates with Regional Leaders of Open Education. At her Hispanic serving institution, she transformed the Spanish curriculum to address heritage students’ unique learning needs. She is currently leading a project to develop the nation’s four-year Spanish HL program with zero-cost textbooks. She has won teaching and service awards at her university, and on state, semi-national, and national levels—including the inaugural *Olga Kagan Award for Advancing HL Education* and the *2021 Open Education Global Award*.

**Julio Torres** (PhD, Georgetown) is Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics and

Multilingualism in UC Irvine’s Spanish & Portuguese and Language Science departments and directs the Spanish language program and minor in Spanish/English bilingual education. His research interests include heritage and L2 acquisition, bilingualism, cognition, and task-based language learning. He is co-editor of *El español como lengua de herencia* (Routledge).

## Staff

**Kathryn Paul** (UCLA Anderson School of Management MBA Certificate), the Heritage Center’s

Managing Direct, has over 30 years of experience in grant and project management for government and foundation funders, and is a representative for the UCLA Administrative Managers Group. Ms. Paul has won three UCLA awards for staff excellence.

**Arturo Díaz** (ABD, UCLA) is the executive director of UCLA’s CWL and a Ph.D. candidate in

the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at UCLA. His research focuses on heritage languages with a concentration in Spanish, bilingualism, dialectal variation, language contact, sociolinguistic theory, and syntax. He has co-authored published chapters in the *Handbook of Research and Practice in Heritage Language Education* (2018) and *Urban Sociolinguistics: The City as a Linguistic Process and Experience* (2018). He manages the Center’s workflow and its compliance with government and university policy.

**Sanja Laćan**, (PhD, UCLA) is Managing Editor of the *Heritage Language Journal*. She holds a

PhD (2018) in Slavic Languages and Literatures from UCLA. Sanja has authored articles analyzing gender and nationality in Croatian cinema, as well as American prestige television series such as *The Sopranos* and *Mad Men*. She has taught courses on Russian language, literature, and

Imperial history; Soviet history and popular culture; Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian language and culture; analytical writing; and second language pedagogy.

**Oliver Chien** (UCLA) is the Multimedia Coordinator for UCLA’s International Institute and

liaison to the Institute’s IT team. He specializes in video and still photography, video and audio editing, Web design, graphic arts and animation, scriptwriting and interactive media. He will provide IT services for four center projects: the Digital Repositories (R2); Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges (LT2); Open Educational Resources Initiative (LT3); and the Community- Based HL Schools (CB3).

# Budget and Cost Effectiveness

## Budget

We request $197,000 each year (total $788,000 over four years). The majority of this is for salaries and benefits. The second largest category is Other, for project consultants (including the co- directors and one associate director) and related travel. The third largest category is travel for Heritage Center personnel to present at conferences and workshops.

**Table 3: Budget Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Budget Category** | **4-year total** | **Notes** |
| Personnel | $347,157 | Principal Investigator & various staff |
| Fringe Benefits | $155,621 |  |
| Travel | $27,654 | Airfare, lodging, M&I for conferences and workshops |
| Supplies | $11,715 | For workshops, projects, and general use |
| Other Direct Costs | $171,232 | Consultants, travel, communications, & rental space |
| Indirect costs | $58,370 | 8% F&A cost base |
| Total | ~$788,000 | Any discrepancies between the budget and written cost proposal are due to rounding |

## Cost Effectiveness

The total budget request does not include the following monetary and in-kind support from UCLA, partner institutions, and revenue from conference registration fees.

**UCLA’s contribution to the Heritage Center includes**: (1) office space, furniture, equipment and supplies; (2) one additional summer ninth for PI Cowe (above that requested in our budget); (2) 15% effort for Associate Director Paul; (3) IT support for Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges (LT2), Open Education Resources Initiatives (LT3), the Community- based HL Schools network (CB3), and the quadrennial international conference (CB1); (4) UCLA NRCs will support teachers to attend each Summer Teacher Workshop (LT1); (5) funding for the outside evaluator; and (6) UCLA’s Center for Digital Humanities and Office of Instructional Development will provide foreign language technology consultants and access to the computer and language labs.

**Partner organizations also contribute:** (1) the Coalition of Community-based Heritage Languages Schools supports Joy Peyton (CB3); (2) the Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages and the Berkeley-UCLA Southeast Asia NRC will provide travel and support for the Southeast Asian Language Pedagogy Symposia (LT4); (3) Kansas University’s Open Language Resource Center (OLRC) will provide support for the speaker at multiple professional development workshops pertaining to OER (LT1 & LT3); (4) the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa’s National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC) will provide travel and support for speakers at the Summer Teacher Workshop (LT1) and the Project-Based Language Learning study (R4); (5) the Pennsylvania State University’s Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research (CALPER) will provide travel and support for speakers at the Summer Teacher Workshop (LT1) and Digital Repositories (R2); and (6) Research Institutes are hosted at

universities that provide the meeting space and audio-video resources. In addition, we work with other NLRCs and NRCs to share advertising and recruiting activities that reduce our costs and broaden participation.

The Heritage Center is maximally cost effective in large part because of leveraged funds from other sources. Staff and faculty appointments accurately reflect the effort for Center programs without administrative burden; we monitor and report spending and time commitments.

# Evaluation Plan

## Approach

To address the needs of all stakeholders, we are guided by Patton’s Utilization Focused Evaluation framework. In this approach, we compile and interpret data in order to: (1) facilitate the DoE’s mandated reporting process; (2) provide Heritage Center leadership with metrics on program performance and outcomes; (3) allow practitioners to express their goals and preferences; and (4) meet the needs of HL speakers and learners. The framework deploys a mixed-method approach using qualitative data to validate and contextualize quantitative measures. This allows us to track performance, outcomes, procedures, and alignment with sponsor requirements, all toward improving program effectiveness and impact.

Thomas P. Miller & Associates (TPMA) will provide consulting services to implement the framework. TPMA has abundant expertise in this regard, having served as external evaluator on 13 DoE grants (including Title VI centers), 16 multi-year U.S. Department of Labor grants to higher education institutions, and numerous foundation grants. **TPMA will**: (1) create and advise on evaluation protocols (both procedures and instruments); (2) conduct interviews and focus groups for which outside facilitation is preferred; and (3) provide an external perspective during

preparation of the annual and summative reports. TPMA is also certified in Human Subject Protection and will host surveys on its secure server to ensure respondent confidentiality. TPMA also serves as the evaluation consultant for all UCLA Title VI centers—this will facilitate evaluation of programs in which multiple centers participate and provide economies of scale in data collection and reporting.

**Heritage Center staff and faculty will then replicate or adapt these model protocols for all projects and collaborate with TPMA to refine them throughout the grant cycle.** We will meet twice each year with TPMA to review the evaluation *process* in order to improve data collection. We will have a third meeting to review the evaluation *findings*, identify substantive improvements needed in program delivery, and discuss the annual report. Between formal meetings, Heritage Center staff will consult with TPMA as needed by phone and email.

## Methodology

Our mixed-method approach will utilize data of various types from multiple sources. All evaluation instruments and procedures are subject to review by UCLA’s IRB.

### Quantitative Measures of Program Output

For every program, we will use internal records to enumerate such relevant output indicators as: # of participants or attendees, webpage visits, downloads of materials, podcast views, lessons created, articles published, citations, certificates awarded, *etc.* Center staff will record these data during or after program delivery.

### Qualitative Measures of Program Outcomes

We will use interviews and focus groups to capture information on program effectiveness with respect to stakeholders’ needs and challenges. We use this data to understand the “how” and

“why” of the stakeholder experience—*i.e.,* to provide context to quantitative measures (see below). It helps us plan more effective, scalable, and sustainable programming. Data collected during the formative stage of new projects will also be used to improve program implementation.

The Heritage Center Executive Committee and Program Leaders will consult with TPMA to develop interview and focus group goals and identify participants. TPMA will help write questions and protocols which avoid leading respondents; it will also develop focus group discussion guides with probes to generate follow-up information. It will also serve as an independent interviewer/facilitator so respondents feel free to share information; TPMA will provide Heritage Center staff with verbatim records. (Respondents’ identities will only be shared with permission; otherwise, detail and context will be provided after removing identifying information.)

Qualitative data will be analyzed using Glaser and Strauss’s (2012) grounded theory. This thematic inductive methodology codes data into categories, subcategories, and themes to identify respondents’ interests and concerns. By triangulating across focus groups, interviews, and open- ended survey questions—and considering both articulated and *un*articulated responses—the analysis produces context-specific, detailed, and ecologically valid representations of stakeholder interests. TPMA will compile narrative summaries of the coded data and collaborate with Heritage Center project leaders to interpret the findings.

### Quantitative Measures of Program Outcomes

We use surveys to capture aggregate data about program effectiveness with respect to stakeholders’ needs and challenges. Data will be interpreted in the context of the quantitative data to increase program effectiveness, scalability, and sustainability. Data collected during the formative stage of new projects will also be used to improve program implementation.

The Heritage Center Executive Committee and Program Leaders will consult with TPMA to develop survey instruments and identify respondents. TPMA will design questions using best practice to minimize the burden on respondents and increase responsive rates. Instruments will contain both closed-ended Likert-scaled and open-ended questions. Heritage Center staff will administer surveys using either paper or web-based methods (such as SurveyMonkey or custom webpages). Surveys administered online will use skip logic, pre-filled fields, and similar techniques to minimize burden and increase response rates. To ensure confidentiality, TPMA will host the online survey and report aggregate results to the Center.

Quantitative data will be cleaned and validated generating descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations, frequency counts) and crosstabulations. Where there are sufficient numbers of cases, we will disaggregate to allow comparisons across groups. TPMA will recommend appropriate univariate/multivariate analyses, which will be performed by Center staff.

### Review of Material

* Materials created for **LT3 Open Enrollment Resources** project will be submitted to the California Open Educational Resources Council for inclusion in the new California Open Source Digital Library.
* We will consult with two collaborating initiatives (CLARINO in Norway and Giellatekno in Sweden) for materials submitted to the **R2 Heritage Language Repository** in certain Scandinavian languages. We will reach out to collaborators in other languages as appropriate.
* Curricula for **LT2 Online Teaching Certificates and Badges** will be reviewed by the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages.

### Annual and Final Reports

For the first three years of the grant cycle, TPMA will provide an annual report of qualitative and quantitative findings on those projects in which they participate. They will prepare a final report in the fourth year, describing all evaluation findings related to program implementation and outcomes in response to the evaluation questions. The report will include a summary of each project, evaluation methodology, data collection and analysis procedures, and recommendations for future programming. Center staff will incorporate this into our final report to the agency.

## Model Evaluation Plan

The evaluation will engage multiple stakeholders to track output and outcomes and to identify ways to improve content and process. Here, we present a model evaluation plan for one project to illustrate when and how data will be collected and how TPMA and the Center divide responsibility for the process. The protocols described would be replicated or adapted as needed for other projects. The final evaluation plan for each project and for the full Center will be developed in consultation with the DoE and TPMA upon notification of the award.

This model plan is for **LT3: Open Education Resources Initiative**. It was chosen

because it engages a broad range of stakeholders. It is directly integrated with Teacher Workshops and Certificates and Badges (LT1 and LT2). Indirectly, moreover, textbooks and materials developed could be presented at Conferences (CB1) or promulgated through Community Based Schools (CB3). Participants in the Community College Focus Groups (R4) are also expected to play an important advisory role in defining the need and form of materials. The metrics and activities described under each data type are not a comprehensive list; they are meant to serve as examples.

### Formative Evaluation

As a new project, we will undertake a formative evaluation both to identify ways to improve project implementation and to identify stakeholders’ criteria of effectiveness. TPMA will facilitate focus groups for the Teaching Certificates and Badges project (LT2) and the Heritage Center’s application for Summer Workshops (LT1). Both will ask about needs for and awareness about OER materials; interest in developing them; and current and preferred methods/formats for using OER curricula.

### Summative Evaluation

To measure ***Program Output****,* Heritage Center Staff will use internal records of participation in projects LT1 and LT2 to compile a list of materials developed by type; # of scholars and teachers participating in their creation; and # of badges earned. We will also survey schools which download materials to determine the # of classes adopting them and # of students served.

To measure ***Program Outcomes & Effectiveness***, TPMA will convene a teacher focus group to explore the quality, usefulness and relevance of: training videos for OER design; the Summer Workshop as a mechanism to develop materials; the online certificate/badge modules; etc. Heritage Center Staff will conduct a conference attendee survey to measure impressions about the clarity the presentations; the likelihood they will adopt the materials; the quality, usefulness and relevance of the materials, etc. We will request schools downloading the materials to also distribute a survey to teachers and students to measure their satisfaction with format, ease of acquiring the materials, etc. Data will be collected annually.

## Reporting

Each year, we will compile the evaluation findings for all projects into a report that is discussed at

the Heritage Center’s annual Advisory Board meeting. The Director will compile evaluations of process and goals alongside expert assessments for all individual projects, and transmit this as an annual report to the DoE. The Center Staff will present its report in whatever format the DoE requires, to be determined when the grant is awarded. We will produce concise reports with actionable recommendations accessible to internal and external audiences.

# Adequacy of Resources

## Institutional Support

The Heritage Center draws on the talent, management, programmatic experience, and financial support of the UCLA Center for World Languages (CWL) and UCLA International Institute.

The CWL pioneered the field of HL learning, teaching, and research and has led the field for nearly 40 years. It provides significant leverage in support of the Heritage Center. Its administrative staff has decades of experience managing language programs for the U.S. Departments of Education, State, and Defense; the National Security Agency; the National Endowment for the Humanities; and the American Council of Learned Societies. CWL provides offices and meeting rooms, computers, printers, copy and fax machines, projectors, cameras, and recorders. CWL’s other grants and contracts also support and complement the Heritage Center’s activities.

CWL is a unit of UCLA’s International Institute, which provides IT support and fund management. The Institute also administers two existing NRC Area Studies Centers (i.e., Center for Near Eastern Studies and UC Berkeley-UCLA Consortium for Southeast Asian Studies) and four proposed centers which will compete for NRC awards in the current cycle (African Studies Center, Asia Pacific Center, Center for European and Russian Studies, and Latin America

Institute). Each of those six NRC proposals include support for the Heritage Center’s teacher training workshops in languages relevant to their missions. The Institute also contributes to TPMA’s evaluation contract.

The Heritage Center also has full access to computer labs, research libraries, and other support from UCLA’s Summer Sessions office, Center for Digital Humanities, and Office of Instructional Development. UCLA provides classrooms for workshops and courses and conference venues for meetings of all sizes.

## External Collaborations

The Heritage Center collaborates with six institutions for additional leverage to our budget request. These partners include an evaluation consultant, a school district, three LRCs, and one NRC:

(1) external evaluator Thomas P. Miller & Associates, (2) Glendale Unified School District, (3) Kansas University’s Open Language Resource Center; (4) Penn State’s Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research, (5) the University of Hawaii’s National Language Resource Center; and (6) the UC Berkeley-UCLA Consortium for Southeast Asian Studies and Asia Pacific Center. These collaborations are described in the evaluation section and project list (see Section VI.C, below).

# Need and Potential Impact

Our program is designed to take advantage of HL speakers’ and learners’ ability to reach high proficiency and to meet their pedagogical needs. In Section A, we describe their characteristics and instructional needs based on our survey of ~2000 HL learners in U.S. colleges and universities (Carreira & Kagan, 2009, 2011). In Section B, we identify the main settings for HL instruction in the U.S. and discuss needs. In Section C, we present a full slate of our projects.

## HL Speakers and Learners

### Speakers of Languages other than English

The U.S. Census Bureau collects data on speakers of languages other than English (LOTE), including people who immigrated to the U.S. (~15% of U.S. residents are foreign born) or were born in the U.S. to immigrant parents or parents who speak a U.S. indigenous language. The Census Bureau estimates that nearly one-fifth of U.S. residents speak a LOTE at home. This rate varies and in some cities is substantially higher than the national figure: for example, LOTE speakers make up 58.3% of Los Angeles, 77.6% of Miami, 48% of New York, 37% of Phoenix, and 35.5% of Chicago.

### Table 4: Languages Other than English Spoken in the U.S. (million speakers)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Language** | **1990** | **2000** | **2010** | **2016** | **2020** |
| Spanish | 17.4 | 28.0 | 36.9 | 39.1 | 40.5 |
| Chinese | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.4 |
| Tagalog | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Vietnamese | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| French | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Korean | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.09 |
| German | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | .88 |
| Arabic | .4 | .6 | .8 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| African Languages | not listed | .2 | .8 | 1.1 | 1.38 |
| Russian | .2 | .7 | .9 | .9 | .94 |
| **Totals** | **24.69** | **37.75** | **49.34** | **52.62** | **53.79** |

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau: Census 1990, Census 2000 (Languages other than English Spoken at Home); American Community Survey, Table B16001 (Languages Spoken at Home for by Ability to Speak English for the Population 5 years and over), 2010, 2016, 2020 5-year estimates.*

Table 4 shows U.S. Census Bureau data on speakers of ten LOTE languages or language groups. From 1990 to 2020, the total number of LOTE speakers more than doubled and six of ten increased. Except for Spanish, German, and French, all are LCTLs; moreover, African languages are “*truly less commonly taught*” and are studied almost exclusively by HL learners (Gambhir, 2001).

### HL Speakers’ Characteristics

Our survey of 1,700+ college-level HL learners in the U.S. (Carreira & Kagan, 2009, 2011) remains the basis for the information in this section and informs the design of our research and language and teaching projects. While this is our most recent data, we will update this data based on responses to a detailed survey in 2023 (Project **R3: Heritage Language Survey**), conducted across a larger geographical area of the U.S. than the 2009 survey.

HL speakers typically are dominant in their heritage language until they start school, when they rapidly switch to English. Nearly all survey respondents reported following this pattern and shifting to English at about the age of six. As adults, most respondents reported speaking English most of the time while remaining proficient in their HL and using it regularly at home and in their communities.

This pattern of early dominance and continuing but diminishing proficiency in an HL results in specific language gaps: because of the home-based nature of their language knowledge, even HL speakers with high oral/aural proficiency rarely can use their HL in formal, academic, or professional settings. The survey responses reveal a complex profile of HL speakers’ language abilities: most respondents rate their proficiencies as low in writing, intermediate in reading and speaking, and as native-like only in listening (which is the most difficult skill for L2 learners). Appropriate HL instruction must target these gaps rather than covering the elementary structures

and home-based vocabulary typically taught in foreign language classes. Moreover, gaps must be addressed with care to avoid causing students insecurity about learning their heritage language.

### HL Speakers' Potential

HL speakers’ potential to reach high-level proficiency faster than L2 learners is widely acknowledged. Although HL speakers fall short of “native speaker” proficiency (Benmamoun, Polinsky, & Montrul, 2010), they have significant advantages over L2 learners and “usually possess skills that a non-native speaker of the language would require hundreds of hours to acquire” (Kagan & Dillon, 2001, p. 510). Kagan (2005) reports that many Russian HL learners who are illiterate in Russian nonetheless have measurable speaking proficiency. Davidson and Lekic (2013) found that 70% of Russian HL speakers tested at ILR Level 4 (ACTFL Distinguished) across all modalities after completing a year abroad in a rigorous undergraduate language program, and the remaining 30% tested at ILR Level 3 (ACTFL Superior). All HL learners in their study tested higher than L2 learners in the same overseas program.

Language experts call for initiatives to capitalize on HL speakers’ potential: Wiley and Bhalla (2017) support Spolsky’s (2011) call for a U.S. national language policy that includes attention to heritage speakers’ potential, and an ACTFL position statement (2010) argues that optimal instruction for HL speakers should provide an opportunity to reach full bilingualism and biliteracy for participation in the global economy. Similar views are expressed by those concerned with economic competitiveness and global engagement, e.g., the Council for Foreign Relations’ article *A “Language for Jobs” Initiative.* A 2007 Senate hearing on U.S. language strategy included testimony by an undersecretary of defense who characterized a military program drawing on HL learners’ language and cultural skills as "wildly successful" and advocated increased efforts

by the U.S. government to develop their proficiency to meet national language needs (Lost in Translation, 2007).

## Educational Settings for HL Instruction

**Regular K-12 Classrooms**

A 2020 survey by the California Department of Education found that administrators and world language teachers cited an absence of professional development opportunities as a major barrier to success in the classroom. The second-most cited challenge was the need for suitable curriculum and materials. Heritage speakers were mentioned specifically as an underserved group: Wiley and Bhalla’s (2017) compared K-12 foreign language enrollments with U.S. Census Bureau data and found that the languages taught in K-12 schools do not correspond to the languages spoken by school-age HL speakers.

HL instruction is not offered to most HL speakers in elementary and secondary grades; HL and L2 students are treated the same and appropriate instructional materials are not available. Indeed, most U.S. HL learners receive inadequate instruction because their teachers’ formal training does not include discussion of their special needs (Carreira & Potowski, 2011). Fewer than five US schools of education offers a formal HL teaching certificate or even list a class on HL teaching in its catalogue. Insofar as more than 65 million Americans speak a language other than English at home and increasing numbers are enrolling in classes that teach their home languages, the extent of this deficiency is considerable.

Kagan’s (2017) study of public schools in metropolitan Los Angeles confirmed this pattern: while Spanish and Chinese are widely taught in the region, languages of other large immigrant communities (e.g., Tagalog/Filipino, Persian, Russian, and Vietnamese) are either taught in only a few communities where they are spoken, taught irregularly, or not offered at all.

Seven percent of the teachers in the 2020 survey “raised issues of equity and access in language classes, and the challenge of meeting the needs of specific student groups.”

### Dual Immersion Programs

According to a report by American Councils Research Center (2021), approximately 3,600 dual language immersion (DLI) programs operate in U.S. public schools. These programs offer content and language instruction in English and in another language that for a student could be either a foreign or a heritage language. Nationally, most DLI programs are in Spanish, but DLI programs often reflect languages spoken locally as well (e.g., Armenian in Glendale, CA; Hmong in St. Paul, MN; Polish in Chicago). This poses a challenge to providing equitable access to instruction for HL learners in DLI programs for LCTL: research guiding on DLI implementation emphasizes Spanish programs or English Learners without reference to variation in language profiles. Providing resources to inform teachers about the needs of different HL communities will help expand educational resources and opportunities to HL students of LCTLs.

In addition, our work with a local school district revealed that parents or caregivers in some HL communities resist expanding DLI beyond the elementary school level, citing concerns over their children’s English language development. This is despite research on specific languages which dispels these notions for certain language communities. Sohn and Merrill (2008) found that scores in reading, math, Korean, and English in two Los Angeles Korean DLI primary schools were equal or above scores of students in area English-only schools. Development of outreach materials is thus an important adjunct to development of curriculum.

**Higher Education**

Across all levels of HL education, Carreira (2014) found persistent shortages of appropriate materials and teacher training in post-secondary settings, despite significant growth in the number

of dedicated HL classes in the past decade; in another study (2017) she found an absence of materials for mixed HL/L2 classes. Carreira confirms Beaudrie’s (2011) claim that pedagogical practices in HL-dedicated classes are often not informed by research on HL instruction. She finds that instruction in college-level mixed HL/L2 classes tends to focus solely on L2 learners, and HL speakers' pedagogical needs are rarely addressed. This lack of teacher preparation, HL-suitable materials, and attention to HL learners’ needs prevents them from reaching their potential.

Citing Kagan and Dillon (2001/2003), Carreira and Hitchins Chik (2018) recommend that instruction for mixed HL/L2 classes be based on the principles of: (1) differentiated instruction, to meet the needs of all students; (2) scaffolding of what HL learners already know to build new skills (e.g., from speaking on a topic to reading about it); (3) macro-based teaching which begins with complex texts in all modalities to develop correctness and cohesiveness; and (4) project-based language learning (PBLL) that aims at applied problems.

Indeed, the Heritage Center’s most recent teacher workshops have emphasized principles of PBLL. Participating instructors (at all levels) have raised questions about how to implement the framework in established curricula that require the completion of textbook units or other materials. Higher education teachers—especially those of LCTLs—have questioned the efficacy of an approach that has been generally implemented with commonly taught languages. While literature on PBLL shows it to be highly effective in mathematics and science, there is a scarcity of research about this approach in the language classroom generally and none on heritage language. In addition, community college instructors who have attended our summer workshops have identified a variety of institutional barriers to expanding HL instruction on their campuses. They cite a lack of suitable curricula and materials as well as difficulty scheduling distinct HL courses. Moreover, they note that community college students have substantially different needs and skills

than students who matriculate from high school to four-year institutions. A 2021 Modern Language Association report on college-level language enrollment also identifies issues complicating community college students’ ability to pursue HL study.

### Community-based Heritage Language Schools

The vast majority of work focusing on student outcomes of HL instruction is conducted at the university level (Bowles & Torres, 2021). This is natural, given that studying instructional settings is central to universities and they can recruit participants for research studies from their classes fairly seamlessly. However, a result of this focus is that minimal inquiry has been focused on the other contexts in which HL instruction occurs, including public and private K-12 schools and community schools. **In particular, little is known about community HL schools, with just a handful of studies in the literature**. Because K-12 schools rarely teach the languages offered in community schools (Wiley & Bhalla, Kagan 2017), these schools are often the only possibility for instruction in many heritage languages.

Understanding of the goals, methods, and culture of community language school teaching is critical for the vitality of HL education. These schools are staffed by a variety of people, often including parents who are native speakers of the language who volunteer their time to teach and promote the heritage language and culture. They come from a variety of professional backgrounds but seldom have received teacher training in education, language teaching, or HL acquisition. However, they are highly motivated to maintain and transmit their heritage languages and cultures, and eager to understand the impact their work is having on their children’s development.

**Table 5. Needs and Heritage Center Projects That Address Them**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Needs** | **Research** | **Learning & Teaching** | **Community Building** |
| Prepare HL speakers to use their HL in personal, formal, academic, and professional settings | R1 – R5 | LT1 – LT5 | CB1 – CB4 |
| Identify and target specific gaps in HL learners’ competencies | R1 – R4 | LT1 – LT5 | CB1 – CB3 |
| Shorten time to develop high-level competency in critical languages | R1 – R5 | LT1 – LT5 | CB3 |
| Exploit knowledge HL learners bring from their home-based exposure | R1 – R5 | LT1 – LT5 | CB1, 3 |
| To offer effective instruction in languages taught to K-12 grades that reflect languages spoken in HL communities | R1 – R5 | LT1 – LT5 | CB3 |
| Incorporate HL instruction into bilingual DLI education |  | LT5 |  |
| Understand HL challenges and solutions in community schools |  |  | CB3 |
| Understand HL challenges and solutions in DLI programs |  | LT5 |  |
| Acquire pedagogically sound HL teaching materials | R5 | LT1, 3, 4 | CB3 |
| Provide teachers with sound training to serve HL learners |  | LT1 – LT5 | CB3, 4 |

## Heritage Center Projects for 2022-2026

To address the issues cited above, we have created a framework of interrelated projects that are listed and described in detail below. See Section VIII for a resume of the results anticipated and dissemination activities.

### Research Projects (R Series)

**R1. Research Institutes (Continuing Project, Years 1-3)**

Project Leader: Maria Polinsky; Project Advisor: Silvina Montrul

The Heritage Center convenes a summer Research Institute every year except during the quadrennial Heritage/Community Language Conference. Diverse groups of scholars across disciplines meet to share research findings and set new directions. In the last cycle, 61 scholars presented 29 papers and 68 posters; we convened six panels, 11 moderated question sessions, and three tutorials; 29 LCTLs were discussed and analyzed and two special issues of the *Heritage Language Journal* were published on LCTL heritage languages and on linguistic complexity. An important goal of our institutes has been to expand the audience of language researchers to include language practitioners; we will continue this focus by providing themes that appeal to a broad audience. The following areas of focus are planned for the upcoming grant cycle: (Year 1) Immigrant languages and cultures in a post-pandemic world; (Year 2) Language loss in teenage bilingual populations; and (Year 3) Differences between HL *speaking* and HL *learning.* In particular, the research institute for Year 2 will recruit participants for the Community-Based HL Schools project (CB3).

### R2. Digital Repositories (Continuing and New Project, Years 1-4)

Project Leader: Olesya Kisselev; Project Advisors: Maria Polinsky

In the last cycle, we started development of a digital repository to facilitate the collection, storage, and ethical sharing of data from scholarly HL research on any language. The repository makes accessible a variety of formats including spontaneous speech samples, elicited narratives, videos of structured and semi-structured interviews, written responses collected in experimental settings, and written samples collected in naturalistic (e.g., classroom) settings. This fully searchable database is designed to: (1) facilitate replication and meta-analysis; (2) enable collaboration among researchers studying different languages; (3) avoid duplication and permit division of labor; (4) provide a mechanism to meet federal agencies’ data sharing requirements; and most importantly,

to (5) facilitate access to materials in less-commonly-taught languages. We will work with Pennsylvania State University’s CALPER to complete programming for this project in Year 1, and publicize its availability at our Research Institutes (R1) and conferences (CB1), encouraging scholars to contribute their materials. In addition, we will create a second repository specifically for pedagogical materials. We will include materials from our past professional development events, and incorporate newer materials developed in our Summer Teacher Workshops (LT1), OER Initiative (LT3), and Southeast Asian Language Pedagogy Symposia (LT4).

**R3. Heritage Language Survey *(Continuing Project, Year 1)***

Project Leader: Melissa Bowles; Project Advisors: Julio Torres

To better understand issues affecting students in higher education, we have updated the Heritage Center’s 2009 survey to examine how college HL programs impact language proficiency as well as outcomes that are not strictly linguistic (e.g., motivations and attitudes). The survey will gauge learners’ self-ratings in their heritage language using reliable and valid methods, but also using language that is broadly accessible and familiar to teachers. We piloted the survey with two classes in the last cycle but suspended it because of pandemic disruptions to language classrooms. In the upcoming cycle, we will launch the survey at the national level to obtain detailed data about higher education HL speakers and their educational experiences in the HL before and during college. We aim to learn what factors helped them further their HL knowledge, predict higher self-rated proficiency, and increase motivation to transmit the HL. We foresee this factor analysis feasible only in larger languages (e.g., Chinese, Korean, Spanish, etc.), but we expect to obtain a smaller yet valuable dataset on under-studied languages as well. Results will inform updates to the Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges Course (LT2), and they will be disseminated through peer- reviewed journals and conferences (CB1).

**R4. Community College Focus Groups *(New Project, Years 1-4)***

Project Leader: Susan Bauckus; Project Advisor: Melissa Bowles

To address the issues that community college instructors have cited above, we will create a working group to gather data on community college Spanish and Russian HL learners and their environment, surveying instructors and students at 10 Los Angeles area colleges. We will convene a focus group to discuss instructional issues that will inform the development of a teacher survey of the types of classes offered in their language programs, heritage speaker enrollment, instructional challenges, the complications of teaching mixed HL/L2 classrooms, levels offered, materials and strategies used, best practices, instructors’ experiences of students’ academic and socio-affective needs, instructors’ educational backgrounds, and the education they have received in HL teaching. Results from this survey will be used to create a second student survey that will allow us to assess the needs and skills of community college HL students. An analysis of the surveys will be used to inform updates to the Online Teaching Certificate and Badges course (L2), and they will be disseminated through the peer-reviewed journals. We will also work with an instructor from Mt. San Antonio College to create a panel presentation by community college instructors at our quadrennial international conference (CB1).

### R5. Project-Based Language Learning (New Project, Years 3 & 4)

Project Leader: Irina Dubinina; Project Advisor: Julio Rodriguez

To address questions about the implementation and efficacy of PBLL (cited above), the Heritage Center will conduct a pilot study with the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa’s NFLRC to examine the PBLL framework in Russian and Spanish university language classrooms. This two-pronged approach will focus on teacher implementation and student outcomes. Instructors of Russian and Spanish will participate in our Summer Teacher Workshop (LT1) in Year 1 and complete

NFLRC’s PBLL training. In Year 2, they will implement PBLL principles in their curricula, document processes of materials development and implementation, identify challenges and successes, and assess student engagement and motivation.

The project will document PBLL implementation in language classrooms, with reference both to general issues of language instruction and issues specific to different HL communities. It will examine how PBLL can be integrated effectively into existing language curricula; specify conditions for optimal results; and address potentials and limitations in PBLL design, execution, and classroom presentation. Results will be used to update content in the Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges course (LT2), and disseminated through collaborating centers’ websites, Summer Teacher Workshops (LT1), conferences (CB1), and peer-reviewed journals.

### Learning and Teaching Projects (LT Series)

**LT1. Summer Teacher Workshops (Continuing Project, Years 1-4)**

Project Leader: Melissa Bowles; Project Advisor: Alegría Ribadeneira

The Summer Teacher Workshops provide needed professional development opportunities to create suitable curriculum and materials for HL learners. K-16 and community school instructors receive training in the principles of HL curricula through a three-week asynchronous online pre-session that covers two modules from our Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges (LT2). This is followed by a one-week in-person session at UCLA to develop materials. The focus of the workshop has been and will continue to be the design and production of materials for HL instruction. Instructors in the California Department of Education survey cited above mentioned the absence of or difficulty of finding up-to-date authentic materials for language instruction. In the upcoming cycle, we will work with Kansas University’s OLRC, which develops and evaluates OER materials for language learning, to emphasize the creation of OERs in line with our OER

Initiative (LT3). We will also work with the NFLRC to integrate its PBLL framework from project R5. Workshop participants will work in teams to locate authentic sources appropriate for their students’ proficiency and interests; they will then design, create, demonstrate, critique, and adapt materials from those sources; and determine how best to incorporate them into instruction. In Year 2, this workshop will be critical to train the instructors who will be part of our PBLL study (R5).

### LT2. Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges (Continuing & New Projects, Years 1-4)

Project Leader: Claire Chik; Project Advisor: Alegría Ribadeneira

To fill gaps in language teacher training and expand opportunities for asynchronous professional development, the NHLRC developed five self-paced online modules for teachers whose classes include HL students: (1) Key Concepts and Pedagogical Approaches in Heritage Language Teaching; (2) Understanding and Meeting the Language Needs of Heritage Language Learners;

(3) Differentiated Instruction: Responding to the Needs of Individual Learners; (4) Strategies for Teaching Mixed HL/L2 Classes; (5) Tying it all Together: Principles of Project-Based Language Learning.

These modules are used in our Summer Teacher Workshops (LT1), and they are also open to the public. Since publicly launching the program in 2020, 225 participants, representing 22 languages, have taken at least one module. In total, 226 badges and 36 certificates have been conferred. The popularity of the modules indicates the pressing need for training in the area of HL education. With the evolution of HL pedagogy and increasing demand for online teaching, there is an acute need to expand the program. We will do so as informed by the HL Survey (R3), Community College Focus Groups (R4), PBLL study (R5), and OER Initiative (LT3).

### LT3. Open Educational Resources Initiative

Project Leader: Alegria Ribadeneira; Project Advisor: Jonathan Perkins

To address the need for appropriate materials for HL classes, the Heritage Center will support the development and use of OERs for HL teaching. This project will be integrated with the Summer Teacher Workshops (LT1) and other professional development opportunities. We will work with the OLRC to convene other workshops to teach HL practitioners about principles of OER design. They will learn how to adopt, adapt, and create openly licensed materials and deploy best practices for their use and dissemination. The Center will also explore existing OER repositories and technologies to determine the best platforms to house the materials produced by participants. Workshops will be offered in different modes (e.g., live, online synchronous, and asynchronous) to increase access. The NHLRC will also curate a series of videos and tip sheets that instructors can access as needed. Results will be integrated into our Summer Teacher Workshops (LT1) and inform updates to the Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges course (LT2).

### LT4. Southeast Asian Language Pedagogy Symposia (New Project, Years 2 & 3)

Project Leader: Melissa Bowles; Project Advisor: Juliana Wijaya

Given the large number of Southeast Asian HL Learners, the Heritage Center will collaborate with the joint-Berkeley-UCLA Center for Southeast Asian Studies and the UCLA Asia Pacific Center to host two language pedagogy workshops focused on that region. These workshops will cover such topics as differentiated instruction, PBLL, oral proficiency assessment, and technology training for classroom hybridization.

In Year 2, the collaborating centers will host a “Teaching Indigenous and Endangered Asian Languages” symposium to highlight scholarship from researchers from Asia and language instructors in the U.S. In Year 3, another symposium “Connecting Discourse Analysis to Asian Language Instruction” will train Asian language instructors on how to improve their classroom

interaction using contextual and discourse analysis of authentic texts and speech in different social contexts. Both symposia will extend language teaching research into practice and give HL LCTL researchers and teachers opportunities to network. The Heritage Center will interview invited presenters at the symposia as part of our initiative Bridging Research and Practice (CB4).

### LT5. Dual Language Immersion (New Project, Years 2-3)

Project Leader: Julio Torres; Project Advisor: Peter Cowe

During the last funding cycle, we studied the attitudes of parents/caregivers of children enrolled in the Glendale Unified School District’s dual language immersion programs. The study was prompted by district administrators who had indicated that certain language communities had expressed resistance to expanding DLI past the elementary grade level, citing concerns over the English language development as mentioned above. These schools provide an ideal environment to analyze parental/caregiver attitudes towards DLI programs, their perception of its linguistic and affective impact on their children’s language development, and the teachers’ resources and training to address the needs of these HL learners. The study has focused on language programs in Armenian, Korean, and Spanish, which have a high representation of HL learners from the local communities. In the next cycle, we will expand the study to the student population to understand the motivation, attitudes, and needs of HL learners in DLI programs, and analyze what factors contribute to the development, maintenance, and retainment of the heritage language beyond DLI. Results from the study will be used to create guidelines and literature for teachers and parents, and they will be disseminated through presentations directed toward school administrators and families, and the Bridging Research and Practice project (CB4).

### Community Building Projects (CB Series)

**CB1. Conferences (Continuing Projects, Years 1-4)**

Project Leader: Kathryn Paul/Arturo Diaz; Project Advisor: Peter Cowe

The conferences below will provide venues for disseminating information on our projects.

* We will host the Fifth Quadrennial International Conference on Heritage/Community Languages (Year 4). This is the premier forum for HL researchers, practitioners, and other specialists to share knowledge and meet collaborators. More than 300 domestic and international participants attend the conference, spanning multiple disciplines and languages. The event also provides a venue to showcase the results of our work throughout the grant cycle. In particular, we plan to include presentations and panels from our research projects HL Survey (R3), Community College Focus Groups (R4), and the PBLL study (R5).
* Heritage Center faculty and staff attend the annual ACTFL Convention and, in collaboration with other LRCs, present workshops and sessions (Years 1-4). This venue is ideal to showcase our Digital Repositories (R2), Summer Teacher Workshops (LT1), Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges (LT2), and OER Initiative (LT3).
* We will participate in the annual conference of the Coalition of Community-based Heritage Language Schools that is hosted by the American University. The venue will be used to start a new initiative to pair HL researchers with community school teachers (see CB3 below).
* In 2026, we will participate in the Southwest Conference on Language Teaching hosted by the NFLRC in Hawaii. This venue will be used to showcase our collaborative study on PBLL (R5).

### CB2. Heritage Language Journal (Continuing Project, Years 1-4)

Project Leader: Sanja Laćan; Project Advisor: Andrew Lynch

The *Heritage Language Journal* (HLJ) has defined the field since its founding by the NHLRC in 2002. We partnered with Brill Publishers (a leading publisher of language and linguistics-related research) in 2021 to create a sustainable publication platform. This has brought new distinction and increased visibility to the journal, substantially raising its global standing in the field of HL studies. The number of submissions and published issues has increased substantially over the past four years. Top HL scholars published in the journal in 2021. The peer-reviewed HLJ is an important organ to disseminate the results of all our projects.

### CB3. Community-Based HL Schools (Continuing Project, Years 1-4)

Project Leaders: Melissa Bowles; Project Advisors: Joy Peyton

The Heritage Center has worked closely with the Coalition of Community-based Language Schools (Coalition) in their effort to create a network of resources, professional development opportunities, and support for HL community schools. In the upcoming cycle, we will continue our work with Coalition leadership and membership to disseminate information and expand the network for community school teachers. In addition, the Heritage Center’s Education Director will present at the Coalition’s annual conference.

To foster understanding of outcomes of HL teaching in these schools, we will also introduce a new initiative to pair HL researchers with community language school teachers and their communities. Scholars will share expertise and provide feedback on teaching, while teachers will provide data on pedagogical approaches and outcomes. The project will result in a database that will include contact information and experts’ language(s) of expertise. We will also produce a report and present findings at the Coalition conference, produce webinars/podcasts on best practices for community school teaching (disseminated through the Center’s and Coalition’s websites), and conduct interviews for our Bridging Research and Practice project (CB4).

### CB4. Bridging Research and Practice (New and Continuing Projects, Years 1-4)

Project Leader: Julio Torres; Project Advisor: Melissa Bowles

In our efforts to foster understanding between language researchers and practitioners, the Center will expand our Webinars and Podcasts Project. Between 2018 and 2021, we recorded and published 18 podcasts and three webinars for teachers of HL learners. We will continue these publications and expand into an HL YouTube Channel. Interviews with scholars will present research published in the HL Journal (CB2) in lay terms accessible to teachers and parents. Roundtables with parents and teachers will highlight practical problems that can motivate research. We will also use these media to promote and publicize our projects on the Southeast Asian Language Pedagogy Symposia (LT4), Dual Language Immersion (LT5), and Community-Based HL Schools project (CB3), both to teachers and parents, and promote the benefits of HL education.

# Likelihood of Achieving Results

The Heritage Center met nearly all of our project goals in the current funding cycle despite the COVID-19 pandemic and expects to achieve similar results in the next cycle, based on:

* **Experienced leadership and management:** The Center’s PI and co-Directors are thought leaders with decades of experience in research and project management. Dr. Cowe serves as director of the UCLA Center for World Languages and he worked with Dr. Olga Kagan in activities related to the Armenian HL community. Dr. Polinsky has served as co-director of the Center since its founding, and both she and Dr. Bowles have collaborated on various projects in previous cycles. Our Associate and Executive Directors and Center staff have more than 50 years of combined experience. Program officers from several federal agencies have cited them for exemplary performance, fiscal transparency, and responsiveness. Project

Leaders’ expertise and contributions were summarized in Section II (above); more details can be found in their vitae in Appendix I.

* **Logistic and financial support from UCLA and our Partners:** UCLA’s International Institute will provide fund managers and IT support for all web-based programs. The budgets of six UCLA NRCs include funding to support participation by teachers of languages relevant to their missions to participate in our summer professional development workshops. In addition, Kansas University’s OLRC, Pennsylvania State University’s CALPER, and the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa’s NFLRC will contribute resources for program delivery.
* **Guidance from our formative evaluations:** Our outside evaluator will design and conduct formative evaluations to identify procedural or substantive changes to operational plans that are needed to achieve our proposed outcomes. In addition, they will provide us with guidance as we conduct formative evaluations for all new projects to review recruitment, delivery, and participant satisfaction.
* **Demonstrated Commitment from Partners and participants:** The impetus for many of our new programs comes from the intended consumers: teachers, professional societies, school districts, and community schools. This engenders a commitment to implementation and fosters development of long-term relationships. Indeed, two of the projects proposed in this cycle were suggested by and will be led by people who originally participated in our summer workshops.
* **Methods and Procedures for Ensuring Project Success:** Before any project begins, its project leaders will establish a work plan outlining procedures, activities, tasks, and due dates. The Managing Director will review these and present them to the Executive Committee and

Board of Advisors for approval. Project leaders will make quarterly progress reports to the Executive Committee with reference to the approved work plan.

* **Project Oversight:** Each project has been assigned to a member of the Board of Advisors for oversight. Communication between project leaders, the Advisory Board, and the Executive Committee is of the utmost importance; accordingly, the Heritage Center’s Assistant Manager will track project scope, tasks, and resource use, and ensure timely and appropriate communication.
* **Project Linkages:** The projects described above form an interrelated framework of activities, which exploit leverage and synergy, and translate research into practice. For example, results from the research on PBLL (R5) and the OER Initiative (LT3) inform the content of the Summer Teacher Workshops (LT1) and Online Teaching Certificates and Badges (LT3); and these results are disseminated through our conferences (CB1), HL Journal (CB2), and initiative to Bridging Research and Practice (CB4).

# Description of Final Form of Results

Every Heritage Center activity and project will produce concrete, shareable results and involve the widest possible representation of languages and learning institutions, educational levels, and geography, and we will make these results available to the public. In addition to our efforts to reach out geographically and across levels of education, our collaborators at other NLRCs have agreed to disseminate Heritage Center results. Work products will be disseminated on the shared LRC website, listservs and the ACTFL Heritage Special Interest Group Newsletter.

The following lists the final form of results for each Heritage Center project by category.

### Research Projects (R Series)

Work products include reports, articles, and conference presentations that inform and expand the field. We disseminate these products at workshops and conferences, on the Heritage Center and other NLRC’s websites, through networks in our Community Building projects, and through peer- reviewed publications.

### R1: Research Institutes

We publish a web page for each research institute with a call for proposals, registration information, and schedule of presentations. At the institute’s conclusion, we post abstracts, posters and presentations. Some institutes result in a special issue of the HL Journal (CB2) guest edited by participants. For example, two recent issues focused on the research institute’s themes on lesser studied LCTLs and linguistic complexity.

### R2. Digital Repositories

The project websites will include instructional webinars on how to register, gain access, and submit language data, along with an explanation of the federal data-sharing requirements. In addition, we will conduct tutorials during the research institutes, showing real-world application of the repositories, and present a session at the Quadrennial International Conference (CB1).

### R3. Heritage Language Survey

We will publish tables, graphs, and a summary of survey data on the Heritage Center’s website and will submit an analysis to a peer-reviewed journal.

### R4. Community College Focus Groups

We will publish tables, graphs, and a summary of survey data on the Heritage Center’s website and will submit an analysis to a peer-reviewed journal. We will organize a panel on community colleges for the Quadrennial International Conference (CB1).

### R5. Project-Based Language Learning

The webpage for this project will include language- and community-specific case studies and guidelines for incorporating projects into curricula for HL learners and mixed groups. Data from this project will also be used to create lesson plans for the Online Teaching Certificates and Badges course (LT2).

### Learning & Teaching Projects (LT Series)

These projects will produce syllabi, teaching guides, curriculum templates, lesson plans, reports, and white papers for various languages. Materials will be disseminated through the Center’s and partners’ websites and published in peer-reviewed and practitioner journals.

### LT1. Summer Teacher Workshops

Participants will create lesson plans, course modules, and similar materials. The workshops’ webpages will include the schedule, required readings, assigned online asynchronous activities, video presentations and transcripts, guides and resources for creating OER materials for HL and mixed classrooms, and links to download participants’ materials.

### LT2. Online HL Teaching Certificates and Badges

Our five existing modules will be revised and enhanced based on consultation with experts, participant feedback, and data from other projects. We will add lessons on creating OER and PBLL materials. We will advertise the opportunity to earn certificates and badges at conferences and other LRC websites.

### LT3. Open Educational Resources Initiative

The OER materials we develop will be available on the Heritage Center website. A new webpage will include links to resources explaining OER, guides to creating OER materials (developed in collaboration with Kansas’ OLRC), videos, and links to materials developed on other platforms.

### LT4. Southeast Asian Language Pedagogy Symposia

Our webpage for this project will include announcements, schedules, abstracts, selected readings, presentations from the symposia, and any materials developed by participants. UCLA’s Center for Southeast Asian Studies and Asia Pacific Center will host mirror pages.

### LT5. Dual Language Immersion

The webpage for this project will include guidelines for parents and support materials for teachers of dual immersion classes, and links to video interviews that are recorded for the Bridging Research and Practice project (CB4). In addition, we will produce informational materials for parents, such as brochures and presentations, that highlight the advantages of long-term HL development.

### Community Building Projects (CB Series)

Proceedings, agendas, recordings of plenary and session presentations, and podcasts of conference keynote speakers’ presentations, will be uploaded to the Heritage Center website.

### CB1. Conferences (Continuing Projects, Years 1-4)

The web page for the conference will include the call for papers, the conference program, schedule, abstracts, and the text or recordings of plenary talks.

### CB2. Heritage Language Journal

HLJ is now published in conjunction with Brill and is available for individual subscription as well as part of a package subscription that many academic institutions make available to their faculty. HLJ’s first 17 volumes are available through Open Access on the Brill website.

### CB3. Community-Based Heritage Language Schools

The Coalition website includes information on the yearly conference, which will be held virtually or in person. In addition, it will present information on the languages represented in the coalition; results of a survey on community schools in the U.S.; a searchable database and an interactive Google Map identifying U.S. community schools; webinars on issues relevant to community language schools; presentations and resources from past conferences (including recordings of some talks). Future conferences will generate similar materials. NHLRC- generated materials, including the project report and recommendations on community school teaching, will be available on both the NHLRC and Coalition websites.

### CB4. Bridging Research and Practice (New and Continuing Projects, Years 1-4

We will add new podcasts to the project’s existing webpage. We will also create a YouTube channel that will showcase a series of interviews with researchers about recently published articles on HL-related topics and information that results from our projects.

# Competitive Preference Priority

**Promoting Equity in Student Access**

The Heritage Center has established connections with language instructors of 10 community colleges in the Greater Los Angeles Area to analyze structural impediments to HL instruction and recommend solutions. We plan to continue to work with the following colleges with our

Community College Focus Groups (R4): East Los Angeles College, El Camino College, Glendale Community College, Long Beach Community College, Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles Mission College, Mt. San Antonio College, Pasadena City College, Santa Monica College, and West Los Angeles College. All of these colleges are Hispanic- and Minority-serving institutions, and the language faculty teach Arabic, Armenian, Chinese, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Turkish, and Vietnamese.

As part of our deliverables for R4, we will work with an instructor from Mt. San Antonio College to organize a panel on community colleges and LCTLs for the Center’s Quadrennial International Conference (CB1). In addition, we prioritize community college faculty at our conferences and professional development workshops (LT1, LT3, & LT4).

In particular, OER resources are especially important in community colleges due to students’ limited financial resources. The OER Initiative (LT3) will be particularly relevant to strengthen equity and increase access for these students.
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