

**A
PLURALITY
OF VOICES**

**REPORT OF THE
LANGUAGE TASK FORCE**

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

2005

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Governing Principles and Assumptions.....	5
3. The Linguistic Landscape of the Greater Toronto Area	7
4. Language Experiences Elsewhere.....	9
5. Language Teaching and the Undergraduate Student Experience	12
6. Languages in Graduate Programs	17
7. Less Commonly Taught Languages: Teaching, Research, and Public Policy	19
8. Language Teaching in the Summer	21
9. Language Resources and Technical Support	22
10. Recommendations.....	25
Appendices.....	29
1. Membership of The Language Task Force.....	29
2. Languages Spoken at Home in the GTA (Statistics Canada 2001 Census Data).....	30
3. Non-official Languages Used at Work (Statistics Canada 2001 Census Data).....	33
4. Registrants by First Language in Direct-Entry Programs, University of Toronto	35
5. First-Entry Student Survey, University of Toronto	36
6. Proposal for University of Toronto Language Citation.....	38
7. Language Task Force Undergraduate Questionnaire	39
8. Languages Taught in Arts and Science	43
9. Language Task Force Graduate Questionnaire	45
10. Recognized Campus Groups related to Languages	47
11. Student Associations Related to Departments Providing Language Teaching	48

Executive Summary

Language activity makes a significant contribution to teaching and research in the Faculty of Arts and Science at the University of Toronto. Languages are spread across at least fourteen units, more than 20% of Arts and Science students take one or more languages, and language study is important for our graduate programs and for professional training. The work of the Language Task Force represents the first comprehensive study of language activity in the Faculty. Language study at the University is diverse and plays a significant role in the undergraduate student experience, in research training, and in the internationalization of the curriculum.

Dean Pekka Sinervo established the Task Force and its membership in March 2004. The Task Force met between May 2004 and March 2005, examined practices at peer institutions, gathered information from relevant units, and consulted widely. Our information indicates a high level of common practice in language teaching among Arts and Science units and a strong commitment to the presence of regular faculty in the language classroom. It also indicates that the University's support for language instruction has not kept pace with the growth of new academic fields and new initiatives in research and teaching. The Task Force acknowledges that addressing the historical unevenness in institutional support for new languages, while maintaining strength in traditional areas, will be one of the most difficult challenges for the University, yet also one of its most important opportunities.

The Task Force is making a series of recommendations to enhance opportunities

and resources for languages in Arts and Science. The key recommendations include:

1. Under the sponsorship of Arts and Science and Simcoe Hall, 2006–07 should be designated the *Year of Languages* at the University of Toronto. During this year Arts and Science and its academic units will hold public events focused on teaching and research in languages, and introduce initiatives to enhance the place of languages in undergraduate studies, graduate studies, and research.
2. Arts and Science should establish a standing Dean's Advisory Committee on Languages, with membership from appropriate sectors of the Faculty.
3. Arts and Science should create and maintain a web portal for language study at the University of Toronto, and prepare a brochure for incoming students on language study in the Faculty.
4. Arts and Science should introduce a Language Citation Program to encourage students to proceed beyond the introductory and intermediate levels of language study.
5. Faculty members from appropriate sectors – language departments, social science departments, and college programs – should develop a proposal to the Academic Initiative Fund that will link the University, the local communities, and the federal government in supporting the study of less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) at the University of Toronto.

6. Humanities and social science units should work with the administration in building flexibility into the graduate funding formula and in intensifying summer activity for the purposes of language study, archival research and field work.
7. The Dean's Advisory Committee on Languages should collaborate with departments and the School of Graduate Studies to improve instruction in research languages for graduate students.
8. Units should collaborate with Arts and Science in expanding the range of summer language activity, by enriching the language courses available in the summer term and using the web portal to publicize these offerings. Summer courses should include language sequence courses, courses in literature and culture, Latin courses at the Centre for Medieval Studies, the initiative for South Asian languages, and special courses in less commonly taught languages.

1. Introduction

The Language Task Force was established in the spring of 2004 with a threefold mandate: analyze the current state of language instruction for our students, review current and alternative models for the teaching of both living and dead languages, and develop a set of recommendations regarding how language instruction can best be supported by the Faculty and the University. Feedback was also requested concerning how language instruction supported other academic priorities.

Chaired by Acting Vice Dean David Cameron, the Task Force included representatives from the Departments of East Asian Studies, French, Germanic Languages and Literatures, History, Italian Studies, Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations, Slavic Languages and Literatures, Spanish and Portuguese, and the Centre for Medieval Studies (a full list of members is included in Appendix 1). From May 13, 2004 to March 2, 2005, the Language Task Force met on twelve occasions, received written submissions from several units, and made a formal presentation at the Humanities Retreat on January 14, 2005.

No other committee has previously surveyed the remarkably diverse language programs spread throughout the departments, colleges, and programs of the Faculty of Arts and Science. As a result, the Language Task Force conducted two surveys to collect basic information on the more than forty languages offered in the Faculty, one for languages taught at the undergraduate level and one for

those required as research languages at the graduate level. Many of the results and recommendations of the Task Force are based on the data collected. The breadth and depth of the language programs in the Faculty makes it difficult to conduct a truly comprehensive review, yet this report represents the first endeavour in what should be an ongoing process of surveying the teaching of languages at the University. We acknowledge the support and assistance of the staff in the Registrar's Office – particularly Kelly Jay and George Altmeyer – in gathering and collating information. We are also grateful to Ida Ferrinho for her assistance as secretary to the Task Force.

During the course of the review, the Language Task Force was impressed with the many strengths of language instruction at the university, while noting that the Faculty faced several challenges. Most importantly, the Language Task Force recognized the significance of language courses for the undergraduate student experience. At a time when the Faculty is seeking to improve faculty-student ratios, the Language Task Force observed that language courses offer one of the few venues for students to participate in a succession of small class settings from their first year right through to their graduating year.

The work of the Language Task Force supports and intersects with the activities of the LLUT Virtual Centre (Languages and Linguistics at the University of Toronto).

LLUT is concerned with connecting research and teaching in linguistics across departments and Faculties and can also provide important links for language study through the proposed web portal on language activity at the University of Toronto.

The Task Force also recognizes the significance of languages to the university's recent emphasis on internationalization. Whether in support of the increasingly global reach of research projects or in support of the Faculty's goal to double the size of the study abroad program, the acquisition of languages is key to achieving our international academic priorities. One of the challenges facing the faculty is how best to support language instruction for areas of research that are new to the university.

As an overarching recommendation, the Task Force proposes that the 2006–07 academic year be declared the Year of Languages at the University of Toronto. Such a year will raise the level of awareness of the centrality of language instruction to academic priorities across the divisions and will provide a concentrated time period for implementing the recommendations of the Language Task Force

in areas as varied as coordination and publicity, advancement initiatives, graduate research, undergraduate student experience, teaching, and summer term initiatives.

The central objective that informs the various recommendations of the Task Force is to strengthen teaching and research in languages over the period of the *Stepping Up* Plan. Increases in the following areas will be among the measures that will indicate success in achieving this goal are:

- the number of students enrolled in language courses in Arts and Science
- the number of sections offered each year, including summer teaching
- the percentage of courses and course sections in language taught by tenured, tenure-stream, and teaching-stream faculty
- the number of languages taught on a regular basis in the context of the Arts and Science curriculum
- enrolment in language, literature, and culture courses in the 300- and 400-series
- participation in international programs, including summer study, exchanges, and Study Elsewhere
- enhanced training and professional development for graduate students.

2.

Governing Principles and Assumptions

The following principles and assumptions have guided the Task Force in its deliberations and inform its recommendations. Some follow from current practices in language teaching and research at the University of Toronto; others describe best practices in the profession or principles related to current planning priorities.

1. Language study can play a significant role in the student experience. Language courses are best when classes are small. Students must be involved in active use of the language and language instructors often serve a significant mentorship role during the course of a student's study at the University of Toronto.
2. Best practices in language teaching integrate linguistic skills with literature, culture, and social practice. The University can build awareness of these best practices through institutional support of teaching initiatives.
3. The study of modern languages at the university level responds to all levels of linguistic expression, but stresses the formal registers in speaking, reading, and writing.
4. The range of languages that can be studied in the Faculty of Arts and Science is a significant strength of the University of Toronto and contributes to the richness and diversity of the student experience.
5. Language acquisition and cross-cultural understanding are significant to the internationalization of the curriculum. A meaningful program of international experience includes the study of languages and cultures.
6. Ancient, medieval, and modern languages are the subject of fully developed disciplines within the humanities, involving the acquisition of technical skills, cultural literacy, and knowledge of historical and literary traditions. Such study takes place at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
7. In their linguistic features, social functions, and literary and cultural traditions, languages are an object of scholarship and research. They are also instruments of research in other disciplines and are crucial to many forms of interdisciplinary collaboration. The teaching of languages for research purposes is a priority of research universities.
8. Differences in the structures and writing systems of languages have implications for teaching and learning, and approaches to teaching and coordinating language courses must have the flexibility to deal with linguistic differences.

Significant areas of study demand greater language expertise, particularly in less commonly taught languages (LCTLs).

9. Our language courses address the skills and needs of a linguistically and culturally diverse student population. Many of our students speak languages other than English, and are acquiring a third or fourth language at the university level. This

diversity has implications for teaching methods, placement, and research opportunities. Language study may be a key to building connections with the city of Toronto.

3.

The Linguistic Landscape of the Greater Toronto Area

When analyzed by mother tongue, the total population of Canada includes residents from 160 languages, more than 100 of which are currently spoken in the metropolitan census area of Toronto. If by linguistic diversity we mean the range of languages routinely used in public and private settings, Toronto is one of the most linguistically diverse cities in North America. This fact alone distinguishes Toronto from other cities in Canada and from most in the United States. In the past 50 years or so, immigration from virtually all areas of the globe has transformed Toronto into a multiracial, multiethnic, and multilingual metropolis. Of all immigrants entering Canada in a given year, 42% settle in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), where they can count on the support of established ethnic communities. Almost half (49%) of GTA residents were born outside of Canada, while 43% belong to visible minority groups. The cultural backgrounds of the largest ethnic communities are Chinese, Italian, East Indian, Filipino, and Portuguese, in descending order.

Within the ethnic communities of the Toronto area, language loyalty, understood as the frequency with which the language of origin is used at home and at work, varies from one community to the other but is on the whole very high. Over 33% of residents speak a language other than English at home, and at least 49 different languages are used at work.

The highest degree of loyalty is shown by Torontonians of Chinese origin, 80% of whom regularly speak Chinese at home while 68% speak it at work. By comparison 43% of those of Italian origin speak Italian at home while 21% speak it at work. In 1996, children from immigrant families accounted for 22.5% of the school-age population (ages 6 to 18), up from 16% in 1986 and likely to increase proportionally by 2006. Data for the metropolitan census area of Toronto from the 2001 census are supplied in Appendices 2 and 3.

Several communities have successful radio and television programs, magazines and newspapers, religious services, and a variety of social services in their language of origin. The GTA has 79 ethnic publications, while public libraries located in ethnic communities include in their holdings collections of books, records and films in the heritage language of the community. Within each community the awareness of language loss among its own second-generation speakers and the need for professional services (lawyers, doctors, psychologists, social workers, accountants) in the language have induced a large number of community organizations to provide – frequently in collaboration with the support of the consular offices of their countries of origin – language courses for adults, while other community centres offer heritage courses for children, designed to enhance language loyalty and to preserve cultural identity.

The chief implications of this linguistic landscape for the University of Toronto are the following:

1. The student population is probably characterized by a degree of cultural and linguistic diversity comparable to that of Toronto and its surrounding area. Registration records for the past five years indicate that in direct-entry programs a large proportion of registrants list a language other than English and French as their mother tongue. Unfortunately only aggregate figures are available (Appendix 4), so it is not possible to compile a list of all the languages involved. However, precise data are available from a survey sample of 2309 undergraduate first-entry students (Appendix 5). If we assume that the linguistic cross-section of this group corresponds to the linguistic cross-section of the total student population, we can say (i) that approximately 43.6% of our students were born outside of Canada, and (ii) that their linguistic diversity includes at least 61 languages other than English.
2. We have a highly diverse student population in language courses and departments are faced with particular challenges to sequence courses which accommodate the needs of students with mixed language experience, for example, both genuine beginners and those with high oral fluency but limited or no knowledge of the written language
3. Canada needs educated speakers of a wide variety of world languages both for specific language skills and for advanced research.
4. The GTA can serve as a resource for the University community providing a rich array of local cultural and linguistic resources.
5. Many ethnic communities have provided substantial financial support to the university for courses, student scholarships, and bursaries. The Office of Advancement should continue to develop these links with appropriate communities.

4.

Language Experiences Elsewhere

The Task Force looked at the organization and philosophy of language instruction in selected post-secondary institutions in Canada and the United States. The other institutions were selected as peer units, whether public or private. One (Middlebury) was chosen because of its renown as a centre of immersion language teaching in the summer months. The experiences and contacts of members of the Task Force also influenced the inclusion of institutions that were known through members' areas or disciplines. The goal of these comparisons is to see where the University of Toronto fits in a broader spectrum, to consider what we might emulate, and to identify what we should not or cannot do.

Middlebury

This is a small wealthy private institution known for its intensive summer language programs. It offers undergraduate and graduate programs, including an MA in languages, over a two-summer period. It is a practical degree, focused on pedagogy. The general emphasis is on oral expression, and the intensive summer program is significantly supported by federal government money (much of it from the Department of Defense). The Middlebury model is considered not commensurate with Toronto's needs and expectations.

Harvard

Harvard was cited as an example of how institutions can raise students' consciousness

about language study. Every incoming student receives a booklet, *Languages at Harvard*, which gathers information about language study in one place. The Harvard booklet is seen as a model of how the University of Toronto could raise the profile of language study by publicizing resources and opportunities that already exist here.

Stanford

Language teaching at Stanford is kept separate from literature and culture teaching and is coordinated by the Stanford Language Center. The Language Center was created to oversee all language instruction at Stanford. At present there are 60 full-time lecturers on contract. The Language Center coordinates overseas study programs, live-in language residences and placement testing. On most departmental websites, information on language teaching is re-directed via the Language Center's home page. A large number of minor languages are offered on an on-demand basis, subject to funding. Stanford offers centralized on-line placement testing and language residences, and it puts special emphasis on its state-of-the-art digital language laboratory. Undergraduates are required to complete one year of foreign language study.

Cornell

In contrast to Stanford, language teaching at Cornell is decentralized and integrated into the various undergraduate literature and culture programs. The language lab has a website that gives a clear overview of languages offered at

Cornell. Like Stanford, Cornell offers live-in language residence options, and it places special emphasis on its state-of-the-art digital language laboratory. After having experimented with a centrally administered language teaching facility (like Stanford's), Cornell reintegrated language instruction into the departments. However, the various language departments still offer a unified face via the Language Resource Center, essentially a language laboratory and media library. There is an undergraduate language requirement for three semesters of language study (if starting at the introductory level), or an intermediate level course for students with some background already.

Michigan

This institution receives federal money under Title VI to support area studies including language programs. Its model appears to resemble that of Cornell, inasmuch as languages are taught within departments and are integrated with literature and culture programs. Like Cornell, Michigan's languages present a common front on the web via the Language Resource Center. In addition to its language laboratory and media library functions, the Language Resource Center also aspires to serve as a clearing-house for language pedagogy support.

Indiana

Another Title VI institution, whose mandate for language study allows it to enrich languages across the curriculum. Indiana at one time contemplated moving beginning language teaching to a centre, but this option was rejected in favour of continued integration within departments. There is an Office of International Programs that handles all types of non-academic or extracurricular activity and coordinates resources. Undergraduates are required to take four semesters of language. Indiana's web page publicizing its foreign language opportunities represents a possible model for the University of Toronto. Like the Harvard booklet, Indiana's web page serves the purpose of highlighting language offerings

and giving them a more visible profile.

Berkeley

Like most of the other institutions cited here, Berkeley teaches languages within departments, linked to literature and culture curricula. Since 1994 the Berkeley Language Center has served as a coordinating body for language learning, offering professional development courses for language instructors, research support, curriculum support, technical support, and access to materials for language teaching and research via a dedicated library and archive.

UCLA

Like Berkeley and many others cited here, UCLA teaches languages within departments tied to literature and culture curricula. There is a UCLA Language Resource Center web portal, with links to various UCLA services and information sites, including a list (and links relevant to) foreign languages offered at UCLA. The Language Resource Center has an office address, but it does not appear to have a more extensive bricks-and-mortar presence.

McGill

McGill teaches languages within departments, and language instruction is integrated with literature and culture courses. (Both English and French get privileged treatment, since they are not considered "foreign.") Placement testing is decentralized, and there is no special funding for language courses. A limited number of summer courses are available.

On the basis of this survey of peer institution, the Task Force offers the following comments.

There is substantial peer support for the existing Toronto model, in which academic staff teach languages within departments and the curriculum integrates language, literature, and culture courses, that is, *not* the specialized Middlebury or centralized Stanford models. However, Indiana, Michigan, and Cornell offer ideas for enhancing existing Toronto practices through creating (at a minimum) a

web portal focusing attention on University of Toronto languages, through experimenting with foreign language residence halls, and through properly resourcing a coordinating body to develop language laboratories and digital learning aids.

The Task Force also noted that universities such as Indiana and Michigan receive substantial federal government support for language teaching, research, and resources. The University of Toronto cannot hope to match the resources of these universities, yet through intensive Advancement outreach, and a more complete understanding of language

resource needs, the University of Toronto can substantially increase the range of language activities at the University.

Several universities have adopted Foreign Language Citation Programs (e.g. the University of Chicago, Harvard University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University) which encourage students to continue language study beyond the introductory and intermediate levels. The University of Toronto should develop its own citation program to meet the specific needs of our undergraduates. A proposal for such a program is included in Appendix 6.

5.

Language Teaching and the Undergraduate Student Experience

The Task Force prepared a questionnaire on language instruction at the undergraduate level in Arts and Science and distributed it electronically to academic units in November 2004. The intent of this survey was to gather information on the current scope and depth of language activity within the Faculty. Specific questions addressed various aspects of language teaching within and beyond the classroom, including the number of languages taught, the number of levels of each language, weekly contact hours, teaching methods, assignment of instructors, TA training, language sequence coordination, uses of instructional technology, placement of students with native ability, international opportunities, and community outreach. Units were also invited to submit additional comments or concerns to the attention of the Task Force. The questionnaire was sent to 43 Chairs, Principals, and Academic Directors; 13 responses were received. The results are summarized here under nine general headings. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix 7.

Languages Taught in Arts and Science

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the University of Toronto offers instruction in over forty languages. The languages differ in manner of instruction and years of study offered, but taken together they exemplify the wealth of language teaching activity at the University.

Languages are taught in at least fourteen different departments, centres, and college programs, some at the undergraduate level, some at only the graduate, many at both levels. Some are offered through a four-year language sequence, others through one year of language instruction, and many through two or three year sequences. Of the forty-three languages currently offered, more than a dozen are dead languages or early forms of modern languages, taught for reading and research:

Akkadian, Ancient Greek, Aramaic, Biblical Hebrew, Classical Chinese, Classical Japanese, Egyptian Hieroglyphs, Latin, Old and Middle Welsh, Old and Middle Irish, Old Church Slavonic, Old English, and Old Norse-Icelandic.

The Faculty offers a wide range of living languages, languages representing a number of different language families among European, Asian, North American Aboriginal, and African language groups including:

African: *Bantu* Swahili

Asian: *Sino-tibetan* Chinese; *Altaic* Japanese; Korean; *Mon-Khmer* Vietnamese

European: *Altaic* Turkish; *Celtic* Modern Irish, Scots Gaelic, Modern Welsh; *Germanic*: German, Yiddish; *Finno-Ugric* Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian; *Romance* Catalan, French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish; *Slavic* Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Czech, Macedonian, Polish, Russian, Ukrainian

Middle Eastern: *Semitic* Arabic, Hebrew,
Indo-Iranian Persian; *Altaic* Turkish
North American Aboriginal: Inuktitut,
Iroquoian–Oneida, Ojibway
South Asian: *Indic* Bengali, Hindi

In this summary of languages taught we are only able to provide a snapshot of current language activity. It does not reflect the year-to-year offerings in some departments. For example, Albanian and Bulgarian have been taught as non-credit languages for graduate students in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, and Vietnamese may be offered next year. Catalan will be offered starting in 2006. Languages taught are listed by administrative unit in Appendix 8.

The number of hours per week of instruction ranges from two to five, with most offered three or four hours per week. This variation stems from a number of factors, but is due, in part, to limited financial resources. In the Slavic Department, for example, where students already receive the most hours of instruction in the faculty, the department is seeking ways to increase the number of hours of language instruction through language labs and participation in overseas programs. Students of Slavic languages currently receive less than five hundred contact hours over their four years of study, well below the seven hundred hour threshold recommended for advanced proficiency in these languages. Many languages are offered in the evening. Currently few are offered in the summer, but the Task Force expects that this number will increase as Arts and Science expands its summer offerings.

The number of years offered in a language affects various programs; for example, European Studies requires a three-year sequence, and the Language Citation Program, if adopted, will require four semesters beyond the first year. While not all languages offered have sufficient resources to fill these requirements, there is a mix of living and dead languages, as well as a mix of language families. The languages currently offering three and four-year language sequences include:

Akkadian, Ancient Greek, Aramaic, Chinese, Czech, Egyptian Hieroglyphs, Finnish, French, German, Hebrew, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Turkish, Ukrainian and Yiddish.

There are other languages in which advanced courses in literature and culture are offered following a two-year language sequence. These languages could also be used for both a three-year language requirement and the citation program. Here are included:

Bengali, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Hindi, and Persian.

These data show that the University of Toronto has made a significant investment in language, literature, and cultural studies. We need to alert incoming students of these resources, particularly since many delay language study and find themselves without adequate skills when they continue on to second-entry programs.

We must caution that this diversity is fragile. The Task Force notes that the University's support for language instruction has not kept pace with the growth of new academic fields and the establishment of various centres of research excellence. While we are developing new fields of study (for example, African Studies, South Asian Studies, and Southeast Asian Studies), commitment to language, an integral part of these programs, has lagged behind. Some of the languages are not taught regularly (Vietnamese) and some important languages have been stopped altogether (Sanskrit) or have lost upper level courses (Turkish). These courses are integral parts of programs of study. For example, Sanskrit is essential to the study of Hinduism and Indian Buddhism, and is key both to the undergraduate and graduate programs.

The Task Force recognizes that within the existing departmental structure it has been difficult for new academic fields to find the sustained financial resources necessary to

create language programs supporting their research directions. In some cases, various units have used OTO funding to support research programs with language courses. None of these efforts, however laudable, meet the best practices as outlined in this report. As a consequence, the university has developed certain areas of excellence – social sciences on Indonesia, to cite just one example – that are hampered in their efforts to match their scholarly research with a well developed graduate program by dint of the lack of a supporting language program. The Language Task Force acknowledges that coming up with a solution for the historical unevenness in institutional support for new research languages will be one of the most difficult challenges for the university, yet also one of its most important opportunities.

Language-Teaching Methodologies

The data here indicate a common interest in explicit grammatical structures and in a balanced approach to teaching the core skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The degree of consensus is striking, given the functional independence of individual units within Arts and Science. All units report that a meaningful fraction of instructional time in beginning and intermediate courses is devoted to grammatical structures (15–70%). At the beginning level there is measurable variation between modern languages, which cluster around 20–30%, and ancient and medieval languages, which cluster around 50%. At the intermediate level this variation is less marked. In advanced language sequence courses the emphasis tends to shift toward skills in speaking, reading, and writing. The strong commitment to grammatically-based instruction may suggest a conservative approach, but responses concerning the emphases in introductory courses counter this impression. Of the 33 languages reporting, 19 stress oral communication at this level, either as a primary teaching emphasis or in balance with the skills of reading and writing. On the balance of literature and culture, 15 report more emphasis on culture and 7 an equal emphasis on the two areas. A primary stress

on literature is reported primarily for ancient languages. In these emphases the teaching of modern languages within the Faculty responds to a current shift in the profession toward communicative approaches and cultural literacy.

Instructors for Language Courses

Responses on the assignment of instructors reveal a strong presence of tenure-stream faculty in the language classroom and an almost equal presence of teaching-stream faculty. Regular faculty are more frequent at the high intermediate and advanced levels, but they contribute significantly to teaching at all levels. TAs and graduate Course Instructors are an important resource in introductory and intermediate courses, particularly in modern languages. These reports suggest that for most academic units the primary and preferred staffing resources for language teaching are tenured and tenure-stream faculty, teaching-stream faculty, and graduate students. Since the Modern Language Association of America regards the presence of regular faculty in undergraduate courses as an index of program quality, this practice indicates a high academic standard in our teaching of languages. It is noteworthy, however, that units report a continuing reliance on OTO funding arrangements for instruction in LCTLs (for example, Iroquoian–Oneida, Swahili, Bengali, Korean, Vietnamese, Finnish, Scots Gaelic). Since best practices clearly point to full-time teaching staff as the ideal, measures should be developed to provide mid- to long-term stability for languages that now depend on consecutive OTO arrangements.

Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants

Seven units report on their current training practices, for Teaching Assistants involved in teaching nine modern languages. Some of the training involves consultation with course supervisors and occasional sessions on methodology. Four units report a formal orientation session required of all TAs; each of these units also reports non-required workshops offered over the course of the

academic year. The number of required hours varies (6–20). Several units comment that improvements should be made in this area. The Task Force recommends that enhanced methods of TA training be developed, perhaps through collaboration among cognate units.

Coordination

Practices in coordinating the language sequence show wide variation. In seven units coordination falls within the responsibilities of the Undergraduate Coordinator; it is assigned in eight units to tenure-stream faculty and in twelve to teaching-stream faculty. Three units have a Language Committee that undertakes this task. The range of practices here is probably advisable, and reflects the differing demands of language sequences that vary in teaching resources and in the number of levels offered. Some review of practices for language coordination may nonetheless be advisable, particularly in cases where responsibility is currently assigned to one faculty member.

Use of Technology in Language Courses

There is little doubt that the rapid expansion of technological resources has had a profound effect on language teaching in universities. Numerous publications describe the use of CALL, e-mail, web-based, hypertext and various other technologies in language teaching, and many journals are devoted to this topic. There is little doubt that the trend toward incorporating multimedia and web-based technologies into language teaching – inside and outside the classroom – will continue to increase and that students will expect this as part of the delivery of language teaching.

The questionnaire shows a wide diversity in the implementation of language teaching technologies at University of Toronto. This is in keeping with the general findings of the Task Force, and like the general findings, it indicates a healthy diversity in the language teaching environment. Some languages are less suitable for intensive use of technology,

primarily due to a paucity of resources. This applies for example to Akkadian, Turkish, and Persian. In other cases, language instruction employs a wide range of technologies. French, Spanish, Portuguese, and the Slavic Languages are all relatively technology-intensive. In many cases, it would seem that instructional method concentrates on a more conservative approach to technology. The Task Force did not see any obvious advantage in adopting a progressive or a conservative approach to instructional technology in the classroom.

Among the technologies canvassed in the questionnaire, the most widely utilized are internet web-sites, movies, tapes and instructional CDs. E-mail is slightly less common and only French uses chatrooms. Sharing of knowledge among units may enable instructors to make better informed decisions about the uses of technology in language instruction.

When asked to comment on the types of technology that should be made available in the language labs and classrooms, there was a strong sense that the well-equipped language classroom should have access to digital projection facilities, TV monitors with VHS and DVD, CD and tape capacity and internet access. The Task Force agrees that more classrooms should be provided with these resources.

Testing and Streaming Students

The problem of placement involves determining whether a student has had some exposure to a language, and if so, how much he or she knows, and how that translates into the level of courses provided for that particular language. There are a number of problems that can arise from inadequately informed decisions in placing students. They can be given credit for work done before joining the department, and concern arises that students who are too advanced may create insecurity among their peers. In addition, students with native ability have specific instructional needs that are not addressed by courses designed for non-natives.

The first step is to find reliable methods for placing students. There seems to be a large degree of conformity in the method used for ascertaining the level in which a student should be placed. There is a high level of common practice; most languages utilize written placement tests at the beginning of the semester, often in conjunction with individual interviews. Some languages use questionnaires, while in others the instructor decides. French and Italian have developed on-line placement tests, in accordance with one of the current briefs of the LANG group, and such a test is in development for Spanish.

The next question after placement testing concerns streaming, that is, what does a program do with students with prior knowledge, be this from school or home, or from having lived in a country. These students constitute a specific sector of the diverse population within the Faculty of Arts and Science. Departments have developed various strategies for dealing with this, such as separate streams, special bridging courses and the like. All of these have resource implications. Some departments are facing significant challenges in this respect. It is important that existing limits on resources not determine departmental practice in placing and streaming students.

Exchange and Study Abroad Opportunities

The questionnaire showed that there is a wealth of opportunity for students of languages at University of Toronto. Some of these are very formalized, others less so. Some are short-term (3 weeks), others last a whole year. Some are administered internally by the university; others require the student to take the initiative in locating the most suitable program. The Task Force supports the growth of exchange opportunities, with special attention given to equality of opportunity for study abroad.

Programs with a Community Outreach Component

There is a large amount of activity in the area of community outreach. Such activities include public lectures, films, language courses open to the community, poetry readings and similar events. This was generally greeted as a positive aspect of language teaching, though the Task Force noted that it brings hidden costs into language teaching, including transaction costs. In this respect the Task Force noted that some languages are partially or fully funded by local communities.

6.

Languages in Graduate Programs

The Task Force prepared a questionnaire on languages required for graduate-level research and distributed it to Graduate Coordinators and Chairs of 34 academic units in August 2004. Our intent was to survey demands and expectations in the area of research languages. Graduate units were asked to identify the languages required of all students in specific programs or defined as essential for dissertation research, to describe the forms of language training and testing currently available to graduate students, and to comment on their expectations concerning the provision of languages for their students. Units were also invited to suggest effective means for meeting their language needs. The discussion here is based on the 29 responses received to the questionnaire, and on discussion within the Task Force of the place of languages and language training in graduate education. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix 9.

At the graduate level, language training is important for many doctoral programs across the Faculty. Most departments require PhD candidates to acquire proficiency in one or two languages, viewed as necessary tools of scholarly research, before they begin to work on their theses. In the language departments and in area studies departments, the languages required are additional to the primary language or languages of the discipline itself. Where two or more languages are required, one is normally regarded as basic to the discipline as a whole and is therefore mandatory (for example, Latin in the Department of Italian

Studies, German in the Department of Fine Art History), while the others are elective and determined by the candidate's precise area of specialization within the discipline.

In the humanities, proficiency is normally understood as reading knowledge. Students are expected to be able to conduct archival research, to examine primary sources, and to read contemporary scholarly prose in the required languages. Proficiency is routinely assessed by means of formal reading knowledge examinations conducted twice a year by the departments in which the languages are taught. In the anthropological sciences proficiency is generally understood as the ability to communicate orally in conducting field research and is assessed in interviews with appropriate faculty. In a few programs (for example, Linguistics) both types of proficiency may be required, though not necessarily in the same language. The most frequently requested languages are French, German, and Latin, but the range includes Albanian, Arabic, Breton, Bulgarian, Classical Chinese, Catalan, Cree, Croatian, Czech, Greek (ancient and modern), Hausa, Hebrew, Hindi and other South Asian languages, Hungarian, Indonesian, Inuktitut, Italian, Japanese, Kiswahili, Korean, Macedonian, Old and Middle Irish, Occitan, Ojibway, Old and Middle English, Old Norse-Icelandic, Old and Middle Welsh, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Sanskrit, Serbian, Spanish, Swahili, Tagalog, Tibetan, Turkish, Ukrainian, Vietnamese, and Yiddish.

Graduate programs with language requirements generally depend on the University's language and area-studies departments as well as centres and institutes with language sections for the necessary training in both types of proficiency. Currently a few units (such as Medieval Studies, German, and French) offer courses especially designed to meet the language requirements of other doctoral programs, but most other units (such as Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, and Slavic Languages and Literatures) generally offer training only in the form of introductory courses in their regular undergraduate programs. Languages for which the demand is not routinely high are taught on an ad hoc basis as directed research courses, while other languages are not taught at all. In such cases the students are forced to acquire the necessary linguistic training independently at other institutions. The Task Force notes that other universities often used as peer institutions offer internally generated funds to support language study outside the curricular offerings of the home institution through various kinds of external opportunities.

Yet the Task Force has learned that the five-year funding model for doctoral-stream students, while a most welcome initiative, has not proven sufficiently flexible to accommodate our students' need for specialized language training overseas. Students who do attend overseas language institutes often pay tuition at their host institutions, yet are still required to pay full tuition to the University of

Toronto simply to maintain their registration, despite often being thousands of miles away and not using university facilities. Moreover, one often unrecognized consequence of the new funding model has been to pressure students to complete the degree in five years, generally at the expense of attaining mastery of the second or third languages expected of scholars in their fields of expertise. These two factors – the economic disincentives for overseas language studies and the difficulties in completing language training – may make our graduate students less competitive on the academic job market when faced with students from institutions that provide students with the resources and the flexibility to develop the language skills necessary for their future careers.

It is clear from these considerations that at the graduate level our chief concern is with the teaching of languages as research tools or as languages of scholarship. The vast majority of doctoral programs formally require this kind of linguistic training. There is a consistent need to offer courses designed to give graduate students the type of proficiency they need quickly and systematically, concentrating on the instrumental aspects of language and focusing only on what students need to carry out their research. Courses designed to serve other purposes – especially in undergraduate programs in the living languages – necessarily focus on different areas of language study and are governed by different concepts of proficiency.

7.

Less Commonly Taught Languages: Teaching, Research and Public Policy

The Task Force discussed the challenges related to LCTLs at the University of Toronto, noting that at present, while many LCTLs are departmentally based, several have no stable home within the departmental structure of Arts and Science and are made available through OTO funding, sometimes with the support of local language communities. These languages are nonetheless central to program activity in the Faculty, including teaching and research in emerging fields. Several submissions were made to the Task Force from faculty members in African Studies, South Asian Studies, and Southeast Asian Studies, expressing frustration that efforts to develop new centres of excellence are hampered by the lack of supporting language programs. This has been especially an obstacle to the development of competitive graduate programs that must train students in the necessary research languages. The Task Force also noted that the initiative to create a new program in Diaspora and Transnational Studies does not include language study in its program requirements, in part because many of the relevant languages are not offered at the University.

Reference is made in our review of Language Experiences Elsewhere (Section 4) to Title VI funding for LCTLs at peer institutions in the United States. Title VI Centers, in large part funded by Defense Department money and private foundations such as the Ford Foundation, were established by the United

States Congress to train specialists in languages related to US national interests. This funding provides for the development of educational materials, stipends for language training, teaching fellows, resource centres, and foreign exchanges. The Task Force notes that the Title VI Centers provide resources beyond anything available in Canada, whether from private foundations or various levels of government. A recently published study attests to the impact of the Title VI Program; although fewer than 3% of the U.S. institutions that offer modern languages have Title VI National Resource Centers, these institutions represent 23% of all undergraduate enrolments in LCTLs and 59% in the *Least Commonly Taught Languages*; Title VI Centres account for 59% of all graduate enrolments in LCTLs and 81% in the *Least Commonly Taught Languages*.

The Task Force recommends that appropriate departments, colleges and centres develop a proposal to the Academic Initiatives Fund to provide stable arrangements for the teaching of LCTLs, to support graduate study, and to develop teaching materials related to LCTLs. This proposal will be linked to the priority objectives of the *Stepping Up* Plan: student experience, internationalization, interdisciplinary initiatives, enhanced research opportunities, and outreach and engagement in the processes of public policy. In addition, a proposal for LCTLs at the University of Toronto may create an opportunity to attract

new government funding in support of our academic mission. The role that Canada seeks in the world clearly differs from that of the United States, yet languages remain central to our national aspirations in such areas as international aid, peacekeeping, humanitarian initiatives, and trade relations. The University

of Toronto is ideally positioned to support these public policy objectives, and the Task Force recommends that units involved in teaching LCTLs work with the Faculty and with Simcoe Hall to lobby the federal government for funding of languages in the Canadian national interest.

8.

Language Teaching in the Summer

The Task Force considered various measures for increasing the range of language options in the summer. Since increasing summer enrolment is a priority in the *Stepping Up* Plan for Arts and Science, such measures should be centered in the first instance on undergraduate courses offered through the Faculty and approved by DACCA. Departments should be encouraged to make popular language courses available in the summer and to offer summer courses in such areas as cultural studies and cinema. Some courses in culture or literature in translation might be designed specifically for the summer session. The Task Force recognizes that courses must normally attract a minimum enrolment (30 students) for approval by DACCA, but notes that lower enrolments in specialized summer offerings might be balanced against higher enrolments in language and culture courses.

The summer also presents opportunities for research languages and less commonly taught languages. At present the Centre for Medieval Studies offers a successful summer program in medieval Latin, which attracts students from outside Toronto and can be offered in some cases for certification at other universities. The

School of Graduate Studies has supported summer courses for graduate students in reading knowledge of French and German. A proposal has been presented for a Summer Institute in South Asian languages at New College. These various courses are important for the academic mission of Arts and Science, but the Task Force recognizes that, with the exception of courses in commonly required research languages, they are unlikely to attract the benchmark enrolment for support from DACCA. The AIF proposal for less commonly taught language should include initiatives for summer teaching.

The Task Force recommends that Arts and Science support summer teaching through coordinating courses offered by individual units – a function already undertaken by DACCA – and by publicizing the full range of summer language activities at the University of Toronto. In cooperation with individual units, the Faculty should prepare and maintain a web portal dedicated to languages in the summer. This portal will bring summer opportunities to the attention of our own students and attract students from other universities.

9.

Language Resources and Technical Support

A variety of resources are already available for language teaching and learning. Except for the Language Advisory Networking Group (LANG), the multimedia centres and labs, and the undergraduate and graduate student societies, these resources do not specifically target languages. However, some of these resources may be adapted and/or further developed to serve language teaching and learning better.

There are five different units which offer direct support to the teaching community at the University of Toronto, in the following ways: as repositories of knowledge, through training sessions and workshops, through research and development, through consultation, and through counseling. They are: the Resource Centre for Academic Technology, the Teaching Assistant Training Program, the Office of Teaching Advancement, the Modern Language Centre at OISE, and the Language Advisory Networking Group.

Resource Centre for Academic Technology (RCAT)

Although they do not have a specific mandate to support language activities, the Centre is willing to offer specific services to the language community upon request (for example, implementation of software, workshops and support).

Teaching Assistant Training Program (TATP)

None of the services provided by the TATP is specific to language teaching. However, the program could organize seminars or prepare material dealing with specific needs or topics upon request, granted that a sufficient number of TAs are involved. This specific support could only be provided in English.

Office of Teaching Advancement (OTA)

The website offers many resources on general teaching practices (such as Classroom Management, Course Design, Teaching and Technology, Active Learning), but nothing directly related to language teaching. Teaching guides, teaching issues and links are also offered on the website.

Modern Language Centre (MLC) at OISE

The Modern Language Centre addresses a broad spectrum of theoretical and practical issues related to second and minority language teaching and learning. Potentially, the MLC could provide support to departments offering language courses in three ways. First, through research and development projects, which cover a broad spectrum of theoretical issues and practical needs related to language and literacy education in bilingual and culturally diverse contexts; second, through its Second

Language Education website, which presents a guide to second language organizations and centres, journals, resources and services, and selected thematic sites which have a presence on the web; third, through its professional expertise in the area of language teaching and instructional methodology.

The Language Advisory Networking Group (LANG)

LANG was created in 1998. To date, LANG has developed two projects to various degrees of completion, depending on the language or department involved. The first is the Multimedia Database hosted by CHASS, which allows users to search through multidisciplinary collections of objects that refer to a multitude of topics stored in a variety of digital formats. The database provides many resources for French and Italian, some resources for Spanish, and fewer resources for Arabic, English, German, Hebrew, Japanese, and Slavic.

The second project was the creation of both an online Placement Test, which is available for French and Italian, and a flexible shell that can be filled for any language (provided that the problem of font-compatibility is solved).

While the group should, in principle, have representatives of all departments involved in language teaching, as well as representatives of CHASS, only a small number of departments have been involved in its activities on a regular basis, due in part to limits on the provision of useable resources for lesser commonly taught languages and those without Roman-based alphabets. Due in part to these technical issues, many departments do not see LANG's agenda or activities as relevant to their needs and concerns.

The Task Force recommends that one of the tasks of the Dean's Advisory Committee on Languages should be to review current resources and program needs in the area of technology.

Language Teaching Facilities

Two types of facilities are available for language teaching: Multimedia Centres and labs, and multimedia classrooms.

Multimedia Centre and Labs

There are three multimedia labs on the St. George campus: St. Michael's Multimedia Centre (32 computers), University College Language Lab (24 computers) and Kelly Library Electronic Classroom (30 computers). Each lab also has one instructor work-station, a projector, a sound system with wireless microphone, tape deck, VCR, DVD-ROM player.

Basic software, such as system, lab management, administrative, server-side or security, gets updated regularly - some of it is licensed software, and some of it is free. Software needed for specific languages (for example, a dictionary or spell checker) must be purchased by the relevant departments. Hardware is replaced as needed, although replacement may be a long and disruptive process. The lab machines themselves were on lease for the last 5 years or so, and have recently come off lease with the option of purchasing them outright for a fraction of the initial cost. It should be noted that conversion to computer-only labs caused a major disruption to language departments which had to digitize a vast array of taped materials.

The number of students and instructors using the labs varies from week to week. In Fall 2004, 33 classes per week were taught at St. Michael's College, 7 classes per week at Kelly and 21 classes per week at University College. The labs are used primarily by the French Department: 18 French classes are taught at Carr Hall, 1 at Kelly and 9 at UC (per week). The Departments of Italian, English, Linguistics, and Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations also use the labs: 4 Italian classes are taught at Carr Hall and 2 at UC (per week); 6 English classes are taught at Kelly (per week);

6 Linguistics courses are taught at UC (per week); 2 in Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations are taught at UC (per week). Also RCAT and St. Michael's use the labs: 2 RCAT workshops are given at Carr Hall (per week); 2 SMC workshops are given at Carr Hall (per week). Seven OTAS periods (open to all students) are available at Carr Hall and 2 at UC (per week). The Slavic Department has used the labs in the past, but found working there difficult and not ideally suited to regular class time.

There is generally 12–25 hours of support per week in the labs, although this varies from week to week. Support is provided primarily to Teaching Assistants and Instructors. Student help is provided on an as-needed basis. However, many lab users have repeatedly encountered technical difficulties (inadequate or missing equipment, lack of support) that have led them to limit their use of the lab, if not to avoid it altogether.

Classrooms with A-V Equipment

There are 114 classrooms with A-V equipment available for courses in the Arts and Science. These classrooms are of the following types, scattered across the campus (east and west of St. George Street):

- 17 electronic classrooms equipped with: stereo sound system, front screen video/data LCD projector, room control system, network connectivity, podium, Document Camera and VHS/DVD player (13 east campus, 4 west campus)
- 5 A/V internet classrooms equipped with: internet access, TV/VCR, Cassette/CD, overhead and screen (all at St. Michael's)
- 20 A/V classrooms with TV/VCR, Cassette/CD, overhead and screen (east campus)
- 3 classrooms with screens and TVs (east campus)
- 1 classroom with sound system and 2 screens (east campus)
- 3 classrooms with projection equipment (east campus).

The Task Force notes, however, that departments have to pay on a per-class basis to use these resources (except in Sidney Smith), and, therefore, some departments are reluctant to use them. Since the University has limited resources, the Task Force recommends that serious consultation take place with academic units before major expenditures are made for technology.

Student Groups related to Language

There are two types of students associations: recognized campus groups and student associations. Recognized campus groups are voluntary organizations recognized by the Office of Student Affairs under the University's Policy on the Recognition of Campus Groups. The groups have been identified as "related to language" if their denomination reflects mainly an ethnic or linguistic interest. There are 53 recognized groups related to language (see the list in Appendix 10).

Student societies are organizations on whose behalf the University collects a compulsory non-academic incidental fee, in which membership is automatic and determined by registration in one or more divisions of the University. Course and Program Unions are organizations that represent particular subsections or constituencies within a student society. There are program and course unions within the Arts & Science Students Union (ASSU) and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU). There are 13 associations that have direct links to a department providing language teaching (see the list in Appendix 11).

The 13 undergraduate and graduate associations all interact regularly with their home academic unit. This interaction may take various forms: organization of special events, information seminars, promotion of courses, evaluation of courses. In contrast, most of the 53 recognized groups do not have an explicit link with an academic unit. They present themselves as groups who aim at gathering students of common linguistic or ethnic origin and, in some cases, at establishing links with the local community.

10.

Recommendations

The Language Task Force is making a series of recommendations to enhance opportunities and resources for languages in Arts and Sciences. Our initial recommendation brings together a number of key initiatives that highlight the role of languages as a significant part of the undergraduate experience and of graduate training. Further recommendations are clustered into the categories: coordination and publicity, undergraduate education and the student experience, graduate education, teaching and academic staffing, summer term initiatives, technology, and advancement initiatives.

The Task Force recommends:

1. Year of Languages

That Simcoe Hall:

- 1.1 Declare 2006–07 the **Year of Languages** at the University of Toronto. A number of initiatives will be coordinated to begin in this academic year. These specific initiatives are starred in the list below (*).

2. Coordination and Publicity

That Arts and Science:

- 2.1 Create a web portal highlighting language activity across the university (2005–06).
- 2.2 Create a web portal for Summer Language activities, such as summer research languages, introductory courses, intensive language study, and the South Asian initiative (2005–06).

That the sections for Communication and Student Recruitment in the Office of Advancement:

- 2.3 Create a brochure on languages at the University of Toronto to be included in the information packet.
- 2.4* Begin a new ad campaign focusing on humanities, languages and cultures at the University of Toronto (2006–07).

That the Office of the Dean: **2.5** Create a standing Dean’s Advisory Committee on Languages to undertake as one of its first tasks coordination of the Year of Languages (2005–06).

3. *Undergraduate Education and the Student Experience*

That Arts and Science and Simcoe Hall: **3.1** Recognize and promote language study as an important venue for small-class experience.
3.2* Encourage language study at advanced levels through the implementation of a Language Citation Program.
3.3 Promote international study abroad opportunities.
3.4 Promote cooperation with the colleges to enhance experiential language learning (for example, language-based housing options).

That departments and college programs: **3.5** Promote undergraduate research opportunities involving non-English language resources.
3.6 Encourage majors and specialists who intend to proceed to graduate study to undertake appropriate language study at the undergraduate level.

4. *Graduate Education*

That Arts and Science and SGS: **4.1** Examine ways to add flexibility to the five-year funding formula to allow doctoral students time to acquire research languages essential for scholarly purposes and to achieve high levels of language proficiency.

That Arts and Science and SGS, in collaboration with the relevant departments: **4.2** Develop summer research language courses at the University of Toronto.

That the Dean’s Advisory Committee on Languages: **4.3** Develop a funding model to enable departments to offer research language courses for graduate students.
4.4 Seek resources for students who need languages not taught at the University of Toronto to study elsewhere (either in-country, or at other universities), perhaps in conjunction with the AIF proposal for LCTLs.

5. Teaching and Academic Staffing

That the Dean's Advisory Committee on Languages:

5.1 Work with the Office of Teaching Advancement to support language teaching across academic units.

That the Office of the Dean:

5.2 Encourage best practices in staffing language courses through tenured, tenure-stream, and teaching-stream faculty.

5.3 Encourage best practices in graduate education and student experience by improving teaching opportunities and professional training for graduate Course Instructors and Teaching Assistants.

5.4 Explore staffing LCTLs through CLTAs at the rank of Assistant Professor or Lecturer, allowing for the recruitment of professionals with a better understanding of the integration of language, literature, and culture.

That departments, colleges and centres offering LCTLs:

5.5 Develop an AIF proposal for LCTLs, particularly for Southeast Asian, South Asian, and African languages that have no departmental home.

5.6 Work with the Faculty and with Simcoe Hall to lobby the federal government for funding of languages in the national interest.

That departments, colleges and centres:

5.7 Develop enhanced methods of TA training, perhaps through collaboration among cognate units.

6. Summer Term Initiatives

(Some of our recommendations have been mentioned above; they are summarized here)

That Arts and Science:

6.1 Create a web portal for Summer Language activities, such as summer research languages, introductory and intermediate language sequence courses, and the South Asian language initiative.

6.2 Develop summer research language courses at the University of Toronto.

6.3 Work with DACCA to develop a flexible model for teaching small-group languages in order to help the University of Toronto develop as a centre for the teaching of languages during summer term.

That departments:

6.4 Work with DACCA to increase undergraduate enrolments in summer language courses.

6.5 Consider offering popular courses in language and culture during the summer.

7. Technology

That Arts and Science:

- 7.1** Review technology needs and resources in consultation with relevant units of the University to create better access and awareness of needs.

8. Advancement Initiatives

The Office of Advancement:

- 8.1** Seek donors to support the expansion of language activity, for example, conferences, programs, chairs, particularly in areas involving less commonly taught languages.
- 8.2** Generate matching funds as seed to attract donors for language programs.
- 8.3** Seek donors for student scholarships to broaden student participation in study abroad opportunities.

Appendix 1.

Membership of the Language Task Force

David Cameron, Acting Vice-Dean Undergraduate, Arts and Science, Chair (until 12/01/05)

Susan Howson, Vice-Dean Undergraduate, Arts and Science, Chair (from 13/01/05)

Anne-Marie Brousseau, Associate Chair Undergraduate, French

Willi Goetschel, Acting Chair, German (from 01/01/05)

Allan Greer, History

Brad Inwood, Chair, Classics (until 30/06/04)

Yuki Johnson, Associate Professor, East Asian Studies (until 30/06/04)

David Klausner, Director, Centre for Medieval Studies (until 30/06/04)

Christina Kramer, Chair, Slavic Languages and Literatures

John Magee, Acting Chair, Classics (from 01/07/04)

John Noyes, Chair, German (until 31/12/04)

Andy Orchard, Director, Centre for Medieval Studies (from 01/07/04)

Domenico Pietropaolo, Chair, Italian Studies

James Reilly, Chair, Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations

Stephen Rupp, Chair, Spanish and Portuguese

André Schmid, Chair, East Asian Studies (from 01/07/04)

Appendix 2.

Languages Spoken at Home in the GTA (Statistics Canada 2001 Census Data)

	Total Speakers	Frequency of language spoken at home			
		Only	Mostly	Equally	Regularly
Aboriginal languages	15	10	10	0	0
African languages	1,075	130	250	140	555
Amharic	4,355	1,415	1,125	580	1,235
Arabic	47,060	15,525	12,980	6,015	12,540
Armenian	9,715	3,505	3,445	845	1,920
Asiatic languages	195	110	40	0	45
Austro-Asiatic languages	35	30	0	10	0
Bantu languages n.i.e.	1,535	185	300	210	840
Bengali	15,785	6,050	5,640	1,500	2,595
Bulgarian	3,815	1,410	1,335	225	845
Byelorussian	105	75	10	0	20
Cantonese	159,085	88,970	45,110	5,590	19,415
Celtic languages	10	0	0	0	10
Chinese	155,000	81,945	43,200	7,620	22,235
Cree	70	10	10	20	35
Creoles	3,210	575	390	380	1,865
Croatian	16,940	3,870	5,240	1,635	6,195
Czech	3,655	785	1,255	255	1,360
Danish	945	75	195	115	560
Dravidian languages	20	0	0	0	20
Dutch	4,840	305	700	400	3,435
English	3,940,275	2,902,975	420,160	151,505	465,635
Estonian	3,275	845	990	155	1,285
Finnish	1,945	370	675	65	835
Flemish	140	25	65	10	40
French	81,855	9,875	13,275	8,730	49,975

	Total Speakers	Frequency of language spoken at home			
		Only	Mostly	Equally	Regularly
Frisian	80	10	10	10	55
Gaelic languages	145	10	10	0	130
German	20,745	1,945	3,885	1,710	13,205
Germanic languages	770	125	125	35	485
Greek	48,535	12,630	12,700	4,370	18,835
Gujarati	35,860	11,635	10,545	4,325	9,355
Hakka	1,935	520	675	85	655
Hebrew	9,255	1,530	1,965	810	4,950
Hindi	25,825	4,975	6,595	3,185	11,070
Hungarian	14,985	3,940	4,275	1,330	5,440
Icelandic	50	0	10	20	20
Indo-Iranian languages	2,100	690	535	250	625
Inuktitut (Eskimo)	10	10	0	0	0
Italian	162,415	51,805	31,595	12,260	66,755
Japanese	6,770	2,545	1,550	340	2,335
Kannada	745	80	215	90	360
Khmer (Cambodian)	1,600	730	350	245	275
Konkani	1,135	155	120	160	700
Korean	35,670	18,950	10,120	1,205	5,395
Kurdish	1,125	390	435	75	225
Lao	2,415	995	460	525	435
Latvian (Lettish)	2,740	625	870	220	1,025
Lithuanian	2,800	980	590	195	1,035
Macedonian	11,775	2,970	3,370	1,025	4,410
Malayalam	3,515	745	1,010	225	1,535
Malay-Bahasa	2,145	460	650	145	890
Malayo-Polynesian languages	6,800	1,500	2,035	1,230	2,035
Maltese	3,645	465	685	435	2,060
Mandarin	37,120	18,860	11,640	1,275	5,345
Marathi	1,370	195	505	200	470
Niger-Congo languages	3,895	570	635	470	2,220
Norwegian	260	35	80	0	145
Ojibway	255	25	10	60	165
Pashto	3,340	1,580	1,150	135	475
Persian (Farsi)	45,150	21,020	13,675	3,460	6,995
Polish	68,715	25,535	23,050	5,895	14,235
Portuguese	98,850	37,060	24,360	7,545	29,885
Punjabi	99,000	49,180	25,780	9,675	14,365
Romance languages	100	10	45	0	40

	Total Speakers	Frequency of language spoken at home			
		Only	Mostly	Equally	Regularly
Romanian	16,770	5,970	5,915	1,185	3,700
Russian	47,330	22,910	15,820	2,205	6,395
Semitic languages	2,350	1,010	745	225	370
Serbian	16,135	6,800	5,725	815	2,795
Serbo-Croatian	5,790	2,190	2,155	340	1,105
Sindhi	5,120	990	1,655	585	1,890
Singhalese	3,805	620	1,215	170	1,800
Sino-Tibetan languages	1,425	620	355	165	285
Slavic languages	1,815	575	375	200	665
Slovak	2,735	835	730	230	940
Slovenian	3,285	545	960	355	1,425
Somali	14,465	5,995	3,820	2,315	2,335
Spanish	85,160	27,515	25,290	8,355	24,000
Swahili	1,985	445	380	190	970
Swedish	750	65	210	60	415
Tagalog (Pilipino)	82,560	17,495	24,670	17,650	22,745
Tamil	77,595	36,225	24,260	7,565	9,545
Telugu	1,805	415	710	185	495
Thai	585	135	70	95	285
Tigringa	2,430	1,040	740	205	445
Turkic languages	665	105	315	35	210
Turkish	7,360	2,495	2,195	610	2,060
Twi	8,735	2,850	2,010	1,350	2,525
Ukrainian	19,855	6,585	5,975	1,125	6,170
Urdu	58,955	20,255	19,270	8,280	11,150
Vietnamese	38,685	19,660	10,440	2,580	6,005
Welsh	75	10	20	10	35
Yiddish	2,835	335	735	195	1,570
Other languages	8,590	4,080	2,205	1,025	1,280

Appendix 3.

Non-official Languages Used at Work (Statistics Canada 2001 Census Data)

Mother tongue	Language Used at Work			
	Most often	Regularly	Never	Total
Toronto				
Total - Mother tongue	4.2%	5.5%	90.3%	100.0%
Arabic	4.3%	7.6%	88.1%	100.0%
Armenian	4.6%	9.1%	86.2%	99.9%
Bengali	2.9%	6.0%	91.1%	100.0%
Cantonese	27.7%	17.7%	54.5%	100.0%
Chinese	21.0%	15.0%	64.1%	100.0%
Cree	0.0%	14.3%	92.9%	107.1%
Creoles	1.1%	2.3%	96.2%	99.6%
Croatian	3.6%	7.6%	88.8%	100.0%
Czech	3.4%	5.9%	90.6%	99.9%
Dene		N/A	N/A	N/A
Dutch	1.4%	4.4%	94.3%	100.0%
English	0.3%	0.9%	98.8%	100.0%
English and French	0.8%	1.6%	97.5%	100.0%
English and non-official language	5.9%	8.4%	85.7%	100.0%
English, French and non-official language	6.1%	6.1%	87.2%	99.4%
Finnish	3.0%	10.3%	86.6%	100.0%
French	0.4%	1.6%	98.0%	100.0%
French and non-official language	4.7%	12.2%	83.1%	100.0%
German	2.6%	8.4%	88.9%	100.0%
Greek	5.0%	11.9%	83.1%	100.0%
Gujarati	4.9%	7.2%	87.8%	100.0%
Hindi	3.0%	7.9%	89.1%	100.0%
Hungarian	3.9%	8.5%	87.7%	100.0%

Mother tongue	Language Used at Work			
	Most often	Regularly	Never	Total
Icelandic	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Inuktitut (Eskimo)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Italian	5.4%	14.1%	80.5%	100.0%
Japanese	17.1%	24.8%	58.0%	99.9%
Korean	16.1%	16.5%	67.5%	100.0%
Macedonian	2.9%	8.1%	88.8%	99.9%
Mandarin	24.3%	16.2%	59.5%	100.0%
Micmac	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Ojibway	0.0%	10.0%	85.0%	95.0%
Other Aboriginal languages	0.0%	10.5%	94.7%	105.3%
Other non-Aboriginal languages	4.0%	7.2%	88.8%	100.0%
Persian (Farsi)	5.8%	11.2%	82.9%	100.0%
Polish	8.2%	13.4%	78.4%	100.0%
Portuguese	14.8%	17.2%	68.0%	100.0%
Punjabi	11.2%	15.5%	73.3%	100.0%
Romanian	4.4%	5.5%	90.0%	100.0%
Russian	10.0%	14.6%	75.5%	100.0%
Serbian	6.0%	9.2%	84.8%	100.0%
Serbo-Croatian	4.5%	9.3%	86.1%	100.0%
Slovak	2.9%	7.2%	89.8%	100.0%
Spanish	10.0%	18.0%	72.0%	100.0%
Tagalog (Pilipino)	2.6%	7.3%	90.1%	100.0%
Tamil	6.0%	9.7%	84.4%	100.0%
Turkish	8.0%	10.5%	81.5%	100.0%
Twi	1.6%	4.9%	93.5%	100.0%
Ukrainian	8.7%	9.4%	81.9%	100.0%
Urdu	3.6%	7.8%	88.6%	100.0%
Vietnamese	10.1%	13.5%	76.4%	100.0%

Appendix 4.

Registrants by First Language in Direct-Entry Programs, University of Toronto

Session	Division	English	French	Other	Unknown
20009	Applied Science & Engineering	2088	38	1577	12
	Arts & Science	15115	136	6046	109
	UTM	4721	41	1348	12
	Physical Education & Health	394	4	41	2
	Music	411	7	65	9
	UTSC	3830	35	1910	116
20019	Applied Science & Engineering	2166	38	1668	17
	Arts & Science	15779	135	6508	124
	UTM	4888	51	1453	12
	Physical Education & Health	385	3	48	4
	Music	379	8	67	5
	UTSC	3927	33	2119	139
20029	Applied Science & Engineering	2227	35	1819	20
	Arts & Science	16361	149	7055	136
	UTM	5388	57	1721	17
	Physical Education & Health	391	3	48	3
	Music	380	7	78	6
	UTSC	4238	40	2536	149
20039	Applied Science & Engineering	2352	35	1906	18
	Arts & Science	17031	152	7716	130
	UTM	6180	67	2019	16
	Physical Education & Health	442	1	59	3
	Music	370	5	90	3
	UTSC	4885	41	3039	131
20049	Applied Science & Engineering	2278	32	2039	12
	Arts & Science	17703	180	6898	94
	UTM	6591	70	2258	9
	Physical Education & Health	446	2	67	4
	Music	363	2	93	1
	UTSC	5298	45	3416	96

Appendix 5.

First-Entry Student Survey, University of Toronto

What language did you usually speak at home when you were a child?		
	Frequency	Percent
Afrikaans	2	.1
Albanian	7	.3
Arabic	29	1.3
Armenian	5	.2
Bengali	12	.5
Bulgarian	2	.1
Burmese	1	.0
Cambodian	1	.0
Cantonese	275	11.9
Creole	1	.0
Croatian	10	.4
Czech	2	.1
Dari	1	.0
Dutch	1	.0
English	1264	54.7
Estonian	2	.1
Farsi	18	.8
Filipino	3	.1
Finnish	1	.0
French	13	.6
German	5	.2
Greek	16	.7
Gujarati	16	.7
Hakka	1	.0
Hebrew	5	.2
Hindi	23	1.0
Hungarian	5	.2
Indonesian	6	.3
Italian	18	.8
Kannada	1	.0
Kejia	2	.1
Konkani	1	.0
Korean	69	3.0

	Frequency	Percent
Latvian	2	.1
Lithuanian	1	.0
Macedonian	4	.2
Malayalam	4	.2
Mandarin	120	5.2
Marthi	3	.1
Norwegian	1	.0
Pashtu	1	.0
Persian	19	.8
Polish	57	2.5
Portuguese	22	1.0
Punjabi	22	1.0
Romanian	17	.7
Russian	33	1.4
Serbian	17	.7
Singhalese	3	.1
Slovak	5	.2
Somali	4	.2
Spanish	30	1.3
Swahili	1	.0
Tagalog	10	.4
Taiwanese	2	.1
Tamil	29	1.3
Turkish	2	.1
Twi	1	.0
Ukrainian	13	.6
Urdu	52	2.3
Vietnamese	15	.6
Yugoslavian	1	.0
Total	2309	100.0

Appendix 6.

Proposal for University of Toronto Language Citation

The University of Toronto wishes to enhance study in languages. Through the Language Citation program, students are encouraged to pursue language study at more advanced levels. This program is not intended to take the place of a Minor which has language proficiency as a significant element, but is intended to provide an incentive to students who may be interested in intensive language study and language proficiency, but who do not wish to complete a major or minor. Students fulfilling a Minor who meet the minimum grade requirements for the citation, will have the citation noted on their transcripts along with the Minor.

The University of Toronto is an ideal place for students to achieve this proficiency. Our students live in a country that promotes multiculturalism and our university is located in one of the world's most diverse cities. In addition, we offer significant language opportunities in both ancient and modern languages. We offer a variety of study abroad programs and the number of such programs will expand. As our students seek further international study, work opportunities, and post-graduate study, the citation program allows students to take better advantage of our rich language offerings.

The Language Citation can be earned in any language, modern or ancient, which provides sufficient advanced training. The following departments offer citations in languages: Classics, East Asian, French, German, Italian, Near and Middle Eastern Studies, Spanish and Portuguese, and Slavic Languages and Literatures. Typically students will take four semesters beyond the first year. Students must earn a minimum grade of B- in each course. Students may take courses taught in the target language, e.g. literature or linguistics, as part of the citation program. Students for whom English is not their native language and who wish to earn a citation in their home language should consult with the relevant department for approval to participate in the language citation program. Students wishing to earn credits in the country where the language they are studying is spoken, should discuss study abroad programs with the department.

Languages typically offering the citation option are:

Akkadian, Ancient Greek, Aramaic, Chinese, Czech, Egyptian Hieroglyphs, Finnish, French, German, Hebrew, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Turkish, Ukrainian and Yiddish.

There are other languages in which advanced courses in literature and culture are offered following a two-year language sequence. These languages could also be used for the citation program. Here are included:

Bengali, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Hindi, and Persian.

Citations in other languages could be arranged through consultation with individual academic units.

Appendix 7.

Language Task Force

Undergraduate Questionnaire

To the Chair: The Language Task Force is continuing to gather information on language instruction at all levels at the University of Toronto in order to understand the variety of instruction offered and to coordinate our efforts. Please ask appropriate faculty members to fill out a separate questionnaire for *each language taught for credit* in your department.

To the Faculty filling out this questionnaire: The Language Task Force is seeking information to improve the University's efforts in providing language instruction for multiple purposes at both the undergraduate and graduate level. We will use this data to provide better information to the University Community and perspective students on the types of language instruction available. We will also be able to better coordinate information on language availability as well as increase visibility and new opportunities. We recognize that some questions may not be relevant for each language taught, e.g. dead languages obviously are taught differently from living ones. If questions are not relevant to the specific language, please mark that question N/A.

1. For which language are you filling in this questionnaire?
2. At how many levels is this language taught? e.g. elementary, intermediate, advanced
3. How many contact hours does each level course meet per week?

Course number	Contact hours

4. What is the teaching emphasis in first year:
 - a. More emphasis on reading and writing than oral communication
 - b. Equal emphasis on reading, writing, and oral communication
 - c. More emphasis on oral communication than reading and writing
 - d. Emphasis on reading only.

5. What is the balance of literature and culture in the introductory course:
 - a. More emphasis on culture than literature
 - b. Equal emphasis on culture and literature
 - c. More emphasis on literature than culture
 - d. Emphasis on literature only

6. What is the cap for student enrolment at each level per section, and the average actual enrolment?

Course number	Cap/average enrolment

7. Who is normally the primary instructor at each level?

Introductory (1st year)

- a. Tenure-stream faculty
- b. Teaching stream faculty?
- c. Graduate students?
- d. CLTAs?
- e. Stipendiary appointments

Intermediate (2nd year)

- f. Tenure-stream faculty
- g. Teaching stream faculty?
- h. Graduate students?
- i. CLTAs?
- j. Stipendiary appointments

High Intermediate (3rd year)

- k. Tenure-stream faculty
- l. Teaching stream faculty?
- m. Graduate students?
- n. CLTAs?
- o. Stipendiary appointments

Advanced (4^h year)

- p. Tenure-stream faculty
- q. Teaching stream faculty?
- r. Graduate students?
- s. CLTAs?
- t. Stipendiary appointments

8. What type of teaching assistance is available for each language level (check the categories that apply)?

Course (e.g. SPA100)	Oral practice	Sole instructor	Marking	TA instructor	Other (please specify)

9. What type of T.A. training is provided? How many hours of training are given?

10. Who oversees the language sequence? Check all that apply.
- a. separate faculty line
 - b. teaching stream faculty
 - c. tenure stream faculty
 - d. regular professor as special assignment
 - e. undergraduate coordinator
 - f. chair
 - g. language committee
 - h. no one
11. To what extent are upper level language courses taught in the target language?
12. To what extent are other upper level courses taught in the target language?
13. At each level of language, how much use is made of labs and other media?
14. Look at the skills list below and answer the following questions. We recognize that many teaching methodologies are currently used, and most people tend to be eclectic. How much time is devoted at each level to:

Course Number	Hours, or percentage of course time
a. explicit structures (grammar)	
b. Listening and speaking	
c. Reading: media, literary texts, other realia	
d. Writing	

15. In advanced language courses, what type of texts are emphasized:
- a. More literary than non-literary.
 - b. Equal weight to literary and non-literary
 - c. More non-literary than literary
16. Is technology used:
- a. in the classroom
 - b. in student practice outside of classroom
 - c. in media centres
 - d. in distance learning
 - e. in testing and placement
17. What types of technology are used in the language courses:
- a. Internet web sites
 - b. email
 - c. chatroom
 - d. tapes
 - e. instructional CD's
 - f. movies (VHS or DVD)
 - g. other, please specify
18. What are your strategies for testing and streaming native speakers?
19. What overseas language training and/or internship opportunities are there?

20. Do you offer any courses designed for other divisions, e.g. engineering, business?
21. What follows is a list of special language opportunities. In column A, tick those that you are currently doing, in column B, those that you would like to see implemented:
22. Community Intensive language for spoken proficiency
- a. Intensive language for reading proficiency
 - b. Internships in local target community
 - c. Immersion courses
 - d. Residential arrangements for language floors in residence
 - e. Pre-registration programs
 - f. Intersession/summer programs
 - g. Pre-semester programs
 - h. Courses in a foreign language as a section of regular curricular courses
 - i. Programs with professional schools
23. What types of study abroad programs are available, e.g.:
- a. Exchange programs
 - i. summer
 - ii. fall/winter
 - iii. year
 - b. Internships
 - c. Service programs
24. Do you offer any programming to the community for outreach and enrichment,
Eg: Films
- a. Lectures
 - b. Language courses
 - c. Other programs
25. When is each level taught, e.g. fall term day/evening/ night; spring term day/evening/ night; summer

In addition to the above questions relating to specific languages, could you please answer the following two as well?

- a. Do you offer any non-credit language courses? Please specify how and why they are offered.
- b. What courses are taught using external funding?

Appendix 8.

Languages Taught in Arts and Science

Aboriginal Studies, University College	Inuktitut Iroquoian-Oneida Ojibway	
African Studies: New College	Swahili	
Celtic Studies: St. Michael's	Old, Middle, and Modern Irish** Scottish Gaelic Old, Middle, and Modern Welsh**	
Centre for Medieval Studies	Latin** Old English** Old and Middle Welsh** Old and Middle Irish** Old Norse–Icelandic	
Classics	Ancient Greek Latin**	
East Asian	Chinese Classical Chinese Japanese	Classical Japanese Korean
English	Old English**	
French	French	
Germanic Languages. and Literatures	German Yiddish	
Italian Studies	Italian	
Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations	Akkadian Arabic Aramaic Egyptian Hieroglyphs	Hebrew Persian Turkish
Slavic Languages and Literatures	Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian Czech Macedonian Old Church Slavonic Polish Russian Ukrainian	Estonian Finnish Hungarian
South Asian Studies: New College	Bengali Hindi	
Spanish and Portuguese	Portuguese Spanish	

*This table provides a snapshot of current language activity. It does not reflect the year-to-year offerings in some departments. For example, Albanian and Bulgarian have been taught in the Slavic Dept. as non-credit languages for graduate students, Vietnamese is not taught regularly. Catalan will be offered starting in 2006.

** Some languages are offered in more than one unit. Latin, for example, is taught in both Classics and CMS, and Old English in both English and CMS; most Celtic languages are cross-listed with Celtic Studies and CMS.

Appendix 9.

Language Task Force Graduate Questionnaire

Department/Academic Unit: _____

As part of the work of the Dean's Language Task Force, we wish to compare the actual needs of graduate programs with what is offered in language instruction. We also are looking for suggestions for improvements that can be implemented within the current budget and planning framework. We would be grateful, therefore, if you would respond to this questionnaire to Ida Ferrinho in the Dean's Office by 15 September 2004. E-mail responses would be fine; Ida's e-mail is ida@arts.utoronto.ca and her telephone number is 978-3390.

- 1) In normal practice, what are the language instruction needs that arise in your graduate programs, above and beyond those linked to language skills required for admission to the program, and (if relevant) above and beyond the instructional activity that forms a normal part of your graduate curriculum? Please specify what level of language proficiency (reading, oral, aural) is needed for each program.
 - a) What languages are required on a regular basis by a substantial number of your graduate students?
 - b) For what languages is there a pressing need, though the numbers of students requiring instruction may be small and may vary greatly from year to year?
- 2) How are these needs presently addressed?
- 3) Is your department currently offering reading-knowledge courses as service courses for graduate programs?
 - a) If **no**, have you done so in the past?
 - i) If you did so in the past, why did you discontinue the practice?
 - b) If the answer to (3) is **yes**:
 - i) do you offer reading courses in winter, in summer, or both?
 - ii) are these courses for graduates only, or are they also open to undergraduates?
 - iii) are these courses taught by professors? by lecturers? by stipendiaries? by graduate students?
 - iv) what is the approximate enrollment of these courses?

- 4) In your opinion, is it the university's responsibility to provide for all of the language needs that might arise within a graduate program?
 - a) If **yes**, suggest a model for providing these needs within current planning and budget frameworks.
 - b) If **no**, suggest what criteria should be used to determine which language needs are University responsibilities and which are not.
- 5) Suggest ways that the University could more effectively meet graduate program language acquisition needs.

Please feel free to add any additional comments which you think could be of help to the Language Task Force in its review of language activity at the University of Toronto.

Appendix 10.

Recognized Campus Groups related to Languages

U of T African Students' Association
U of T Albanian Students Union
Arab Student Collective (ASC)
Arabic Language Learning Group
U of T Armenian Students' Association
Asia Pacific Club
Bangladeshi Students' Association
Bulgarian Students' Association
Canadian Asian Student Society
Caribbean Connections at St. George
U of T Celtic Society
U of T Chinese Students' Association
U of T Association of Chinese
Students & Scholars (UTACSS)
U of T Chinese Culture Society
U of T Croatian Student Association
Czech and Slovak Club
U of T Eritrean Association
Ethiopian Students' Association of Toronto
Filipino Students' Association of Toronto
U of T Finnish Club
Étudiants Francophones
de l'Université de Toronto
U of T Greek Students' Association
Hindu Students' Association (HSA)
Hindu Students Council (HSC)
Hong Kong Students at U of T
Hungarian Students' Association
Canada Indonesian Association (CIA)
Iranian Association at U of T
The U of T Iranian Students Union
U of T Ismaili Students' Association
U of T Italian Canadian Association
Japan Canada Student Association
Korean Canadian U of T
Students' Association
U of T Korean Students' Association
U of T Lithuanian Students Fellowship
Malaysian Singaporean Students' Association
U of T Mauritian Society
Negah Association
Pakistani Students' Association
Polish Students' Association
U of T Portuguese Association
Romanian Students Club
Russian Student Association
Russian Union of Students
U of T Serbian Students Association
U of T Shanghai Fellow Club
South Asian Alliance
Sri Lankan Students' Association
Taiwan Republic of China Student
Association
Thai Students' Association of U of T
U of T Turkish Students' Associations
Ukrainian Students Club
U of T Vietnamese Student Society

Appendix 11.

Student Associations Related to Departments Providing Language Teaching

Those associations that have direct links to a department providing language teaching are the following:

At the undergraduate level:

- Chinese Undergraduate Association at U of T
- East Asian Studies Student Union
- French Course Union
- Germanic Languages Students' Union
- Italian Studies Students' Union
- Slavic and East European Union of Students
- Spanish and Portuguese Students' Union

At the graduate level:

- East Asian Studies Graduate Student Union
- Graduate French Association (SESDEF)
- German Graduate Students' Association
- Graduate Students' Association of Italian Studies
- Slavic Studies Graduate Students' Association
- Spanish and Portuguese Graduate Students' Association