

**REPORT OF THE 2011 FACULTY SENATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE
IMPLEMENTATION TASKFORCE (FLITF)**

March 10, 2012

Members of the FLITF

John W. Frazier, Chair

Elizabeth M. Abate

James Hassell

Jennifer Jensen

Gregory Ketcham

Donald Loewen

Harolyn Pasquale

Rumiko Sode

school proficiency equivalency for second-semester foreign language. It should be noted that if we set the Regents 85 as equivalent to two semesters of high school foreign language, we would be setting a higher equivalency for the Regents 85 than SUNY does; SUNY equates the Regents 85 with one semester of college foreign language.

While not part of our charge, FLITF provides some potential options for setting the high school equivalency for two semesters of college-level foreign language at Binghamton University in Appendix A of this report.

recommendations of this report be

THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Charge. -level foreign level requirement
2. Previous Conclusions. Previous conclusions that Spanish language coursework would dominate an increased foreign language requirement proved to be incorrect because the possibility that students would choose alternatives among a broad range of foreign language offerings was not considered.
3. The Need to Conduct a Comprehensive Analysis. It became clear that the paucity of data on course-specific

d.

-semester requirement.

e.

e. Cost Estimates and Uncertainty

1. The ability to predict cost implications to implement the first phase (second-semester requirement) is much stronger than predicting the final phase (full implementation).
2. The implementation cost of the first phase is much lower than the costs of full implementation.
3. The presence of multiple shifting factors over the next several years provide a serious challenge to accurate prediction of the proposed implementation plan, especially in 2016, when full implementation is recommended.

Introduction

In 2000 the Binghamton University faculty added a

language coursework required for transfer students, the inability of some transfer students to begin at level two without remedial coursework (due to the time lapse between taking a language in high school and transferring to Binghamton). It also, in some cases, is due to lack of proficiency because the students have not taken coursework that prepares them to meet the demands of a level two course at Binghamton.

Another issue is the belief that a disproportionate number of transfers will request cours

significantly negative impact on transfer students enrolling at Binghamton and graduating in a timely fashion. We are at a time when economic resources for the University and the SUNY System are at an all time low. We are already stretched to our maximum capacity and are being asked to do more with less. We know that increasing the foreign language requirement for transfers from one college semester to three college semesters will mean more students taking foreign language courses and that there will be a need for additional resources to handle additional sections and instructors.

Some of these issues present serious concerns that have delayed the implementation of the foreign language requirement, which went into effect in 2000, but never was implemented for transfers. They remain important issues and require careful consideration because of their current and future implications for Binghamton University.

It is also important to note that the complexity of the 3-semester foreign language requirement presents a challenge as we move forward with implementation. Currently, advisors from referring colleges and universities and transfer students once at Binghamton require an explanation despite the posting of this requirement on the Binghamton University website.

Clearly communicating the increased foreign language requirement to transfer students is critical to any implementation plan. However, the foreign language requirement is the most complicated
ation requirements, with numerous options, waivers, and
equivalencies. There are three possible choices for fulfilling the requirement in college, four possible standards of high school or equivalent proficiency, a full waiver for students in one

- Responses from foreign language departments regarding the potential impacts and costs associated with the implementation of the foreign language requirement for transfer students.
- An additional request for specific estimates from the Romance Language Department.
- A discussion and feedback from advisors about a phase-in plan.

During this information gathering enterprise, the FLITF considered potential strategies for the implementation of the requirement.

The results of our information gathering appear below.

Summary of FLITF Findings

The OIR Data: Foreign Languages Taken by Transfer Students, 2005-2010

The anecdotal information provided to the FLITF suggested that as much as 80% of the foreign language course demand would likely be in Spanish language courses. This task force deemed it

continuity in future years. However, these percentages are dramatically lower than those that presented to our Task Force.

Another finding revealed an annual variation among the foreign languages that attracted the highest percentage of transfer student enrollments; one year it was Spanish, another Japanese, another year something else. This finding may suggest that there is a strong correlation between the foreign language course offerings and the student enrollment patterns. This may also suggest a correlation between foreign language adjunct appointments in a given year and transfer student enrollments.

The other obvious finding from these six years of data is that transfer students at Binghamton are interested in a variety of foreign languages. In fact, the variety of foreign language options is strength of this institution that deserves wide acclaim and that should be incorporated into strategies to implement the foreign language requirements for transfer students.

The Meeting with Representatives of Foreign Language Departments

The FLITF requested a meeting with all foreign language teaching departments and encouraged attendance by the Chair, Undergraduate program Director, and interested teaching faculty.

Departments were encouraged to report on concerns related to the implementation of the foreign language requirement for transfer students, to respond to some of FLITF ideas for implementation, and to offer their own ideas.

A substantial amount of the discussion of this meeting surrounded the issues of resource needs and related topics, and to proficiency and placement of transfers. A summary of those discussions follows.

1. Resource issues are linked to a number of concerns of foreign language departments, including the types and frequency of foreign language courses offered on a regular basis, existing large classes, the need for full-time tenure track faculty, and the inability to estimate resource needs due to insufficient data on transfer demands. The foreign language departments were unanimous in their position that limited faculty resources have caused an increase in size of their classes to levels that exceed the ideal class size for teaching language courses. Some also emphasized that the current lack of faculty resources results in an inability to repeat the same 100- and 200-level foreign language courses in subsequent semesters, which would benefit transfer students. It also limits the ability to teach upper division foreign language courses to some extent. These limitations have resulted in larger foreign language course enrollments that exceed ideal class size.

It was noted that rising enrollments have caused many Harpur departments to increase class sizes that exceed desired limits for seminars and other courses. For foreign language departments, rising enrollments, more transfer students in the future, and the more stringent foreign language requirement implemented for transfers results in a situation that demands more full time teaching faculty. Foreign language teachers and

When asked if a mix of full-time and part-time faculty were necessary to handle the implementation of the foreign language requirement for transfer students, those present were reluctant to offer estimates, indicating that there has been insufficient data to determine demand.

A number of strategies for implementation of the requirement for transfer were briefly presented, including summer and winter courses, distance learning and a bridge course for transfers deemed lacking in proficiency. None was endorsed by this group. It was noted, however, that some mix of full-time and adjunct faculty might be possible in the future. Nothing specific was discussed.

2. Proficiency and Placement were two other important topics discussed at this meeting.

and different broader viewpoints associated with the implementation of the three

The Survey of Recent Transfer Students, 2011

A random survey of transfer students entering Binghamton University in 2008 and 2009 was conducted by FLITF in the Fall 2011 semester. The purpose of the survey was to cross-check the results of a previous transcript analysis and to begin gauging the potential impact of the implementation of the 3-semester foreign language requirement on student decisions to transfer to Binghamton. The 2008 and 2009 number of transfer email addresses was 2,500. All students were offered an opportunity to participate in the survey and reminders were sent twice to enhance the response rate. A total of 385 transfer students responded to the survey, yielding an approximate 15% sample of the universe (See appendix). The results of this survey are summarized below.

1. About one-half of this transfer population (52%) had taken Spanish as their foreign language in high school. Only 3% took no language in high school. Thus, 45% enrolled in a language other than Spanish in high school. Notably 18% of the total transfers had taken French in high school.
2. Nearly one-third (31%) of the transfer sample completed a third-level language course in high school and another 47% took a level 4 or 5 foreign language course.
3. In response to a question as to whether students enrolled in a second foreign language in high school, 70% said they had not. Of the 30% who did take a second language, the languages taken were quite diverse, representing seven (7) languages.
4. One important concern for Binghamton language departments is proficiency and placement. The survey asked the amount of time that had lapsed since the transfer student Binghamton. Forty-two percent (42%) reported that their last language course was taken 3 or more years prior

to entering Binghamton University. This may suggest the need for a bridge course or careful placement for those who would still require a third foreign-language course to meet the newly implemented foreign language requirement. The point is that we do not know the level of achievement without some measure, such as a placement/proficiency exam.

5. The sample transfer students who did take a foreign language at the college/university attended prior to transferring to Binghamton took a wide variety of languages. The three most frequently taken were Spanish (17%), French (7%), and Chinese (5%). It is noteworthy that nearly one-half of these surveyed students (47%) selected a wide range of foreign languages prior to transfer.
6. It was important to measure transfer preferences for meeting the 3-semester language requirement. These transfer students were asked to state a preference for either:
 - a) taking an additional (third) course in the same language previously taken, or b) taking the first two courses in a new foreign language requirement.Nearly two-thirds (66%) reported a preference for remaining with their existing foreign language by taking a third course. However, one-third (34%) expressed a preference for taking two courses in a new foreign language. This flexibility and broad interest could have significance for planning foreign language coursework as we move to the implementation stage of the 3-semester foreign language.
7. A follow-up question to the language preference asked which second language might be preferred by those opting for a new language and two courses. Given the previous broad interests among this sample population, it is not surprising that a range of foreign languages was included in their responses: 20% selected Italian, 17% chose

French, 15% selected Chinese, and 10% opted for German. There also was interest in Russian and other languages. Again, this flexibility and broad interest in a variety of foreign languages may have important implications for the planning of the implementation of the 3-semester foreign language requirement for transfers.

8. The final question on the survey addressed the potential loss of transfers due to a more stringent foreign language requirement for transfer students. The question posed to this sample transfer population was: would you still have enrolled at Binghamton University if the language requirement for transfer students had been 3 semesters of a foreign language? The results to this question should be interpreted with caution. First, the complexity of the options available within this requirement prohibits a complete explanation within the survey question. Second, these transfer students have had the benefit of time to absorb the many benefits offered by Binghamton University and to become part of its culture. These facts allow for bias in both negative and positive directions.

Nearly one-

would still have

evidence that some transfers would be lost due to the more stringent requirement. As expected, this seems clear for those transfer students who completed two or fewer foreign language courses prior to transferring to Binghamton. This is a potentially serious issue for Binghamton University and requires monitoring as we move forward in the implementation of the 3-semester requirement for transfer students.

The Results of the January 2012 Student Transfer Survey

The Task Force interviewed a sample of transfer students who entered in the current semester (Spring 2012). One hundred fourteen transfer students completed the same survey taken by the Fall 2011 transfer sample. Full analysis of the January 2012 survey of new transfer students has not been completed, but initial analysis shows that responses are broadly similar to those found in the survey of transfer students conducted in Fall 2011. Some of the relevant findings are:

Among students who indicated a preference for how they would prefer to fulfill the requirement, 60% indicated that they would prefer to continue with the language previously studied, while 40% indicated that they would prefer to start a new language. This corroborates information gathered in the Fall 2011 survey, where approximately 33% indicated that they would prefer to start a new language.

The percentage of students who studied Spanish is somewhat higher (59%) in the January 2011 survey, but still doesn't approach the levels that the task force had anticipated when it began its work. Approximately 17% studied French, and the remainder studied a wide variety of other languages

assistant professor. He also noted that the previous effort to estimate the cost of implementation of the 3-semester foreign language requirement for transfer students was a cost prohibitive \$652 per credit hour. Dr. McGoff also noted that given recent budgets, the challenge is attempting to implement a requirement that provides Binghamton University with another academic distinction among SUNY campuses, including high quality coursework taught by full-time faculty and/or numerous adjuncts in an increasingly restricted economic climate, tight budgets and the projected need for more transfer students. The budget has been and continues to be a zero-sum game for the campus, and time-to-degree, while not currently an issue, may become a future issue.

Vice Provost McGoff admitted the difficulty of creating an accurate cost estimate for implementation without adequate demand data. He offered to rerun the budget estimate if better or different data are provided by FLITF.

The Task Force found the information and context provided by Dr. McGoff useful because they provided the range of potential instructors, underscored the inadequacy of demand data, suggested the need to be sensitive to the increased anticipated need for transfers, and the necessity of having resource needs of departments to implement the 3-semester foreign language requirement.

Reports from Foreign Language Departments

The Task Force requested that foreign language departments respond to issues and ideas related to implementation of the 3-semester requirement during the Fall 2011 semester (and prior to the student transfer survey results). The issues and questions to be addressed included reactions to the idea of a bridge course, the potential modification of a third level foreign language course to

include more emphasis on the culture, the role and value of proficiency examinations/assessments for proper placement of transfer students in the appropriate course level, and estimates of the potential resources by the departments to meet the implementation of the 3-semester requirement for transfer students. The departmental responses are summarized below.

Romance Languages

- Faculty are not interested in a bridge course. They believe that we need to look more into -level courses are 4 days per week, and ours are 5 days per week, so those students do not have the level of preparation that our students have. They also believe that the transfer students would be more appropriately placed in the second 100-level course (115) even if they have had two semesters at BCC. The implications of this would be huge. Romance Languages thinks the students can use the review and continuation in the second 100-level course. J. Hassell noted that the department will allow the students to go on if they are ready, but that many students are not ready. The department says we need to recheck equivalencies of all institutions sending transfer students to make sure the courses are equivalent.
- They reported that they need to look into placement tests. This is something the department would be interested in and will be looking into.
- J. Hassell suggested to the department that they look into developing a different kind of Intermediate I class that is not intended to prepare students for another course, with more of a cultural context. The department believed that having two different courses was not a good idea; they want to be able to encourage students to continue, particularly in French and Italian. They cannot necessarily isolate the students who want to go on at the

beginning of the course, so they believe the department would ultimately lose students.

This was a

First, and foremost, the Department believes it has inadequate data to be completely accurate. With this in mind, Professor Hassell, a member of that department and of the Task Force, provided these estimates, which the FLITF considered when formulating its estimates.

Pre-Recommendations, Observations and Advice for Implementation of the 3-semester Foreign Language Requirement for Transfer Students

Prior to making any recommendations, we offer the following observations and advice.

1. We have made an effort to secure or create information to support our recommendations due to the lack of information provided to the Task Force at the beginning of this process. We were instructed to be creative and to attempt to find potential means to implement the requirement, or recommend its reconsideration by the Faculty Senate. It is difficult to be creative in the absence of knowledge and information.
2. Despite our best efforts in a single semester, we approach our final task with some trepidation, frustration and uncertainty given the lack of solid information required in such decisions.
3. As we move forward, we must monitor the potential impact of this implementation on the number and quality of the transfer-student pool.
4. We advise flexibility and review of the decision to move to the 3-semester foreign language requirement, if necessary, based on the monitoring of the real costs of implementation and its impact on the transfer pool. There is a need to balance the desire for a language requirement that is unusual in the SUNY system and that

, with

the practical realities of costs during restricted budgets and the necessity of future enrollments from student transfers.

The Task Force considered a number of methods to deal with the perceived issues related to implementation of the 3-semester foreign language requirement. These included proposals for a bridge course, improved proficiency examinations that might improve placement in courses, summer and winter teaching, distance learning, and modification of third level courses to include a stronger cultural component. These received little or no support from the foreign language departments, perhaps with the exception of investigating the use of proficiency examinations. It became clear that resources were the overriding concern of the foreign language departments. The absence of good data made it difficult for them and for the Task Force to make accurate estimates for transfer-student demand for their courses and, therefore, the number of sections required for implementation of the requirement. The Task Force sought input and data from a number of constituencies. These were helpful but not definitive, in determining resource needs and the impact on the number and quality of future transfers. Despite these problems, the Task Force attempted to make recommendations for implementation of the 3-semester foreign language requirement.

We considered three options. One involved requesting a change in the requirement from mandating three semesters to mandating two semesters of foreign language for transfer students. A second option was a variable foreign-language requirement (three semesters for freshmen and sophomores and one semester for junior and senior transfers). The Task Force concluded that these two options were not in keeping with the intent of the faculty that the same 3-semester requirement be the same for all. Also, the charge of the Task Force was to try to find means to implement that requirement for transfers. While the Faculty Senate can discuss these two options

at will, the Task Force settled on a third option- it is our recommendation for the uniform implementation of the 3-semester requirement for all students. (We would maintain the existing -semester requirement for students in Watson Computer Science and in the Decker School). We offer this recommendation with what we believe includes necessary action items for any hope of successful implementation of the plan. The recommendation is outlined below.

Recommendations for a Phased Implementation of the 3-semester Foreign Language Requirement for Transfer Students in 2013

Given the uncertainty of demand related to a lack of data and the potential negative impact on the transfer pool, we cannot recommend the implementation of the 3-semester foreign language requirement in 2013. However, given the merits of that requirement, we recommend a 4-year, phased-in implementation plan for the 3-semester foreign language requirement for student transfers. This plan, to begin in 2013, permits time to assess both demand and effects. The four years would entail the following:

Year 1(2013-14) A 2-semester foreign language requirement for transfer students (except Watson and Decker students) during assessment of demand and potential impacts, as well as a calculation for additional resource needs to implement the 3-semester requirement.

Year 2(2014-15): Continuation of the 2-semester foreign language requirement for transfers, as data collection, analysis and planning for Year 3 continues (with

same exceptions noted above).

Year 3(2015-16): Continuation of the 2-semester foreign language requirement for transfers, as data collection, analysis and planning for Year 4 continues (with the same exceptions noted above).

Year 4(2016-17): Assuming that the findings of years one through three allow for full implementation, the 3-semester requirement becomes permanent for all transfer students (same exceptions).

If, at any time, _____ o provide adequate resources, or if there is clear evidence that the transfer pool has been diminished in quality, then the Faculty Senate should be alerted and should reconsider the 3-semester requirement. We believe the necessary action items and resource estimates that accompany this recommendation are prerequisite to its implementation.

The Necessary Action Items Prior to and During the Phase-in Implementation Plan

We have noted throughout this report that the data necessary to make sound judgments regarding foreign language course demand and to assess the potential impacts of the implementation of the requirement for transfer has been lacking. For this reason, we argue that routine data collection and analysis are vital during the four-year period of implementation period. We also have emphasized the complexity of the current foreign language requirement structure at Binghamton.

The following are specific recommendations regarding data and analysis needs and advising that begins with referring campuses and is enhanced on the campus.

Action Items for Improving Communication

The Task Force proposes the following actions for improving communication about this requirement:

1. Requiring the high school transcript from transfer students upon application, discussed elsewhere in this document, will allow advisors to focus directly on what students still need rather than trying to encourage them to remember what they might have had.
2. The General Education Coordinator has developed an on-line

Data Collection for Determining Future Demand, Monitoring Transfer Student Progress, and Assessment of Changes in the Transfer Pool

The Task Force also recommends a 4-year effort to collect data from feeder schools and from transfer students. This can take several forms, including routine surveys of transfer advisers at feeder colleges and universities, surveys of transfer students as they enter and monitoring their progress and any problems they incur, including performance and graduation rates. The FLITF has agreed to continue its work during the Spring 2012 semester and to analyze a survey of the Spring semester entering transfer class. This can be a model for the future. It is essential to have data that direct the progress toward full implementation of the 3-semester foreign language for transfers and to assess the potential impacts on the future transfer pool.

Minimum Resources Required Executing the 3-Semester Foreign Language Requirement in a 4-Year Implementation Plan

Three types of resources are required for implementation of the proposed 4-year foreign language implementation program for transfer students: advising support, collection, monitoring analysis of transfer student data, and faculty resources.

1. Advising of transfer students for the three-year plan must be intensive at particular periods, beginning with the communication of Binghamton University advisers with the transfer advisers at other universities and colleges in the appropriate seasons and intensifying at transfer advising orientations at Binghamton. It is likely that additional advising support will be required, either on a half-time, but more likely a full-time basis to handle the challenge associated with transfer foreign language issues. As

noted previously, this amounts to speaking with other campus advising offices, our foreign language departments, and transfer students. It also means meeting with those analyzing the data collected from transfer students. This likely is an SL-2 level position with an annual salary of \$37,873.

2. The collection of transfers-related data will be crucial to the successful monitoring of

interest in Spanish language courses and this is also reflected in the estimated resource needs supplied to us by the Romance Language Department. So, as we believe that with proper advising many transfer students will select other languages and that some Binghamton foreign language departments indicated an ability to absorb some of these students, we recommend more resources for Spanish language courses in the initial implementation phases. We also are sensitive to the position of the foreign language departments that they cannot and should not rely strictly on adjuncts to handle the increased enrollments associated with the implementation of the requirement for transfer students. Thus, our recommendation is as follows. Using the course estimates provided by the Romance Language Department, their perceived necessity to have full-time and adjunct faculty to implement this plan, we propose the following hiring plan for Year 1 of the recommended plan.

3. Year 1 (2013):

- a. One-full-time Spanish language professor appointed in the Romance Languages teaching a six-course load: two introductory level Spanish courses and one advanced undergraduate Spanish course for transfer students each semester, while also serving as a coordinator for the languages in the department to standardize proficiency examinations for future transfer students, to work with foreign language faculty on appropriate transfer student course placements, and also as a liaison to the advising person hired under the previous recommendation. This hire will teach a significant proportion of the anticipated transfer demand for the initial year of implementation, while serving the other needs associated with a successful implementation. The estimated cost is a \$50,000 salary.

- b. The remaining adjunct needs associated with teaching the Romance Language coursework include 2 Spanish, 2 French, and 2 Italian courses. If demand does not support one of these sections, the resources should be shifted at the discretion of the Romance Language Chair to fill another foreign language transfer need. The cost for each course is an anticipated \$4,500.

6. Year 4 (2016):

Full implementation is required in Year 4, which adds a third level course for all transfers. By year 4, the University should have a better understanding of the impacts and resource needs of the full implementation costs of the 3-semester foreign language requirement. The cost estimate and assumptions for Year 4 are more complex and substantially higher on an annual basis.

The third semester implementation comes with major challenges and complications. The first complication that provides a challenge is due to the Binghamton University "deemed equivalency" dilemma. Currently, the University awards the equivalency of second semester to students with a HS Regents score of 85, or a course grade of 85 for the third

Currently, this is a logical inconsistency but presents no real functional problem. However, as soon as we require the third semester, the issue becomes very different.

Perhaps, most importantly, we must acknowledge that SUNY's functional proficiency estimate is probably more accurate than our more generous deemed proficiency; three foreign language units in HS is not usually the same as two semesters in college.

The real problem for implementation strategy is creating plausible budget estimates under uncertainty and in the face of the inconsistency identified above. Perhaps examining a few scenarios helps clarify the challenge.

Below are two plausible scenarios when a three-semester foreign-language requirement is implemented for transfer students in the fourth year of the proposed phased-in approach.

Scenario One

The total incoming transfer students in 2016-17 is estimated to be 1,743. Now, of the incoming transfer students subject to the three-semester foreign-language requirement (SOM, CCPA, Harpur), total approximately 1400,

Of the 1400, those with less than two semesters of proficiency are estimated to be 460
Of the 1400, those considered having two semesters of proficiency are estimated at 460.

The remaining students will have satisfied the foreign-language requirement.

The big change in 2016-17 is that the ground rules are fundamentally different than in previous years.

1. It may still be most likely that students with less than two semesters of foreign language credit will prefer to continue with the language they studied previously; this would require them to take two semesters of foreign language (at the 2nd and 3rd semester level). Otherwise they would have to take 3 semesters of a new language, or one semester of their previous language and two semesters of a new one.
If we assume that all of these students will opt for 2nd and 3rd semester in their previous language, this would result in:

460 students will take two courses (one at the second semester level, one at

the third semester).

Approximately 160 would require one first semester and one second semester course
Approximately 560 would require one second semester and one third semester course
Approximately 200 would require one third semester course

The additional required seats when the requirement is fully implemented are:

160 seats at first semester
720 seats at second semester
760 seats at third semester

The exact allocation of these seats into language sections is currently impossible to predict, but if we take a conservative estimate of 25 seats per section, we will have:

6 sections at first semester level
29 sections at second semester level
30 sections at third semester level,

or 65 total sections.

It is likely that the majority of courses at the second semester and, especially, the third semester level will be in Spanish, but there will be significant numbers added elsewhere, especially at the first semester level.

Wherever these sections may be allocated, it seems very likely that new full-time faculty hires must be part of the equation. However, it also is likely that adding full-

added demand would occur the year AFTER full implementation of a three-semester foreign-language requirement is implemented. Not every student will try to fulfill the requirement during the first year.

Furthermore, the budgetary assumption that tenure-track faculty will teach all of their courses in the General Education language sequence appears unrealistic. Almost all tenure-track faculty will teach both language and content courses.

Summary and Conditions of Uncertainty

There is a fundamental difference between the way students will approach the two- semester and the three- semester foreign-language requirements. The calculations in the report reflect the two-semester scenario fairly well. However, the three-semester scenario is far more open to error. If proficiency testing reveals that students with three units of high school foreign language are unprepared for BU third semester courses, then these numbers could change dramatically in one of two ways. Either more students will take second- and third-semester foreign languages, or more students will take first- and second- semester foreign languages.

In short, there is a very high level of uncertainty in all of these estimates, but especially those used to estimate enrollment for a third semester implementation. Uncertainty is due to:

- a) Not knowing what our enrollment will be in 2016-17,
- b) Not having accurate data on the functional proficiency of students with three years of high school foreign language,
- c) Not knowing how many students really prefer to start a new foreign language, rather than continue with the one they studied previously, and
- d) Not knowing how many students who were below our third semester foreign language requirement completed a second semester or third semester of foreign language at their previous college before transferring to Binghamton.

The suggestions made in this report are complicated and uncertain. However, given the

complexity of the BU foreign language requirement and its logical inconsistency for transfers, as well as a paucity of reliable data on transfer students necessary to good budget estimates, the recommendations cannot be more specific and must be taken with substantial caution.

End Notes

Note 1. This is still just an estimate, since it will depend on how many of these students took another language course in college.

Note 2. Two recent FLITF surveys asked for the number of students who studied Spanish in high school. In the Fall survey, it was about 52%. In the January survey, it was about 65%. So we used 60% as a working number.

We assumed that after the first year, BU will continue to grow at the rate of annual increase of 120 transfer students/yr subject to the revised foreign-language requirement (CCPA, SOM, and Harpur). Of these, about 40/yr would not have completed the second semester requirement.

By 2015-16, this would result in a total of about 460 transfer students/year that haven't completed 2 semesters, so there would probably be an additional few sections necessary by that hat

Appendix A:
Suggestions for Setting a High School Proficiency Standard for Second-Semester Foreign Language

There are several possible approaches we can take to setting the high school equivalency for two semesters of college-level foreign language:

1. We extend the two-semester proficiency standard currently in place for freshmen to transfer students: the Regents 85 (or its equivalent) will equal two semesters of college foreign language, even though this is inconsistent with the SUNY standard.