

A WIN-WIN: THE INTENTIONAL CULTIVATION OF RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LSP AND COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Patricia Moore-Martínez
Joshua M. Pongan
Temple University

Resumen: Este artículo identifica una necesidad y presenta un modelo sostenible para incorporar la integración a la comunidad en los cursos de español para fines específicos (EFE). Para combatir el descenso en la matrícula, los programas han aumentado su oferta de EFE—cursos que proporcionan relevancia y valor, igual a la integración de componentes de aprendizaje experiencial. Estos componentes contextualizan el aprendizaje experiencial y abarcan desde entrevistas informativas hasta pasantías estructuradas. El acoplamiento de estas prácticas de alto impacto requiere superar obstáculos: desembolso de recursos o establecimiento de expectativas razonables. Este modelo detalla integraciones de varias intensidades para hacer accesible la práctica a educadores independientemente de su experiencia previa y para asegurar beneficios tanto para los estudiantes como para las comunidades: una relación recíproca.

Palabras clave: español para fines específicos, modelo de aprendizaje experiencial, enseñanza en justicia criminal, competencias profesionales, diseño curricular

Abstract: This article identifies a need and presents a sustainable model for incorporating community engagement into Spanish for Specific Purposes (SSP) courses. To respond to enrollment stresses, language programs have increased offerings of SSPs which have been recognized as a pathway toward relevance and value, as has the incorporation of community engagement components. Integrating engagement opportunities into an SSP course contextualizes learning outside of the classroom and can range from informational interviews to structured internships. Marrying these high-impact practices requires overcoming obstacles, such as the outlay of resources or setting reasonable expectations. This model outlines varying intensities of integration making it accessible to educators regardless of their community engagement experience and assuring benefits for both students and community partners: a reciprocal relationship.

Keywords: Spanish for Specific Purposes, experiential learning model, Criminal Justice education, professional competencies, curricular design

THE CRISIS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

In 2007, a Modern Language Association (MLA) report emerged recommending that language programs move beyond the traditional two-tiered lower-level language study and upper-level literature programs, to reconfigure higher education language study to address the needs of the 21st century student living in a globalized society. The needs enumerated included the incorporation of translanguingual and transcultural competencies at every stage of the curriculum as well as a concerted effort to promote the study of languages for students majoring in professional studies such as law, medicine and business. Translanguingual and transcultural competencies prepare students not only for communicating with educated speakers in another language, but also for recognizing their own positionality related to speakers of that other language (Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages 237). Simultaneously, in an effort to attract students studying in areas outside of the dwindling liberal arts, departments have increased their beginning and intermediate Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) course offerings (Long 1). However, the essential pedagogy and effort to augment student language acquisition has yet to respond to the MLA recommendations. Sánchez-López notes in 2014, a full seven years after the MLA report, that only 39% of language departments answering a survey had made a conscious effort to incorporate any of the MLA suggestions. Yet changes must be made as enrollment in language classes continues to decline. Although there was a 6.2% increase in overall language enrollment between 2006–2009, a sharp decline in enrollment was seen between 2009–2013 (-6.7%) and between 2013–2016, enrollment in language classes in the United States declined by 9.2% (Looney and Lusin 130). These language enrollments mimic the general trend in higher education towards professional education which Delucchi noted as early as 1997 “Our review of relevant literature has revealed a historical trend toward more professional education and less study of traditional liberal arts fields throughout American higher education...the curricular trend in higher education since about 1970 has been toward studies related to work.” These findings were then reiterated by Brint et. al.'s study in 2005. The market crash and subsequent Great Recession at the end of the 21st century's first

decade accelerated and cemented the vocational nature of higher education. A concurrent demand for institutional accountability (ROI) and the rise of assessment and standardization has also fed the employability expectations of students and their family members regarding what should be achieved from a college education. In order to reinstate and to communicate the role language education plays in an undergraduate's education and development, language departments need to consciously and explicitly incorporate the high impact practices which meet the competency demands of employers, ultimately providing undergraduates with the tools they need in a global marketplace.

Language departments have faced this evolving reality in a variety of ways, reflecting stances ranging from denial to risk-taking innovation. Denial of these developing trends is demonstrated in the continued preeminence of the traditional fields of literature and linguistics in foreign language departments. While historically these disciplines have functioned as the core medium through which foreign languages are studied and acquired, their relevance does not resonate with student and parent concerns for employability. Alternatively, other departments seek to boost enrollment through forging new paths. The expansion of online education, the proliferation of short-term study abroad programs, and even the inclusion of courses taught in English are all strategies departments have utilized in an attempt to fight the ebbing tide of students in their courses. While these initiatives may provide attractive options to students, they fall short both in directly addressing the challenge of reconciling foreign language study with professional prospects, and in highlighting the natural intersection of the two domains.

This article purports to present a model for addressing the obstacles inherent in integrating the high-impact practice of community engagement into LSP courses. After identifying the acute need for innovative practices in foreign language education stemming from the mandate to attract and prepare students for the global stage, this paper will address the challenges facing faculty, as well as the benefits for the primary stakeholders: the community, students, faculty and the institution. In order to mitigate these challenges, this paper first outlines oft-overlooked preliminary steps that create the infrastructure to address unforeseen obstacles, and to ensure a successful semester regardless of surprises. Moving forward, this article presents a

model that allows faculty, whether new to or experienced with community engagement, to integrate this high-impact practice meaningfully to a degree that aligns with their capacity, yet meets their learning outcomes. This model uniquely places primacy on the community's needs, with a series of steps which stem from an initial dialogue, assuring that the community has a voice in identifying these needs, then assessing the efficacy of the relationship, and finally debriefing the semester; thus, even new faculty members deepen their ties with the community and develop their ability to incorporate community engagement. Three diverse courses illustrate the varying degrees of integration of community engagement: (1) Spanish for Criminal Justice and Social Services, (2) a module for Immigration and Education, and (3) Spanish Internship and Service Learning. Lastly, a discussion on the feasibility of this model, regardless of institutional support, reinforces the degree to which faculty agency can establish and maintain long-term reciprocal relationships with community partners, furthering student outcomes and meeting community needs.

TWO CURRICULAR STRATEGIES TO COMBAT THE CRISIS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES

As a direct response to the economic realities of low enrollment and the changing landscape of higher education, tactical approaches have emerged that both reposition foreign language proficiency as the key to a competitive advantage in a globalized workforce and intertwine language study with professional-specific content knowledge and skills: (1) the development and expansion of courses in LSPs, and (2) the inclusion of community engagement. LSP is an interdisciplinary field of foreign language education that marries specialized, professional content and language acquisition. Hallmarks of LSP programs frequently include courses for professions such as medicine, business and legal studies. Despite a presence of LSPs in the language curriculum, data indicate that in the years following the economic crisis of 2008, the field had not yet responded by an increase in departments offering LSP courses, with over a third of language departments not offering these courses (Long and Uzcinski 182). This does not suggest, however, that the field has remained static. The findings of Long and

Uzcinski's survey do indicate a diversification of offerings in LSPs since 1990, suggesting that departments are finally addressing the varying needs and demands of both students and the professional markets they are preparing to enter.

The inclusion of community engagement or service learning elements is another strategy some departments have turned to in order to react to student needs and demands. However, due to the complex nature of community engagement, the capacity to include such an element continues to be dependent upon highly motivated faculty in any given department. Still, the courses not only proffer myriad personal, academic and career benefits to the students, but also strengthen the relevance of the course and its home department within the domains of the university, the immediate community and the global network. The importance of community engagement cannot be overstated. Community engagement or service learning embedded into a Spanish course invites and demands that students access, meaningfully, all of the skills that their language courses have been preparing them for, from communicating clearly with supervisors and community members, to listening carefully and decoding meaning. In this real-life setting, the most fundamental of language acquisition strategies—circumlocution and interpretation—become highly desirable competencies. Thus, explicitly combining the rigorous and content-driven LSP course with the dynamic, tangible and cerebral demands of community engagement results in a student equipped to take on any challenge in the workforce, locally or globally. In today's world in which societal and parental pressures urge students to select courses that contribute to a certificate, program or degree, creating a presentable employable package, the LSP community engagement course bestows both the external rewards easily noted on a CV or *résumé* as well as the invaluable, internal benefits which result in future success.

THE HIGH-IMPACT ROLE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN LSP COURSES

In 2014 Sánchez-López recognized and assessed the natural pairing of LSP and service learning, and calculated that either an internship or service learning component appears in 58% of Spanish for specific purpose (SSP) programs. The required completion of a service learning component is significantly lower,

at 32%. This information indicates a clear presence of service learning in LSP courses, specifically SSP; however, it also suggests significant opportunities both for expansion and enhanced integration of service learning into SSP curricula. Sánchez-López points out that these percentages also indicate that a significant portion of programs either do not include service learning or provide it as an option for students.

Given the innumerable studies on the benefits of community engagement in higher education which explore the personal, social, academic and cognitive development of students and the indisputable success of LSPs in the language curriculum, the lack of more widespread intentional development of LSP community engagement courses may seem surprising (Butin; Eyster and Giles; Donahue and Plaxton-Moore; Felten and Clayton). However, the challenges associated with any community engagement course must be addressed and overcome, not only by a single faculty member, but by a department in order to establish a frequently offered, high quality LSP community engagement course. There are three frequently stated challenges in realizing this. The first is that institutions may be reluctant to commit to the community; this commitment could take the form of fiscal or human resources, or an assurance of a sustainable relationship, but without the backing of an institution, the sole weight of the relationship depends upon faculty. This imbalance between the stated goals of the institution (student learning and success) and what the involved parties need; the community partner (long-term fulfillment of their mission) and the faculty (incorporation of high-impact practices and a manageable workload) may lead to an interested faculty member abandoning the practice and returning to the known and predictable on-campus curriculum. The capacity to cope with unpredictability represents the second major challenge to the LSP community engagement model. Grant funded or government funded community partners are often stretched to their limit in their infrastructure and an additional responsibility, even one which could facilitate the work, may not be a feasible addition. Alternatively, an established relation with a community organization may vanish when the contact individual leaves the position, the grant money ceases to come in, the organization restructures or the burden of the students' presence outweighs the benefits. Confronted by the need to establish new connections or to rely on a new, unknown partner,

it is not uncommon for faculty to determine that the demands are too great, and the practice is scrapped. The final stakeholder in the course, the students, represents the third challenge. The range of students enrolled in language classes can both delight and terrify faculty and community partners in a community engagement environment. Unlike the highly structured classroom in which all partners understand the implicit rules of comportment and roles, service-learning places students in unfamiliar contexts performing non-scripted or unrecognizable tasks. Students may enter this new environment with fears, anxieties, prejudices and expectations that impact their ability to learn and function, and they may encounter situations which provoke stress or flight. The community organization must be willing to work with all the students of a class, not just selected and vetted students, and this expansiveness requires profound trust and clear communication from all involved parties. In spite of the above-stated challenges, the value of the students' personal, linguistic and academic growth necessitates an increase in the number of LSP community engagement courses available to students and an inquiry into viable, long-term strategies to overcome the inherent challenges.

THE PLANNING OF AN LSP ENGAGEMENT COURSE: INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the preliminary stage, to develop a meaningful LSP engagement course, community partners must be identified and brought on board, and truly reciprocal relationships must be established so that the engagement is integrated into the curriculum design through learning outcomes, assessments and reflections. A reciprocal relationship must, perforce, benefit all stakeholders, moving the relationship from a personal connection into an institutional necessity (norm). The higher education institution must gain: positive recognition, student growth, room for faculty scholarship and consistent collaboration. The community organization's primary criterion for a healthy relationship must be that the resource investment in the collaboration provide benefits that outweighs costs. The benefits may include: increased knowledge *of* the community by outsiders, increased knowledge *about* the community through research efforts, increased capacity to support the community through labor hours and ultimately, the forging of continual and

progressively deeper relationships allowing for the development of more complex projects to meet community needs.

The initial impetus for developing a reciprocal relationship must come from aligning the LSP course goals that can be fomented through community engagement with the concrete needs of community organizations. Once the course's learning outcomes are determined, the innumerable iterations of community engagement can serve to open a dialogue with several community organizations in order to empower the organizations. This dialogue paves the way for a creative negotiation, resulting in benefits for both parties and solidifying how students will interact with the organization. Once the "what - what students will do" is determined, the "how" will follow. The initial implementation of the engagement is often messy, chaotic and unpredictable, but through appropriate student preparation and communication with the organization, many of the solutions to challenges can be addressed beforehand, again strengthening the relationship and the commitment to everyone's success. Although every institution's context will differ, a quick summary of the experience at a large public institution will illuminate areas of which to be aware. The following table enumerates these areas as determined by a qualitative analysis of community engagement successes and failures in multiple LSPs.

Table 1. Potential challenges to successful community engagement implementation

	Challenges for students	Challenges for instructors / institutions	Challenges for organizations
1. Student apathy at site		X	X
2. Student attendance		X	X
3. Lack of supervision at site	X		
4. Lack of support at site	X	X	
5. Lack of structure at site	X	X	
6. Interpersonal Problems	X	X	X
7. Student costs (transportation, clearances, time)	X		

Through pinpointing and ultimately predicting potential complications for all parties involved, faculty can take preventative measures to both avoid these challenges and then intervene if in fact these challenges do arise. The lists below present a series of strategies organized as either preventative steps or direct interventions. A clear grasp of these options, their functions and their context are key in ensuring that the community engagement experience is optimally executed for students, instructors and organizations. The notion of reciprocal relationships, beneficial for both students and organizations, hinges on the minimization and management of complications.

Preventions:

- A student contract co-created with instructor, students and community organization
- Regular student reflections integrated into coursework, shared with the site
- A pre-determined description for the role and position of the student in the organization
- Pre-engagement trainings
- Enumeration of student costs in course description and syllabus
- Mid-semester follow-up with site supervisor
- End of semester debriefing and pre-planning for following semester

Interventions:

- An email between supervisor and professor with student copied
- A one-on-one meeting with the supervisor
- A one-on-one meeting with the professor
- A meeting with both supervisor and professor
- The implementation of a probationary period

The common thread uniting both the preventions and interventions is the active, frequent and targeted communication between the site personnel and the faculty contact. The co-construction of the student engagement and the parameters guiding it, as well as the explicit and articulated partnership between the organization and the university not only ensures

greater success for all stakeholders, but moves the arrangement from service to engagement as defined by Frabutt et al., "engagement is characterized by reciprocity, bi-directional relationships and mutual respect between institutions of higher learning and the communities" (105). A reciprocal, bi-directional relationship is one that is more likely to continue.

Nevertheless, both university settings and their policies and community organizations are dynamic institutions, subject to capricious change, and what may seem to be the most stable of collaborations can evaporate, frustrating and threatening a well-established LSP community engagement course. Thus, using a replicable model in the initial design of the course and treating the maintenance of the course as analogous to the time dedicated to following trends in any given field, allows the course to constantly evolve, yet can counterpose both predictable and unforeseeable changes.

PRESENTATION OF THE MODEL

A replicable LSP community engagement course model is one in which a language department can offer the course consistently, preserving the engagement component, with multiple instructors and various community organizations, adapting to changing circumstances, while retaining both the integration of the high-impact practice and the reciprocal relationship with the community partner. The model offered below for establishing, maintaining and optimizing reciprocal relationships between LSP community engagement courses and community organizations recognizes the demands and time pressures on students, faculty and community organizations, the limits imposed by policies and circumstances and further upends the notion that the students' learning exists in function to the service they perform. In the following model, student learning, personal and academic growth, linguistic development and career preparation, progress even when ideal conditions (variability in target language use or responsibilities not directly related to the LSP) lag.

The model presented in this article incorporates community engagement into LSP courses in a variety of modalities recognizing the needs and potential benefits to all stakeholders: students, faculty, organizations and institutions. The

model is divided into two components in order to address both the theoretical and practical concerns inherent in a higher-ed community partnership. The first component initiates the planning phase, providing the structure to define and concretize how community engagement would add value to the course. This component includes: (1) identifying linguistic and professional outcomes (2) purposefully integrating multiple interdisciplinary methodologies (3) incorporating meaningful experiential components (4) and devising relevant reflection components for students. The practical thrust of the second component allows for the realization of the goals identified in the first component. The model evolved from initial efforts to improve outcomes for all stakeholders. Once established the model was shared with other colleagues to expand capacity, better meeting students' and community partners' needs.

To illustrate the model's versatility, it will be mapped onto three SSP courses with distinct levels and manifestations of community engagement: Spanish for Criminal Justice and Social Services, a module for Spanish for Education in an intensive language semester and a Spanish Internship course. These case studies will demonstrate that this model is a powerful tool not only for its role in establishing impactful relationships, but also for the flexibility required for different learning contexts. For example, this model recognizes the need for multiple stages of student engagement, ranging from community ethnographies to student-led development and teaching of ESL courses. Each stage can offer different kinds of knowledge and contribute to the forging of deeper understandings. As Hoyt notes, the stages are continuums that ultimately lead to “[a]n epistemology of reciprocal knowledge, realized through a two-way network of human relationships, [allowing] faculty, students, civic leaders and residents to experiment” (86). Because reciprocal knowledge and different levels of engagement are intrinsic to the model, a second result of this flexibility, and in part a consequence of the possibility of multiple stages of engagement, is that the model increases the feasibility of teaching an LSP course for diverse faculty interested in taking on community engagement, ranging from an educator experienced in engagement to a faculty member nascent to experiential learning.

By and large, both scholarship and practice pertaining to service learning intimate that there is an inherent assumption that

students in a "service learning" context are making a positive contribution to the organization or community with which they are involved. The label itself suggests this. Institutions, instructors and even students, often with the most altruistic of motives, are quick to identify the variety of ways they provide a "service". Whether students are teaching English to seniors or interpreting in a medical clinic, it is too frequently assumed that the net result is a positive contribution. What is not taken into consideration is the cost borne by the organizations and communities due to the intermittent frequency or potentially superficial contact with which students and faculty work in LSP community service learning contexts. The model presented here is unique in that it takes into consideration not only the needs of the course and students, but also the needs, limitations and demands of the community partners. All parties make an investment and receive a return. This is essential in a context in which non-profits are already working with limited and strained resources. For example, non-profits constantly shape decisions based on limitations for funds, space, personnel, time and even supplies. These factors, though alluded to, are seldom incorporated into earlier models for community service learning (Sánchez-López "Service-Learning Course Design"). The framework offered here begins to rectify this issue and creates the groundwork for a paradigm of partnership that not only recognizes this position for non-profits, but rather aims to ensure that participating students reduce this strain and ultimately support the organization in achieving its goals.

The model for establishing reciprocal relationships is first and foremost a practical guide to initiating and ensuring sufficient bi-directional benefits from the experience. The model has two parts. Part one consists of a summary of the steps needed to integrate best practices into language and community engagement classes and then synthesizes the steps to depict what realistic outcomes would look like in an LSP community engagement course. Part two is a series of concrete steps, applicable to any location, institution, language-level and level of instructor experience with community engagement.

PART ONE: CONSIDERATIONS FOR CONCEPTUALIZATION

Identify Linguistic and Professional Outcomes

As foreign-language instructors, a primary learning outcome must inevitably be the development of student skills in the target language. This development has been understood, reasonably so, to require maximum input and output in the target language in a variety of settings, from the classroom to the community to study abroad. Faculty and student expectations when making arrangements for students to engage with community partners is that the target language will be the language of communication of all parties and that the students, *de facto*, will be immersed in the target language. However, community organizations working with non-English dominant populations adapt to their community's fluid language use. In addition to the use of English, community members often speak highly non-standard varieties, and regularly code-switch, contrasting greatly to language input students receive in the classroom. In this context, a valid and necessary outcome for students is to describe, without evaluative judgment or prejudice, the linguistic reality of the population with which they are working. Beyond this, to be effective communicators, this situation necessitates that students utilize a range of communicative skill sets including the target language, their native language, culturally informed pragmatics and a degree of intercultural competence. LSP courses, by definition, seek to prepare students for employment in specific fields. Being aware of what language use looks like in any given professional environment is critical to student understanding and eventually competent, effective communication. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages' (ACTFL) guiding principles in their mission statement explicitly indicate the broad-mindedness that must come to bear on understanding linguistic outcomes: ("Opening Statement"):

- Participate in face-to-face interactions via technology, internships and volunteer opportunities in the community.
- Apply their competence in a new language to their career and personal goals, broadening their thinking beyond self-serving goals.

- Become more adept in understanding diverse cultural perspectives and their own identity.

Thus, a primary step in identifying linguistic outcomes for an LSP course is recognizing what can be achieved in the classroom and on site, and maximizing the student progress in both.

A review of the 2015 AACU literature on employers' needs also indicates the primacy of liberal arts outcomes and "soft skills". A rigorous curriculum which demands that students be observant of all input and careful in their output, and one in which every interaction enriches students' epistemology and synthesizes previous learning and present experience, hones the knowledge and proficiencies the 21st century marketplace needs. The following outcomes and skills, mentioned by more than 70% of surveyed employers include: problem solving; understanding of democratic institutions; civic knowledge, skills and judgment; intercultural skills and knowledge of societies outside the United States; the ability to communicate orally; work in teams; write effectively; analyze and above all; to apply both knowledge and skills to the real world.

By recognizing at the outset that less than ideal conditions reflect the workplace, these realities can be incorporated into every lesson, assessment and reflection in the course. For example, helping students draw explicit connections between the skills they have acquired in the process of their language acquisition (such as circumlocution, clear writing and close listening) to the demands of the new context, deepens not only language skills but also a student's awareness of the transferability of those skills.

Integrate Purposefully Multiple Interdisciplinary Methodologies

By definition, LSP courses approach course design from an interdisciplinary lens. By interweaving theory and practice from fields of language acquisition and other disciplines such as business, health care, criminal justice etc., there is an effectively automatic interdisciplinarity, which has even been lauded as a valuable characteristic of the LSP field. Although any degree of drawing together different fields is impactful and reflective of the varied nature of the world outside of academia, the reality is that

the inherent interdisciplinary nature of LSPs is superficial, and does not optimally promote learners to cultivate the diverse tools and skill sets they need to truly marry language study and their diverse professional pathways. For example, in an SSP for health care, learners enhance their control of specific structures while learning vocabulary and even general content pertaining to different topics in health care. While it is impossible to deny the inclusion of these two fields, they too often serve as tools to cursorily view and see the other, resulting in a lack of depth into either domain. In order to maximize the LSP community engagement experience, this model moves beyond a casual overlap and proposes a conscious and purposeful integration of multiple interdisciplinary methodologies. The term *purposeful* is key in this description, and contrasts with the *automatic* inclusion of different areas by building on relationships with specialists in relevant fields and constructing course designs and components around their input, resources and perspectives. Going beyond frequent LSP practices, which simply tie together language and relevant, yet basic professional content, this model truly integrates distinct disciplines as tools for realizing course outcomes and preparing students to consciously and effectively use multiple discipline-specific frameworks in an effective way, impacting all of their coursework, including the community engagement components. This approach champions a literal and academic dialogue with units in the higher education institution, often with professionals in fields that may not appear at first to be logical collaborators. Although additional case studies will be explored below, the SSP, Spanish for Health Professions exemplifies the multidisciplinary framework in the course design. Despite the focused content of the course, the reality is that health care is a field approached by a variety of professions and backgrounds ranging from health care providers to advertising agents. During the planning stages of the course, faculty from a range of departments were consulted and included to shape a holistic and diverse multidisciplinary component of the course, reflective of the diversity of the student experience and interests. Naturally, this included conversations with the university's College of Public Health, but also resulted in surprising, yet valuable interactions with the School of Communications and even distinct departments within the College of Liberal Arts. This course looked to logical, but non-traditional directions for enriching the degree of

multiperspectivism in the course and found valuable methodologies from the fields of anthropology, urban studies, sociology and psychology. In the context of Spanish for Health Professions, anthropology provided a solid theoretical foundation for student ethnographies of the communities with which they were engaging. The lens of urban studies utilized data mining techniques from mapping to calculate the location and density of clinics and hospitals, assessing access to health care for individuals in this community. Statistical and survey-driven strategies that inform sociology also shed light on the health care experience of the community. Finally, cognitive psychology provided insights into varying issues that intersect with health care ranging from factors that impact patient learning and understanding of information to how the immigrant experience can affect patient and health care provider relationships. All of these components shape student course work and experiences with and in the community.

Although the inclusion of these elements for all students would theoretically be ideal, in practice it represents the overextension of course objectives and student time and energy when placed into the context of other assignments, course materials and community engagement. As a response, the model takes the purposeful inclusion of interdisciplinary methodologies and utilizes them to allow a degree of personalization in the course. This strategy not only recognizes the diversity of interests that students bring with them to a course, but ultimately affords them agency in applying different lenses to the health care context. For example, a final research paper requires students to explore an aspect relevant to their community engagement experience utilizing three distinct methodologies.

There are numerous benefits to allowing students to personalize their learning experience. In part, it expands student exposure to a diversity of ideas. Not only are learners potentially examining various topics, but the ability to select different perspectives injects the project with variation, ensuring that no two projects are the same. This variation creates the perfect information gap for a final, professional presentation. Since not only topics, but frameworks are different in each presentation, every student is positioned to interact with new information in new ways, ultimately enhancing the project's value for everyone, not just the individual student. Additionally, this component

highlights connections to coursework for students who have experience in other disciplines. Often, students in Spanish courses are enrolled in programs in different departments, frequently pairing their Spanish courses with other majors or minors. Providing these structured opportunities for the incorporation of interdisciplinary methodologies simultaneously demonstrates the relevance of Spanish to other contexts and the relevance of both Spanish and other disciplines to contexts outside of academia, specifically in relation to their interactions with communities and community organizations. Since this model allows students to utilize and build on previously existing knowledge and skills, they can engage in the course with greater depth and expertise.

Incorporate Meaningful Experiential Components

Once the outcomes and the multidisciplinary methodologies are established, the penultimate step is to incorporate experiential components into the course. To reiterate the scholarship previously mentioned on community engagement learning, every phase and level of engagement can transform student and community experiences; thus, a range of opportunities to engage allows faculty, students and organizations at varying stages to meaningfully interact. At its core “... experiential learning means learning from experience or learning by doing. Experiential education first immerses learners in an experience and then encourages reflection about the experience to develop new skills, new attitudes, or new ways of thinking” (Lewis and Williams 5). This rather obvious definition belies the infinite ways in which students in an LSP community engagement course can experience and engage with the world around them. Drawing from the characteristics that Chapman et al. enumerate for a course component to be considered experiential, a selection of LSP course activities has been designed to provide students with the opportunity to apply their classroom learning outside the university setting and to contemplate and evaluate what they have learned. Salient features when incorporated in an LSP course would allow it to be designated community engagement. These include: the explicit connection between course content and the experience, intentional discussion and writing prompts to help students to understand the experience in a larger framework, and the fostering of meaningful relationships. These features augment

the learning that takes place when a student is outside of familiar contexts (Chapman et al. 243). These components can take the form of several smaller incursions into the community, each one adding to the body of student knowledge, or a semester-long project, be it research or direct service. Even when a course does not permit a semester-long project or an organization does not have the service capacity for a large number of students, the following experiential learning pedagogy may be introduced and completed in two to three weeks. These examples incorporate the previously mentioned salient features and meaningfully engage the entire class. The connection between course content and the experience can be highlighted through focused student research about a local community using news and data sources. Intentional discussion would dissect previous student conceptions and compare them to researched findings. Developing a meaningful relationship could take place by assigning students ethnographies, allowing them to interact with community members in a respectful, open-minded and objective way. In another iteration, students could engage the community through interviews in which the question topics are co-created by the class, based on their subject and the community.

Thus, during this module, the course content is comprised of the community engagement experience through the explicit connections, intentional pre and post interview discussion, and the interview itself. A third, yet not final variation results in a tangible product for the community. Students are assigned to investigate resources relevant to the community within the course topic framework (health, criminal justice, urban studies, education, etc.). For this component, students investigate the availability of resources, the community's knowledge of resources, and resource accessibility (location, language, childcare). Working with community partners, students identify the most optimal approach to increasing accessibility and compile this information in the target language and English and then share the tangible product, resource guide, with community organizations. Each one of these components encapsulates the relevance of the students' language and academic skills and what that might look like in a professional setting. The artifact or the product from endeavors such as these also opens the door to more extensive connections such as those found in more traditional service learning approaches. Historically, service learning has been understood to involve a

lengthier relationship between the university and the community, and ample literature has been devoted to how to assure the success of that experience. Sánchez-López correctly points out that experiential learning, as defined by David Kolb, and service learning share many of the same methodologies and outcomes (385). An application of Kolb's experiential learning theory criteria to a sample LSP service course demonstrates how this theory can simplify and deepen the steps needed to maximize student realization of outcomes. The table below suggests one way in which Kolb's four-stage process can map onto an LSP service course.

Table 2. Kolb's four-stage process mapped onto LSP service course

Kolb	LSP service course example
Concrete Experience:	Tutoring writing literacy to children whose first language may be Spanish, English or both.
Reflective Observations:	Reflecting on how language is used and decided. What language do the children use with the tutor, to discuss school, to speak to their parents.
Abstract conceptualization: Modification of previous concepts or new idea	Considerations on language and power or prestige, educational systems, context, language competencies.
Active experimentation: Testing of hypothesis	Active observation of "new" conceptualization. Students focus on their own use of language, thus, advancing in self-awareness, pragmatics and language choice.

Data from a 2014 Gallup poll highlight that college graduates are two-times more likely to be engaged in the workplace if they had had a job or an experience that allowed them to apply what they were learning in the classroom (Gallup). The key to this outcome lies in student articulation of the connection between theory and practice and the students' recognition of their learning gains.

Devise Relevant Reflection Tasks for Students

Often considered the culminating activity in any experience, reflection is indisputably the glue which binds experience to learning. In the present model's conceptualization of LSP community engagement, however, reflection partners with experience from the commencement of the course. Before even beginning an experiential component, a service or an engagement, having students articulate, in writing, their current perspectives and emotions, serves to create the baseline for transformative learning. Mezirow clarifies that reflection must take into account presuppositions and assumptions (2). By having students state and examine both presuppositions and assumptions, alongside the experience or service, the complexities of language, language use, interpersonal dynamics, the workplace and the myriad other competing elements of an experience come into focus. Thus, students can deepen their reflection and analysis with each subsequent writing, inviting students to consider Butin's critical questions on the nature of service learning and pedagogy and the role they play in the community-university relationship. "How is knowledge created and by whom? What is the 'usefulness,' if any, of disciplinary knowledge? What is the role of higher education in a liberal democracy? What is the role, moreover, of students, faculty and institutions in their local and global communities" (Butin 8)?

PART 2: CONCRETE STEPS TO IMPLEMENTATION

Absent from much of the discussion is the recent scholarship on community engagement which questions the academy's focus on student learning as the preponderant outcome from the collaboration. Nicole Nicotera cites O'Meara and Rice to underscore both the need for a shift in focus to "...genuine collaboration [in order] that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared" (28) and to emphasize the dangers of a simplistic understanding of service learning in order to move "beyond the expert model that often gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration ... to move beyond outreach ... to go beyond 'service' with its overtones of noblesse oblige" (28). Embedded within the following six concrete steps is a collaborative core which aspires to cement the

bi-directionality of the relationship, regardless of the instructional faculty, the student body or the community organization's contact.

Preliminary Steps Before Reaching Out to Organizations

In order to have a more focused, productive meeting within the time constraints of the community organization, faculty must thoroughly prepare the following steps.

1) Revisit potential linguistic and professional outcomes indicated in pre-planning stage from this list. Establish and identify multiple learning outcomes which could be met through community engagement within any given organization.

2) Identify student preparation for the course: language level, academic year, previous contact with the targeted community, practical issues such as class size, transportation, student availability—are they working students, etc.

3) Brainstorm concrete tasks for students ranging from observation (ethnographies, data searches) and service (labor fulfilling stated organizational need) to research for and with the community (needs assessments, focus groups, etc.). Consider how these tasks could be assessed.

4) Research organizations: their mission, hours, location, staff, capacity.

5) Reach out to multiple organizations and set-up face-to-face meetings on site, with two supervisors if possible.

6) Attend the face-to-face meeting prepared to listen and compromise:

6.1) Ask the community organization about their needs, their mission, what they would like the students to learn from the community. Inquire about their capacity, both in numbers and staff, to work with you.

6.2) Inquire about past collaborations with the university or students to have a complete understanding of their prior experience and their present expectations.

6.3) Negotiate with the community organization about what the students can do that both meets stated course learning outcomes and organizational goals.

- 6.4) Determine from the outset time commitments and specifications.
- 6.5) Establish with the organization a timeline for the engagement, from pre to post-semester:
 - i. When will students be informed about organizations and time involved? When will the organization know how many students to expect?
 - ii. Estimated start date with organization bearing in mind: mandatory trainings, clearances, etc.
 - iii. Plan check-in dates with the site, factoring in the ebb and flow of the organization's time and responsibility.
 - iv. Choose a date for completion of student responsibilities both in terms of time and duties.
- 6.6) Summarize, in writing, the meeting. Include the plan with as many known details as possible (estimated number of students, available time-slots at organization, etc.). Share the document with the organization to assure that both parties are in agreement.

Repeat with an additional organization bearing in mind that the learning outcomes, tasks and particulars may differ. Following these steps creates opportunities for LSP students to participate in community engagement, while at the same time offers agency to the organization in ensuring the interaction is supportable, sustainable and reciprocal.

The implementation of the above model, both the conceptualization segment and the concrete steps, are illustrated through three case studies in the following tables. Each case study highlights a unique course or portion of one in which the manifest goals, those most apparent to students, are nuanced language acquisition outcomes developed in a non-classroom environment.

Table 3. The planning phase through case studies

	Spanish for the Professionals in Criminal Justice	Program Module:	Internship
--	--	------------------------	-------------------

	and Social Services	Immigration and Education	
Identify linguistic and professional outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use and retain vocabulary related to policing, lawyering and social services • Practice Spanish and cultural sensitivity in a variety of real-world situations • Translate a variety of documents used in law and social service settings • Practice interpretation in law and social service intake settings • Communicate effectively with the Spanish-speaking population • Learn and use strategies that facilitate communication in any language • Investigate, assess and present research on language and access within the criminal justice or social services systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use and retain vocabulary related to immigration, law, asylum and educational services • Practice Spanish and cultural sensitivity in a variety of real-world situations • Identify challenges and resources for accessing educational resources • Practice strategies that make education effective • Recognize the impact of socioeconomic factors in the educational experience of immigrant communities • Support organization educational initiatives • Communicate effectively with the Spanish-speaking population • Learn and use strategies that facilitate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate the history that factored into the presence of differing, local Spanish-speaking populations • Practice Spanish and cultural sensitivity in a variety of real-world situations • Work with internship site to identify gaps in resources • Translate or create relevant documents • Explain diverse Hispanic/ Latinx perspectives and cultural contexts of the site population • Communicate effectively • Learn and use strategies that facilitate communication in any language • Strengthen academic Spanish reading and writing and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize violations of Title VI and formulate solutions • Summarize research around the effects of being a non-native speaker in different situations 	<p>communication in any language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate, assess and present research on language and access for immigrants within the education system • Summarize research around the effects of being a non-native speaker in different situations 	<p>professional oral skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sight-translate high frequency documents • Recognize one's interpretation limits • Determine when a qualified interpreter is required • Access research relevant to the site, analyze it relative to the experience and community perspectives
Integrate purposefully multiple interdisciplinary methodologies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latin American & Latinx Studies • Linguistics • Sociology • Anthropology • Business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History • Political Science • Gender Studies • Literature in Spanish • Education and Literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Health • Public Policy • Latinx Literary Studies • Sociolinguistics • Latin American Studies
Incorporate meaningful experiential components.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnography • Site visits to immigration-focused organizations • Translation for local law clinics • Interpretation at local law clinics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnography • Interpretation for parent-teacher conferences • Tutoring in after school education programs • Program planning and design for after school and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research on neighborhoods using local Spanish language periodicals • Intensive time commitment to site • Collaboration with the site to fulfill needs

		summer programs	for incoming interns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report on the role of students in the community site
Reflections	Reflections which spiral, beginning with student assumptions and presuppositions, progressing according to student epistemology and concluding with the nature of university service learning and community	Reflections which spiral, beginning with student assumptions and presuppositions, progressing according to student epistemology and concluding with the nature of university service learning and community	Reflections which spiral, beginning with student assumptions and presuppositions, progressing according to student epistemology and concluding with the nature of university service learning and community

Table 4. The practical steps in case studies

	Spanish for the Professionals in Criminal Justice and Social Services	LASS Module: Immigration and Education	Internship
Establish which course learning outcomes could potentially be met by community engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use and retain vocabulary related to policing, lawyering and social services • Practice Spanish and cultural sensitivity in a variety of real-world situations • Translate a variety of documents used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use and retain vocabulary related to immigration, law, asylum and educational services • Practice Spanish and cultural sensitivity in a variety of real-world situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice Spanish and cultural sensitivity in a variety of real-world situations • Work with internship site to identify gaps in resources • Translate or create

	<p>in law and social service settings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice interpretation in law and social service intake settings • Communicate effectively with the Spanish-speaking population • Learn and use strategies that facilitate communication in any language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice strategies that make education effective • Work with community organization to support educational initiatives • Communicate effectively with the Spanish-speaking population • Learn and use strategies that facilitate communication in any language 	<p>relevant documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain diverse Hispanic/Latinx perspectives and cultural contexts of the site population • Communicate effectively • Learn and use strategies that facilitate communication in any language • Recognize one's interpretation limits and determine when a qualified interpreter is required
<p>Identify student preparation for the course: language level, academic year, previous contact with the targeted community, practical issues such as class size, transportation, student availability (are they</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junior • Intermediate mid to native speakers • Basic contact with the community • 20 students maximum • Moderately accessible through public transportation • Large percentage of students work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freshman to senior • Novice high to advanced low • None to significant contact with the community • 30 - 45 students • Some sites easily accessible; other sites require a time investment and transfers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juniors and seniors • Advanced-low to native speakers • None to significant contact with the community • 10 - 15 students • Some sites easily accessible through walking or

<p>working students, etc.).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fixed 17-credit class schedule • Large percentage of students work 	<p>public transportation; other sites require a time investment and transfers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student commitment to 10 hrs./week
<p>Brainstorm concrete tasks for students ranging from observation and service to research for and with the community.</p> <p>Consider how these tasks could be assessed for student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnography • Site visits to immigration-focused organizations • Translation for local law clinics • Interpretation at local law clinics • Prison tutoring • Volunteer work at victim service agencies • Police ride-alongs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnography • Interpretation for parent-teacher conferences • Tutoring in after school education programs • Program planning and design for after school and summer programs • Community-based participatory research • Community information sessions • Evening parental tutoring • ESL classes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research on neighborhoods using local Spanish language periodicals • Intensive time commitment to site • Collaboration with the site to fulfill needs for incoming interns • Final report on the role of students in the community site • Entrepreneurial collaborations • Research for law firms • Community-based participatory research • Implementation of student project ideas
<p>Research organizations:</p>	<p>Representative organizations:</p>	<p>Representative organizations:</p>	<p>Representative organizations:</p>

their mission, hours, location, staff, capacity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immigrant legal clinics • Penal system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latinx social services non-profits • Non-profit after school educational services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latinx social services non-profits • Hospitals • Immigrant legal and medical outreach clinics
---	---	--	---

DISCUSSION

The three courses mentioned have used this model to successfully incorporate community engagement in multiple semesters, bringing together various faculty members and community partners. In addition, the model has been shared and utilized in courses not included in this article such as: Spanish for Medical Professionals (online), Basic Spanish I and II, and General Education courses such as Eating Cultures. Despite the ease with which faculty unfamiliar with community engagement have been able to integrate it into their course, this model merits further study in diverse institutions and locations tested by non-associated faculty. Next steps include qualitative studies to more systematically measure the impact on the parties involved.

Ultimately, the model presented above intends to cement community engagement as an intrinsic component in LSP courses, as fundamental for student learning as a textbook once was. Thus, it is incumbent upon the field to offer validated models of incorporation for LSP faculty, whether full-time or contingent, so that best practices are not goals, but rather realities. Through accessible, manageable steps, clear parameters and contingency plans, community engagement does not have to be daunting or peripheral, but transparently valuable to students.

In a constantly evolving higher education landscape in which a single change in administration can radically impact faculty and student resources and thus instruction, evidence-based pedagogy which does not require insurmountable institutional support is a must. AACU's mission statement to "advance the vitality and public standing of liberal education by making quality and equity the foundations for excellence in undergraduate education in service to democracy" is a call to arms to the

humanities and liberal arts, bidding faculty to intentionally embed quality and equity in the curriculum for all disciplines. How better to promote quality, equity and serve democracy than by forging, nurturing and constantly fine-tuning equal, democratic, multilingual partnerships between the local community and the university? The skills development, knowledge exchange and heightened sense of community that occur in a well-designed LSP community engagement course may imprint each student uniquely and sometimes unexpectedly, but with appropriate structure and guidance that imprint will result in excellence in undergraduate education. It is up to the faculty, the curators of course content, to choose how students in our language courses learn to interact with and understand target language speakers, language use and their own competencies. By engaging students in the community, knowledge is constructed by students, not given to students. The cognitive models of Piaget, Perry and Kurfiss underscore how crucial this construction is to learning about one's self, one's subject and the connection of both to the world. Knowing these connections and committing to them requires purposeful course design, but not ideal conditions, unlimited resources, sustained institutional support or a single personal contact. The commitment to designing, implementing and sustaining an LSP engagement course depends upon an appreciation of its transformative effect and a willingness to embrace, appreciate and learn from a sometimes unpredictable and unexpected relationship. In the words of a longstanding community partner, "All this is to keep saying THANK YOU. We're off to the start of a phenomenal semester, and we would not be in this position without students from your class."

WORKS CITED

- Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World." *Profession*, vol. 2007, no. 1, 2007, pp. 234-245.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. "Guiding Principles for Language Learning" www.mla.org/content/download/83540/2197676/2016-Enrollments-Short-Report.pdf Accessed 3 March 2018.

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. "Opening Statement" www.actfl.org/guiding-principles/opening-statement Accessed 3 March 2018.
- Brint, Steven G., Mark Riddle, Lori Turk-Bicakci, and Charles S. Levy. "From the Liberal to the Practical Arts in American Colleges and Universities: Organizational Analysis and Curricular Change." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 76, no. 2, 2005, pp. 151-180.
- Butin, Dan W. *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Critical Issues and Directions*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Butin, Dan W. "Toward a Theory and Practice of Community Engagement." *Service-Learning in Theory and Practice*, edited by Dan W. Butin, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 125-142.
- Chapman, Steve, Pam McPhee, and Bill Proudman. "What is Experiential Education?" *The Theory of Experiential Education*, edited by Karen Warren, Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1995, pp. 235-248.
- Delucchi, Michael. "Liberal Arts: Colleges and the Myth of Uniqueness." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 68, no. 4, 1997, pp. 414-426.
- Donahue, David M., and Star Plaxton-Moore. *The Student Companion to Community-engaged Learning: What You Need to Know for Transformative Learning and Real Social Change*. Stylus Publishing, 2018.
- Eyler, Janet, and Dwight Giles. *Where's the Learning in Service-learning?* Jossey-Bass, 1999.
- Felten, Peter, and Patti H Clayton. "Service-Learning." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, vol. 2011, no. 128, 2011, pp. 75-84.
- Frabutt, James M., April D. Forsbrey, and Carol Mackinnon-Lewis. "A University-Community Partnership's Use of Qualitative Methods to Foster Community Engagement in Adolescent Research." *Journal of Higher Education and Engagement*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 105-118.
- Gallup-Purdue Index Report. "Great jobs, great lives," 2014. www.gallup.com/file/services/176768/GallupPurdueIndex_Report_2014.pdf Accessed 23 April 2018.
- Hoyt, Lorlene. "A City-Campus Engagement Theory from, and for, Practice." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2010, pp. 75-88.

- Kolb, David A. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, Prentice-Hall, 1984.
- Kurfiss, Joanne, and Richard D. Odom. "Sequentiality and Structure in a Cognitive Model of College Student Development." *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 6, 1977, pp. 565-571.
- Lewis, Linda H., and Carol J. Williams. "Experiential Learning: Past and Present." *Experiential Learning: A New Approach*, edited by Lewis Jackson and Rosemary S. Caffarella, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994, pp. 5-16.
- Long, Mary K., and Izabela Uzcinski. "Evolution of Languages for Specific Purposes Programs in the United States: 1990-2011." *Modern Language Journal* vol. 96, no.1, 2012, pp.173-189.
- Long, Mary K., editor. *Languages for Specific Purposes: Trends in Curriculum Development*. Georgetown UP, 2017.
- Looney, Dennis, and Natalia Lusin. *Enrollments in Languages Other Than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016: Preliminary Report*, 2018.
www.mla.org/content/download/83540/2197676/2016-Enrollments-Short-Report.pdf Accessed 21 Feb. 2018.
- Mezirow, Jack. "How critical reflection triggers transformative learning." *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood: A Guide to Transformative and Emancipatory Learning*, edited by Jack Mezirow, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990, pp. 1-20.
- Nicotera, Nicole, Nick Cutforth, Eric Fretz, and Sheila Summers Thompson. "Dedication to Community Engagement: A Higher Education Conundrum?" *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, vol. 4, no.1, 2011, pp. 37-49.
- Perry, William Graves. *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1999.
- Piaget, Jean. *The Construction of Reality in the Child*. Basic Books, 1954.
- Sánchez-López, Lourdes. "Service-Learning Course Design for Languages for Specific Purposes Programs." *Hispania*, vol. 96, no. 2, 2013, pp. 383-396.

Sánchez-López, Lourdes. "An Analysis of the Integration of Service Learning in Undergraduate Spanish for Specific Purposes Programs in Higher Education in the United States." *Cuadernos de ALDEEU*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2014, pp. 155-170.

Sánchez-López, Lourdes, Mary K. Long, and Barbara A. Lafford. "New Directions in LSP Research in US Higher Education." *Language for Specific Purposes: Trends in Curriculum Development*, edited by Mary K. Long, Georgetown UP, 2017, pp. 13-34.