Spanish heritage language (HL) education in the US emerged in the 1970s as a response to misguided approaches adopted by foreign language departments when, for the first time, they encountered significant numbers of Latina/o students (Valdés, 1981, 1997; see Lynch, this volume). This history resulted in a bifurcated development wherein HL education pursued a trajectory that was, in large part, segregated from that of traditional second language (L2) education, with distinct goals (Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowski, 2014).

While HL educators pursued their own goals, L2 education was exploring new and different ways of increasing access to L2 education and of improving connections with the L2 culture. Spanish for the Professions (SP) emerged as a way to engage L2 learners in functional domains that were not included in the traditional L2 sequence, including Spanish for Business and Spanish for Healthcare. Community Service Learning (CSL), on the other hand, grew out of a desire to expand opportunities for L2 learners to interact with speakers of the target language while simultaneously transforming perceptions and stereotypes about immigrant communities in the US and developing a sense of civic identity and responsibility (Rabin, 2009, 2011). These two key developments had been absent from HL education throughout its formative years. The growing professionalization of the field of HL education in the early 2000s, however, led to increasing awareness of and enthusiasm about SP and CSL among HL educators.

In this chapter, we will discuss the history of SP and CSL in greater detail concentrating particularly on its interactions with HL education. The purpose of this chapter is threefold: to trace the development of SP and CSL as single strands that then lead to their entwinement with HL; to consider the current landscape of SP and CSL and offer insights into areas that deserve further development; and to aid language educators in the development of sound SP and CSL
programs that incorporate HL insights, thus consolidating the role of SP and CSL within HL education through its next decade of development.

To be clear, SP is closely related to and sometimes synonymous with Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) which focuses on “the integration of language-related competencies through connections to other disciplines, comparisons of native and target languages and cultures, and communication with target culture communities” (Lafford, 2012, p. 2). An SP course might be taught through a CSL pedagogical approach, but not necessarily; likewise, the pedagogy of CSL can support academic content from any discipline, including, but not limited to professions, such as “Business for Medicine.”

**Historical development**

Although relatively new in language disciplines, experiential education has a long tradition in US higher education, and CSL has grown from it. At the beginning of the 20th century, both John Dewey and Jane Addams wrote about and created educational settings that were a nexus of social justice and experiential learning, though their goal was to integrate immigrants, not necessarily to maintain HLs (Rabin, 2009, 2011). Several decades later, Paulo Freire’s (1970) critical pedagogy presented a more bottom-up and explicitly anti-colonial concept of social justice through education, while David Kolb (1984) offered a four-step model of experiential learning (concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, active experimentation) that was less ideological but also influential. CSL emerged from this background of progressivism and pragmatism. CSL is “a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5). Three important volumes mark the increasing interest of language scholars in CSL: *Construyendo Puentes (Building Bridges): Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Spanish* (Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999), *Juntos: Community Partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese* (Hellebrandt, Arries, & Varona 2003), and *Hispania’s Special Focus Issue: The Scholarship of Community Engagement* (Sánchez-López, 2013). The later volume included a robust representation of articles describing CSL projects inclusive of HL learners. Amor Petrov stated that CSL in an HL course promoted “identification and solidarity with Latino communities of the greater Chicago area” (p. 310); Tacelosky (2013) reported positive outcomes of a CSL project with transnational students in Mexico; Carraces-Juncal (2013) studied Latino graduate students; and Tijunelis, Satterfield, and Benki (2013) described a CSL experience for both L2 and HL learners with positive outcomes for the community organization.

Courses that combine the pedagogy of CSL and the content of SP exploit their shared focus on language in context. Sánchez-López (2014) found that CSL was available in more than half of the SP programs in the US and that it was required in roughly a third of them. Notwithstanding this organic convergence, with the exception of a few key articles (e.g., Abbott & Lear, 2010 and Lear & Abbott, 2008) little has been published about the nexus of CSL and SP. Lear’s work has teased out the rewards and challenges of combining CSL and SP (2012) and offered insight into community partners’ perspectives (Lear & Sánchez, 2013), while Sánchez-López proposed a set of guidelines for service learning courses in SP programs (2013). Even less has been published about the intersections among HL learners, SP and CSL, though Martinez and Schwartz (2012) demonstrate how the convergence of SP and CSL in HL instruction for undergraduate students in health sciences uniquely addressed and enhanced many of the objectives of traditional, classroom-based HL instruction:
HL students re-affirmed their commitment to language maintenance and revitalization, expanded their bilingual range by applying critical thinking and scientific knowledge in language encounters, and developed an enhanced sense of respect for local varieties of the language.

Because SP and CSL are emerging fields that are just beginning to converge and to focus on HL learners, this is a propitious moment to carefully examine critical issues and establish a solid foundation. The critiques and suggestions that follow are applicable to courses and programs either dedicated solely to HL learners or with a mixed enrollment of HL and L2 students.

Critical issues and topics

The relevance of HL teaching to the multilingual needs of the professions has been a central tenet of HL promotion and program building for many years now. International economic competition and the growing recognition of global competencies in what Thomas Friedman called a “flat world” emerged as workforce development imperatives in the early 2000s (Friedman, 2005). Educators were quick to point out that HL students provided an expedient solution to this workforce challenge. Carreira and Armengol (2001) explain that many HLs “have developed a level of language proficiency and depth of cultural understanding that would be difficult to replicate even in the most advanced second language learner” (p. 109). The Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages, furthermore, argued that HL students have been an untapped resource to meet critical economic and national security needs (www.cal.org/heritage). In what follows, we will consider the presence of the workforce challenge in the evolution of HL teaching materials and approaches to instruction, awareness of community perspectives, immigration policies and policing, and a different approach to culture.

Teaching materials and approaches to instruction

HL teaching materials have historically targeted the development of academic skills in the target language with the purpose of preparing students for advanced study in language and literature. Early textbooks focused on the eradication of stigmatized language features (Baker, 1966; Marquez, 2011). More recent textbooks, however, have incorporated nuanced perspectives on language variation within HL communities (Carreira and Geoffrion-Vinci, 2008; Colombi and Pelletieri, 2006; Roca, 2011). In addition, many of these recent curricular materials have incorporated cultural knowledge about Latin@s in the US and have created a space to explore important topics that impact HL communities such as immigration, education, health care, and gender issues. Potowski’s text *Conversaciones Escritas* crystallized the effort to contextualize HL teaching in a wider set of topics and considerations that are relevant both within and outside of the advanced study of literature (Potowski, 2011). While issues that transcend language and literature are continually beginning to gain ground in HL teaching materials, there is a lack of availability of teaching resources that systematically incorporate SP and CSL perspectives and practices for HL learners. We believe that this is a curricular void that is in urgent need of being filled.

SP teaching materials have not begun to systematically incorporate HL perspectives either. The traditional approach to language instruction in SP courses has focused on the acquisition of specialized vocabulary for specific professions. This emphasis can be seen in the titles of
Ann Abbott and Glenn Martínez

courses, textbook chapters organized around long vocabulary lists, and even in student expectations. While students obviously need to know vocabulary that is fundamental to the profession they are studying, those terms are best acquired in context in courses that combine SP and CSL (Martínez & Schwartz, 2012). Even more helpful is a focus on strategies for maximizing communication with the vocabulary students already have and for acquiring new, specialized vocabulary. As an example, a Spanish for Veterinarians book (Frederick, Mosqueda, & García Ángeles, 2000) includes separate chapters and vocabulary lists focusing on individual animals (cattle, horses, dogs, etc.), in the traditional fashion. However, even during school veterinary students specialize in either large or small animals. Later, as practicing professionals, their focus will likely further narrow and deepen in ways they cannot predict while they are still students. Thus, teaching strategies for acquiring more and more precise vocabulary, such as using specific browsers to look for authentic sources, using online translation tools effectively, etc., is a critical skill for students’ future terminology needs.

Grammar instruction in SP textbooks is sometimes absent, with an underlying assumption that students are already proficient or uninterested in proficiency (e.g., phrasebooks). On the other hand, some textbooks offer a (re)teaching of the same normative grammar sequence that students have been exposed to in all of their language courses and grammar reviews. Even if the grammar is presented within discipline-specific examples, for L2 learners this unnecessarily diverts their attention to forms that are difficult to acquire (e.g., multiple uses and tenses of the subjunctive), at the expense of commonly used grammatical structures whose misuse can cause important miscommunications (e.g., singular versus plural commands) or represent a cultural misstep (e.g., not using usted correctly and consistently). For HL students, the reinforcement of normative grammar may place students at a disadvantage by assuming a level of formal instruction that they have not had (see Bowles, this volume). Furthermore, it may create false expectations about the use of language in professional contexts. HL approaches to teaching normative grammar differ significantly from L2 approaches in that they contextualize grammatical concepts within a more comprehensive and nuanced view of language variation (Potowski, 2005). Both HL and L2 students in SP courses need this approach in order to understand and effectively use the language in professional settings that serve a linguistically diverse population. In medical discourse, for example, the use of “stigmatized” lexico-grammatical features has been shown to increase communication and play an important role in establishing communicative rapport between health care providers and patients. Magaña (2012), for example, demonstrates how Spanish-speaking health professionals can mitigate the power differentials between themselves and patients in a bilingual/bicultural environment through the use of code-switching. Martínez and Schwartz (2012), furthermore, showed how heritage language students in a community service learning activity developed a sense of the importance of non-standard Spanish when providing nutrition counseling.

Awareness of community perspectives

Awareness of Latino communities’ lived realities and perspectives is an essential goal of CSL and SP. Development of awareness through CSL and SP, however, need not be limited to L2 students. HL students often have particular and relevant insights into a local Latino community that can be treated as strengths and resources, but we must also sensitize them to their own relative privilege. HL students encounter complex intersectionalities when they engage with the Latino community. For example, an HL learner who immigrated with her family when she was an infant might share undocumented status with one of the many unaccompanied minors who...
came to the US in the summer of 2014, but would not have personal insight into the perspective of a youth who journeyed alone, fleeing gang initiation and without parental emotional and financial support.

Likewise, the Latino community is shaped by local conditions that HL and L2 learners might not share. Although students benefit from a broad introduction to Latino communities in the US, SP and CSL curricular materials should guide instructors and students through a process of questioning, researching, and understanding the needs of specific communities. Students from an urban upbringing might struggle to understand the living conditions of Latinos in the semi-rural area where their university campus is located, for example. Is the main source of employment in factories, farms, or hospitality services? Are they located in an immigrant-friendly community or a hostile one? Is the crime rate high or low? Are language barriers ubiquitous or rare? HL and L2 learners alike need to be equipped to more fully understand the specificities of the local community and its individual members through information provided by instructors, community experts, demographic data, local media sources, and structured visits to community sites.

Furthermore, these localized conditions have profession-specific implications. For example, a medical Spanish curriculum tied to a local Latino community principally employed in agriculture would approach occupational health differently than one in which many Spanish-speakers worked in a chemical factory. If the HL community commonly encounters hostility, language barriers, and crime, a course for social work and mental health should focus at least partly on depression, anxiety, and other conditions related to adverse environments.

**Immigration policies and policing**

It would be a mistake to attribute all practices and perspectives of Latino communities to “culture,” conceived in an ethnic, religious, or national sense. Instead, many community members find themselves constrained by laws, public policies, and government institutions that college students, both L2 and HL learners, need to know in order to understand the structural and institutional challenges community members face (Abbott, 2017). The unresolved, decades-long political fight for comprehensive immigration reform has left an alphabet soup in its wake (e.g., DACA, DAPA, SB1070), and because of the dynamic nature of law making (and unmaking) we cannot rely on textbooks for a comprehensive view. Course readings, research projects, or reflection prompts should expose SP and CSL students to at least a few cases in which structural and organizational forces are superimposed upon individual community members’ beliefs and actions. When students of medical Spanish, for example, know whether or not undocumented immigrants in their state have legal access to a driver’s license, they will better understand the risks and obstacles families face to keep healthcare appointments and access emergency care. These immigration issues also present opportunities for students to gain exposure to larger health policy and public health challenges. In sum, SP and CSL create openings in the Spanish curriculum to discuss issues that might otherwise be ignored.

**A different approach to culture**

Teaching transcultural competence is fundamental to SP and CSL curricula and requires a new approach that has not yet fully crystallized in the literature or in curricular materials, despite its centrality in the MLA’s Special Report in 2007. Providing students with lists of cultural traditions and taboos in a variety of countries perpetuates the notion that culture is something
“the other” has and that can be learned through facts and artefacts. Moreover, that approach presents a homogeneous “US culture” to be contrasted with the “homogeneous culture” of other countries. Instead, SP and CSL students need an approach to culture that first renders visible students’ own culture and then presents legitimate alternative perspectives. This new approach must be dynamic, situating both HL and L2 students as facilitators among cultures in community-based and professional situations rather than as learners in a fixed position studying about another culture at arm’s-length. Furthermore, the curriculum must emphasize the transcultural nature of many Latino communities in the US who preserve aspects of the culture from their countries of origin and meld them with their lives in this country.

Emphasizing only two of the so-called 3 Ps of culture—products and practices—does not fully prepare students to work in culturally appropriate ways in professional and community contexts where they must understand cultural perspectives, the third P. However, a gap exists in the available teaching materials. CSL and SP educators need textbooks or materials that provide an inquiry-based approach to culture that is dialogic and offers explicit strategies for observing, asking questions, searching for signs of misaligned perspectives, and repairing misunderstandings. Other fields offer helpful and less classroom-centric models, like the “repertoires approach” from education (Gallo, Wortham, & Bennett, 2015). Finally, because Latino communities are often stigmatized through racialized discourses that also hinge on issues of socio-economic class (Hill, 1998; Lippi-Green, 2004; Schmidt, 2002; Schuck 2006), an approach to culture that acknowledges these sometimes uncomfortable topics will prepare students for encounters with culture that go beyond classroom discussions to actual exchanges in community and professional contexts.

Contested institutional place of SP and CSL

The institutional reception of SP and CSL within Spanish departments in the US is ambivalent at best. A recent survey of 183 departments of modern or foreign languages revealed that 62% offered courses in SP. Furthermore, courses in SP were offered in 174 of the 183 institutions surveyed. Notwithstanding the ubiquitous presence of SP courses, the survey also revealed that programs and courses were more likely to exist in smaller schools. Degree tracks, minors, or certificates were less common among surveyed institutions than single courses. More than half of the institutions surveyed indicated response to student demand and attraction of new students as a primary motivation to include SP offerings in the curriculum. Even so, most departments surveyed cited budget restrictions and lack of qualified faculty as the most significant challenges to sustaining SP offerings (Long & Uscinski, 2012). The external threats perceived by department administrators, such as decreases in the number of majors and enrollment dips, furthermore, are intensified by internal threats including opposition by senior faculty members. Grose and Voght, echoing the observations of numerous researchers in languages for specific purposes, note that “established literature and linguistics faculty still do not recognize LSP as a legitimate academic interdiscipline” (2012, p. 193). The growing presence of adjunct faculty teaching these courses and the constitution of SP offerings as “side jobs” or “service enterprises” of the department, furthermore, creates a vicious cycle that may exacerbate the opposition.

Lafford (2012) argues that while academics in the US continue to compartmentalize SP within a praxis-oriented framework, global perspectives on LSP (Language for specific purposes) have developed a much more robust synergy between research and practice. Bowles (2012), for example, argues that theoretical and methodological advances in discourse analysis have significantly propelled LSP research. The combination of conversation analytic, ethnographic, and pragmatic analysis has extended the corpus of professional language from a small set of
specialized vocabulary to a comprehensive conglomeration of linguistic, stylistic, rhetorical, and interactional features characteristic of professional communication. He argues, furthermore, that this growing body of research should inform a set of clear priorities for LSP which would include expansion of the research enterprise itself, translation of research findings into curricular materials, additional research on the ecological relationships of languages in the professions to English as a lingua franca, and a focused line of questioning on computer-mediated communication. The research program that Bowles describes can and should be expanded to include insights, perspectives, and methodologies from allied fields such as literary and cultural studies.

The relative absence of SP within the graduate curriculum, however, presents a serious constraint to the realization of these research priorities. Long and Uscinski (2012), for example, note that graduate level LSP courses existed in only a handful of departments, and the majority of courses covered practical and theoretical aspects of translation (p. 181). There is a need, however, to introduce graduate level courses that deal specifically with theory and methods in SP research. Such courses might explore the growing body of applied linguistic research on Spanish in professional settings (Alarcón & Heyman, 2013, 2014; Dávila, 2001; McGroarty & Urzúa, 2009; Moyer, 2013; Villa & Villa, 2005). They might also draw on the body of research in literary and cultural studies elucidating the connections between biomedicalization and neoliberalism, globalization and environmental justice, or global markets and citizenship (Clarke et al., 2010; García Canclini, 2001; Ong, 2006; Peña, 2014). The injection of such courses into the graduate curriculum would generate interest in these issues as dissertation topics, both in Hispanic linguistics and Hispanic cultural studies, and would begin to fill the longstanding void of qualified faculty members to teach courses in SP.

Focused research initiatives at major universities across the country are creating a unique platform for Spanish departments to productively engage with this line of research. In 2007, Princeton University launched its Grand Challenges program to provide leadership and solutions to address global threats in the areas of energy, development, and health (www.princeton.edu/grandchallenges). In 2011, former Chancellor Phyllis Wise led the Visioning Excellence initiative at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign that created a strategic focus on critical areas facing the nation and the world such as economic development, social equality and cultural understanding, and health and wellness (www.oc.illinois.edu/visioning). In 2012, The Ohio State University unveiled its Discovery Themes initiative with the intent of leveraging “Ohio State’s special strengths to address the technological, social, and environmental stresses that define today’s global world” (https://discovery.osu.edu). In 2013, these consolidated initiatives received a nod from the White House when President Obama unveiled his 21st Century Grand Challenges program to expand the frontiers of human knowledge while responding to important problems related to energy, health, education, and the environment (www.whitehouse.gov/grand-challenges). The fluidity of these grand challenges and their growing salience across the globe will create an important niche for SP perspectives both in terms of support for research and in terms of faculty positions for recent PhD graduates. These benefits can be realized, however, only if Spanish departments actively participate in the dialogue surrounding these key issues.

**A new purpose for Spanish in higher education?**

An interrogation into the place of SP and CSL within Spanish programs leads to critical reflection on the fundamental purpose of Spanish studies in the US today. In 2007, the same year as the MLA’s special report on foreign languages, Carlos Alonso wrote in Profession that Spanish is now “a second national language and culture in this country” (p. 220), yet close to a decade...
later most Spanish departments still operate as foreign language programs and train students for graduate study in literature and linguistics, despite the fact that “only 6.1% of college graduates whose first major is foreign languages go on to attain a doctoral degree” (MLA, 2007). Nowadays, departments in all parts of the US can embrace the local and transnational nature of Spanish, adopting the theoretical lens of the engaged humanities. Currently, though, these efforts tend to result in scattered HL sections and CSL and SP courses.

At the other extreme, the Spanish department at Mount Holyoke College completely merged with the Latina/o and Latin American studies programs and actively promotes CSL, SP, and the notion that, “heritage speakers embody a courageous model of linguistic and cultural perseverance in the face of societal resistance to translingual and transcultural Latinas/os” (Miñana, 2013). Indeed, SP and CSL courses bolster HL learners’ meta awareness of their bilingualism and its value. Expanding the objectives of an undergraduate education in Spanish to include content, methods, and pedagogies that seek connections among our traditional scholarly projects of inquiry and issues of importance to the communities around us, will imbue our programs with an urgency and relevance that today’s students and other stakeholders seek.

**Recommendations for practice**

**Course design**

At the simplest level, a CSL course should be designed to include: (1) a service that students can provide to meet a community-identified need, (2) which simultaneously enhances their understanding of the academic content of the course, and (3) provides continuous structured student reflection (Zlotkowski, 1998). Likewise, it is the opinion of the authors that an SP course should include: (1) basic information about the specific profession, (2) insights about the characteristics of the language community involved in the practice of that profession, and (3) explicit strategies for intercultural communication and transcultural competence. In both kinds of courses, students should also receive support for their linguistic development. Whenever possible, we recommend combining CSL and SP to enhance students’ learning experiences; discern differences between theory and practice; build confidence in their linguistic, cultural, and pre-professional abilities; and identify areas for improvement.

In practical terms, the CSL course planning process should begin by identifying potential community partners and then including them in the course design. It is important to find a community partner organization (or organizations) with the capacity to receive students (provide the necessary space, materials) and supervise them (provide orientations, be available to answer questions, check their hours, etc.). On the other hand, it is equally necessary that students be able to clearly contribute to the community partners’ needs. This can almost always be accomplished by matching students’ language proficiency, cultural skills, and content knowledge to the necessary level of supervision and the nature of the service, though there is a clear need for research that delineates these characteristics and tasks.

Ideally, the community partners co-create knowledge by sharing their expertise and knowledge (guest lectures, video interviews), suggesting content for the course (topics, readings, activities), and assessing student work (providing feedback and/or assigning grades). Realistically, busy community partners should decide the level of involvement they can give to the course design. Finally, community partners should be informed about the characteristics of HL students so that they appropriately anticipate their strengths as well as the specific areas in which they might need guidance.
Once the community partnership is established and students' service defined, the syllabus and teaching materials can be planned. The syllabus should be specific yet also elastic enough to tackle emerging policies, changing conditions in the community, and unfolding student inquiries. As mentioned previously, no textbook currently available thoroughly integrates CSL, SP, and HL. Instead, teaching materials can come from multiple sources. When selecting course readings, these courses benefit from an introduction to a theoretical lens (from linguistics, cultural analysis, literature, or other fields, like critical race theory, differential consciousness, etc.), research findings (both from academic journals and policy foundations), and literary readings. Furthermore, the Internet offers many authentic resources and instructional materials, though rarely focused specifically on HL learners. For a course focused on the health professions, MedicalSpanishPodcast.com provides useful and detailed information in both sound files and written form. For business language courses, the University of Colorado, Denver offers case studies in a variety of languages and for a variety of proficiency levels (Language Case Studies).

Indeed, case studies and simulations are common pedagogical tools in both business and medical schools but are rarely used in language education. They offer scenarios that students encounter in SP and CSL contexts: multifaceted interactions among individuals and systems in multilingual and multicultural contexts that require reasoned responses that move beyond simple right-or-wrong answers. However, those types of curricular materials for SP and CSL are limited, pointing to the need for CSL and SP educators to create new categories of pedagogical tools and share them in systematic ways through online and scholarly publications. Finally, traditional course components such as research papers, tests, and oral presentations are still useful in SP and CSL. There is no need to radically change the in-class teaching methodology, either; communicative language teaching, task-based instruction, project-based learning, and active learning remain effective methods.

Critical reflection, on the other hand, is not commonly used in language education where analytical writing prevails, but SP and CSL educators can use it to maximize and personalize HL students’ learning. With instructors’ prompts about the community experience, guided reflection takes students from the level of summary and description to higher-order thinking skills such as analysis and creation. “Critical reflection” goes a step further, asking students to “question . . . the justification for the very premises on which problems are posed or defined in the first place” (Mezirow, 1990, p. 12). A common framework for critical reflection includes three stages: (1) What?, in which students describe an experience or piece of information; (2) So what?, requires students to analyze the information from the previous step, often connecting it to supporting information; and (3) Now what?, is future-oriented, asking students to draw conclusions or create something with the insights they have gained in steps one and two (Driscoll, 2007, pp. 42–45). Prompts for critical reflection can be easily designed to incorporate issues of specific concern to HL students.

Common problems

Almost all the literature on CSL in language education springs from well-designed courses, or at least ones that are unproblematic. One article focuses on the challenges of constructing CSL experiences in which both students and community partners are fully aware of both their potential and limits, especially regarding language proficiency, cultural knowledge, and professional skills (Lear & Abbott, 2009). It is important to acknowledge potential problems with CSL courses, and though it is beyond the scope of this chapter to enumerate and provide solutions to them all, there are at least three categories of problems—structural, academic, and ethical—that stand out.
Structural problems loom large for the first-time CSL practitioner and those who are interested but uncommitted. However, they often have relatively obvious solutions. For example, the question of how today’s overscheduled students can arrange their CSL work can be solved by self-scheduling on a wiki or Google doc (e.g., http://spanishcommunityservicelearning.pbworks.com). A community partner’s personnel turnover, program changes, or budget cuts can have a negative and sudden impact on the CSL program, but they can usually be anticipated through careful and regular communication. In most instances, structural problems stem from weak partnerships that can be strengthened through direction communication and participation.

Academic dilemmas can usually be solved through classroom management and syllabus design. At some institutions, CSL is an “extra” credit, organized and administered by a central campus office, potentially leading students to experience their CSL work as extraneous to their coursework. In this case, instructors can use transitions and follow-ups in their class sessions to elicit students’ experiences in the community and connect them to the course content. To add academic rigor to reflective essays, students can respond to theoretical or research-based readings that instructors provide. In sum, instructors can almost always overcome academic challenges by using the same tools they would in other courses.

Ethical issues are very important to address and resolve. Both the syllabus and the community partner’s orientation session for students should include information about community members’ privacy and best practices for dealing with vulnerable populations. Using the University of Kentucky’s materials (www.uky.edu/toolkit/to-hell-with-good-intentions), students can read Ivan Illich’s speech, “To hell with good intentions,” in order to place their work into a broader, critical perspective, followed by a class discussion. Despite the seriousness of all these potential problems, the biggest problem of all might be instructors’ reluctance to tackle this pedagogy that has rich rewards.

**Future directions**

Demographic trends in the US support the increasing importance of SP, CSL, and HL courses and programs in language departments, especially in Spanish. A sampling of current headlines from the Pew Research Center on Hispanic trends confirms the need to promote HL learning as Latinos’ English proficiency rises, a fluctuating situation at the US border complicated by unresolved domestic issues in Central America, the rapidly yet unevenly changing racial makeup of the US, and an increasing number of unauthorized immigrants in white-collar professions. Spanish programs that continue to be built around Peninsular Spanish with some attention to Latin America will not prepare students for the linguistic and cultural realities they will encounter where they live and work—in the US—and that require new ways of thinking about civic engagement and professional skills.

Moreover, these demographic trends provide both an impetus and opportunity for Spanish programs in all parts of the US to forge ties to local Latino communities. The new Latino diaspora extends beyond the areas that have traditionally received immigrants from Spanish-speaking countries and into rural areas and small towns in the Midwest, South, and other areas unaccustomed to the linguistic and cultural issues they suddenly face (see the maps in the introduction to this volume). This new Latino diaspora has important implications for education (Hamann, Wortham, & Murillo, 2015), mental health and human services (Buki & Piedra, 2011), and civic engagement (Allegro & Grant Wood, 2013). Spanish programs that tie advanced language learning and cultural knowledge to literary studies alone will miss the chance to help shape...
responses to the changing and expanding role of Spanish in the US. Instead, we need to open a space within Spanish programs that prioritizes educating both HL and L2 students as future bilingual professionals—whatever those professions might be—who are critical thinkers capable of brokering among languages and cultures. Literature and linguistics should continue to be an inherent part of that training, and language instruction will benefit from the current turn toward proficiency-based instruction assessed through can-do statements (NCSSFL-ACTFL, 2015). Because research shows that professionals with some language proficiency are often positioned as impromptu translators, interpreters, and advocates (Colomer & Harklau, 2009), both HL and L2 students should obtain some knowledge of the ethics and professional practices of translation, interpreting, and advocacy in their coursework. Finally, students should graduate equipped with communication strategies that allow them to effectively negotiate meaning in typical professional settings with Spanish-speakers, such as gathering complete, correct information for forms, giving comprehensible instructions, and building trust.

The convergence of HL, SP, and CSL presents an important opportunity for Spanish Departments to develop a visible profile within the research enterprise of their institutions. From healthcare to agriculture, and from education to public policy, there are myriad federal and foundation research funding programs that target research on Spanish speaking populations. Developing a research and teaching focus on issues related to HL, SP, and CSL within Spanish departments can contribute to an infrastructure that will allow Spanish departments to collaborate on these projects and to play a vital role on research teams.

The new curricular directions suggested here should be accompanied by research as well. Although important foundational strides have certainly occurred in both SP and CSL, rich areas of scholarly inquiry remain untapped. The field will continue to benefit from researchers who dedicate their scholarly work to these fields specifically, but interweaving SP and CSL into the entire curriculum will hopefully encourage more scholars from literature, cultural studies, and linguistics to shift their theoretical lenses and research agendas toward SP and CSL, at least occasionally. Researchers in applied linguistics and second language acquisition, for example, could turn their attention to the unique challenges faced by learners in CSL and SP contexts. Researchers in sociolinguistics and language policy have a large and relatively unexplored field in the study of language use in professional and CSL settings. Researchers in cultural studies and performance studies could also utilize these intercultural encounters as a basis for theorization and advancement of their fields. It goes without saying that these fields would benefit greatly from the attention of more HL researchers. After all, they share a conceptualization of language as embedded in specific contexts and understand the fight for legitimization in the face of hierarchies that impose the dominance of certain language varieties as well as certain areas of scholarly inquiry.
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