Already significant research and materials exist addressing issues of the newer field of Heritage Language (HL), from linguistics, second language acquisition, and pedagogy, in general, but also specifically to Slavic, here mostly for Russian (see, for example, the Heritage Language Journal, the National Heritage Language Resource Center at UCLA, the bibliography in Benmamoun et al., 2010, Brinton et al., 2008, Carreira & Kagan, 2011, etc.). Our paper focuses on contributing to one of the less researched spheres of HLs, viz., curricula and instructor training of a less commonly taught HL (see, for example, Kondo-Brown, 2010, p. 31–32), Russian. As a case study, we draw on our combined experience in curricula design, teaching, and supervising of our Russian heritage course. Specifically, we address the following:

1) Discussion and response to Carreira and Kagan’s (2011) characteristics of the limitations of one-size-fits-all curriculum, and discussion of Carreira’s (2007) suggestions for other types of curriculum;

2) We respond to points (2), (7), and (9) from Kondo-Brown (2010, p. 33–34). Specifically: a. our curriculum as an example of a content-based HL course for a less commonly taught language that helps students advance their competencies; b. the serious challenge of mixed proficiencies students in the Russian HL course, introducing the concept of a pedagogically manifested proficiency plateau; c. issues and practices in instructor training for this particular course (which has a rotating instructor).

3) We suggest the introduction of specific topics from sociolinguistics (language and identity, standard language vs. other varieties, etc.) and general linguistics (descriptive vs. prescriptive, etc.) as a solution to many of the problems of intra-group dynamics typical of many HL courses, which can include mixed proficiency levels among HL students, both HL students and non-HL students, etc.