

# **The Importance of Title VI Programs that Develop Research and Teaching Materials: The Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA) Program and International Research and Studies (IRS) Program**

**Testimony to the National Academies' Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays (F-H) International Education Programs at the Department of Education**

**David Wiley**  
**Director, African Studies Center, and Professor of Sociology,**  
**Michigan State University**  
**Co-Chair, Council of National Resource Center Directors**

The largest investment of the Title VI programs is in academic programs at our nation's higher education institutions that train students in international studies and foreign languages, principally the National Resource Center (NRC), Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowship, Language Resource Center (LRC), and Centers for International Business Education (CIBE) programs. I report here on the purposes and some accomplishments of two smaller Title VI programs that fund complementary projects that (1) provide U.S. scholars and students access to information from foreign sources and (2) create instructional materials and conduct research and evaluation of instruction in modern foreign languages, area studies, and other international fields. These are the *Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA) Program* and *International Research and Studies (IRS) Program*.

Then I want to share with you the findings of one program funded by the IRS program that documents the contributions of Title VI programs to the teaching of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) and demonstrates that research projects can create opportunities to improve practices and make more efficient use of the federal investment in these programs.

## **Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA) Program**

**What do you view as the purpose of the Department of Education's Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs?**

One of the newest of the Title VI programs, the TICFIA program (Sec. 606) is an effort by the U.S. Department of Education (US/ED) to support innovative use of rapidly expanding Internet technologies "develop innovative techniques or programs using new electronic technologies to collect information from foreign sources." Specifically, the funds are to support projects that "collect, organize, preserve, and widely disseminate information on world regions outside the United States . . . that address our Nation's teaching and research needs in international education and foreign languages." This pilot demonstration program was authorized in 1998 and began making grants the following year. For each of the Fiscal Years 2002-2005, the appropriation for TICFIA program was \$1.7 million, and US/ED planned to fund 10 awards for an average amount of \$170,000 each year for three years (ranging from \$100,000-200,000).

TICFIA originated from a Mellon Foundation library research project which found that materials from the newly independent republics of the former Soviet Union and other remote nations were extremely costly and difficult to obtain.<sup>1</sup>

Originally limited to higher education institutions and libraries, TICFIA grants are now available also to public or non-profit libraries and consortia of these institutions. The recipient must provide at least one-third of the total funding of the project. These guidelines ensure that the federal TICFIA grants leverage significant funding by the grantee institutions and also are used efficiently. The program also strongly encourages collaborations among institutions with relevant expertise, further increasing the likelihood of effective use of the grant funding.

There is considerable breadth among the 28 projects that have been funded by the TICFIA program, reflecting the diversity of activities the program will support. These include: giving access to or preserving print or electronic foreign information; developing new means of full-text document delivery from abroad and shared electronic access; collaborative indexing and cataloging to increase U.S. access; providing LCTL instructional materials for teachers, dissemination of resources in non-Roman alphabets, and other technology-based collaboration in foreign language and area studies. See Attachment A (following) for a list of all TICFIA projects and brief descriptions of several.

Several TICFIA projects focus on making available materials in foreign languages, particularly less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). For example, the University of California at Los Angeles *Language Materials Project* has created a collection of "authentic materials" (produced for native speakers) in 14 LCTLs for use in language teaching, including Arabic, Turkish, Kazakh, Russian, and Swahili.

The Center for Research Libraries in Chicago has created the *Digital South Asia Library* and Yale is creating a Middle East Electronic Library with libraries in Egypt, Germany, U.S., Netherlands, and Lebanon. University of Southern California is building a new "Access Indonesia" website for information on the world's largest Muslim society and the fourth most populous nation in the world. Michigan State University's collaboration with six U.S. universities and the West African Research Association is digitizing and presenting online materials about *Diversity and Tolerance in the Islam of West Africa* in Senegal and Ghana.

The University of Virginia and Cornell University with eight other Western universities and the Tibet Academy of Social Sciences and Tibet University have created the *Tibetan and Himalayan Digital Library and Information Community* as the world's premier Web-based archive of interdisciplinary knowledge about Cultural Tibet and the Himalayas. A University of Wisconsin collaboration will produce the online *SEAlang Library* for information in all

---

<sup>1</sup> *Scholarship, Research Libraries, and Global Publishing*, Jutta Reed-Scott, Washington, DC, Association of Research Libraries, 1996; "Library Collections and Access: Supporting Global Expertise," Deborah Jakubs and David Magier, Ch III-7, in *International Education in the New Global Era: Proceedings of a National Policy Conference on the Higher Education Act, Title VI, and Fulbright-Hays Programs*, Edited by John N. Hawkins, Carlos Manuel Haro, Miriam A. Kazanjian, Gilbert W. Merckx, David Wiley, Los Angeles: International Studies and Overseas Programs, University of California, Los Angeles, 1998; and "Library and Information Resources for International Education," Deborah Jakubs and Dan Hazen, paper in Conference on Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education, Duke University, January 23-25, 2003 ([www.jhfc.duke.edu/ducis/globalchallenges/pdf/jakubs.pdf](http://www.jhfc.duke.edu/ducis/globalchallenges/pdf/jakubs.pdf))

Southeast Asian scripts, starting with the five mainland countries (Burma, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam).

### **What are the programs strengths, weaknesses and criticisms?**

**Strengths:** The TICFIA projects brings new access to foreign publications, documents, images, and language materials just when there is a strong push from the federal government and the academic community to access foreign languages and culture abroad. It capitalizes on the new technologies that were not envisioned at the beginning of the Title VI program and the advances of the past decade in online access to databases of these materials. These materials deepen the quality of language and area studies and assist learners in achieving advanced proficiency in the LCTLs. TICFIA also is helping to underwrite the otherwise prohibitively high cost of collecting, preserving, and digitizing materials from newly emerged nations and remote foreign sources.

**Criticisms:** The principal problem of these projects has been their extended startup times. Most require new technologies, new hardware, new negotiated partnership agreements, and new contracts with partners abroad. All this requires negotiation, iterative drafting, and complex contracts that allow the grantees to transfer funds to partners abroad and frequently foreign travel. Inevitably, such negotiations and arrangements will produce empirical results usually toward the end of the three-year projects. Some adjustment may be needed in the length of the projects in order to take these into account.

### **How would you define “success” for this program?**

Success probably is best defined for these programs by the extensity and depth of new materials made available to U.S. users by the projects that otherwise would not occur. A second criterion can be the sustainability of the projects, both in (a) the continuing financial support found from other sources and (b) the durability of the partnerships with collaborators and providers abroad, based on reciprocity and transparency of the relationships. A third criterion is the extent to which the program has facilitated the development of new technologies and new standards of digital preservation and dissemination.

### **How would you use the results of an evaluation?**

The results of the evaluation would be used as a basis for improving the program and enhancing its effectiveness that ultimately could lead to growth of the program. Over time, there also could emerge principles of collaboration with foreign partners as well as protocols and standards of digitization, coding of content and definitions of meta-tags, and copyright issues.

### **How do you view the role of the Department of Education’s Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs as similar or different from the role of other related federal programs?**

Although potentially such technology projects might be funded by such agencies as the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, these agencies have not provided significant funding for this type of program. This program targets a very specific function that strengthens the ability of Title VI grantees to address national needs for foreign language and area knowledge. Building library information and resources is one of a set of strategies necessary to building capacity and expertise. The US/ED IEPS staff is able to monitor the need for and effectiveness of these projects in the particular context of the wider Title VI programs.

## **International Research and Studies (IRS) Program**

### **What do you view as the purpose of the Department of Education's Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs?**

The International Research and Studies Program was one of the three original Title VI programs - alongside the support for area and international studies centers and foreign language fellowships - that was first authorized by the Congress in 1958 as part of the National Defense Education Act. During the first year of Title VI, \$2.5 million was allocated to the IRS program, while \$3.5 million went to grants for NRC centers and FLAS fellowships. "The reason for this level of allocation," according to Richard D. Scarfo, former Director of the International Education and Graduate Programs at the United States Department of Education, "was simply the pressing need for basic preparation, which had to be done before any substantial improvement could be made in language instruction." [Scarfo, "The History of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays," in *International Education in a New Global Era*, eds: Hawkins, John and Carlos Manuel Haro, Miriam Kazanjian, Gilbert Merckx, and David Wiley. CA: UCLA, 1988.]

By FY 2005, funding for IRS was only \$5.9 million. This level is 67% below the program's FY 1967 high point in funding of \$18.1 million, as expressed in FY 2005 constant dollars. This level of funding allowed only 10 new and 34 continuation awards in FY 2005.

Many of the IRS grants, then as now, are for creating needed instruction materials in less commonly taught languages. During the 1960s - the first decade of the program - approximately 370 instructional materials were created in about 130 LCTLs, quite an astonishing record. In the 35 years since then, approximately the same number of instructional materials in LCTLs was produced in a cumulative total of 150 languages.

As its name implies, the purposes of the International Research and Studies Program extend beyond language instructional materials. In the area of foreign languages, IRS also funds research on more effective methods of providing instruction and achieving competency in foreign languages and studies and surveys to determine needs of government, education, and the private sector for foreign language instruction. More specifically, this small amount of funding supports grants to public and private agencies, organizations and institutions, and individuals for a broad range of activities for: (1) studies and surveys of needs for increased or improved instruction in language, area studies, or other international fields; (2) research on more effective methods of providing foreign languages instruction and competency; (3) research on performance tests and standards of foreign language instruction; (4) developing and publishing materials for foreign language, area studies, and other international fields; (5) studies of the uses of graduates of Title VI programs; (6) studies of strategies for international higher education; and (7) studies of the outcomes and effectiveness of Title VI programs.

While 740 is a large number of instructional materials, there are several urgent reasons for the continuing need for additional materials, and the IRS program is still by far the most significant program attempting to meet this need.

First, newer materials build on advances in understanding about "best practices" in language instruction as well as the evolving electronic technologies that can make audio and visual materials accessible to language learners, including through distance learning.

Second, personnel in U.S. government agencies and scholars teaching in U.S. higher education institutions need to be able to learn a large number of LCTLs used throughout the world. The distribution of IRS grants across many languages has varied widely. For example, approximately 80 IRS instructional materials grants have been in Chinese, 65 in various forms of Arabic, and 40 in Japanese, with much smaller numbers in more than 100 "least commonly taught languages," such as Pashto (circa 16), Vietnamese (circa seven), and Yoruba (circa four), to name a few.

Third, U.S. needs for particular languages change over time, and it is important not to wait for the need for a particular language to become urgent before developing basic instructional materials, such as introductory and intermediate texts and dictionaries.

Although language instructors are concerned that some of the materials developed with IRS grants are now dated, in both their pedagogical approach and cultural content, the materials continue to be a valuable foundational national resource. Two recent examples make this point. After September 11, 2001, several federal agencies recognized the need for speakers of Pashto, a language spoken by about 19 million people in Pakistan. From the 1960s to the 1990s, the IRS program had funded approximately 18 materials for teaching Pashto, including beginning and

intermediate textbooks and teacher's manuals, workbooks, a grammatical outline, introduction to the writing system, a reader, and two glossaries. Secondly, the federal government recently needed to provide training to some staff in Cebuano, a language of 20 million people in the Philippines. They turned to a beginning text and reference grammar developed with IRS support in 1962 and 1972 but still in use today. The accompanying table of a sample of IRS projects funded in FY 2005 reflects their strategic value.

**Table: 17 New International Research and Studies Projects funded in FY 2005**

<p>Language, Literacy and the Early Foreign Language Learner  Punjabi Course Materials  Resources for Teaching Culture in Grades K-12  Standards for the Less Commonly Taught Languages  Research Tool and Studies to Improve Language Learning  Directory of Foreign Languages Test Instruments  Understanding Sudan  Story Telling in Russian Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPI)  Teaching and Learning Linguistically Complex Languages  Assessment of Performance and Proficiency in Languages  Evaluation Needs in College Foreign Language Programs  Minority Student Participation in International Programs  Access Islam: Resources for the Global Classroom  Advanced Filipino Text, DVD and Web Materials  A Door into Urdu  Common and Less Commonly Taught Languages at HBCUs  Iraqi Arabic and Azerbaijani Languages</p>
---

Few people are aware that the IRS program has made possible series of foundational surveys concerning foreign language in U.S. higher education. The Modern Language Association (MLA) has relied on IRS support since the 1960s for its surveys of enrollments in foreign languages in our nation's community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities. The IRS program also has supported several MLA surveys of foreign language requirements at our higher education institutions. This basic knowledge is absolutely essential for any national planning on foreign language instruction, and federal funding of such research is well-spent.

The IRS program also provides a vital function for all of the Title VI programs by funding studies and surveys that assess how graduates use the training provided by various Title VI-funded programs in their employment in governmental, educational, and private-sector

employment. IRS also funds comparative studies of the effectiveness of strategies "to provide international capabilities at institutions of higher education."<sup>2</sup>

Congress and the Administration – and higher education institutions themselves – have been giving increased emphasis to accountability for the effective use of their resources. All the Title VI programs have been increasing their expectations for both internal and external evaluation organized by the grant recipients themselves.

It also is crucial for scholars who are knowledgeable about international studies and language acquisition to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of Title VI programs overall, and the IRS program is the source of funding for these types of studies. During the past three years, for example, IRS-funded projects have evaluated Title VI-funded international outreach programs, undergraduate programs in international education and elementary school teachers, and National Resource Centers on the Middle East. Other projects have focused on assessment of performance and proficiency in languages and evaluations needed by college foreign language programs.

### **What are the programs strengths, weaknesses and criticisms?**

**Strengths:** Because of the small amount of funding each Title VI program receives, budgets of those centers are not adequate for creating new language and area learning materials or for conducting studies of how to accomplish those goals more effectively. This program provides needed funding for national and local studies and for new language materials. In the 1970s and 1980s, significant funding for developing language learning materials was provided by NEH, NSF, US/ED FIPSE, Peace Corps, and private foundations. Now, none of these offer this support for languages, making the IRS program the essential sole source of such funding. IN addition to languages, the IRS program serves as the prime funding source for research and studies on standards for language and area studies and innovations for K-12, college, and graduate and professional levels. Another strength of the program is the number and breadth of authorized activities allowed under the statute, giving ample flexibility and choice to the field.

**Weaknesses** - None to report.

**Criticisms:** The major criticism of this program is that the materials and information it produces are not sufficiently disseminated or made readily available to the public. The IRS might address this concern by requesting applications for a project that would document the current availability of the language instructional materials that have been produced with the support of IRS and the Language Resource Centers. Another criticism involves the grant selection procedure. The large number and variety of proposals makes it difficult for any one review panel to have the expertise necessary to make wise choices. Perhaps a greater effort can be made to tailor the choice of reviewers to the subject matter at hand or increase the number of reviewers to incorporate the expertise needed. This challenge has been compounded by the US/ED new system of reviewing only with electronic documents by distant panelists who cannot readily consult with each other. There is a belief that this decreases the quality of the selection.

---

<sup>2</sup> See the study, supported by an ISR grant, by Dr. Ann Schneider on the obstacles to internationalizing K-12 teacher education, "Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?: A Research Report on the Undergraduate Training of Secondary School Teachers," by Ann Imlah Schneider ([www.iienetwork.org/?p=44829](http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=44829), 2/11/2006)

**How would you define “success” for the programs? Would you measure effectiveness differently for the various Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs?**

The effectiveness of this program can be measured by (1) the number and quality of language-learning materials added to the U.S. inventory for international studies and the less commonly taught languages, (2) how strategic are the choices of projects that will measurably increase the effectiveness of other Title VI programs and of the language, area, and international studies effort nationwide, and (3) how well the materials and information produced by this program are disseminated and made widely accessible to the public, per the statute’s mandate to issue an annual report.

**How would you use the results of an evaluation?**

These results can inform the allocation of appropriations to this program, the project selection process, and the dissemination of findings and other results.

**How do you view the role of the Department of Education’s Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs as similar or different from the role of other related federal programs?**

This IRS program is a unique and critical component of the Title VI effort to build capacity in foreign language and international education, thus serving the national interest. Only the relatively new Title VI Language Resource Centers are building the U.S. inventory of LCTL instructional materials. IRS remains a crucial federal program serving these needs for LCTLs and the studies that make for more effectiveness and greater strategic focus in Title VI and other international programs.

**The e-LCTL Initiative: An IRS Project**

*The e-LCTL Initiative*, a project at Michigan State University funded by an IRS grant, exemplifies how the IRS program supports research that (1) assesses Title VI programs and provides information to the government and public about their significance and (2) helps recipients of Title VI funding to be more effective and to make more efficient use of federal funds. It also demonstrates – both in its implementation and its findings – the synergies that are possible among Title VI programs, in this case the National Resource Centers (NRC), Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships, Language Resource Centers (LRCs), and International Research and Studies (IRS).

**Findings of the e-LCTL Initiative and Communication with Federal Policy-Makers**

As a first element, the e-LCTL Initiative studied enrollments in LCTLs at higher education institutions with Title VI centers, based on information provided to the US/ED in the 2002 applications of centers that were successful in receiving NRC and FLAS funding. For the 2002-05 grant period, funding was provided to 120 centers at 55 universities located in 27 states and the District of Columbia. With IRS support, the Modern Language Association (MLA) regularly surveys language instruction at virtually all higher education institutions in the country; however, the official enrollment data provided to the MLA by university registrars' offices does not always fully report very small classes and individualized tutorials in least commonly taught languages. The reporting of language enrollments by the centers that administer these programs and the graduate fellowships to study those languages used in this report is more complete than the MLA inventory.

The e-LCTL study found that, during the 2001-02 academic year, the 55 universities with NRC and FLAS awards taught 128 LCTLs. In 2002-03, FLAS fellowships were awarded to graduate students to study 107 of these languages. These centers reported that they had the capacity to teach an additional 98 LCTLs upon demand in the 2001-04 period.

In 2001-02, more than 30,000 students per semester were taught LCTLs at these Title VI universities. We estimate that this accounted for nearly 80% of all instruction in these LCTLs throughout the nation that year and more than 60% of the national enrollments in the 10 languages deemed to be “critical” by the National Security Education Program (NSEP). A summary of the numbers of languages offered and enrollments by world region is provided in the accompanying table and on the project website at: [www.elctl.msu.edu](http://www.elctl.msu.edu).

The e-LCTL study found that Title VI-funded institutions offered 226 LCTLs in 2004, while the two primary federal language training programs at the U.S. Defense Language Institute (DLI) and the U.S. Foreign Service Institute (FSI) offered a combined total of 75 LCTLs in 2004. (Language offerings were made available by these two institutions, but not enrollments, so we compared language that institutions had the capacity to offer, not those actually offered during the particular year.)

The DLI and FSI do provide excellent training, often to advanced proficiency, in a number of the major, but they do not have the capacity or the demand to teach the 150 additional LCTLs offered by the NRCs. Furthermore, their training ordinarily is focused and specialized for particular types of learners with specific purposes. With their focus on each world region, the NRCs have developed a broad capacity with native speakers, teaching materials, and country experts in the LCTLs who can offer these rarely taught languages for a national pool of student learners.

For the first time, the e-LCTL Initiative has provided publicly accessible information about federally-supported LCTL offerings in major U.S. universities by language and instructional level. We have taken every opportunity to publicize this information about national LCTL training to the public and to federal policy-makers, for example at a conference on a new national initiative on LCTLs sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and other agencies summer 2004 and a meeting of the Federal Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) in 2005.

With a relatively small amount of federal funds, over almost 50 years, this Federal partnership with these now 55 U.S. universities with NRCs and FLAS Fellowships has created a capacity to teach foreign languages and international and area studies about that is unparalleled among university systems around the world.

The universities bear the major costs of area and international studies and foreign language instruction. We estimate that, on average, each university hosting an NRCs provides \$12-20 for each dollar of federal support, most of which is salaries for faculty specialists.

Title VI funding is essential, however, for leveraging this continuing university support. Indeed, federal funding for instruction in LCTL, especially *least* commonly taught languages with small enrollments, is uniquely important. Most of the teaching of least commonly taught languages at these Title VI-funded universities is coordinated through the Title VI National Resource Centers.

Language instruction in least commonly taught languages with small enrollments simply cannot pay for itself through student tuition payments. Furthermore, a significant number of these languages have different scripts that are more difficult and time-consuming for English-speakers to learn compared to commonly-taught Western languages. Title VI programs wisely provide funding for both faculty and language instructors (through the NRC program) and fellowships to graduate students to study these languages (through the FLAS program) that make these programs viable. Working with the NRCs, the LRCs are developing learning materials and proficiency testing for some LCTLs. Without the NRC, LRC, and FLAS programs, combined with the instructional materials funded by the IRS program, instruction at our nation's universities in many of the least commonly taught languages would not be possible.

### **Setting priorities and enhancing cooperation for LCTL instruction**

A second part of the *e-LCTL Initiative* engaged Title VI centers in reassessing what are the highest priorities for instruction in the U.S among the hundreds of LCTLs in each world region. The Initiative coordinated a series of conferences and meetings in which representatives from the NRCs discussed the national needs and priorities for the teaching of LCTLs in their respective world regions. Reports on progress of the prioritization process for each world region are posted on the Initiative website, and a few summary conclusions highlighted below. This is an important step forward in assuring that Title VI funding for language instruction is used effectively and with maximum coordination to optimize the outcomes of federal funding.

There are different levels of cooperation among coordinators of LCTL programs in each world region, and that cooperation was at different stages at the outset of this project. Progress was made especially among Latin America and Caribbean centers in making plans to collaborate in the development of proficiency testing in several Latin American LCTLs and among South Asian centers in establishing a joint summer intensive language institute for those languages.

In Attachment B (following), details are summarized for each world region of the LCTLs offered, the enrollments, and the priorities begin established for teaching the LCTLs among the NRC centers for that world region.

Document created by David Wiley, Christine Root, and Steve Backman,  
Michigan State University  
February 11, 2006

**- Attachment A -**  
**Title VI US/ED Program for Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA)**

**Projects 1999-2009 in the Title VI US/ED Program for Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA)**

See project details at [www.ed.gov/programs/iegpsticfia/index.html](http://www.ed.gov/programs/iegpsticfia/index.html)

See US/ED TICFIA Website at: [www.ed.gov/programs/iegpsticfia/index.html](http://www.ed.gov/programs/iegpsticfia/index.html)

Funding FY 2001: \$1,337,918; FY 2002-2005: \$1,700,000 per year

Average Size of Awards \$170,000; Number of Awards 10

**Projects 1999-2002**

Accessing African Scholarly Journals  
 American Overseas Digital Library  
 Central Eurasian Information Resource  
 The Digital Asia Library  
 The Digital South Asia Library  
 Latin Americanist Research Resources Project  
 Providing Web-Based Bilingual Access to Chinese Business Education Materials  
 Russian Periodical Index Digital Project

**Projects 2002-2005**

Access Indonesia  
 An English-Language Website on Developments in Japan in On-Line Journalism and Information/ Communications Technologies  
 Access to Russian Archives  
 Mining Hidden Gems: Building a Latin American Open Archives Portal for Scholars  
 OACIS for the Middle East: Online Access to Consolidated Information on Serials  
 Portal to Asian Internet Resources (PAIR)  
 Sources of Authentic Materials for Less Commonly Taught Languages  
 South African Collaborative Film and Video Project  
 South Asian Information Access: A Federated Program to Expand the Resources for Understanding the Subcontinent  
 The Tibetan and Himalayan Digital Library and Information Community: A Technological Model for the Nexus of Information and Community in the Academic Study of Other Cultures

**Projects 2005-2009**

Arabic and Middle Eastern Electronic Library  
 Central American and Mexican Video Archive  
 A Digital Library of the Caribbean  
 A Digital Library for Tibetan and Himalayan Studies  
 Diversity and Tolerance in the Islam of West Africa  
 Harvester for Knowledge Streams in the Americas  
 Local Libraries and Archives Project  
 The Southeast Asian Languages Library  
 The Southeast Asia Digital Library  
 TICFIA South Asia

### Variety and Complexity of the TICFIA Projects

Several TICFIA projects focus on making available materials in foreign languages, particularly less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). For example, the University of California at Los Angeles *Language Materials Project* has created a collection of "authentic materials" in 14 LCTLs for use in language teaching. "Authentic materials" are materials written for native-speakers rather than materials written specifically for foreign language learners. Authentic materials have been collected in 14 LCTLs, including Arabic, Turkish, Kazakh, Russian, and Swahili. The materials are as diverse as product advertisements, brochures of civic organizations, newspapers, and political cartoons.

Another TICFIA-funded program making available materials in less commonly taught languages is the University of Wisconsin, Madison's collaboration with several organizations in South East Asia, funded in 2005, that will produce the online *SEAlang Library*. The project is building core lexical and software resources required to find, catalog, deliver, and interpret information in all Southeast Asian scripts, starting with the five mainland countries (Burma, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam).

Many of the TICFIA-funded projects are creating on-line digital libraries of materials from particular world regions. For example, the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago has created the *Digital South Asia Library* of key texts, statistical materials, dictionaries, journal indexes, electronic finding aids, maps, and photographs for use by academic researchers, business leaders, government officials, and citizens in general.

A new grant in 2005 will create a Middle East Electronic Library (AMEEL) at Yale University, to serve the increased U.S. interest in that key world region. Yale is partnering with libraries in Egypt, Germany, JSTOR (New York, USA), Brill Publishers (Netherlands), Multidata (Lebanon), and Oxford University Press (UK). This collaborative virtual library project will make available important Middle Eastern resources by developing a common format for digital from diverse sources, digitize key journals on and about the Middle East, build and expand capacity for full-text scanning of Arabic, and develop technologies and protocols to expand interlibrary lending between U.S. and Middle Eastern libraries.

A TICFIA project at University of Southern California has built a new "Access Indonesia" website for a broad range of information on the world's largest Muslim society and the fourth most populous nation in the world. The project is a collaboration of the USC School of Policy, Planning and Development, the Institute of Technology in Bandung, Indonesia, and the Center for Urban and Regional Development Studies.

Another example is Michigan State University's collaboration with researchers at Harvard, Boston, James Madison, Indiana, Western Washington, and Florida University and the West African Research Association to digitize and present online previously-unavailable oral, photographic, video, and archival materials about Muslim practices in Senegal and Ghana, on the website *Diversity and Tolerance in the Islam of West Africa*.

**- Attachment B -**

**Some Findings of the e-LCTL Initiative, a National Project of Title VI  
National Resource Centers and funded by the U.S. Department of Education  
International Research and Studies Program**

*For details see [www.elctl.msu.edu](http://www.elctl.msu.edu)*

**Strategic National Planning and Coordination For the Less Commonly Taught Languages  
- a project for the national US/ED Title VI community -**

In a time of national and global need for an enlarged pool of speakers and learners of key languages around the globe, a strategic effort is needed in the United States to make those less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) available to learners at the post-secondary level. This requires collaboration among the nation's universities in deciding what LCTLs to offer, at what levels, when and where, in what formats, and what new learning materials will be required. These were the tasks that precipitated the *e-LCTL Initiative*.

Here, following, are some of the findings for all world regions (see table following) and for each world region. They reflect a survey of what LCTLs are being offered, what are the enrollments, and what consensus was developed about the priorities for NRC LCTL offerings of each world region.

The data from the *e-LCTL Initiative* study can be viewed in more detail on the initiative's website: [www.elctl.msu.edu](http://www.elctl.msu.edu). The findings show that in 2001-02 more than 30,000 students per semester were taught LCTLs at these Title VI universities which is estimated to account for nearly 80% of all instruction in these LCTLs throughout the nation that year. These include more than 60% of the national enrollments in the 10 languages deemed to be "critical" by the National Security Education Program.

In addition the data is broken down in tables by world region on the website. For each of the world regions Title VI universities offered more LCTLs than the federal government language programs, with more than twice as many LCTLs being offered in five of the nine world regions (56 to 10 in Africa, 52 to 19 in Middle East, 31 to 11 in South Asia, 16 to 2 in Latin America, 24 to 12 in Inner Asia). A short summary of the data and coordination efforts for each world region follows:

**Africa: LCTL Offerings:** At the 11 Title VI funded African NRCs 2,972 students were enrolled in 25 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 56 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 10 African LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 141 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 23 African LCTLs.

**Priorities:** African language coordinators at NRCs first worked together to prioritize teaching the languages of the region in the late 1970s. Setting priorities was particularly needed for the estimated 750-1,000 African languages, and criteria were set to rank them in four priority categories. Under the e-LCTL Initiative, these categories were reassessed, based on recent linguistic, social, and political conditions in Africa. Since their inception, these priorities have facilitated coordination among African NRCs to teach more African languages to U.S. students in order to prepare them to do dissertation research in many parts of the continent. The Summer Cooperative African Language Institute (SCALI) began in 1998, rotating among universities with NRCs. More than 50 students have enrolled each year, studying a total of 18 African languages since 2001. The early model of prioritizing and collaboration among African NRCs has been helpful to LCTL coordinators for some other world regions.

**Latin America and the Caribbean: LCTL Offerings:** At the 20 Title VI funded Latin American/Caribbean NRCs 5,501 students were enrolled in 15 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 16 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 3 Latin American LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 255 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 12 Latin American LCTLs

**Priorities:** The Latin America/Caribbean region is one of the few that does not have a Title VI Language Resource Center (LRC) for the languages of the region. This has somewhat hampered coordination that other regions have enjoyed. The prioritization process under the *e-LCTL Initiative* significantly expanded cooperation among language coordinators of this region. Priorities were established among Latin American LCTLs, and plans were made to begin to cooperate in producing proficiency-testing materials for several Latin American LCTLs.

**East Asia: LCTL Offerings:** At the 19 Title VI funded East Asian/Asian NRCs 24,790 students were enrolled in 11 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 14 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 10 East Asian LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 200 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 7 East Asian LCTLs.

**Priorities:** The “Big Three” East Asian languages, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, do not fit typical definition of LCTL because of their large enrollments. Therefore, language coordinators arrived at “categories of need” rather than more obvious priority categories for teaching of its LCTLs. They agreed that lesser-taught languages of the region might best be taught cooperative-ly through summer institutes or distance learning. They also recommended expanding communication, including use of the Internet, to monitor the field and coordinate efforts.

**Southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands: LCTL Offerings:** At the eight Title VI funded Southeast Asian/Pacific Islands NRCs 3,186 students were enrolled in 14 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 24 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 13 Southeast Asian/Pacific Island LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 70 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 8 Southeast Asian/Pacific Island LCTLs.

**Priorities:** The Southeast Asian Summer Studies Institute (SEASSI), begun in 1983, has enrolled 140-155 students each summer in recent years and regularly offers eight languages. The languages taught at SEASSI have acted as a de facto prioritization. Upon review of these priorities, the regional coordinators have agreed that more languages should be added but were concerned about the availability of funds needed to do so.

**Eastern Europe and Russia: LCTL Offerings:** At the 18 Title VI funded Eastern Europe and Russia NRCs 6,981 students were enrolled in 26 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 47 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 28 East European LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 306 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 28 East European LCTLs.

**Priorities:** Due to the great historical and political changes and uncertainties in Eastern Europe, it has been difficult to establish stable priorities for the teaching of its LCTLs. Russian is the major language of the region which continues to enjoy large enrollments throughout the U.S., although the number of classes in high schools recently has fallen precipitously. Perceptions of priorities among other languages of the region are still somewhat in flux. Nevertheless, the region’s NRCs have cooperated for years in supporting two summer intensive language institutes held at Indiana University and the University of Pittsburgh that teach the least commonly taught languages of the region.

**Central or Inner Asia: LCTL Offerings:** At the only Title VI funded NRC for Central or Inner Asian studies housed at Indiana University 237 students were enrolled in 13 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 24 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 12 Inner Asian LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 28 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 12 Inner Asian LCTLs.

**Priorities:** There is only one Title VI-funded NRC on Inner Asian. This means that prioritizing the teaching of LCTLs does not require coordination among a number of centers, but the overlap of languages between Central Asia and Eastern Europe/Russia, Middle East, and South Asia must be taken into account when establishing priorities.

**Middle East: LCTL Offerings:** At the 18 Title VI funded Middle East NRCs 8,028 students were enrolled in 30 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 52 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 19 Middle Eastern LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 260 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 10 Middle Eastern LCTLs.

**Priorities:** Since September 11, the "big four" languages of the region – Arabic, Modern Hebrew, Persian, and Turkish – have received increased strategic attention and funding. However, expanding offerings of the lesser-taught languages of the region has occurred more slowly, building on a much smaller base. The Middle East is only region in which DLI and FSI currently offer some languages that Title VI NRCs do not. The NRCs will need continued and increased investment of institutional and grant resources in languages of strategic importance such as Kurdish and Pashto as well as "the big four."

**Western Europe: LCTL Offerings:** At the 13 Title VI funded Western Europe NRCs 8,767 students were enrolled in 23 LCTLs during 2001-02, with the capacity to teach a total of 27 LCTLs. This is in comparison to FSI/DLI which offered 17 West European LCTLs in 2004. In 2002-03 a total of 84 FLAS fellowships were awarded for the study of 17 West European LCTLs.

**Priorities:** The distinction between Western and Eastern Europe is becoming less useful, and the NRC directors recommended that the two regions start to be considered together as a single region. NRCs of the region teach all four of the Most Commonly Taught Languages (MCTLs) - Spanish, French, German, and Italian - and a number of LCTLs. Unfortunately, much of the Title VI funding (75% of FLAS fellowships) was allocated to the teaching of these MCTLs. In order to enhance the teaching of LCTLs, some funding needs to be re-directed.

### Attachment B

**Table - Less Commonly Taught Languages Offered by Title VI National Resource Centers and by the Defense Language Institute and the Foreign Service Institute, 2001-04<sup>1</sup>**

<b>World Region</b>	<b>Title VI NRC LCTLs Taught in 2001-02</b>	<b>Title VI NRC LCTLs Available 2001-04<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>FSI<sup>3</sup> &amp; DLI<sup>4</sup> LCTLs Available 2004</b>	<b>Title VI NRC Semester Enrollments in LCTLs 2001-02</b>	<b>Title VI FLAS Fellowships Awarded 2002-03</b>
<b>Africa</b>	25	56	10	2,972	141
<b>Middle East</b>	30	52	19	8,028	260
<b>Inner Asia</b>	13	24	12	237	28
<b>South Asia</b>	15	31	11	3,284	180
<b>East Asia</b>	11	14	10	24,790	200
<b>Southeast Asia</b>	11	18	13	2,864	67
<b>Pacific Islands</b>	3	6	0	322	3
<b>Eastern Europe/Russia</b>	26	47	28	6,981	306
<b>Western Europe</b>	23	27	17	8,767	84
<b>Latin America</b>	15	16	2	5,501	255
<b>Total</b>	<b>128 Langs<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>226 Langs<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>75 Langs<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>61,124<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>1,632 Fwps<sup>7</sup></b>

**1** - Data for these tables are drawn from the applications of the 119 university centers to be designated as Title VI National Resource Centers (NRC) and Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) centers submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (US/ED) in November 2002. (We have not included enrollments from the 11 International Studies NRCs not specialized to a world region and the 2 Canadian NRCs.)

**2** - "LCTLs available" are those that Title VI NRCs state in their 2002 Title VI applications which they have the capacity to teach. 38 of these languages are historical languages, which are ancient or extinct according to Ethnologue ([www.ethnologue.com](http://www.ethnologue.com)) or are used only for reading ancient texts.

**3** - Foreign Service Institute (at the US State Department's National Foreign Affairs Training Center) data on language offerings available are derived from the FSI pamphlet, "Language Training, School of Language Studies, NFATC, Foreign Service Institute, US Department of State" (distributed June 24, 2004) and from supplementary list provided by the FSI on June 25, 2004.

**4** - Defense Language Institute (DLI) data about languages available are derived from the DLI website at [www.dliflc.edu/Academics/schools/index.html](http://www.dliflc.edu/Academics/schools/index.html), last consulted on June 14, 2004, with additional information provided by Dr. Scott McGinnis, DLI - Washington, June 24, 2004 and February 2, 2005.

**5** - Languages that overlap world regions are only counted once in the "Total" row.

**6** - There was some overlap of reported language enrollments at a few universities which host NRCs for more than one world region (e.g. Arabic for African and Middle East centers), those enrollments are counted only once in the "Total" row of the table. We have accounted for a total of 2,622 overlapping LCTL enrollments by subtracting them from the subtotal of all world region enrollments (63,746 - 2,622) giving us 61,124.

**7** - Total FLAS Fellowships includes 11 awarded by Canadian Studies NRCs (all in French) and 97 awarded by International NRCs. These have been added to the 1,523 FLAS Fellowships awarded in the world regions listed above (11 + 97 + 1,523 = 1,631).