

**STATEMENT OF MARK H. CHICHESTER
FOR
THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES**

**TITLE VI, PART C
THE INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC POLICY**

FEBRUARY 14, 2006

What do you view as the purpose of the Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP)?

The IIPP seeks to enhance U.S. national security and global competitiveness by promoting excellence, international service and awareness among a broader, more representative cross-section of the American citizenry. The IIPP also seeks to broaden access to international education and training opportunities for underrepresented minorities. To that end, IIPP:

- **Recruits fellows from diverse backgrounds to participate in a comprehensive program of summer policy institutes, overseas study, intensive language training, internships, graduate study, career services and professional development, and training in cultural competence;**
- **Enhances the capacity of minority-serving institutions (MSIs) to produce more internationally aware and competitive citizens through a targeted program of resource development that includes demonstration projects, technical assistance, institutional grants, and peer mentoring;**
- **Creates partnerships across the international service sector and beyond, to provide a diverse array of internship and employment opportunities for IIPP Fellows, and provide institutional partners with a source of diverse area, international and foreign language (AIFL) talent to meet the challenges of the 21st century; and**
- **Serves as a ramp for minority-serving institutions to broader participation in Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs.**

- **Conducts and disseminates research for higher education policymakers on minority participation and interest in international education.**

In an increasingly interdependent yet turbulent world of different languages, ethnic rivalries, cultural and religious strife, and the emergence of new markets, America possesses a largely overlooked comparative advantage in the diversity of its citizenry, as compared to China, for example. Indeed, if leveraged as it can and should be, America's rich trove of diverse cultural capital could prove the key to US leadership in this new century. This cultural capital is not defined and limited to the traditional notions of diversity, but, rather, by a broader conception of diversity as reflective of life experiences, perspectives, language skills and cultural competence. Such diversity necessarily encompasses racial and ethnic differences, but is not defined solely in those terms. While initial consideration of the issue might lead some to relegate the diversity imperative to the tactical level, questions of cultural competence take on significant and undeniable strategic significance when considered in the context of attempts to win 'hearts and minds' in regions of the world and among peoples that do not think well of American foreign policy or values.

There is strategic value as well in the symbolic messages conveyed through diversity. On this point, a former head of the Council on Foreign Relations Washington Program and member of an early delegation of observers to Iraq after the height of hostilities argued that that the example of democracy in multicultural America projected by the mere composition of U.S. forces and military leadership could not be lost on the ethnic minorities concerned with their futures in the new Iraq.

What are the programs strengths, weaknesses and criticisms?

The program's strengths are found in the following:

- **The measurable impact the IIPP Fellowship is having in addressing the supply side challenges that the US faces in expanding the pipeline of human capital to meet the challenges of the 21st century;**
- **The success of IIPP institutional capacity-building initiatives in increasing the participation of MSIs, including historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), in Title VI/Fulbright-Hays and other international programs;**
- **The substantive partnerships that IIPP has developed with leading graduate schools of international affairs and national security and international affairs institutions—among others, the Department of State, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Office of the Army Chief of Staff (Eisenhower National Security Series), the Congressional Research Service, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Partnership for Public Service and the Council on Foreign Relations; and**
- **The strong program emphasis on research and evaluation as tools for ongoing and rigorous performance measurement.**

How would you define success for the program?

There is a range of performance measures that combine to roll up into key factors that speak to the success of the IIPP enterprise. Those include:

- **The overall retention rate for the fellowship;**
- **Increased numbers of minority students interested in international affairs careers;**
- **Increased numbers of minority students studying foreign languages—less commonly taught and studied languages in particular;**

- Increased numbers of minority students enrolling in graduate degree programs in international affairs;
- A larger pool of talent from which US international affairs institutions can recruit AIFL talent (e.g., an IIPP Fellow fluent in French and proficient in Thai, serves as the human rights officer in the US embassy in Haiti; another administers the China program at the Brookings Institution; and yet another, fluent in Arabic, is the first American ever to win IIPP, Pickering (State Department) and Fulbright fellowships)
- Enhanced international education capacity at MSIs that participate in IIPP institutional development programs, as measured in part by the number of students that benefit; and
- Research that benefits policymakers in meeting critical workforce development challenges in a global environment.

How would you determine if the program is successful or effective?

To determine if the program is successful and effective, it should be measured against the success factors set forth above to the extent data is available. It would also be useful to try to assess what IIPP has done, relative to the human resource offices of leading international affairs institutions, to grow the pool of human and cultural capital for US international affairs institutions.

Would you measure effectiveness differently for the various Department of Education Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs?

While quantitative measures are useful in assessing program effectiveness, my sense is that they should not form the sole basis for doing so. There are stories and contexts beyond the naked numbers that are as valuable to gaining a sense of program impact as any bean-counting exercise—necessary and valuable though bean-counting is in accounting for the application and investment of public funds. I would simply argue that sufficient flexibility be allowed beyond the numbers for

policymakers and appropriators to be able to make as fully informed decisions as is possible when considering program effectiveness.

What data do you use to measure the effectiveness of this program?

The IIPP staff collects and analyzes more data than can economically be cited here, so I will make available to the committee samples of the kind of data we collect from two subcomponents of the range of programs IIPP administers. Broadly speaking, we look at performance and retention, student commitment to and interest in international service careers, quality of program design and administration, numbers of students impacted, and we will soon survey employer's as part of a 10-year retrospective on the impact of IIPP. I can say emphatically that we see research and evaluation as so critical to our work that we have a professional evaluator and a researcher as staff resources. (See Attachments A, B and C)

How would you use the results of an evaluation?

We would use the results as we do those we collect now: 1) to refine and improve program design; 2) to strengthen program administration; 3) to support our effort to demonstrate value for funding requests to meet the substantial matching requirement and expand program offerings; and 4) to seek to achieve maximum return on the federal investment.

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?

With a few exceptions where there is overlap with other federal agencies like the State Department's Bureau and Educational and Cultural Affairs, Education Title VI / F-H programs are unique in that they seek to align public investment in higher education programs with the critical national need for a globally aware and competent citizenry. These programs can and should be designed with the longer

range view in mind, as compared to agencies and institutions more directly involved in the nation's foreign affairs and national security activities. If properly coordinated with other interested agencies, the Department's Title VI / F-H programs should continue to be the rich resource of AIFL talent and of research they have historically been and provide as well the critical human and institutional resource for achieving the leadership, security and competitiveness goals that the nation aims to attain into the future.