

STATEMENT
FOR THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ON

The Higher Education Act, Title VI
and the
Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, Section 102(b)(6),
International Education and Foreign Language Studies
on
Title VI, Section 604,
Undergraduate International Studies and
Foreign Language (UISFL) Program

Madame Chairwoman and Members of the Committee:

I am Uliana Gabara, Dean of International Education at the University of Richmond and incoming president of the Association of International Education Administrators, an organization of Chief International Education Administrators at a wide range of institutions of higher education across the country. Thank you for the opportunity to present our views on Title VI, Section 604, Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program. My statement will respond to questions posed by the NAS.

The purpose of Title VI, Section 604, Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language (UISFL) program

I would like to call attention to the backdrop to our conversation today. In recent years we have seen policy makers at all levels of government and the corporate sector underscore the importance of international competence in meeting our global challenges and promoting understanding throughout the world. The President's FY 2007 budget, which includes the National Security Language Initiative, places greater attention on foreign languages and

international education then any federal budget since the Eisenhower Administration. The proposal highlights the urgency of improving this country's preparedness for interaction with the world not merely in English and not on the basis of knowledge limited to our own culture, political system and economy. A recent Congressional finding is quoted in the announcement of this Review of Title VI by the Center for Education of the National Research Council: "The need for the review came about as a result of Congressional findings that globalization and the war on terrorism have increased America's need for international experts as well as for citizens with foreign language skills and global understanding."

This is not the first time that, as a nation, we have become aware of the urgent need to understand the world and to do so through the prism of languages and cultures foreign to us. The Findings of the Higher Education Act, Title VI begin with the following:

"The security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States in a complex global era depend upon American experts in and citizens knowledgeable about world regions, foreign languages, and international affairs, as well as upon a strong research base in these areas."

Since enactment of Title VI in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, it has been the main vehicle for the federal government's role in meeting the nation's need for the education of both experts and knowledgeable citizens.

I am here to speak primarily about the undergraduate part of Title VI, International and Foreign Language Studies, Sec. 604 (20 U.S.C.1121).

The purposes of this section of the legislation are made quite explicit in the Act. They include: "incentives for the creation of

new programs and the strengthening of existing programs (...) to improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.” Funds can be used “for the Federal share of the cost of projects” and for activities such as: planning or development and expansion of programs in international studies and foreign languages; teaching and research, curriculum development, faculty training in the United States and abroad, library and teaching resources, pre- and in-service teacher training; expansion of opportunities for learning foreign languages, including less commonly taught languages; linkages between 2-, 4-year and post-baccalaureate programs and institutions; development of programs abroad; development of model programs; integration of professional and technical education with foreign languages, area studies and other international studies; establishing linkages abroad; summer institutes; development of partnerships with the private sector, government and K-12; and use of innovative technology. This is a very broad and ambitious mandate.

Two points need to be stressed when we consider the importance of the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language programs. First is the fact that the education of “knowledgeable citizens” happens primarily at the undergraduate level. Secondly, that the creation of international experts and fluent foreign language speakers requires years of study and the natural selection of the most capable and dedicated students. Like in athletics and music, to name just two areas, it is necessary to educate large numbers of beginners in order to select and cultivate a few who have the talent and the determination to excel.

Assessing Effectiveness in the UISFL Program

To offer an assessment of the impact of Section 604, I will be speaking from extensive experience involving directing two campus grants for International and Foreign Language Studies at

the University of Richmond; membership in a research team, which conducted a longitudinal study of 107 Title VI projects funded in alternate years between 1982 and 1990¹; another study, of nearly 200 Title VI undergraduate projects funded between 1990 and 1995²; the perspective of more than a dozen evaluations of Title VI projects, including some repeated visits, which afforded the special advantage of being able to observe progress at close range; the example of one particular project, which demonstrates the extent to which the undergraduate program, through its support of institutional capacity building is, in fact, the linchpin of many Title VI programs. Finally, I have, for a number of years, been involved in various national and international organizations for international education, which gives me a sense of the significant changes having taken place in the field both in the US and abroad.

The two Title VI projects at the University of Richmond were not untypical, as I discovered when I later became involved in the research project. The University had, at the time, made the decision to become involved in international education at a number of levels. An Office of International Education was created and its director was charged with the implementation of a new, interdisciplinary International Studies major. The focus of the first project was strengthening the Latin America concentration and support for creating a self-instructional course in Brazilian Portuguese. The second project, funded some three years later, focused on a newly created Africa concentration and on another self-instructional course in Swahili. A small, liberal arts university, the University of Richmond had never abandoned the foreign language requirement for graduation, but, needless to say, it offered neither of these “less commonly taught” languages. And,

¹ Ann Imlah Schneider and Barbara B. Burn, “Federal Funding for International Studies: Does it Help? Does it Matter?” *Long Term Impacts of Federal Funding on International Studies and Foreign Language Programs: A Research Report*, (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1999).

² JoAnn McCarthy, “Continuing and Emerging National Needs for the Internationalization of Undergraduate Education,” *International Education in the New Global Era: Proceedings of a National Policy Conference on the Higher Education Act, Title VI, and Fulbright-Hayes Programs*, ed. John N. Hawkins, et al. (Los Angeles: University of California, 1998).

again, as a small liberal arts university, we had too few courses or even modules to offer students solid concentrations in either Latin America or Africa. Yet, we did have faculty members who were prepared to develop both area studies and language courses, the latter employing what for us was a new methodology, one appropriate and cost efficient for languages, which in the foreseeable future were not going to attract large numbers of students and therefore would not be likely to receive dedicated faculty lines. Recognition attached to Title VI funding, because it involves a peer-review, a highly selective process, demonstrated to the administration and, importantly, to faculty members themselves, that they were embarking on a legitimate project, what's more - becoming involved in a forward-looking, perhaps even a cutting edge movement in higher education.

Now, from the perspective of more than ten years, I can tell you that Title VI, through its relatively small budget, combined with matching institutional funds, resulted in nothing less than "institution building." We still have the Latin America and Africa concentrations in International Studies, and while the Swahili self-instructional course is used only intermittently, it is always ready for any interested student. As for Portuguese, we have progressed from the self-instructional model to a regular course, still offered only to students with high levels of Spanish preparation, but on the move. And in the intervening years, we have hired a significant number of faculty members in various academic fields in both Latin America and Africa. We have also developed study abroad programs in both regions and a number of exchanges with local universities. More than 60% of students now graduate with a study abroad experience. The Faculty Seminar Abroad, funded by the University, has taken faculty from across the campus to West Africa and to a number of countries in Latin America. And, the University of Richmond is one of the top 'feeder' schools for the Peace Corps.

Membership in the research team responsible for the study of long term impact of federal funding on undergraduate international studies and foreign language programs involved participation in developing a questionnaire, which was sent to directors of projects, and subsequent visits to a number of campuses. During the site visits, members of the research team, armed with a set of pre-determined questions, met with project directors, faculty who had been involved in them, students, as well as academic administrators at various levels. Finally, the research team engaged in a joint analysis of the results of both the questionnaire and the site visits. The final result of the study, the report published in 1999, is the basis of much of what follows, including direct quotations from it.

To summarize then, from direct experience with projects, research, and the powerful examples of many institutions:

Program Strengths:

"Research indicates that the program's impact has been strong and long lasting for both course development and campus environment. Nearly 80% of the survey's respondents reported a high overall impact...Over 90% indicated that their institutions are currently supporting the programs that had received Title VI funding five or more years previously."³

Being the grass-roots part of Title VI, the UISFL has the broadest impact on institutions, faculty, students, and communities. Grantees include institutions that are public and private, rural and urban, community colleges with a vocational orientation and others that are feeder schools to 4-year institutions, small liberal arts colleges, large research universities, Historically Black Colleges

³ Schneider and Burn, 12. The McCarthy study found a similarly high level of satisfaction with outcomes and success in maintaining gains among project directors.

and Universities. The size of institutions in the Schneider and Burn study ranged from under 1,000 to 62,000 students.

By reaching out to institutions that serve minority students, the undergraduate program plays an important role in attracting underrepresented minority students to international careers, whether it is in the State Department or other agencies and the private sector.

The Schneider and Burn study demonstrates that project directors observe an impact on student participation in study abroad and internships, as well as on their choices of career paths.

By offering funding, small though it is, together with models, benchmarks and advising from the DOE staff, Title VI encourages a creative approach to campus internationalization and provides the necessary incentives for faculty members to become involved in the process.

Grantees range from those in the earliest stages of internationalization to others who are at much more advanced levels. Some have no international majors or minors, no staff dedicated to the support of international students and study abroad; others are in the process of enriching such majors and minors and working on the implementation of strategic plans, which call for significant increases in study abroad by a diverse student body. Yet all report tangible outcomes at the end of the project period, which means that the federal government, through the Department of Education, is instrumental in initiating and contributing to building institutional capacity for broad-based international and foreign language studies. Respondents in the Schneider and Burn study, faculty and administrators, stressed the institutions' need for seed money, a key function performed by these grants.

Whatever the stage of institutional internationalization, faculty participants report that receiving a Title VI grant bestows internal and external legitimacy on their work and thus encourages them to continue involvement, even though academic structures rarely reward this work in the tenure and promotion processes.

While initially the cost of each project is funded jointly by Title VI and the institution, the continuation and expansion, which happen in nearly all cases, are funded by the institution itself. The multiplier effect of the federal grant is significant. This effect continues as grantees benefit from the recognition attached to Title VI and pursues additional funding from various granting agencies and foundations.

The projects are very often interdisciplinary, involving also faculty from different schools, e.g. arts and sciences and business. Relatively small funding encourages the creation of interdisciplinary courses and programs, rarely supported by academic disciplines and departments.

Undergraduate projects often involve significant numbers of immigrant faculty members whose knowledge of ‘foreign’ cultures and languages is an important resource for the US, one which may be left untapped were it not for the Title VI funding.

Institutions, including some with only marginal language offerings, expand the range of languages taught and methodologies used. The cited studies have found that, once introduced to a campus, a language continues to be offered, often moving from being offered only as self-instructional to adjunct-taught, to a dedicated faculty line.

Less commonly taught foreign languages are often introduced to campuses for the first time as a result of UISFL and subsequently become part of the regular offerings. The diversity of grantees in

the undergraduate program means that for some Russian, Chinese, or Japanese will qualify as ‘less commonly taught’, while others will be adding Arabic, Hindi, Pashto, or Polish.

The mandate of Title VI 604 is broad enough to permit the inclusion of a Languages Across the Curriculum program, one of the more creative new approaches to infusing development of linguistic fluency into various disciplinary courses.

By bringing together a cadre of faculty members dedicated to internationalization, grants encourage the next stage: thinking in terms of internationalization across the curriculum and across the campus, including co-curricular activities, linkages in the region and abroad, and new administrative structures to support a centralized approach to international education.

Project reviews by experts in the field become a vehicle for mentoring and progress to the next level of internationalization. Whenever I reviewed a project, I found myself offering ‘instant advice’ on additional opportunities, benchmark activities and on resources available at the national and international level.

As a result of the work of Department of Education staff, grantees of UISFL form a network for sharing best practices, resolving difficult issues, and thinking creatively about international education. Annual conferences of current program directors are a rich, though not the only source for all of these activities.

The undergraduate projects are the foundation for other parts of Title VI, such as the National Resource Centers and the Language Resource Centers, which are charged with the education of experts in graduate schools. Without casting the net wide, and educating the citizenry in the process, how would we prepare students for entry into graduate programs and subsequently for work in the

public and private sector, in government and education, in all kinds of professions?

Undergraduate projects frequently create an institutional infrastructure, which result not only in faculty, course, and program development, but also in future Title VI projects in cooperation with other institutions and leading to the creation of National Resource Centers. At another point, you will be hearing about the experience of North Carolina State University, which exemplifies the full potential for developments following a UISFL.

Casting the net wide in international education is essential if we want to break out of the cycle of reacting to the most recent crisis. As a nation, we focused on Russian after the sputnik, on Pashto after the Taliban, and now on Arabic. Our goals of positive global engagement are better served by offering many “less commonly taught languages” as a matter of course, rather than waiting until a crisis happens.

Leaders in a free society should and do come from all walks of life. Most often they are not ‘experts’ in international affairs or fluent speakers of foreign languages, yet we rely on them to adopt enlightened policies, which will protect and promote this country’s political system, its economy, natural resources and environment. Through the small budget of Title VI, the federal government and the Department of Education contribute to the development of such leadership.

UISFL projects almost always include funding for the development of library resources to support new and revised courses. They are also encouraged to implement the newest technology available. Project directors and Department of Education staff realize that technology is crucial to assuring the sustainability and efficacy of new programs.

Outcomes of UISFL projects are, by definition, intended to become available to the full spectrum of undergraduate institutions. The diversity of projects mirrors the diversity of this sector of higher education. Thus, given comprehensive and user-friendly archiving, every successful project becomes a shared resource, with significant likelihood of being emulated, if not reproduced verbatim.

The strong infrastructure created by UISFL serves other programs, such as the National Security Education Program (NSEP) and will support the new Lincoln Fellowships and the National Security Language Initiative.

Program Weaknesses

As the grass roots part of Title VI, the UISFL appeals, and should appeal, to institutions with the most limited resources, for example many of the HBCUs and community colleges. Often those institutions that the program is particularly interested in reaching are not able to match federal funds. While the insufficiency of the funding is most acute in those cases, the problem extends to other institutions, even those, which have made the commitment to international education many years ago.

Other weaknesses of the program are closely related to funding and cannot be overcome without increases in dedicated budgets. They include: need for faculty travel to develop curricula, study abroad programs, and exchange relationships/linkages with universities abroad.

Systematic research on national needs in the area of international and foreign language studies should be conducted as the basis for prioritizing future funding.

The two cited studies of the Undergraduate Title VI program were conducted in the mid-90's and were, by necessity, of a preliminary nature. It is time to commission extensive research on the outcomes of projects from the last 15 years at a minimum. The Schneider and Burn study concludes with a list of recommendations for specific research topics.

The Department of Education needs more funding and staff to support the UISFL. The solution to this problem will require a study involving consultations between the provider – the Department of Education, and the community of current and potential grantees.

The following needs should be addressed, given additional funding and staff:

- Greater and more systematic outreach to institutions, which have never applied for grants.
- Encouragement of second-stage applications, for building on the infrastructure created by the first project.
- Systematic collection and dissemination of information, materials and outcomes in the form of digitized databases.
- More systematic and fully documented evaluation of projects.
- Closing the loop between evaluation, continuation of projects, and the next stage of internationalization.

Program Criticisms

Among the recent criticisms are:

- Limited outreach to K-12 and community organizations: a real concern even though it is done in some projects. With the present insufficient funding levels, it can be addressed

- only to a limited extent. Yet the Schneider and Burn study shows that the institutions that initiated outreach activities during the grant period were continuing their engagement many years after the conclusion of the project. As anyone who has ever attempted outreach knows, it is very labor-intensive. While many institutions are interested in, even committed to sharing their Title VI projects, they lack staff adequate to meeting the real needs of the nation at large and of communities adjacent to them.
- Need for more pre- and in-service teacher international and foreign language education programs. This is of particular importance as the nation's need for greater international and foreign language knowledge becomes more acute. Two studies of the obstacles to internationalizing colleges of education recently have been funded by the Title VI Research and Studies program. The recommendations of these studies might inform future projects funded under UISFL.
 - Insufficient dissemination of project outcomes and “best practices,” lack of accessible and searchable databases. All of these are valid criticisms, which can and need to be addressed when the Department of Education is able to dedicate more staff and resources to them.
 - Insufficient oversight: at present there is significant oversight by peer review panels, which include members from outside of academia; by reviewers who are experts in international education; by the required electronic submission of outcome indicators under EELIAS, now undergoing another revision and improvement. Site visits by Department of Education staff are done, but are limited by funds and staff time.
 - Title VI is funding anti-American activities: while this has been a criticism of some Title VI centers, it has not, to my knowledge, been even attempted in relation to the undergraduate program. In none of my site visits and reading of UISFL materials, have I ever encountered any basis for such criticism.

Define "success" of the program and ways of measuring effectiveness specific to the UISFLS

Success in the undergraduate program can be demonstrated and measured through the following parameters. (The choice of specific parameters would be determined by the project.)

- number of faculty members involved in project activities
- number of new and redesigned international courses
- number of languages included in the project, the levels of proficiency achieved by students and methodologies employed
- new or redesigned majors and minors involving international and foreign language studies
- institution building measures, such as a faculty committee with oversight of international education; administrative support for study abroad and international students
- involvement of administrators, as well as faculty, in leading internationalization
- how inter-disciplinary and inter-school is the leadership of the project
- what instruments for assessment and research have been put in place
- sustainability of project outcomes and demonstrations of ongoing changes towards comprehensive internationalization
- leveraging of the seed money from Title VI for multiplier effect - what additional external funding has been secured
- what institutional funding has been added to international initiatives after the project's completion
- change in library resources during and after Title VI funding
- what new technology has been introduced or augmented
- what new teaching methodologies have been introduced
- have institutional linkages/exchanges in the US and abroad been added

- are student career choices reflecting the imbedding of international and foreign languages into the curriculum and institutional culture

How would you use the result of an evaluation?

The Schneider and Burn and McCarthy studies of the undergraduate Title VI and Fulbright-Hayes were extremely useful in understanding the past impact of the programs. Ten years later, we are living in a new environment. Few would deny the urgent need for collaboration between the federal government, institutions of higher education, and the private sector in infusing international studies and foreign languages into the education not just of an elite, but of a generation of citizens and experts. The NAS evaluation can be instrumental in creating a fuller assessment of national needs and existing resources in the field. This, in turn, we hope will lead to a reaffirmation of the Department of Education's commitment to moving forward with fulfilling those needs.

How do you view the role of the Department of Education's Title VI and Fulbright-Hayes programs as similar or different from the role of other related Federal programs?

While there is some overlap with Department of State and Defense programs, the Department of State approaches its mandate from the perspective of the nation's foreign policy while Defense focuses on national security. Programs in these agencies provide largely student and faculty support.

Title VI, Section 604, the longest-standing comprehensive federal government program, supports institution/capacity building in undergraduate international and foreign language education. To some extent, the Department of Education's FIPSE international consortia programs can be an overlap, but they focus on specific

areas/countries of the world and focus on two-way exchange programs.

Because of their breadth of mandate and depth of past experience, Title VI and Fulbright-Hays have an appeal and capacity to deliver results in international and foreign language studies not matched by other programs. The strong partnership the Department of Education, and specifically the Title VI – Fulbright Hays staff have developed with a multitude of higher education institutions and organizations is in itself a national resource. It should be used to its full capabilities in the continued and, we hope, expanded process of internationalizing education across the country.

Conclusion

I wish to thank members of this committee for the opportunity to offer a perspective on the undergraduate Title VI programs. I will be glad to respond to questions and queries.