

**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

February 14, 2006

On Behalf of the Following Organizations of the  
**COALITION FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION:**

American Association of Community Colleges  
American Association of State Colleges and Universities  
American Council on Education  
American Council on International Intercultural Education  
American Councils for International Education: ACTR/ACCELS  
American Political Science Association  
Association of American Universities  
Association for International Business Education and Research  
Association of International Education Administrators  
Association of Research Libraries  
The College Fund/UNCF  
Consortium of Social Science Associations  
Council of American Overseas Research Centers  
Council of Directors of National Foreign Language Resource Centers  
Council of Directors of National Resource Centers  
Council for Opportunity in Education  
Joint National Committee for Languages  
Middle East Studies Association  
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities  
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges  
National Humanities Alliance

**Madame Chairwoman and Members of the Committee:**

My name is William Brustein and I am Director of the University Center for International Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, and Professor of Sociology, Political Science, and History. I am pleased to have the opportunity to present the views of the Coalition for International Education on the Higher Education Act, Title VI and the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, Section 102(b)(6), commonly known as Fulbright-Hays. The Coalition for International Education is an ad hoc group of 35 national higher education organizations with principal focus on the aforementioned international education, foreign language and exchange programs, as well as other international education programs in the U.S. Department of Education. Together the Coalition represents the nation's 3,300 colleges and universities, and numerous international education and disciplinary organizations encompassing various academic disciplines, as well as the international exchange and foreign language communities.

The sense of urgency about the United States' shortfalls in international competence against a backdrop of enormous international challenges has been so strong within the higher education community, that it moved us to form this Coalition in the early 1990s and has drawn our different perspectives into a single consensus position.

We believe this study by the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council to be both timely and important. Developing the international expertise the nation needs in the 21st Century requires a long-term, sustained commitment. Just as the federal government maintains military reserves to be called upon when needed, it should invest in an educational infrastructure that steadily trains sufficient numbers and diversity of American students. International and foreign language expertise cannot be produced quickly; it must be cultivated and sustained. For nearly five decades, Title VI and Fulbright-Hays has been the linchpin for federal efforts supporting the production of this expertise in the U.S. These programs provide key incentives for ensuring a teaching and knowledge infrastructure upon which other federal and nonfederal efforts rely. Therefore, we welcome the NAS review as a step toward ensuring that these programs are well positioned to help meet the enormous global challenges the nation faces.

My remarks will address the questions forwarded by the NAS staff in a broad sense for all Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs. My presentation will be followed by colleagues representing several Coalition associations who will focus on the questions as they relate to individual programs.

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

The federal government plays a critical role in international and foreign language education because of the clear relevance of international competence to U.S. foreign policy, national security, and the health and vitality of the U.S. economy in a global marketplace. Informed decisions in these areas depend on citizens who have foreign

language skills and understanding of other nations' cultures and systems. Through Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs, the federal government shares this responsibility with institutions of higher education, in partnership with the corporate and state/local government sectors. Overall, the purpose of these programs is to develop and maintain the nation's expertise and knowledge on the foreign languages, cultures and systems of other nations, with emphasis on the less commonly taught languages and areas of the world.

At the height of the Cold War, Congress created Title VI in the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, and Section 102 (b)(6) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 out of a sense of crisis concerning Americans' lack of knowledge about other countries, cultures and their languages.

The early Title VI programs included the National Resource Centers (NRCs), Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships, Research and Studies, and Language Institutes. The NDEA-Title VI statute stated:

“Sec. 601(a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them...of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government, or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States.”<sup>1</sup>

The statute went on to authorize instruction in “other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used...” Early programs focused on training teachers and faculty for our education institutions, and experts for government.

Over nearly five decades now, Title VI has undergone numerous statutory and administrative reforms designed to better address evolving and expanding national needs for international knowledge and language skills. Of the core programs created in 1958, the NRCs, FLAS and Research and Studies still exist. However, seven additional programs were added over this time, along with statutory purposes and priorities that are much deeper and broader than the original NDEA. They support:

- The development and improvement of undergraduate education in foreign languages and international studies (UISFL);
- Foreign language research and pedagogy (LRCs);
- The use of technology to improve library resources and preservation (TICFIA);
- Graduate and undergraduate programs in international business and research (CIBER and BIE);
- American research centers overseas (AORC); and

---

<sup>1</sup> National Defense Education Act of 1958, PL 85-864, Section 601(a)

- Programs to encourage and educate underrepresented minorities for international careers (IIPP).

Other recent improvements include more rigorous requirements for evaluation of grantee performance; greater emphasis on language pedagogy and methodologies in the less commonly-taught languages; redirection of resources by world area and languages to reflect changing government priorities (including the study of cross-regional thematic issues); the infusion of international and foreign language studies into professional education; and most recently, efforts to address homeland security issues.

While Title VI largely supports the domestic side of training and research, Fulbright-Hays supports an essential overseas component. The current Section 102(b)(6) statutory language dates back to the original Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (commonly known as the Fulbright-Hays Act), which focuses on training “teachers and prospective teachers.” In 1962, President Kennedy issued an Executive Order placing the administration of Section 102(b)(6) in the Office of Education (within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare--DHEW) as a complementary overseas program to NDEA-Title VI. The reason was the similarity of purpose to provide Americans with foreign language and area studies education, and in particular, to train “teachers and prospective teachers.” An internal 1992 memo in the Department of Education states that “Correspondence between DHEW and State, the Bureau of the Budget (today’s OMB), Senator Fulbright, et. al., confirm that the purpose of 102(b)(6) was to add an overseas dimension to the Title VI programs.”

Programs are not specified in the Fulbright-Hays statute. The Department of Education in consultation with the Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board created and administers four programs: Doctoral Dissertation Abroad, Faculty Research Abroad, Group Projects Abroad, and Seminars Abroad. Each has a specific mandate, but in general provide opportunities for overseas study to further language skills and cultural/area knowledge.

Today, Title VI and Fulbright-Hays together remain the federal government’s largest and most comprehensive mechanisms for supporting the production of the nation’s expertise in foreign languages, and area and other international studies, including international business. The 14 Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs support activities to improve our educational capabilities throughout the pipeline, from K-12 through the graduate levels and advanced research, with emphasis on the less commonly-taught languages and areas of the world. Through institutional development activities, they help create and maintain a higher education infrastructure that produces graduates with international knowledge and foreign language skills in a variety of disciplines and at varying levels of expertise. They produce curriculum materials, research, and outreach to government, education, business, civic and nonprofit sectors in the U.S. They also support programs designed to increase the pool of underrepresented minorities in international service. Graduates who have benefited from these programs go on to graduate school, research, and/or employment in a variety of professions at all levels of government, education and the private sector.

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

### **I. Strengths**

#### *Incentives*

Title VI/Fulbright-Hays provide essential outside resources that act as incentives for developing and sustaining interdisciplinary programs, underwriting high cost, long-term programs in the less commonly-taught languages and areas, and providing extensive outreach and collaboration among education institutions, government agencies, and corporations. All of these activities would not occur in our higher education institutions without outside support. For example, state and local governments and the private sector, including foundations, will not by themselves focus on long-term national needs for international expertise, such as the sustained support needed for the 10-12 years of study and research to produce an expert on the Middle East fluent in Arabic. Universities cannot bear this responsibility alone.

#### *Legitimacy/Multiplier Effect*

Title VI grants have a legitimacy and multiplier effect. The national stature of Title VI funding on campus create a legitimacy that leverages a large amount of non-Federal funding (more than 10 times the amount of federal funding in most institutions with NRCs, for example). This translates into an institutional commitment that leads to changes/improvements in curriculum, number of faculty/instructors, library support, use of technology, outreach programs and more. Thus, the Department of Education is able to have a substantial impact on the field of international education for a small investment of taxpayer dollars<sup>2</sup>.

#### *A Strong Infrastructure*

Title VI develops and maintains a strong infrastructure in foreign languages and international education in the U.S. sustainable over time, from which new programs are leveraged, and on which other federal and nonfederal programs rely.

For example, grants for Title VI UISFL projects have been the foundation for new National Resource Centers and/or Language Resource Centers, and BIE grants have been used to build new Centers for International Business Education and Research. Many institutions with National Resource Centers have combined to form American Overseas Research Center consortia.

Other federal and nonfederal programs rely on the Title VI infrastructure. The National Security Education Program (NSEP) in the Department of Defense, for example, relies on the infrastructure for teaching the less commonly-taught languages that Title VI supports. (NSEP's K-16 Chinese pipeline project at the University of Oregon is coordinated by the

---

<sup>2</sup> Combined Title VI/Fulbright-Hays funding in the President's FY 07 budget is roughly two-tenths of one percent of the entire proposed budget for the Department of Education.

Title VI Language Resource Center.) The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) and the Defense Language Institute (DLI) utilize resources and instructional materials from Title VI programs. State and local educational agencies rely on the outreach activities, resources, and short-term projects abroad provided by Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs.

### *Capacity in the Less Commonly-Taught Languages*

The success of language promotion in the Title VI foreign language and area centers in the last decade is well documented. According to a study of Title VI language programs and national security,

" Perhaps the clearest indicator of the success of this flagship strategy [Title VI foreign language and area centers] is the simple and indisputable fact that in this country many languages, including almost all of the less commonly taught languages, would not or could not be taught on a regular basis if it were not for Title VI. ...For certain languages, such as the Central Asian languages and African languages other than Swahili, no instruction is available outside institutions supported by Title VI/F-H." <sup>3</sup>

Today these centers have the capacity to offer 226 languages, and actually teach 128 languages,<sup>4</sup> many more than in the 1980s and previous decades and three times the number of languages offered by the Defense Language and Foreign Service Institutes. The increase includes hard-to-learn languages that became strategically important over the last two decades. Over 78% of the graduate students in the least commonly taught languages, such as those for which national security agencies have identified shortfalls (e.g., Hindi, Pashto, Tajik, Serbo-Croatian and Urdu), are taught at Title VI centers.

It is safe to say the Title VI/Fulbright-Hays support the strongest and most comprehensive system in the world of learning the less commonly-taught languages and area studies, and production of language and area studies materials.

### *Internationalizing Across the Curriculum*

Title VI/Fulbright-Hays provide support for infusing international content and foreign languages across the curriculum at both undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as through outreach to the K-12 sector. The early years of Title VI focused on the humanities and social sciences. Today, Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs work with a diverse group of faculty from a large variety of disciplines and a wide array of curricula developed by academic departments. In the last decade at the direction of Congress and the Department of Education, centers have expanded this interdisciplinary approach to

---

<sup>3</sup> *Language and National Security for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Role of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays in Supporting National Language Capacity*, Richard D. Brecht and William P. Rivers, The National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland, 2000.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://elctl.msu.edu/summaries/world/>

linking the liberal arts and professional school faculty, such as from business schools, public health and law. Teaching and research across the board are held to professional standards of objectivity and the particular standards of their disciplines, and are not based on ideology.

In addition, Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs provide the authority for a full range of strategies necessary to achieve international competence. They include such activities as, the development of foreign language and international content courses and majors, faculty/teacher training, summer institutes, study abroad, linkages with institutions abroad, new language and area learning materials, innovative use of technology and much more.

### *Pool of Expertise*

Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs create a pool of expertise for potential recruitment by a wide range of public and private employers, and for consultation by government, business, the media and education institutions. Graduates of Title VI centers serve in key U.S. government positions in all agencies involved in national security, international relations and foreign affairs, and in the corporate and education sectors. The fact that the expertise of these specialists has been sought in recent years by the U.S. Congress, the Department of State, the National Security Council, the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, other government agencies and corporations suggests the seriousness with which their scholarship is taken. Scholars regularly brief military, intelligence, and diplomatic agencies. In crises such as the Afghanistan war and the aftermath of the Iraq war, U.S. intelligence analysts as well as the media routinely turned to Title VI supported scholars and specialists for information about subjects as diverse as Pushtun tribal politics in Afghanistan and Shiite Muslim groups in Iraq.

Other examples: 1) The U.S. Army Foreign Area Officer (FAO) Program continues to send its officers to Title VI centers for their M.A. in language and area studies training and has done so since the inception of the FAO program three decades ago. 2) The U.S. Air Force relies on the resources of Title VI centers, most recently for course materials on the Turkmen language. 3) Title VI centers developed language training materials for Vietnamese, Tagalog, Indonesian, Mandarin Chinese and Korean learners for the National Security Agency and Department of Defense. 4) The Title VI Centers for International Business Education and Research are collaborating on a project to research the impact of homeland security issues on the international competitiveness of U.S. firms. 5) The State Department recently requested the American Overseas Research Centers to provide additional language training overseas in critical languages to address national needs.

## II. Weaknesses

### *Insufficient Resources to Fully Meet Program Objectives and National Needs*

The Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs have clearly articulated national needs and purposes that they are expected to address. Over time, the number of important goals and objectives the programs have been asked to meet has grown. Unfortunately, the level of resources provided has not been commensurate. This has become increasingly difficult in recent years as the demand for international expertise has surged.

During the 1970s and 1980s, funding levels for Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs did not keep up with inflation, while at the same time additional programs were added to Title VI. The erosion in funding, combined with expanding needs and rising costs, have contributed to today's shortfall in experts. Despite significant increases in funding in the last 15 years, FY 1967 is the highpoint in funding for the three original Title VI programs (that exist today) and Fulbright-Hays. Today's comparable funding levels for these programs are roughly 30% below the FY 1967 levels in constant dollars.<sup>5</sup> Inadequate resources coupled with increased responsibilities has limited the extent to which Title VI centers and programs can adequately fulfill their statutory mandates, especially at this time of high demand. For example, additional FLAS fellowships would enhance the ability of centers to recruit students in certain strategic languages. Additional funding might also allow for the hiring of full time outreach directors with the ability to respond to increased demands at the K-12 and undergraduate levels.

### *Collection and Dissemination of Information and Materials*

An enormous amount of expertise and information/research is produced by Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs, but is not easily accessible to stakeholders and the public. Certain Title VI programs have established websites from the field, while others have not. Since FY 2002, Congress has provided the Department of Education with authority to set aside up to 1% of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays funds for evaluation, dissemination, and outreach. It is our understanding that through this authority the Department is beginning to make strides to better collect and disseminate information, and strengthen evaluation and outreach. We applaud their efforts. We believe what's needed is a comprehensive, digitized database involving the collection and wide dissemination of information and materials, including best practices. It is also important for the Department of Education to preserve and digitize historic data and information on these programs.

### *Dearth of Research on Supply and Demand*

Research is lacking on the needs of government agencies, education institutions, and corporations for employees with foreign language skills and international knowledge. In

---

<sup>5</sup> Combined National Resource Centers, FLAS Fellowships, and Research and Studies funding for FY 05 was about \$63 million, which is \$29.4 million or 32% below the FY 67 high point in constant dollars. About 33% more FLAS fellowships (roughly 783) were awarded in FY 67 as compared to FY 05. Fulbright-Hays FY 05 funding was 28% below the comparable FY 67 level in constant dollars.

addition, though anecdotal evidence and some data are available, ongoing research is needed on program outcomes. It is our understanding that the Department of Education is addressing the supply issue through revision of the entire "Evaluation of Exchange, Language, International and Area Studies Programs" (EELIAS) framework, which the community welcomes.

### *Inadequate Staffing at the Department of Education*

We believe that the Department of Education's International Education Program Service (IEPS) may be understaffed and overburdened, leaving little time for creativity, analysis, data collection/dissemination, and progressive program and administrative reforms. In 1970, the international education staff in the Office of Education consisted of roughly 170 employees. Today IEPS has 21 employees. As longtime staff retire, it is important that new employees have the appropriate background in international education. We urge a review of the adequacy of staffing and support in IEPS, especially given the heightened importance of these programs today.

### **III. Criticisms**

A number of criticisms have been launched against Title VI over the last few years. Among them include,

*K-12 outreach by Title VI centers and programs is inadequate.*

The national shortages in foreign language expertise underscore the necessity for enhancing and expanding international and foreign language education at the K-12 level. Title VI grantees engage in outreach activities, many of which can be found on the Title VI website OutreachWorld.Org, which recently received a commendation from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Outreach funding is inadequate, enabling only part-time staff in most cases. Title VI does not have the resources or capacity to address the vast needs for in-service and pre-service teacher training and program/curriculum development. (Centers also are expected to conduct outreach to the media, journalists, the general public, and businesses, for which budget support is inadequate.) Additional federal, state and local K-12 programs are needed in these areas, as well as additional funding for Title VI outreach.

*Centers and programs are not producing graduates with high levels of foreign language proficiency. Students are not taught communicative skills.*

As student demand and national need have increased in recent years, more language programs funded by Title VI and across the board have been moving toward the teaching of communicative skills. However, foreign language proficiency examination is not routine among higher education language programs, primarily due to 1) the lack of consensus in the community on proficiency testing instruments; and 2) the lack of proficiency testing instruments in many of the rare languages of national strategic need. Although the Title VI Language Resource Centers and others are in the process of

developing testing instruments in LCTLs, more should be done to refine and streamline language proficiency testing, especially in rare, critical languages. Additional Title VI FLAS Fellowships to extend language training of graduate students to the fourth, fifth, or sixth years would enable more to attain advanced levels of proficiency.

*Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) has not evolved since 1961*

Since Fulbright-Hays has a permanent authorization, the current Section 102(b)(6) statutory language dates back to the original Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. The focus then was on foreign language and area studies, and “teachers and prospective teachers.” Although the Title VI statute has changed and evolved over the decades to respond to expanding national needs for international expertise, Section 102(b)(6) has not.

Section 102(b)(6) currently states,

“promoting modern foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges and universities by supporting visits and study in foreign countries by **teachers and prospective teachers** in such schools, colleges and universities for the purpose of improving their skills in languages and their knowledge of the culture of the people of those countries, and by financing visits by teachers from those countries to the United States for the purpose of participating in foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities;”

To restore complementarity with Title VI, the program’s purview might be expanded to allow funds to support visits and study in foreign countries by individuals who are participating in intermediate or advanced foreign language training and international studies and who plan to apply their language skills and knowledge of these countries in the fields of government, the professions, or international development. Since FY 2002, Congress has enacted similar language in successive appropriations bills in order to obviate the Fulbright-Hays statutory constraints.

*Title VI is funding anti-American activities.*

There have been no credible reports of federal money being abused or supporting anti-American activities under Title VI.

In one example at the University of California-Santa Barbara, a critic in 2002 cited a few pages in a collection of readings from a one-day Title VI outreach workshop. The document consisted of xeroxed articles for K-12 teachers from mainstream publications. The criticism included objection to 20 pages (of 212) in the document designed to consider the question “Why do they [the Muslim world appear to] hate us?” Not surprisingly, readings on such a question are critical of the United States. The Department of Education looked into the allegation and found that the center did nothing improper. To our knowledge, no formal complaints of anti-American activities funded

by Title VI have been filed with the Secretary of Education since.

On the contrary, Title VI programs do not promote any ideology. The programs have been enormously successful in creating and maintaining foreign language and international education programs serving the national interest that would not otherwise exist without federal support.

*Title VI should have more oversight.*

Title VI expenditures and program performance are already strictly supervised and monitored through a multi-layer system put in place by the Department of Education:

- Grant applications are judged by peer review panels based on the highest academic standards. Peer-review committees are not drawn from a narrow community but from a broad spectrum of area and language specialists not in applicant institutions, including members of think tanks and federal government employees (such as the FBI, Defense Language Institute and Department of State).
- Title VI centers submit detailed annual reports on how they are spending funds and meeting stated objectives. Recently this has included electronic submission of performance outcome indicators under EELIAS, a response to the Government Performance Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). The EELIAS program is undergoing revision and improvement at present.
- Frequent site visits to the grantees are made by the Department of Education staff.
- The Department of Education at any time can review a grantee's activities.
- Many grantees have their own outside advisory boards.

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

To some extent, program effectiveness should be measured differently for each of the 14 program, as each has a slightly different set of objectives in building and sustaining international competence and expertise throughout the educational pipeline. My colleagues to follow will address this issue for individual programs.

However, we suggest that defining success for these programs overall might include the following criteria and factors:

- Reliance on the expertise and researched produced in these programs over time by government, education and the corporate/NGO sectors;
- The number of individuals who benefited from these programs and who served or are serving in the federal government, education and the private/NGO sectors in positions in

which they utilize their international education and research;

- Sustainability of programs over time;
- Multiplier effect in generating additional funding from non-federal sources;
- Leveraging the expansion of international and foreign language education programs and spawning new ones;
- Significant teaching and research capacity in the less commonly-taught languages and areas of the world, and in international business;
- Internationalization across the curriculum;
- Promotion of interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaboration; and
- Increase in the number of underrepresented minorities entering international service.

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

It has been at least two and a half decades since the last overall evaluation of Title VI.<sup>6</sup> We are not aware of any overall evaluation of Fulbright-Hays, other than a study conducted by the Council of American Overseas Research Centers of the DDRA program. We are hopeful that the NAS evaluation will yield constructive suggestions for program improvement and needed change. We also are hopeful that the NAS review will identify what further studies and surveys are needed on both supply of and demand for international and foreign language expertise. This would greatly assist in better defining the national needs these programs are expected to address over time.

### **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?**

Clearly there is some overlap between Title VI/Fulbright-Hays and other similar federal programs. However, Title VI/Fulbright-Hays are distinct in the following ways:

- These programs are the most comprehensive in the federal government in that they address educational pipeline needs from K-12 through postgraduate research. No other federal international education program has such a wide range of parameters and activities.
- These programs provide the authorities to use the full range of instrumentalities needed to impart international competence, from the development of programs and infrastructure in U.S. education institutions, to the support of American students and faculty for study and research in the U.S. and abroad. Few, if any, other federal programs include the same breadth of activities.
- These programs have developed and maintain a foreign language and international

---

<sup>6</sup>Lorraine M. McDonnell, Sue E. Berryman, and Douglas Scott, *Federal Support for International Studies: The Role of NDEA Title VI*, Santa Monica, CA, The Rand Corporation, May, 1981.

education infrastructure on which many other federal programs depend. By the same token, Title VI centers and programs utilize the resources of similar programs in the Departments of State and Defense. This is a complementary relationship that leverages federal resources and enhances the effectiveness of all programs.

- Located in Department of Education, these programs focus on strengthening the U.S. educational system and the training of Americans in the foreign languages and cultures of other nations. Most similar programs in the State Department by and large are driven by cultural diplomacy needs abroad, and in the Department of Defense by national security concerns.

### **Conclusion**

Thank you again for this opportunity to present our perspective on Title VI and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6). I would be pleased to answer your questions.