

# COALITION FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

*Promoting U.S. Global Competence*

August 2, 2013

The Honorable John Kline  
Chairman  
Committee on Education and the Workforce  
U.S. House of Representatives

The Honorable George Miller  
Senior Democratic Member  
Committee on Education and the Workforce  
U.S. House of Representatives

The Honorable Virginia Foxx  
Chairwoman  
Subcommittee on Higher Education  
and Workforce Training  
U.S. House of Representatives

The Honorable Ruben Hinojosa  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Higher Education  
and Workforce Training  
U.S. House of Representatives

Dear Education and the Workforce Committee Leadership and Members,

We are pleased to submit the attached views of the Coalition for International Education on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Title VI-International Education. The Coalition for International Education consists of over 30 national higher education organizations with interest in the U.S. Department of Education's international and foreign language education programs. The Coalition represents most of the nation's 3,300 colleges and universities, and organizations encompassing various academic disciplines, as well as the international exchange and foreign language communities.

Each reauthorization of the Higher Education Act finds the United States facing new global challenges. Today our nation's successful global engagement, security and economic competitiveness depend on our ability to understand and adapt to the more complex world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. International and foreign language education is an essential strategy for promoting that understanding.

Unlike the time of Sputnik when the National Defense Education Act first created federal international education support to serve Cold War needs, today's challenges require a far wider and deeper range of knowledge about the world, its cultures and many more of its languages, from high level expertise to a globally competent citizenry. The increased demand for highly proficient speakers of many strategic, less commonly taught languages by federal agencies in recent years is stark illustration of the expansion in needs. The federal government must continue to strengthen its catalytic role in international and foreign language education. The path to peace and prosperity lies in engaging the rest of the world.

Title VI programs have had a tremendous impact on the nation's international and foreign language capabilities. We strongly urge these programs be continued with the bipartisan support they have enjoyed over the decades.

**HEA-Title VI, International Education, Page 2.**

We are eager to work with the committee to ensure the future success of Title VI in a constrained budget environment, and would be pleased to provide any additional information requested.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Submitted by the following organizations,

American Association of Community Colleges  
American Council on Education  
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages  
American Councils for International Education: ACTR/ACCELS  
American Political Science Association  
American University of Beirut  
Association for Asian Studies  
Association for International Business Education and Research  
Association of International Education Administrators  
Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies  
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  
The Forum on Education Abroad  
Joint National Committee for Languages  
Latin American Studies Association  
Middle East Studies Association  
Modern Language Association  
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities  
National Council for Languages and International Studies  
National Humanities Alliance  
North American Small Business International Trade Educators Association  
Social Science Research Council

cc: Members of the House Education and Workforce Committee  
Enc:

# COALITION FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

*Promoting U.S. Global Competence*

August 2, 2013

## STATEMENT ON REAUTHORIZATION OF HEA-TITLE VI INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION for the EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE COMMITTEE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Today, the U.S. faces an urgent education issue that will directly affect our nation's well being for generations to come: the *global competence*<sup>1</sup> of Americans. Ensuring the nation's security, economic competitiveness, foreign policy leadership, and ability to understand and meet global challenges in the 21<sup>st</sup> century depends on U.S. global competence. We believe HEA-Title VI is the vehicle to address this education goal.

### **Title VI Overview**

At the height of the Cold War, Congress created Title VI in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and Section 102(b)(6) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays) out of a sense of crisis about U.S. lack of knowledge on other countries, their languages and cultures. Spanning more than five decades, these world-class programs remain the federal government's most comprehensive for incentivizing and maintaining a higher education infrastructure that steadily produces and ensures the nation's deep expertise and knowledge on over 200 foreign languages, global and regional affairs, and international business.

**Title VI programs have evolved and improved over this time in response to expanding needs for international expertise and workforce skills driven by changing world conditions, such as the fall of the Soviet Union and globalization.** Today Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs support activities to improve our nation's international education capabilities, from K-12 outreach through graduate level education and advanced research, with strategic emphasis on the less commonly taught languages and regions of the world. Title VI largely supports the domestic side of training and research, while Fulbright-Hays supports an essential overseas component.<sup>2</sup>

A March 2007 report by the National Academies of Sciences (NAS) concluded, ***"Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs have served as a foundation for internationalization in higher education."***

---

<sup>1</sup> The components of what we call "global competence" range from deep expertise in the languages and cultures of other nations and regions, to basic understanding of the rest of the world and the U.S. role. Global competencies involve, among other things, having cross-cultural skills, foreign language proficiency and the ability to function effectively in other legal, political, economic, social and cultural environments and value systems.

<sup>2</sup> Although Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) is not a part of the HEA statute, in 1961 President Kennedy placed it in the Office of Education for administration with Title VI to provide essential complementary overseas training. Our reauthorization comments herein focus on HEA-Title VI only.

## The Federal Role: U.S. Department of Education

**The federal government plays a critical role in international and foreign language education. This role stems from the clear relevance of global competence to the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, the national security of the U.S., the health and vitality of the U.S. economy in a global marketplace, and not the least of which, the global challenges permeating almost every professional sector today, at home and abroad.** Informed decisions in these areas depend on Americans who have the necessary skills and understanding of foreign languages, cultures and systems. Successful global engagement depends on Americans who understand how the people of other cultures think and work and who can competently assess the political, economic, business or social implications of decisions and actions. In short, it is an essential federal interest to ensure that Americans are successfully prepared to engage with other nations, cultures and languages in today's interconnected world.

Through the U.S. Department of Education's Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs, **the federal government carries out a catalytic function in partnership with institutions of higher education**, and with support from corporate, foundation and state/local government sectors. State and local governments and the private sector, including foundations, will not by themselves focus on long-term national needs for international expertise. While these sectors support short-term projects from time to time, they do not provide the long-term, sustained support for the decade-long study and research needed to produce an expert on the Middle East highly proficient in Arabic, for example.

The 2007 NAS report on Title VI and Fulbright-Hays stated, ***“Universities themselves have invested significant resources beyond those provided by the Department of Education.”*** However, colleges and universities cannot bear this responsibility alone. Outside resources are essential incentives for developing and sustaining high cost programs in the less commonly taught languages and world regions, providing fellowships to undergraduate and graduate students, and conducting extensive educational outreach and collaboration between and among education institutions, government agencies, and businesses. **Most of these programs would not exist without federal support, especially at a time when state and local governments, and institutions of higher education also are financially strapped.**

Title VI therefore ensures the federal goals of ***access to and delivery of*** the international and foreign language education and training critical to the national interest. Based on standards of excellence, Title VI fellowships and education abroad opportunities encourage both ***accessibility*** to deserving students and ***completion*** of their studies.

### Why Reauthorizing HEA-Title VI Is Critical to the National Interest

The 2007 NAS report found: ***“A pervasive lack of knowledge about foreign cultures and foreign languages in this country threatens the security of the United States as well as its ability to compete in the global marketplace and produce an informed citizenry.”*** The impact of globalization at home and abroad, and changing world conditions are expanding the need for globally competent Americans. For example,

*Government.* Numerous GAO reports over the last decade provide clear evidence that too few American government employees have sufficient knowledge of or skills in foreign languages, cultures, and other political, economic, and social systems to meet our national strategic needs at home or abroad. This deficit exists across a broad range of federal, state and local government agencies.

*Business.* Surveys have shown that the highly competitive global economy requires American business people with the requisite training and expertise to succeed. Increasing exports, especially to emerging markets, is essential to job creation and economic development in the U.S. In Europe and Asia bilingual workforces are spurring economic growth. U.S. firms also must have Americans who understand foreign markets and cultures, speak their languages, and are equipped to meet the many complex challenges of doing business with other countries and cultures.

*Education.* Our nation's educational institutions at all levels face unmet needs for faculty, instructors and teachers trained in or knowledgeable about foreign languages and world regions, especially in less commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Chinese and Farsi.

*Professions.* Globalization today affects virtually every profession in America, creating new demands for citizens with international and foreign language knowledge in almost all fields of endeavor—from health and the environment, to journalism, to science and engineering—whether it be in the culturally diverse U.S. workplace or on assignment abroad.

*Citizen Understanding.* With our ever more interconnected world, the need for international understanding today is much deeper and wider than ever. Elected representatives and voters need to understand the global nature and causes of such issues as immigration, trade, infectious disease, and environmental conservation, among others, to make informed decisions.

The United States lags significantly in cultivating these skills of its citizens and should dedicate resources adequate to the task.

## **Recommendations for Reauthorizing HEA-Title VI**

Title VI authorizes eleven programs, ten of which have been funded. The appendix contains a list and brief description of each program.

### **1) Continue the Title VI Statute Intact**

**We urge the committee to continue the historic bipartisan support for Title VI by reauthorizing its programs intact.** These are quality programs with proven results. While several Title VI programs have not been funded in the last few years, the reason is due to the disproportionate, accumulated budget cuts of \$57 million or 44% since FY 2011. **We urge that any currently unfunded Title VI program that was funded continuously from the FY 2008 reauthorization up to FY 2011 be reauthorized intact.**

**Rationale:** Title VI programs support the educational pipeline for foreign language, world area, and international studies and research, including international business. The Coalition is open to a dialogue about how these programs might be strengthened and their administration improved to address current challenges. Congress should maintain its commitment to building and maintaining the education infrastructure that produces the graduates the nation needs to meet global challenges, whether in government, business or education. Title VI has built educational models that are dynamic and able to adapt to new global realities, and are needed now more than ever.

## 2) Maintain Focus on Expertise, Excellence, and Access

**We urge the committee to ensure that Title VI continues to focus on training Americans with advanced international and foreign language expertise and knowledge to meet national strategic needs.** Just as the federal government maintains military reserves to be called upon when needed, the historic focus on maintaining an educational capacity through **Title VI centers of excellence that steadily produce high quality expertise and knowledge** must be continued. Title VI centers and programs provide **access** to its expertise through courses, research, consulting, and outreach, and are relied upon by all levels of government, education and business across the nation.

**Title VI programs addressing this goal include: Part A**–National Resource Centers, Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships, Language Resource Centers, American Overseas Research Centers, International Research and Studies Program, and Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access; **Part B**–Centers for International Business Education and Research.

**Rationale:** Continuing Title VI centers and their ability to respond to new and unanticipated global challenges requires maintaining capacity in over 200 languages, cultures and other international expertise. As the 2007 NAS report noted: *“Too narrow a focus...could be detrimental to the country.”* Second, infusing an international dimension to American education across-the-board, from K-12 to post-graduate education, must be informed by expertise. Third, maintaining this capacity requires a substantial investment that hinges on federal support. Title VI leverages resources at institutions of higher education, and partnerships with public and private sector organizations, thus yielding a multiplier effect in a constrained budget environment.

## 3) Strengthen Emphasis on Internationalizing Undergraduate Education

**We urge the committee to support the goal of enhancing the international knowledge and foreign language skills of our citizens across the professions and workforce.** Title VI programs should continue to be the vehicle for addressing growing needs for basic global competence in the workforce by strengthening international undergraduate education. International and foreign language studies should be infused throughout the undergraduate curricula—such as teacher development, STEM, and business—along with related student education abroad and university international engagement opportunities. Title VI undergraduate programs also should continue to emphasize serving underrepresented institutions and underserved populations. While Title VI programs are well positioned and designed to address this goal, the Coalition is open to dialogue on cost-effective and innovative ways to move forward in the current budget environment.

**Title VI programs addressing this goal include: Part A**–Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language program, **Part B**–Business and International Education, **Part C**–Institute for International Public Policy, and **Part D-Sec. 637** Science and Technology Advanced Language Program.

**Rationale:** Internationalizing undergraduate education supports the international educational pipeline by preparing students planning to pursue graduate study in international areas. For example, higher levels of language proficiency are attainable when language learning starts early. In this respect, more articulation of language learning between K-12 and higher education to gain higher levels of proficiency is needed as well. What’s more, in our interconnected world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, instilling basic global competence should be recognized as part of the core education of all undergraduates, whether or not advanced study is intended.

#### **4) Provide Authorization Levels *At Minimum* Equal to FY 2010 Appropriations**

Given the *national security and global competitiveness import* of these programs, **we strongly urge the committee not to set the authorization levels to current appropriations levels. We believe the FY 2010 appropriations level of \$110 million at minimum in the first year of reauthorization, and such sums thereafter, would better serve the nation's needs.** Modestly funded for decades at roughly 0.1% of the Department of Education's budget, these programs should be restored as soon as possible to at least their FY 2010 levels. Any new initiatives within Title VI should be funded with new resources.

**Rationale:** The FY 2013 Title VI appropriations levels are below 1960s levels in constant FY 2012 dollars. Recent campus surveys indicate that the prolonged cuts have eroded programs, staffing and the overall international education and research infrastructure, putting at risk the preparation of our next generation of international experts and a globally competitive workforce. The substantial gains made with the post-9/11 Congressional investments to enhance training, research and outreach on strategic priorities are being lost, as federal funding reductions are not being permanently replaced with nonfederal funds. This world-class educational infrastructure took decades to build and is not easily replaceable if dismantled.

#### **5). Strengthen the Department of Education's Leadership Role on International and Foreign Language Education**

**We urge the committee to support a greater leadership and coordination role for the Department of Education in promoting international and foreign language studies, both among federal agencies as well as within our educational system across the nation.** For example,

- The Department of Education should engage in a national dialogue among national, state and local education leaders and policy makers to explore what systemic policy and program reforms are needed to strengthen international and foreign language education at all levels in the U.S. Global competence is key to successful international engagement, but is also important at home in our increasingly diverse communities.
- The Department of Education should expand its international benchmarking surveys—now focused on reading, math and science—to include foreign language learning. This activity should include comparisons with non-English speaking nations as well as English speaking countries. For example, many of the nation's global economic competitors mandate that their students learn English and another foreign language, in addition to their native language.
- The Department of Education should support systematic, periodic inventories of the numbers of foreign language teachers and faculty in the U.S., the languages they teach, and foreign language enrollments by language. An inventory is needed to determine teacher shortages, especially in languages of national need. This also holds true for U.S. area studies faculty by world area.

===

## APPENDIX

### HEA-Title VI, International Education Brief Program Descriptions

Title VI authorizes the following eleven programs. Those in italics are not currently funded due to budget reductions since FY 2011.

**PART A, International and Foreign Language Studies** focuses on increasing knowledge and expertise in more than 200 foreign languages, world areas and global issues.

**National Resource Centers (NRCs)** support institutions of higher education (IHEs) to establish and operate centers to train students, specialists, and other scholars; maintain important library collections; conduct advanced research; and conduct outreach to K-12 & higher education institutions, business, government, and the media.

**Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships** support academic year and summer fellowships for graduate and undergraduate-level training at IHEs having nationally recognized programs of excellence.

**Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language (UISFL)** program is a seed program that supports the establishment of instructional programs in international studies and foreign languages at the undergraduate level.

**International Research and Studies (IRS)** projects support IHEs, public and private nonprofit organizations and individuals in projects to conduct research on the needs, methods and strategies for teaching foreign language and area and international studies.

**Language Resource Centers (LRCs)** support IHEs to improve the teaching and learning of foreign languages.

**American Overseas Research Centers (AORCs)** program supports consortia of IHEs to establish centers overseas to promote postgraduate research, faculty and student exchanges for advanced training and research.

**Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA)** supports IHEs to develop innovative techniques or programs using electronic technologies to collect, organize preserve and widely disseminate information on world regions that address our nation's teaching and research needs in international education and foreign languages.

**PART B, Business and International Education Programs** provides support to expand international business education and enhance U.S. leadership in the global economy.

**Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER)** support university centers to improve international business education and serve as national and regional resources for businesses, government and other educational institutions.

**Business and International Education Projects (BIE)** is a "seed" program that supports IHEs to enhance international programs in business schools and to promote linkages with the international business community.

**PART C, Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP)** builds international education capacity at minority-serving institutions and provides an opportunity for the best students at these schools to receive training and participate in internships that lead to international careers.

**PART D-Sec. 637, Science and Technology Advanced Foreign Language Education Grant Program (never funded)** supports programs in institutions of higher education that encourage students to develop an understanding of science and technology combined with foreign language proficiency, including teacher training.