

**"REPRESENTING FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION  
AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN THE UNITED STATES"**

This document presents all the proposals offered by the panelists at four national conferences, ACTFL, MLA, Northeast Conference, AAAL, as they have been received as of March 26, 2008.

***The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)***  
San Antonio, TX: Friday, November 16, 2007: 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

- Robert Blake, University of California, Davis. [rjblake@ucdavis.edu](mailto:rjblake@ucdavis.edu)
- June K. Phillips, Dean & Professor Emerita, College of Arts & Humanities, Weber State University. [jphillips@weber.edu](mailto:jphillips@weber.edu)
- Paul Sandrock, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. [S.Paul.Sandrock@dpi.state.wi.us](mailto:S.Paul.Sandrock@dpi.state.wi.us)

❖ **ROBERT BLAKE**

- I. Two by Two: two goals, two methods
  - a. Goal #1: provide government personnel with advanced language proficiency (level 3+) in the an array of strategic languages
  - b. Goal #2: increase our students' multilingual/multicultural competence in K-16 and the overall acceptance of multilingualism as a societal norm
  - c. Method #1: top down, have the federal government direct the development of goals #1 and, if the money lasts, goal #2
  - d. Method #2: *federalist* approach where each state and local community take action to meet goals #2 and, indirectly, goal #1.
- II. Advanced Proficiency (level 3+, Goal #1)
  - a. Leveraging existing expertise of heritage learners
  - b. Pipeline Flagship grants (Chinese, Korean, Russian, Farsi)
  - c. Title VI center (National Academies report)
  - d. Up-to-date SLA research findings: joint UC Lang. Consortium/UCLA NLRC for Heritage Languages
- III. Increase multilinguistic/multicultural competence and acceptance of multilingualism as a norm (Goal #2)
  - a. Impact lives of our students so as to prepare them for a multilingual world
  - b. Reverse negative public attitudes (i.e. ENGLISH ONLY) about speaking other languages
  - c. Change our approach to dealing with the rest of the world
  - d. Change our approach to dealing with diversity within our own society

**Stating the goals correctly (section ii and iii) allow us to determine what are the best means for reaching them (IV, V, and VI)**

- IV. The centralist approach (method #1)
  - a. Do we need a central language figurehead? (conclusion of the 2005 Consortium Colloquium on U.S. Educational Language Policy: “It cuts both ways”)
  - b. Department of Education: NCLB but what else are they doing? FL testing was never mandated as part of the NCLB legislation and as a result many local districts devalued language study
  - c. DOD: Can they work with academia? Can we work with them?
- V. The *federalist* approach (method #2)
  - a. Top down
    - i. State level: department of education
    - ii. University level (MLA report; requirements): Can the faculty agree on the need to stimulate language study?
  - b. Bottom up
    - i. Student abroad programs (only 3% of the college population goes abroad)
    - ii. Unified districts (L.A. and S.F. examples)
    - iii. Local schools
    - iv. Community level
- VI. Interface between centralist and federalist approaches
  - a. Central government provides leadership toward a new internationalism (this leadership is not trivial by any means!), starting with valuing immigrant languages in this country (less immigrant bashing)
  - b. Central government can support more study abroad through increases to Title VI program (as called for by me in the National Academies report)
  - c. Heritage language instruction also a priority at the state and local levels; insights in training programs can flow up to the central government level
  - d. Increased FL requirement in an articulated state and local educational system will feed the needs of the central government in the long run
- VII. Conclusion
  - a. Goal #1 is problematic for academia: not our purview, not our area of expertise; best pursued by Method #1. Central government meets its own immediate needs.
  - b. Goal #2 is of concern to everyone but best carried out locally with a federalist approach.

❖ **JUNE K. PHILLIPS**

Will there ever be a time when language learning will take center stage without an impetus related to war, or diplomatic failures, or being on the wrong side of a competitive battle? Some of us have lived through Sputnik and its impact on education, had our hopes raised with the Carter Commission Report and thought we might contribute to reducing

the risk of a “nation at risk.” This time, it seems as all those factors contribute to renewed interest in the study of languages and cultures – or at least some languages and cultures. Being the eternal optimist, I want to believe that maybe the third time is the charm.

If change is to occur in the standing of foreign language learning in this country, it will require strategic planning to replace tactical steps. It will require long term commitment and not sporadic efforts; it will require support from multiple entities, from those who understand teaching and learning as well as from those who want special skills. I hesitate to define what the organizational chart might look like, but I will posit some thoughts as to the mission and tasks that must be undertaken.

- Language and cultural learning in schools, colleges, and universities is an academic and humanistic enterprise. To that end, responsibility must be assumed at the federal level by a department, unit, foundation, or center charged with assuring systemic continuity in programs for learners. It should have a strong leader who can develop credibility and influence among government, business, community leaders and other educators. Representatives of groups with special interests in having linguistics in career fields should interact regularly, but the first and key role must be to have U.S. students learn other languages and gain knowledge of their cultures. The goal is to have language learning be a common academic undertaking for all learners. That is the premise upon which one builds capacity so that as students mature and consider careers, they have the ability to continue with a language begun early or to switch or layer a new one. They will do that successfully because they understand how to learn a new language and have ideas of how to connect that learning with their preferred disciplines.
- The mission of this federal department would consist of at least three major thrusts: Coordination, Collaboration, Communication.

**Coordination:**

- ✓ With states and local districts, with higher education, and with other government departments (e.g., defense, state) so that education solutions proposed for critical needs are educationally sound, appropriate to the age of students, and taught by professional teachers
- ✓ With funded programs to assure that proposed outcomes are assessed
- ✓ With funding agencies both public and private for research in high priority areas

**Collaboration:**

- ✓ To assure that language learning is a part of every child’s educational experience
- ✓ To gather information on successful curricular models that address the demographics of different types of local schools (e.g., size, number of languages that can be offered and sustained, community interests).
- ✓ To work with higher education to develop a competent professional teaching force for those who are certified through comprehensive university programs or by alternate routes. As more potential teachers make career changes or come to teach in the U.S. from abroad, the quality of preparation should not be less although the path followed may be different.

- ✓ To support research in teaching, learning, and assessment that is longitudinal and to work with language educators on an agenda that can be systematically pursued

**Communication:**

- ✓ Through its established standing, the office needs to be a source of information on the importance of the study of languages and cultures
- ✓ Respond with collaborators to disinformation promulgated by partisan and bickering masses (need for at least a “truthiness” squad). The schizophrenia that occurs with issues such as:
  - English only, anti-immigrant, no taxes spent on dual immersion schools
  - Politicians bemoaning a lack of students’ studying languages spoken in countries they label as evil, enemies, and fascists
- ✓ Be a source of review, feedback, and monitoring for legislative proposals that have impact on international education and language learning.

❖ **PAUL SANDROCK**

1. Where does the message come from that students and citizens need more than one language?
2. Each sector has its own funnel for funding – to further its own “ends”
3. What is missing? Funding world language education up front
  - Emphasize K-8, K-10 programs
  - World languages are alone among the core subject areas of the No Child Left Behind Act left behind without a place in elementary grades and middle schools.
4. Consider a decision model based on potential impact and feasibility
  - Presentation by Andreas Schleicher, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), head of the Education Indicators and Analysis Division, at Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills (Washington, DC, November 7)
  - Useful model for this panel to examine the value of various proposals

		High Potential Policy Impact			
Low Feasibility		<b>Must Haves</b>	<b>Quick Wins</b>		High Feasibility
		<b>Money Pits</b>	<b>Low Hanging Fruit</b>		
		Low Potential Policy Impact			

5. Proposal with both high policy impact and high feasibility: US Department of Education World Languages Coordinator
  - To develop coordination across levels; provide oversight to a variety of program supports; be the insider to emphasize and advocate world language programming and support

- Facilitate communication (2-way, 3-way, 4-way; LEA-SEA-National)
  - Parallel to what works in other arenas:
    - Local: LEA – District Supervisor
    - State: SEA – State Supervisor
    - National: USDOE – National World Languages Coordinator
6. What needs to be represented; areas for influence in federal government?
- A. Systems – interagency mechanism
  - B. Assessment – identify “markers of readiness” for various applications of language skill
  - C. Broader representation is required: a federal World Languages Oversight Board

### ***The Modern Language Association (MLA)***

Chicago: Saturday, December 29, 2007: 8:30 – 9:45 a.m.

Katherine Arens, University of Texas, Austin. [k.arens@mail.utexas.edu](mailto:k.arens@mail.utexas.edu)

Dennis Looney, University of Pittsburgh. [looney@pitt.edu](mailto:looney@pitt.edu)

Catherine Porter, SUNY College at Cortland. [porterc@cortland.edu](mailto:porterc@cortland.edu).

#### ❖ **KATHERINE ARENS**

### **For Want of a Strategic Education Resources Administrator: A Not-So-Modest Proposal**

#### **1. The Need for a Counter-Proposal, Re-Thinking the Norms**

- to contextualize FL education within education, not as a mandate in itself
- to capitalize on extant structures and infrastructures
- to accommodate stakeholders, not theories, and long-term strategic resources development in many areas

#### **2. Educational Mandates and Policy: What Might Be**

- Federal versus centralist is wrong heuristic. "National Language Policy Summit" (2005) identified stakeholders: business, government, and academe
  - Respectively: lobbying and future assessment; policy; and expertise and best practices models
  - Add any local lobbies that can attract earmarks from any of the above
- Suggested alternative: parallel to "national science advisor" in executive branch, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, charged with administering resources, consciousness-raising, models, and funding

#### **3. The Immodest Proposal: Language Study Considered as Education**

- PROPOSITION: Create a Strategic Education Resources Administrator charged with coordinating *all* aspects of education, balancing federal and local missions.
- LOCATION: Not in ED or executive branch, but perhaps in oversight entity like the Government Accountability Office
- FUNCTION:
  - representing *all* aspects of education, not just languages; supplement to language expert within the Department of Education
  - address language study as part of a more general area, *the arts and humanities* together, balanced off the sciences and social sciences.

- **MISSION:**
  - To coordinate stakeholders (business, academe, government, and local entities) and adjudicate accountability
  - Administrating language and other expertises as "strategic reserves" or "strategic resources" fostered by education not only for security purposes or current market issues, but also as long-term assets to be maintained at readiness, even if not immediately required
  - like FDIC, fostering "effective management of strategic resources" including human capital, financial and infrastructure resources, information technology, risk management
  - adjudicating policy and resources tradeoffs originating from any of its significant stakeholders as an interlocked set of demands on establishment and maintenance of strategic education resources.
- **GOAL:**
  - Tying federal funding and policy accountability into local funding and stakeholder accountability under comprehensive "best practices" models
  - To bring locally established standards (including criteria for performance/under-performance) into transparent national comparisons with peers, best-practice planning, financial and social planning
  - To iterate between short-term and long-term planning for fiscal accountability and response to newly emerging needs
  - To set up transparency on education costs and benefits, including:
    - Plans with benchmark levels, appealing to precise research bases for design validation, outcomes assessment, articulation among levels, plans for human resources involved (e.g., teacher [re-]training)
    - Move away from "core curriculum" as set-asides into a more flexible curricular framework, designed like *Standards* projects around functions (and probably treating *clusters* of subjects as alternative and tradeoffs)
    - Clear triggers for implementation of exit/transition strategies, sunset reviews, retraining, revision, [voluntary/involuntary] opt-out from federal scrutiny and federal funding.

#### **4. Function of Administrator: Accountability, Adjudication, Suasion**

- Routine auditing and reporting on outcomes for *public scrutiny* as ground for policy and funding calls at all levels (public "outing" actual situations and allowing for comparisons)
- Adjudication of progress/lack thereof in terms of plans and benchmarks set by local entities, national best-practices norms, fiscal accountability, expert assessments for outcomes at levels, local ability to provide basic services
- Critical exercise of central, long-term strategic planning, to sustain resources in face of "immediate needs" (asserted by government [e.g., DoD], individuals [e.g. culture-lobby, business-lobby], or academe [earmarks for "academic freedom" or "pure research" without outcomes accountability])
- Tying post-secondary education, scholarship, and research into public space as generating models for future best-practices, outcome assessments, definitions of and stewardship of strategic resources
- Comprehensive review of funding for expert scholarship, research, archival stewardship, media accessibility and post-secondary education (including NEA, NEH grants, Fulbright, etc.), including
  - Justification of research in terms of long-or short-term stewardship of public interests, not just within its own disciplines

- Local and national accountability for iterating K-12 with post-secondary education, development, and a strategic reserve of innovation
- Public advocacy for sharing, imposition of public peer pressure, relating *rights* and *accountability*.

❖ **DENNIS LOONEY**

**I. Challenges**

- Challenges of promoting FL study K-16 by federal decree
- Challenges caused specifically by NCLB

**II. Three models of federalism**

- ‘layer cake’
- ‘marble cake’
- ‘Christmas cookies’ (?)

**III. Centralization at the local level: the third model of federalism at work**

- Successful models of federalism adapted to the local level
  - How school-based perspectives can shape foreign language education policy (Donato and Tucker)
- Building support rather than creating resistance
- Beware of tokenism and marginalized inclusion
  - Perils of marginalization in the ‘inclusive syllabus’ (Ditmar)

**IV. The European Union and its supranational redefinition of federalism**

- Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)
- A possible fourth model of federalism

❖ **CATHERINE PORTER**

**Challenge**

Identifying an interlocutor to represent FL professional concerns to federal agencies

**Obstacles**

Numbers and diversity of concerns within profession

**One approach**

- (1) Identify common goal
- (2) Develop structure and strategy for working toward goal

**Proposed goal**

Introduce FL education into K-12 core curriculum throughout US

**Advantages**

- (1) Would solve or alleviate most problems currently facing post-secondary FL educators
  - a) Shift in focus from lower- to upper-level work
  - b) Experienced FL learners = more capable learners
  - c) Advanced proficiency levels within reach
  - d) Increased numbers for study abroad
  - e) Broader upper-level curricular choices
- (2) Would address many aspects of current “language deficit” at the national level
  - a) Larger pool of people with FL proficiency to meet crises
  - b) Larger pool of people with FL proficiency available to teach

- c) Larger pool of people with FL proficiency to meet the everyday needs of government and business
- d) Citizenry experienced in seeing the world through the lens of at least one language and culture other than English

#### **Obstacles**

- (1) Need to build a consensus, change the culture
- (2) Need to resolve practical issues at local level
  - (a) starting age/grade level
  - (b) choice of language
  - (c) choice of methodology/materials
  - (d) recruitment of teachers
  - (e) adaptation to diverse student bodies
  - (f) assessment of outcomes
  - (g) financing

#### **Proposed approach**

- (1) Establish working group/task force through JNCL-NCLIS
  - (a) prepare position statement summarizing the arguments in favor of incorporating foreign language education into the K-12 core curriculum in the United States (Resources: ERIC, NFLC, other)
  - (b) develop strategies for mobilizing our memberships to undertake advocacy efforts aimed at influencing federal, state, and local policies and practices at the K-12 level. Examples:
    - (i) study and publicize approaches used in other nations
    - (ii) publicize and encourage replication of existing programs
    - (iii) introduce and publicize new model programs
    - (iv) seek out and reward FL competence in schools and in the workplace
    - (v) orchestrate support at the local, state, and federal levels for measures that would further our goal (e.g., legislation such as H.R. 2111, the “Foreign Language Partnership Program”)

**Summary:** agreement on common goal and multi-level plan of action to pursue it will give the profession a way to represent some of its concerns effectively at the federal level.

### ***Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (NECTFL)***

New York City: Friday, March 28, 2008: 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Helene Zimmer-Loew, Executive Director, American Association of Teachers of German  
[helene@aatg.org](mailto:helene@aatg.org)

Ron Woo, Director of the Teaching Fellows Program, Hunter College, NY City  
 Former Director of LOTE, NY City Department of Education  
[ron\\_woo@hotmail.com](mailto:ron_woo@hotmail.com)

Christine Brown, Assistant Superintendent, Glastonbury Public Schools, Glastonbury, CT  
[brownc@glastonburyus.org](mailto:brownc@glastonburyus.org)

❖ **HELENE ZIMMER-LOEW****Goal**

The establishment of a coordinated federal language presence/department

**Achievements**

Foreign Language Standards Collaborative (since 1993)

Growing use of the Standards developed by the Collaborative

Joint National Committee on Language/National Council for Languages and International Studies (since 1976)

Many strong language programs at all levels of instruction

Growing numbers of Advanced Placements exams and students

Growth in study abroad/internship programs

Positive public opinion about the importance of language study (especially in the earliest grades)

Recent interest in language study for a range of uses

Established and evolving assessment strategies

**Challenges**

Low percentage of students studying languages at all

Even lower percentage of students continuing to an advanced level of proficiency

Special interest groups especially within the education community

Cost-cutting/accountability-oriented legislatures, school boards, boards of trustees

Economic conditions at all levels of government

Federal government imposed and unfunded mandates

Inability of government agencies/departments to work together

Lack of consistency of the status of language learning at state and local levels

Lack of language coordinators at the state and local levels

**Approaches to Meeting the Challenge**

Establishment of a policy-focused taskforce from within the profession

Strategic plan to accomplish goal

Work on establishing mandates at local and state levels

Advocacy at all levels of instructions and government with every language instructor involved

Identification of model programs at all levels of instruction

Coordination of K-12 with college/university programs

Research on the benefits of learning languages

Outreach to all decision-making constituencies (administrators, policy makers etc.)

Involvement with ASCD, NASSP, NAESP, PTA, ACE, etc.

❖ **RON WOO**

- NCLB – Is foreign language a core curricular area or not?
- Federal framework - What is the national focus?
  - Informed by research - learning a second language increases cognitive and reasoning skills aiding in academic achievement

- Is it the Five C's (Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparisons, Communities) as proffered in *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (1999)? Is it solely about grammar and vocabulary, or reading and writing, or social oral language, etc.?
- When should foreign language instruction start – elementary school, middle school, or high school?
- How much? What is the intensity?
- Looking to other states for models
- Measuring what's important – High stakes testing in foreign language
  - Implementing a National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for foreign language - In 2000, the National Assessment Governing Board adopted the *Framework for the 2004 Foreign Language National Assessment of Educational Progress*.
- Federal assistance
  - Program development and implementation
  - Teacher development
  - Enforcement and consequences???

❖ **CHRISTINE BROWN**

*Representing Language Education at the Federal Level in the United States: A Focus on Well Defined Engagement*

Assumption 1: Present federal language initiatives are not sufficient to ensure long term changes in language education in the United States.

Assumption 2: A greater language education presence at the federal level of education could jumpstart a new era of support for language education.

Assumption 3: A greater language education presence at the federal level would help to unify the language and international studies fields at all levels.

Reality 1: There is no other viable choice given the pressures on local districts and states to meet ever increasing expectations in Math, Science, and Literacy.

Reality 2: Students in grades K-8 know frighteningly less today about international issues than in decades past due to the narrowing of the curriculum.

Reality 3: This lack of knowledge of the world and inability to speak other languages is intersecting with world events and failures of economies that are of crisis proportion for humanity.

Recommendation 1: Establish a position at the highest level of government that would oversee a new, coordinated federal campaign to improve language and international education. This could take the form of an Office of Language and International Outreach (OLIO).

Recommendation 2: All educational sectors (Elementary and Secondary, Higher Education, Defense, Intelligence, and State) would serve or be represented under the leadership of the Director of the OLIO.

Recommendation 3: The first charge of OLIO would be to create a strategic plan for revolutionizing the teaching and learning of languages and cultures in the United States.

Recommendation 4: The Director of OLIO would work with national and international experts in the field to redefine the content of language and culture education to include all aspects of international awareness and intercultural competence. All languages would be represented in this effort.

Recommendation 5: Aspects of the “Five V’s” that follow would have to become parts of the strategic plan and initiatives undertaken by the new Office of Language and International Outreach.

### **THE FIVE V’S:**

#### **View**

- ❖ Americans have differing views about language learning that would need to be revealed and addressed.
- ❖ A view of the past times when multilingualism was valued in the United States (the first one hundred years) should be capitalized on in order to move the rhetoric beyond the English centered and sometimes xenophobic feeling about language learning today.
- ❖ The needs of the PreK-12 educational system are different from the needs of higher and adult education.
- ❖ All levels of instruction have very different contexts in which they operate and view language education.

#### **Vision**

- ❖ The spokesperson(s) at the federal level would need to be visionary.
- ❖ The vision of the life that Americans could lead if there was far greater language and culture competence from PreK -12 through adulthood would need to be crafted and marketed in the same way as has been done in other critical, federal campaigns.
- ❖ The federal leadership for language learning, cultural competence and international education would need to be supported by a “delta- force back office.”

#### **Value**

- ❖ Ongoing research into the cognitive, general linguistic, affective and other benefits of learning multiple languages would be raised to a level of national importance.
- ❖ Annual data about language programs would be collected.
- ❖ The impact of learning multiple languages on English language competence would be researched.
- ❖ An instrumental, federal role would need to provide ongoing and sustained funding for establishing, supporting, evaluating, and revising educational approaches that lead to language and culture competence.
- ❖ Multiple pathways to voters for funding language education at all levels would need to be established.
- ❖

**Visibility**

- ❖ The federal lead for language education would elevate what are now ad hoc, profession-based advocacy campaigns to systematic and ongoing, national awareness campaigns.
- ❖ A federal initiative could showcase Americans who are already multilingual and, as a result, reap the benefits in jobs and opportunities.
- ❖ Federal initiatives would include many training opportunities for school administrators and elected officials who have no experience in language learning.
- ❖ A sustained and funded federal initiative would provide nation wide curriculum development institutes, materials development, teacher recruitment, teacher training and web based courseware.

**Victory**

- ❖ Americans would become proud to be multilingual.
- ❖ Americans would understand the general cognitive and affective value of knowing other languages.
- ❖ Americans would understand complex world problems from multiple perspectives and vantage points.
- ❖ There would be a system in place to ensure the opportunity for all American students to study languages in addition to English in an articulated fashion from Pre-K to old age.
- ❖ Technology would greatly enhance local language offerings.
- ❖ All American teachers and educational administrators, regardless of the discipline they teach or the level they oversee would have studied additional languages from elementary school through the college level.

***American Association for Applied Linguistics***

Washington, DC: March 31, 2008: 2:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Lyle F. Bachman, Professor and Chair, Applied Linguistics, UCLA,

[lfb@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:lfb@humnet.ucla.edu)

Representative Rush Holt (D-New Jersey). Mail: [Christopher.Hartmann@mail.house.gov](mailto:Christopher.Hartmann@mail.house.gov)

Diane Auer Jones, Asst. Secretary for Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, [Diane.Jones@ed.gov](mailto:Diane.Jones@ed.gov)

Ambassador Michael Lemmon, National Defense University, [lemmonm@ndu.edu](mailto:lemmonm@ndu.edu)

Mary Ellen O'Connell, Senior Program Officer, The National Academies, [moconnell@nas.edu](mailto:moconnell@nas.edu)

❖ **MARY ELLEN O'CONNELL**

*Committee to Review the Title VI and FH International Education Programs*

NRC committee charged with reviewing Title VI and FH programs at ED

Who committee was/why requested

Programs created almost 50 years ago, but mission expanded significantly over time

Prompted committee to look at context beyond Title VI/FH

National security, language capacity across a range of languages potentially competing issues; need to do both; not clear to universities what national security needs are  
 Language fluency one of controversial issues; Fluency requires early study which again directed beyond Title VI/FH

Other programs – federal, state, and local – need to be in mix with federal leadership/strategic guidance

Several recommendations focused specifically on Title VI/FH. Broad based recommendations include:

- ◆ The Department of Education should consolidate oversight of its international education and foreign language programs under an executive-level person who would also provide strategic direction, and consult and coordinate with other federal agencies. The position should be one that requires presidential appointment and Senate confirmation.
- ◆ Congress should require the secretary of education, in consultation and coordination with the departments of State and Defense, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and other relevant agencies to submit a biennial report outlining national needs identified in foreign language, area, and international studies, plans for addressing these needs, and progress made. This report should be made available to the public.
- ◆ The Department of Education needs to develop and implement an integrated strategy for foreign language and international education involving both K-12 and higher education, and ideally additional resources. In carrying out this strategy, the department should work closely with its federal partners, state and local education officials, higher education, and national experts, and engage all of its relevant programs, including the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs. Such an integrated strategy is needed to enhance national security, help U.S. businesses compete in an increasingly global economy, and broadly educate and inform the nation's citizens.

❖ **AMB MICHAEL LEMMON**

*Committee to Review the Title VI and FH International Education Programs*

Widespread concern among USG departments and agencies about insufficient foreign language, culture and regional expertise needed to do the job among employees

In-house training capabilities limited and more efficiently used to “top off” incoming employees with solid language/culture and areas skills and hone those skills in ways appropriate to the needs of the organization and range of missions

Some collaboration among “national security” agencies underway to share information, programs and materials, but needs vary according to mission

Need for expanded discussion with Dept of ED and broader education and academic communities as to what are the national needs and requirements for which foreign language, culture and regional skills and expertise and to what level

Establishment of an Assistant Secretary for International Education and Foreign Language provides a needed central and authoritative POC for State, Defense, IC and other USG agencies and the Hill and to oversee compilation of biennial report to Congress outlining national needs, plans for addressing those needs and progress made

Could provide long-term strategic focus and facilitate contact with broader education and academic communities to provide informed strategic guidance (not necessarily direction)

Particularly important to marry efforts at K-12 levels to those in higher education in a strategic, integrated and articulated programmatic approach to foreign language and international education

Also important to note that the nation's needs go beyond specific "national security" requirements and encompass a broad demand for "global professionals" to ensure US global competitiveness not only economically, but across the board

Critical challenge is how to integrate regional, cultural and language competencies amid all the other competencies needed by the 21<sup>st</sup> Century workforce.

Need to find additional ways to broaden partnerships among federal government, foundations, professional organizations and the education and business communities while simultaneously enhancing collaboration at the federal, state and local levels.

Key questions are what modes such an approach might take and whether it might be assisted by building public-private partnerships encompassing a wide array of those stakeholders

Another recommendation in the NRC Committee Report is that the USG contract for a new National Foreign Language Assessment and Technology Project initially to focus on R&D to design and implement technology-based methods to assess language proficiency and support language instruction via common platforms

NRC/LRCs (and CIBERs) could infuse language/culture/area expertise across academic departments and professional schools and expand collaboration with schools/colleges of education in curriculum development, design of instructional materials and teacher education

Public-private partnerships again could play a critical role in fostering collaboration and diffusion of information and innovation and finding partners among a broad array of interested stakeholders among governmental and non-governmental entities at the local, state and federal levels and among business and non-profit communities

Whether a more senior or separate USG "coordinating mechanism" or "national language advisor" is required or desired to effect Coordination/ Collaboration/ Communication is a political question requiring Executive and Legislative Branch agreement and action

Another possibility might be an NSF-type arrangement or a standing NAS "roundtable" that includes academics, government, education community, professional and business groups to monitor, assess, evaluate and discuss

❖ **LYLE F. BACHMAN***Foreign Language and International Education in America: Quo vademus?*

## I. Some background (“déjà vu all over again”)

- A. 1950’s (Parker, Sputnik, NDEA)
- B. 1980’s (Lambert, NFLRC)
- C. 2000’s (Flagships, NSLI, numerous reports)
- D. What, if anything, have we learned?

Democratization of resources does not work. In other words, Lots of cooks and rich ingredients don’t guarantee a satisfying and nutritious meal.

## II. Need to think broadly and outside of the current FL&amp;IE establishment/structure

- A. more broadly than federally supported programs (e.g., DOE -T6, State - F-H, DOD - Flagships, Pipelines): → need to include state depts. of education, teacher education programs, business
- B. more broadly than FLE. → need to include IS
- C. more broadly than university and Fed language programs: → need to include preK-12

## III. Need to think about structures that are independent of any special interests, sources of funding, or government agencies, but which would work with all the major stakeholders

## IV. New structures that would provide both research and implementation:

- A. A policy and research “think tank”: Ideally, a standing committee at the National Academies.
- B. A development and implementation center: (T6 F-H Committee Report: need for “continuous improvement”, Recommendation 12.3)

Heidi Byrnes, Georgetown University. [byrnes@georgetown.edu](mailto:byrnes@georgetown.edu)

Project information:

<http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/faculty/byrnes/perspectivespanels/>

March 25, 2008