

# NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICIES: PRAGMATISM, PROCESS, AND PRODUCTS

Joint National Committee for Languages

National Council for Languages and International Studies

J. David Edwards, Ph.D. Executive Director

Ashley L. Lenker, Program Manager

Dara Kahn, Researcher

**SUMMARY:** The following article with its accompanying overview and bibliography provide a comprehensive examination of major national language policies in the United States since 1979. The **article** discusses the policy process at the federal level and provides information about significant policies created since the 1979 President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (PCFLIS). The **overview** briefly discusses specific important policies, programs, legislation, studies, and conferences/meetings of note regarding foreign languages since World War II. The **bibliography** inventories articles, books, hearings, legislative report language, studies, and proceedings dealing primarily with language policies and policy studies rather than academic or scholarly materials. The article, overview, and bibliography are attempts to provide background and understanding for those who would address and change current policies or attempt to develop new policies. It is hoped that these materials will help to set the stage and provide valuable information and insight for the discussion, planning, development, and implementation of future policies for our nation, our citizens, and our students.

## National Language Policies

Recently there has been renewed discussion of national, federal and/or United States language policy/policies. As in previous surfacings, this discussion has been sometimes intense, sometimes insightful, sometimes naïve, and sometimes uninformed. Discussion of language policy in this country dates back to the founding fathers' consideration and rejection of the idea of actually having an official national language. Through both World Wars, and the Cold War, language policies were a topic of serious deliberation.

### President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies

Current discussions of language policies actually date from November 1979, with the publication of *Strength through Wisdom*, the Report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (PCFLIS). The Commission, appointed by President Jimmy Carter, included a number of federal policy makers such as Senator Mark Hatfield (R-OR), Representative (later Senator) Paul Simon (D-IL), Representative (later Chairman of the House Budget Committee) Leon Panetta (D-CA), and Representative (later Ambassador) Millicent Fenwick (R-NJ). The single most telling conclusion of the Commission's report was that the state of foreign languages and international studies in the United States was "scandalous." PCFLIS offered numerous recommendations for rectifying the problem.

One of the Commission's major recommendations was the creation of a "Washington presence." One year after the Report, in 1980, that presence was the Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL), an educational association originally comprised of eight member organizations. JNCL was joined a year later by a sister association for advocacy that became the National Council for Languages and International Studies (NCLIS). For more than a quarter of a century, JNCL/NCLIS has been active and influential in the discussion, creation, and implementation of national/federal language policies and legislation.

Some years after the President's Commission Report, at the request of Senator Paul Simon (one of the Commissioners), JNCL/NCLIS staff researched the status of the remaining PCFLIS recommendations and then met with him to discuss their findings. Some had been accomplished, more had not been achieved, and even more were either no longer appropriate or had been addressed in a different fashion.

In its very first year of existence, JNCL became quite involved in the 1980 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA), which preserved provisions of the highly-regarded National Defense Education Act (NDEA) by incorporating these provisions into part of Title VI of HEA. Working with Senators Robert Stafford (R-VT) and Claiborne Pell (D-RI), JNCL/NCLIS was able to assist in the creation of a new Part B of Title VI providing grants for Business and International Education.

Within a year of their creation, JNCL and its sister advocacy organization, NCLIS, undertook the first of eight annual consecutive budget battles to prevent the Reagan Administration from eliminating funding for Title VI entirely. Despite eight House and Senate attempts to eliminate and/or rescind Title VI during this Administration, JNCL/NCLIS, working with appropriations staff, testifying orally and in writing in hearings, seeking champions in Members of Congress, finding allies within the Administration, and through constituent calls and letters, played a major role in increasing funding for these programs by approximately \$10 million during this period. At the same time, in an Administration quite unfavorable to languages and international education, funding for the State Department's Education and Cultural Affairs was nearly tripled. In a policy context, were JNCL's efforts policymaking, policy implementation, preservation of policy, or all three?

### **Language Policy in the 1980s**

Often the times and the context contribute to the creation of policy and determine how policy is shaped. As to the discussion and implementation of policy, the launching of Sputnik certainly contributed to many meetings and hearings which led to the creation of NDEA in a remarkably short period of time. The 1980 reauthorization of HEA literally followed close upon the heels of PCFLIS with its many hearings and deliberations. Another example is that many policy makers in the 1980s, including key members of Congress, subscribed to the theme that "Toyota is the Sputnik of the eighties." Business and international economic competitiveness was of national importance. JNCL/NCLIS, the American Council on Education (ACE) and, later, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business Education (AACSB) collaborated with Senator Christopher Dodd (D-CT) and other Members of

Congress over two years in an ultimately successful effort to amend Title VI of HEA to create the Centers for International Business Education (CIBER).

During this decade, discussions within the language community at numerous conferences and meetings, deliberations by the JNCL/NCLIS Board of Directors and at our annual Delegate Assembly and Legislative Forum, and the publication of a series of papers entitled "New Directions in Foreign Languages" by an Ad Hoc JNCL Policy Committee, resulted in the identification of a number of areas where the creation of national language policies would be valuable. Two of these concerns were foreign language proficiency and early foreign language study. Working very closely with Senators Pell, Stafford and Dodd, and with the Chairman of the House Education Committee, William Ford (D-MI), JNCL and its advocacy arm were able to create new National Foreign Language Resource Centers (NFLRC) in Title VI and to include references to achieving language competence throughout HEA, despite strong opposition from some of the area studies community. In fact, a compromise resulted in the substitution of the term "language competence" for "language proficiency." Moreover, this debate and change in legislative policy laid the groundwork for and contributed to subsequent deliberations by the entire language community about what constitutes proficiency and how to measure/test it.

As to the issue of when to begin the study of another language, the discussion was within the language community: disagreements were sometimes quite strong, and the debate rigorous. It was not just a discussion of when to begin, but also of how to teach languages, what works best, what alternatives are available, how are languages learned, and much more. All of these factors had to be taken into consideration as JNCL/NCLIS worked with Senators Christopher Dodd and Paul Simon and Representative Leon Panetta, to create the Foreign Language Assistance Act (FLAA) and have it included as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1988. It was necessary to establish at least general agreement and relative commitment and cooperation within the community in order to proceed legislatively. As a consequence, the initial Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) was quite flexible and, in a general context, allowed applicants to determine the parameters of the issues raised above. Programs had to be new and innovative, within K-12, and were awarded primarily to local educational agencies (LEAs), but with state educational agencies (SEAs) eligible as well. There was now, at long last, a policy generally acceptable to many language professionals. Two more years of very difficult advocacy were required before languages would receive funding for that policy.

Appropriations for FLAP (a policy in its own right) have varied over the years from \$10 million originally to \$5 million through the nineties with increases since 1998 to over \$25 million at present, thanks to the efforts of Senators Thad Cochran (R-MI) and Arlen Specter (R-PA), working with JNCL/NCLIS to enlarge the program. The George W. Bush Administration requested the program's elimination each year until 2007, when it was incorporated into the President's National Security Initiative (NSLI). The program has been further shaped and refined, partially by the language professionals who have been awarded FLAP grants, through two subsequent reauthorizations of ESEA (the last being No Child Left Behind in 2001). Additionally, political realities and the views of policy makers have played a role, as is the case in most seri-

ous legislation. In one reauthorization, a provision rewarding strong existing programs was included by a Member of Congress seeking to recognize his district. Most recently, “critical languages” have benefitted greatly from the Department of Education’s regulations and interpretation of those regulations. During this same timeframe, a variety of other policies which included foreign languages in broader education programs, such as the Education for Economic Security Act (EESA) were also enacted, existed, and were funded for a limited time.

### **Language Policy in the 1990s**

It should come as no surprise that a major factor in determining national/federal language policies has been national security/national defense. In 1991, after Operation Desert Storm, the Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator David Boren (D-OK), held a series of hearings on actions, competence, logistics, communication, and the overall conduct of the operation. Shortly thereafter, Senator Boren’s staff and, later, Committee staff contacted JNCL/NCLIS, ACE, and the Liaison Group for International Educational Exchange to talk about creating legislation to address some of the problems in these areas revealed by Desert Storm. Months of discussions, negotiations and compromise produced the National Security Education Act (NSEA). Needless to say, the National Security Education Program (NSEP) created by this law was not without some controversy because it was funded by intelligence and housed in the Department of Defense (DoD). Despite a number of political ups and downs, NSEP functioned effectively, offering fellowships, scholarships and institutional grants, right up until the abrupt emergence of an unprecedented national security concern. With the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, NSEP’s responsibilities were actually increased to include language flagship programs and the development of a national language service corps.

Before turning to the latest policies and policy proposals spawned by 9/11, it is necessary to note another set of national concerns that produced a different category of language policies. *A Nation at Risk* had been written in 1983, and the 1989 National Education Summit at Charlottesville, convened by President George H.W. Bush and attended by education leaders, Members of Congress, and governors, produced a new consideration in determining the federal role in education. On the one hand, the Reagan and conservative position contended that there should be no, or only a limited, national role in education as exemplified by attempts to eliminate the U.S. Department of Education. On the other is the traditional view that the federal government’s role in education is to ensure equality and opportunity, as demonstrated by the GI Bill, the Elementary and Secondary Education of 1964, and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

What the National Education Summit established was the concept that while the federal responsibility for equality and opportunity remains paramount, the national government also has a responsibility for quality — excellence in education, later demonstrated by the move towards disciplinary standards, by President Clinton’s Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and even by President Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act. In the standards and goals, languages were included and treated as an important educational concern largely because JNCL and its members were able to provide a

forum for discussion and consensus building, and because NCLIS provided policy proposals to include foreign languages in Goal 3 of Goals 2000, Public Law 103-227 in March of 1994. In fact, JNCL/NCLIS worked very hard to ensure that foreign languages were fourth on the list of content subject areas. With this development, the language community gained the momentum necessary to seriously address policies for national foreign language standards and proficiency.

In the final years of the Clinton Administration, and with a federal government bitterly divided by partisan politics, educational excellence was relegated to the national back burner where education usually resided. Attacks on the Department of Education were renewed, new attacks were launched against the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and the neoconservatives began to question the value and objectivity of Title VI. Attempts to reduce or eliminate programs such as NEH, NSEP, Title VI, FLAP, and other small programs that included, but were not exclusive to, foreign languages became regular, ongoing battles.

Nevertheless, the Clinton Administration and Congress did reauthorize the Higher Education Act in 1998, adding provisions to Title VI to promote technological innovation and cooperation, include more internships, and encourage outreach. Given the national politics of this period, legislative policy proposals, even for moderate change, had to be modest in order to achieve any improvement whatsoever. However, as the nation began a new century, the federal government was able to establish a number of administrative policies that benefited foreign languages and international education. In early 2000, the President put forth an Executive Memorandum ordering all federal agencies to determine and take steps to address their needs for foreign languages and international education. Following this memorandum, the Departments of Education and State began to hold meetings and discuss internal changes to improve the nation's knowledge of languages and global competence. In November, President Clinton announced the nation's first International Education Week. Secretary of State Madeline Albright and Secretary of Education Richard Riley held receptions, gave speeches, and availed themselves of their respective "bully pulpits" to preach the gospel of languages and international understanding. Then, as happens with some regularity, the administration changed, and thus so did national policies and priorities.

### **The Impact of 9/11 on Language Policy**

Before turning to the policy initiatives that follow the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, we should note that policies to address the very language shortcoming 9/11 would dramatically demonstrate were already being discussed and considered. Over a year prior to the terrorist attacks in the Fall of 2001 and at the urging of JNCL/NCLIS, the House/Senate International Education Study Group chaired by Senators Thad Cochran (R-MS) and Christopher Dodd (D-CT) requested that the General Accounting Office (GAO) undertake a thorough study of the federal government's language needs and capabilities. This report, "Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency," was finally released in January of 2002. The report concluded, as had been expected, that the agencies studied by GAO all had major language "shortfalls." On September 14 and 19, 2000, a

year before 9/11, Senator Thad Cochran, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services, with the assistance of JNCL/NCLIS, held two sets of hearings on “The State of Foreign Language Capabilities in National Security and the Federal Government.” In the first set of hearings, witnesses from Defense, Intelligence, State, and the FBI testified about the nature of the federal government’s language “crises.” At the September 19 hearings, Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley began by addressing the nation’s need for “biliteracy” and discussing the Education Department’s efforts to improve language education. The Secretary’s remarks were followed by a panel discussion among Dr. Robert O. Slater, Director, NSEP; Dr. Dan E. Davidson, President, the American Councils and on behalf of JNCL; Martha G. Abbott, Foreign Language Coordinator, Fairfax County, Virginia; and Dr. Frances McLean Coleman, Einstein Fellow and teacher, Choctaw County, Mississippi.

While the testimonies pointed to teacher shortages and difficulties in articulation, all agreed that the capacity to teach languages existed, but that resources were seriously lacking. Thus began a range of discussions regarding languages in the U.S., but no serious policy proposals were forthcoming. The lack of immediate action is not surprising, given that normally the policy process in the United States is slow and incremental. The GAO report and the Senate hearings might have begun a period of deliberation that in the future would produce recommendations, amendments, and possibly even new legislation. However, every now and again, a major event occurs and serves to jump-start the policy process. The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, constituted such an event.

With the tragedy of 9/11 (which many think might have turned out differently had it not been for the enormous backlog of unaddressed intelligence materials, inadequately-trained personnel, and political indifference) there emerged a number of ongoing conversations on how to prevent subsequent attacks and what the United States must do to prepare itself internationally for the 21st century. At the forefront of many of the discussions concerning national security were needs for language proficiency and international understanding. Although the term “critical languages” quickly became a catch phrase to encompass a limited list of languages deemed critical to national security at the time, it also allowed languages to become a major issue in 21st century preparedness and competitiveness by ensuring the study of foreign languages a place in numerous pieces of math, science, and technology legislation, including the America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act (America COMPETES) passed in 2007. Government leaders once again remembered the importance of language and culture study for purposes reaching far wider than pure academic enrichment, which resulted in increased interest, conferences, initiatives, and policy developments over the next eight years that would create a new shape for the field of language professionals.

Much of this legislation in reaction to an increasingly volatile world, such as the Homeland Security Act introduced by Senator Richard Durbin (D-IL) in 2001 and the introduction by Representative Rush Holt (D-NJ) of the National Language Flagship Initiative, which established Flagship K-12 and higher education language instruction partnerships, came under the auspices of national defense/security. Thus, the

Department of Defense became a much more active player in considering and addressing language and international education in the United States. JNCL/NCLIS, in concert with the member organizations, has continued to work closely with Members of Congress to produce and refine such legislation and with NSEP, DoD, the Intelligence Community (IC), and Homeland Security in creating, implementing, and promoting such programs.

National defense legislation and policy initiatives promoting languages did not suddenly become short-term “hot button” issues just after 9/11, but have been persistently edging into legislation and education objectives in a variety of areas since then, such as the Department of Education’s FY 2004 Plan, the International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003, the National Security Language Act, and the International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2004, among others. The FY 2004 Appropriations bill included a provision to establish the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Act, the outcome of a recommendation from the Lincoln Commission Report to increase and diversify the group of American students who have the opportunity to study abroad. This has since become the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act.

In 2004, the National Language Conference, where language specialists, business leaders, academics, and state and federal personnel and legislators came together to collaborate and discuss the nation’s language needs and strategies to realistically address diplomatic, security, economic and education shortfalls, was held at the University of Maryland. As a result of this conference, the Department of Defense created its Language Transformation Roadmap (2005), strategizing and organizing ways to increase foreign language competencies within DoD in the coming years.

### **Language Policy 2005–Present**

To continue the very important discussions taking place at such conferences as the National Language Conference, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) held a National Policy Summit in January of 2005 entitled “An American Plan for Action,” where government and business leaders, language experts, and academics would once more engage in setting priorities for language and international education in the United States, this time at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. One of the major victories of this summit was the creation and implementation of the NSEP Chinese K-16 Pipeline Flagship, a model for sequenced, articulated Chinese study beginning in elementary school and continuing through undergraduate study. This model/pilot has since been replicated in two other instances in Chinese and Arabic. Following closely on the heels of the National Language Conference and the National Policy Summit, both houses of Congress approved resolutions making 2005 the “Year of Foreign Language Study.” In the Spring of that year, at the annual JNCL/NCLIS Legislative Day, Senator Daniel Akaka (D-HI) announced the introduction of a bill that called for a “National Coordination Council” for foreign languages to consider present and future national language policies and to allow the numerous pertinent government agencies to share information about language capabilities, resources, and needs with one another. While this legislation became somewhat controversial, it spawned the important idea of establishing a position for a federal representative who

would be responsible for the government's foreign language and international education programs and needs. This idea would later emerge in the form of deliberations about a Deputy Assistant/Assistant Secretary of International and Foreign Language Education in the Office of Postsecondary Education.

In January 2006, five years after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, President George W. Bush and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice announced the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI) at a meeting at the State Department for the U.S. University Presidents Summit on International Education. According to the President and Secretary of State, NSLI would create and expand our nation's critical language and study abroad programs with the intention of developing more proficient speakers of languages important to national security. NSLI is a coordinated effort among four federal agencies (Department of Defense, Department of Education, Department of State, and Office of the Director of National Intelligence) for which President Bush allotted \$114 million dollars (primarily existing funds) to address and implement critical language and culture study.

Soon after the NSLI announcement, the very prestigious Committee for Economic Development (CED) released a report entitled "Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security," which emphasized beginning language study early and using international content across the school curriculum in the U.S. to maintain and strengthen economic competitiveness.

The year following the NSLI announcement and the release of the CED report proved to be a year of planning and preparation to implement the new programs and act on suggested strategies. During 2007 and the early months of 2008, JNCL/NCLIS saw and acted upon increased opportunities to include foreign languages in legislation, to increase funding for language programs such as FLAP, and to boost federal representation and support on behalf of the field. Senators Daniel Akaka (D-HI) and George Voinovich (R-OH) started the year with a hearing entitled "Lost in Translation: A Review of the Federal Government's Efforts to Develop a Foreign Language Strategy," which sought to gather and officially record input from the language field on the need for and importance of foreign language education in the United States. At the same time, but extending over several months, the National Research Council of the National Academies released its report, "International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future," which was requested by Congress for review and evaluation of the effectiveness of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs to better inform the reauthorization of HEA in 2008.

In May 2006, Representative Rush Holt introduced his Foreign Language Education Partnership Program Act, which would establish a competitive grant program for partnerships between LEAs and IHEs in articulated, sequenced foreign language study from kindergarten through the university level. JNCL/NCLIS and the Coalition for International Education (CIE) worked closely with Representative Holt's staff in writing this bill by ensuring constant contact, input, and reaction from the language profession and will continue to work diligently to garner support on its behalf. While the bill did not become law during the 110th session of Congress, JNCL/NCLIS is strongly encouraging its amendment in the next Congress' reauthorization of ESEA

(NCLB). Bills affecting language education that were successfully passed in Congress and signed by the President in the 110th Congress include America COMPETES, which expands AP and IB programs, includes scholarship programs for language majors who become teachers and a critical foreign language partnership program suggested by NSLI, and the College Cost Reduction and Access Act, which provides loan forgiveness for students pursuing teaching careers in “high need areas,” including foreign languages.

In the final days of the 110th Congress, both Houses passed and the President, without any ceremony, signed, the long overdue reauthorization of HEA. Working with two Administrations, four Congressional Committee Chairs, and a variety of Members of Congress and staff from 1998 to 2008, JNCL/NCLIS worked from one legislative extreme (defeating provisions to create a highly intrusive International Education Advisory Council) to the other (defining “Critical Languages” in such a broad and comprehensive fashion as to allow a great deal of flexibility regarding which languages are studied and receive priority). Attempts to create an office of Assistant Secretary of International and Foreign Language Education resulted in the compromise development of a Deputy Assistant Secretary, which may open the door for future considerations. Some other significant accomplishments in the new version of HEA include foreign languages in the adjunct teacher corps, loan forgiveness for teaching in “high-needs areas,” and the definition of foreign languages as an “area of national need.” Within Title VI, most of the fine-tuning and improvements — such as increased outreach, more study abroad, and undergraduate involvement — recommended by the community when reauthorization was first addressed in late 2002 and early 2003, were accomplished in the end.

## Conclusion

JNCL/NCLIS began its advocacy efforts in 1980 with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act that incorporated NDEA into Title VI of one of the nation’s most significant educational undertakings. JNCL/NCLIS has now reached the end of the fifth endeavor to accomplish HEA approval. This latest, largely successful series of amendments supporting languages in higher education is a perfect example of the ebb and flow of policymaking. Policy’s incremental nature, as previously mentioned, is a result of the processes by which government and legislation function, with both positive and negative aspects. Policymaking and implementation require focus, diligence, and patience as ideas evolve into legislation, regulations, executive orders, and/or decisions, and then maintenance of these efforts as support is gained, reinforced, and continued. JNCL/NCLIS has existed for almost 30 years — created from the recommendation of a presidential commission, based on the belief that what we do is important, and committed to the effort to compete for the attention of policymakers and the public. These organizations, since their inception in 1980, have achieved numerous and significant accomplishments, through steps both small and large, for languages thanks to perseverance, understanding of policy and the process, and the support of their constituencies. The policy process is complex and complicated. None of the accomplishments mentioned here, such as the continuance of NDEA, the survival of funding for Title VI, the creation of the CIBERs or the NFLRCs, FLAP, NSEP,

NSLI, or the new Foreign Language Partnerships, have come to pass in exactly the same fashion. Each has been unique to its place in the policy process and is the result of numerous factors, such as need, knowledge, advocacy, leadership, involvement, commitment, inclusiveness and trust.

Some of the current discussions of language policies seem to be ignoring the lessons of previous policies by focusing on policy as an end rather than as a process, as singular rather than plural, as individual rather than consensual, and as academic rather than applied. A few of these approaches face or even create the real danger of being highly shortsighted and thus risk excluding a number of variables vital to the process, such as commitment, inclusiveness and trust. Distrust and disdain for policy, the process, and the other players is a guarantee of failure, or certainly of no more than limited success. Many of our policy and legislative successes have been the result of cooperation and respect for one another as academics, practitioners, and policy-makers and the willingness to work with one another within the policy process. With new and daunting challenges of the 21st century, continued cooperation and communication will be essential to future language policy efforts.

## **AN OVERVIEW OF MAJOR NATIONAL LANGUAGE STUDIES, PROGRAMS, LEGISLATION, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES SINCE WORLD WAR II**

---

### **1946: Fulbright-Hays Act**

In 1945, Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-AR) introduced a bill to Congress that called for the use of surplus war property to fund the “promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science” (Fulbright, 1945 ¶ 1). On August 1, 1946, President Harry Truman signed the Fulbright-Hays Act (P.L. 584) during the 79th Congress to create the Fulbright Program. It originally allocated funds for job exchanges between educators from other countries during peacetime “to increase mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States and other countries, through the exchange of persons, knowledge, and skills” (National Security Education Program, n.d.). The Fulbright program now supports cultural exchange programs not just for scholars, but also for professionals and youth.

This program became the U.S. government’s flagship international exchange program. It currently operates in 140 countries and has sponsored more than 210,000 U.S. and foreign grantees. The Fulbright program, managed through the Institute of International Education, is mostly funded through the Department of State (National Security Education Program, n.d.).

The Fulbright-Hays programs, not to be confused with the above-mentioned Fulbright programs, are largely funded through the Department of Education and were added in the 1961 version of the Fulbright-Hays Act.

### **1948: United States Information and Cultural Exchange Act (Smith-Mundt Act) P.L. 80-402**

The United States Information and Cultural Exchange Act (Smith-Mundt Act) established the programming mandate that still serves as the charter for U.S. over-

seas information and established the framework for cultural and educational exchange programs. It also supported Voice of America, a U.S. organization that has broadcast news and information in numerous languages around the world since 1942, under the auspices of the Office of International Information at the Department of State (Fulbright-Hays Act, n.d.).

President Harry S. Truman signed this act into law on January 27, 1948.

Overlapping policies: It was updated and expanded in 1961 to be incorporated into Section 102(b)(6), commonly known as Fulbright-Hays, in the 1961 Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act.

---

**1954: Revision of the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations**

The basic tenets of the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations of 1936 remained the same. These included the exchange of professors, teachers, and students among American countries as well as encouraging “closer relationships among the unofficial agencies that exert an influence on the formation of public opinion” (A-48 Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, 1954 ¶ 2). However, the 1954 revisions involved an amendment to develop a fellowship plan that each member government would provide to graduate students, teachers, and other qualified applicants to attend a higher learning institution designated by the country awarding the fellowship. This is one of the first embodiments of modern study abroad programs.

Each fellowship included tuition, textbooks, working materials, and a monthly allowance for lodging, subsistence, and other necessary additional expenses for the length of the academic year. The revisions were signed at the Tenth Inter-American Conference, held in Caracas, Venezuela March 1-28, 1954. Members consisted of 35 countries from all over the Americas (A-48 Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, 1954).

Overlapping policies: Registered with the United Nations on March 20, 1989 (No. 24379).

---

**1957: The Soviet Union launches Sputnik I**

Until Sputnik was launched, schooling in substantive disciplinary subject area had been a matter of state and local discretion, with virtually no federal involvement. This perceived threat from the Soviet Union provided impetus for the legislation on international education and foreign languages that became the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in the following year (1958). The NDEA originally focused on relatively narrow goals in direct response to the Soviet Union’s accomplishments and the spread of communism.

---

**1958: National Defense Education Act (P.L. 85-864) and Title VI**

The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) passed Congress in August of 1958 “to correct critical areas of shortage and neglect, which now carry highest priority in the national interest,” according to House Committee on Education and Labor, Report No. 2157, and thus meet and protect national security needs, especially in light

of threats from the Soviet Union. “In passing NDEA, Congress recognized that the defense and security of the nation were inseparably bound with education” (Scarfo, R.D., p. 23). President Eisenhower signed it September 2 of the same year. The main areas of concern include science, math, and modern foreign languages.

Title VI of the NDEA provided funding to educational institutions and individuals in support of international education and research; its original mission was more narrowly focused solely on language. Title VI was originally called “Language Development” and established the Centers and Research and Studies (Part A) and Language Institutes (Part B). The initial language focus of Part A was specifically the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). Part A’s “Centers and Research and Studies” contained the predecessors to the current National Resource Centers (NRCs), Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships, and International Research Studies (IRS) programs. Part B of the act focused on any modern foreign language in elementary and secondary schools and provided support to train K-12 foreign language teachers (Scarfo, R.D., 1998).

Overlapping policies: Title VI programs were supplemented with an internationally-focused dimension from the 1961 Fulbright-Hays Act’s Section 102 (b) (6). Title VI was reauthorized in 1976, 1980, 1986, and 1992 and was amended in 1988. It was incorporated into HEA in its 1980 reauthorization and has since been called “Foreign Language and International Education Programs”.

---

### **1959: Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) Founded**

In the environment of increased interest in language issues fostered by NDEA, Dr. Charles H. Ferguson, a pioneer in applied linguistics, created the Center for Applied Linguistics. “CAL’s original mandate was to improve the teaching of English around the world; encourage the teaching and learning of less commonly taught languages; contribute new knowledge to the field by conducting language research to resolve social and educational problems; and serve as a clearinghouse for information collection, analysis, and dissemination and as a coordinating agency to bring together scholars and practitioners involved in language-related issues.”

CAL’s current mission is to “improve communications through better undertaking of language and culture.” For the last fifty years, CAL has played a leading role, nationally and internationally, in research on language acquisition, language use, practical language applications, and effective language education.

---

### **1961: Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange (Fulbright-Hays) Act (P.L. 402)**

The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange (Fulbright-Hays) Act, which expanded and incorporated both the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1946 and Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, added Section 102(b)(6), commonly known as Fulbright-Hays on January 27, 1948. This section supplemented the Title VI programs mentioned above and establishes “academic, professional, youth, and cultural exchange programs” which awarded grants to U.S. and non-U.S. citizens to study overseas and in the U.S., respectively (Committee for Economic Development, 2006 p. 31). Some of these were Fulbright-Hays programs and some were Fulbright programs. The Fulbright-Hays programs are

funded and administered through the Department of Education, whereas the Fulbright Program is funded through the Department of State (O’Connell & Norwood, 2007).

There are currently nine Title VI programs and four Fulbright-Hays programs.

**1962: Executive Order assigning Section 102(b)(6) of Fulbright-Hays Act to U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare**

President John F. Kennedy issued the Executive Order assigning Section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The new assignment enabled the support of the following initiatives over time: Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad, Faculty Research Abroad, Group Projects Abroad, Foreign Curriculum Consultants (FCC), and the Seminars Abroad program that was added in the 1960s. (Committee for Economic Development, 2006).

**1965: Higher Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329)**

The main goal of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA), according to the text of the legislation, was “to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education” (McCants, J., 2003). It was part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society domestic agenda and mentions the importance of the necessity of language expertise in the U.S. It establishes a National Teacher Corps, creates scholarships, offers low-interest student loans, and gives money to universities. Title VI of NDEA was incorporated into the HEA during its 1980 reauthorization. It was signed in law on November 8, 1965

Overlapping policies: HEA of 1965 was reauthorized in 1968, 1972, 1976, 1980, 1986, 1992, 1998, and 2008.

**1965: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 89-10)**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), enacted April 11, 1965, was also part of President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society agenda. It provided federal funding through a partnership among federal, state, and local governments to target the most needy students and schools. The titles of the Act included financial assistance to LEAs in areas affected by federal activity and for the education of children of low-income families, supplementary educational centers and services, educational research and training, grants to strengthen departments of education, and general provisions (Ohio Education Association, 2007).

Overlapping policies: It has been reauthorized eight times, including the 1994 Improving America’s Schools Act and the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act.

**1966: International Education Act**

President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the International Education Act, which authorized a broader federal role in international education. This aimed at expanding groups affected by federal support beyond the training of specialists to include generalists at the undergraduate level. Unfortunately, though enacted, no funds were ever appropriated for it (Committee for Economic Development, 2006).

Overlapping policies: Some of its provisions were included in Title VI in later reauthorizations.

**1967: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages is created**

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) was founded on September 1, 1967, born out of the Modern Language Association (MLA) to become a national organization for language teachers focused on the pedagogy of language, separate from literary criticism. Many members joined ACTFL in its early days to increase outreach, pedagogical research, and fund-raising in addition to membership in their local, regional, and multilingual organizations. Today, ACTFL's membership includes teachers of a diverse list of languages and all levels of education that seek to improve and expand foreign language education across the nation.

**1968: Bilingual Education Act**

Proposed by: Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-TX)

Federal funding for the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 provided school districts with resources for educational programs, teacher training, development materials and parent involvement programs for multiple languages. It encouraged instruction in English and multicultural programs in the wake of the Civil Rights movement (Tollefson, p. 60).

The Bilingual Education Act began with a bill introduced in 1967 by Texas Sen. Ralph Yarborough and was the first U.S. legislation regarding minority language speakers. It was aimed toward addressing the needs of students limited in their English language proficiency in an attempt to provide minority language speakers with an education equal to that of their English-proficient peers (Cromwell, S., 1998). In the language of the federal law: "Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students" (Cromwell, S., 1998). Originally intended for Spanish-speaking students, this bill became part of the Bilingual Education Act (also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act).

Overlapping policies: This title was revised in 2001 as the English Language Acquisition Act included in No Child Left Behind.

**1969: "An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in United States Secondary Schools"**

This report, commissioned by the Office of Education and written by James Baker and Lee Anderson, examined the objectives, needs, and priorities in international education in U.S. secondary schools. It did not result in increased federal support for international education (Committee for Economic Development, 2006).

**1972: Indian Education Act (Title IV of P.L. 92-318, Educational Amendments of 1972)**

The Indian Education Act of 1972 (IEA), first introduced on February 25, 1971, marking a turning point in native language education in the U.S. With it came the "first federal program to support the preparation of indigenous teachers and the development of Native language teaching materials" (Tollefson, p. 292). This program was sup-

ported with more annual federal funding assistance than had ever been appropriated for Indian education programs. The IEA created new educational opportunities for Native American children and elders in the community. The passing of this legislation also brought issues of Indian education to the national level, many of which had previously been neglected.

---

**1974: Lau vs. Nichols (414 U.S. 563)**

Argued: December 10, 1973

Decided: January 21, 1974

A class action suit brought by non-English speaking Chinese students against officials in charge of the San Francisco Unified School District led to one of the first decisions to mandate basic English instruction to minority ethnic groups.

This decision established that failing to provide English language instruction to the approximately 1,800 non-English speaking students of Chinese ancestry in the San Francisco school system denied them the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the public school system and, therefore, violated 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (*Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563, 1974).

Lower federal courts had ruled that the San Francisco school district was not obligated to provide special instruction for minority students who could not understand English; however, a unanimous Supreme Court disagreed and overturned that ruling, mandating that English language instruction to minority ethnic groups be standard. Justice William O. Douglas delivered the decision on January 21, 1974.

---

**1975: Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act (P.L. 93-638)**

Sponsored by: Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-WA)

The Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act provided maximum Native American participation in education and formalized the process by which tribes and other indigenous communities could contract with the federal government for funding and the operation of social and educational services. It also allowed Indian nations the choice of contracting to run and lead Indian schools or start tribal schools (Lynch, 1990). "In conjunction with the 1968 Bilingual Education Act, this legislation laid the legal and financial framework for reconstituting indigenous schooling as bilingual/bicultural education" (Tollefson, p. 292).

---

**1976: Joint National Committee for Languages begins to meet as a forum**

The Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL) began to meet as a forum comprised of eight associations (MLA, ACTFL, AATF, AATG, AATSP, ATSEEL, AATI, TESOL) to discuss language policy issues of importance to the profession. The JNCL office would not be created until 1980.

---

**1979: President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies**

Convened by: President Jimmy Carter

The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (PCFLIS), convened during President Jimmy Carter's administration, defined the problem of Americans' "scandalous" incompetence in foreign languages, among many other points, and concluded that "nothing less is at issue than the nation's security" (Committee for

Economic Development, 2006). Its report, *Strength through Wisdom*, was issued in 1979 after interviewing various representatives from business, government, education, and other nonprofit institutions. Some direct results of the commission included the establishment of the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies (NCFLIS) in New York, and the Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL) in Washington, D.C. as national spokespersons for language and international studies.

---

### **1980: NDEA's language programs included within HEA as Title VI**

In 1980, as part of the reauthorization of HEA, the language programs of NDEA were incorporated into the HEA as Title VI. This later became the group of programs combined with Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) commonly referred to as "Title IV" dedicated to foreign language and international education programs.

---

### **1980: Joint National Committee for Languages is created**

The creation of the Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL) was a direct result of President Carter's Commission of 1977-1979, where it became clear that support for global education was inadequate. Though it began in 1976 as a forum of eight associations to discuss language policy, it was in 1980 that JNCL was established as a formal educational association with an office in Washington, D.C. Over the years, JNCL grew to become an organization comprised of representatives from more than 65 organizations from throughout the language profession. JNCL is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization and is affiliated with the National Council for Languages and International Studies (NCLIS), a 501(c)(4) not-for-profit professional association.

JNCL hosts an annual Legislative Day and Delegate Assembly in Washington, D.C. where language professionals can identify community needs and to chart new directions in language policy. The organization increases public awareness about language policy, works to enhance JNCL's Washington representation through coalition membership; produces alerts, reports, and articles for the profession, policymakers, and the media; and maintains a website.

---

### **1980: National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies is created**

Also as a result of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Education, the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies (NCFLIS) was created. NCFLIS was a nonprofit organization that served to emphasize the importance of U.S. communication among other countries and was a collaborative effort of private foundations, businesses, and some government agencies. NCFLIS advocated on behalf of expanding foreign language and international education and worked to influence related public policy initiatives. (National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies)

---

### **1981: National Council for Languages and International Studies is created (originally the Council for Languages and Other International Studies)**

The creation of the National Council for Languages and International Studies (NCLIS) was one of the direct results of President Carter's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies. The organization's creation aimed at raising

awareness of policymakers about the importance of international education for the good of not only the language profession but also the nation as a whole.

NCLIS is registered as a 501(c)(4) lobbying organization to engage in public advocacy on behalf of languages and international education. It was originally called the Council for Languages and Other International Studies (CLOIS). Beginning with 12 national language associations, NCLIS is currently comprised of over 60 members and is affiliated with JNCL. Among other things, NCLIS tracks the federal budget and appropriations to maintain and augment funding for language and international education programs and works with Members of Congress, congressional staff, and the executive branch to translate its priorities for language and international education into national policies and programs. NCLIS also provides legislative updates and advocacy training for its members.

---

### **1983: “A Nation at Risk” report is released**

The “A Nation at Risk” report, released by President Reagan’s National Commission on Excellence in Education, surveyed various studies that pointed to academic underachievement in the U.S. in the context of national and international standards. It stated that “if an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war” (“A Nation at Risk”, p. 5). In response, the Commission made 38 recommendations, one of which included the stance that college-bound students should complete two years of foreign language study as part of five main elements of high school education (Committee for Economic Development, 2006).

---

### **1986: National Foreign Language Center is created**

Proposed by: Richard Lambert, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania

Discussions with a number of national foundations for creating and implementing the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) began in the mid-1980s as a direct result of the attention to foreign language and international studies garnered by President Carter’s 1979 Commission on Language and International Studies. In order to describe and emphasize the need for a national strategy to enhance language capacity in the U.S., Dr. Richard Lambert conducted a study entitled “Points of Leverage,” published by the Social Science Research Council in 1986. The study focused specifically on the need for a national strategy to enhance language capacity in the U.S. NFLC was officially created in 1986 through a multimillion-dollar start-up grant from various charitable foundations (National Foreign Language Center, 2008).

The goal of the center was to formulate public policy to enable the language teaching systems in the U.S. to be more responsive to national needs. Over the years, NFLC conducted surveys concerning the evolving foreign language needs of the economic, diplomatic, and national security sectors of the U.S. and organized numerous discussion forums about the same subjects in a search for applicable solutions.

Overlapping Policies: In 1987, the NFLC’s Institute of Advanced Studies was set up thanks to a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to support scholars conducting empirical research with the potential for directly influencing teaching and learning of foreign languages.

---

### **1986: Title VI of HEA is reauthorized to include National Foreign Language Resource Centers**

Language Resource Centers (LRC's) were established as section 603 of Title VI of HEA to improve the effectiveness of the teaching of foreign languages by providing grants to higher education institutions. These grants were intended to “support the development of new materials, the development and application of proficiency testing, the training of teachers in the administration and interpretation of proficiency tests, the use of effective teaching strategies and new technologies, the publication of instructional materials in less commonly taught languages, and the dissemination of research results, teaching materials, and the development of improved pedagogical strategies” (U.S. Department of Education, n.d. *International Education and Foreign Language Studies*).

---

### **1987: Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Language and International Studies is created**

The Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Language and International Studies (CAFLIS) was established as a central point for discussions regarding the importance of internationalizing higher education. CAFLIS promoted a proposal to create a National Endowment or Foundation for Foreign Language and International Studies, which would work with public and private colleges and universities, associations, and school systems to increase international competence.

After more than a year of discussion, CAFLIS released three white papers dealing with the creation of a National Foundation, recommending greater involvement in language and international studies at the state and local level, and increased involvement and commitment by businesses and the private sector in improving the nation's language skills and economic competitiveness.

---

### **1988: Foreign Language Assistance Program enacted by Congress**

Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) three-year grants are awarded to state and local educational agencies (SEAs and LEAs) to “establish, improve, or expand innovative foreign language programs in elementary and secondary school students” (U.S. Department of Education, n.d., *Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP)*). These include foreign language instruction in elementary schools, immersion programs, curriculum development, professional development, and distance learning. FLAP is one of the largest federal sources of foreign language program funding in U.S. schools. The grants are funded on both the LEA and SEA levels. FLAP was enacted as part of Special Projects in ESEA.

---

### **1991: National Security Education Program established**

Proposed by: Sen. David L. Boren (D-OK)

The National Security Education Program (NSEP) was established under the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 to provide undergraduate scholarships, graduate fellowships and institutional grants. The purpose of NSEP, as initially developed by Senator Boren, was to create a larger and more qualified pool of U.S. citizens with foreign language and international knowledge, skills, and experiences in

order to serve in areas critical to U.S. national security needs. Boren Scholars and Fellows, in exchange for the funding they receive to pursue foreign language and international studies abroad, are committed to seek work in the federal government at the end of their studies (National Security Education Program, NDU).

NSEP is currently comprised of three main parts:

- 1) The NSEP David L. Boren Scholarships for Study Abroad, created for undergraduate students to study abroad in regions critical to U.S. interests but typically underrepresented in study abroad programs;
- 2) the NSEP David L. Boren Fellowships, designed for graduate students to specialize in area study, language study, or increased language proficiency critical to U.S. national security interests; and
- 3) the Language Flagship program which offers Fellowships for advanced training in Arabic, Central Asian languages, Korean, Mandarin, Persian or Russian (National Security Education Program, IIE).

**1992: Title VI of HEA is reauthorized**

This HEA reauthorization created the American Overseas Research Centers, which support centers abroad to promote research and exchange in language and area studies. It also added the Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP), which became a section in Part C, that increased the number of underrepresented minorities in international careers.

**1992: Foreign Language Incentive Program**

Under the Foreign Language Incentive Program (FLIP), which was included as the second part of FLAP in 1992, the Secretary of Education awarded grants each fiscal year to public elementary schools as an incentive for programs leading to communicative competency in a foreign language. These programs were “comparable to a program that provides at least 45 minutes of instruction per day for not less than four days per week throughout an academic year” (U.S. Department of Education, n.d., *Elementary School Foreign Language Incentive Program*). Although FLIP was a part of FLAP in the early 1990’s, it was not included the last time ESEA was reauthorized.

**1994: U.S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement conducts study of U.S.-based corporations with more than 400,000 employees**

This study found that U.S. corporations were beginning to place a higher value on second language proficiency and established that exposure to multiculturalism and diversity in the college environment is positive preparation for employment in the global workplace (Committee for Economic Development, 2006).

**1994: Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-382)**

Title I of the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 was comprised of amendments to ESEA, which included help for disadvantaged children to meet high standards, improving basic programs operated by LEAs, start up of family literacy programs, education of migratory children, prevention and intervention programs for neglected, delinquent, or at risk of dropping out youth, among others.

Title VII established the Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, which included money for bilingual education, FLAP and the Emergency Immigrant Education Program. It also included Title IX that outlines assistance for Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Education programs (Improving America's Schools Act, 1994).

---

### **1994: Goals 2000: Educate America Act (P.L. 103-227)**

Sponsored by: Rep. Dale Kildee (D-MI)

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act, signed into law on March 31, 1994 by President Bill Clinton, set targets for students leaving 4th, 8th, and 12th grades, and included the desirability of competence in foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (Goals 2000: Educate America Act). Sections (v) and (vi) of Goal 3 of this act, "Student Achievement and Citizenship," stated that students competent in more than one language will increase and that students will be more knowledgeable about diversity in the U.S. and the world at large. A main goal was that "quality bilingual education programs enable children and youth to learn English and meet high academic standards including proficiency in more than one language" (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Sec. 7102(a)(9)).

---

### **1996: Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century**

"Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century" was a report, first published in 1996, that set out content standards in foreign language education. These standards were agreed upon during the meeting of a collaborative eleven-member task force, comprised of representatives of nine nationally recognized foreign language associations that span a variety of languages, levels of instruction, program models, and geographic regions. The task force was conducted with the help of a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education and the National Endowment for the Humanities (National Standards for Foreign Language Education, n.d.).

Five major standards were established (the "5 C's" as they are commonly called), which were then further subdivided into more detail. These include communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities. The published document has been used by teachers, administrators, and curriculum developers at both state and local levels to improve foreign language education in the U.S.

---

### **1998: New Visions in Action**

The New Visions in Action (NVA) process began in 1998 by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC) at Iowa State University (Special Projects, ACTFL ¶ 2). The purpose of NVA was to identify and implement necessary actions that would effectively refurbish the language education system in order to achieve the goal of language proficiency for all students in the U.S. It conducted a survey of language professionals in order to determine whether there was consensus on criteria for curriculum, instructional strategies, assessment practices, professional development, recruitment and retention programs. In addition to the survey, NVA produced

a series of papers, progress reports, and set up task forces to address the aforementioned issues (New Visions in Action, n.d.).

**1998 Amendments to Title VI of HEA (P.L. 105-244)**

Proposed by: Rep. Howard McKeon (R-CA)

Amendments to Title VI of HEA were signed into P.L. 105-244 on October 7, 1998. One of the findings of Section 601, “International and Foreign Language Studies” of Title VI, stated: “The security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States in a complex global era depend upon American experts in and citizens knowledgeable about world regions, foreign languages, and international affairs, as well as upon a strong research base in these areas.” Thus, the main goals of these amendments were to establish a trained pool of foreign language-proficient citizens, increase materials necessary for promoting foreign language competency, and to internationalize the study of undergraduate and post-graduate students (Higher Education Act Amendments, 1998)

Amendments in this authorization of Title VI of HEA included the establishment of Language Resource Centers, to “establish, strengthen, and operate” a few national language resource and training centers to improve the ability to effectively teach and learn foreign languages in the U.S. In addition, the National Language and Area Centers and Programs were authorized. In practice, this translated into grants for IHEs that provide extensive foreign language and international studies programs. The money could go to activities such as curriculum planning materials and bringing visiting faculty, maintaining library collections, outreach grants and summer institutes, and graduate fellowships. It also provided money for undergraduate international studies and foreign language programs (Higher Education Act Amendments, 1998).

Another part of this reauthorization was the inclusion of the Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access Program to promote original uses of technology to collect and distribute information from foreign sources.

**April 2000: Executive Memorandum in Support of International Education**

On April 19, 2000, President William J. Clinton issued an Executive Memorandum, which encouraged the support of international education, study abroad, teacher and scholar exchanges, and foreign language and culture study in the U.S. and essentially called for an international education policy. Clinton’s memorandum stated that the administration is committed to:

- “Encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States
- Promoting study abroad by U.S. students
- Supporting the exchange of teachers, scholars, and citizens at all levels of society
- Enhancing programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise
- Expanding high-quality foreign language learning and in-depth knowledge of other cultures by Americans
- Preparing and supporting teachers in their efforts to interpret other countries and cultures for their students
- Advancing new technologies that aid the spread of knowledge throughout the world” (NAFSA, 2000, ¶ 2)

Both Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Secretary of Education Richard Riley voiced their position in favor of this initiative and commitment to its objectives. (Clinton, W.J., 2000)

---

### **November 2000: International Education Week**

On November 13, 2000, President William J. Clinton released Proclamation 7376, stating November 13-17, 2000 would be the first annual International Education Week (IEW) in the U.S. and encouraged Americans to observe and participate in the programs offered during this time.

IEW was coordinated nationally by a joint effort of the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Education and event sponsors include U.S. embassies abroad, educational institutions and nongovernmental organizations that host a variety of events from roundtable discussions and lectures to potluck dinners and open houses at universities. (International Education Week, 2001)

---

### **November 28, 2000: White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy**

The first White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy was hosted by President and Mrs. Clinton and was chaired by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. During this event, diplomats, artists, and scholars joined to discuss the integration of culture into U.S. foreign policy and to bolster “cultural exchange programs that serve as invaluable forms of international communication” (White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy, 2000, ¶ 1). The conference included several panels of speakers, workshops, and plenary sessions where diplomacy, culture, language and communication, and other international issues were discussed.

In the closing plenary session of the conference, several priorities for the future were defined and included educating Americans to understand other cultures, increasing funding for Department of State cultural programs, and encouraging cultural partnerships between countries, among others.

---

### **2001: “Asia in the Schools: Preparing Young Americans for Today’s Interconnected World”**

This report released by the Asia Society addressed the lack of international knowledge of U.S. students, especially regarding Asia. It was the most thorough analysis ever done of the teaching and learning about Asia in the U.S. and found a huge gap between the “strategic importance of Asia...and Americans’ disproportionate lack of knowledge about this vital region”. To conduct the analysis, a Task Force on International Education was formed and charged with conducting an “inventory of each state’s Asian and other and international resources to examine how these could be used to further education...” (Asia Society, 2001, p. 8-9).

---

### **2001: No Child Left Behind Act passed (P.L. 107-110)**

Congress passed the latest reauthorization of the ESEA, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). This federal education policy included foreign languages as a core subject area; however, testing of foreign languages for annual yearly progress or accountability was not required. This authorization of ESEA focused on accountability for all

students in math and reading and placed strict testing requirement on all students, even English language learners.

---

**April 2001: Senate Resolution on International Education Policy**

Proposed by: Sen. John Kerry (D-MA), Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN)

Introduced on February 1, 2001 and passed in the Senate on April 6, 2001, Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 expressed the “sense of Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy” (Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, 2001). This policy addressed the needs of international education as necessary to further national security, foreign policy, economic competitiveness, and to promote mutual understanding and cooperation among nations, among other purposes.

---

**September 11, 2001: Terrorist Attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon**

The tragic terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon sparked a number of new policies to increase national security and international communication. It resulted in a number of policies dealing with critical languages and international study for the purpose of national security in the coming years.

---

**December 2001: Homeland Security Education Act (S. 1799)**

Proposed by: Sen. Richard Durbin (D-IL)

Introduced on December 11, 2001, the Homeland Security Education Act attempted to strengthen national security by improving elementary, secondary, and higher education needs in the U.S. It would have amended HEA by establishing grants for math and science education, to assess long-term math and science needs, and forgive interest payments on student loans for students obtaining undergraduate degrees in certain areas, including specified languages.

This legislation would have also amended ESEA to establish early language instruction, and create grants for institutions of higher education (IHEs) to develop innovative programs for teaching foreign languages. It would have amended the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 to make grants available for advanced proficiency in national security languages. Finally, it would have directed the National Research Council to conduct a study on the feasibility of creating a National Language Foundation.

---

**January 2002: “Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls”**

Requested by: Senators Thad Cochran (R-MI) and Christopher J. Dodd (D-CT); Representatives James A. Leach (R-IA) and Sam Farr (D-CA)

The U.S. General Accounting Office released a report entitled “Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls”, which reviewed the use of foreign language skills in four federal agencies: U.S. Army, U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of Commerce’s Foreign Commercial Service, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The report assessed the use of foreign language skills by such agencies, and determined and evaluated their strategies to address shortages in language proficient personnel.

Results showed that there was indeed a shortage of language specialists and staff for positions in which language skills are important for overall job performance. This shortage led to a backlog in information that needed to be reviewed or translated. For diplomatic and intelligence personnel, this foreign language shortage “weakened the fight against international terrorism and drug trafficking and resulted in less effective representation of the U.S. interests overseas” (Christoff, J.A., 2002, p. 2).

---

### **September 2002: Fiscal Year 2003 Intelligence Authorization Act (P.L. 107-306)**

Proposed by: Rep. Porter J. Gross (R-FL)

Congress passed the FY 2003 Intelligence Authorization Act to fund intelligence-related activities in 2003, to authorize NSEP’s effort to implement the National Foreign Language Initiative (NFLI), and determine the need and feasibility for a Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps. The Reserve Corps would be comprised of U.S. civilian citizens with advanced proficiency in foreign languages important to national security that the U.S. government could call upon in times of shortage of proficient personnel in such languages.

---

### **November 2002: 2002 Global Geographic Literacy Survey**

The National Geographic Education Foundation and Roper released results from the 2002 Global Geographic Literacy Survey, conducted to assess the competency of young adults in nine countries, including the U.S., in their knowledge of global geography. The study was a follow-up to a “groundbreaking study” by the National Geographic Society in 1988 that found a “poor level of geography knowledge among Americans in general and particularly among young adults (18-24 year olds)” (National Geographic Society and Roper ASW, 2002, p. 1).

The study showed a lag in U.S. young adults as compared to their international peers in geographic and current events knowledge. This study ultimately affected an increase in HEA funding related to language and global competency programs, especially in the Middle East and Central and South Asia.

---

### **January 2003: Global Challenges & U.S. Higher Education**

The Coalition for International Education held the Global Challenges & U.S. Higher Education: National Needs & Policy Implications conference hosted by Duke University. The conference was prompted by the pending reauthorization of HEA, which would expire in 2003. The conference objective was to examine current and future needs for foreign language and international education and to contribute to the framework upon which the reauthorization would be constructed. Attendees and presenters represented various government agencies, as well as faculty from universities across the United States and participated in numerous plenary and breakout group discussions during the three-day event. (Global Challenges & U.S. Higher Education: National Needs & Policy Implications, 2003)

---

### **March 2003: U.S. Department of Education Releases FY 2004 Plan**

The Department of Education FY 2004 plan included objectives that would “improve students’ knowledge of world languages, regions, and international issues and build international ties in the field of education” (Committee on Economic

Development, 2006, Appendix 1:A). It also included a goal of increasing foreign language and area studies teaching in American colleges and universities.

**June 2003: Asia Society/Goldman Sachs Foundation Award for Excellence in International Education**

The Asia Society and the Goldman Sachs Foundation granted the first Award for Excellence in International Education to recognize best models for international education in the U.S. Since this first award, the Goldman Sachs Foundation and the Asia Society have given over \$700,000 to schools, media organizations, IHEs, states, and individuals in order to help them develop international knowledge and skills (Goldman Sachs Foundation Prizes for Excellence in International Education, 2008, ¶ 2).

**September 2003: International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003 (H.R. 3077)**

Proposed by: Rep. Peter Hoekstra (R-MI)

Rep. Peter Hoekstra introduced the International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003 on September 11, 2003 that would have amended Title VI programs in HEA to enhance international education. A major and controversial new provision in this bill would have created an International Higher Education Advisory Board to oversee Title VI programs to make recommendations on the ways in which Title VI programs would be implemented.

This bill passed in the House of Representatives on October 21, 2003, but never passed in the Senate, and, consequently, died and was not reconsidered.

**October 2003: The Complete Curriculum: Ensuring a place for the arts and foreign languages in America’s schools**

This report of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Study Group on the Lost Curriculum, entitled “The Complete Curriculum: Ensuring a place for the arts and foreign languages in America’s schools”, addressed the importance of arts and foreign language education in the core school curriculum, which is sometimes marginalized or even eliminated due to accountability emphasis placed on other core academic subjects. “While NCLB includes subjects such as the arts, civics and geography as part of the core curriculum, there is a fear that states are focusing their attention and resources on the law’s primary emphasis on reading, math, and science to the detriment of other curricular areas.” (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003)

This report made several recommendations that states were encouraged to pursue regarding arts and foreign language education, which include:

- Adopting high-quality licensure for arts and foreign language teachers that are standards-aligned;
- Ensuring adequate time for professional development;
- Ensuring expertise at the state level to provide support for the areas of arts and languages;
- Incorporating and increasing the numbers of credits for arts and foreign languages into graduation requirements;

- Incorporating arts and foreign language into curriculum in early education curriculum, standards, and requirements. (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003)

Some other recommendations put forth by the report focused on advocacy and policy reform that would support and advance education in the arts and foreign languages. (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003)

---

### **November 2003: Homeland Security Federal Workforce Act (S. 589)**

Proposed by: Sen. Daniel Akaka (D-HI)

Introduced on March 11, 2003 and passed by the Senate on November 5 of that year, the Homeland Security Federal Workforce Act would have strengthened national security by assisting government agencies in addressing areas of need and form goals and strategies for recruitment and retention of federal employees possessing specialized critical skills, such as language proficiency.

---

### **December 2003: National Security Language Act (H.R. 3676)**

Proposed by: Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ)

The National Security Language Act was introduced by Rep. Rush Holt in December 2003 in order to strengthen national security by expanding and improving foreign language study in the U.S. The bill proposed to amend HEA by establishing grant programs to IHEs and LEAs in order to encourage early foreign language instruction. This bill contained provisions that would provide funding to market language study, identify heritage language communities in the U.S, and would give loan forgiveness to students who major in a critical foreign language and go on to teach or work for a federal agency.

The legislation also proposed to amend the David L. Boren National Security Act of 1991 to establish an International Flagship Language Initiative.

Overlapping policies: The National Security Language Act was reintroduced in 109th and 110th Congress.

---

### **January 2004: FY 2004 Appropriations include Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship**

Congress passed the FY 2004 appropriations, which included a provision to establish the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship program to increase the number of American students studying abroad, particularly in developing countries.

---

### **June 22-24, 2004: National Language Conference, University of Maryland**

On June 22-24, 2004, the University of Maryland held the National Language Conference: A Call for Action, where federal and state agencies, businesses, academia, and language experts collaborated to discuss “strategic approaches to meeting the nation’s language needs in the 21st century” and to “identify actions that could move the United States toward a language competent nation” (The National Language Conference, 2005, ¶ 4). The event was co-hosted by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense and the Center for the Advanced Study of Language (CASL) in College Park, MD.

Conference sessions included presentations and discussions regarding the national need for language education, future needs for language proficiency, global competitiveness and national security, and practices for furthering language education in the U.S.

Overlapping policies: Led to the creation of Department of Defense Language Transformation Roadmap

**July 2004: International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2004 (S. 2727)**

Proposed by: Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-CT)

On July 22, 2004, Sen. Chris Dodd introduced a bill that would amend Title VI of HEA to revise international and foreign language studies provisions. The International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2004 would have made grants and other funding available to undergraduate students for language, area, and international studies, especially in less commonly taught languages. It also contained a provision authorizing the Secretary of Education to collect, analyze, and disseminate data that would have aided in achieving the other goals of this act.

**December 2004: Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-458)**

Proposed by: Sen. Susan M. Collins (R-ME)

Introduced by Susan M. Collins on September 23, 2004, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act of 2004 reformed the intelligence community and activities. In addition to many national security initiatives, one of the provisions of this law required the FBI and CIA to develop and maintain language programs and for the Secretary of State to increase the number of language proficient Foreign Service Officers, especially in languages spoken in Muslim countries. The law would also increase exchanges and study in Islamic nations.

**December 2004: Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2005 (P.L. 108-487)**

Proposed by: Rep. Porter J. Goss (R-FL)

Signed by President George W. Bush on December 23, 2004, the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2005 authorized funding for intelligence programs and activities for 2005. In this law, National Flagship Language Initiative (NFLI) was given a funding increase over that of 2004, which includes funding for participating institutions. Furthermore, it authorizes the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to implement programs to increase proficiency skills in critical foreign languages.

Overlapping policies: S. 2386, H.R. 4548

**December 2004: Council on Competitiveness releases “Innovate America” Report**

On December 15, 2004 at the National Innovation Summit, the Council on Competitiveness released its “Innovate America: Thriving in a World of Challenge and Change” report (later published in 2005). Samuel J. Palmisano and G. Wayne Clough, co-chairs of the National Innovation Initiative, presented the report at the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center in Washington, D.C.

This report focused on the innovative initiatives that the U.S. can and should act on in order to maintain and increase competitiveness in the 21st century's global economy. Recommendations made by the report were divided into the categories of Talent, Investment, and Infrastructure, all three of which are centered around the idea of using creative collaboration for the purpose of supporting and growing the strength of the U.S. economy on a global level. (Council on Competitiveness, 2005)

Overlapping Policies: Recommendations from this report led to the creation of America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act (America COMPETES).

---

### **January 2005: U.S. Department of Defense Language Transformation Roadmap**

Proposed as: Strategic Planning Guidance for FY 2006-2001

The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Language Transformation Roadmap is both a result of the National Language Conference at the University of Maryland in June 2004 and a directive from the Strategic Planning Guidance for FY 2006-2011 to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. The Roadmap is a comprehensive guide to achieve the language goals and capabilities that would be necessary to support the previous year's Defense Strategy. The Roadmap is based on four goals. These include creating language and cultural expertise among certain DoD and military personnel; creating the abilities to find and utilize language abilities beyond these in-house resources; establishing what will become a Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps with 3/3/3 Interagency Language Roundtable rating in reading, writing and speaking respectively; and to establishing a process by which these language experts can be tracked for accession, separation, and promotion. (U.S. Department of Defense, 2005)

---

### **January 10-11 2005: National Language Policy Summit: An American Plan for Action**

On January 10-11, 2005, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) held the first National Year of Languages event, the National Language Policy Summit: An American Plan for Action. The event was hosted by the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill and attended by U.S. academic, business, government, and humanitarian leaders whose goal was to set priorities and establish a plan for language policies and initiatives in the U.S. in the coming decade.

A number of priorities were identified to promote language learning and increase effective language instruction in the U.S. The following are the priorities:

- "raising the American public's awareness of the need and value of learning languages and understanding cultures;
- "establishing at the federal level a National Language Advisor;
- "surveying businesses to identify their language and cultural needs;
- "partnering with CEOs of corporations to advocate for the importance of language and culture;
- "creating a fully articulated Chinese language program for students in grades kindergarten through college and subsequently expanding this model to other languages;

- “developing effective assessment strategies for measuring students’ language learning;
- “implementing a civilian language corps; and
- “advocating for expanded language legislation” (Baucorn, 2005, ¶ 8).

Overlapping policies: NSEP Chinese K-16 Language Flagship; Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps

**February 2005: “Year of Foreign Language Study”/Year of Languages (S. Res. 28/H.R. Res. 122)**

Proposed by: Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-CT)/Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ)

Passed on February 17, 2005, the Senate resolution designated 2005 as the Year of Foreign Language Study in order to promote and expand such study in elementary and secondary schools, as well as IHEs, businesses, and government programs.

The House of Representatives’ identical counterpart to the Senate resolution passed on March 8, 2005.

**May 2005: National Security Education Program - K-16 Pipeline Project**

On May 4, 2005, NSEP released the announcement of a Chinese K-16 Pipeline Project as the most recent component of the National Flagship Language Initiative (NFLI). This pipeline project focuses on developing an articulated and sequenced language program for students in elementary school through college with the goal of “graduating linguistically and culturally competent students” (National Security Education Program, 2005, p. 1).

This program responded to a number of the national language needs that were expressed at the 2004 National Language Conference at the University of Maryland. These needs included:

- “Increasing language skills and cultural awareness are national requirements that will be filled primarily at the state and local level.
- “Meeting the need for greater coordination within the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary educational system and a need for coordination at the national level.
- “Providing a national language strategy that is affordable and encompasses both bottom-up and top-down initiatives.
- “Recognizing that the rich population of multi-lingual Americans found in our heritage communities needs to be invited to participate in this national initiative” (National Security Education Program, 2005, p. 1)

With this announcement, the NSEP released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for IHEs working in collaboration with elementary, middle, and high school systems that already offer Chinese language instruction to establish such a Flagship program. The intention is to produce student speakers with a superior (ILR 3) level of proficiency in Chinese through the end of the pipeline project (National Security Education Program, 2005, p. 1).

Overlapping policies: National Language Conference, 2004; National Language Policy Summit

**May 2005: National Language Coordination Act of 2005 (S. 1089)**

Proposed by: Sen. Daniel Akaka (D-HI)

The National Language Coordination Act of 2005 would have established the National Foreign Language Coordination Council that would have developed and implemented a national foreign language policy. A National Language Director would have been appointed by the President to chair such a Council, and members would have included heads of numerous government agencies. Their primary objectives would have been to develop and oversee implementation of strategy, among other duties.

**May 2005: International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2005 (S. 1105)**

Proposed by: Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-CT)

The International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2005 would have amended HEA to extend the authorization of appropriations for Title VI international education programs. This would have included funding for international and foreign language studies, business and international education, and the Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP).

**May 2005: United States-People's Republic of China Cultural Engagement Act (H.R. 3275)**

Proposed by: Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D-DE), Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN)

Introduced on May 25, 2005, the United States-People's Republic of China Cultural Engagement Act would have established grants for Chinese language and cultural studies at the elementary, secondary, and higher education levels. The use of funding would have been broad in scope and potential programs would have included language, art, and cultural studies; Asian business education center programs; educational and governmental exchange programs; and assistance to nongovernmental organizations that facilitate exchanges.

Furthermore, this Act contained provisions that would strengthen U.S.-China diplomacy, revise visa requirements, and increase outreach to the People's Republic of China.

**July 2005: Teaching Geography is Fundamental Act (H.R. 1228/ S.727)**

Proposed by: Rep. Chris Van Hollen/Sen. Thad Cochran (R-MI)

This legislation would have created a geography education grant program for national nonprofit education organizations of a consortium under Title II (Teacher Quality Enhancement) HEA. The Act would have required grantees and sub-grantees to expand geographic literacy among children in grades K-12 by improving teachers' professional development programs.

**October 2005: "Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future"**

On October 12, 2005, the National Academies released a congressionally requested report entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future". This study and subsequent report (later published in 2007) addressed the concern that the U.S. is not produc-

ing students that are workforce ready and able to compete with their international peers in an increasingly global economy. The report was written by a 20-member committee with the purpose of examining the current status of U.S. education in science, math, and technology, as well as making proposals for increasing and stabilizing the traditionally privileged position of the U.S. in the global economy.

Ultimately, the authors of the report made four recommendations for improving and preserving the U.S.' economic position. These are:

- “Increase America’s talent pool by vastly improving K-12 mathematics and science education...
- “Sustain and strengthen the nation’s commitment to long-term basic research...
- “Develop, recruit, and retain top students, scientists, and engineers from both the United States and abroad...
- “Ensure that the United States is the premier place in the world for innovation” (The National Academies, 2005).

Additionally, the committee suggested 20 “implementation actions” that federal policy-makers should take to ensure high-quality jobs, increased competitiveness in math, science, and technology, and other changes that would allow the U.S. to improve its global leadership status (The National Academies, 2005). These recommendations resulted in the introduction and subsequent passage into law of the America COMPETES Act in 2007. (The National Academies, 2007)

Overlapping policies: “Innovate America” Report, America COMPETES Act

**November 2005: “Year of Study Abroad” (S. Res. 308)**

Proposed by: Sen. Richard Durbin (D-IL)

Passed on November 10, 2005, the Senate designated 2006 as the Year of Study Abroad. This resolution encouraged secondary schools, IHEs, businesses, and government programs to “promote and expand study abroad opportunities” and for the people of the United States to support these initiatives (Year of Study Abroad, 2005).

**January 2006: National Security Language Initiative**

Proposed by: President George W. Bush

On January 5, 2006, President George W. Bush announced the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI) at the U.S. University Presidents’ Summit on International Education. The objective of NSLI is to increase the number and proficiency of speakers of languages critical to national security in the U.S. through a White House-coordinated effort of the Department of Education, Department of Defense, Department of State, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposal of NSLI included \$114 million dollars to cover the costs of 14 programs that promote critical language and international studies. Some of these 14 programs existed prior to NSLI, but would receive more funding and change their focus to prioritizing critical languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Japanese, and Korean, and the Indic, Iranian, and Turkic language families. The Initiative’s programs encompass both student and teacher language instruction, teacher development, study abroad and exchanges, and critical language training expansion and articulation with the overall goal of increasing U.S. global communication abilities and resources. NSLI has reopened the

national discussion of the need for better language education beginning in the elementary years and continuing through university and adulthood and has resulted in a number of new policies and programs. (National Security Language Initiative (NSLI), 2007)

### **February 2006: Committee for Economic Development Publishes “Education for Global Leadership” Report**

The Committee for Economic Development (CED) published “Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security”. This report emphasized the importance of language education in order to remain an economically stable country. “America’s continued role as a global leader will depend on our students’ abilities to interact with the world community both inside and outside our borders.” (Committee for Economic Development, 2006, p. 1)

This report proposed three key recommendations that would help to expand foreign language and international education nationwide:

- International content should be taught across the curriculum at all levels;
- The language training pipeline should be expanded at all levels to address the shortage of Americans learning foreign languages, especially those critical to national security, and;
- National leaders should be involved in informing the public of the importance of improving foreign language and international studies education. (Committee for Economic Development, 2006)

### **January 2007: “Lost in Translation: A Review of the Federal Government’s Efforts to Develop and a Foreign Language Strategy”**

On January 25, 2007, Senators Daniel Akaka (D-HI) and George Voinovich (R-OH) of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs held a hearing to officially address and record the importance and need for well-articulated language programs in the U.S. The witnesses included the Honorable Michael L. Dominguez, Ms. Holly Kuzmich, Mr. Everette Jordan, Ms. Rita Oleksak, Mr. Michael Petro, and Dr. Diane Birckbichler.

During this hearing, testimonies on the need for more foreign language education in the U.S. were presented by professionals representing the education, language, and business fields. Further discussion ensues due to questions asked of the witnesses by Sen. Akaka and Sen. Voinovich. Furthermore, Sen. Voinovich expressed his own perspective on the need for language education in the U.S. in stating, “I am deeply concerned that Americans are lagging behind much of the world in critical foreign languages, cultural awareness, and geographic knowledge. This lag can negatively impact our nation in very real ways, such as losing valuable business opportunities overseas, faulty intelligence from failing to promptly translate critical documents, or of misunderstandings in diplomatic communications.” (Sen. George Voinovich, 2007)

This hearing took place approximately one year after NSLI was announced, which also allowed for an informal assessment of how its implementation was actually affecting the language field. Although some stated that progress was being achieved, others still expressed the need for better programs and more funding to involve

higher numbers of students at all levels of education. (Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, 2006)

Overlapping policies: NSLI, National Language Coordination Act of 2005 (S. 1089)

**March 2007: “International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America’s Future”**

Proposed by: Public Law 108-447

According to Public Law 108-447, Congress requested and received \$1,500,000 to be used for “a contract with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to carry out an independent review of Title VI international education and foreign language studies and section 102(b)(6) Fulbright-Hays programs” (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005). The March 23, 2007 publication and report to Congress of the “International Education and Foreign Language: Keys to Securing America’s Future” report by the National Research Council served as a culmination of that study.

“In particular, the study reviews the adequacy and effectiveness of these programs in addressing their statutory missions and in building the nation’s international and foreign languages expertise — particularly as needed for economic, foreign affairs, and national security purposes” (The National Academies, 2007, ¶ 1). Generally, the report concluded that Title VI and Fulbright-Hays have made significant contributions to foreign language and international education in the U.S.; however, there were also recommendations for future improvements to increase the programs’ effectiveness in higher education.

Some of these recommendations included the collaboration of National and Language Resource Centers with colleges of education in developing curriculum, materials, and teacher education. The creation of a position that would require presidential appointment and Senate confirmation within the Department of Education for oversight and strategic direction of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays and other foreign language and international education programs (as later proposed in H.R. 5179). It noted the need for a biennial report submitted by the Secretary of Education reporting on national needs, progress made, and strategies in these areas, as well as a new National Foreign Language Assessment and Technology Project. Also among the recommendations of the report was to maintain a national capacity in both commonly and less commonly taught languages. The report addressed issues such as articulation and long-term sequencing of language programs, time requirements, assessment, and the need for teachers and resources for language education. (O’Connell & Norwood, 2007)

Overlapping policies: H.R. 4137, H.R. 5179, S. 1642

**May 2007: Foreign Language Education Partnership Program Act of 2008**

Proposed by: Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ)

On May 2, 2007, Rep. Rush Holt introduced the Foreign Languages Education Partnership Program, a bill that would have created articulated, sequenced language programs through partnerships between LEAs and IHEs. The legislation would have amended the ESEA by establishing a competitive grant to create foreign language study programs that would run from elementary school through college/university study.

The Secretary of Education would have been given the authority to make incentive payments to eligible partnerships to “develop and maintain model programs that support articulated language learning in kindergarten through grade 12” (Foreign

Language Education Partnership Program Act, 2007). The funds could have been used for program design and teaching strategies according to best practices and available research, curriculum and materials development, national assessment development and enhancement, teacher in-service and pre-service program development, and recruitment incentives for new teachers and students. The funds could also have been used to provide opportunities for maximum language exposure for students, dual-language immersion programs, scholarships for study abroad opportunities, activities that encourage whole-school and community involvement, effective and innovative use of technology, and certification and alternative certification programs.

This legislation was being considered in the House of Representatives' draft for the reauthorization of ESEA as a second part of the FLAP.

Overlapping policies: House of Representatives draft of the ESEA reauthorization

---

### **August 2007: America COMPETES Act passes into law (P.L. 110-69)**

Proposed by: Sen. Harry Reid (D-NV) (S.761) and Rep. Bart Gordon (D-TN) (H.R. 2272)

On August 9, 2007, President George W. Bush signed into law the America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act (America COMPETES). The purpose of this legislation is to invest in innovation and education to improve the competitiveness of the U.S. in the global economy. The America "COMPETES" Act is an updated version of the National Competitiveness Investment Act introduced by Senators Frist and Reid in 2006.

America COMPETES is a bipartisan response to the National Academies' "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report and the Council on Competitiveness' "Innovate America" report (see previous entries). Its objective is to increase research investment, strengthen educational opportunities in science, technology, engineering and mathematics from elementary through graduate school, and develop an innovation infrastructure. In addition to expanding Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs and funding for math, science, engineering, and technology, the America COMPETES Act would develop and implement programs for bachelor's and master's degrees in critical foreign languages with concurrent teaching credentials.

Furthermore, it would expand critical foreign language programs in elementary and secondary schools in order to increase the number of students studying and becoming proficient in these languages through a Foreign Language Partnership Program provision. The legislation also proposes programs to develop and train more teachers in these subject areas. This law is relatively broad in scope and creates programs in a number of federal agencies.

Overlapping policies: "Innovate America" and "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" reports, H.R. 2111

---

### **September 2007: College Cost Reduction and Access Act becomes law (P.L. 110-84)**

Proposed by: Rep. George Miller (H.R. 2669)

The College Cost and Reduction and Access Act of 2007 (CCRAA) was passed in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. It was signed by President Bush

on Thursday, September 27, 2007. The purpose of this legislation is to increase college financial aid and reduce loan costs in order to make college more affordable. The legislation makes changes to the Pell Grant program and alters the current HEA student loan program.

Of particular interest, this law provides student loan forgiveness to borrowers who serve in areas of national need as early childhood educators, nurses, foreign language specialists, librarians, certain highly qualified teachers, child welfare workers, speech language pathologists, National Service participants, and public sector employees. It also establishes a TEACH Grant program, which provides tuition assistance to undergraduate and graduate students who commit to teaching a high-need subject and in a high-need school for four years.

---

**January 2008: International Education Leadership Act of 2008 (H.R. 5179)**

Proposed by: Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ)

On January 29, 2008, Rep. Rush Holt introduced the International Education Leadership Act of 2008 with the intent of establishing an Assistant Secretary for International and Foreign Language Education and an Office of International and Foreign Language Education within the Department of Education. The responsibilities of this office and the Assistant Secretary would include 1) encouraging and promoting foreign language and culture study at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels in the U.S.; 2) administering all Department programs dealing with international and foreign language education and research; 3) coordinating with other international and foreign language programs in other Federal agencies, and; 4) administering and coordinating the Department of Education's activities in international affairs.

Overlapping policies: H.R. 4137

---

**August 2008: Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-315)**

Congress passes the latest reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which was supposed to be accomplished in 2005. On July 29th, a House/Senate Conference Committee reported the *Higher Education Opportunity Act: Expanding College Access, Strengthening Our Future* to both congressional chambers. Two days later the Act was passed by both the House and the Senate and some highlights from the Committee's summary of the 1,158 page bill include:

- A number of general provisions deal with college costs, loan accountability, textbook costs, opportunities for minorities, veterans, and students with disabilities, campus safety, energy efficiency, and competitiveness;
- A broad definition of "critical foreign language" in Title I, General Principles, as suggested by JNCL-NCLIS;
- A new competitive grant program for math, science, technology, and critical foreign languages to serve as adjunct content specialists to support teachers in Title II, Teacher Quality Enhancement;
- Provisions for loan forgiveness for teachers in high need areas, including foreign languages, in Title IV, Student Assistance;
- Foreign languages as an "area of national need" in Title VII, Graduate and Post Secondary Improvement Programs;

- Increased and improved linkages and outreach for foreign languages and international studies to public and private sectors, cooperation with math, sciences, and technology, increased study abroad, and reinstated FLAS fellowship eligibility in Title VI;
- The creation of a new Deputy Assistant Secretary for International and Foreign Language Education in Title IX, the Department of Education Organization Act. Specifically within Title VI (International Education Programs), the legislation would authorize new activities for grants to National Resource Centers, including instructors of less commonly taught languages and projects that promote use of science and technology in coordination with foreign language proficiency and strengthen outreach to SEAs and LEAs. It would reinstate the eligibility of undergraduates for Foreign Language Area Studies fellowships and amend the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language program to allow up to 10% of grant funds to be used toward programs that promote language proficiency and cultural knowledge in study abroad. Furthermore, the bill would add provisions to increase systematic data collection, analysis, and dissemination. An amendment to create an International Higher Education Advisory Board was defeated. This new five year reauthorization was signed by President Bush on August 14, 2008 as Public Law 110-315.

## NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICIES BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1998 Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965*. Retrieved July 29, 2008 from the U.S. Department of Education Web site: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/hea98/index.html>
- A-48: Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations. (1954, March 28). *Department of International Law: Organization of American States*. Retrieved July 7, 2008, from <http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/Sigs/a-48.html>
- A brief history of the national foreign language center. (2008). *National Foreign Language Center*. Retrieved July 15, 2008, from [http://www.nflc.org/about\\_us/history/](http://www.nflc.org/about_us/history/)
- A call to action for national foreign language capabilities. (2005, February). *The National Language Conference*. Retrieved July 30, 2008, from <http://www.nlconference.org>
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *National standards for foreign language education: Preparing for the 21st century*. Yonkers, NY: Author.
- Alatis, J.A. (2001) *History of U.S. policy and efforts for education in the less commonly taught languages*. Paper presented at the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Language annual conference, Arlington, VA.
- American Council on Education. (1984). *What we don't know can hurt us: National policy on international education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Asia Society. (2001). *Asia in the schools: Preparing young Americans for today's interconnected world*. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, from [http://www.askasia.org/teachers/about-materials/ASIA\\_101.pdf](http://www.askasia.org/teachers/about-materials/ASIA_101.pdf)
- Association of American Universities. (2006, January). *National defense education and innovation initiative: Meeting America's economic and security challenges in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.

- Baucorn, L. (2005). World leaders establish a plan of action for U.S. language policy. *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*. Retrieved on July 11, 2008, from <http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3725>
- Blake, R.J. & Kramsch, C. (eds.) (2007). The Issue: National language education policy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 247-249.
- Brecht, R.D. (2007). National language educational policy in the nation's interest: Why? How? Who is responsible for what? *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 264-265.
- Brecht, R.D., Golonka, E.M., Hart, M.E. & Rivers, W.P. (2007). *National capacity in language and area studies, post 9/11: An evaluation of the impact of Title VII Fulbright-Hays of the Higher Education Act*. College Park, MD: The National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland.
- Brecht, R.D., & Rivers, W.P. (2000). *Language and national security in the 21st century: The role of Title VII Fulbright-Hays in supporting national language capacity*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Burn, D.B. and Perkins, J.A. (1980). International education in a troubled world. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 449(1), 17-30.
- Byrnes, H. (2008). *MLJ Perspectives panels: Representing foreign language education*. Retrieved on July 25, 2008, from Georgetown University Web site: <http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/faculty/byrnes/perspectivespanels>
- Celebrating five years of excellence in international education. (2008). *Goldman Sachs Foundation Prizes for Excellence in International Education*. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, from <http://www.internationaleled.org/prizes/>
- Christoff, J.A. (2002, January). *Foreign languages: Human capital approach needed to correct staffing and proficiency shortfalls*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Accounting Office.
- Chu, D.C. (2006, March). Prepared statement of The Honorable David S. C. Chu Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) before the Senate Armed Services Personnel Subcommittee. Retrieved on September 30, 2008, from [http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2006\\_hr/060301-chu%20.pdf](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2006_hr/060301-chu%20.pdf)
- Clifford, R.T. & Fischer, Jr., D.C. (1990). Foreign language needs in the U.S. government. Foreign language in the workplace. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 511 (Special Edition), 232.
- Clinton, W. J. (2000). Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies [Electronic version]. *Department of Education*. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/04-2000/wh-000419.html>
- College Cost Reduction and Access Act (CCRAA). (n.d.) *House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor*. Retrieved July 10, 2008, from <http://edworkforce.house.gov/>
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005) *Global competence and national needs*. Retrieved September 25, 2008, from [http://www.nafsa.org/\\_/Document/\\_/lincoln\\_commission\\_report.pdf](http://www.nafsa.org/_/Document/_/lincoln_commission_report.pdf).
- Committee for Economic Development (2006). *Education for global leadership: The importance of international studies and foreign language education for U.S. economic and national security*. Washington, DC: Committee for Economic Development.
- Committee on Education and Labor. (2007, September). [Press release]. *Chairman Miller statement on signing of the College Cost Reduction and Access Act*. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, [http://www.house.gov/apps/list/speech/edlabor\\_dem/rel092707.html](http://www.house.gov/apps/list/speech/edlabor_dem/rel092707.html)
- Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy. (2005). Rising above the gathering storm: Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future. *The National Academies*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

- Committee on Science Engineering and Public Policy. (2007). Rising above the gathering storm two years later: Accelerating progress toward a brighter future. *The National Academies*. Retrieved on July 11, 2008, from <http://www7.nationalacademies.org/gatheringstorm/>
- Consolidated Appropriations Act*, P.L. 108-447. (2005). Retrieved July 25, 2008, from [http://www7.nationalacademies.org/ocga/Laws/PL108\\_447.asp#TopOfPage](http://www7.nationalacademies.org/ocga/Laws/PL108_447.asp#TopOfPage)
- Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations. (2000, March 1). *Global Legal Information Network*. Abstract retrieved July 15, 2008, from <http://www.glin.gov/view.action?glinID=134785>
- Council on Competitiveness. (2005). *Innovate America: Thriving in a world of challenge and change*. Retrieved on July 10, 2008, from <http://www.compete.org>
- Cromwell, S. (1998, January 19). The bilingual education debate: Part I. *Education World*. Retrieved July 20, 2008 from [http://www.education-world.com/a\\_curr/curr047.html](http://www.education-world.com/a_curr/curr047.html).
- Crump, T. (2000). *Translating and interpreting in the federal government*. Alexandria, VA: American Translators Association.
- Edwards, J.D. & Sayers, M. J. (1985). *Federal funding for foreign language and international education in elementary and secondary schools*. [Occasional paper]. New York, NY: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.
- Edwards, J.D. (1988). Public policy and international awareness: Time for a realistic assessment. *ADFL Bulletin*, 20(4), 20-23.
- Edwards, J.D. (1995). The future of languages. *FLES News*, 8(3), 8.
- Edwards, J.D. *Modified Remarks to the National Press Club 1/16/02*. Washington, DC [Speech]. 16 Jan. 2002.
- Edwards, J.D. (2004). The role of languages in a post- 9/11 United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(2), 269-272.
- The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: From the war on poverty to No Child Left Behind. (2007, August 10). *Ohio Education Association*. Retrieved July 21, 2008, from: <http://www.oea.org/GD/Templates/Pages/OEA/OEADetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=170&Content=8038>
- Donato, R. & Terry, R.M. (Eds.). (1995). *Foreign language learning: The journey of a lifetime*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Fixman, C.S. (1990). The foreign language needs of U.S.-based corporations. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 511(1), 25-46.
- Foreign Language Education Partnership Program Act*. (2005). Retrieved July 28, 2008, from Library of Congress THOMAS database.
- Freedman, S.G. (2004, 16 June). *On education: After Sputnik it was Russian; After 9/11 should it be Arabic?* Retrieved on September 30, 2008, from <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E03E3DC1E30F935A25755C0A9629C8B63>
- Fulbright-Hays Act*. Retrieved July 5, 2008, from U.S. Department of Education Web site: [www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/fulbrighthaysact.pdf](http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/fulbrighthaysact.pdf)
- Fulbright: Program History. (n.d.). *Institute of International Education*. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from [http://us.fulbrightonline.org/about\\_programhistory.html](http://us.fulbrightonline.org/about_programhistory.html)
- Global challenges and U.S. higher education. (2003). *Coalition for International Education*. Retrieved August 1, 2008, from the Duke University Web site: <http://www.jhfc.duke.edu/ducis/globalchallenges/schedule.html>
- Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from U.S. Department of Education Web site: <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/index.html>

- Hart, G. & Rudman, W.B. (Co-chairs). (2002). *America still unprepared — American still in danger: Report of an independent task force*. Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved on 29 September, 2008, from <http://cis.state.mi.us/mpsc/reports/AmStillUnprep.pdf>
- Hawkins, J.N. & Haro, C.M. (1998). Introduction. In J.N. Hawkins (Ed.), *International education in the new global era: Proceedings of a national policy conference on the Higher Education Act, Title VI, and Fulbright-Hays programs* (pp. 9-16). Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles International Studies and overseas programs, University of California.
- Improving America's Schools Act of 1994*. Retrieved July 16, 2008, from U.S. Department of Education Web site: <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/toc.html>
- The Indian Education Act of 1972. (1975). *Journal of American Indian Education*. 14(2). Retrieved July 10, 2008 from <http://jaie.asu.edu/v14/V14S3ind.html>
- International education: *Hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 2* (1966).
- International Education Week. (2000). *Department of State Archives*. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, from <http://exchanges.state.gov/iep/events.htm#educational>
- Jensen, J. (2007). National foreign language policy: A state language coordinator's perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 261-264.
- Jorden, E.H. & Walton, A.R. (1987). Truly foreign languages: Instructional challenges. *Foreign language instruction: A national agenda. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 490, 251.
- Lambert, R.D. (1986). *Points of leverage: An agenda for a national foundation for international studies*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Lambert, R.D., Barber, E.G., Merrill, M.B., Jorden, E., & Twarog, L.I. (1984). *Beyond growth: The next stage in language and area studies*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.
- Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974). Retrieved July 15, 2008, from <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&navby=case&vol=414&invol=563>
- LoBianco, J. (2002). Uncle Sam and Mister Unz. *Australian Language Matters*, 10(4), 8-10.
- Lost in translation: A review of the federal government's efforts to develop a foreign language strategy. (2006, January 25). *Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs*. Retrieved on July 25, 2008, from <http://www.senate.gov/~govt-aff/index.cfm?FuseAction=Hearings.Detail&HearingID=416>
- Lynch, P. (1990). The emergence of American Indian leadership in education. *Journal of American Indian Education*. 29(2). Retrieved July 10, 2008 from <http://jaie.asu.edu/v29/V29S2eme.htm>
- Malone, M.E., Rifkin, B., Christian, D., & Johnson, D.E. (2005). Attaining high levels of proficiency: Challenges for foreign language education in the US. *Eric Digest*. Retrieved on September 29, 2008, from [http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest\\_pdfs/attain.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/attain.pdf)
- McCants, J. (2003, February). The early history of the Higher Education Act of 1965: A trio history fact sheet. *National TRIO Clearinghouse*. Retrieved July 10, 2008, from [www.pellinstitute.org/Clearinghouse/shared/DYKHistoryofthe1965HEA03.doc](http://www.pellinstitute.org/Clearinghouse/shared/DYKHistoryofthe1965HEA03.doc)
- Modern Language Association language map. (n.d.) [Interactive webpage]. *Modern Language Association*. Retrieved on July 25, 2008, from the Modern Language Association Web site [http://www.mla.org/map\\_main](http://www.mla.org/map_main)
- The National Academies. (2005, October). [Press Release]. *Broad federal effort urgently needed to create new, high-quality jobs for all Americans in the 21st century*. Retrieved on July 29, 2008, from <http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?RecordID=11463>

- The National Academies. (2007). [Congressional Briefing]. *International education and foreign languages: Keys to securing America's future*. Retrieved on July 11, 2008, from [http://www7.nationalacademies.org/ocga/briefings/International\\_Education\\_and\\_Foreign\\_Languages.asp](http://www7.nationalacademies.org/ocga/briefings/International_Education_and_Foreign_Languages.asp)
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (2003, October). Ensuring a place for the arts and foreign languages in America's schools. *The Complete Curriculum*. Alexandria, VA: NASBE.
- The National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983, April). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Geographic Society and Roper ASW. (2002, November). *Roper 2002 global geographic literacy survey*. Retrieved July 23, 2008, from <http://www.nationalgeographic.com/geosurvey2002/download/RoperSurvey.pdf>
- National Research Council. (2007). *International education and foreign languages: Keys to securing America's future*, Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, M.E. O'Connell and J.L. Norwood, Editors. Center for Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- National security and economic growth through foreign language improvement: *Hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 97th Cong., 1 (1981)*.
- National Security Education Program. (2005). [Press release]. *National flagship language initiative: Chinese K-16 pipeline project*. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, from <http://www.committee100.org/initiatives/education/NFLI.pdf>
- National Security Education Program*. (2007, December 13). Retrieved on July 21, 2008 from National Defense University Web site: [www.ndu.edu/nsep/](http://www.ndu.edu/nsep/)
- National Security Education Program. (n.d.) . *Institute of International Education*. Retrieved July 14, 2008, from <http://www.iie.org/programs/nsep/>
- National Security Language Initiative (NSLI)*. (2007, October). [Brochure]. Washington, DC: U.S. Government.
- National standards for foreign language education*. Retrieved July 25, 2008, from American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Web site: <http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3392>
- New Visions in Action. *New visions in action — Foreign language education*. Retrieved July 30, 2008, from <http://nflrc.iastate.edu/nva/newsite/overview/homepage.html>
- O'Connell, M., & Norwood, J.L. (Eds.) (2007). *International education and foreign languages: Keys to securing America's future*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Panetta, L.E. (1999). *Foreign language education: If 'scandalous' in the 20th century, what will it be in the 21st century?* Retrieved September 29, 2008, from <https://www.stanford.edu/dept/lc/language/about/conferencepapers/panettapaper.pdf>
- Parker, W.R. (1961). *The national interest and foreign languages*. 3rd edition. Washington, DC: National Commission for UNESCO (Department of State),
- Pratt, M.L., et al. (2008). The issue: Transforming college and university foreign language departments. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(2), 287-292.
- President Clinton issues executive memorandum on international education. (2000). NAFSA: *Association of International Educators*. Retrieved July 28, 2008, from site [http://www.nafsa.org/public\\_policy/sec/public\\_policy\\_document/international\\_education\\_6/president\\_clinton\\_issues\\_1](http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy/sec/public_policy_document/international_education_6/president_clinton_issues_1)
- Rhodes, N. C., & Branaman, L. E. (1999). *Foreign language instruction in the United States: A national survey of elementary and secondary schools*. Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

- Rhodes, N. & Christian, D. (2002). Foreign language education: An international perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(4), 615-616.
- Scarfo, R. D. (1998). The history of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays. In J.N. Hawkins (Ed.), *International Education in the New Global Era: Proceedings of a National Policy Conference on the Higher Education Act, Title VI, and Fulbright-Hays Programs* (pp. 23-25). Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles International Studies and overseas programs, University of California.
- Scott, R.A. (2003). *Many calls, little action: Global illiteracy in the United States*. Presented at the National Language Conference, College Park, MD. Retrieved on 30 September, 2008, from [http://www.nlconference.org/docs/For\\_Lang\\_Pres\\_Speech.pdf](http://www.nlconference.org/docs/For_Lang_Pres_Speech.pdf)
- Simon, P. (1980) *The tongue-tied American: Confronting the foreign language crisis*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Special projects. (n.d.) *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*. Retrieved July 17, 2008, from <http://actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3379>
- The state of foreign language capabilities in national security and the federal government: *Hearing before the Committee on Governmental Affairs, Senate, 106th Cong., 2* (2000).
- Thompson, R.T. (1980) New directions in foreign language study. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 49(1), 45-55.
- Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- United States Department of Defense. (2005). *Defense transformation roadmap*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Department of Education. (n.d.) *Elementary school foreign language incentive program*. Retrieved July 15, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/flip/index.html>
- United States Department of Education (n.d.) *International education and foreign language studies*. Retrieved July 16, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Biennial/523.html>
- United States Department of Education (n.d.) *Foreign language assistance program (FLAP)*. Retrieved July 20, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/flap/index.html>
- United States Department of Education (1979, November.) *Strength through wisdom: A critique of U.S. Capability*. A report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Department of State. (2004). *Language continuum*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States General Accounting Office. (2002, January). *Foreign languages: Human capital approach needed to correct staffing and proficiency shortfalls*. U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02375.pdf>
- United States General Accounting Office. (2006). *Department of State: Staffing and foreign language shortfalls persist despite initiatives to address gaps*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Van Houten, J. (2006). Turning a new light on assessment with LinguaFolio. *Learning Languages*, 12(1), 7-11.
- Weber, W.K. (1990). Interpretation in the United States. Foreign language in the Workplace. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 511(1), 145-158.
- White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy*. (2000) *Department of State*. Retrieved on July 28, 2008, from <http://www.state.gov/r/whconf/index.html>