

## **Breakout 2, Presentation**

# **Challenges for Title VI Programs of Outreach in Foreign Language and International Studies**

John M. Metzler

Michigan State University

### **Abstract**

As we approach the twenty-first century, the United States must prepare for an increasingly interconnected global society. The U.S. academy, particularly through the Title VI centers and programs, has a unique opportunity and obligation to work with a variety of American publics in enhancing the capability to negotiate and take full advantage of new international opportunities. Outreach programming from Title VI centers and programs plays an important role in preparing the populace for these opportunities through assistance to U.S. foreign policy professionals and the Congress, as well as state and local governments; innovations in foreign language and international studies curricula in both K-12 and postsecondary institutions; assisting U.S. companies to take advantage of international trade; supporting local, state, and national agencies in developing initiatives abroad; and assisting the media in becoming more comprehensive and accurate in their international coverage. A more robust commitment to and focus on outreach functions is needed if the national needs are to be met in the face of relentless internationalization of almost every aspect of U.S. domestic life. The small amounts of outreach funding available and the many other activities “mandated” for the Title VI National Resource, Language Resource, and International Business Centers, results in a sometimes ambivalent university commitment to expenditure for outreach personnel and programming. Moreover, in spite of rhetorical commitment to service, outreach or service is peripheral to the culture of many universities and is perceived as not being important to scholarship. This breakout session and paper will address the great national need for foreign language and international studies outreach for a variety of U.S. populations, institutions, and agencies. We also (i) explore ways in which outreach can be promoted as an integral part of scholarship and the agenda of the university, (ii) critique established and current outreach initiatives, and (iii) survey new ways of doing outreach through collaborative endeavors and the creative use of technology.

## **I. Background**

### **A. The Mission**

There is a wide consensus within the internationalist community that as we approach the twenty-first century our planet is becoming increasingly interconnected. This process of “glo-

balization” presents on one hand tremendous opportunities for economic growth, increased political freedom, and social development; however on the other hand, globalization also presents the possibility of dangerously increased economic disparity, political destabilization, and social disintegration. Internationalist scholars from across the disciplines can play an impor-

tant role in generating and disseminating knowledge that is essential to realizing the potential of globalization while concurrently minimizing its risks. In this regards the U.S. academy, particularly through the Title VI centers and programs, has a unique opportunity and obligation to work with a variety of American publics in enhancing their capability to negotiate and take full advantage of new international opportunities, while minimizing the risks to international peace and security.

Outreach programming from Title VI centers and programs can and should play a central role in realizing this agenda by disseminating appropriate knowledge and enhancing the analytic capabilities of individual citizens, business personnel, educators at all levels, the media, and policymakers at the local, state, and federal levels. However, in order to realize these achievable goals a more robust commitment to, and focus on, the outreach functions of the Title VI National Resource, International Business, and Foreign Language Resource Centers is imperative.

The objective of this session (and chapter) should be to explore ways in which we can more clearly define the outreach agenda in the age of globalization and to develop guidelines and strategies that will facilitate the realization of these important goals.

There is undoubtedly a consensus among the individuals, universities, and organizations represented at this conference that Title VI centers should engage extrauniversity communities by addressing issues related to globalization. There is little consensus, however, as to how central this outreach mandate should be to the larger agenda of international education in the academy generally and of Title VI centers specifically. If outreach is to fulfill its potential, we will have to actively engage this debate. To be effective in this endeavor it essential that we first:

- Understand and address the problematic of outreach and its current peripheralization within the academy;
- Critically assess the normative outreach endeavors of Title VI National Resource Centers, Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBERs), and National Foreign Language Resource Centers (NFLRC), celebrating outreach achievements while challenging our shortcomings.

## B. Peripheralization of Outreach within the Academy

One of the central problems of outreach work in Title VI centers has been that although outreach has been mandated since the early 1970s, it has traditionally been perceived as peripheral to the main objectives, goals, and tasks of the centers. This is not surprising given the institutional context of the larger academy in which Title VI centers operate.

**Outreach as Peripheral to Knowledge Generation.** The academy—even those that pride themselves as “land-grant” institutions—have had an ambivalent and often ambiguous relationship with the concept and practice of outreach. From the perspective of the academy the primary tasks of the academy are:

- The production of knowledge which is achieved through scholarship/research;
- The training of the next generation of scholars/researchers (producing the producers of knowledge) which is achieved through quality graduate education programs;
- The dissemination of knowledge through the traditional medium of undergraduate instruction.

Dissemination of knowledge beyond the traditional modalities of undergraduate and graduate education has seldom been given much support within the academy, beyond the sometime established practices of :

- University-based extension services to rural and agricultural communities;
- Post-graduate professional association with academy alumni—e.g. relationships with K-12 educators, medical personal, business persons, engineers, etc.

But even in these situations the relationship between the academy and “clients” has been an uneasy and often uncomfortable one. The “clientele” relationship (often one-way dissemination of knowledge) is not conducive to trust and collaboration, nor has this relationship been seen as being an integral part of scholarship, the production of knowledge, and the primary function of the university. Moreover, and relatedly, the academy has often treated academics who are involved in outreach activities as being “second-

class,” as not being committed to real scholarship.

Parenthetically, Title VI programs that are thematically based or hosted by professional units, for example, CIBERs, may find it easier to do outreach, given the disciplinary tradition of working with “clients” external to the university. On the other hand, centers housed in the more normative and traditional (for Title VI centers) social science and humanities administrative units have a more restricted tradition of working with communities outside of the academy and, consequently, may perceive outreach to be of limited value.<sup>1</sup>

**Outreach and the University Reward Structure.** Not surprisingly the academy’s reward structure has traditionally devalued outreach in terms of its reward and tenure structure. Even at land-grant universities which claim a tripartite reward structure—research, teaching, and outreach—outreach is seldom (outside of extension appointments) given weight in terms of tenure, promotion, and salary considerations. Consequently, outside of the units with traditions of outreach (agriculture, medicine, education) scholars who see the value of outreach as a legitimate and important part of the academy often minimize their own outreach activities.

Title VI international centers are for the most part administered and supported by a core faculty who come from this disciplinary tradition, i.e., the social sciences and humanities. Consequently not many Title VI directors, and fewer of the center core faculty, perceive great value in doing outreach. This frame of mind and consequent practice (or lack thereof) is sanctioned by the larger university culture and structure, including deans or directors of international programs, as well as central university officials, who in most cases provide no leadership in the area of outreach.

Moreover, it is clear that many Title VI directors perceive that the International Education and Graduate Programs Service (IEGPS), U.S. Department of Education, assigns low priority to

outreach—both in terms of the competition point system and the manner in which outreach is assessed and monitored. Consequently, although we do not have definitive data, the evidence indicates that most Title VI centers do not have a full-time person appointed to outreach. Quite often the outreach functions are part of the numerous responsibilities of an assistant or associate director, or they are handled by a part-time person, not infrequently by a graduate assistant.

Until Title VI centers are pressured from their university administration and IEGPS/USED, and until there is a change in the manner in which it is perceived, outreach will remain peripheral and, as a result, will likely be poorly done and have little lasting impact, locally, regionally, or nationally.

### C. Addressing the Outreach Problematic

I would argue that for the outreach endeavor to be taken seriously in the academy our initial task will involve a two-prong agenda:

#### 1. **Demonstrate that Outreach Is Compatible with and Strengthens Scholarship.**

We need to convince the academy that outreach can and should be perceived as central to the scholarly enterprise, and not simply a peripheral activity which can be done in a haphazard manner by graduate students or “para-”professional, “want-to-be” scholars.

That is, outreach should be viewed as

a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research and service. It [at its optimum] involves generating, transmitting, applying and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external [to the university] audiences in ways that are consistent with the mission [of the academy]. (Michigan State University 1993, 1)

Moreover, as Ernest Lynton has observed:

For pragmatic . . . as well as substantive reasons, we believe that it is necessary to reexamine prevalent conceptions of what it means to be a scholar. Balance of esteem among research, teaching, and outreach requires the recognition that teaching and outreach not only are essential activities, but that they constitute as much an intellectual challenge as research, and are equally integral parts of the professional work of

1. This is not an indictment of the marvelous community services provided by humanities and social science units through university based museums, music programs, and distinguished lecture series, etc.

a scholar... Scholarly research occurs when the facts and figures are transformed into new knowledge. Similarly, just as research is more than the gathering of information, so are teaching and outreach more than the transmission of facts. *All three activities advance knowledge by the process which transforms information into understanding. Knowledge is based on but transcends information, and the transformation of information into new knowledge is the essence of scholarship* [emphasis added]. (Lynton 1992)

**2. Demonstrate that Outreach Is Central to the Future of the Academy.** A fairly high percentage of Title VI centers are housed in public institutions, most of which are AAU research universities, and some of which are land-grant institutions. These institutions are publicly funded and, according to our own mission statements, must serve the citizens and institutions (public and private) that fund them. Obligations to the citizens have traditionally been fulfilled, it is argued by the academy, by providing on-campus training in the form of undergraduate and graduate education. With the notable exceptions of outreach done by some professional programs, such as agricultural and education extension work, public universities have done little outreach or service to noncampus communities. Indeed, there is ample current evidence that the public perceives institutions of higher learning to be increasingly insulated from the realities of the “real world.”<sup>2</sup>

I suggest that outreach can play a central role in reestablishing trust and connection between the academy and the public. This pragmatic argument goes beyond recognizing the important public relations value in establishing meaningful programmatic relationships with the public through meaningful and well constructed and administered outreach programs. A number of leading experts in higher education have cogently argued that as we “bridge to the twenty-first century,” the scholarly endeavor requires reform, which in part can come only

---

2. There are numerous examples of this alienation between public-funded academies and the public. One of the most troubling examples is the apparent strong public support for attempts in the Minnesota State Legislature to reform the tenure system and structure at Minnesota’s public universities.

from redefining the role of the academy and scholarship in larger society. As the late Ernest Boyer asserted:

We proceed with the conviction that if the nation’s higher learning institutions are to meet today’s urgent academic and social mandates, their missions [and practices] must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered.... Redefining [scholarship] means bringing to scholarship a broader meaning, one in which legitimacy is given to the full scope of academic work. (Boyer 1990, 13)

International outreach, obviously, can play only a very modest role in this endeavor. However, successful international outreach will depend on increasing support from the academy and the U.S. Department of Education. Realistically, increased support for international outreach will only happen if outreach, broadly defined, is perceived to be essential to the reformulation of scholarship and the revitalization of the academy.

## II. History and Current Status of Title VI Outreach

Area and international thematic studies centers, Centers for International Business Education and Research, and National Foreign Language Resource Centers traditionally have focused their outreach in one of five areas:

- K-12 educators and students;
- Educators in institutions of higher education;
- Business community, usually small- and medium-scale businesses;
- Community-based organizations—service clubs, religious organizations, etc.;
- Press and media.

### 1. Outreach to K-12 Educators and Students

I was unable to carry out a systematic survey of outreach activities by National Resource Foreign Language and Area Studies Centers, but based on my ten-year experience of working in the outreach field, I would suggest that most of the Title VI centers (i.e., area and NFLRCs) which have active outreach programs place

emphasis on outreach to K-12 educators and students. This tradition of emphasizing K-12 education in outreach endeavors is based on several factors:

- The International Education and Graduate Programs Service/U.S. Department of Education has for many years given priority to outreach endeavors to K-12 educators and students. Many Title VI centers have responded to this priority by emphasizing K-12 in their outreach endeavors (however limited their overall outreach program may be).
- Many Title VI administrators and faculty share with the IEGPS the belief that K-12 outreach projects are the most effective in terms of return for effort. Given the limited priority given to outreach by many centers, well-conceived and executed programs for K-12 educators are perceived to be the most efficient use of scarce outreach resources. However, effective K-12 programs necessitate considerable resources, particularly in terms of time commitment by outreach personnel, a factor that is often ignored by resource-poor outreach programs.
- There is a widely shared conviction among Title VI centers that outreach resources should be allocated to activities that have the greatest potential for promoting international competency and understanding. This conviction converges with an equally widely shared perception of the ameliorative potential of education. Consequently, there is an acceptance of the argument that K-12 outreach, with the possibility of shaping the minds and attitudes of America's youth, should be given high priority.
- Given the previous points, Title VI centers often appoint to the outreach positions persons who have a background in K-12 education. Outreach coordinators with K-12 experience are likely to continue to emphasize outreach to schools and teachers, and may feel uncomfortable in undertaking initiatives outside this arena.
- Even in cases where outreach coordinators have no direct K-12 experience, these coordinators report that they and faculty recruited to assist in special programming (workshops, institutes) indicate a higher comfort level in working with educators than with other extrauniversity populations. Even when the "snobbery factor" is taken into con-

sideration there is strong anecdotal evidence that university faculty are more responsive to and more effective in working with educators than with other groups.

### *Types of K-12 Outreach*

Outreach programs have been involved in numerous types of endeavors aimed at the K-12 community.

- **Teacher In-service Workshops.** One of the most popular and effective modes of outreach to K-12 educators (if planned and executed in a professional manner) has been in-service programming. Such programming usually allows for an in-depth exploration of issues to a group of teachers. When in-service workshops are sponsored by schools or districts it provides an opportunity to impact teaching throughout the school or district. This is much more effective than providing one-on-one consultation to individual teachers. Teacher in-service workshops also provide an ideal locale for collaborative efforts between regional centers. (Collaboration will be addressed in greater detail below.) Numerous Title VI centers have also sponsored special summer programming for teachers. Examples of effective and rewarding summer programming are the National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institutes (or Seminars) for Teachers, which focus on African, Asian, or Latin American studies; the Fulbright-Hayes Group Projects Abroad, which heavily subsidizes four-week international study-travel programs for educators; and collaborative summer institutes for foreign language teachers, such as the Taos Institute for Language Teachers.
- **Resources to Teachers.** Many outreach programs continue to provide consultation to individual teachers, even though these services are not emphasized. In addition many centers have outreach resource collections which are specifically oriented to K-12 educators. Such collections contain reference books, model curricula, introductory level texts, trade books, textbooks, music, slide collections, computer simulations, videos, etc. In some institutions which host more than one Title VI center, resource collections have a common location.

- **Outreach through State and National Teacher Organizations.** A number of outreach programs have developed positive working relationships with state and national level disciplinary associations. Area and thematic centers have often concentrated on state level Councils for the Social Studies, state level Geographic Alliances, and working with the educational programs of state level Councils for the Humanities. Additional efforts should be made to effectively take advantage of the opportunities offered by national level organizations through their conferences and publications.<sup>3</sup> The National Foreign Language Resource Centers have been quite successful in working with state and national level foreign language associations in influencing both important changes in foreign language curriculum and pedagogy. These endeavors stress intercenter collaboration and have national as well as local impact. They are important and should be encouraged.
- **Curricula and Textbooks.** In addition to resource collections a number of outreach programs have targeted their resources to the development and marketing of curricular modules in the social studies and humanities for different grade levels. Other centers have been involved in collaborative endeavors in the critical review of global studies textbooks.<sup>4</sup> Other programs have undertaken the task of publishing texts for K-12 educators.<sup>5</sup> Several outreach programs have produced short videos for teachers and students.<sup>6</sup> These endeavors are very commendable, but also very time-consuming, and beyond the scope of what many outreach programs are able to undertake.
- **Student Oriented Activities.** Although many outreach programs will facilitate classroom presentations, most programs minimize these activities on the conviction that classroom presentations are very time consuming and have minimal value in reaching teachers. However, there is a large body of anecdotal evidence that classroom presentations, particularly by international students, can have a tremendous impact on students.<sup>7</sup> Other programs have cooperated with extrauniversity groups in working with K-12 students in activities such as Model U.N., Model Organization of American States, and Model Organization of African Unity. Centers that have worked with students in these fora have found these activities to be very rewarding. Moreover, there is considerable anecdotal evidence that a number of the students exposed to these programs have gone on to major in international studies in their undergraduate careers.
- **Foreign Language Instruction.** Some Title VI centers have emphasized outreach to language teachers. This, of course, is particularly, but not exclusively, true of the National Foreign Language Resource Centers. These initiatives have generally emphasized one of three curricular objectives. The NRLRCs have focused primarily in promoting curricular and pedagogy reform in the teaching of the more commonly taught foreign languages at the K-12 level: French, German, and Spanish. A number of Latin American and African programs have worked with teachers of Spanish and French to encourage the infusion of African and Latin American cultural studies into the

---

3. A number of regional outreach councils, for example, have edited special regional-global focused editions of *Social Studies*, the monthly journal of the National Council for the Social Studies.

4. The Middle East Studies Association Outreach Council has completed a comprehensive review of social studies textbooks; the South Asian Studies Association and the Outreach Council of the African Studies Association are undertaking a similar review.

5. The South East Asian Studies Center at Columbia University, for example, has coordinated the publication of a number of resource books for teachers.

---

6. For example, the Outreach Program of the African Studies Program at Boston University has produced an excellent video that introduces Africa and challenges commonly held stereotypes.

7. Consequently, a number of programs are involved in collaborative efforts that facilitate presentations by international students in K-12 classrooms. For example, the African, Asian, and Latin American centers at Michigan State University assist a locally based group, Community Volunteers in International Programs, to recruit and train international students for classroom presentations.

teaching of French and Spanish respectively. Other centers have worked with teachers of less-commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Swahili, among other languages which are taught in American high schools. Some of these centers have also sponsored Group Projects Abroad for foreign language teachers.

## 2. Outreach to Higher Education

In their reports to the International Education and Graduate Programs Service, most Title VI centers indicate outreach activities which focus on faculty at institutions of higher learning. However, many of these activities are not exclusively outreach activities (e.g. special on-campus seminars, conferences, and events to which faculty from other institutions are invited). That is, most of these reported activities are not perceived by the centers as being primarily outreach functions and they are primarily valued for their contribution to other areas of scholarship.

There are, however, a number of Title VI centers that are involved in outreach programming specifically oriented to faculty at institutions of higher learning. Many of these endeavors have been cross-regional and cross-thematic, resulting from collaboration of several area studies centers, international studies programs, CIBERs, and NFLRCs at the same or neighboring institutions. A number of these endeavors have focused on working with consortia of either liberal arts colleges or community colleges. Examples of collaborative endeavors will be noted below.

Specialized outreach to faculty at higher education have focused on five activities or objectives:

**1. Curriculum Development for Infusion of International Modules.** Because many community colleges and small liberal arts colleges cannot offer regionally specific or even internationally focused courses in the humanities (literature, music, art, religious studies, etc.) or social sciences (history, anthropology, economics, geography, sociology, political science), outreach programs for college faculty often focus on developing skills necessary to infuse international (including regional specific) modules into

existing undergraduate courses. A number of Title VI centers cosponsor curriculum development workshops and institutes for faculty. These institutes are often cosponsored by one or more regional studies programs, CIBERs, and NFLRCs.<sup>8</sup>

A number of CIBERs have initiated collaborative programs internationalizing business curricula for faculty at community and four-year colleges.

It would be beneficial to explore ways in which Title VI National Resource Centers can collaborate with individual or consortia of institutions which have been awarded Title VI internationalizing undergraduate grants in developing programs that meet their international education objectives.

- 2. Internationalizing Campus and Student Life.** A number of Title VI programs collaborated with external consortia to assist in internationalizing campuses through the promotion of a variety of activities including visiting scholar programs, international/global festivals, international music and film series, and programs that facilitate international students from Title VI institutions visiting campuses which have little international presence.
- 3. Outreach to Local Communities.** Many small colleges, particularly community colleges, have a rich tradition of outreach to the local community. A number of Title VI outreach initiatives in higher education have focused on assisting smaller colleges to “internationalize” their community outreach activities. Such activities include facilitating community college efforts to assist local businesses to take advantage of international business opportunities.
- 4. Scholarly Opportunities.** The most fre-

---

8. At Michigan State University three Title VI centers—African Studies, Latin America/Caribbean Studies Center, and the Center for the Advanced Study of International Development—have collaborated in several outreach programs to four- and two-year colleges. The most extensive of these is the Michigan International Development Education Outreach Network (MIDEON), which administers a variety of outreach programs to faculty from twenty-one participating liberal arts and community colleges.

quent outreach activity to scholars at smaller institutions are programs which allow faculty to take advantage of the superior resources at Title VI institutions to enhance their own scholarship. Programs for these colleagues include visiting fellow programs which allow individual scholars to carry their own scholarship to more formal seminars that provide specialized training.<sup>9</sup>

- 5. Teacher Education.** Given the emphasis the IEGPS and Title VI centers have placed on outreach to K-12 schools and educators, it is surprising and disturbing that there have been limited attempts and fewer successes in internationalizing teacher education programs. In fact, even though there is a growing appreciation of the importance of educating a globally competent generation of Americans, the greater streamlining of teacher education programs has on occasion resulted in the removal of global education electives from the teacher education curriculum. It is vitally important the IEGPS/USED and Title VI centers explore ways in which they can actively engage teacher educators in the project of internationalizing K-12 education through incorporating global education in the teacher education curriculum.

---

9. A number of regional and international Title VI centers have had programs which facilitate visiting faculty research. An example of this type of specialized training is the CICALS program (Consortium for Interinstitutional Collaboration in African and Latin American Studies) a collaborative outreach endeavor by the Michigan State University College of Arts and Letters, African Studies Center, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, and three college consortia (Great Lakes Colleges Association, Association of Midwestern Colleges, and nineteen Historically Black Colleges and Universities). CICALS programming has brought consortia faculty to MSU each summer for a four-week intensive language program in either Portuguese or one of three African languages (Amharic, Swahili, Shona). The following summer these scholars participate in a four-six week research project in one of the language areas—Brazil, Ethiopia, Kenya, or Zimbabwe.

### 3. Outreach to Community Groups

Most Title VI centers have experience in working with various community groups in promoting international competency and understanding. For the most part these endeavors have not been systematic or part of an established effort (such as programs for K-12 educators). Rather, most area and international thematic centers worked with local religious groups and civic organizations (Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, etc.) in response to specific requests for information related to special international projects being undertaken by the organization. For example, a church or civic organization may be involved in raising funds in support of an international project and will ask the Title VI center to assist in providing background information on the region (or crisis) and perhaps to give advice on logistical issues.

Title VI centers should assess the opportunities for outreach to community groups. Should these opportunities be given higher priority? Or is the effort too time consuming for often limited results, which take away from targeted outreach efforts at the regional and national levels?

### 4. Outreach to Businesses

Prior to the creation of CIBER programs most Title VI centers did very little systematic outreach to the local, state, or national business community. This is due partially to the difficulty that centers staffed primarily with humanities and social science scholars have in accessing the business community. Moreover, there has often been a mutual discomfort, if not suspicion, between the two communities which limited the contact between regional and thematic centers and the business community.

CIBER centers have not only filled this void but they have also drawn area Title VI centers into outreach to the business community. CIBER seminars for the business community often feature area scholars who make presentations related to society, culture, and politics in the region(s) of focus in the seminar. For example, the CIBER at Michigan State University has involved faculty from the Canadian, Latin American/Caribbean, and Asian centers in offering seminars on trading opportunities in Canada, Mexico, and Japan, Michigan's three largest international trading partners. The MSU-

CIBER has also developed the nationally recognized International Business Academy. This innovative program brings together representatives from five to six midsize Michigan businesses for monthly day-long sessions over a fifteen-week semester.

## 5. Outreach to the Press and Media

There is a strong consensus among Title VI centers that the entertainment and news media share responsibility for both the lack of international competency among the American public and for the inchoate opinions and often egregious stereotypes held by many Americans.

Many of the Title VI centers have responded to requests from the news media on issues related to their regions of expertise. Unfortunately, communications between the international scholarly community and the popular news media is nearly nonexistent. Ironically the advances in electronics which have allowed for instant TV access to the "remotest" parts of the world has reduced the need to consult scholars as the media have enhanced the possibility of "parachute journalism."<sup>10</sup>

An area of potential collaboration between Title VI centers is the compilation of a comprehensive database of scholars with thematic, disciplinary, and regional/country-specific expertise. An easily accessible database could be used by the news media (among other groups) to quickly identify scholars who could provide necessary background to the important international stories.<sup>11</sup> In addition, centers could encourage their faculty with relevant expertise to write unsolicited op-ed pieces on little-understood world events for submission to local and national media.<sup>12</sup>

The effects of the "Tarzan syndrome" in creating and reinforcing images held by Americans of

Africans, Asians, and Latinos has been well documented. Consequently, more than a few of the Title VI regional centers have been involved in generating and disseminating reviews of films and videos related to their region.<sup>13</sup> These reviews, *inter alia*, provide educators at all levels with information that will enhance their ability to identify and select films and videos which are appropriate to the intended theme and audience.

## III. Collaboration

Although there are numerous examples of exceptional outreach projects developed by individual centers working on their own, many programs work collaboratively with other centers, pooling resources in an attempt to provide more effective service. Moreover, it is worth noting that IEGPS/USED has in recent years looked favorably on collaborative outreach endeavors.

Outreach collaboration has taken several forms:

- Joint programming between Title VI (or other nonfederally funded) international centers (area studies, thematic, CIBERs, NFLRCs) at the same institution.<sup>14</sup>
- Cooperative programming between analogous centers. Many of the national and regional level seminars and workshops spon-

13. The Middle East Studies Association has sponsored a project that has systematically reviewed many of the feature and documentary films which focus on this region. Similarly, the Africa Media Program, housed in the MSU African Studies Center, is undertaking the systematic review of many of the feature and documentary films on Africa which are available in the United States. These reviews will soon be accessible on the AMP web site.

14. For example, the international programs at the University of Illinois publish a joint newsletter to teachers. At Michigan State University, the African Studies Center, the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, and the Center for Advanced Study of International Development have collaborated in outreach programming to both K-12 and higher education. In addition they have cooperated with the MSU CIBER in outreach endeavors to both businesses and college faculty. There are many other examples of this type of systematic cooperation between Title VI centers at the same institution.

10. This term refers to the tendency of the U.S. press to (a) to cover only crises in developing areas and (b) without any background, "parachuting" into the troubled areas to bring interpretation of the crisis to the American public.

11. This could be an activity promoted by the outreach councils of the area studies associations.

12. For example, during the recent crisis in the Great Lakes region of East Africa, a number of Africanist experts on this region, submitted detailed, but accessible, analyses of the crisis.

sored by area studies centers, CIBERs, NFL-RCs, and undergraduate centers are collaborative endeavors.

- Collaborative endeavors between Title VI centers from different universities. While not common, there are examples of joint outreach efforts between Title VI centers (across regions) at different institutions.<sup>15</sup>

IEGPS/USED in its proposal guidelines for all international programs emphasizes the importance of collaboration in outreach endeavors. There are numerous cogent arguments for collaboration in outreach endeavors which deserve our attention:

- **Resources/Finance.** Outreach programs are competing with other legitimate activities of centers for scarce resources. Moreover, as indicated above, outreach has seldom been given pride of place in centers' goals and programs. Consequently outreach programs have had to operate on very limited resources. Collaborative programs between centers at the same institution, regionally, or nationally, will enhance the capacity of outreach efforts to develop and execute effective programs.
- **Regional and National Significance.** Even the most well-resourced, innovative, and effective outreach programs are severely limited by capacity to have a larger regional or national impact, be it on education (K-12 or higher education), the press, business, or public policy. However, well-conceived collaboration between centers has the potential of influence at the regional and national level. (The issue of national level outreach will be discussed in greater detail below.)
- **Positive Response to the Challenge of "Globalism."** The issue of "globalism" (sometimes referred to as "globalization") has impacted debates within the Title VI

community (see Heginbotham 1994). The worst case scenario would indicate a reduction of support for area studies with a corresponding emphasis on centers which focus on cross-regional international themes. Collaborative outreach activities cosponsored by regional and thematic centers have the potential of providing perspective to this debate. Regionally focused or cross-regional seminars are not likely to persuade "globally oriented" clients of the importance of regional perspectives to global problems. However, collaborative outreach programs between thematic and regional centers have the potential to provide fora in which global issues can be explored comparatively in the context of regional similarities, specificity, and exceptionalism. Such venues are not only vital to the agenda of regional centers but can also provide rigor and authenticity to the study of global themes.

## IV. Technology

The rise of the contemporary electronic and computer technology has the potential to radically change the structure of international outreach. The Internet and the World Wide Web provide the opportunity for centers to share information and resources and provide consultation to "clients" locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. There are a number of examples of electronic international outreach which are instructive:

- **Outreach Web Sites.** In the very near future all Title VI centers will host their own web site. Outreach programs should be central to this endeavor, providing information on outreach services, but also using the site as a source of outreach resources and materials (e.g. model curricula, teaching materials which can be downloaded, etc.). There are a number of Title VI outreach programs which have already developed exceptional web sites that provide comprehensive services to educators, students, business persons, and the general public.<sup>16</sup> Web sites provide the potential for making local resources available to a national and international audience.

---

15. For example, in Michigan there has been programmatic cooperation between Title VI centers at MSU (Africa and Latin America) and the University of Michigan (Middle East and Asia—Southeast Asia and Japan). Moreover, the outreach coordinators of these institutions work together in lobbying the Michigan State Department of Education on issues relating to international/global education.

- **List Serves.** A number of outreach programs are experimenting with discussion-oriented list serves for educators and other clients. Most outreach list serves are fairly restrictive in scope, bringing together a small group of educators. However, H-Net, an international multidisciplinary/regionally specific moderated list serve, is encouraging outreach programs from across the regions to develop their own moderated list serves that will be oriented to educators.<sup>17</sup>

Technology will provide the opportunity for modestly resourced outreach programs to provide state of the art services to local, regional, national, and international communities. The linking capabilities of the Internet will also encourage collaboration, since each center will not have to develop comprehensive databases but will be able to provide linkages to other institutions and programs that have specialized expertise or electronic holdings.

## V. The Challenge of Multiarea Level Outreach: Local, Regional, National, and International

The "Federal Regulations for Higher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Language Training and Area Studies" (*Federal Register* 1996) in response to comments from outside reviewers on the reasonableness of expecting Title VI centers to engage in comprehensive outreach programming to local, regional, and national audiences stated that

---

16. For example MSU's CIBER program has developed a very comprehensive web site on international business which is widely used by businesses nationally and internationally. The African Studies Program at the University of Pennsylvania has the most comprehensive outreach site currently available; it is accessed by thousands of clients each week.

17. H-Net hopes that by the end of 1997 H-Africa/Teachers, H-Asia/Teachers, and H-Latin America/Teachers will be operational. These list serves will provide educators with the opportunity to seek advice and to share curricular/teaching ideas. The African Studies Center at MSU will host and moderate H-Africa/Teachers, as a pilot project, beginning before the end of the current academic year.

The Secretary believes the proposed scope of outreach functions and their point allocations are sufficient to enable all applicant institutions to *demonstrate impact at the national and regional levels* [emphasis added]. The Secretary also believes that it is appropriate to expect national Centers to engage in all three areas (education, business, media). (*Federal Register* 1996, 50193)

The intent is clear that national centers are expected to engage in local/state, regional, and national level outreach. However, effective, as opposed to token, multilevel outreach will necessitate, inter alia, increased emphasis on, and resources allocated to, outreach on the part of centers. Increased emphasis on outreach, without a corresponding increase in resources, is likely to result in the proliferation of token programs that will have only minimal outreach impact.

Developing meaningful regional and national level outreach projects given the realities of minimal resources can be accomplished through the creative initiatives which take advantage of:

- **Use of External Funding Sources.** Outreach programs can take advantage of federal funding programs to develop regional and national level endeavors. For example, a number of centers have received programmatic monies from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), Fulbright-Hayes Group Projects Abroad, National Endowment for the Humanities (Summer Institutes/Seminar for Teachers or college faculty), and in collaboration with other institutions, Title VI Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs.
- **Inter- and Intrainstitutional/Center Collaboration.** In order to develop effect programs that have regional and national impact, National Resource Area Studies Centers, CIBERs, National Foreign Language Resource Centers, and Undergraduate Centers have increasingly emphasized collaborative outreach programming, seeking partners within their own institutions, with corresponding centers at other institutions, and across thematic and regional areas.<sup>18</sup>
- **Collaborative Programming with Outreach Clients.** In addition to collaborating

with other Centers, effective outreach can be done through developing collaborative (as opposed to “one-way”) projects with potential outreach clients. For example a number of centers have cosponsored Title VI Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs, creating programs that have integrated the resources of the centers with a consortium of underresourced institutions.<sup>19</sup>

It should be noted that such efforts may program at the state or regional levels, but they model projects and relationships which can and do have national significance.

• **Work with National Level Disciplinary and Cross-Disciplinary Organizations.**

A number of Title VI centers have worked closely with national level organizations such as the Global Forum and the National Association for the Social Studies in promoting an international agenda. Personnel from some centers have been involved in working with their national level disciplinary associations to facilitate national guidelines and recommendations for infusing international and regional studies into disciplinary curricula (for example, see Groennings and Wiley 1990).

- **Use of Technology/Internet.** Of limited expense, and in terms of breadth of dissemination, potentially the most effective method of outreach to local, regional, national, and international clients is the use of the Internet. As indicated above, the effective use of the Internet will both necessitate and facilitate multiple levels of collaboration and “linkage” between the unique resources and offerings of cooperating centers.

---

18. An example of outreach collaboration across thematic areas is the joint programming in developing “business” language skills in which some CIBERs and NFLRCs are involved. For example, MSU’s CIBER and NFLRC are involved in developing German “business” language skills among U.S. business persons and business majors.

19. For example, the Michigan International Development Education Outreach Network, a consortium of MSU (CASID, ASC, CLACs) and twenty Michigan Community and four-year colleges, received a Title VI undergraduate grant, 1993–96.

A word of caution may be advisable as centers debate the question of prioritizing outreach efforts in terms of local, regional, and national initiatives. Some outreach programming, such as services provided through a web site, will service clients at all three levels. However, there are some types of programming that can only be done effectively at the local and/or state level, and these should not be automatically discounted in an effort to have regional or national impact in our outreach programming. For example:

- Outreach to K-12 educators, given that education policy in the United States is a local district and, to a lesser extent, state function, is probably most effective when oriented to the district and state level. This of course does not negate the importance of developing instructional materials, audio-visuals, etc., that can be disseminated nationally. Nor is it an argument against sponsoring regional or national level institutes for K-12 teachers. But it should be recognized that while such programming is national in terms of its recruitment, it is local in terms of the impact. That is, teachers participating in national or regional level institutes will have minimal impact on national or even state educational policy, but they are likely to impact the internationalizing of teaching (be it foreign languages, language arts, or the social studies) within their own schools and districts.<sup>20</sup>
- Outreach directly to business communities is often most effective when done on a direct, “face-to-face” basis.<sup>21</sup> This is probably a truism, regardless of the potential client, be they community groups, religious organizations, the media, etc.

Many outreach programs that have the greatest impact at the national level may well be

---

20. Again, this is not an argument against working at the state and national levels, say, through disciplinary organizations, such as the national (or state level) Council for Social Studies, to promote internationalizing of the curricula. Such outreach endeavors can be effective, but research on teaching strongly suggests that successful changes in teaching are most easily achieved through direct contact with teachers (long-term in-service and institutes).

locally or regionally focused, but serve as models for adoption nationally.

## VI. Additional Issues

This paper cannot address, even in minimal detail, all of the issues related to the development and administration of effective international outreach endeavors at Title VI centers. In this final section I would like to briefly address a few issues for consideration:

- **Financing Outreach.** A strong argument can be made that, given the importance of outreach, IEGPS, centers, and universities should allocate more funds to outreach endeavors. However, given the budgetary realities and the legitimate needs of other center activities, it is not realistic to expect higher levels of funding. Consequently, outreach programs, if they are to have impact, will have to actively seek alternative sources of funding. There are two methods of raising additional funds for outreach, which while promising are also problematic:

- *External grants.* a number of outreach programs have received external funding for outreach activities. Grants can facilitate wonderful outreach initiatives, and should be cautiously pursued. However, grant monies in outreach are usually for special programs and are not aimed at increasing the institutional capacity to do sustained outreach. Consequently, once the project is completed there is usually no internal capacity to sustain the project. Moreover, grant seeking, writing, and subsequent administration demands a huge time commitment on the part of outreach professionals. Without adequate university/center commitment to outreach in terms of personnel, it is impossible to obtain and administer outreach grants.

- *Fee for service.* In order to fund outreach activities, centers are increasingly offering outreach services on a fee-for-service basis. This system works very well in situations in which the “client” is anxious for the service and has the ability to pay. CIBERs, for example, have been able to develop extensive and comprehensive programs for target members of the business community on a fee-for-service basis. Educators, on the other hand, at both the K-12 and undergraduate level, are frequently receptive to outreach initiatives, but are often unable to pay for the services rendered. Consequently, centers which have traditionally reached out to the educational community are faced with a dilemma of providing services to only those school districts or colleges that are able to pay for services, and discontinuing services to less well-endowed institutions.

- **Outreach to Local, State, and National Government Agencies.** A number of CIBER centers, at times in association with area studies centers, have developed innovative linkages with state level international business offices, providing consultation on international trade.<sup>22</sup> Area studies centers, however, have been less successful in engaging state and local agencies which have international responsibilities. In this age of “globalization” it is imperative that governmental agencies, which have responsibility for establishing and administering international policy, have access to the tremendous expertise that resides within the associated faculty of Title VI centers. Serious exploration of ways in which we constructively engage these agencies should be a priority of Title VI centers.

- **Niche or “Targeted” Outreach.** The current reality in most Title VI centers prescribes multilevel and multiple outreach endeavors. Some centers have attempted to

---

21. An example of this is the nationally recognized International Business Academy sponsored by MSU-CIBER. This innovative program brings together representatives from five to six midsize Michigan businesses for monthly day-long sessions over a semester. This program, while certainly a national model, is effective only at the state or local level.

---

22. For example, the MSU CIBER, with assistance from the MSU Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, has worked closely with the International Trade Office of the Michigan Department of Commerce in promoting trade relations with Mexico.

engage in numerous outreach endeavors even though they do not have adequate human or financial resources to adequately support them. Consequently, the majority of the attempted programs do not succeed, leaving a negative “after-taste,” both to the client and to the center staff, with the unintentional consequence of reenforcing negative attitudes toward outreach.

A more positive strategy for a center where outreach is understaffed and underfunded would be to develop an outreach niche for the center and target resources to this activity. Such a strategy is likely to result in positive outreach experiences which can be used as capital to slowly invest in an expanding outreach program.

- **Outreach to “Nontraditional” Clients.** With the exception of CIBERs, which have a natural client in the business community, and NFLRCs, which have a target outreach clientele among foreign language teachers, Title VI centers have not attempted to service communities with which they may have a thematic or regional connection. Some area studies centers, the largest set of Title VI institutions, for example, have not attempted to cultivate relationships within the U.S. ethnic or “heritage” communities whose ancestors (distant and immediate) migrated from the regions they study.

I would suggest that while our mandate stipulates that we provide outreach programming to all U.S. communities, regardless of ethnic or regional heritage, it would be mutually beneficial to explore linkages with these communities.<sup>23</sup> In addition to providing scholarly affirmation for the richness of their history and sociocultural heritage, such linkages have the potential of developing important grassroots (at local and national level) support for National Resource Centers.

Another important population which has not been traditionally serviced by the out-

---

23. This suggestion in no way negates our obligation to do outreach to the wider American community. Indeed, for almost all regions represented by Title VI National Resource Centers, the “majority” culture desperately needs a clearer understanding and appreciation of Africa, Asia, Latin America, etc.

reach endeavors of Title VI centers are Americans who live in rural areas. Computer technology as it becomes more readily available in rural areas will provide a medium through which centers can provide service to these communities. However, technology alone is not sufficient. Centers, particularly those at land-grant universities, should explore opportunities to collaborate with existing university-based structures of outreach such as 4-H Clubs, and university-based state extension services.<sup>24</sup>

- **Outreach through Continuing Education Programming.** Most universities that host Title VI centers have continuing education programs which provide off-campus credit courses for “nontraditional” students. International centers should explore the possibility of offering international and foreign language courses to this growing community of adult students.<sup>25</sup>

## Conclusion

Within the greater Title VI community there is a clear and strong consensus that the United States is not adequately prepared to meet the economic (competitiveness and sustainable development), political (security, democratization, and peace keeping), social (meeting and maintaining an adequate standard of living), and cultural (sociocultural fissures, “universalization of knowledge) challenges of globalization. This consensus further recognizes that the academy has a central role to play and a social responsibility to address this need.

---

24. David Hansen, associate dean of agriculture, Ohio State University, for example, is very keen in exploring ways in which Title VI centers can provide services to rural communities through collaboration with university-based outreach structures, such as extension services.

25. For example, Robert Lapiner, dean of Continuing Education at UCLA, orally indicated that UCLA offers a wide variety of international and language courses to nontraditional students through their continuing education program. He indicated that in developing these courses he has worked closely with the faculty of the international centers at UCLA.

Traditionally the academy has confronted societal crises and needs through the production and dissemination of knowledge necessary to ameliorate problems. Internationalists within U.S. academies feel confident that provided adequate resources we can bring to bear our considerable intellectual resources to address the challenges of globalization through research (producing new knowledge), graduate education (training new internationally competent researchers), and undergraduate education (training of globally competent citizens). However, to adequately prepare U.S. citizens, businesses, educators, and institutions of the state (local, state, and national level) and civil society to face the challenges and take advantage of the opportunities of globalization, it will be imperative for internationalists within the academy to reach out beyond the traditional confines of scholarship.

As argued above, the challenges of globalization provides the academy with an obligation and an opportunity to reconnect with the public through the effective provision of outreach services that will assist individual Americans, as well as institutions in the private, civil, and public sectors, to develop the level of global competency necessary to realize international security and prosperity.

## References

- Boyer, Ernest. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Federal Register*. 1996. "Federal Regulations for Higher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Language Training and Area Studies." *Federal Register* 61, no. 186 (September 24): 50193.
- Groennings, Sven, and David Wiley, eds. 1990. *Group Portrait: Internationalizing the Disciplines*. New York: American Forum for Global Education.
- Heginbotham, Stanley. 1994. "Rethinking International Scholarship: The Challenge of Transition from the Cold War Era." *Items* (Social Science Research Council) 48: 2-3.
- Lynton, Ernest. 1992. "Scholarship Recognized." Unpublished manuscript submitted to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Michigan State University. 1993. *University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society*. A report by the Provost's Committee on University Outreach, East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University (October).

## **Breakout 2, Rapporteur**

# **Challenges for Title VI Programs of Outreach in Foreign Language and International Studies**

Cynthia P. Williams

University of Wisconsin, Madison

The objective of this session was to define outreach needs more clearly and to develop strategies to meet these needs.

### **What Is Outreach?**

While outreach has not been clearly defined by the Department of Education, in the academy it has traditionally been defined as service to the department or campus. Our group agreed with a definition developed by Michigan State University that outreach involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of audiences external to the university. The group agreed that there is a need for Title VI centers to reach across boundaries within the academy, but decided that this was “in-reach” not “outreach.”

### **What Is the Role of Outreach?**

Outreach should help address the international needs of the community at large. The major role of outreach is to enhance competitiveness in a global era by creating a more internationally knowledgeable citizenry, including K-12 students, business leaders, professionals, media, etc. CIBERs have been very useful in helping area programs gain access to a business audience.

### **What Audiences Should Outreach Target?**

The group agreed that there are multiple audiences for outreach, including both those traditionally targeted by area studies, and groups not generally served by Title VI. There was a general consensus that broadening outreach to serve new constituent groups is important to building a broader base of understanding of, and support for, international education.

Groups traditionally served by Title VI include:

- K-12 teachers;
- Popular and news media;
- Higher education community (especially community colleges);
- General public (community groups).

Several members of the group noted that the language and culture mandate in *Goals 2000* is having a very positive impact on internationalizing K-12, and demand for outreach to this group is expected to continue to rise. However, the group agreed that not all outreach should be K-12, and suggested a variety of groups that Title VI might try to reach.

Groups traditionally targeted less by Title VI outreach include:

- Business;
- Public agencies;
- Ethnic communities;

- Professional groups (nurses, law enforcement, social workers, etc.);
- Agricultural and rural communities;
- Informal education for K-12 such as 4-H, FFA, Girl and Boy Scouts, etc.

The concept of informal education for the K-12 group was viewed as having the potential for strong impact, particularly if materials can be developed for distribution by national associations.

The group noted that, given limited resources, not all institutions will be able to serve all of these audiences, and the major focus for outreach should be determined based on the specifics of the university involved. Collaboration both within and among institutions was seen as increasingly important in reaching these various audiences. It was suggested that specialized outreach “niches” should be developed to utilize resources effectively and avoid duplication of effort.

The group also discussed the need to serve these audiences at different levels, including local, state, and national. The use of new technology was viewed as an important new tool for reaching these various levels. Materials made available on the Internet can be utilized by multiple groups at low cost. For example, Michigan State University’s African Studies Program is developing a site on the World Wide Web that will describe the content of audio visual materials involving Africa and note the appropriate age group and usefulness for teaching purposes. This site will be accessible to teachers from around the state as well as nationally, and should reduce the time required to answer individual inquiries.

There was considerable discussion of the possibilities for working with extension or continuing education to reach new audiences, such as rural communities and agriculture. Extension has considerable experience in developing specialized materials for these groups, and infrastructure that Title VI lacks for offering training programs. For example, UCLA continuing education offers a number of LCTLs to large numbers on a fee-for-service basis. While some mem-

bers of the group expressed concern about moving toward fee-for-service programs, there was agreement that Title VI should explore this option.

## The Problematic of Outreach

Outreach is not highly valued within the academy, especially at research-oriented institutions. Title VI needs to do a better job of connecting outreach to the core mission of the university—the production and dissemination of knowledge. This is easier to do in professional schools, which have a history of working with “client” groups, than with humanities and social science faculty which make up the core of NRCs.

Issues to be considered in strengthening outreach:

- Increase use of technology such as the World Wide Web as a cost-effective way to reach a broader audience.
- Collaborate in outreach between area studies on a single campus, between area studies and CIBERs, and between area studies on different campuses. For example, community college programs on a theme with collaboration by different regional programs have been very successful.
- Explore ways that Title VI can utilize extension or continuing education programs on their campus to reach new or broader audiences. These programs have created the infrastructure to reach various audiences (community groups, rural populations, etc.) and have marketing expertise that most area programs lack.
- Explore new sources of support for outreach, including fee-for-service, grants, business, etc.
- Consider developing “niche” markets rather than trying with inadequate human and financial resources to serve too many groups.