

I. Conference Overview Papers

[18--THIS PAGE IS BLANK]

Overview 1

Charge of the Conference

Miriam A. Kazanjian

Coalition for International Education

I have been asked to provide the conference charge today. I will cover three areas: background information/history leading up to the conference, conference parameters and goals, and organization of the conference.

Background

As many know, this conference is the product of a seven-year evolution. In the two decades prior to 1990, the HEA-Title VI and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) community experienced a long history of internal conflict in which disparate groups approached the U.S. Congress with conflicting proposals. The long-term result was an erosion of overall funding. In 1990 one national higher education presidential association launched an effort to end the historic infighting over Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges successfully achieved consensus within its constituents on policy issues surrounding the last reauthorization of Title VI. With that success as an example, the effort was broadened to include five other higher education presidential associations: the American Council on Education, the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, and the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. Over time, through much negotiation and many compromises on all sides, seventeen additional higher education organizations, each with a particular interest in Title VI/Fulbright programs,

joined the effort now known as the Coalition for International Education. The predominant motivational theme was, “a rising tide lifts all boats.”

The accomplishments of the consensus approach have been significant. For example, in the last Title VI reauthorization nearly all of the associations’ proposed statutory amendments were enacted into law. Since our efforts began in 1990, Title VI funding has increased nearly \$20 million, or 60 percent. In the early years of the Clinton Administration, the Coalition worked to see that these programs remained on the radar screen for policymakers in the Department of Education, and were not eliminated or drastically reduced under reinventing government and budget reduction initiatives. More recently, support from key congressional members ensured that these programs were saved from attempts to eliminate them in the last U.S. Congress.

Today, the Coalition for International Education is a successful ad hoc group of twenty-five diverse national higher education organizations and is still evolving. It operates without a formal organization per se, or bureaucracy. The groups meet once or twice a year to achieve consensus on whatever Title VI/Fulbright-Hays issues are at hand. Although the Coalition’s organizational representatives have met on numerous occasions and work together on common goals, this marks the first time in the long history of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays that a meeting of the broad spectrum of higher education constituents is being convened to discuss policy issues related to all thirteen programs.

The idea for the conference came about after the last U.S. Congress threatened to eliminate

Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs. New congressional leadership in the House of Representatives asked pointed questions about their organization and structure, and the continuation of federal responsibility in a new era. Working closely with Coalition constituents, we were able to convince key members of Congress to save them because of their continuing importance to U.S. national security and global economic leadership. But their questions, as unwelcome as they may have been to the international education community, prompted a realization that after more than thirty-five years of existence and vast changes in our domestic as well as global landscape, it is time for the community, together with the Department of Education, to take stock of how well these programs are serving our national interests. As we begin this task, let me make five brief observations as backdrop to our discussions:

1. Title VI/Fulbright-Hays continue to be among the most significant federal programs supporting the development and maintenance of a higher education infrastructure that produces the nation's expertise in foreign languages, area, and other international studies, including, in more recent years, international business.
2. Since 1990, we have seen a nearly \$20 million or 60 percent increase in Title VI funding. Despite the increase, funding has not kept up with inflation as compared to a relatively high funding point in the late 1960s. Fulbright-Hays unfortunately has not seen a significant increase since the early 1980s. Table 1 illustrates the point more dramatically.
3. In roughly the last two decades, increasing responsibilities have been placed on these programs without commensurate increases in funding, causing strains on the programs, not to mention fractures within the international education community, as increasing numbers of constituencies battled over a shrinking pie. For example, in 1958 the original NDEA Title VI began with three or four programs; today, HEA-Title VI contains eleven authorized programs, nine of which are funded. (Please see Table 1.)
4. The depth and breadth of demands for internationalization within the academy (and without, for that matter) are increasing at a time of severe budgetary constraints on all

levels, creating conditions for future conflict among diverse higher education sectors.

5. The community continues to be faced with uncertainty about the very survival of these programs in the 105th Congress: Title VI with the upcoming reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and perhaps Fulbright-Hays with the Administration's review of all Fulbright programs.

With these points in mind, I believe the future of these programs hinges on the ability of the higher education community to achieve a clear vision of Title VI/Fulbright's place in this new global era, and most importantly, to continue to strive for consensus on whatever challenges are confronted along the way.

Conference Parameters and Goals

Next I will describe the parameters and goals we have set for our scope of work in the next day and a half.

This conference was conceived and designed to be an education policy conference prepared by and for the academic community. Its purpose is to conduct a discussion within the academic community, intended to raise the collective level of understanding and awareness among various higher education sectors about issues in international education and the role of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs.

Conference planners have set at least five specific goals, as follows:

- To identify and substantiate continuing and emerging national needs in international education in a new global era;
- To discuss the role of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays in addressing these national needs;
- To identify a set of issues to be considered for strengthening Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs to enhance their effectiveness;
- To clarify and discuss ways of improving the synergy among the various Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs to better achieve their collective mission;
- To publish the papers and proceedings of the conference.

It is my strong hope that this group will be able to continue the Coalition for International Education's momentum of consensus as we try to achieve these goals in the next day and a half.

Our challenge is not without caveats. Boundaries are set to ensure that we do not engage in what could be construed as lobbying activities. This is especially important since the conference has received support from the U.S. Department

Table 1. Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs at a Glance

Title VI Programs		Fulbright-Hays Programs	
National Resource Centers		Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Program	
Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships		Faculty Research Abroad Program	
International Research and Studies Program		Group Projects Abroad Program	
Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs		Special Bilateral Projects (Seminars Abroad Program)	
Language Resource Centers			
American Overseas Research Centers			
Centers for International Business Education and Research			
Business and International Education Projects			
Institute for International Public Policy			
Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Funding Profile This Decade (in millions, rounded)			
Fiscal Year	Title VI	Fulbright	Combined Total
1990	34.7	5.1	38.9
1991	40.0	5.9	45.9
1992	47.5	6.0	53.5
1993	49.3	5.3	55.1
1994	53.3	5.8	59.1
1995	53.3	5.8	59.1
1996	51.4	4.7	56.1
1997	54.5	5.3	59.8
Title VI and Fulbright Historical Funding Trend from High Point in the 1960s Adjusted for inflation (in millions, rounded)			
	FY 1967*	FY 1995*	% Difference
Title VI	64.2	53.3	-17
Title VI (original 3 programs**)	64.2	35.2	-45
Fulbright-Hays	13.8	5.8	-56
* In constant 1995 dollars.			
** NRCs, FLAS, research.			
SOURCE: Based on data from the U.S. Department of Education.			

of Education, and since the term “lobbying activities” has been broadened in the recent Lobby Disclosure Act. Therefore, the following activities are out of bounds at this conference:

1. Discussion of or recommendations on specific legislative, report, or regulatory language, or individual program funding issues;
2. Identification, planning for, or coordination of lobbying contacts; and
3. Use of the documents developed in this conference for the purpose of making lobbying contacts.

Tempting as it may be with reauthorization in sight to propose specific legislation, the focus of discussion should stay within the boundaries. Be assured that the Coalition has put into place a process by which the issues identified in the next day and a half will be considered in Title VI’s reauthorization. Under the auspices of the American Council on Education and with the involvement of the Coalition, a Title VI Reauthorization Task Force has been formed, representative of twenty-six national higher education organizations. The Task Force will consider and strive for consensus on proposed statutory language changes, as well as any other policy and strategic issues that need to be brought to the attention of U.S. Congress and the U.S. Department of Education.

Organization of the Conference Program

The conference was organized through consultations with representatives of the Coalition organizations and suggestions from the U.S. Department of Education, with opportunity provided to

all segments of the Title VI community to be heard. The schedule is organized into five main segments. The first is the overview panel to set out the parameters and provide background information. This will be followed by another plenary session to hear and discuss five papers addressing international education issues covering the broad sweep of higher education.

During the third segment of the conference, the conferees will break into ten groups to focus on more specific areas. Papers have been prepared for some of these groups, and for others, talking points and/or survey results. Abstracts can be found in your conference packets, and the papers can be obtained from the authors. We would like each of the breakout groups to identify issues that need to be addressed in their focus areas.

The fourth segment, on Saturday morning, will be presentation of the reports from the focus groups and discussion in plenary session. In the final plenary session we will consider a synthesis of the conference presented by our conference rapporteur, David Wiley of Michigan State University.

Acknowledgments

On behalf of the Coalition for International Education, I would like to extend our deep appreciation to the conference planners, authors, chairs, group rapporteurs, and conference rapporteur, David Wiley; to UCLA Dean John Hawkins and Assistant Dean Carlos Haro and staff for their hospitality and organization of the conference logistics; and to the U.S. Department of Education officials for their support and counsel.