

## Overview 2

# The History of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays

Richard D. Scarfo

United States Department of Education

This meeting has been convened to discuss issues which are important to all of you as well as us in the Department of Education as we look toward the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. As we develop plans and strategies for reauthorization, it is appropriate to look at the past and examine the origins and purposes of Title VI and how it has developed over these almost forty years.

## **Beginnings in 1958**

The national Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed by the U.S. Congress in August 1958 and signed into law by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1958. In passing NDEA, Congress recognized that the defense and security of the nation were inseparably bound with education.

Title VI of NDEA was titled "Language Development" and was composed of two parts, Part A, entitled "Centers and Research and Studies," and Part B, "Language Institutes." Part A authorized three programs: Centers, Fellowships, and Research and Studies.

Initial support began in academic year 1959–60 when \$3.5 million was appropriated with \$500,000 each going to Centers and Fellowships and the remaining \$2.5 million allocated to Research and Studies. The reason for this level of allocation was simply the pressing need for basic preparation, which had to be done before any substantial improvement could be made in language instruction.

In 1959, the Commissioner of Education, on the basis of a report prepared by the American

Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), designated six critical languages: Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Hindi-Urdu, Portuguese, and Russian as requiring primary emphasis; 18 other languages as second priority emphasis; and 59 additional languages as third priority emphasis. Since the original emphasis of Title VI was on foreign language instruction rather than area studies, support for courses other than language, while authorized, was given a secondary role.

In the first year of the program, contracts were let to support nineteen centers based on each institution's potential resources for teaching these languages which were needed for government, business, industry, and education, and for which adequate instruction was not available. Fellowships in the first year were made to 171 students studying the six priority languages. Fellows were selected based on recommendations submitted by the institutions.

Twenty research projects were funded in that first year; six were studies and surveys, six were on more effective methods of language teaching, and eight were for the development of teaching materials.

Part B of Title VI had as its primary goal to provide for advanced training of elementary and secondary language teachers or teacher trainers. Such training was carried out through short-term and regular session institutes. Sixteen such institutes were conducted in 1959, training 930 teachers of French, German, Spanish, and Russian at a cost of \$1.5 million.

During the second year of the program, the number of centers increased to 46, and 472 fellowships were awarded. Ninety-five new

research projects were supported, and 37 summer institutes and 5 academic-year institutes received funding under Part B, training 2,130 teachers.

During the first four years of operation, appropriations increased each year and by fiscal year 1963, the number of centers had reached 55, fellowships went to 904, and 33 contracts were issued for research and studies projects. The Part B language institutes had increased to 83, training more than 4,300 teachers. It is interesting to note that the language institutes received \$7.25 million and the other three programs a total of \$7.97 million.

At this same time and largely through the efforts of Senator Fulbright, the Congress passed the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays Act). Section 102 of the act authorized a wide range of cultural, technical, and educational interchange activities, but one section, 102(b)(6), focussed exclusively on strengthening education in the fields of foreign languages and area studies throughout the American educational system. Given the nature of that focus, President Kennedy issued an executive order assigning the functions authorized by Section 102(b)(6) to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which at that time had statutory responsibility for domestic education matters.

There was a general concurrence by HEW, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of State, and Senator Fulbright that 102(b)(6) was to add an overseas dimension to the Title VI programs.

While Section 102(b)(6) contains no specificity as to programs, but rather speaks of support to visits and study in foreign countries by American teachers and prospective teachers, the department established and continues to administer four distinct programs: Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA), Faculty Research Abroad (FRA), Group Projects Abroad (GPA), and Seminars Abroad (SA).

I think it important to note in this chronology that in 1966 Congress passed the International Education Act (IEA), authorizing a broader federal role in international education, which would have encompassed the Title VI programs, but would also have permitted centers that focused on functional fields or issues that transcended individual countries or regions. Congress also intended that professional schools be included in international activities beyond the traditional

base of humanities and the social sciences. Finally, the IEA was aimed at expanding the groups affected by federal support beyond the training of specialists to include generalists at the undergraduate level.

No funds were ever appropriated for the IEA, but some of its provisions were enacted into Title VI under later reauthorizations.

## **First Efforts to Cut Title VI**

For the first ten years, Title VI support was steadily increased and by the late 1960s the number of centers had grown to 106. But in the early 1970s, the Administration of President Nixon made the first of several attempts to reduce funding for Title VI and ultimately phase out the program. Their rationale was that Title VI had succeeded in meeting the urgent need for highly trained specialists and the continuing need would be filled by individuals sufficiently motivated to pursue studies in these fields without a special federal program. Furthermore, the federal share of center support was only 10 percent and the institutions should now be able to assume the full cost.

The academic community moved vigorously to counter these arguments and academics working in the Nixon Administration, most notably Henry Kissinger and Daniel Moynihan, worked with university presidents to convince President Nixon to change his position on Title VI. In addition, Congress continued to appropriate funds for Title VI, despite the Administration's attempts to eliminate it.

In the early 1970s, the Office of Education saw the lower appropriation levels as an opportunity to redirect the programs. The number of centers was cut in half, a three-year competitive cycle for centers was established, centers focusing on Western Europe and functional topics were funded, a two-year seed money program was established to internationalize general undergraduate curricula, and centers were required to spend part of their Title VI funds on outreach activities beyond the centers' immediate faculty and student population. There was a belief that such changes would make the program less vulnerable by broadening the constituency for Title VI beyond the major research institutions.

When Title VI was reauthorized in 1976, the undergraduate program was codified in the statute along with a new provision (Section 603) entitled "Citizen Education." This program was to promote a general awareness of and education about global issues of "pressing domestic consequence." It was funded for the first time in 1979, but subsequently this provision was eliminated from Title VI and the authority for this type of activity was provided for in the Elementary and Secondary Act through general education grants to state and local education agencies.

In the next reauthorization, in 1980, a new Part B of Title VI provided for grants on a matching basis for business and international education programs. This addition reflected a judgment that federal support for international education should address economic productivity and international economic competition as well as foreign policy and national security interests. It was also a result of the 1980 reauthorization that Title VI of NDEA became Title VI of the Higher Education Act.

The 1986 reauthorization of Title VI further expanded the authority through a new Section 603 program for a "small number of national language resource and training centers" to improve the national capacity to teach and learn foreign languages in an effective manner.

In addition, a new Section 605 authorized Summer Language Institutes for advanced language students and professional development of pre-service and in-service language teachers.

Finally, the 1986 reauthorization provided a Section 607 Foreign Periodicals Program for the acquisition of and access to periodicals and other materials published outside the United States.

In 1988, under separate legislation, Part B of Title VI was amended to include the Centers for International Business Education Program to provide for support to centers as national resources in teaching improved techniques, strategies, and methodologies in international business, instruction in critical foreign languages, and other fields to better understand U.S. trading partners, and to conduct research and training in international aspects of trade and commerce.

Finally, the last reauthorization of Title VI in 1992 added two new activities: Section 610, the American Overseas Research Centers, which authorized support to operate centers which had been established abroad by consortia of higher education institutions to promote research and exchange in language and area studies. At the same time, a new Part C was added, the Institute for International Public Policy, whose goal is to increase awareness of and interest in careers in international service among undergraduate students who are members of underrepresented minority groups.

From the original four programs authorized by Title VI of NDEA almost forty years ago, we now have eleven programs, nine of which are funded along with the four programs currently conducted under the Fulbright-Hays authority.

I believe the strong, unwavering support of the academic community has been the critical factor in the growth of and success of Title VI. We in the department look forward to working with you as we move through the reauthorization process.