

IV. Conference Rapporteur's Synthesis

[212-THIS PAGE IS BLANK]

International Education in the National Interest

Conference Rapporteur's Synthesis of the Findings of the National Policy Conference on Title VI of the Higher Education Act and Fulbright-Hays Programs

David Wiley

Michigan State University

Abstract

This conference was a unique effort by the education community in the United States to assess an almost forty-year history of the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs and their relevance to the needs of the nation and its peoples in the twenty-first century. This report summarizes the purposes and parameters of the conference, some of the salient findings of scholars analyzing the Title VI effort in preparatory papers for the conference, proposals for changes in Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs and directions, and the discussions of the participants in the conference plenaries and breakout sessions.

Conference Goals and Parameters

The goal of the conference, as suggested by Professor JoAnn McCarthy (Plenary Paper 2), was to consider—like Janus, the backward- and forward-looking Roman God of Portals—where we have been and where we are going in order to reassess how these two important federal programs can serve better the needs of the United States and, indeed, of humanity.

This conference was organized specifically to assess the relevance to national interests of the international education policy of the United States as embodied in the federal programs of Title VI of the Higher Education Act and Fulbright-Hays Section 102(b)(6) (hereafter labeled Title VI/Fulbright programs). The conference

aimed to examine the continuing and emerging national needs for international education in an era of globalization, to discuss the role of Title VI/Fulbright in addressing these needs, to discern ways to enhance the effectiveness of these programs, and to identify synergies of these programs in achieving their collective mission.

The conference did not consider specific recommendations on legislation, report or regulatory language, or any plans for reauthorization or appropriations for Title VI or other legislation. In fact, the goals of the meeting were much broader—to assess first the changes in the foreign areas and the global system, in higher education, and in the economy and politics of the United States, and then to appraise the relevance of U.S. international education programs in addressing the emerging realities that will shape the nation in the twenty-first century.

A. The Challenges and New Possibilities of Globalization

In surveying the new situation of the United States at the turn of the millennium, these faculty and administrators gathered at the UCLA conference from the nation's leading universities were struck by the rapid panoply of changes that have transformed the nation, by the mounting need in the U.S. for international knowledge, and, hence, the nationally strategic role of foreign language and international studies programs of Title VI. In the post-cold war years, global change is rippling throughout the world systems and the United States, creating a myriad of transformations. These changes challenge the answers developed in the past by our domestic institutions of society, economy, and technology. But simultaneously, they open the door to many new possibilities for improving qualities of life and even sustainable development.

Technologically, a dizzying array of changes is engulfing and empowering us. The technologies of knowledge through the computer, the Internet, and the World Wide Web are facilitating an explosion of information from distant corners of the globe. Suddenly, there is a new presence of international communities in our homes, our businesses, our unions, our schools, and our daily lives. The foreign areas studied by Title VI centers and programs no longer are so distant, and the pace of change abroad has accelerated measurably. As a result, our Title VI National Resource Centers (NRCs) have new opportunities to communicate with our international study areas and to reach out with information and understanding for the American public.

Politically, the cold war is over, and U.S. national security policy has shifted from a bipolar concentration on military power to a multipolar focus on economic strength through linkages across the global trading system, the world regions, and 170 separate nations. Now, the dominance of some older powers dwindles, new nations are rising, and new global identities are emerging as an international culture appears alongside local religious and ethnic identities. The U.S. military is stretched to face new issues of nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and a global purview. U.S. security agencies are faced with the international threats of political and white collar corruption, organized and random crime, and the spread of the drug business. The new

U.S. focus on democracy and human rights systems abroad demands an acute understanding of the social and political institutions of civil society abroad which support or erode democratic reforms. All these issues require new knowledge of foreign peoples and their languages, cultures, economies, religions, and governments.

Economically, the market liberalization and the burgeoning pace and scale of international trade and financial flows create new possibilities and deep turbulence in corporate ownership, labor relations, and the wealth and power of companies and nations. In new ways, our economy is intertwined with other powerful competitors and partners and with the emerging new markets. In the decades ahead, U.S. trade is expected to grow most *not* with our older European trading partners but with China, India, Indonesia, South Korea, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, South Africa, Poland, and Turkey. This new interdependence brings the possibility for new strength with it, but also new vulnerability to each other's economic weaknesses, inflation, and depression.

Socially, there is deep and turbulent change across the globe. While the communications systems intermingle Western and non-Western cultures and customs, the globe is threatened in new ways by wasteful consumption, overpopulation, and environmental degradation on a global scale. The rapid travel and migration of humanity compact the global populations, make new interchange possible, and bring our cultures, our languages, our ethnic and religious conflicts, and our diseases to each other's communities.

B. The Needs of the Nation for an Altered International Knowledge System

As Burkart Holzner and Matthew Harmon asserted (Plenary Paper 1), this collection of changes that we term globalization is accelerating, and it is radically altering the national need for high quality knowledge concerning foreign areas and nations, foreign languages, and international systems. The nature, pace, and availability of knowledge about the foreign world has shifted.

First, in the past, the U.S. State Department, U.S. AID, DOD, and USIA have cared for most

U.S. foreign interests; now, nearly every federal agency is engaged with foreign issues and programs—from the departments of the Interior and Education to Health and Human Services and Commerce. These engagements require high quality validated knowledge about foreign societies of a magnitude and diversity not experienced before.

Second, an increasing number of agencies of government and businesses need personnel with global and foreign language competence and need access to expanding levels of knowledge provided ever more quickly. Global and area competence has immediate impacts as corporations cope with international industrial and quality standards, and multinational and multicultural firms and labor forces. As a result, they require new training for employees and validated foreign area information quickly. Ironically, as the Internet connects distant places, institutions, and scholars and as some types of information are more readily available, the demand on libraries for access to foreign publications also increases. This occurs just when U.S. university libraries are under increasing financial pressure. Indeed, even the Library of Congress and other U.S. national libraries need cooperation with the university international library collections which are linked to foreign area centers to supplement what they cannot afford to acquire.

Third, across the nation, universities, two- and four-year colleges, and schools understand the import of globalization, and they are endeavoring to increase the global competence of their graduates. The students (and their parents) are expecting new levels of international education, including access to study and internships abroad. Thus, institutions of higher education are under pressure to insert more international content in their curricula that address both global and foreign area issues, teach a broader array of needed languages, provide more programming and experiential learning abroad, and cover a wider array of foreign areas with faculty and library competence. Title VI center faculty and outreach programs are being pressed to provide expertise and graduates in support of these new demands.

Fourth, just when university budgets are under pressure for cost-effectiveness, streamlining, and reduction, university area and international studies centers simultaneously are under pressure to produce more with less—more spe-

cialists with M.A./M.S., MBA, and Ph.D. degrees who are competent on both area and global realities; more coverage of less commonly taught languages at multiple levels with very low enrollments; more consultation and outreach with schools and colleges that are internationalizing; new electronic access to area resources; new international content in general education, disciplinary, and graduate courses and seminars; better access for the nation to film, video, and digitized resources for instruction; and more.

Globalization also creates needs for new international specialties in such fields as international business, technology, environment, engineering, law, education, security, and public affairs studies. Demands also are made on the area studies scholars who now need to understand national and global change in their region, and globalists need to understand how global realities are refracted in quite different ways in particular nations and regions. Finally, many disciplines and professions that long held a domestic focus are having to cope with global and foreign realities, for which most graduate education did not prepare their faculties.

Fifth, foreign languages present peculiar problems. In an economy heavily dependent on information technologies for growth, foreign languages are uniquely important—for selling, interpreting and accessing, and shaping the technologies around the unique needs of foreign cultures. In a host of other commercial arenas, especially tourism, U.S. foreign language capacity affects productivity and growth. And an increasing number of Americans need foreign language for communicating with clients for whom English is a second or third language (see Rodriguez, Breakout Paper 5). U.S. language teaching methods in higher education need upgrading, access to the best technologies, and to increase the proportion of students who graduate with usable language skills (see Brecht and Walton, Plenary Paper 5).

C. Revisiting the History and Rationale for Title VI Programs for Foreign Language and International Studies

After reviewing the global and local changes confronting the nation, the conferees asked what

can be affirmed about Title VI programs in their present form, what is serving national interests only weakly or not at all, and, then, what changed emphases and new principles should be used in shaping the responses of the nation and the universities to the altered global order. Participants also asked what are the unique contributions that Title VI programs can make to leverage a more internationally intelligent, more language capable, and more creative nation of diverse peoples that more fully share the benefits of global engagement.

1. The Changes and the Constants in Title VI Programs

Several conferees chronicled the many changes in the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs over almost four decades. These programs have:

- developed more than one hundred National Resource Centers (NRCs) and related programs from an original nineteen area centers in 1959, now providing more foreign language capacity and international or area studies training than any other nation;
- innovated over the years to support new forms of centers and programs as national resources, such as Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBERs), Language Resource Centers (LRCs), Overseas Research Centers (ORCs), business and international education programs, and undergraduate foreign language and international studies programs, as well as an institute (in the form of a consortium of universities) to increase the number of under-represented minorities in foreign service; and,
- refocused the centers and programs since the 1970s to provide outreach services directly to business, the federal government, state and local authorities, schools and colleges, the media, and the general public.

Others listed specific achievements of the Title VI centers and affiliated programs, including:

In foreign language capacity:

- created a national capacity for instruction in dozens of less commonly taught languages

(LCTLs) that is unrivaled in breadth in the globe. These university representatives were clear that most of the LCTLs would not be taught at all without the Title VI programs; and,

- developed new language-learning texts, pedagogies, and technologies.

In foreign language and area studies graduate education:

- trained most of the nation's graduate-level international expert scholars and professionals in foreign area studies with language competence; and,
- supported, and usually initiated, most of the intensive summer institutes in the LCTLs, both in the United States and abroad.

In producing the nation's corpus of international knowledge and understanding:

- generated deeply contextualized knowledge for the United States about foreign economies, governments, science, and societies through language and cultural immersion and through research founded on deep-seated links with foreign citizens, faculty, and higher education institutions;
- published, through center faculties and graduate students, a huge quantity of information and interpretation of the foreign world, constituting most of the monographs and journal articles on the culturally most distant societies of the non-Western world, including topics on democratization, economic development, market liberalization, techniques of foreign investment and trade, foreign affairs and policy, tropical disease, political and social histories, and environmental planning;
- engendered new research questions and tested theory in the social sciences about the nature of social, political, and economic change; and,
- produced an impressive body of innovative applied research on foreign areas in social and environmental impact analysis, applied and policy analysis, project assessment, participatory research, and development project design and assessment.

In building the national holdings of information on foreign areas:

- supported the assembling in the libraries associated with NRCs of huge repositories of documentation, monographs, and professional journals from foreign areas which complement the incomplete holdings of the Library of Congress and other national libraries.

In internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum across the United States:

- engendered many new experiments in foreign language pedagogy and in bringing area and global issues content into undergraduate courses in a broad array of two- and four-year institutions through the Title VI Undergraduate Foreign Language and International Studies Program and the outreach programs of the NRCs; and,
- supported consortia and extension of information on curricular innovation, film and video for use in the curriculum, and seminars and workshops for faculty enrichment.

In internationalizing the business education curricula and encouraging international business education research across the United States:

- supported projects under the Business and International Education Programs to internationalize the business education curricula of community colleges, and undergraduate and graduate schools of business; and
- created Centers for International Business Education and Research to infuse the business education curricula with critical foreign languages, area, and other international studies; to develop improved business techniques, strategies, and methodologies for transacting business in the global marketplace; and to conduct research and training in international business.

In serving the national needs by extending consultation and assistance directly to U.S. clients:

- encouraged the core Centers for International Business Education and Research and

the related International Business Programs to directly assist U.S. firms and the state and federal departments of commerce in trading, investing, and operating abroad; and,

- developed more than one hundred outreach programs through mandates to the NRCs to take area, international, and foreign language knowledge to government, K-12 schools and teachers, teacher education colleges, college and university faculty, libraries, business, journalists and the electronic media, and the general public.

In addressing the expanding needs for more diversity in the international professions, and for a better appreciation of the growing diversity of the nation's population:

- created the Institute for International Public Policy to encourage more African Americans and other underrepresented minorities to pursue international careers, and to assist minority-serving institutions to strengthen international affairs programs on campus; and
- provided the intellectual and cultural tools of Title VI centers and programs to understand the diverse heritage of the racial and ethnic groups in the United States that are projected to emerge as the nation's new majority in the twenty-first century.

2. Evaluating the Usefulness of Federal Support for International Education Programs

Over the years, many observers outside the U.S. international education community have asked how such significant and nationally strategic institutions, including so many centers and programs of high quality, were created with such small amounts of funding and with so small a staff to administer the programs of the U.S. Department of Education (US/ED). The character of the programs was analyzed to answer these questions.

The Federal Responsibility for National Competence in Foreign Language and International Studies and the University Partnership

Successive U.S. congresses and administrations have asserted that competence in foreign language and international knowledge is a federal responsibility—but implemented in partnership with the higher education community.

During the crises of World War II, the United States discovered that the key to its success as a global leader was first in mobilizing the science and technology capacity of the universities linked with the industrial capacity of the private sector under the leadership of the federal agencies. Simultaneously, as a global leader in the 1940s, the U.S. also realized the crucial importance for analyzing the foreign world and conducting diplomacy of mobilizing the foreign language capacity necessary to communicate with, and the area studies to understand, a wide array of other nations and peoples. As new levels of U.S. international leadership were required in the global devastation after World War II and as the cold war began soon thereafter, the pivotal relevance of language and area studies was reaffirmed for creating a strategic reservoir of competence necessary to address the matrix of nations (more than 150 by 1970) and institutions that confront the U.S. government, industry, and the private sector in working in a global economy and society.

The Federal Incentive System in Foreign Language and International Studies

In building national capacity in foreign language and international studies, the Congress and Administration did not use the command-and-control model of creating and funding all aspects of a program as the Defense Department did with military industries. Instead, the US/ED provided incentive funding that rewarded private and public university initiatives to respond to the national needs by investing in the labors of faculty and administrators, their programs, and their libraries for foreign language and international studies. Thus, by the 1980s, circa 95 percent of all funding for foreign language and international studies in the National Resource Centers was derived from the universi-

ties, with only 5 percent from the US/ED. (In the CIBERs and LRCs, as well, more university funding was invested than federal, although at not as high a ratio of match.) As a result, a broad array of programs was created with only a small investment where there was a clear consonance in university goals and national needs. In many of these universities, decisions were made to sacrifice other domestic and internal needs for faculty and academic programs in order to seek national standing in centers built around national needs for language and international studies.

Achieving the Highest Quality of Foreign Language and International Studies Programs through Merit-Based Competitions

From the beginning of Title VI the US/ED conducted merit-based competitions in awarding contracts for procurement. This US/ED practice established a norm that national status in a particular world area or topic (e.g., international studies, international business, or language resources) would be awarded to a particular university's center only after selection in peer-reviewed quality-rankings utilizing multiple criteria of excellence. Still today, in the competitions (usually triennial) the applicant centers are ranked on a dozen criteria by anonymous academic reviewers.

In spite of the relatively small amount of funding awarded a center, the national reputational status among faculty and students and the frequent re-competition is very important to universities in deciding whether to invest in new faculty positions, librarians, library holdings, and other resources for the study areas or fields. As a result, over almost four decades of such competitions, a number of area studies faculties have grown to more than one hundred faculty, a majority of whom are relatively full-time in their commitment to the area or field. This healthy competition has created the magnitude, depth, and programming that characterizes the NRCs, CIBERs, and LRCs today. In the other Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs all awards were made after national peer-review rankings based on merit as well. At the Los Angeles conference, participants reaffirmed this traditional Title VI emphasis on merit-based selection of grantees.

Education for the Diversity of U.S. International Knowledge and Language Capacity

The Title VI program has created and maintained the core of the U.S. national capacity in the less commonly taught languages, especially in the least available languages. Almost 100 percent of U.S. academic learners of Hindi, Uzbek, Kazakh, Hausa, Shona, Xhosa, Indonesian, and other least commonly taught languages are taught at Title VI centers. In the past decade, the end of the cold war, the rise of global trade, and the breadth of U.S. leadership has required the country to focus on a broader array of nations than before, and the Title VI programs have sought to respond to these needs with more diverse offerings.

D. New Needs for a New Century of U.S. Global Leadership

The conference was focused especially on the emerging changes in the world that require realignment of the resources and agendas of the higher education community as well as of the programs and resources of the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs. These shifts in the political and economic relationships of the United States in the global system require the universities to respond to the new needs in foreign language and international studies. At the UCLA conference, fifteen major emphases or foci emerged from the papers and discussions that are relevant to shaping the university and government responses to the new challenges of globalization in a post-cold war period.

Addressing the National Shortfall in Producing Language and Area Specialists

With a quadrupling of the proportion of GDP accounted for by foreign trade since the 1970s, the U.S. requires an increasing number of foreign language and area specialists. Professor Merckx (Plenary Paper 3) provided estimates of the shortfalls of specialists in foreign language and international or area specialists in universities as well as in government and corporations. If these needs are not addressed vigorously in the coming decade, the nation's corpus of inter-

national expertise will be in danger. With the current level of Title VI fellowships and faculty resources inadequate to even meet the universities' replacement needs, there is little capacity to broaden the training and analysis needed for the widening challenges in this era of globalization.

Ensuring Adequate Research and Studies on Language, Area, and International Studies Issues

Basic research for new knowledge is at the heart of the Title VI and university international education processes. The new rapidity of international change coupled with new electronic access to documentation accentuates the need for basic and applied research. Globalization does not mean "homogenization," and research on regional and national differences and on local knowledge remains important. A number of Title VI centers have developed innovative research-focused seminars for increasing the quality of graduate student research proposals and field-research performance. A nation such as the U.S. which is so dependent for economic success on information and information technologies needs to give greater attention to the care and feeding of the research institutions and the scholars who will keep valuable international analysis flowing.

Maintaining the Breadth of Area and International Studies Training in an Era of Specialization

In a period of disciplinary specialization and dominance of rational-choice models in the universities, area and international studies programs need to ensure that breadth of perspective and knowledge is maintained within disciplinary graduate degrees. Title VI must guard against simply supporting disciplinary biases that create narrow specialists who must be "retrained" by employers to achieve the needed breadth in order to fulfill crucial roles (see Merckx, Plenary Paper 3). There also was a strong affirmation at the conference for encouraging diversity, innovation, and experimental programs within centers instead of seeking to force all programs into standardized molds. Title VI resources cannot cope with all the needs of all U.S. educational institutions; therefore, centers should be encouraged to experiment on the cutting edges of inter-

national curriculum, research, and outreach—both to more systematically work toward nationally relevant and replicable models, as well as to institutionalize important innovations in instructional methods of internationalizing consciousness, language, experience, and knowledge. Experimenting with distance learning is important, especially in offering the LCTLs.

Bridging Regional and Functional Education: Linking the International Affairs Schools, Area Studies, and Other Academic Units

In the competition for funding and reputation in the financially constrained academic world, there has been too little cooperation among scholars who emphasize the context-based in-depth research of area studies (usually within the disciplines), more applied policy analysis, or foreign policy and international relations programs. In fact, the diversities of these types of scholarship provide fertile opportunities for mutually beneficial collaboration which extends the contributions of the full panoply of Title VI programs. The social science disciplines provide a theoretical guide for formulating research questions within the cultural contextualization of area studies. These then offer a theoretical background for policy analysis, which often offers new intellectual challenges for both area specialists and social scientists.

Universities need to give more attention to structuring opportunities for cooperation among these separate specializations, encouraging matrix degree programs in which graduate students obtain both a disciplinary masters and an area studies certificate or, at the Ph.D. level, in programs organized around cross-disciplinary or thematic concentrations. Further cooperation is needed to foster innovative comparative and interdisciplinary work across regions, disciplines, policy, and thematic areas. Title VI programs can facilitate this cross-field collaboration and innovation in pyramiding resources from its various programs.

The participants agreed that there are emerging needs for addressing broad cross-cutting themes and issues that can link the variety of Title VI programs and strengthen the resultant analysis. Similarly, both National Resource Centers and International Business Centers need greater cooperation in producing the gradu-

ates and the competencies needed in business and government. Area and international studies faculties also need to mount more joint training and research with natural science and professional school faculties.

Responding to New Foreign Language Needs

At least three factors of the post-cold war period are driving U.S. needs for a growing capacity in less commonly taught languages. First, widening U.S. economic interests in emerging markets, particularly the “big emerging markets” such as China, Brazil, Mexico, India, Indonesia, Korea, Poland, South Africa, and Turkey, are increasing the need for teaching less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). Second, as the U.S. assumes the role of broadened leadership in the world political and economic system, the scholarly analytical community needs language capacity for keeping abreast of and providing advanced analysis of a broadened list of countries. Third, the shifting sites of international crisis require national readiness and language capacity to deal with issues such as the Iran/Iraq, Bosnian, and other Middle East tensions; the panoply of problems in the former Soviet Republics; the response to the opening of Vietnam; the religious conflicts of Algeria, Egypt, and Sudan; the shifting politics of Cambodia; the internal convolutions of Peru and Colombia; human rights issues in many lands; and more.

For many key languages—in the Middle East, Africa, Europe, East and Southeast Asia, India, Pakistan, and even Latin America—there still is an enormous shortage of up-to-date teaching materials in both print and computer-assisted formats, particularly beyond the introductory level. Even basic reference materials have not been created for a number of the less commonly taught languages offered by some centers. Teacher training and development also are lacking. Increased coordination and collaboration among centers are required to meet these needs, particularly to develop instructional and assessment materials and to create the technology for language teaching and teacher training. Additional intensive summer language institutes are needed for the LCTLs in serving the broader needs of learners from across the nation.

Bringing Standards of Functional Learning for Fluency to Language Education

For too long, language education has been a stepchild to the literary and linguistics disciplines, and teaching personnel and program structures have not been oriented sufficiently toward functional literacy and fluency. The universities need a new commitment to language teaching methods that produce proficiency in the most efficient manner. Active cooperation among language specialists at all levels and in the universities and government are needed to ensure a broad and extensive national competency—including the Title VI NRCs, CIBERs, and Language Resource Centers, and the various language schools of the federal agencies.

There was a difference of opinion among the conferees about what should be the focus of the LRCs in the years ahead. On the one hand, many NRC directors and national language specialists complained about inadequate support of materials development for the languages of particular world areas and urged that the LRCs give special focus to those LCTL needs, which are the priority of the wider Title VI programs and reflect growing national strategic needs. On the other hand, several LRC directors said that their centers should focus primarily on general language learning research and methodologies, although not excluding the LCTLs. The issue remained unresolved.

With Title VI support, various university centers from the same world area which normally compete are uniting to offer intensive summer language institutes in both the U.S. and abroad that provide instruction in more languages than the same universities can support separately. These cooperative models lack sufficient financial support and fellowships for participants in the LCTLs. Nevertheless, the conference found that Title VI support was absolutely indispensable in maintaining the instruction that exists in LCTLs. Without this federal support, most of those language capacities in the country, even in the larger research universities, would wither.

Encouraging Immigrant, Gender, and Minority Diversity in International Education Programs

While international knowledge and participation often have been arenas of elite privilege in the U.S. and abroad, the conference reaffirmed

the emphasis on including previously excluded groups in programs, services, and participating personnel in Title VI programs, including immigrant heritage groups, minorities, women, and the poor.

The U.S. population is being transformed by the largest wave of immigration since the turn of the twentieth century. By the middle of the twenty-first century, ethnic or racial minorities will constitute more than half of the population, and they will be increasingly diverse. This growth of immigration makes the previous distinction between studies of overseas areas and ethnic or heritage communities less salient. Foreign area specialists can play an important role in addressing the challenges of the increasing diversity of the U.S. population. Both foreign and domestic policy can be made more intelligent by taking into account the multicultural realities abroad and in the U.S. domestic population. In addition, growing U.S. heritage communities can contribute to both international and multicultural education in a range of areas including research, teacher training, curricular development, public outreach, and language teaching. In those parts of the U.S. where heritage populations are particularly large, there are many cases of cooperation between area study faculties and U.S. ethnic communities. This cooperation results in deeper understanding of issues of international migration and its domestic and international impacts. (See Breakout Paper and Rapporteur's Report 9.)

Reaching the U.S. Undergraduate with International Education

The America 2000 Program calls for ensuring "that every American adult . . . has the skills necessary to compete in a global economy." The end of the cold war and economic globalization increase the importance of undergraduate international education. The U.S. is economically disadvantaged by having a labor force that is less literate in international understanding and multicultural skills as compared to many of its major competitors. These skills are needed for interacting not only with people from foreign countries but also the growing population of different heritages within the United States.

To achieve the internationalization needed by U.S. undergraduates, support is needed to develop cost-effective strategies, methods, and

materials. Faculty development is crucial to improving undergraduate education, and training programs must be structured to allow participation by community college faculty who teach half of the country's students in higher education. For instance, K-12 and undergraduate textbooks, general education, and disciplinary curricula need to be internationalized, and faculty in two- and four-year institutions need access to more advanced training (see McCarthy, Plenary Paper 2). New video and web-based materials are needed to visualize foreign areas and issues. New data is needed on the international competence of secondary students and undergraduates in language, area, and global issues. New models of language education are needed to develop proficiency that frequently is not now being achieved. New means are needed of incorporating international students and local immigrant minorities into the classroom and experiential learning.

In addition, international undergraduate education will be improved by developing partnerships with the private sector and government—in such areas as sharing technology, development projects, and internship programs. Title VI support should be flexible enough to allow longer commitments to ambitious projects; projects should be more carefully evaluated based on their outcomes; and exemplary projects and curricula should be shared.

Planning for Cooperation in Building the International Collections of the Nation's Libraries

No U.S. library or library system can cope with the national need for foreign holdings, especially in foreign language materials that are vital for research and teaching about foreign areas. This results from the simultaneous explosion of print and electronic publishing abroad, the surging costs of journals and monographs, unfavorable exchange rates, the high labor costs of cataloging, and the stagnating budgets of university libraries (see Jakubs and Magier, Breakout Paper 7). In this environment, library collections increasingly are coming to resemble each other, as all major university libraries struggle to maintain a "core" collection. A critical strategy to address these problems is to share the effort and expense of acquiring foreign materials, especially those in foreign languages, by coordinating

specialized collections at designated institutions that would be available broadly through interlibrary loan. The nation urgently needs a new plan of cooperation both among the university libraries associated with the NRCs, CIBERs, and LRCs and which engages the Library of Congress, National Agricultural Library, National Medical Library, Center for Research Libraries, and the many international collections of various federal agencies. Increasingly, the weaknesses of the nation's documentary capacity and the lack of a shared system of collection put at risk our intelligence about foreign nations, economies, and cultures. At the same time, the new electronic technologies open new opportunities for collaboration at home and abroad in collection development.

Strengthening the Capacity of Underrepresented Minorities to Pursue International Service Careers

Minorities and women are underrepresented in international relations professions. A growing diversity of women and minorities in the U.S. international affairs agencies can reflect both the true diversity of the United States and the principles of equity and democracy in our core national values. A more diverse foreign service also may increase our ability to understand culturally diverse countries and to deal effectively with populations of color in many regions of the world. Both greater financial support for educational programs and, especially, mentoring are needed to enable minorities and women to excel and advance in international fields. The discussants also felt that "capacity" needs to be built in graduate international affairs programs in minority institutions, which provide student trainees but themselves educate only a small fraction of international relations professionals. The discussants also noted that despite recent court decisions against affirmative action, the universities need to commit themselves to including the greatest number possible of minority and female students in international education programs.

Providing Experience Abroad for Faculty and Students

Creating the nation's next generation of foreign language, area, and international studies

experts is not possible without immersion and renewing of research experience and language proficiency abroad. A major increase is needed in the capacity of the nation to give its students and faculty the international experience requisite to language fluency and currency of international knowledge. Fulbright-Hays programs provide the complementary overseas experience to Title VI domestic programs. Participants provided ample evidence of the great value of this program, even though the number of awards is small and decreasing in recent years due to a significant erosion of funding. Fulbright-Hays programs are well positioned to provide support for student and faculty experience and research abroad if adequately funded.

The one specifically Title VI program for U.S. centers abroad is the American Overseas Research Centers program. These centers provide fellowships and practical assistance to U.S. scholars, organize seminars, and encourage collaboration with scholars in the host country. Session members suggested that this program provides useful support to established scholars and that there is potential for increased scholarly collaboration between these Overseas Research Centers and Title VI National Resource Centers.

Finally, a new interest in study abroad among American undergraduates and their families is challenging universities and national structures to develop the linkages and exchange programs abroad and the intensive language education at home to offer these crucial international experiences. Programs to provide internships and experiential learning abroad are needed at new levels by students in business, engineering, medicine, agriculture, and a variety of other professional colleges, but participants acknowledged that Title VI does not have the funding capacity to address these expanding needs. On campus, much work is needed in integrating study abroad learning with the domestic curriculum. Other challenges include how to diversify the access of students who are ethnic minorities, women, or poor; how to deal with the complex issues of curriculum and security abroad; and how to encourage study and provide new programs in non-Western countries. (See Holzner and Harmon, Plenary Paper 1.)

Strengthening Linkages with International Education Communities Abroad

To be effective in building U.S. libraries and foreign area knowledge, Title VI programs need to place more emphasis on linkages abroad, building more collaboratively with the scholars and institutions in the foreign world. The twenty-first century is an appropriate time to end some of the more unilateral modes of international education and dissemination that perhaps were more relevant to the assumptions of the cold war and nationalist past periods in Western nations. As educators working abroad, we have learned that the centers of area studies scholarship increasingly are located in the universities and institutes of those countries. U.S. libraries, analysts, and scholars need the knowledge, the creativity, and resources of our international colleagues in the areas we study. Their cooperation is essential in the advanced training in language and in field research for our graduate students. Scholars abroad also are struggling to provide education and competence for their peoples to cope with globalization and change. Thus we need them at the table with us in developing new knowledge across the globe for a more innovative, intelligent, universal, efficient, just, and sustainable global system.

More Effectively Meeting the Needs of Business for International Expertise

In an era of expanding international investment and trade, the business community requires personnel with increased international knowledge, language fluency, and cross-cultural skills. Business also needs a broad base of global awareness and sensitivity, both among the general citizenry and corporate employees in the U.S. Global expansion into "emerging markets" increases the demand for specialized international expertise, although businesses are sometimes skeptical of the value of coursework as compared with first-hand overseas business experience. In this changing business climate, educators need to revise curricula to better integrate area studies, economics, and business, and to provide opportunities for business students to participate in projects directly relevant to international business, such as internships abroad and working with small companies in the U.S. to research foreign markets. Emphasis also is needed on the

needs of small companies, emerging markets, overseas educational programs, linking international expertise and professional skills, and mid-career training of managers.

Cooperating Nationally in Cost-Effective Outreach

The outreach mission of Title VI centers has become more important because of the increased need for a globally informed citizenry, not only among undergraduate and graduate students but in civil society at large. As globalization touches every institution of U.S. society, the need and demand for Title VI outreach programs have grown, especially for business (see above), government, K-12 institutions, two- and four-year colleges, professional colleges, and the media. There is a mixed response of Title VI centers to this challenge, and some centers, finding their Title VI budgets eroded over the years and beset by proliferating demands to serve more diverse needs and clients, prefer to keep their focus on outreach through scholarly publishing and consulting.

Every Title VI center is besieged by the many diverse client needs and claims of schools, colleges, businesses, and the general public. Some of these needs can be met by specialization of services and better coordination among centers, e.g., sharing programs and collaboratively producing print, video, or CD-ROM materials for strategic clients. Much greater use of the Internet and WWW technologies offers more cost-effective provision of reference services. Cost recovery from clients with resources is needed now to sustain some programs. Additional funding should be sought from the private sector and foundations in order to support the growing needs of centers for innovating in and sustaining outreach programs. New Title VI resources could encourage collaborations among Title VI centers and programs using innovative applications of technology.

An especially important new agenda for Title VI centers is to serve better the needs of the expanding international linkages and programs of federal and state agencies whose basic mandates have been domestic in the past, but which now face the pressures of globalization. Innovative programs should be made available to link those agencies with Title VI resources and centers.

The expanding new demands by diverse clients for language and area outreach programs pose starkly the problem voiced at the conference by John Vaughn (Overview Paper 3), "How can a program that is so small, relative to its authentic national needs, meet the needs of so many claimants?"

Addressing the National Predicament of Declining Resources for International Education in the Face of Increasing Globalization

Although funding issues were not on the conference agenda, the conferees repeatedly voiced concern at the declining funds available for these increasingly important and widening national needs. As the analysts at this conference surveyed the rapidly expanding demands for competencies and experts, several of the observers commented that funding for Title VI has not even kept pace with inflation since its high point in the 1960s, even after achieving the small but significant increase of \$20 million since 1990. Indeed, measured in "constant dollars," foundation and federal funding for international research have decreased in real value. Fulbright-Hays funding has not only fallen from levels in the late 1960s as measured in "constant dollars," but has declined in real dollars since the levels of the early 1980s.

E. Summary Findings on Title VI of the Higher Education Act and the Associated Fulbright-Hays Programs

The conference concluded that this almost forty-year-old program has been responsible for creating a uniquely American system of foreign area, language, and international education capabilities that is unexampled among the nations. The participants also noted that U.S. needs were exceptional among nations because of its global leadership status. Therefore, the nation is in a period when its economy and security are becoming even more dramatically and more deeply interlinked with distant nations and peoples. As a result, a broad cross-section of U.S. government agencies, companies, and NGOs are experi-

encing a surge of need for international knowledge and experience. The Title VI centers and programs have experienced an exponential increase in demand for language, area, thematic, global, and outreach services.

These needs are arriving at the doorsteps of the Title VI programs just when much of the nation's established language and area faculties are nearing retirement, when the long-term inflationary erosion of the federal support becomes more problematic, and when many universities are questioning the wisdom of continuing to fund low-enrollment languages, no matter how nationally strategic. Yet, the new technologies also make possible both broader cooperation among the universities as well as a higher quality of education and services to the many new clients.

These Title VI structures are strong, though small, and are suffering under the stress of success born of globalization. University budgets alone cannot sustain them, so they would not exist without the incentive systems of the Title VI programs. They constitute a national treasure of inestimable value to the long-term interests of the nation and its peoples, but they need additional support from the universities, from the foundations, and from the federal coffers.

Therefore, the conferees concluded that a strong national need exists for continuing and strengthening of a broad national program of support for foreign language and international studies in order to achieve purposes that are uniquely related to the broad welfare of the peoples of the nation as a shared responsibility of the federal government and the universities.

[226-This page is blank