DOCUMENT RESUME

07092 - [B2587621]

[Study of Foreign Languages and Related Areas: Federal Support, Administration, Need]. ID-78-46; B-145541. September 13, 1978. 40 pp. + 3 appendices (9 pp.).

Report to the Congress; by Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General.

Issue Area: Federally Sponsored or Assisted Education Programs (3300).
Contact: International Div.
Budget Function: Education, Manpower, and Social Services: Higher Education (502).
Organization Concerned: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Office of Education.
Congressional Relevance: House Committee on Education and Labor; Senate Committee on Human Resources; Congress.
Authority: National Defense Education Act of 1958, title VI. Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended.

Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 authorized Federal financial assistance to institutions of higher education to promote the study of needed foreign languages and related areas. Through fiscal year 1978, about $229 million in such assistance has been provided through the Office of Education (OE). Grants were awarded to support language and area centers and research projects, and "starter" grants were awarded for new international studies programs. Findings/Conclusions: Since 1968, overall enrollments in the study of modern foreign languages have fallen, but enrollments in languages supported by title VI have increased. Grants are being made on the basis of 1972 data from an OE study on language priorities. National language needs are still undetermined because of the many languages and fields of study and the difficulties in determining needs. Also, it has been difficult to assess the appropriate levels of Federal funding for title VI programs. Conditions giving rise to the need for title VI have changed, but the need still exists in view of present international relations. The stable level of funding provided by the Congress in recent years should be continued. Federal administration of title VI programs seems to be effective and management of the programs has been improved, but additional administrative improvements are needed. Recommendations: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should require the OE to: visit centers receiving title VI grants at least once every 2 years, prepare and distribute to appropriate parties a biannual report containing "lessons learned" based on reports from the visits to centers, provide feedback reports to the centers at least once a year on their reports to OE, and develop a system to evaluate the effectiveness of the program providing starter grants to new international studies projects. (HTW)

7621

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Report To The Congress

OF THE UNITED STATES

Study Of Foreign Languages And Related Areas: --Federal Support --Administration --Need

The launching of Russia's Sputnik in 1957 alerted Americans to Soviet scientific advances and focused national attention on U.S. educational needs. Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 authorized Federal support to institutions of higher learning to promote the study of needed foreign languages and related areas.

Through fiscal year 1978 this support has amounted to $229 million; fiscal year 1978 funding was $15 million. The study of all foreign languages has decreased whereas the study of the less commonly taught languages, those supported by Title VI, has increased.

Program managers are faced with the problem of determining the national needs for the study of foreign languages and related areas. Also, some improvements are needed in the administration of the Federal support.

ID-78-46
SEPTEMBER 13, 1978

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-145541

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

This report discusses Government support of foreign language and area studies in institutions of higher education.

As U.S. leadership in the world community of nations faces increasing challenges, a program conceived 20 years ago to meet educational needs as seen at that time continues to operate to prepare Americans for this leadership role. We believe that information explaining this program and the issues surrounding the Government's role in promoting understanding of other cultures through the study of foreign languages and areas will be useful to those considering the future of this Government role in the American educational system.

Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Director, International Communication Agency; cognizant congressional committees; and organizations and individuals active in this area.

Comptroller General
of the United States

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND RELATED AREAS:
--FEDERAL SUPPORT
--ADMINISTRATION
--NEED

D I G E S T

The importance of the study of foreign language and related areas became more apparent after the launching of Russia's Sputnik in 1957. Consequently, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was passed to, among other things, make grants to colleges and universities to promote this study. (See p. 1.)

From inception through fiscal year 1978, about $229 million has been provided through the Office of Education. In fiscal year 1978, 80 grants were made to institutions of higher education to support language and area centers at a cost of $8 million and 828 fellowships were awarded at a cost of about $4.6 million. About $1 million was awarded for 35 research projects, and about $1.4 million was awarded for 38 projects as "starter" grants for new international studies programs. (See ch. 2.)

TRENDS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENROLLMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Since 1968, overall enrollments in the study of modern foreign languages have fallen; enrollments in the "needed" languages, those supported by Title VI, have increased. (See ch. 3.)

DETERMINING NATIONAL NEEDS

Since the inception of Title VI, the Office of Education has sought to determine priorities among language and area studies in the context of national needs. In 1972, data from a study initiated in 1968 became available, providing a basis for awarding grants in fiscal year 1973 and the following years. Grants are still being made using the 1972 data.

A 3-1/2 year research project was initiated in the summer of 1977 to develop a dynamic inventory of Soviet and Eastern European studies in the United States. If this project is successful, the Office of Education may seek to fund similar projects for other world areas.

The national needs remain undetermined. Because of the many modern foreign languages and the different fields of related study, it is unknown whether the greatest national needs are being met. Determining the national needs is a difficult thing to do. (See ch. 4.)

APPROPRIATENESS OF THE FEDERAL FUNDING LEVELS

For fiscal years 1975-78 funds totaled $11.3 million, $13.3 million, $14.65 million, and $15 million, respectively. For fiscal year 1973, the executive branch requested only $1 million for Title VI but the Congress provided $12.5 million. For fiscal year 1974, no funds were requested but the Congress provided $11.3 million. (See p. 28.)

Grant recipients offered convincing reasons for why Title VI increases and improves the study of needed modern foreign languages and areas. (See pp. 23 and 24.)

There are many arguments for and against Federal funding for area studies and language programs, but none are helpful to assessing an appropriate Federal funding level for the programs. (See pp. 24 to 27.)

The specific need to which Title VI was addressed 20 years ago in the wake of Sputnik is less apparent today than it was then. Contemporary problems relating to interdependence, trade relations, and U.S. leadership in a world community of nations argue in favor of continuing programs to promote the study of needed modern foreign languages and areas.

During the last several years, the Congress has provided a stable level of Federal funding with slight increasing levels to offset inflation. No convincing case has been made known to GAO for increasing or decreasing the funding level. (See p. 29.)

FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Most of those interviewed by GAO who are affected by the Title VI programs believed the Federal administration to be fair and effective.

Federal managers have succeeded in making important improvements in the programs during the past several years. (See pp. 30 and 31.)

Additional administrative improvements are needed. GAO recommends that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare require the Office of Education to:

--Visit at least once every 2 years each of the 80 centers at institutions of higher education receiving Title VI grants.

--Prepare and distribute to center officials and other appropriate parties a biannual report containing helpful "lessons learned" as gleaned from the reports submitted by each center to the Office of Education and visits to centers by staff members of the Office.

--Provide feedback reports to the centers at least once a year on their reports to the Office of Education.

--Develop a system to evaluate the effectiveness of the program providing starter grants to new international studies projects. (See ch. 6.)

Tear Sheet

AGENCY COMMENTS

GAO did not obtain written agency comments on this report, but did discuss it with key officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Education. They did not indicate any major disagreement with the report and were receptive to the intent of the recommendations. (See pp. 31, 37, and 38.)

Contents

ABBREVIATIONS

GAO	General Accounting Office
NDEA	National Defense Education Act

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Russians launched Sputnik, the world's first artificial satellite, in 1957. Sputnik helped to alert the United States to Soviet scientific advances and concentrated American attention on U.S. needs.

The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, enacted September 2, 1958, sought "To meet the present educational emergency" by providing Federal financial assistance to individuals and to States and their subdivisions "in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States." Science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects were to be supported.

Title VI of the NDEA authorized grants to institutions of higher education to (1) establish and operate "centers" to teach any needed modern foreign language for which adequate instruction was not readily available in the United States and (2) support instruction in other fields needed to fully understand the geographical areas in which the language is commonly used. Although not restricted to specific fields, those named in the original legislation were "history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology."

The importance of scholarly work produced in other countries was recognized. Foreign language and area studies would contribute to the interchange of ideas and research across national boundaries and would help to make foreign scholarship accessible to increasing numbers of American scholars.

Title VI also authorized research to promote improved instruction in languages and other fields relating to the geographical areas where the languages were spoken.

The programs authorized by Title VI today remain, on the whole, the same as those originally provided in 1958; the name of Title VI has been changed from Language Development to Foreign Studies and Language Development, specifically named fields have been deleted, and similar other minor changes have been made.

A potentially significant amendment to Title VI (Section 603) was enacted October 12, 1976, but remains unfunded. This amendment authorizes grants to "any public or private agency or organization" to stimulate educational programs to increase U.S. students' understanding of the cultures and actions of other nations in order to enable them to better evaluate the international and domestic impact of major national policies. The term "students" was intended to be widely encompassing, since specific authority was provided to include programs at all levels of education, including community, adult and continuing education programs.

Since its inception, Title VI has been administered by the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and has received funding of about $229 million. Fiscal year 1978 funding amounted to $15 million.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

We reviewed the programs of Title VI of the NDEA as part of an overall review of programs related to "public diplomacy," a contemporary catch phrase to refer to transnational activities conducted outside official, traditional diplomatic channels. We also reviewed those programs administered by the Office of Education that are authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended, that are supportive of Title VI objectives.

This is our first comprehensive review of Title VI. Our January 22, 1973, report, "Need to Improve Language Training Programs and Assignments for U.S. Government Personnel Overseas" (B-176049), addressed the research phase of Title VI.

This review of the Title VI programs was principally designed to determine whether the objectives were being achieved and to identify opportunities for improvement.

At the Office of Education, we examined records and procedures and interviewed those responsible for administering the programs. To obtain firsthand information about the programs' effects, we interviewed faculty, students, and officials of 17 universities or colleges receiving Title VI support. We also talked with representatives of educational associations and with officials of other Government agencies. (See app. I.)

Title III of the NDEA authorizes payments to State educational agencies as financial assistance for strengthening instruction in academic subjects, including modern foreign languages. Federal payments are matching payments, made to States by an allotment formula to help them acquire equipment and to make minor remodeling changes in laboratory and other space used for the equipment.

From inception of the NDEA through fiscal year 1975, approximately $90 million in Federal funds has been made available to States for modern foreign languages. We excluded this program from our review of Title VI programs because Title VI is oriented to postsecondary institutions whereas Title III is oriented to elementary and secondary institutions.

CHAPTER 2

FOREIGN STUDIES AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Nine programs are administered by the Office of Education to promote development of foreign language and area studies, as shown in table 1.

Five of the programs are domestic and are authorized by NDEA Title VI.

The other four programs are authorized by section 102(b)(6) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended, which authorizes the President to provide for "promoting modern foreign language training and area studies in United States schools" by supporting visits abroad of teachers and prospective teachers and visits to the United States by teachers from other countries. These functions were delegated by the President to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by Executive Order 11034, as amended.

NDEA TITLE VI PROGRAMS

Centers

Grants are made to institutions of higher education to establish and operate centers focusing on one world region or world problem. Centers are variously referred to as international studies centers, NDEA Title VI centers, or language and area centers. Appendix II lists the current centers.

Centers vary in their operating methods. Essentially, a center draws upon the resources of several departments of a university to build programs of international studies. Most of them have the following characteristics, although there may be exceptions.

--A center is an administrative unit and has a budget made up of its own resources as well as NDEA support. It works closely with students, faculty, and operational elements of a university.

--A center does not award degrees, the university does.

Table 1

Programs Administered by the Office of Education Foreign Studies and Language Development

	Fiscal year 1978 (estimated) Amount (millions)	Number of awards	From inception through FY 1978 (note a) (millions)
NDEA Title VI:			
Centers	$ 8.0	80 centers	$ 81.1
International Studies:			
Graduate	.5	13 projects	3.5
Undergraduate	.9	25 projects	5.2
Fellowships	4.6	828 awards	88.0
Research	1.0	35 studies	47.3
Summer Intensive Language Program (note b)	-	-	4.0
	15.0		229.1
Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act:			
Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad	1.1	119 fellowships	12.8
Faculty Research Abroad	.7	69 fellowships	7.7
Foreign Curriculum Consultants	.3	25 consultants	3.2
Group Projects Abroad	.9	17 projects (340 participants)	8.3
	3.0		32.0
Total	$18.0		$261.1

a/ Does not include money made available through excess foreign currency.
b/ Discontinued after fiscal year 1972.

--A center is not an academic department, although in a very small number of instances it has the same title as a department and its director also heads the department.

--A center, as a focal point, provides an important influence and impetus to increased study and improved instruction in language and area studies.

International Studies Program

Grants are made to institutions of higher education to establish instructional programs in international studies at either the graduate or undergraduate level. The Graduate Program is aimed at improving linkages among disciplines and among various international studies programs and professional schools to bring a comparative focus to instruction. The Undergraduate Program is designed to develop an international dimension in the general education programs of an institution, particularly in the first 2 years of postsecondary study.

Grants are made for 2 years to individual institutions and for 3 years to consortia of institutions, and programs must be global or multiregional in instructional coverage. These programs are also known as Exemplary Projects.

These projects receive one-time grants, which are "starter" grants, and the programs are expected to continue after Federal funding is terminated. Center grants, described earlier, can continue indefinitely, if successful in subsequent competitions.

Fellowships

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships, academic-year grants to graduate students in foreign language and area studies, are to be used for study in the United States (certain exceptions are made for approved overseas programs) and cover tuition costs and stipends to help with living costs. Fellowship quotas are given principally to those institutions having NDEA centers. The institutions nominate the recipients and the Office of Education selects the students to receive the fellowships from among those nominated. Students may receive successive annual awards. These fellowships were previously called National Defense Foreign Language Fellowships.

Research

Contracts and grants are awarded to support surveys and studies to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign language, area, and international studies or to develop more effective or specialized material for such training.

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT

This act, also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act, authorizes grants for the following four programs.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad

Fellowships are awarded to advanced graduate students at eligible institutions to engage in full-time (6 to 12 months) dissertation research abroad in modern foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs.

Faculty Research Abroad

Faculty at eligible institutions are given fellowships for 3 to 12 months for research abroad to maintain expertise, update curriculums, and improve teaching methods.

Foreign Curriculum Consultants

U.S. educational institutions are given grants to bring experts from other countries to the United States for an academic year to assist in planning and developing State and local curriculums in modern foreign language and area studies.

Group Projects Abroad

Grants are made for varying time periods to eligible U.S. institutions or other organizations for training, research, curriculum development, and preparing or acquiring instructional materials in international and intercultural studies through overseas projects.

HISTORY OF AWARDS TO NDEA CENTERS

In March 1959, the Commissioner of Education formally designated Arabic, Chinese, Hindustani, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian as priority languages for Title VI

funding. French, German, Italian, and Spanish instruction were already available and adequate.

In June 1959, the Commissioner formally designated an additional 18 languages as a second priority.

Bengali (India, Pakistan)
Burmese (Burma)
Finnish (Finland)
Hebrew, Modern (Israel)
Hungarian (Hungary)
Indonesian-Malay (Indonesia)
Khalkha (Outer Mongolia)
Korean (Korea)
Marathi (India)
Persian (Iran, Afghanistan)
Polish (Poland)
Serbo-Croatian (Yugoslavia)
Singhalese (Sri Lanka)
Swahili (East Africa)
Tamil (Sri Lanka, India)
Telugu (India)
Thai (Thailand)
Turkish (Turkey)

Within the next year or so, an additional 59 languages were included in a third priority.

In June 1961, Latin American Spanish was added to the eligible languages based on a finding that adequate advanced instruction was not then available for Latin American area studies.

Title VI grants to centers since the inception of the program cover three phases. Phase I, 1959-73, represented the growth era in which the objective was to encourage the general expansion of the centers. After the initial grants in 1959, national competitions for new awards were held in 1962, 1965, and 1967; previously funded centers did not have to compete.

Phase II, 1973-76, started a new era of competition. An institution seeking a center designation had to meet more rigid criteria, and funded centers had to compete with potentially new centers for the initial 50 center grants. In 1975, an additional 16 centers were funded. New priorities were established among world areas based on a comprehensive study of the status, resources, needs, and priorities in foreign languages and area studies. Applications (proposals) for Title VI support were subjected to competitive review and those funded were said to have won the competition. In selecting the best, emphasis was placed on those with comprehensive programs. Outreach was made a criterion for evaluation. Through outreach, centers were expected to share their knowledge and resources with other institutions of higher learning, elementary and secondary schools, community and small colleges, the business community, and the community at large.

Phase III started in 1976, with national competition for awards covering a 3-year period. Successive annual awards are made for the second and third years based on the centers' performances during the preceding year and the availability of appropriations. In 1976, 80 centers received awards and all 80 were renewed in 1977. Of the 80 center grants, 15 were for undergraduate centers. Under this phase, as in 1975, schools were able to compete for undergraduate center grants.

Phase III introduced more specific requirements for outreach and required an amount equal to a minimum of 15 percent of the grant funds to be used for outreach programs. Phase III further emphasized the need for more cooperation among departments and schools of a university to promote the international aspects of professional and other fields of study, including, where instruction was available, such fields as education, business, journalism, architecture and urban planning, law, public administration, library science, and the health professions. Such efforts are referred to as "linkages."

FEDERAL LIMITATIONS ON MANAGING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Title I of the original NDEA stated:

> "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system."

That provision is no longer found in the authorizing legislation, but the following provision is.

> "The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense."

Thus, by design, Title VI program managers have no responsibility for managing Title VI-supported education programs, although they are able to influence them in

certain ways. Title VI financial support to centers amounts to about 11 percent of the cost of centers, and those costs are only a small part of the total costs of a university. Thus, even if the legislation did not prohibit Federal intrusion, the amount of Federal funding involved for any one center is too small to permit any meaningful intrusion.

Finally, the $15 million value of fiscal year 1978 Title VI programs, although large as an absolute amount, is small compared with the estimated $22.1 billion in total Federal spending on education in fiscal year 1978, of which over $8.8 billion is administered by the Office of Education.

CHAPTER 3

TRENDS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENROLLMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The number of enrollments in foreign language courses is the only national data compiled in a consistent way showing trends related to the purposes of NDEA Title VI, i.e., to promote the increased and improved study of modern foreign languages and area studies in the United States. Data revealing national trends in area studies are not available.

Many factors influence the study of modern foreign languages in the United States, and overall national trends should not be attributed to the operation of the Title VI programs.

The first broad category of foreign languages is known as the "commonly taught modern foreign languages" and includes French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. The second category is known as the "less commonly taught foreign languages" and includes all other modern foreign languages and some ancient languages, but not Latin or Ancient Greek.

The data used for postsecondary institutions were compiled by the Modern Language Association under contract to the Office of Education.

OVERALL U.S. ENROLLMENTS IN STUDIES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES ARE DECLINING

Enrollments in postsecondary foreign language studies climbed from about 608,000 in 1960 to over 1 million in 1968 and thereafter decreased to less than 900,000 in 1977. As a percent of total postsecondary enrollments, enrollments peaked in 1963 at 17.8 percent and have steadily fallen to 9.9 percent in 1974.

The same trend has occurred in public secondary schools.

Comparative data from surveys by the Modern Language Association of postsecondary institutions for the academic years 1965-66 and 1974-75 show a marked reduction in academic requirements for foreign languages. Requirements are of two

kinds, an entrance requirement and a degree requirement. An institution may have one, both, or none of these requirements.

The survey data shows that the number of postsecondary institutions with academic requirements for foreign languages dropped from 1,053, or 90.9 percent, of institutions surveyed in the 1965-66 academic year to 786, or 61.2 percent, of the institutions surveyed in 1974-75. The number of institutions with both entrance and degree requirements fell from 366, or 31.6 percent, of the institutions surveyed in the 1965-66 academic year to 137, or 10.7 percent, of the institutions surveyed in 1974-75.

Thus, academic requirements for foreign languages have fallen in two respects; some institutions have removed all requirements and those that formerly had both requirements have removed one or the other.

OVERALL DECLINE IN ENROLLMENTS CAUSED BY LOSS OF ENROLLMENTS IN COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES RATHER THAN THOSE SUPPORTED BY TITLE VI

In postsecondary institutions, enrollments in the most commonly taught foreign languages fell from over 1 million in 1968 to about 820,000 in 1977. During the same period, enrollments in the less commonly taught languages increased from about 31,000 to 64,000.

In public secondary schools, enrollments in the most commonly taught languages also declined from about 4.3 million in 1968 to about 3.8 million in 1974. During the same period, enrollments in the less commonly taught languages went from 21,000 down to 17,000 and back up to about 24,000.

Thus, in both postsecondary and secondary schools the decline in the study of modern foreign languages is attributed to the decline in enrollments in the most commonly taught languages rather than the less commonly taught. (See table 2.)

Table 2

Statistics on Foreign Language Enrollments

Year	Modern foreign languages: Number	Percent of total enrollments	Five commonly taught languages	Less commonly taught languages
Postsecondary institutions: (note a)				
1960	608,749	17.0	595,324	12,099
1963	801,781	17.8	781,920	19,642
1965	975,777	17.6	929,215	23,690
1968	1,073,097	15.5	1,040,284	31,517
1970	1,067,217	13.5	1,021,465	45,710
1972	963,930	11.6	904,398	59,425
1974	897,077	9.9	832,945	64,071
1977	883,222	Not available	819,294	63,928
Public secondary schools: (note b)				
1968	4,357,786	24.8	4,336,422	21,282
1970	4,286,570	23.3	4,269,520	16,903
1974	3,853,265	18.4	3,828,317	24,483

a/ Colleges and universities.
b/ Grades 7-12.

The enrollment statistics are also helpful to show the dominance of the five commonly taught foreign languages in the United States, for which the 1974 enrollments break down as follows.

	Postsecondary	Secondary
French	253,137	1,253,696
German	152,139	441,367
Italian	32,996	51,728
Russian	32,522	17,165
Spanish	362,151	2,064,361
Total	832,945	3,828,317

ENROLLMENTS IN LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The data we used included 187 less commonly taught languages; some are supported by Title VI, some are not. They include familiar names that suggest countries, such as Norwegian, Czech, Iranian, and Korean; languages indigenous to the United States and in no sense "foreign," such as Navajo, Hawaiian, Cherokee, Sioux, and Eskimo; Indian languages of South and Central America, such as Quechua, Mayan, and Aztec; "history-related" languages, such as Hittite, Babylonian, Phoenician, and Sumerian; African languages, such as Swahili, Ibo, Twi, and Xhosa; and languages few Americans are likely to have ever heard of, such as Ugaritic, Akkadian, Ilocano, Syriac, Telugu, and Tlingit.

It is difficult to generalize about the changing enrollment rates for all these languages. Some have increased dramatically. Between 1960 and 1974, enrollments in Chinese in postsecondary institutions increased from 1,763 to 10,616 and in Japanese from 1,539 to 9,604. On the other hand, enrollments in Korean went from 168 to 87. In Hungarian, little change occurred, 69 in 1960 and 64 in 1974. And there are enormous variations; for example, enrollments in Vietnamese totaled 908 in 1963 but were never over 57 in any other year surveyed.

Table 3 shows the more significant enrollments in the less commonly taught languages in postsecondary institutions for all the years surveyed by Modern Language Association since 1960. The first part of the table lists all languages with enrollments of 100 or more in 1974; the second part lists selected languages with enrollments of less then 100 in 1974. A note appended to our data source states that "Because many registrars assume that MLA surveys don't include ancient languages, reports for ancient languages are incomplete."

Table 3

Enrollments in the Less Commonly Taught Languages
Postsecondary Institutions

Language	1960	1961	1963	1965	1968	1970	1972	1974
Hebrew	3779	4637	5538	7983	9892	16567	21091	22371
Chinese	1763	2200	2444	3341	5061	6203	10055	10616
Japanese	1539	1976	2718	3503	4439	6620	8273	9604
Portuguese	1017	1307	2051	2983	4048	5065	4837	5073
Arabic	525	693	835	902	1056	1324	1660	2034
Swahili	22	48	123	138	608	1787	2322	1694
Norwegian	675	712	942	886	1103	1084	1248	1557
Swedish	605	561	705	683	1101	1138	1166	1396
Polish	539	729	708	596	656	734	954	1123
Yiddish	13	34	20	10	109	257	912	1079
Navajo	-	-	-	-	24	154	273	589
Hawaiian	50	33	73	92	121	251	461	555
Modern Greek	139	293	440	217	146	251	381	533
Dutch	130	143	172	143	158	305	281	456
Sanskrit	-	-	-	299	296	348	405	402
Aramaic	-	-	-	24	161	142	496	371
Czech	95	192	176	158	182	154	231	337
Persian	62	97	176	113	181	246	282	278
Slavic, Old Church	-	-	-	102	102	138	269	258
Serbo-Croatian	149	145	131	134	209	349	354	242
Hindi	106	168	177	146	213	281	329	223
Philipino	-	-	-	-	-	22	12	203
Danish	80	90	108	93	146	245	177	183
Akkadian	-	-	-	23	83	128	166	168
Hindi-Urdu	-	-	-	104	136	76	115	161
Turkish	76	111	106	92	119	170	186	156
Finnish	20	9	65	43	76	81	137	134
Tagalog	1	-	14	28	14	9	89	122
Armenian	20	35	61	37	31	42	110	121
Indonesian	-	-	-	66	95	103	114	121
Basque	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	118
Ukranian	59	55	54	59	70	65	77	117
Iranian	-	-	-	-	13	19	70	104
Albanian	8	5	8	2	-	2	1	-
Bengali	9	12	12	18	18	14	23	27
Bulgarian	23	34	38	8	7	17	4	4
Burmese	25	12	19	-	-	5	6	4
Cambodian	-	-	-	-	26	-	3	4
Egyptian	-	3	-	37	39	52	70	64
Hungarian	69	78	83	74	65	81	66	64
Icelandic	17	33	5	20	7	26	26	11
Korean	168	190	182	82	70	101	97	87
Laotian	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2
Malay	24	84	99	-	7	6	-	10
Nepali	-	1	1	6	-	-	9	24
Romanian	23	26	49	-	20	15	38	31
Thai	48	98	102	58	71	67	82	71
Tibetan	13	13	13	30	53	59	88	61
Vietnamese	38	16	908	20	19	18	57	29
	11929	14873	19356	23353	31051	44821	58108	62992
Other	170	213	286	337	466	889	1317	1079
Total	12099	15086	19642	23690	31517	45710	59425	64071

Less commonly taught languages in grades 7-12 in the fall of 1974 with 100 or more enrollments included:

Japanese	8,195
Hebrew	5,475
Chinese	4,105
Portuguese	2,749
Polish	757
Modern Greek	565
Norwegian	434
Swahili	420
Finnish	321
Armenian	294
Swedish	273
Czech	258
Arabic	184

The fundamental question is, what languages and area studies should Title VI support? What are the national needs? This is a difficult problem and is addressed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

THE INTRACTABLE PROBLEM:

DETERMINING NATIONAL NEEDS

From the beginning of Title VI, the Office of Education has sought to determine priorities among languages and area studies in the context of the "national needs." It is imperative to know those needs in order to apply Federal funds to meet the most urgent needs.

During the first 2 to 3 years of Title VI, languages to be supported were identified, and, until about 1972, attention was focused on developing and managing the program. The national needs were believed to be generally known and to be so great that Federal support for any language and area study, other than those few Western languages commonly taught, would help to satisfy them.

The year 1972 was a watershed; data from a study initiated in 1968 by the Office of Education became available to provide a basis for awarding grants in 1972 and the following years. The study, "Language and Area Studies Review," was published by the American Academy of Political and Social Science in October 1973. It was prepared under the direction of Dr. Richard D. Lambert, University of Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council with funding provided by the Office of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and a private foundation.

The study presents the results of a 3-year review and evaluation of American college and university programs of Latin American, East European, Middle Eastern, African, and Asian studies. It is exhaustive in its scope and contains 169 tables of data.

Before we continue with the Lambert study, we will introduce the notion of a "specialist." There is no standard definition of a specialist, and those who seek to "inventory" American specialists start with criteria one must meet to be categorized.

At one extreme, the great American area specialists are those few individuals who have devoted many years to their chosen area and field of study; traveled extensively in the geographical area; speak, read, and write one or more (typically more), languages of the area, and are usually engaged in teaching, studying, and writing.

At the other extreme is the new graduate with a degree or certification as an area specialist. Since the Title VI fellowships are most often awarded to doctoral candidates, the area specialists in the context of the Title VI programs have such degrees. Office of Education officials told us that the current trend is to increase the number of fellowships awarded to students pursuing masters degrees.

Criteria for a competent specialist, as set forth by Dr. Lambert, were:

Residence	At least 3 years in the geographical area of competence, including at least 2 visits to the area, the last not later than 5 years ago.
Language	Read, write, or speak easily any language indigenous to the area.
Education and work	Formal training consisting of at least three or more courses on country or area at both undergraduate or graduate levels, currently working in area, and has published and/or taught about the area.

The programs administered by the Office of Education to promote foreign studies and language development that can be related to developing new specialists are:

--Centers, and the universities of which they are a part, which provide the institutional resources for students to become specialists.

--Fellowships, which provide tuition costs and stipends for students.

--Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad fellowships, which provide opportunities for "soon-to-be" specialists to experience firsthand the culture of the area studied as well as to use and increase foreign language skills.

Returning to the Lambert study, we quote one paragraph, the first and last sentences of which are of particular importance.

"That so few attempts to enumerate individual specialists have been made is remarkable considering that the prime motive for heavy financial inputs by universities, foundations, and governments over the past two decades has been the scarcity of specialists dealing with the non-Western world. Where enumeration has been attempted, it has been largely in terms of complete programs; statistics on individuals have been confined to course enrollment and program faculty. While such statistics are valuable, both the programs and the students who inhabit them are part of a process presumably leading to the creation of more specialists. Therefore, we have only rudimentary knowledge of the number of people in the current national pool with a competency on one or another of the countries of the world. Since one of the primary goals of the language and area studies educational enterprise is the expansion and upgrading of competences in such a pool, at least a preliminary attempt to estimate the size, levels of competence, and degree of balance of this pool seemed necessary. A system for periodic sample surveys should be established to measure changes in the characteristics of this pool."

A system for periodic sample surveys to measure changes in the characteristics of the specialists pool has not been established. The Office of Education, however, does have cumulative data on specialists graduating from the institutions which have Title VI centers and also has information from its Title VI fellowships.

The Office of Education presently programs its funds on the basis of the data in the Lambert study, specialists produced from institutions receiving center grants and NDEA fellowships, and such other information as it may acquire.

We do not criticize the lack of a system for measuring changes in the characteristics of the specialists pool. A way has yet to be devised for developing a system where benefits would outweigh costs. Such a system may be forthcoming from a pilot project now underway.

The Office of Education has provided initial funding for the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies to develop a "Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States." The Inventory will

include specialists, and, as the word Dynamic in the title suggests, will, if successful, provide information on changes. The project, started in summer of 1977, is financed by an annual renewable grant and is to run for about 3-1/2 years, with a completion date of December 15, 1980.

If this project is successful, the Office of Education may seek to fund similar projects for other world areas.

Ideally, a system should be able to project trends in area and language specialization, to track existing specialists and identify their current competencies, and to indicate where assistance is needed to maintain competence. Office of Education officials said that numerous obstacles preclude developing a system along these lines.

The following Office of Education designation of equal priorities for 1977-78 academic year fellowships indicates the magnitude of the problem of defining the national need for specialists.

Area of study	Priority disciplines
Africa	Economics, history, humanities (art, drama, music, philosophy, religion), sociology, and languages other than Swahili.
East Asia	Anthropology, economics, geography, sociology, and humanities.
Eastern Europe	Anthropology, geography, humanities, sociology, and languages other than Russian.
Latin America	Humanities, sociology, and Portuguese and Amerindian languages.
Middle East	Anthropology, economics, geography, humanities, political science, sociology, and languages other than Hebrew.
South Asia	Anthropology, humanities, linguistics, literature, sociology, and geography.
Southeast Asia	Economics, history, humanities, linguistics, literature, and sociology.

Western Europe	Anthropology, economics, geography, philosophy and religion, political economy, sociology, and languages other than French, German, Italian, or Spanish.

The number of participants in the NDEA center program, as shown in table 4, offers some measure of the production of specialists. These are not national statistics, because participants in programs not supported by Title VI are excluded. National data are not available. As noted above, specialists are most appropriately viewed as those graduating with doctorates.

Table 4

Degrees Received by Participants in NDEA Center Program--Minimum of 15 Credit Hours in Language and Area Training Academic years 1959-76

Area of study	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorates
East Asia	8,674	2,568	914
South Asia	1,638	1,008	569
Southeast Asia	175	404	231
Inner Asia	74	92	43
Asia, general	3,884	2,001	512
South and Southeast Asia	1,480	595	266
Middle East	4,350	1,531	793
Soviet and Eastern Europe	11,848	4,156	1,425
Africa	5,387	2,755	940
Latin America	24,471	7,439	2,688
Pacific	37	79	23
Canada	233	3	12
Comparative study	148	78	36
General	-	503	43
Asia-East Europe	278	150	28
Northwest Europe and Western Europe	573	228	97
Total	63,240	23,590	8,620

Determining national needs is of compelling importance because, if it were done scientifically and quantitatively, (a very tall order), the annual problem of determining a proper Federal funding level for Title VI programs would be relatively easy.

We now turn, with the above difficulties in mind, to the matter of an appropriate level of funding for the program.

CHAPTER 5

APPROPRIATENESS OF FEDERAL FUNDING LEVELS

In this chapter, we identify generally perceived benefits of the program as seen by those receiving the grants, list some of the commonly heard arguments for and against Federal funding, and offer our own judgments about some of these things, including appropriate levels of funding, with the view that such comments may be helpful to those who make the difficult, important decisions on funding levels.

PROGRAM BENEFITS GENERALLY PERCEIVED BY GRANT RECIPIENTS

Center officials told us that the prestige stemming from being a Title VI center attracts funding to the centers from other sources, including the resources of the institutions of which the centers are part. Therefore, the Title VI grant is seen as having financial value in excess of its stated value and as contributing to the national pool of specialists to an extent greater than the Federal funds alone would suggest.

Center officials said that Title VI grants make possible library acquisitions that would not otherwise be made, permit otherwise uneconomic instruction in "limited demand" foreign languages to small numbers of students, and in other ways make possible learning opportunities that would be foregone without the grants.

Outreach coordinators and other center officials told us that their outreach programs were designed to provide services to those participants beyond the institutions of which the centers are part and have grown as the direct result of Title VI center grants. This, in our opinion, is unquestionably a direct and highly useful Title VI center program benefit.

Because Title VI fellowships are based on academic excellence rather than need and because of the availability of other fellowships, it cannot be determined how many students would remain in school without Title VI fellowships; many students we spoke with said they could not remain in school without them. Other students, who unsuccessfully sought fellowships, said they were able

to remain in school because of on-campus employment, but without the fellowships it was "hard times." Students' financial aid from all sources, including employment, is finite, with demand exceeding supply, and students enrolled in doctoral programs have limited time for employment. Therefore, in our opinion, many students would not be able to pursue area and language studies without Title VI fellowships.

Students told us that an NDEA fellowship, because it is awarded for excellence, is a recognized mark of distinction which is useful in seeking employment after graduation.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST FEDERAL FUNDING FOR AREA STUDIES AND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

Here we briefly mention some of the commonly heard arguments for and against Federal funding of the programs.

The constitutional argument that education is the responsibility of State and local governments and parents is met with the counterargument that, because of Federal primacy in foreign affairs, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to support international education. National policy is contained in the National Defense Education Act.

> "The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense."

The argument that Americans are provincial (for historical and geographical reasons and as compared with Europeans) and are therefore ill-prepared to cope in an increasingly interdependent world is met with the counterargument that the present state of American international activities proves that Americans, provincial or not, are able to cope in today's world.

The argument that Americans are provincial is usually based on statistics such as those below, which were considered by the Congress in 1958 when it passed the National Defense Education Act.

--There were 24 languages spoken natively by more than 20 million people, yet only Spanish and French were studied by any appreciable portion of American high school students.

--Over half of the high schools in America offered no modern foreign language.

--A 1954-55 survey showed that less than 15 percent of the public high school students were studying modern foreign languages.

--Only an estimated 15 percent of the 3 million college and university students were studying foreign languages.

--Less than 1 percent of the elementary school students were receiving training in foreign languages.

--The number of college graduates prepared to teach who had majored in a foreign language declined from 2,193 in 1950 to 1,525 in 1957.

--The national supply of high school teachers of foreign languages was reported to be 25 percent short of demand in 1956.

--It was estimated that not more than 25 institutions of higher education were suitable for the establishment of either foreign language institutes or foreign language area studies centers.

An October 1975 report by the International Education Project, American Council on Education, "Education for Global Interdependence," used these updated statistics:

--Only 3 percent of all undergraduate students, less than 1 percent of the college-age group in the United States, were enrolled in any courses dealing specifically with international events or foreign peoples and cultures.

--A 1973 survey revealed that barely 5 percent of the teachers being trained received any exposure to global content or perspectives in their coursework for teacher certification.

--Notable imbalances characterize the nature of expertise among specialists on foreign cultures and areas. Over 100 million persons spoke Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, French, German, Hindi, Indonesian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Swahili, and Urdu. Fewer than 50 Americans were expertly trained in at least half of these languages.

--Foreign language instruction in American schools (already meager) was increasingly ignored.

--International specialists and scholars were disturbingly absent in the field of education, applied professional fields, and various fields which made up the humanities apart from literature and history.

--Multinational enterprises did one-half trillion dollars worth of business and accounted for fully one-seventh of the world's gross national product. That monumental enterprise involved relatively few language and area graduates.

In our opinion, these examples of Americans' inadequate training to cope with international affairs are not convincing because there is no standard for adequacy. The counterargument that the present state of American international activities proves that Americans are able to adquately cope in today's world is unconvincing for the same reason.

In respect to the formal study of foreign languages at traditional educational institutions, the argument that the language learned, if learned at all, is soon forgotten, is too often true. The argument that one can acquire a foreign language, when needed, at a commercial language school devoted exclusively to that purpose is also true, except that many important, but little demanded, languages are not available in that way. The argument that Americans do not need a foreign language because "everybody" speaks English is true or false depending on one's communication needs--the specialist doing research from original writing in a foreign language must be able to read the language used in the writings.

One irrefutable argument is that, whether federally funded or otherwise, programs are needed to replace the specialists who grow old and die.

A difficult argument raises the question of why the Federal Government should support "elitist" institutions in view of the needs elsewhere, including the basic needs in education. The elitist institutions say elitist doesn't mean rich.

Arguments for and against Federal funding of area studies and language programs are seemingly interminable as well as inconclusive but one goes to the heart of the program; i.e., any great institution, if it is to remain great, will inevitably support comprehensive area studies and language programs without Federal funding as it supports programs in other fields of study, such as business, law, medicine, and so on. This is true, but it misses the point of Title VI center funding, which is to increase and improve language and area studies in the United States.

APPROPRIATENESS OF EXISTING FUNDING LEVELS FOR TITLE VI PROGRAMS

A comparison of Title VI authorized, requested, and congressionally recommended use of appropriated funds during the 1970s, as shown in table 5, is interesting. As can be seen, the executive branch attempted to drastically curtail the program in 1973 and even attempted to eliminate it in 1974, but the Congress maintained the funding level.

Table 5

National Defense Education Act
Title VI

Fiscal year	Authorized	Requested	Congressionally recommended funding
1970	a/$30,000,000	$15,000,000	$13,002,000
1971	a/ 38,500,000	4,930,000	7,170,000
1972	b/ 38,500,000	13,940,000	13,940,000
1973	b/ 50,000,000	1,000,000	12,525,000
1974	b/ 75,000,000	0	11,333,000
1975	b/ 75,000,000	8,640,000	11,300,000
1976	c/ 75,000,000	8,640,000	13,300,000
1977	c/ 75,000,000	8,640,000	14,650,000
1978	d/ 75,000,000	13,300,000	15,000,000
1979	d/ 75,000,000	15,000,000	

a/ Public Law 90-575, Oct. 16, 1968
b/ Public Law 92-318, June 23, 1972
c/ Public Law 94-482, Oct. 12, 1976
d/ Public Law 95-43, June 15, 1977

There is no apparent way to determine appropriate annual funding levels for Title VI programs, currently funded at $15 million, and the related Fulbright-Hays programs, currently funded at $3 million.

The "present educational emergency" to which the Title VI programs were addressed 20 years ago following Sputnik is less apparent today than it was then.

On the other hand, the knowledge Americans gain from these programs today can easily be viewed as contributing to the national needs suggested by such contemporary problems as interdependence, trade relations, and U.S. leadership in a world community of nations. Transnational activities have increased in the last 20 years and will continue to increase.

An important benefit of these programs has been overlooked by those debating the merits of the programs. There exists today an apparatus, system, or structure consisting of American universities, the Office of Education, and mutually understood and acceptable procedures capable of delivering at an increasing rate highly specialized area study and language training when the Nation next faces a "present educational emergency." One cannot place a value on this

apparatus, but if it is lost, it can be replaced in the future only at great cost over a long period of time.

During the last several years, the Congress provided a stable level of Federal funding, with slight increases to offset the effects of inflation. No convincing case has been made known to us for increasing or decreasing this funding level.

CHAPTER 6

FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The International Studies Branch, within the Division of International Education, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Office of Education, advertises the availability of grants, receives applications for them, and, following the necessary higher level approvals, makes and monitors them.

The programs do not lend themselves to quantitative measures of effectiveness; that is, it would not be appropriate to apply traditional methods of comparing program inputs and outputs to assess the quality of Federal management of these programs.

To gain information helpful to such an assessment and to complement our review of procedures and processes at the Office of Education, we talked with a very large number of people affected by the grants. We visited 17 universities and colleges with a total of 27 of the 80 Title VI centers. We talked with center directors, deans, department heads, faculty members, librarians, administrative officers such as those in charge of student financial assistance, students, outreach coordinators, and former students. In some instances, we talked with university presidents and vice presidents.

Although we visited 27 of the 80 Title VI centers, we believe our findings to be generally applicable to all centers because clear patterns emerged from our numerous discussions with people affected by the grants. Most of them believed the Federal administrative efforts were fair and effective. Lines of communication between the Office of Education and those applying for and receiving grants are open. The Office is responsive to the community it serves and during the past several years has made important improvements in the programs by:

--Regularizing open national competition on a triennial basis for awards to centers in 1972. Open national competition includes publishing criteria for awards, announcing the competition, using peer review panels to judge the quality of applicants' proposals, and awarding the grants to the

"best". Previously, each application was considered only on its own merits without the benefit of the larger competitive process.

--Establishing requirements for developing outreach programs at the centers. Through outreach, the services of a center are made available to agencies, organizations, and individuals which are interested in the resources of the center but are not part of the institution operating the center. Outreach was instituted as a requirement during the 1972 competition, and in the next competition in 1975 an amount equal to at least 15 percent of the center grant was required to be used for outreach.

--Initiating the Graduate and Undergraduate International Studies Programs in 1972. Using open national competition, one-time awards are made to institutions of higher education to establish instructional programs in international studies.

--Funding the first general international studies centers, those without a single world area focus, in 1973.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

From our review of procedures and records at the Office of Education and from conversations with those using grant funds at the institutions we visited, we believe that officials of the Office of Education should make more visits to centers, disseminate useful information given to the Office by each center to all centers, provide feedback on centers' reports, and systematically follow up the status of all International Studies Programs after the completion of the grant period.

Generally, officials at the Office of Education agreed that these activities would be helpful; however, they stated that available staff are fully engaged in other, essential activities and additional staff would be necessary to do these things. They estimated the time devoted to the various programs as of May 1978 as follows.

	Staff years
Center and research:	
Center programs	1.3
Graduate international studies	.7
Undergraduate international studies	.5
Research	2.5
Section supervisor	1.0
	6.0
Fellowships and overseas projects:	
Fellowships	1.1
Faculty research	.9
Doctoral dissertation abroad	1.0
Group projects abroad	2.0
Foreign curriculum consultants	1.0
Section supervisor	1.0
	7.0
Branch chief	1.0
Total	14.0

Following a discussion of each of the needed improvements, along with our estimate of additional staff time required and our related recommendations, we will suggest ways in which we believe additional staff time can be made available if the existing staff level is not increased.

More visits to centers

Center directors and faculty expressed interest in having officials of the Office of Education visit the centers. They welcome the opportunity to learn firsthand of reactions to their various programs. They would also like to learn of innovations at other centers.

We believe such visits would be useful to the Office of Education to obtain firsthand information on (1) center progress in achieving grant objectives and (2) how to improve the administration of its programs.

Periodic visits to centers by Office of Education officials were part of the original program. A report

on the early history of the Title VI programs [1] stated that:

> "The contracting institutions were expected to supply annual technical and fiscal reports to assure that the terms of the contract had been observed. These annual reports were in due course supplemented, as means of communication, by two meetings of center directors in Washington (in 1960 and 1962), and by periodic visits to the centers by staff members of the Office of Education."

Some centers have never been visited and some of the older centers have not been visited in recent years. Examples, as of December 31, 1977, follow.

1/Donald N. Bigelow, and Lyman H. Legters, Language and Area Centers, First 5 Years, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Bulletin 41, OE-56016, 1964, p. 22.

Center	Initial funding year	Last visited
Cornell University Southeast Asian Language and Area Center	1969	pre-1970
University of Pittsburgh Russian and East European Area Center	1973	-
University of Florida Latin American Language and Area Studies Program	1961	pre-1970
Ohio University Southeast Asian Language and Area Center	1973	-
University of Michigan Language and Area Center in Near Eastern Studies	1959	pre-1970
University of Illinois African Studies Center	1973	-
University of Denver Center for Comparative Studies	1973	-

In calendar year 1977, Office of Education staff visited seven centers.

A useful program might require at least one visit to each center every 2 years. As a measure of time required for each visit, we suggest one day for preparing for the visit, 2 days at the center, a half day for preparing a report on the visit, and a half day for traveling, which would result in an average of 4 working days for each center visited. Since several centers would be visited on each trip and the time required for each center would vary, this is an average measure.

Assuming that half of the 80 centers were visited each year, 40 center visits would require 160 staffdays, or almost one additional staff year. Salary, per diem, and travel costs for this would approximate $40,000 to $45,000 a year.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare require a staff member of the Office of Education to visit each center once every 2 years, unless an exception is approved at an appropriate level, such as the associate commissioner.

Disseminate selected information provided by each center

Center officials with whom we spoke expressed interest in learning of activities of other centers which might be helpful in managing their centers, including significant successes, failures, and initiatives. Among such activities might be linkages with professional schools, language teaching and learning methods, outreach programs, and ways to improve and/or simplify center reports to the Office of Education.

Information exchanges now take place during professional meetings and through professional publications.

The Office of Education presently receives a lot of information from centers in the form of the reports referred to above. Substantially increasing the frequency of visits to centers would add to the information available to the Office on center operations.

We believe the Office of Education should prepare a biannual report of "lessons learned," as gleaned from its review of center reports and visits to centers. This report should be distributed to each center and made widely available to others who can contribute to improving the Title VI center program. It should avoid duplicating the other information exchanges and should work to develop information tailored precisely to improving the Title VI center program.

A biannual report could be supplemented with quarterly or other periodic newsletters.

In our opinion, the biannual report should take the form of a 5 to 10 page photocopy and should not require an extensive, glossy, expensive process. Moreover, since the needed information would have already been obtained through the Office of Education's reviews of center reports and center visits, we estimate that the preparation, review,

reproduction, and distribution of the report would require about 60 staffdays.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare require that Office of Education officials prepare and distribute to center officials and other appropriate parties a biannual report containing helpful "lessons learned."

Feedback on center reports

Each center director submits two reports annually to the Office of Education in accordance with the grant agreement. The reports usually are comprehensive narratives of the center's goals, accomplishments, failures, and future plans. Center officials told us that they were concerned about the lack of feedback from these reports, which require so much effort to prepare and which are so rich in information. Office of Education officials noted that the centers receive oral feedback on previous year reports and on current proposals when grants are negotiated for renewal.

We believe that the administration of the Title VI programs would be enhanced if each center received written feedback at least once a year on the adequacy and usefulness of its reports, praise for innovations, criticisms for lack of performance, and such other information that would indicate whether the Office of Education was satisfied with center operations. The feedback would also help to improve the quality of the reports to the Office of Education in terms of the use made of such reports.

Written, rather than oral, feedback is necessary to provide for wide distribution. It would also be useful as a basis for conversations between Office of Education and center officials during periodic visits of the Office officials to the center.

The written feedback could take the form of short letters. In the event of a significant problem, it could be identified--or simply alluded to--and the matter could be fully addressed in conversation during the next center visit.

In our opinion, the analyses of the center reports are the time-consuming part of the operation; providing

feedback to the centers from the analyses should not be unduly burdensome and would require only 1 or 2 days each to prepare. An estimate of 1-1/2 days for each of the 80 centers would require 120 staffdays to prepare the recommended feedback reports.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare require that Office of Education officials provide feedback reports at least once each year to centers on their reports to the Office.

Agency Comments

Officials of the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concurred with the intent of the above recommendations to improve communication. The officials stated that they plan to evaluate the recommendations in accordance with existing program priorities and staff resources.

Need for systematic follow up on status of International Studies Program

Since the inception of this Program in 1972 through fiscal year 1978, 145 projects have been funded at a total grant cost to the Office of Education of $8.7 million; 38 projects were funded in fiscal year 1978 at a cost of $1.4 million.

These grants for both graduate and undergraduate projects are designed to be starter grants with the expectation that the projects would continue after the Federal grant period of 2 to 3 years ended.

The Office of Education does not systematically follow up the status of these projects after the grants end and, therefore, lacks essential management data to evaluate the effectiveness of the overall Program, improve the selection of new projects, and provide information on previous successes and failures potentially useful to managing new projects.

We visited one project which has continued to exist following the completion of the grant period because, we were told, it was built on a sound, existing program within one school at the university. At another university, the

project continued for 2 years after the grant period before it folded because of the difficulty in resolving persistent interdepartmental conflicts. Office of Education officials told us they were unaware of the status of these projects.

We believe the Office of Education should implement a system for evaluating its International Studies Program, with provisions for obtaining information for each project at the beginning of each academic year after the completion of the grant period for at least 5 years unless the project is cancelled. This information should include reasons for success or failure.

The system ought to provide some mechanical indications useful to triggering evaluations of the overall Program within the Office of Education. For example, one could arbitrarily say that unless 75 percent of the projects continue for 3 or more years and 50 percent for at least 5 or more years, the usefulness of the projects for achieving Title VI objectives should be reevaluated with a view to terminating the Program or revising the concept to make the projects more viable after Federal support ends.

We believe that obtaining the necessary information from projects would require little staff time; in any event, since it is essential to proper Federal evaluation and improvements implicit in effective management, it should be acquired regardless of the time required to do so.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare require that Office of Education officials develop a system to evaluate the effectiveness of the International Studies Program. The system would include information on the continuing status of projects after the end of the grant period and reasons for successes and failures.

Agency Comments

Office of Education officials concurred with this recommendation.

WAYS IN WHICH ADDITIONAL STAFF TIME MIGHT BE MADE AVAILABLE TO CARRY OUT OUR RECOMMENDATIONS

When university officials expressed to us a wish for more feedback and other information from the Office of Education, they frequently added they knew the staff of the Office carrying out the Title VI and the Fulbright-Hays programs responsibilities had a significant workload and were very busy.

Two ideas, neither of which is new to the Office of Education, could be used to make additional time available to Office of Education personnel who are responsible for the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs.

1. Longer grant periods--center officials told us they would like longer grant periods in order to reduce their own workloads associated with the competition and to add more stability to center programs. Of course, it would be necessary to determine if these advantages to the centers would outweigh the disadvantages of having longer periods.

   It is clear that longer grant periods would reduce the workload of the Office of Education.

   Better information must be obtained on the results of International Studies Program projects, however, before longer grant periods could be considered.

2. Changing report procedures for centers --much of the information contained in the two annually required center reports is the same and repeats information in the original grant proposal. Preparing this material is time-consuming for the center staff and reading, analyzing, and evaluating it is time-consuming for the Office of Education staff.

   The duplication in these reports could be eliminated if one annual report was required which highlighted the accomplishments; included the proposed budget

and program for the succeeding year; provided data on enrollments and degrees awarded; and described deviations from or changes to the previously approved proposal, such as changes in faculty, course offerings, or program goals.

To facilitate analysis and comparison with the approved proposals, the Office of Education should limit the size of the "new" annual report. Detailed performance information would be maintained by the centers for review during visits by the Office personnel.

APPENDIX I

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS VISITED BY GAO

Centers visited by GAO are identified in the list of NDEA Title VI centers in appendix II.

International Studies Programs visited include those at Duke University, University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Massachusetts, University of Michigan, New York University, and the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University.

Group Projects Abroad were discussed at Duke University, University of Massachusetts, University of Michigan, Ohio State University, and University of Wisconsin.

We visited the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and the following educational associations: American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, American Council of Learned Societies, American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Business Council for International Understanding, and the Modern Language Association of America.

We held discussions with representatives of the following area associations: Association for Asian Studies, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, African Studies Association, International Studies Association, and Latin American Studies Association.

APPENDIX II

NDEA CENTERS FOR INTERNATIONAL AND LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES FOR ACADEMIC YEARS 1976-77 AND 1977-78

Centers visited by GAO	Grant amounts 1976-77	1977-78	Total
Center for East Asian Studies (UG) (note a) Amherst College (with Smith College, University of Massachusetts, Mount Holyoke College, and Hampshire College)	$ 65,000	$ 74,000	$139,000
Far Eastern Language and Area Center	90,000	99,000	189,000
South Asian Language and Area Center	103,000	111,000	214,000
Middle Eastern Language and Area Center University of Chicago	104,000	113,000	217,000
Southeast Asian Language and Area Center	120,000	128,000	248,000
Center for Study of World Food Issues Cornell University	90,000	97,000	187,000
Canadian Studies Center Duke University	92,000	98,000	190,000
African Studies Center	85,000	93,000	178,000
East Asian Studies Center	90,000	98,000	188,000
Russian and East European Studies Center University of Illinois	104,000	115,000	219,000
Center of Latin American Studies University of Illinois (with University of Chicago)	80,000	91,000	171,000
Russian and Eastern European Studies Center	110,000	117,000	227,000
Center for African Studies	115,000	124,000	239,000
Uralic and Inner Asian Language and Area Center Indiana University	100,000	109,000	209,000
Slavic Language and Area Studies Center	106,000	114,000	220,000
East Asian Language and Area Center	130,000	139,000	269,000
Southeast Asia Language and Area Studies Center	125,000	133,000	258,000
Language and Area Center in Near Eastern Studies University of Michigan	108,000	116,000	224,000

[a]/(UG) Denotes undergraduate center.

Centers visited by GAO	Grant amounts 1976-77	1977-78	Total
South Asian Language and Area Studies Center	$110,000	$118,000	$228,000
Modern Near East Studies Center University of Pennsylvania	106,000	115,000	221,000
Center for International Studies Tufts University (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy)	108,500	120,954	229,454
East Asia Studies Center (UG)	50,000	60,000	110,000
Russian and East European Studies Center (UG)	45,000	52,000	97,000
South Asian Studies Center (UG) University of Virginia	56,000	66,000	122,000
Center for Latin American Studies	97,887	108,000	205,887
Center for South Asian Studies	114,000	122,000	236,000
African Language and Area Studies Center University of Wisconsin	115,000	124,000	239,000
Other centers			
East Asia Study Center (UG)	45,000	59,000	104,000
Middle Eastern Center (UG) University of Arizona	50,000	55,000	105,000
East European Language and Area Center	81,000	91,000	172,000
South Asian Language and Area Studies Center University of California at Berkeley	100,000	108,000	208,000
East Asian Studies Center University of California at Berkeley (with Stanford University)	170,000	178,000	348,000
Latin American Center	87,000	99,000	186,000
Near Eastern Language and Area Center	104,000	114,000	218,000
African Studies Center	105,000	114,000	219,000
Russian and East European Studies Center University of California at Los Angeles	94,000	102,000	196,000

APPENDIX II

Other centers	Grant amounts 1976-77	1977-78	Total
Western European Studies Center Columbia University (with City University of New York)	$115,000	$126,000	$241,000
East Asian Language and Area Center	125,000	135,000	260,000
Soviet and East European Language and Area Center	110,000	118,000	228,000
South Asian Center Columbia University	78,000	88,000	166,000
Center for Comparative Studies University of Denver	100,000	111,000	211,000
Latin American Language and Area Studies Program	93,000	99,000	192,000
African Studies Center University of Florida	87,000	100,000	187,000
Middle East Studies Center Georgetown University (with John Hopkins University)	95,000	85,000	180,000
Soviet and East European Studies Center	80,000	90,000	170,000
Center for East Asian Studies	130,000	139,000	269,000
Center for Middle Eastern Studies Harvard University	104,000	113,000	217,000
Pacific Islands Studies Center	95,000	102,000	197,000
East Asian Studies Center University of Hawaii	90,000	97,000	187,000
Russian and East European Studies Center University of Kansas	85,000	93,000	178,000
Latin American Studies Center University of Kansas (with Kansas State University and Wichita State University)	80,000	89,000	169,000
African Studies Center Michigan State University	95,000	105,000	200,000

APPENDIX II

Other centers	Grant amounts 1976-77	1977-78	Total
Center for International Studies (UG) University of Nebraska	$ 55,000	$ 65,000	$120,000
Near Eastern Studies Center New York University (with Princeton University)	114,000	115,000	229,000
Center for Sub-Saharan Africa Northwestern University	95,000	105,000	200,000
East Asian Studies Center (UG) Oberlin College	40,000	48,000	88,000
Southeast Asian Language and Area Center Ohio University	100,000	110,000	210,000
Center for Russian and East European Studies Ohio State University	96,000	104,000	200,000
Center for Mediterranean Studies (UG) Ohio Wesleyan University	40,000	35,046	75,046
Russian and East European Studies Center (UG) University of Oregon	45,000	50,000	95,000
Russian and East European Area Center University of Pittsburgh	85,000	94,000	179,000
Middle East Studies Center (UG) Portland State University	55,000	62,000	117,000
East Asian Studies Center Princeton University	90,000	96,000	186,000
Latin American Studies Center (UG) San Diego State University	50,000	58,000	108,000
East Asian Studies Center University of Southern California (with UCLA)	100,000	108,000	208,000
African Language and Area Studies Stanford University	90,000	92,000	182,000

APPENDIX II

Other centers	Grant amounts 1976-77	1977-78	Total
Middle East Studies Center	$ 90,000	$ 100,000	$ 190,000
Center for Latin American Studies	94,000	101,000	195,000
Center for South Asia (UG) University of Texas	58,000	67,000	125,000
Latin American Studies Center Tulane University	82,000	92,000	174,000
Middle East Center University of Utah	86,000	99,000	185,000
Canadian Studies Center (UG) University of Vermont	42,000	47,000	89,000
Soviet Union and East European Studies Center	106,000	113,000	219,000
East Asian Studies Center	115,000	125,000	240,000
South Asian Language and Area Studies Center	85,000	93,000	178,000
Middle East Studies Center University of Washington	88,000	97,000	185,000
Latin American Studies Center (UG) Western Kentucky University	36,113	45,000	81,113
Center for Russian and East European Studies Yale University (with University of Connecticut)	113,120	117,000	230,120
Center for East Asian Studies	110,000	118,000	228,000
Latin American Studies Center Yale University	70,000	79,000	149,000
Total	$7,247,620	$7,900,000	$15,147,620

FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES FELLOWSHIPS

GRADUATE AWARDS

Languages studied	Fiscal year 1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
AFRICA:					
Afenmai	1	-	-	-	-
Afrikaans	1	-	-	-	-
Akan	-	-	1	1	1
Amharic	2	2	6	6	4
Bambara	3	3	1	2	1
Bantu	-	-	-	1	-
Bemba	1	-	-	-	1
Chichewa	-	-	-	1	1
Cinyanja	-	-	-	1	1
Efik	-	-	-	-	2
Etsako	1	-	-	-	-
Fang	1	1	-	-	-
Fula	-	-	-	-	1
Ga	-	-	-	1	-
Hausa	25	18	15	16	17
Igbo (Ibo)	-	1	1	-	1
Kikuyu	-	1	-	2	-
Kipsigis	-	1	2	-	-
Kpelle	-	-	1	-	-
Krio	-	2	2	2	-
LiNgala	3	5	2	5	11
Lobi	-	-	1	-	-
Luganda	2	-	-	-	-
Lukya	-	-	-	-	2
Luo	1	-	-	-	-
Mandingo	6	5	2	2	2
Mende	3	1	-	-	1
Olutsootso	-	-	1	-	-
Shona	-	-	-	3	4
Sierra Leone (Creole)	1	-	-	-	-
Sotho	-	-	1	-	2
Swahili	44	30	22	24	12
Tamachek	-	-	-	1	-
Tswana	-	-	-	2	-
Twi	7	2	5	5	5
Wolof	-	-	2	-	2
Xhosa	2	2	2	2	2
Yoruba	11	11	6	6	3
Zulu	-	-	2	-	2
	115	85	75	83	78

APPENDIX III

Language studied	Fiscal year 1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
EAST ASIA:					
Chinese	181	142	115	116	105
Japanese	121	88	81	75	83
Khalkha-Mongolian	3	1	3	3	2
Korean	10	5	3	4	5
	315	236	202	198	195
LATIN AMERICA:					
Aymara	1	-	2	3	2
Mayan	-	-	1	-	2
Nahuatl	-	-	1	2	1
Portuguese	46	36	26	36	42
Quechua	-	-	4	6	11
Spanish	68	52	20	27	26
Yucatec	-	-	-	-	1
	115	88	54	74	85
MIDDLE EAST:					
Arabic	136	100	106	119	108
Hebrew	2	1	6	2	2
Kurdish	1	-	-	-	-
Persian	17	15	16	22	26
Turkish	20	15	16	17	17
	176	131	144	160	153
SOUTH ASIA:					
Bengali	4	4	7	5	4
Godie	-	-	-	-	1
Gujarati	-	-	-	1	-
Hindi-Urdu	81	72	62	60	63
Kannada	-	-	-	1	-
Malayalam	-	1	-	-	1
Marathi	7	1	1	3	2
Nepali	1	1	1	1	6
Singhalese	1	-	-	-	-
Tibetan	14	11	5	10	10
Tamil	20	8	15	19	11
Telugu	2	1	4	5	4
	130	99	95	105	102

APPENDIX III

Language studied	Fiscal year 1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
SOUTHEAST ASIA:					
Burmese	3	4	3	5	1
Cambodian	4	3	1	-	1
Ilocano	-	1	-	-	-
Indonesian-Malay	36	30	39	52	46
Javanese	-	3	2	4	3
Lao	1	1	-	-	-
Tagalog	5	1	2	1	4
Thai	16	7	12	14	12
Vietnamese	6	3	4	3	6
	71	53	63	79	73
U.S.S.R. AND EASTERN EUROPE:					
Armenian	3	2	4	-	2
Bulgarian	1	3	2	4	2
Czech	8	3	5	9	16
Estonian	-	-	-	-	2
Finnish	-	1	2	3	2
Georgian	1	-	-	-	-
German	-	-	-	1	-
Greek (Modern)	-	-	1	2	1
Hungarian	2	4	3	3	3
Lithuanian	1	-	-	3	-
Polish	10	9	11	21	30
Romanian	2	1	1	1	1
Russian	118	87	90	76	61
Serbo-Croatian	15	11	8	17	16
Slovene	-	-	1	1	1
Ukranian	4	2	2	-	4
Uzbek	1	1	-	2	3
	166	124	130	143	144
WESTERN EUROPE:					
Danish	1	4	-	-	-
Dutch	-	-	-	-	3
Icelandic	-	1	-	-	-
Italian	13	6	-	-	-
Norwegian	3	2	-	-	-
Swedish	5	2	-	-	-
	22	15	0	0	3
TOTAL	1,110	831	763	842	833