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Context to help focus

• If this was a meeting of RR engineers ...

• Global English is the absolutely MOST taught language in the world
  – Like Latin in the first major global era

• US government vs others’ “need” for FL’s
  – 140-170 languages for the US (75 on critical list)
  – 35-40 for Germany
  – See D. Wiley’s tables
State Department

Foreign commercial Service

Defense Department

FBI

Treasury

The Patent Office

And many others …

Table 5-1. Approximations of Critical Language Priorities from Multiple U.S. Government Agencies, 2010

**Highest Priority**
- Arabic
- Chinese (Mandarin)
- Farsi (Persian)
- Hindi
- Korean
- Russian
- Urdu

**Second Priority**
- Bengali (Bangla)
- Chinese (Cantonese)
- Dari (sometimes with Farsi)
- Japanese
- Kazakh
- Kyrgyz/Kirghiz
- Panjabi/ Punjabi
- Turkish

**Third Priority**
- Azeri (Azerbaijani)
- Indonesian
- Swahili
- Uzbek

**Fourth Priority**
- Hausa
- Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian)
- Tagalog
- Thai
- Vietnamese
- Yoruba

**Fifth Priority** Approximately 50 other languages on the list resulting from the U.S. Department of Education consultations with other federal agencies and with members of the Title VI NRC, LRC, and language education communities.

(See notes 24 and 35.)
Context to help focus

Remember why these are the **Most Commonly Taught** in the US university, i.e., Spanish, French, German, Italian

– hark to our West European roots as universities and doctoral institutions

– Liberal ideal of the cultured, educated person and citizen

– Scientific measurement and “advanced proficiency” very recent additions......
Context to help focus

• **why now** for Less and Least commonly taught languages in the university? Federal support?
  – academic interests/research needs
  – Access/travel for students and faculty
  – Immigrant waves – Arabic in Detroit
  – Global “new” powers – China, Brazil, India, Nigeria
  – Security hotspots, threats and wars – Ivory Coast, N. Korea, Iraq
Three perspectives

• REAR VIEW
  – Quick review of federal T6 programs on campus
• 3,000 FEET VIEW
  – Yale’s basic strategy
  – Tales of success and failure
• 10,000 FEET VIEW
  – Markers to help in mapping federal interests with LCTL’s on campus
Rear View: T6’s 2 major goals

• **Reservoir**
  – support capacity of HE to provide expertise in international, area and foreign languages

• **Irrigation system**
  – Provide this expertise for national interests

• **NOT a spigot**
  – demand side weak, bad signals but blame falls on the higher education supply side
Contrast other programs

• Others aim to meet government “need” rather than the broader national interest
• NSEP aka Boren program (Fellowships, Flagships, etc.)
  – Funds LCTL training on campus, overseas
  – Boren fellows have a government work obligation
• Fulbright Language Teaching Assts
  – Diplomatic ties and language training for US campuses
• Pickering, Foreign Affairs, Brown Fellows
  – Direct recruiting for State Dept and Commerce Dept
Rear view: T6 trends

• NRC regional funding over 50 years
  – Consistent proportions, supports reservoir policy
  – Small bump for MidEast post 2001, but reverted

• FLAS top 20 languages over 50 years
  – Chinese, Russian, Arabic are the top 3
  – Includes Spanish at #6 or 7

• Thanks to David Wiley & Robt. Glew (eds)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia³</td>
<td>see S.Asia</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia³</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia³</td>
<td>see S.Asia</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sino-Soviet</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Asia⁴</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia, E. Europe</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Russia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total percentage³      | 100.0     | 100.3     | 100.1     | 100.0     | 100.0     | 100.1     | 99.8      | 100.0     | 100.0     | 99.9      | 100.0     |


² Information for these cycles is for FY 2000 and FY 2006 funding only, not for the full grant cycle.

³ East Asia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia were combined for the 1959–1973 funding periods in the table supplied by Ann I. Schneider.

⁴ Funding for Central Asia was grouped with Russia and Eastern Europe for 1959–1973. In 1997–1999, one Central/Inner Asia Center was funded and is listed under Inner Asia.

⁵ Not all totals sum to 100.0 because of rounding.
Table 4-3. Most Frequently Studied FLAS Languages, 1958–2008 (IRIS 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rear view: enrollment trends

- LCTL enrollments heavily on T6 campuses
  - True in 1995 but mixed pattern in 2006
- In the table on three world regions
  - T6 campus rose for Central Asia (59% to 66%)
  - T6 African fell (46% to 30%)
  - T6 Southeast Asian fell (38% to 30%)
- Total LCTL nearly doubled: 3,928 to 7,113
Table 4-4. Enrollments in African, Southeast Asian, and Central Asian/East European Languages at Title VI and non-Title VI U.S. Colleges and Universities in 1995 (Janes 1998: 168)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Enrollment at Title VI Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment at Non-Title VI Institution</th>
<th>Percent of Students Registered at Title VI Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total African</strong></td>
<td><strong>644</strong></td>
<td><strong>762</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Southeast Asian</strong></td>
<td><strong>773</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,269</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian/Croatian</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Central Asian and East European</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,698</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-5. Enrollments in African, Southeast Asian, and Central Asian/East European Languages at Title VI and non-Title VI Colleges and Universities, 2006 (Higgins 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Enrollment at Title VI</th>
<th>Enrollment at Non-Title VI Institution</th>
<th>Percent of Students Registered at Title VI Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total African</strong></td>
<td><strong>814</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,803</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Southeast Asian</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,264</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,773</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian/Croatian</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Central Asian and East European</strong></td>
<td><strong>303</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,381</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,732</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2006
Rear view: Close up in 2009

• In 2009... 130 NRC’s at 53 research universities
  – Each had 6-10 FLAS (AY and summer)
  – together they taught 135 LCTLs with capacity for another 30+ on demand

• Average NRC grant was $230k/year plus 6-10 FLAS each
  – in a four year cycle <$1M total
  – 8% Overhead compared to typical federal grant rate of 60+%

• Total T6 & FH 14 budget in Dept Educ was $125M
  – The NRC portion was approximately $30 M
  – The NSLI in ‘08 was $86M
3,000 feet: recent competition

• FLAS – advanced proficiency and LCTL’s
• NRC – focus on teaching and curriculum, NOT research
  – teacher training, campus and outreach to K-12
  – Depth of area and FL courses and degrees
  – Course and faculty development is guise for research
  – Assessment with 30% of points for outcomes and impact over career of all, especially FLAS grads
3,000 FEET VIEW: YALE TALES

• The MacMillan Center since 1930s (other names)
  – interdisciplinary faculty innovation in research and teaching (4 MA’s, 8 BA’s, 7 Grad Certificates)
  – Area AND International
  – Languages and library are fundamental to us

• Center for Language Studies since 1998
  – Key partner for curriculum, faculty and projects,

• Lang-Lit departments and Councils for FL
3,000 feet view: basic strategy

• Seed, match, spin-off = institutionalization
  – External used as seed funding for pilots
  – Matching as needed to build up, leverage more
  – Spin-off to university resources...... or die

• Test of the “markets”
  – first, internal with institutional leaders, faculty and student on campus “vote with their feet”
  – second, external with donors and partners
3,000 feet: core curriculum

• African languages – long term success
  – Started with T6 phase-in funds in 1980s and before
  – Taught regularly: Swahili, Yoruba, Zulu
  – Enrollments strong and sustainable in Swahili, Yoruba
  – T6 pressure to do more: Bad fit with Yale expectations

• Good/bad news... embedded but Yale rules

• Institutional interests strong – Afro-Am plus African Studies and growing development/global health faculty
3,000 feet view: core curriculum

- Building and sustaining **NEW** LCTL programs
- Student enrollment (UG) *sine qua non*
- Vectors for start-up, embedding
  - Individual teacher
  - Language program leadership
  - Faculty/grad program interest
  - Plus programming: Overseas, summer, on-campus
3,000 feet: Czech success

- **REES NRC grant**: position in Slavic Lang-Lit Dept, 3 year phase-in, rolling from grant to Yale 100% in year 4, post-grant
- **Enrollments**: built up to average quickly; heavily UG, some Graduate level
- **Teacher**: Entrepreneurial, program builder
- **Leadership**: uninterested but not opposed
- **Faculty/grad**: minimal, built up with Film Studies, Drama
- **Plus programming**: Prague as anchor, language-cum-cinema, built into full-blown film practicum
3,000 feet: Polish failure

• **REES NRC grant**: position in Slavic Lang-Lit Dept, 3 year phase-in, rolling from grant to Yale 100% in year 4, post-grant

• **Enrollments**: limped low-average; tailed off

• **Teacher**: Quiet, ultimately left to pursue a Law degree

• **Leadership**: interested but not much support

• **Faculty/grad**: not linked despite History and SL&L posts

• **Plus**: No real opportunities sought or links to good programs developed; no strong links to Council or library programs
3,000 feet: Polish success

- **Europe NRC grant**: position in Slavic Dept, 4 year phase-in, rolling from grant to Yale 100% in year 5, post-grant
- **Enrollments**: built to avg quickly, students engaged, mostly UG but several Grad/PhD
- **Teacher**: dynamic, entrepreneurial, connected in NYC, Poland and increasingly in New Haven and CT
- **Leadership**: interested, Council supportive, excellent Language Program Director in SL&L
- **Faculty/grad**: strong in History especially, CompLit, SL&L
- **Plus programming**: campus strong, links to Poland too
3,000 feet: Serbian-Croatian failure

- **European NRC grant**: in Slavic Lang-Lit Dept, 3 year phase-in, rolling from grant to Yale 100% in year 4, post-grant
- **Enrollments**: limped low-average; tailed off
- **Teacher**: Researcher, high-powered academic
- **Leadership**: interested but not much support
- **Faculty/grad**: not linked despite History posts, faculty departure made situation more difficult
- **Plus**: One attempt at summer program moderate success, little integration with campus activities, faculty, Council
3,000 feet: extracurricular projects

- **Directed Independent Language Study**
  - Run by Center for Language Study, funds from T6+
  - Language partner, materials, indiv. study plan, OPI test
  - Not for credit, strong faculty support post-eval May 2009

- **Student interest**: strong, appn 2-3/admit 1; UG/G 50%

- **NRC grants** support from all councils + MCMC
  - 2001-04 T6 for Admin and program costs
  - 2005-09 T6 for program costs; Yale for admin costs

- **Future**: shift entirely to University funds???
### 3,000 feet: DILS one term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Nepali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Sign Language</td>
<td>Punjabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic, Egyptian</td>
<td>Quechua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic, Iraqi</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic, Levantine</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Telugu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dari</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efik</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>Uyghur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>Wolof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3,000 feet: other tales

• Nahuatl and distance learning and summer immersion in Mexico
• Professional School LCTL or CTL classes
• Pathways to advance proficiency study
  – 2 year study of 8 languages (Spanish plus LCTLs)
  – Regular Yale classes; Classes plus immersion; x+y+
    extracurricular booster program “FIELDS”
• Consortium efforts... SEASSI and SCALI
• Federal funding for International HE straddles two policy spheres – domestic and foreign affairs
  – National interest vs. national need
  – University resources and responses
  – System-wide resources and responses
10,000 View: T6 in context

Power house to fragile vessel on 4 vectors
- T6 status and focus
- Campus-government nexus
- Intellectual academic trends
- International mobility and access
10,000 view: T6 Centers 1980s

- T6 steady but losing to inflation, FL becomes major focus of competitions; still only game in town
- APSIA builds, taking MA’s,
- gov’t-university nexus breaks down, formalistic, think tanks and consultancy for hire research
- intl student flows and study abroad take off;
- new Centers—LRC’s and CIBER in 88;
- ex-USSR opened major new world to all, not just few area specialists with NATO, EU, etc.
10,000 view: the 90s and LCTL’s

- T6 steady but no growth, shifting focus on LCTL’s and government employment needs;
- Govt accountability focus on outcomes and impact
- NSEP starts with Boren Bill as first major FL fellowship for LCTL’s outside T6; Foundations cancel their area programs to focus on transnational, cross-regional work;
- Globalization is not context sensitive and doesn’t NEED FL’s or only major ones; social sciences shifting back toward policy, real world questions and comparative and trans-national focus with some reliance on FL and context;
- International faculty and student numbers rising along with campus internationalization efforts
10,000 view: post 9/11/2001

- T6 recovery... and loss. Budget up, tighter focus on LCTLs and proficiency and career paths to government;
- religion matters to policy; context and culture matter but regional containers “old” as transnational rises;
- students want to do “good” anywhere and can;
- major new govt programs with campuses but not necessarily area centers... NSEP Flagships, Minerva for research, human terrain systems (DOD and Anthro), CIA’s PISAP;
- soc sciences focus on policy and real world, e.g behavioral economics and psychology, comparativists in plsci
10,000 feet: Higher Ed System

• Higher Educ system in US is diverse, increasingly global and globally competitive
• Much more capacity to do international work across the HE system. And happy to work with government
• Depth, breadth and leadership in T6 campuses?
10,000 feet: measurement matters

• We measure what matters.... Do FL’s matter in Universities? In federal government?
  – GPRA in congress since 1998....
  – NAS report cited T6 on this
  – T6 grantees.... Anecdotal, not systematic outcomes or LT career impact

• NSEP... Boren awards pre and post-tests since early if not beginning, serious fellowship tracking system and “community of fellows” like Fulbright
10,000 feet: prospective....

• Language can be national, transnational, sub-national, cross-national
  -- help re-build the “post-area” and post-T6 world?
  -- comparative advantage on measurement?

• Context priority for FL just as Area-FL links are threatened in “new” federal programs....
  – common cause with new fields, e.g. behavioral econ?
  – transitioning “area” out of old containers into new connections, forming “gateways” to deeper understanding

• Can FL help add rigor, depth to new international programs? Network effects across campuses?
10,000 feet: prospective

• Fragility of interdisciplinary centers
  – Yale and few others are ‘durable’ but without extra lever of T6, more difficult to support LCTL
  – Knowledge networks, links are crucial but how measured? How to advocate? Where?

• Research priority -- analysis of how other programs tap/use T6 reservoir of talent

• Critical language federal rhetoric -- may give breathing room with project funding for LCTL’s
WHEN ONE DOOR CLOSES

ANOTHER OPENS

BUT ..........
...BUT THE HALLWAY CAN BE HELL!
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